

Analysis of self-evaluations from partners organizations who attended Izmir (TR) study visit

Be aware that Turkey, as hosting organization, did not participate to this self-evaluation.

16 answers have been registered ; the score is 100% for the 1st time.

| I. MEETING FACILITIES | TR | COMMENTS |
|--|--------------------|--|
| 1. How would you rate the overall organization and concept of the meeting (e.g. presentations, debates, technical supports, visits, ...) | ++ + - -- | 69% of participants rated the overall organization as VERY GOOD 25% rated it as GOOD while 6% was not satisfied <i>Please be kind to take note that this quotation is a measure of an overview on all matters whatever they are</i> |
| 2. How would you rate the logistics of the study visit (accommodation, food, facilities, schedules, space,...) ? | ++ + - -- | When participants had to evaluate the part which only concerns the logistics, then the results were quite different. Only 56% were very satisfied by the logistic points while 38% were satisfied and 6% was not. The main remark that has been pointed was the distance between the airport and the hotel, and from the hotel to Izmir town centre for personal timebreaks ; the problem of language with hotel's staffs not speaking English has also been noticed. <u>68% did not move their evaluation from Question I.1 to Question I.2, while the 6% is not the same one in QI.1 and QI.2</u> |
| 3. To help you to prepare your visit to attend this seminar, did you get from the hosting organization, answers to your enquiries in the previous weeks? | ++ + - -- | Only 12% thought that answers were a little too long to get, the rest -that means 88%- were fully satisfied. |

| II. PROJECT | | |
|--|--------------------|---|
| 1. To what extent do you feel you have a clear understanding of the project's aims, objectives and activities? | ++ + - -- | 15 months after the project started, it's important to notice that only 56% declare to have a clear understanding of what is expected in FEFI, while 6% still does not understand what is expected. |
| 2. On your opinion, are the objectives realizable within the framework of this project? | ++ + - -- | 50% answered NO and 50% too answered YES. If you compare with the previous question where 38% declared to have a SO and SO understanding, that could mean that partners feel they will fulfill their goals while the project's goals are not totally understood ! <i>To make a focus on this specific point could be important because of the national conferences where <u>partners will have to be clear with their presentations and explanations</u> .</i> |
| 3. To what extent did the meeting contribute to the aims and objectives of the project? | ++ + - -- | 62% evaluated this point as VERY GOOD but it's important to observe that <u>some participants found the presentations of experimentations very superficial</u> , and this is a negative point. Very often, partners did not show how their crossed data from the "state of art" (WP1 and 2) have served to decide about experimentations. |
| 4. During this seminar, is there a reasonable set of instruments proposed for the process? | ++ + - -- | The result are 50% (very good), 44% (good), 6% (not good) but may be the question was not totally understood as all partners validate during IZMIR meeting the monthly report to follow up the experimentations. |
| 5. To what extent do you feel your opinions were heard and taken into account when discussing the project's contents (aims, objectives, activities, organization)? | ++ + - -- | 73% think their opinion has been heard and taken into account during exchanges. |

| | | |
|---|------------------------------|--|
| <p>6. After this meeting, how will you rate the quality of the project so far?</p> | <p>++ + - --</p> | <p>63% thought that the quality of the project is GOOD while 37% quoted it as VERY GOOD.</p> <p>Several participants noticed that we did not spend too much time to go deeper in the presentation of every experimentation and that one extra-day would have been necessary. May be the enquiry was not so clear to them!</p> |
| <p>7. To what extent did the meeting stick to the FEFI work plan?</p> | <p>++ + - --</p> | <p>56% thought that the meeting totally stick to the FEFI work plan and this point has to be crossed with the overview that shows that the progress plan is also accurated to the application.</p> |
| <p>8. Does your organization still feel very much involved in this project?</p> | <p>++ + - --</p> | <p>This question is not evaluable because sometimes national coordinators said YES while their participants said NO. We must have separated their answers to make the analysis.</p> |
| <p>III. TOPIC of this Seminar</p> | | |
| <p>1. Did the seminar contribute to your better understanding of goals and results related to education for female inmates within FEFI project?</p> | <p>++ + - --</p> | <p>100% of participants quoted either VERY GOOD (62%) or GOOD (38%). These results focused more on the project's general topic ("umbrella") than the answers to Question II.1 where participants declared that the understanding of goals and aims was not totally clear.</p> |
| <p>2. To what extent did this seminar already help you to have an overview on the strengths and weaknesses in the domain of formal education for female inmates ?</p> | <p>++ + - --</p> | <p>73% of participants thought that the contain of the study visit contributed to show strengths and weaknesses of the project's topic. This remark in fact has been noticed since partners got in FI the feed-back from the Q1 and Q2 data by University of Malta but they did not clearly mention it when choosing their field of experimentation.</p> |
| <p>3. To what extent have you reached a better understanding of the main challenges in the field of education for female inmates ?</p> | <p>++ + - --</p> | <p>Only 56% thought that they have a quite good understanding of the topic's main challenges, but till now they did not receive the crossed analysis; they just had an overview to help them to choice what they would like to experiment, that could be one explanation on the score.</p> |

IV. INTERNAL ASPECTS

| | | |
|---|------------------------------|--|
| <p>1. Is the coordination of ON OFF project clear?</p> | <p>++ + - --</p> | <p>This result has to be moderated as 6 participants (over 16) are from Germany, the country which coordinates the FEFI project. If we do not consider these 6, only 20% thought that the project's coordination is very clear <u>while 80% thought it is not so clear.</u></p> |
| <p>2. Are the communication system and process of the project adequate?</p> | <p>++ + - --</p> | <p>56% quoted VERY GOOD while 31% quoted it GOOD and 13% NOT SO GOOD. It is difficult to analyze what participants wanted to express but it's also possible to observe that speaking about communication system and process, the working platform has not really been used to collect documents and supports, there is not much exchanges of electronic messages between partners,... It looks like if partners are well doing "their job" but separately from others. Could we guess that this aspect will appear in final recommendations? or is it an effect from the project's coordination that was not so good quoted?</p> |
| <p>3. Did the seminar respect the proposed schedule by the hosting organization ?</p> | <p>++ + - --</p> | <p>87% evaluated it as VERY GOOD but this score is normal as the hosting organization always prepare study visits' programs in concertation with the coordinating organization.</p> |
| <p>4. Is there enough commitment from the partners?</p> | <p>++ + - --</p> | <p>69% scored it VERY GOOD and 25% as GOOD, all together the result is 94%.</p> |
| <p>5. Are partners beginning to feel that they belong to one consortium ?</p> | <p>++ + - --</p> | <p>75% scored it as VERY MUCH but it's important to observe that if our consortium focuses on a same topic which is Education for Female Inmates, it does not mean that all partners think to get involved with same goals and same aims.</p> |

6. How would you rate the fact to mix project's partners with policy makers and/or local networks of professionals to attend the study visit and debate together about formal education for female inmates?

++
+
-
--

The answers are not very relevant here because, and it has been the same in FEFI previous meetings, hosting organizations did not use their study visit to invite local guests and policy makers to attend part of meetings, debates. Visit of Izmir prison for female inmates and formal dinner were the mean to meet prosecutors and to discuss with; it was not the places where to work together.

The project this tool refers too has been funded with support from the European Commission.



Education and Culture DG

Lifelong Learning Programme