

Some points of attention before to present the analysis of MAINZ self-evaluations' synthesis

What is a self-evaluation in our context ? This is the next step after a seminar which involve all project partner organizations. It's included in WP 5 goals and each organization received 1,5 days in Cat. 1 to execute this task. In the proposal that was submitted to the Executive Agency it was mentioned that there will be one self-evaluation by partner organization BUT I tried this time to get feed-back from every participant and it shows that we must go that way as, from the same country, we have various opinions. I will justify this change for the interim report.

What are the different types of evaluation in our project ?

1. Evaluation by participants from FEFI partners organizations (except the organization which host the seminar). You already used it to evaluate Mainz kick-off this month.
2. Evaluation by participants who are associated during a seminar by FEFI partners organizations and by the hosting organization. They are so called "GUEST"
3. Evaluation by professionals in one's official capacity (this refers to WP Communication with the document I presented this morning). They are so called "CRITICAL FRIENDS"

It's for all these reasons that I really need that signatures'list with names and digital addresses are fully completed and on a very clear way as I will need to contact participants as GUEST.

What is our way to register your answers and comments ?

When your evaluation is back, it is checked by the assistant. If answers are missing, she gives me the number of the question and I come back to you to get the answer. When the document is duly completed, the assistant registers the evaluation under one figure, in order of arrival and then destroys the message so we cannot check anymore to who it belongs.

Analysis of self-evaluations from partners organizations who attended MAINZ kick-off

I got 13 answers (one organization did not attend Mainz kick-off seminar - one participant from partner organization did not answer - 2 participants left the organization they were working for at that time)

During the presentation of the analysis, if you want to give complementary point of view, please feel free to do so

I. MEETING FACILITIES	DE	Comments
1. How would you rate the overall organization and concept of the meeting (e.g. presentations, debates, technical supports, visits, ...)	++ + - --	All answers are concentrated in the two higher parts of the quotation (50/50%) that means that the overall organization and the concept of the meeting were OK even if, in the extra comments, several participants wrote that "team building exercises" and "intercultural wake up and ending" were not really useful for the type of professionals FEFI mixes and could have been used for other type of discussions.
2. How would you rate the logistics of the study visit (accommodation, food, facilities, schedules, space,...) ?	++ + - --	Nearly all answers are concentrated in the two higher parts of the quotation, except claims about duration of dinners which were really too long and cost to connect with internet at the hotel
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?	++ + - --	11 answers are concentrated in the two higher parts of the quotation (50/50%) 2 participants did not answer to this question. We can imagine that they were not concerned in preparation because they had the national coordinator who was doing it for them
II. PROJECT		
1. To what extent do you feel you have a clear understanding of the project's aims, objectives and activities?	++ + - --	13 answers are concentrated in the two higher parts of the quotation (50/50%) May be participants expected to go through FEFI project during the kick-off meeting
2. On your opinion, are the objectives realizable within the framework of this project?	++ + - --	62 % of answers (8) are on the second level (+) of quotation but we believe that this is due to the fact that it was a kick-off seminar and we did not have yet sufficient elements on FEFI. A lot among us were still at a discovery step. I guess that the answers to this question will be probably totally different after Finland and Turkey meetings when state of the arts and the analysis will be finished and experiments on its way.
3. To what extent did the meeting contribute to the aims and objectives of the project?	++ + - --	13 answers are concentrated in the two higher parts of the quotation (50/50%) The result is connected to the previous point as, if 50% of participants thought that the objectives could be realizable within the framework of this project, it's also mainly because they did not have yet a clear view of what is expected and because they do not know yet what is expected, it's very difficult to be sure that the meeting contribute to the project aims and objectives.

4. During this seminar, is there a reasonable set of instruments proposed for the process?	++ + - --	77% of the answers were concentrated on the second level (+) of quotation. The fact that financing was not clear could have an influence on this question.
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)?	++ + - --	54 % of answers were totally satisfied while 39 % were nearly satisfied and 7 % mentioned the first level of negative points (-). The question of financing came back several times at the end of the evaluation and it is sure that it had influence on the "atmosphere". One participant commented that it could have been useful to clear the question of budget BEFORE the kick-off meeting.
6. After this meeting, how will you rate the quality of the project so far?	++ + - --	77 % of the answers were concentrated on the second level (+) of quotation. This could be analyzed as 2 alternatives (the quality is not so good... but more surely the result means that partner organizations still expect answers after only one meeting)
7. To what extent did the meeting stick to the FEFI work plan?	++ + - --	54 % of the answers are on the second level (+) of quotation while 39 % are very satisfied and 7 % mentioned the first level of negative points (-). This question was connected to the next one. In fact it was linked to the contain of the project and it's very difficult at the 1st meeting to evaluate how we sticked to the project work plan as there were also administrative, technical and financial points to clear. It's for that reason that FEFI innovates with a Project Steering Group to work on these questions and not to pollute the FEFI pedagogical contain.
8. Does your organization still feel very much involved in this project?	++ + - --	All answers are concentrated in the two higher parts of the quotation (50/50%) that sounds good but we also have to notice that several participants (39%) -in Points 1 and 3 from V. Other comments- expected to know more about services/rules/education/probation... provided in prisons by different member states present at the seminar. Could we imagine that, for the next meeting in Turkey(*), organizations will prepare presentations on that point following a common frame and that these informations could become one FEFI result ? It could be presented in Turkey then loaded on the working platform with public access. (*) The analysis of MAINZ self-evaluations was presented in Finland, this explains why we already talked about TR.

III. TOPIC of this Seminar	
1. Did the seminar contribute to your better understanding of goals and results related to education for female inmates within FEFI project?	<p>++ 69 % quoted their answers on the second level (+). It could be important here to remind that MAINZ was a kick-off seminar focusing mainly on partners' presentations and project's tools. It could have been a meeting for FEFI national coordinators but it was also necessary to take time and work on the two questionnaires so we needed specialists. In any case, 100% of the answers are concentrated in the two higher parts of the quotation.</p> <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>++ 77 % quoted (+) while 23 % quoted (-). This result looks quite normal as it was a kick-off seminar. Probably the score will be different next time after Finland and the state of arts's feed back. In parallel, this question crosses also the comments from 39 % of participants who were expecting information on the different practices for female inmates in every country member of FEFI partnership.</p> <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>++ 23 % quoted (++) 62 % (+) + 15 % (-) - This point was already commented by 39 % who were expecting more presentations on the different national systems of approaches including education for female inmates. --</p>
IV. INTERNAL ASPECTS	
1. Is the coordination of ON OFF project clear?	<p>++ It was the first meeting and the number of participants was important. Coordination will improve with the group investment and by the interest in the subject everybody will bring from his/her national practices but it's important to notice that 70% were very much satisfied and that the rest quoted (+) and (-) at 50/50%.</p> <p>+ - --</p>
2. Are the communication system and process of the project adequate?	<p>++ 62 % quoted (+) while 31 % scored (++) and 7 % (-) + In MAINZ, about communication system and process, we only discussed on logo and presented the moodle. In Finland, you just saw some more elements of communication. I propose that we wait next meeting to see if really we miss supports in this task. I visited the moodle MT initiated for MAINZ and I noticed that there are not a lot of information BUT it's up to FEFI partners to make it live. - --</p>

<p>3. Did the seminar respect the proposed schedule by the hosting organization ?</p>	<p>++ + - --</p>	<p>77 % scored (++) and 23 % (+) that means that 100 % scored in the positive part of the quotation. Some remarks have been made (<u>in Point 2 from V. Other comments</u>) about the fact that we passed too much time in semantics during kick-off seminar, probably referring to the preparation of Questionnaires 1 and 2. May be MT could say a little more about this but it's probably necessary that everybody understand the same thing as they will not be the interviewers and that things must be clear to them to collect data and/or to female inmates when they dully completed Q1 alone.</p>
<p>4. Is there enough commitment from the partners?</p>	<p>++ + - --</p>	<p>38 % scored (++) and 62 % scored (+). In fact it looks to be exactly the reflection from the meeting in Mainz. Could we think that linguistic difficulties did not help and also that experiences in EU projects and programmes are not the same from one country to another one (some are experimented while some others are beginners) ? It's probably difficult to get involved at the same level right from the beginning of a new project, also with different cultures.</p>
<p>5. Are partners beginning to feel that they belong to one consortium ?</p>	<p>++ + - --</p>	<p>62 % scored (+) and 38 % (++) . This point will probably be reversed after the first FEFI result (state of arts' analyse) will be produced so that participants will recognize common points which fit their national observations.</p>
<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?</p>	<p>++ + - --</p>	<p>50/50% on the higher part of quotation with a very slight head for (+). This question is directly linked to the local participants who are invited to join our meetings and this point is under the responsibility of the hosting organization. It can move from one meeting to another one. ZWW invited a duly qualified professional in prison education who delivered a lot of figures about female inmates.</p>

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



Thank you very much