

Analysis of self-evaluations from partners organizations who attended Hämeenlinna (FI) study visit

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

13 answers have been registered and 4 participants from 4 countries did not send back their form.

May be it's important to remind to FEFI partners that self-evaluations are part of internal agreements and also contract between ZWW and EACEA in Brussels. Self-evaluations are included in WP 5 goals and each organization got 1,5 days in Cat. 1 to execute this task.

I. MEETING FACILITIES	FI	Comments
1. How would you rate the overall organization and concept of the meeting (e.g. presentations, debates, technical supports, visits, ...)	++ + - --	70 % of the answers rated this question at its maximum probably because the question was based on the overall organization and concept of the meeting, You will see later that coming to some very precise points, answers moved quite a bit.
2. How would you rate the logistics of the study visit (accommodation, food, facilities, schedules, space,...) ?	++ + - --	85 % of the answers gave the best marking It's important to notice that, except visits to prison, FEFI participants did not loose time in transports either to go to meeting rooms from the hotel or to restaurants. This was appreciated by FEFI partners.
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?	++ + - --	85 % of FEFI partners declared to be fully satisfied regarding the time spent to receive answers to their questions by hosting organization.
II. PROJECT		
1. To what extent do you feel you have a clear understanding of the project's aims, objectives and activities?	++ + - --	62 % declared to have a clear understanding of the project but the more important thing to consider here is that 23 % do not have a clear understanding of what is expected and 15 % seemed to disconnect from the project. It could be important at the beginning of the next meeting in TR to take time to talk again (and have exchanges) about what is expected. We now are half way of the FEFI project and it's crucial that all partners have a clear and full understanding and support to achieve objectives within this project.

<p>2. On your opinion, are the objectives realizable within the framework of this project?</p>	<p>++ + - --</p>	<p>69 % of the answers (instead of 62 % after Kick-off seminar) think that the objectives are realizable within the framework of this project. In fact, we already imagine this increase in our last analysis and we guess that the rate will grow again after TR study visit as we will focus directly on results from data analysis to decide what do we want to experiment.</p> <p>31 % still expect explanations and that is strongly shown through general comments where FEFI partners wrote that they would have liked much more guidance on how operational these Q's need to be interpreted and read, much more information and interaction on potential results as of now, checking results in regard of other EU reference would be wise and also much more about analysis of Qs and exercices on how to cross data.</p>
<p>3. To what extent did the meeting contribute to the aims and objectives of the project?</p>	<p>++ + - --</p>	<p>54 % fully agree on this question and confirm part of the comment on the previous point while 38 % were expecting more and 8 % did not find totally his expectations.</p> <p>It's important to underline that some partners were very late to upload their Qs (<i>mainly due to summer holidays</i>) and that it was impossible to the WP2 leader to manage with so many Qs (440 Q1 and 134 Q2) in less than 4 days (database was closed on 24th September and meeting started on 29th, FEFI partners flying mainly on 28th).</p>
<p>4. During this seminar, is there a reasonable set of instruments proposed for the process?</p>	<p>++ + - --</p>	<p>58 % of FEFI partners thought that the set of instruments is reasonable while 42 % were nearly satisfied. It's possible to imagine that this last rate is a direct issue of the previous point as the study visit in FI was mainly focusing on the data analysis. Since partners left FI, the WP2 leader sent to them a complete set of graphs and it's now up to these partners to indicate which answers they would like to cross to examine future investigations (January 2015).</p> <p>It's important to notice here that, for the first time, FEFI Project Steering Group met so to explore administrative and financial questions between coordinators and this point was quoted as very good by FEFI national coordinators due to the fact that there are so many participants in FEFI meetings.</p>

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)?	<p>++ + - --</p>	<p>All answers are concentrated in the two higher parts of the quotation (50/50%). In fact during the FI study visit there were not too much time to debate and exchange between partners (this was pointed by different partners in the general points of the self-evaluation and FEFI hosting organizations in the future(TR and IT) have to keep this in mind when they will design their study visit's program).</p>
6. After this meeting, how will you rate the quality of the project so far?	<p>++ + - --</p>	<p>62 % of answers are now concentrated on the top level (++) of quotation (instead of 23 % after kick-off meeting). By crossing this result with the answers on "<i>clear understanding of the project's aims, objectives and activities</i>" we do believe that now the contain is well assimilated even if FEFI partners would have learnt more from the data analysis.</p>
7. To what extent did the meeting stick to the FEFI work plan?	<p>++ + - --</p>	<p>It is interesting to consider that 54 % of the answers are now concentrated on the quotation's first level (++) while 38 % are on the second one (+) and 8 % stayed on the first level of negative points (-). Except this last 8 % which would need a specific "investigation" (was it both times same participant ?), refering to the last analysis after Mainz kick-off seminar [54 % of the answers were on the second level (+) of quotation while 39 % were very satisfied and 7 % mentioned the first level of negative points (-)] the two main scores are now exactly reversed.</p>
8. Does your organization still feel very much involved in this project?	<p>++ + - --</p>	<p>63 % on (++) shows that FEFI organizations feel now more involved (instead of 50 % after kick-off seminar) probably because we passed the WP1 focusing on Qs and are now on WP2 from which they still expect a lot (mainly for the reasons we already explained See Point II.2 and II.3).</p>

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?

++
+
-
--

23 % quoted (++) while 77 % (+) still expect answers.
We see how important is the analysis of Qs to start to consider problems on education for female inmates within FEFI project.
It's important to consider here that time spent to solve questions on FEFI internal agreements and financial points postponed (for some partners) the data collection after summer holidays.

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 ?

++
+
-
--

77 % quoted (+) while 23 % quoted (++).
This result shows a very important improvement from the analysis of post-kick-off seminar [when 77 % quoted (+) but 23 % quoted (-)]. That probably means that FEFI partners even if more involved in FEFI contain through Q1 and Q2 still expect informations from Qs analysis and state of arts's feed back.
Next meeting in Turkey must bring answers from WP2 leader (*Creating procedures for new practices*) after FEFI partners crossed their graphs at national levels, then between national levels at European level.

3. To what extent have you reached a better understanding of the main challenges in the field of education for female inmates ?

++
+
-
--

54 % quoted (++) instead of 23 % after Mainz kick-off
38 % quoted (+) instead of 62 %
8% quoted (-) instead of 15 %
The process is on its way (and increasing of scores really show it but next meeting in TR (January 2015) must focus on the overview of the problematic before to start to create procedures of new practices.

IV. INTERNAL ASPECTS

1. Is the coordination of ON OFF project clear?

++
+
-
--

It's important to observe that 69 % (same score than the previous analysis) are very much satisfied (++) . The second level quoting (+) has improved from 15 % to 23 % so that they now are only 8 % of (-) to do not find answer through the project's coordination.

<p>2. Are the communication system and process of the project adequate?</p>	<p>++ + - --</p>	<p>62 % quoted (+) while 30 % scored (++) and 8 % (-) are the same scores than after Mainz kick-off seminar. In Finland, FEFI partners worked on more tools to communicate such as mailing list, digital leaflet and working platform. An investigation was dispatched on how FEFI partners bring back communication into their organizations so things must improved really when FEFI partners will meet in TR next January 2015.</p>
<p>3. Did the seminar respect the proposed schedule by the hosting organization ?</p>	<p>++ + -</p>	<p>85 % scored (++) but due to further discussions with FEFI partners, the attention of hosting organizations as well as coordinating one is drawn on the fact that time planed for administrative and financial points (in Project Steering group) and for evaluation and quality plan in plenary session cannot suffer from missing time while team building exercices (or intercultural wake up) are preserved.</p>
<p>4. Is there enough commitment from the partners?</p>	<p>++ + - --</p>	<p>In this 2nd analysis, 77 % scored (++) which is significant as it's exactly the double from the previous analysis which scored 38 % scored. It could be considered as input from the team building exercices but in any case we must not forget that 23 % are not totally satisfied. Is it possible to imagine that more time for personal interaction will improve on score and also that participants must try to mix themselves with other countries (so to break through the language barrier) during social period such as meals ?</p>
<p>5. Are partners beginning to feel that they belong to one consortium ?</p>	<p>++ + - --</p>	<p>92 % scored (++) when last time the results were 38 % (++) and 62 % (+). The opportunity to have permanent participants attending FEFI meetings but also to add some future "critical friends" is important and FEFI consortium seems to work that way. The participation of every partner till the end of the study visits is important to preserve the project's spirit. As to participate also to evaluation and quality plan of FEFI project, it could be important to maintain all participants till the of the meeting so to share the whole program.</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?

++

54 % on the higher part of quotation (++).

+

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. If ZWW invited a duly qualified professional in prison education who delivered a lot of figures about female inmates during Mainz kick-off seminar, on the other hand RISE as FI hosting organization did not take the opportunity to associate local actors to our works.

--

We draw the attention for future meetings (TR and IT) as this point is really important for the project's dissemination.

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



Education and Culture DG

Lifelong Learning Programme

Thank you very much

