



# National Peer Workshops

(TESTING II)

**DATA COLLECTION & ANALYSIS**

Developed by

**INIT**



PROJECT NUMBER — LLP-LDV-TOI-13-AT-0013

## CONTENTS

<b>0.</b>	<b>Introduction and basic data</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>1.</b>	<b>Methods/tools at introduction phase</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>2.</b>	<b>Methods/tools: Stories of Life</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>3.</b>	<b>Methods/tools: Decision-taking</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>4.</b>	<b>Methods/tools: Motivation</b>	<b>8</b>
<b>5.</b>	<b>Methods/tools: Help and support</b>	<b>9</b>
<b>6.</b>	<b>Personal feedback and evaluation</b>	<b>10</b>
<b>7.</b>	<b>Summary</b>	<b>13</b>
<b>8.</b>	<b>Annex: Evaluation form - Testing II</b>	<b>14</b>

## 0. Introduction and basic data

After undergoing the Peer Education Seminar (*Testing I*) from January 16<sup>th</sup> to 17<sup>th</sup> 2015 in Hanover, Germany, the some of the participants offered (together with others) own workshops in their home countries. These *Testing II* workshops were implemented in all partner countries (apart from IT) from during May 2015; as Tab. 1 shows partners from MT, ES and PL worked with two workshop leaders, in AT there were four involved, in DE even 10.

Tab. 1

Country	Organisation	Dates	Number of workshop leaders	Number of Participants	Age profile	Social profile
Malta	Agenzija Zghazagh	15/05/2015 15/05/2015	2	10 7	17-21 15-16	Young people with low academic achievement/last year of compulsory school
Spain	ADESEMA	25/05/2015 25/05/2015	2	11 10	16-24	Young people at risk, NEETs, in disadvantaged conditions and job-seekers
Austria	Lebenshilfe	27/05/2015 28/05/2015	4	9 10	16-21 16-19	Youth at risk, NEET's, learning disabilities, pupils, in the youth coaching program
Poland	Spoleczna Akademia Nauk	08/05/2015 16/05/2015 23/05/2015 30/05/2015	2	8	15-27	Pupils at risk, learning difficulties, social exclusion
Germany	Stephansstift	08/05/2015 29/05/2015	9	9 4 (6)	17-25 14-17	Young people at risk, drop outs, learning disabilities, psychological disabilities in vocational training/ from a special secondary school

The peer leaders represented youth at risk, currently unemployed or apprentices with psychological and learning disabilities and university students, some already with a degree. However, they all had in common that they are not in a safe employment position and/or go through a critical phase in their educational career.

Most of the peer leaders participated in the preparing *Peer Education Seminar* in Hannover but since some of them found a job in the meantime, not all trained peer leaders were available for the workshops.

Those who remained implementing the workshops felt prepared for conducting them (see also the evaluation results of the *Testing I* seminar). Most of the peer leaders ran the workshops together with their partners, who also participated in the seminar in Hannover. Despite some difficulties in certain groups regarding motivation and taking part actively almost all the peer leaders would like to conduct such workshops again, because they enjoyed it and find it useful to help other people in difficult situations.

## 1. Methods/tools at introduction phase

In the evaluation form for *Testing II* all peer leaders were asked which methods and tools they used which were collected, modified or completely new developed by the *My Way* project group. If they felt more confident they also were allowed to apply own methods and tools; this was a test whether to which extent project products were appreciated and accepted by the peer group leaders.

Tab.2

2.1. Introduction:							
Methods/Tools	Not used	Used and it worked out ... (1 = not at all ... 5 = perfectly well)					Comments, feedback, experiences, recommendations for improvements etc.
		1	2	3	4	5	
2.1.1. packing suitcases	9	0	0	1	5	4	• The participants shared basic information about themselves in a non-threatening way.
2.1.2. Speed datig	11	0	0	4	3	1	• The activity was exchanged for "a piece of paper out of a hat" described below, so as to increase the diversity of the questions asked and to improve the participants' ability to formulate different questions that can be asked to a person they have just met.
2.1.3. Move your name	10	0	0	3	3	3	• An activity that effectively boosts the group's energy.
2.1.4. Bring the participants in order	9	0	0	3	4	3	
2.1.5. Chain of associations	9	0	0	2	5	3	• Initial difficulties in articulating free associations.
2.1.6. Zip-zap-zoom	11	0	0	0	0	5	• An activity that effectively boosts the group's energy.
2.1.7. other: introduction round	9	0	0	4	4	2	
2.1.8. other: powerpoint	10	0	0	1	7	1	
2.1.9. other: role plays	10	0	0	1	5	3	

<b>2.1.10. other: filmed interviews</b>	10	0	0	4	3	2	
<b>2.1.11. other: my chair</b>	17	0	0	0	2	0	
<b>2.1.12. other: [no particular name]</b>	16	0	0	0	1	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• All participants write down as many of their positive traits as possible, and then the traits are linked in a chain and read out. The participants seemed proud of their strong points, and they said this made the group feel united.</li> </ul>
<b>2.1.13. other: [no particular name]</b>	17	0	0	0	2	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The participants wrote down a series of questions you can ask a person you have just met. The pieces of paper with questions were then put into a hat and each of the participants drew a question they had to answer.</li> </ul>

Generally, it was possible to observe that all six methods and tools provided were applied by the work shop leaders (which was not obligatory at all). Additionally, seven other methods and tools were used, most of them for rather short interventions or in combination with those methods and tools provided by the project group.

From the first six methods and tool provided by the project group the peer group leaders gave following overall evaluation: *Packing suitcase* was applied by 10 peer group leaders which gave an overall score of 43 points, all together this makes an overall evaluation of 4.30; *Speed dating* (8/29) received an overall score of 3.63, *Move your name* (9/36) and *Bring the participants in order* (10/40) gained both an overall score of 4.00. The best score of all was 4.63 given for the *Chain of associations*.

According to the evaluation of the introduction methods and instruments it can be said all of them have been tested and all of them were appreciated by the peer group leaders. However, there was also a wide range of other methods and tools used in different countries - there is nothing wrong with that much more this proves that methods and instruments of the *My Way* project can be linked to local/national learning traditions, methods and tools.

## 2.Methods/tools: Stories of Life

Tab.3

2.2. Stories of Life							Comments, feedback, experiences, recommendations for improvements etc.
Methods/Tools	Not used	Used and it worked out ... (1 = not at all ... 5 = perfectly well)					
		1	2	3	4	5	
2.2.1. Life river	9	0	0	1	3	6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A very intensive activity during which the participants shared their experiences. They had positive feelings, as they knew that all people, no matter how well they cope with professional issues, feel frustrated, experience difficulties, and have to deal with problems related to education and professional career.</li> </ul>
2.2.2. Talk show	12	0	0	3	4	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Some of the participants had difficulties in formulating answers to questions.</li> <li>Lower energy and involvement of the group during this activity.</li> </ul>
2.2.3. Time-line of educational career (incl. future plans)	9	0	0	3	1	6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The activity was enriched by drawing a past success in order to make the participants aware of resources allowing them to be successful – the participants noted that this increased their confidence in achieving their goals in the future. The life line helped to present changes taking place – temporary difficulties after which the quality of life improves.</li> </ul>
2.2.4. other: telling of life-path	11	0	0	3	3	2	

The package of *telling life stories* was very intensively discussed by peer group leaders as well as by the participants. It surely was one of the most emotional parts of the workshops therefore sensitively operating methods and instruments were highly asked. The quantitative as well as the qualitative feedback of the peer group leaders was generally positive however they admitted that this was a rather tricky part to go through. Nevertheless, all of the project's methods and tools were tested: *Life river* was tested by 10 peer group leaders; their scoring (1 x 3.00, 3 x 4.00, 6 x 5.00) added up to an overall result of 45 points; divided by 10 peer group leaders who gave their feedback the overall score for this method was 4.5; *Talk show* as tested by seven persons leading to an overall average of 3.57; last but not least *Time-line on educational career (incl. future plans)* was evaluated by 9 peer group leaders with an overall score of 4.30; one other method was also implemented but its evaluation is not of relevance at this stage.

The evaluation shows that all features of the *My Way* project dealing with *Stories of Life* were tested and the result was very positively; this is the result not only from the statistic evaluation but also from the written feedbacks.

### 3.Methods/tools: Decicion-taking

Tab.4

2.3. Importance of Decision-taking							Comments, feedback, exerpientes, recommendations for improvements etc.
Methods/Tools	Not used	Used and it worked out ... (1 = not at all ... 5 = perfectly well)					
		1	2	3	4	5	
<b>2.3.1. Power point presentation</b>	16	0	0	1	2	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Isolated comments from the group concerning the photos presenting fortunately employed and unfortunately unemployed people.</li> </ul>
<b>2.3.2. Open class talks</b>	9	0	0	2	3	5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The students individually wrote down few ideas. Thus, the form of the activity was modified – the students were divided into two groups. The task of one of them was to come up with a list of advantages and disadvantages of having a job, while the other was supposed to focus on unemployment. The activity was modified in order to increase the participants' motivation to look for a job (in the case of advantages and disadvantages of unemployment), but also to increase their awareness of conscious and unconscious factors that stop people from looking for a job.</li> </ul>
<b>2.3.3. other: small group talks</b>	14	0	0	0	1	4	
<b>2.3.4. other: Questionnaire of Vocational Preferences for Youth</b>	17	0	0	0	0	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The group was really satisfied with filling in the Questionnaire of Vocational Preferences for Youth and getting to know or realizing more deeply their preferences related to their vocational personality. They started a discussion on the influence of knowledge of oneself on taking important decisions and how choosing the right career and the place of work depending on their preferences and needs can protect them from unemployment or occupational burnout after they have found a job.</li> </ul>

Concerning *Decision-taking*, the project only provided two methods; *the Power point presentation* was used by only three peer group leaders and reached an overall score of 3.67. The *Open class talks* were applied ten times and reached a total of 4.30. There were two more methods applied which were not provided by the partnership.

In general it seems not to be possible to give a clear feedback concerning the quality of the features provided by this project. Actually, there is only one method which was used by an appropriate number of peer group leaders however its evaluation result was very positive. However, perhaps more features were able to be developed after the project's lifetime for giving an offer to select from.

## 4. Methods/tools: Motivation

Tab.5

2.4. Motivation							Comments, feedback, experiences, recommendations for improvements etc.
Methods/Tools	Not used	Used and it worked out ... (1 = not at all ... 5 = perfectly well)					
		1	2	3	4	5	
2.4.1. Activity & evaluation	11	0	0	2	4	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>An activity boosting the group's energy and involvement. It was clearly easier for the participants to enact pleasant activities (in most cases related to their interests) than activities they didn't like.</li> </ul>
2.4.2. Game of clapping hands	12	0	0	4	1	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The participants were eager to take part in the activity, however, some of them didn't feel that clapping their hands was rewarding, and they felt embarrassed. Occasional difficulties with guessing activities to be performed.</li> </ul>
2.4.3. Try out of motivation engines	13	0	0	2	2	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Initially, the participants had difficulties with coming up with activities they didn't like, which could be performed in class.</li> <li>There was a proposal to enact activities in a form of charades. The rest of the group clapped their hands as instructed.</li> </ul>
2.4.4. Try outs on the spot	19	0	0	0	0	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>There was no time to carry out this activity.</li> </ul>
2.4.5. other: cards	15	0	0	0	0	4	
2.4.6. other: put yourself on the line	17	0	1	1	0	0	
2.4.7. other: ways of motivation	17	0	0	0	2	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The group's task was to divide pieces of paper with types of behaviour/strategies (e.g. success visualisation) into the ones that increase or decrease motivation. This initiated a discussion on some of the strategies. The activity made the group reflect on some issues, however, it lowered the group's energy level.</li> </ul>

Concerning *Motivation* four methods and instruments were given by the project, however lacking of time one, *Try out the spots*, was not tested by anyone. *Activity and evaluation* was implemented by eight peer group leaders with an overall score of 4.00, the same score was achieved for *Try out of motivation engine* (tested by six peer group leaders); the *Game of clapping hands* was implemented by 7 persons leading to an overall results of 3.71. According to the quantitative evaluation, all features were positively tested however from the written feedback it seems that it was not always easy to apply them! According to general experience when working with learner groups, increasing motivation artificially (= by applying methods or instruments) is extremely difficult – mostly one is in threat of reaching the exact opposite reaction. Therefore, special attention needs to be put on this issue when working with features which were supposed to raise information.

## 5.Methods/Tools: Help and support

Tab.6

2.5. Help and support							
Methods/Tools	Not used	Used and it worked out ... (1 = not at all ... 5 = perfectly well)					Comments, feedback, experiences, recommendations for improvements etc.
		1	2	3	4	5	
<b>2.5.1. Informational class talk</b>	6	0	0	0	9	4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The group listened to stories presenting the experiences of leaders in connection with receiving support in case of educational problems. One of the comments from the participants concerned a positive surprise at the fact that leaders also experienced learning difficulties or had doubts related to their professional career.</li> </ul>
<b>2.5.2. Quiz about establishment</b>	14	0	0	2	2	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Apart from the person being a patient of an addiction treatment centre, the participants didn't know any centres providing support.</li> </ul>
<b>2.5.3. Self-aquisition of information (group work &amp; presentation)</b>	11	0	0	2	4	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Due to lack of time to carry out the whole activity, the group, instead of looking for information on their own, received a list of Łódź centres offering psychological support and career consultancy.</li> </ul>
<b>2.5.4. other: brainstorming</b>	17	0	0	0	1	1	
<b>2.5.5. other: Advantages and disadvantages of asking for help</b>	17	0	0	0	0	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The group analysed different aspects of asking for help. Most of them mentioned their fears related to negative responses of people asked for help (humiliation, contempt) in case those asking for help fail to fulfil their goals and plans. Experiences of the person fighting addiction, who shared their thoughts on this issue, turned out to be valuable.</li> </ul>

From the *Help and Support* module three methods and instruments were tested: *Informational class talks* was tested by 13 peer group leaders and reached an overall score of 4.31; five of the leaders implemented the *Quiz about establishment* which was evaluated with 3.80; last but not least *Self-acquisition of information (group work and presentation)* was tested by seven peer group leaders with an overall result of 3.86. Additionally, another two methods and instruments were tested. All tests led to positive results.

## 6. Personal feedback and evaluation

3. Personal feedback and evaluation						
Issues	1 = very poor/little 5 = perfectly well/much					Comments, feedback, experiences, recommendations for improvements etc.
	1	2	3	4	5	
3.1. How did you feel during leading the workshop?	0	0	3	12	4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>As a moderator I felt at ease and I had the impression that the group accepted me as a leader and the workshop moderator, without any sense of distance between me and the group.</li> </ul>
3.2. Did the content of the workshop fit to the participants needs and interests?	0	0	6	6	7	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Relevant to their needs but motivation was poor</li> <li>When initially asked what they expected from the workshops, the participants gave very general answers that they wanted to spend some time with the group, experience something new, and learn something about themselves. As these needs weren't very specific, the activities satisfied them – the participants declared that they liked the workshops which suited their needs.</li> </ul>
3.3. Did you reach the participants and was it able to gain learning/thinking reactions	0	0	6	7	6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>I think that the activities made the participants reflect on some issues, particularly in relation to the story of their life, their successes, as well as methods connected with looking for motivation. In most discussions everyone expressed their opinions and shared their experiences, although in the case of activities during which sharing their stories involved the difficulties experienced some participants were not as willing to discuss them with others.</li> </ul>
3.4. How did the participant cooperate during the workshop?	0	0	0	12	7	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The group cooperated well. They were most willing to act during activities that boosted their energy, such as Zip-Zap-Zoom, a chain of skills, the clapping activity, and they were least willing to act during more static activities requiring a group discussion, listening to others and reflection – an open discussion on taking decisions or a PowerPoint presentation.</li> </ul>
3.5. Did the workshop also make some fun for the whole group?	0	0	4	6	9	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Yes, during most of the integration activities the participants were active and gave non-verbal signals that they were satisfied.</li> </ul>

After they finished with implementing their workshops peer group leaders were asked whether or not they were satisfied with their performance and whether or not they still feel their own training was of some use of them.

The peer group leaders basically *felt well* after they finished with their workshops, which they expressed by an overall score of 4.00 and positive written feedback. The *content of the workshop* was also *aiming at the participant's needs and demands* which an overall score of 4.05 proves. The peer group leader thought they were able to *reach participants* as well as they also *gained learning reaction*; the overall score for this question was 4.00. The highest score of 4.37 was given for the *quality of cooperation with participants during the training*. Last but not least, peer group leaders also confirmed that it *was fun to implement this training*. Also the written comments give clear positive feedback!

3.6. Please be so kind to give below some general feedback concerning your experiences gained during the workshop? What were the most positive outcomes? Where is space for improvement? What did not work out at all? (please type electronically)	
 <p>(very positive; worked out well)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Managed to speak freely [in front of a group] ;-)</li> <li>• Everything was great (3x)</li> <li>• Everybody was highly motivated and participated all activities</li> <li>• Role plays and life stories worked really well</li> <li>• I liked the food we got</li> <li>• Support which one gets</li> <li>• At the end of the workshops the participants looked better than at the beginning</li> <li>• I think these workshops were a great source of information to the participants.</li> <li>• It was an opportunity to know new perspective and people</li> <li>• Managed to cover all activities planned</li> <li>• Engagement and positive feedback</li> <li>• Received respect</li> <li>• Young people's efforts in identifying youth services</li> <li>• I think that the workshops were very successful.</li> <li>• Integration activities were well chosen – the participants felt safe and at ease with each other.</li> <li>• During activities related to life stories, the participants responded best to the encouragement to recall positive experiences, i.e. successes, and to reflect on resources they could use in the future to achieve further successes. They were less willing to share their experiences related to learning or vocational difficulties.</li> <li>• The workshop curriculum was enriched by the Questionnaire of Vocational Preferences for Youth, as it was concluded that self-awareness in this respect increases chances to find a satisfying job. In the end, some of the participants declared that they would remember this part the most and that it was a valuable experience.</li> </ul>
 <p>(was ok but still space for improvement)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Sometimes I missed out thing because I had to care for the group</li> <li>• The number of the participants. I think it would be better to do workshops with 6 or less participant, because it is more probably to get to know better the participants and to make a bond between the peer leader and participants</li> <li>• Breaks during workshops seminars.</li> <li>• I think we should give the participants, not only motivation but resources to help them to go out from social exclusion.</li> <li>• We need to know more about the austrian coaching model</li> <li>• Maintaining young people's interest for work</li> <li>• Participation and engagement at group discussions</li> </ul>
 <p>(did not work out properly)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Taking the video</li> <li>• The time and the number of sessions of the workshops . I think the time wasn't enough to develop properly all the points of the workshops.</li> <li>• I think we should better define what we consider young at risk of social exclusion to take common conclusions.</li> <li>• Cooperation and concentration</li> </ul>

The work group leaders give a lot of written feedback concerning what they thought worked *well*, *fair* and *not all*. It gets evident that more comments report positive issues than negatives. When looking in detail peer group leaders appreciated most of all that they learnt a lot for themselves and that they personally developed; they were able to fulfil their tasks and reached their aims; they felt well when helping others and they also received positive feedback and respect caused by their performance- one participant even liked the food!

Of course, there is also space of improvement: The two most important issues are perhaps to set up appropriate learning groups in quality and quantity, meaning participants should fit together in their learning traditions, social frameworks and behaviour; it is also recommended to have a maximum of six participants in one group.

3.7. Was there anything missing at the peer education seminar in Hannover which would have been helpful for you to prepare better for leading the workshops?			
9 no	1 yes please indicate briefly:		
3.8. Would you like to do such workshops again in future?			
1 definitely no	1 probalby no	8 probalby yes	6 definitely yes
Please eplain your desition briefly:			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Because it was fun (4x)</li> <li>• Because we want to continue to help others</li> <li>• I find it good to work with other youngsters and to explain them the advanctages of working</li> <li>• No, because in future I want to focus on my education</li> <li>• I think these kind of workshops are quite useful to the people target and for peer leeders .These workshops bring opportunities and new experiences.But I think before implement workshops it would be interesting to delimitate more the target of participants and their needs .</li> <li>• To gain experience and identify better the needs of young people</li> <li>• As a young person with psychological education I'd like to conduct workshops that support the development of social competencies, to help people in their everyday lives, to strengthen motivation to introduce changes, and to increase chances of the general wellbeing of young people.</li> </ul>			

Peer group leaders did also confirm that the *Peer Education Seminar* in Hannover prepared them well for their work as workshop leaders; only one person said that something missed during this training - unfortunately, he or she did not say what this was.

16 of the peer group leaders answered to the question if they would like to do such a seminar again in future: 6 (37.5%) of them were *definitely* willing to do such a workshop again, 8 (50%) of them said they were *likely* to do so; 2 (6.25%) of them said they *won't do* it or at least *not very likely*; both of them gave as reason that they have no time anymore since they want to focus on their further career or education.

To this very positive result also the written feedbacks of the participants fit. Again, they underline the usefulness of such seminars, their willingness to help others, the fun-level of the training and experience made and their personal development on several levels.

## 7. Summary

*Testing II* was implemented as foreseen in the application. The only variance was caused by the fact that not all of the participants of *Testing I* were able to participate at *Testing II* - in the time between the two sessions some of them found jobs and were therefore not available. However, the partnership provided appropriate substitution. With 19 peer group leaders there were even more persons tested as originally planned.

According to the feedback forms all methods and instruments provided by the *My Way* partnership were applied and tested. None of the individual results was lower than 3.00, most of them were 4.00 or 5.00. Accordingly, also all average scores were well above the statistic mean of 3.00. As it seems, in *Testing I* participants were provided with appropriate knowledge, skills, methods and instruments to implement *Testing II* successfully.

This seems also to be the result of the qualitative self-reflection of the participants; generally, they underlined the positive effects of both, *Training I* and *Training II*, on their personal experience and development; apart from that both training sessions were also fun to them.

The vast majority of participants assured they will definitely or at least very likely repeat such seminars in future.

There were only a few critical remarks concerning the set-up of *Training II*, one was concerning the size, the other one concerning the homogeneity of the workshop group: it was recommended that the workshop groups should not have more than six participants and that they should fit together in terms of educational level, social background and age. Another important feedback was that future workshops should be provided with appropriate time so there is no hurry during the working sessions.

However, if these recommendations are decently considered, both training sessions of the *My Way* project should work properly and lead to valuable and sustainable results.

## 8. Annex: Evaluation form - Testing II



# National Peer Workshops

## (TESTING II)

**Feedback and Evaluation Form for Peer Leaders**

Developed by

INIT



PROJECT NUMBER — LLP-LDV-TOI-13-AT-0013

Workshop number:

0. Profile of peer leader:	
0.1. Name	
0.2. Gender	<input type="checkbox"/> male <input type="checkbox"/> female <input type="checkbox"/> NA
0.3. Age	___ years
0.4. Others:	

1. Basic data to workshop implementation					
1.1. Country of implementation:	<input type="checkbox"/> AT <input type="checkbox"/> DE <input type="checkbox"/> ES <input type="checkbox"/> MT <input type="checkbox"/> PL				
1.2. Location / venues					
1.3. Date:	2015/MM/DD	1.4a Start:	HH:MM hours	1.4b Start:	HH:MM hours
1.5. Number of participants:					
1.6. Age profile of participants:	From ___ years to ___ years				
1.7. Please describe briefly the social profile of the participants: (e.g. young people at risk, NEETs, job-seekers etc.)					

2. Which of the following methods and tools did you use and how did they work out?							
Methods/Tools	Not used	Used and it worked out ... (1 = not at all ... 5 = perfectly well)					Comments, feedback, experiences, recommendations for improvements etc.
		1	2	3	4	5	
2.1. Introduction:							
2.1.1. Kofferpacken	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
2.1.2. Speed dating	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
2.1.3. Move your name	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
2.1.4. Bring the participants in order	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
2.1.5. Chain of associations	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
2.1.6. Zip-zap-zoom	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
2.1.7. other: _____	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
2.1.8. other: _____	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	

Methods/Tools	Not used	Used and it worked out ... (1 = not at all ... 5 = perfectly well)					Comments, feedback, experiences, recommendations for improvements etc.
		1	2	3	4	5	
<b>2.2. Stories of Life</b>							
2.2.1. Life river	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
2.2.2. Talk show	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
2.2.3. Time-line of educational career (incl. future plans)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
2.2.4. other: _____	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
<b>2.3. Importance of Decision-making</b>							
2.3.1. Power point presentation	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
2.3.2. Open class talks	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
2.3.3. other: _____	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
<b>2.4. Motivation</b>							
2.4.1. Activity & evaluation	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
2.4.2. Game of clapping hands	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
2.4.3. Try outs of motivation engines	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
2.4.4. Try outs on the spot	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
2.4.5. other: _____	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
<b>2.5. Help and support</b>							
2.5.1. Informational class talk	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
2.5.2. Quiz about establishment	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
2.5.3. Self-aquisition of information (group work & presentation)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
2.5.4. other: _____	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	

3. Personal feedback and evaluation						
Issues	1 = very poor/little 5 = perfectly well/much					Comments, feedback, experiences, recommendations for improvements etc.
	1	2	3	4	5	
3.1. How did you feel during leading the workshop?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
3.2. Did the content of the workshop fit to the participants needs and interests?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
3.3. Did you reach the participants and was it able to gain learning/thinking reactions	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
3.4. How did the participant cooperate during the workshop?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
3.5. Did the workshop also make some fun for the whole group?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
3.6. Please be so kind to give below some general feedback concerning your experiences gained during the workshop? What were the most positive outcomes? Where is space for improvement? What did not work out at all? (please type electronically)						
 (very positive; worked out well)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•</li> <li>•</li> <li>•</li> </ul>					
 (was ok but still space for improvement)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•</li> <li>•</li> <li>•</li> </ul>					
 (did not work out properly)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•</li> <li>•</li> <li>•</li> </ul>					
3.7. Was there anything missing at the peer education seminar in Hannover which would have been helpful for you to prepare better for leading the workshops?						
<input type="checkbox"/> no <input type="checkbox"/> yes please indicate briefly:						
3.8. Would you like to do such workshops again in future?						
<input type="checkbox"/> definitely no <input type="checkbox"/> probalby no <input type="checkbox"/> probalby yes <input type="checkbox"/> definitely yes						
Please eplain your desition briefly:						

Thank you very much for your support!