



[www.addresshatecrime.eu](http://www.addresshatecrime.eu)

## **"Increasing the capacity of law enforcement authorities to tackle racist crime, hate crime and homophobic crime through experiential learning"**

**JUST/2013/FRAC/AG/6185**

### **Evaluation report**

#### **Change agent seminar – Rotterdam, The Netherlands 9-11 June**

At the conclusion of the change agent seminar, the 7 participants ('change agents') were requested to fill out an evaluation form. The outcome of this evaluation is presented below.

Six participants found the seminar satisfactory, one was less positive, rating this question with a 3. For nearly all participants the seminar was very relevant to their job and all of them appreciated the combination of participants from different target groups and different countries. The seminar generally met the objectives of participants, although it appears that not all objectives were completely clear to all participants in advance. This concerns the development of protocols, which were not finalized during the training and therefore required some additional work from participants afterwards.

Four participants found the (limited) background material helpful, three rated this a 3. The working methods that were used were generally considered valuable. The plenary discussions, group work at country level and at professional level and the group work in mixed groups were all rated a 4 or 5 by six participants. The support material was assessed somewhat less positively. Five participants consider the personal plan they developed during the seminar to be helpful for their work. Developing the protocols was evaluated to be less useful for participants' work with three participants rating this a 4 or 5.

According to the participants, the seminar was well organised, with adequate and comfortable venue and facilities. Six participants were (very) satisfied with the trainers. Five participants were of the opinion that sufficient time had been allotted for the seminar, two rated this a 3.



GENERAL QUESTIONS	PLEASE TICK ✓				
	NOT AT ALL			VERY MUCH	
	1	2	3	4	5
1. Did the seminar meet your objectives?			1	2	4
2. Were the objectives of the seminar clear?			1	4	2
3. Was the seminar relevant to your job?			1		6
4. Was the distributed background material helpful?			3	1	3
5. Did you find the working methods used in the seminar valuable?			1	2	4
6. Did you find the combination of participants from different target groups valuable?				3	4
7. Did you find the combination of participants from four different countries valuable?				2	5
8. Do you think your personal plan will be helpful in your work?			2	2	3
9. Was the development of protocols helpful for your work?		1	3	2	1
10. Are you satisfied with the trainers?			1	2	4
11. Was the time allotted for the seminar sufficient?			2	3	2
12. Was the venue adequate and comfortable?			1	2	4
13. Were the facilities adequate and comfortable?			1		6
14. In total, was the seminar well organized?				1	6
15. In total, was the seminar satisfactory?			1	2	4

Effectiveness of working methods	PLEASE TICK ✓				
	NOT AT ALL			VERY MUCH	
	1	2	3	4	5
a) plenary discussions				3	4
b) group work at country level			1	1	5
c) group work at professional level (transnational)			1		6
d) group work in mixed groups			1	1	5
e) support material			2	3	2

The change agent presentations by Dutch hate crime experts were valued most positively by participants. This was the main reason for Art.1 to decide to develop an inspirational document on the subject of change agents in combating hate crime, as an extra output of the project. The development of the protocols was considered least valuable with only two participants rating this a 4 and three scoring this a 2. Five participants considered the identification of needs at country level to be valuable, and for four participants, the personal plan is a valuable output of the training. The discussion of the good practice manual was valuable to 3 participants.

Value of elements of the seminar	PLEASE TICK ✓				
	NOT AT ALL			VERY MUCH	
	1	2	3	4	5
a) Identifying needs at country level			2	3	2
b) discussion of good practice manual			4	3	
c) developing protocols		3	2	2	
d) personal plan		1	2	3	1
e) change agent presentations			1	3	3

Comments of participants addressed the development of model protocols which, according to a few participants, should have been communicated more clearly beforehand:

*'I think it was not clear enough in advance that our task is to develop and write protocols in a very short time. And even coordinate and draft? I don't think that was carefully planned. The rest was okay, some parts more than that and the experience I will use.'*

*'It would be helpful if it was mentioned that we would compose working groups on model protocols, so we could be more prepared (bring our laptops etc, do some extra reading before the day that we worked on that).'*

*'Prior information on all subjects and goals.'*

One participant remarked: *'I loved it!'*

*"This evaluation report has been produced with the financial support of the Fundamental Rights & Citizenship Programme of the European Union. The contents of this publication are the sole responsibility of the Centre for European Constitutional Law and its partners and can in no way be taken to reflect the views of the European Commission."*

