



Finishing Report of SHP: A European qualification framework for practice and training in animal mediated assistance and therapy 010-1-FR1-LEO04-14357 2

Partners

- Fitram France
- Handhippo Belgium
- Stowarzyszenie Strapate Ranczo Poland
- Slovenska hipoterapeuticka spolocnost Slovakia
- Förderkreis Therapeutisches Reiten e.V. Germany
- SHP-E(NI) Nederlandse Stichting Helpen met Paarden – Equithérapie

Silent (associated) partner

- Fundacja Hipponoterapeutica Poland

The aim of this project was to build a multi-dimensional framework of contents, legal and organizational aspects of quality. Safety and qualification/ criteria for Animal Mediated Activities and Therapy AMAT. Animal Mediated Assistance includes measures for educational, social, therapeutical or rehabilitative activities being carried out by professionals with the help of the animal as subject within the triangular process (the client, the animal and the professional undergo a relation on which the process is based). The involvement of the animal is supposed to be a sort catalyst within the intended process. This framework should be built on data being extracted in all partner organizations and been formulated on basis of these data.

A number of studies suggest the efficiency of AMAT, if properly done according to well defined quality criteria. But because of the lack of an official framework for teaching an practice of AMAT in European countries and means of official quality control we cannot exploit those opportunities efficiently. Furthermore this deficiency disables the upcoming generation of well educated specialists in AMAT to establish themselves as professionals and to enable cooperation between specialists in practice, training and quality control within Europe. On the other side the outcomes of this project could be profit to the financial

deciders and clients themselves making them able to distinguish between the different offers of practice in AMAT.

As examples for big problems is the fact that in AMA different professions are involved who have to undergo the training as an additional training to their basic profession and practice with clients without animals involved. Therefore we have to do with different basic assumptions at the beginning of the training and in practice we have to do with a lot of very different training programs differing from 3 days to three years. There is a broad variety in definition of competencies and methods partially scientifically well justified partially not.

To approach harmonization of practice, training and quality control of AMA we should on the first place work on a diagnostical review of the concrete practices, competences, profiles and trainings in the involved partner countries. (survey and data analysis addressing practitioners in AMAT, organizations for AMAT and trainings-organizations for AMAT) In the second place a summary of the problems issued from the diagnostical review. In the third place we aim was to work out the common issues resulting from the above done activities. So that these issues can be reflected on and analyzed within thematic European groups to go in depth from international standpoint and goals for AMAT and the important qualification and quality, safety criteria and ethical code for professionals working in AMAT.

This should result in a summary of the main factors on which the risks, competencies, practices and training objectives for a framework of quality and qualification- and ethical criteria for practice and teaching in AMAT on European level could be based on. The outcomes of the carried out surveys and the analysis of the state of the art in the partner countries have to be published within the groups of practitioners, training organizations, decision makers and financing organizations aiming on the system of quality standards within the European Union (as those of EASPD –European Association for Service Providers for persons with disabilities- for care) at the end of the project.

We planned to organize a presentation of our results of our surveys and their analysis and recommendations during a meeting of all groups of interest within the European Union such as politicians, financing organizations, medical health, mental health, social and educational services.

So we hoped to also assist mental health organizations by giving them tools to compare different forms and competences in Animal Mediated Assistance (AMAT) in the different European countries.

In this way we hoped to emphasize the necessity of an official European regulation by presenting valid data and facts to prepare the soil for realization of European quality standards for AMAT.

Further we wanted to come to cooperation between the partner organizations giving teachers students the chance to take part in the AMAT educations of the partner organizations in order to learn from each other.

Products of this partnership project by SHP

Comparative internet questionnaire survey on the practice and training of AMAT in the partner countries

Products:

- 1 Questionnaire survey 1 Practitioners and training organizations in the Netherlands
- 2 Report: Analysis of the survey
- 3 Further development of a questionnaire for practitioners and training organizations in the partner countries
- 4 Questionnaire survey 2
- 5 Comparison of quality and qualification criteria between partner organizations

Comparative studies The quality criteria of Dutch practitioners and trainings organization in AMAT

Analysis of the first basic survey done in the Netherlands

The outcomes of our participation in the EU project on AMAT

We organized a national event for practitioners on AMAT and health caring organizations at the SHP trainings center where we presented the outcomes and our conclusions after having taken part in this project

Presentation and discussion of the outcomes of the EU project

We presented our disappointing conclusions and experiences during the EU project on AMAT Our presentation is published in the conference papers of the polish silent partner organisation, Power Point Ulrike Thiel Critical Presentation of the LDV project

Workshop on the practice of AMAT at the SHP education centre

Workshop for all partner organizations and students on the day before the 4th partner meeting. SHP demonstrated the quality and qualification criteria of their education and certification in AMAT in theory and practice. For students and teachers

Education in AMAT and different methods in European countries

Combined with an international meeting of German speaking organizations providing educations in AMAT we organized a one day seminar for partners, students and representatives of the attendants of this conference

The education and training of the therapy horse

Lecture and clinic for the Slovakian colleagues in theory and practice

Comparison of certification systems in AMAT

Together with the Polish silent partner, the organization for Hippotherapy we organized a cross cultural survey which we discussed with practitioners and organizations in Poland

Examinations and competence tests at SHP-E(NL) trainings centre
Partners and students of partner organizations were invited to participate at the examinations of our students in AMAT to discuss the qualification systems used in the partner countries

Symposium on Harmony in the horses training for AMAT
What does it mean for the horse to be ridden with different trainings concepts. For the rider and / or horse-lover and Equitherapist looking for Harmony and Balance in communication and teamwork with the horse. For sport riders and therapists who wanted to improve their tasks and to discuss different trainings forms.

The Equitherapist (SHP) now and in the future.
Different international speakers referred and discussed the needs of international qualification and certification systems in AMAT at the SHP training centre. Open for all partners and students of partner organizations

Participation in the AMAT training of SHP for partners and students
SHP offered participation in one module of the AMAT education of SHP to students and partners with discussion and evaluation after attending the module

Participation of a student in the LDV partnership project on AMAT
One of our students attending the project for the whole time and working on the data collection topic within the project resumes her experiences in this project

Analysis of submission of quality criteria for AMAT of the partner organizations of LDV project on AMAT
Analysis of the submitted quality criteria of some of the partner organizations of the AMAT LDV project

Analysis of the survey on the practice in AMAT in Poland, Slovakia and the Netherlands
Analysis of the submitted data of the partner organizations on the state of the art of practice and training in AMAT

Critical analysis of the LDV Folder on AMAT
SHP was not approving the produced folder because of bad representation of the practices in different countries and a lot of safety problems shown in the pictures. We carried out a survey in the Netherlands to argue evidence based arguments.

What was the added value of the partnership towards a more intensive European cooperation?

With the Polish associated partner and the Slovakian partner we could establish a partner collaboration which will go on over the end of the project itself. With the other partners this was unfortunately not possible.

Please summarize briefly the main aims/objectives of your partnership.

Our aim, as it was also defined for beginning of the project and at the first partner meeting was to explore the situation of quality standards and educations in the field of AMAT in the partner countries by doing a representative survey. Further to compare the quality standards of the partner organizations and their profile of professionals working in the field of AMAT. On this basis we should develop a framework as described in the aims of the project before.

All partners could learn from each other by sending students to activities of the other partners and to take place in open workshops and seminars. Unfortunately during the project the aim suddenly changed from doing evidence based research on which our recommendations should be based in the direction of just doing emotional PR for AMAT not based on facts or research.

Please specify any concrete measures and activities undertaken at partnership level. Please enter the horizontal issues addressed by your partnership.

Key competences offered by our organization:

Research competencies, organisational competences, educational competences, competences in reporting and presenting workshops. Statistical analysis, critical analysis of the ongoing project in order to evaluate. Competence in organizing moderator assisted meetings and task and timing organization. Competence of development and evaluation of an education for Equitherapists in the Netherlands with certification system.

If some of the tasks carried out are different from those planned at application stage, please explain why.

Till the 5th meeting all partners had given or promised their full cooperation to do the planned surveys in order to gather data on which we could base our framework. We did all the promised preparations and development of the surveys and preparations for analysis. We even took over the work of the polish partner who told us, that he was not able to do the translation etc. Suddenly at the 5th meeting the partners France and Belgium made pulled back and refused to spread out the questionnaire for practitioners and also refused to fill in the questionnaires for the partner organizations about their quality criteria and trainings in Amat they provide.

Without this survey we did only have the material of our own first survey but nothing else to build on the planned framework.

Further at that meeting the partners Germany and Poland offered a folder, which was aimed to represent the working situation of all partner organizations in AMAT based only on emotional PR. We found that the folder did not represent at all the situation and quality and safety measures handled by our organization in the Netherlands. Further it showed that the aim of the project changed from presenting results of scientifically responsible surveys to only emotionally based PR for the last planned event- namely a presentation for the politicians in Strasbourg.

At this meeting we also were involved in a workshop, organized by the Belgium partner in collaboration with the French partner organization, which was meant to be a general repetition for the presentation of the work in AMAT of our organizations at the presentation in Strasbourg. This workshop showed in first instance the risks of unprofessional work in AMAT. There happened a serious accident because of very bad organization of the workshop in combination with unprofessional work of the host with untrained and non known horses.

We asked to evaluate the workshop first together, which was refused by the host and the coordinator. Afterwards we sent an evaluation written by a student which was ignored and we were not "allowed" to publish it..

At that meeting we decided to only stay in the project if we should get the relevant data of all partners before march 2012, if our problems with the folder would be taken serious and the folder should be adapted to our comments which we wanted to present by power point.

Furthermore we decided to only take part in the presentation in Strasbourg and the final report if based on the planned survey and data analysis which should be the basis for our framework to develop.

At the end it seemed, that most partner countries and especially the French coordinator had only one aim - namely emotional PR and the production of a folder and a meeting at the European parliament in Strasbourg, but were not at all interested in the collection and comparison of data within the partner countries, as told before.

We missed the exchange of students. We offered a lot of opportunities, and had students with defined tasks in our project. We never saw student from Poland, France, Belgium.

How would you describe the cooperation and communication between the participating organizations involved in your partnership? Were all organizations equally involved?

We assisted the French coordinator in trying to follow the progress systematically by task lists and mailings, evaluation reports, skype conferences sending around all our reports etc. Some partners were very aggressive, were contra productive, because they / as we saw afterwards / had other plans of their own not corresponding with the aim of the project which we decided on all of us at the beginning

In fact we kept to all promised activities such as organizing workshops, inviting students etc and planning meetings etc and in preparing all parts of the surveys, but could not do the complete analysis because partners stopped the cooperation with the survey being interested in emotional PR only.

We never had been threaten in such an impolite and rude way as we were in this project by the French, Belgium and Polish partner. (see the reports of our students handed over to the national Agency and published at our homepage). Especially our students were very shocked

by this way of rude communication because they had experienced something else during the meeting in the Netherlands which they had attended before.

The Polish partner did not attend a lot of meetings and did not take place in a lot of work (eg data collection) They told us that they had less mobilities to spend, but it turned out, that they had the same amount as all other partners. So we even carried out a lot of work for them thinking that they did not have the chance to attend the working meetings. At the second meeting of the working group data collection all partners who attended the meeting where discussing this problem and it was also noted. After this the Polish partner started to be extremely aggressive toward the working group members and especially the coordinator of this group.

What were the main conclusions and consequences of the monitoring and evaluation?

In the planning stage of the project the French organization FITRAM had asked us to do the coordination and data work in this project. Before beginning of the project the stakeholder of SHP visited FITRAM and they together made the project plan and filled in the LDV application form. Afterwards suddenly FITRAM seemed to have changed some of the plans such as formulated in the application form on beforehand without talking with us.. Suddenly there was no appointment that we should be second coordinator of this project. At the first partner meeting our stakeholder talked this planning over with all partner organizations present and everyone agreed that the project should be done as planned originally. The French coordinator turned very unprofessional. They brought in a lot of silent partners in the first meeting from whom we did not hear anything any more later on. There was almost no correct ntulation, no address lists etc.

Some of the persons representing he partner organizations changed as a consequence, that they had big problems with the way the French coordinator was acting. We tried to make the best of the situation and assisted the French coordinator in trying to follow the progress systematically by task lists and Mailings, evaluation reports, skype conferences sending around all our reports etc.

The way of publishing papers we submitted at their homepage did not work very well, Papers, they did not want they "forgot" or made vanish. Submissions we did where published by them on their name etc. (see also students report on www.equitherapie.org) (find the links at: <http://www.equitherapie.org/page/EU-project-SHP-afgesloten>) So for instance the central questionnaire to do the survey was suddenly "gone" and the French made their own interview, which did not cover the goals having been approved by all partners first. We were the only ones who had done the first survey in their own country before the second partner meeting. So we did a lot of efforts to start up a good meeting with assistance of a Moderator in the Netherlands and to organize the Data collection group in order to still make the survey (The central point in this project) possible, for which we already had lost a lot of time.

At the meeting in the Netherlands plans and tasks where developed and all partners agreed to go for the originally agreed project plan. (see notes of the 4th meeting on www.equitherapie.org) <http://www.equitherapie.org/page/EU-project-SHP-afgesloten>. Our organization invested a lot of manpower, work and money in developing and programming

all the questionnaires and presenting them for all partners via our homepage in a convenient way. We organized and developed evaluation forms for the project which we analyzed before the meeting in the Netherlands, but in between the meeting in the Netherlands and the following meeting in Belgium the French coordinator together with the Polish and German and Belgium partner did not fulfill their tasks and finally at the fifth meeting did not bring the survey into practice. Some partners were very aggressive and contra productive because they / as we saw afterwards / had other plans of their own not corresponding with the aim of the project which we decided on all of us at the beginning

In fact we kept to all promised activities such as organizing workshops, inviting students etc and planning meetings etc and in preparing all parts of the surveys, but could not do the complete analysis because partners stopped the cooperation with the survey being interested in emotional PR only.

We were very disappointed about the unprofessional and brutal way of some partners to change the AIM OF THIS PROJECT FROM DOING A SURVEY AND ANALYSE THE STATE OF THE ART OF AMAT IN THE PARTNER COUNTRIES to doing emotional PR on basis of a folder and an event for politicians only. This meant presenting just personal opinions in place of facts based on evidence based data in all partner countries. So they made a folder in which our organization was not represented correctly by the submitted photographs and our practice in AMAT. This folder was very badly done showing no good practice at all. It could damage our reputation if our name was connected with it.

If your outcomes were different to those indicated at application stage, please explain the reasons for these changes.

In a first meeting and the planning all partners wanted one or more identification questionnaires being filled in by all participants and to be spread in the partner countries. We propose to each partner to make the inventory of what he knows about the practices in AMAT in his own country, the training programs and the quality criteria using identical questionnaires to make comparison possible.

The main questions: • "are the practices responding to the needs of the users (clients, organizations)

• "is the training accorded to the needs of the specialists in the different fields of the AMAT and in the different functions needed for an AMAT? • "are the animals adapted to this work and is the practice accorded to animal wellbeing?"

The Netherlands as coordinator of the working group Data Collection offered the submission forms for data, definitions, contacts and literature for this project, we programmed them and did some translations for other partners and made the surveys accessible for all partner organizations via our homepage

Data collection fulfilled the function to (1) support the report of our project with facts, about the practice of and training for AMAT measures in all the partner countries, Further to (2) support our Framework and Code of good practice by important publications and research results on the affectivity of AMAT Finally(3) they organize the collection of important contacts for AMAT organizations. Practitioners and trainings providers, politicians, health organizations, insurance companies and scientists..... and persons and organizations for dissemination of the final results.

For more details see <http://en.equitherapie.org/page/Submission-Foms-for-AMAT-LDV-p>

Link to the submission forms for the survey carried out for this project

- Submission form Contacts in the field of AMAT
- Submission form Literature and scientific research in the field of AMAT
- Submission form: Definitions of Terms and Processes in the field of AMAT
- • national questionnaires survey 2
- Submission form for activities of partner organizations in the field of AMAT online Questionnaires for survey "State of the Art in the partner countries"
- Questionnaire Dutch Version
- Questionnaire German Version
- Questionnaire French Version
- Questionnaire Polish Version
- Questionnaire Slovakian Version
- Questionnaire English version (word) as pdf english basic word version of national questionnaires suvey 2
- Evaluation form LDV project
- Submission form texts for report LDV project

We and the Polish silent partner organization and the Slovakian Partners had started with the second survey based on the outcomes of our first Dutch survey we had carried out before. Everything was ready for all partners to start with the survey, but suddenly, at the 5th partner meeting the named partners decided not to do this work. This meant that we would not have real facts and comparable data from all partners. But without these it was not possible to develop a framework and recommendations. It turned out, that the partners only wanted "nice folders" and what emotional PR and a framework just based on personal opinions of the stakeholders.

We had tried to make participation in our educations possible for students or partners, but most of the partners were not interested. We did not see a student from France or Poland OR Belgium at the workshops and seminars we organized for this project in order to make comparison and discussion of trainings programs and practices possible. One big problem was the produced Folder. It contained not representative information from SHP and just some photographs of unknown people doing something with horses in NL. Further a lot of situations were shown which were absolutely unsafe and not at all representative for professional work in AMAT. At the 5th meeting we asked the partners to change the folder according to the critical points which we had analyzed in a small survey in the Netherlands, BUT THIS WAS REFUSED BY THE PARTNERS.

In case of underachievement, please explain which aims/objectives were not achieved and for what reasons.

After we told the partners, that we were not willing to take place in a finishing show of this project using folder material not representing safe and professional work in AMAT and that we only would attend this final event if based on results of the promised surveys for which we had prepared all the tools and workload they excluded us from all further information and published the folder with our Logo and we did not receive data from other partners than the silent Polish partner, Slovakia and some from Germany.

So we decided to do the analyses of the Dutch surveys on our own and to present the outcomes of the project at an international congress of the silent Polish partner, two events we organized in the Netherlands and to start up some new research projects in order to do the analysis of the gathered data on our own, as the partners were not willing to participate in this work within the project.

We were very disappointed as well about the way most of the partners did not give students the chance to participate in this project. So our students who were very active in this project did only have the chance to talk to some students from some partner organizations not with all of them.

When taking part in the workshop of our Belgium partner, which was very unprofessionally arranged and carried out one partner became unconscious for some minutes when he fell from the horse, our students saw, that our education and quality criteria in AMAT were very high compared to those of our partners. But it was very disappointing for them to see, that partners were not at all willing to learn from each other.

Especially students were treated without respect by especially the French, Belgian partners. See for more details well the report (a students report.... and comparison of workshops.... by our involved students at www.equithérapie.org) (Find the links at <http://www.equithérapie.org/page/EU-project-SHP-afgesloten>)

Further it turned out that the official Polish partner was not at all a professional organization for training in AMAT but just a lady who practiced AMAT without own good qualifications. She did only take part in some meetings and was only interested to make a folder for her own stable and to use the EU Money of this project for her own riding arena. As she gave us wrong informations about the situation in Poland we had done most of the data collection work together with her silent partner, the Polish organization for Hippotherapy and even had translated the Polish questionnaire for them.

The French Coordinator was in the first place interested to present his organization and his silent partners which we had not seen during the whole project any more at an event for politicians at Strasbourg and they wanted to collect money for this from all partners if correctly represented or not. The Belgium partners wanted to travel and to have nice meetings, but refused to do the tasks they had promised to do.

What we missed in this project, but what all partners had promised to do, where:

- To conduct the evidence based state of the art of AMAT in all partner countries
- To collect the quality and Qualification criteria for AMAT of all partner countries in a professional comparable manner
- To collect literature and research on AMAT in a professional way in all partner organizations
- To publish a framework based on facts and not on personal opinions of partners
- To publish representative folder material on the results of our work representing good practice in AMAT and representing the work of all partner organizations.

Most of the partners except the Slovakian, Polish silent partner and the Netherlands were not at all interested in the practice of AMAT and education in their partner countries and in organizing events where students could come into a dialogue.

This was the reason why we finished all activities we promised to do at the extent we could do but did not take part in a publication of PR material which we considered very bad PR

for AMAT as it represented bad practice and very unsafe situations we just want to avoid in making AMAT a respected form of therapy.

Please enter the concrete activities carried out by your organization at local level and during the mobilities.

- First partner meeting Presentation of quality standard criteria and international efforts to get to agreements about qualifications in the field of AMAT and AAA Power Point presentation and short report and working paper offered to the partners
- Working meeting with German Partner preparing survey. Presenting different opportunities to develop efficient and convenient forms of questionnaires for this project
- Information evening for Students and Trainees about the EU project and opportunities how to join the LDV project group of SHP
- Lecture at the AAIZOO organization over the need of international certification systems for AMAT and the started EU project offering exchange and participation and cooperation especially in doing the national surveys.
- Formation and working meeting SHP LDV team, starting up project planning, division of tasks and organisational and communication systems for working together as a team within this project, Starting up a communication and information Homepage system
- Development and presentation of the first national survey Questionnaire for practitioners and training organizations in AMAT
- Analysis of the first results of the Dutch survey to present at the following partner meeting
- Presentation of results of the Dutch survey and proposition for an improved survey for all partner organizations on basis of the results of the first survey in NL
- Teambuilding for the Dutch LDV team and developing tasks and preparing our further activities till the following partner meeting
- International symposium on Equitherapy and the training of the therapy horse at the SHP training centre open for students and partners of the LDV project
- Preparation meeting of the Dutch LDV team for the 5th partner meeting in Slovakia
- 3 presentations at the 3rd partner meeting in Slovakia Presenting the results of Dutch survey offering assistance to the Coordinator for the working groups Data collection definitions and PR
- First meeting group data collection in Belgium with NL as coordinator in Belgium
- Working days with Slovakian colleague to prepare Meeting Data collection and work on the Questionnaires and usage of the SHP homepage to make all data submission forms available for all partners
- Discussing our ways of teaching and practicing AMAT with the Slovakian partner
- Presentation of the Homepage-pages and forms developed for data collection and internal communication and the role of SHP in this project

- Working meeting to coordinate and develop the further necessary submission forms and analysis for data collection in Slovakia
- International workshop seminar for students, partners and colleagues in AMAT from Germany Switzerland and Austria
- Students and staff member of Slovakian partner taking part in the examinations of our AHP AMAT trainings
- Preparing working visit Data collection in Slovakia further development of submission forms for survey 2
- Training course for Slovakian partners and students over training of the therapy horse at a Slovakian stable for therapeutic riding
- Further preparation of data submission forms for data collection for the different countries
- Meeting of working group data collection in Paris presentation of the state of the art of data collection and planning the following steps for the survey 2 in all partner countries
- Visit to the silent partner and the Polish partner in Poland to visit practitioners in AMAT and to prepare the data collection in Poland with the help of the silent Polish partner (associated organization)
- Visiting AMAT practitioners in Poland and discussing training qualifications and good practice
- Workshop for partners and students at the SHP trainings centre in NL
- Workshop open for own students and students of partners and partners Staff SHP stakeholder SHP Trainees SHP, Partners presents: Germany, France, Belgium, Slovakia
- 4th Partner Meeting at the SHP training centre in NL with moderator in order to solve problems in distribution of tasks and coordination of the project
- Working meeting of group data collection and Definitions in Germany
- Working meeting Data collection preparing analysis of survey and last steps for survey 2 in the other partner countries finishing the questionnaires, translation and programming for presentation via the homepage of SHP
- Student from Slovakia taking place in education module of SHP at the HippoCampus training centre of SHP
- Preparing analysis of all surveys and data submission forms in Slovakia making a common article over the differences in trainings systems in Slovakia and the Netherlands
- Test survey in all languages and finishing the Polish translation of the questionnaire for practitioners and organizations
- Presentation of all submission forms for all partners on the homepage of SHP also TO THE PRESS AND LOCAL authorities
- Working meeting Data collection in Bratislava
- 5th partner meeting in Belgium. Preparation of all data collection activities, forms and analysis, preparation of critical analysis of the AMAT folder

- Analysis of the workshop in Belgium according to process and safety aspects and good practice of AMAT
- At the workshop all partners analyses and evaluation only the Dutch LDV team because other partners refused evaluation
- Presentation of the evaluation and experiences of our participation in the LDV project at the international congress of our silent partner organization in Poland
- Choosing and submitting representative photographs of the work in AMAT of SHP with consideration of the safety and process aspects. The collection of 69 photographs meeting the topics asked for by the partners where submitted to the working group PR
- National event at the SHP training centre: Day of the Equitherapy presenting the results of our participation in the AU project and our publication on Equitherapy in German Dutch and English
- regional press, health organizations, Staff SHP, students SHP trainees SHP practitioners SHP, regional politician

Please identify not fully achieved activities and explain the reasons and impact on the overall partnership. If some of the activities carried out are different from those planned at application stage, please explain why.

In contrary to the other partners we had achieved all the data collection activities to almost the full extent. Unfortunately we where not able to do the complete, already prepared analysis and evaluation of all the surveys, because most of the partners did not submit their data. They had not carried out the till December 2012 agreed activities and had just focused on emotional PR and a folder. We have succeeded the analysis of the well received and self collected data in a follow up study here in the Netherlands with some students.

F.3.1. PUPILS/LEARNERS/TRAINEES

What impact did the partnership have on the pupils/learners/trainees?

AREA	RATING
Increased language skills (Pupil-Lang)	High impact (High)
Increased ICT skills (Pupil-ICT)	High impact (High)
Increased social skills (Pupil-Social)	High impact (High)
Increased vocational skills (Pupil-Vocat)	High impact (High)
Increased motivation (Pupil-Motiv)	Very significant impact (VerySig)
Increased self-confidence (Pupil-Self)	Very significant impact (VerySig)
Increased knowledge about partner countries and cultures (Pupil-Culture)	Small impact (Small)
Other (Pupil-Oth)	Not applicable (NotAp)

Our students could mainly compare the situations together with the Slovakian colleagues, There was no contact to Polish Belgian and French students. Our students finished the project with the idea that our education offers a very high standard compared to the educations offered b the other partners. Unfortunately they did not have so much chance to discuss with other students who did not attend our offered international workshops

F.3.2. TEACHERS/STAFF

What impact did the partnership have on the teachers/staff?

AREA	RATING
Increased language skills (Staff-Lang)	High impact (High)
Increased ICT skills (Staff-ICT)	Medium impact (Medium)
Increased motivation (Staff-Motiv)	Very significant impact (VerySig)
Increased training skills (Staff-Train)	High impact (High)
Increased project management skills (Staff-PrjMng)	Very significant impact (VerySig)
Increased knowledge about partner countries and cultures (Staff-Culture)	Medium impact (Medium)
Other (Staff-Oth)	Very significant impact (VerySig)

Our frustration toleration was very much increased in this project. All participating staff members tried again and again to help with organizational, translational, ICT skills etc and stayed motivated despite the growing unfriendly reactions of especially the French but also Polish and German partners

Our staff members and students who had been involved in his project stayed working together very well after this project. One of the students could be taken over as a staff member after finishing her education.

F.3.3. ORGANISATION

What impact did the partnership have on your organisation?

AREA	RATING
Changes to the curriculum/training programme (Home-Curr)	No impact (NoImp)
Changes to organisational arrangements (Home-Org)	Medium impact (Medium)
Increase support of the organisation management (Home-Supp)	Medium impact (Medium)
Changes in language teaching policy (Home-LangPol)	No impact (NoImp)
Increased cooperation among staff (Home-StaffCoop)	Very significant impact (VerySig)
Other (Home-Oth)	Very significant impact (VerySig)

Financially this project almost ruined our (rather small) organization with a low budget and most staff members working for nothing within this project. Our organization played a lot of workload and common expenses in order to operationalise the surveys we had promised to do. We also invested a lot in our homepage programming in order to make the submission forms and questionnaires available for all partners in a convenient form. We also offered the Workshops for free because we were told that each partner would do this. Afterwards we found out, that we were the only ones to pay as much as we did. We wanted to explain our budget to the other partner countries at the 5th meeting in Belgium, and to discuss how to solve the problem that we did all the work but afterwards could not finish the analysis and evaluation of our planned surveys because we missed the data of most partners. We had already spent more than our Mobility budget and all partners had made the appointment, that common activities should be played by all partner. From the moment on we had decided not to take part in the PR event for politicians at Strasbourg because we could not present results and facts at this event - as promised, partners refused to compare the payments all partners had done for project issues and pay as well for the finished common activities we had done already. We also came in problems because we still have to wait for payment of the last EU rates, which we already had invested in the Mobilities and the common cost.

Our curriculum turned out to be the most complete compared to all partner organizations. We offered our skills for organization and monitoring the state of the art of the project to the other partners. Mostly they refused to use the actually very convenient electronic form, questionnaires and evaluation forms

we offered by internet because they told us because most of them where not used to use computers and therefore they refused to fill in computer forms. This even if we offered helpdesks and personal assistance in using these forms.

F.3.4. LOCAL COMMUNITY

What impact did the partnership have on the local community?

AREA	RATING
Increased cooperation with other local organisations (Local-Coop)	Medium impact (Medium)
Increased cooperation with local companies (Local-Comp)	High impact (High)
Increased support and participation of other local actors (Local-Actor)	Not applicable (NotAp)
Other (Local-Oth)	High impact (High)

If other, please specify.

National health organizations attended our information day and via learning about our quality standards in comparison to the partner countries and the results of our evaluation our trainees and staff improved the connections with representatives of those organization

The comments, reports and photo-documentations on our homepage where well attended and we got in contact with interested persons out the field of AMAT.

Other impacts you have noted

We were positively astonished how we succeeded in the workshop, partner meeting and data collection group, we organized, to reach in the first place a good workings sphere, cooperative communication and with as consequence good and clear agreements. IN the time before the 5th meeting everything seemed to work well and organized. We found out, that investing in good preparation, a well instructed moderator and well organized meeting with possibilities to work and real and to discuss in an open manner can be very successful. All our staff members and students learned a lot from this experience. In the fifth meeting a workshop occurred and an accident happened which was due to bad practice unsafe conditions and no appropriate evaluation. At that moments disagreements - which already existed at the beginning of the project but where later on solved came up very intensely. We where not able to solve this in the fifth meeting. From this moment on the agreement of communicating in the English language was gone and small groups of partners where forming. The same moderator who had moderated the 4th meeting in NL was not able any more to bring the partners together. In connection with our topic, good practice in AMAT we experienced that bringing the horse into a process can be very helpful and efficient if done in a proper and safe way. IF one tries to do the same without taking care of safety and other quality criteria the contrary is happening. Our students where aware of this, analyzed and reported this, but the other partners refused the two reports of our students without arguments or communicating with them about it.

Specify dissemination

We invited a regional journalist who wrote an article about the project. Further we published press releases which where published by the regional press several times during the project. We sent mailings with links to our continuous publications on our homepage to our mailing lists.

Could outcomes been used buy others

The very elaborated questionnaires and submission forms we developed could be used in a world wide research project about the state of the art in AMAT (practitioners and training organizations, literature and research) . The reports and analyses we did during the project could be used by other organizations on AMAT worldwide.

F.6.1. MOBILITY PARTICIPATION SUMMARY

Total No. of Pupils/ Learners/Trainees	Out of which Total No. of Pupils/ Learners/Trainees With Special Needs	Total No. of Staff	Out of which Total No. of Staff With Special Needs	Total No. of Accompanying Persons
6	0	21	0	0

G.1. PROBLEMS/OBSTACLES ENCOUNTERED

If applicable, please describe any difficulty you encountered before/during/after the Partnership and how they were solved.

Organisational problems with partner organisations (OrgProbPar)

Late grant/Contract payments (ContPay)

Lacking support within participating organisations (LackSupp)

Some organizations having been named as partners in this form have not started the project or have been at the first meeting, but did not further work on this project. The Spanish not official partner was excluded by voting at the 4th partner meeting because of very unconstructive to destructive behavior in communication towards most of the partners. (see report of the student on www.equithérapie.org) (Find the links at <http://www.equithérapie.org/page/EU-project-SHP-afgesloten>)

Members of our organization should have been part of the PR working group but were systematically obstructed. So the cooperation did not come to a certain level. The PR group without our participation developed a folder to which we could not approve because of lacking of safety measures and not representing the state of the art and good practice in the Netherlands. After the other partners refused to change the folder according to our comments we asked them to publish it without our name and logo named in the folder. Afterwards it turned out that they did not respect this agreement made at the 5th meeting. Now a folder is circulating by web publication and on paper, with our Logo and name on it, which suggests that our way of working is according to the published folder. This fact is damaging our reputation strongly. On the other hand the German partner published an article on the project not naming us as a partner at all well using a lot of our contributions and productions in the project. This problem has not yet been solved.

G.2. COMMENTS AND SUGGESTIONS

Please provide any further comments you might wish to make to the National Agency or the European Commission on the management and implementation of Comenius/Grundtvig/Leonardo da Vinci Partnerships' projects (such as recommendation for future measures, administrative procedures, level of funding, etc.).

After the fifth meeting the communication with the other partners did not exist any more. We tried to contact them, but they did not respond. We did not receive mailings any more but found a lot of our productions on the home pages of other partners and on the official FITRAM LDV homepage. We tried to contact the national agencies of Germany and France about the problems but did not get any reaction. We started the project hoping that we all were functioning under protection of the EU /LDV agencies. But we experienced that our own contributions were not protected and the other partners could do with it whatever they pleased without our permission.



ASSESSMENT of the final report by the NI National Agency

Outcomes have been achieved as planned?

The cooperation between partners, esp. between the NL partner and the French Coordinator was not good, and stopped at a certain moment towards the end of the project.

Therefore the results described in the application could not be reached, because there was no common agreement in this.

Cooperation and participation of partners were efficient?

There were huge problems in cooperation of partners

Evaluation and monitoring activities on the progress and impact of the partnership were carried out:

Partners tried to solve the problems, and made some evaluation and solution for it, but this did not work out.

Activities were in the line with the partnership's objectives?

SHP tried to do all activities as described in the project plan. However because there was no real European cooperation on this, it was difficult. So instead of following the project guidelines, they turned more towards describing the own vision. With some partners they still were working together, so some results are more internationally oriented than others. Especially Slovakia and Poland.

For students it was a great impact, although there was only exchange with one country. For teachers the impact was good, international activities always have a great impact on this group. For the organization the impact was small, because there was no good cooperation with partner organizations. However a lot of time, energy and finances were spent on this project.

It is a clear and large report with annexes and products that can be seen on the own website of SHP

The cooperation within the project became impossible for the SHP. The partners were not capable to solve the problem

The cooperation within the project between the NL partner and (most) of the other partners, as well as with the French coordinator did not turn out well. It became more and more obvious, that a good cooperation was no longer possible or realistic to expect. Finally the cooperation ended.

There was continuously contact with the NL National Agency.

To stop the project was not an option, because a large number of project activities were executed quite well and all mobilities were used.

There is a large final report with products and other annexes. This cannot be seen as a common result of the project, but this shows very clearly that SHP had a great commitment to reach the results.

In spite of the conclusion that cooperation and commonly reached results are absolutely not sufficient, the participation of SHP is judged as "satisfactory" because SHP continuously tried to repair the cooperation between partners.