Program for meeting of thematic group Data collecting

Belgium 28.8.2011

Participants:

- 1. Ulrike Thiel (The Netherlands coordinator)
- 2. Fabienne Schoonheyd (Belgium host)
- 3. Marie-Therese Kuypers (Belgium)
- 4. Michaela Drobna (Slovakia)
- 5. Stephanie Papendieck (Germany)
- 6. Margueriet Weith (France) Not present
- 7. Stana Tilsova (Poland) Not present
 - Tine Embrechts (The Netherlands student)
 - Agnes de Groot (The Netherlands- assistant member)
 - Tessa Wester (The Netherlands student) (notes)

Papers submitted to the participants

- Program
- Criteria for questionnaire (accorded by all partners at the 1st meeting)
- Table to compare AMAT measures and trainings for AMAT (submitted by Ulrike at the 1st meeting was the basis for criteria for questionnaire)
- Introduction to Questionnaire made by Stephanie and Ulrike
- English translation of the questionnaire (NL Germany)
- Overview communication system for this working group

Welcome to the partners by Ulrike Thiel

- What is the aim of this group according to the project targets?
- What Ulrike and Michaela have done to prepare this meeting.
- What we have to do in future to reach our goals?
- Points in LDV project, which have to be followed and are connected to our thematic group.

Standpoint of each partner:

What do you think:

- What is the goal of this group, what do you expect?
- What does your organization expect for itself from this project?
- What do you want and can offer for yourself and your organization?

Questionnaire and survey for the state of the art of AMAT in the partner countries

What we decided to do and what we have done and what we still have to do.

- Points and decisions discussed and accept on the 1st meeting in September in France about items needed in questionnaire.
- Excell with standpoints of each partner discussed on skype about features of questionnaire.
- Mail documentation of discussion about questionnaire.
- `Lost` and `found` Dutch-German proposal

Internet survey, literature and science collection

- Communication structure and facilities proposal, inclusive reporting
- > Dissemination, network and addresses
- Connection with two other thematic groups
- Proposal worked out by group for time schedule and task sharing (action-list)
- Information flow and communication of the group with coordinator considering the notes sent by Marguerite 24th of August znd needs of the group
- > Position of Spanish participant and data in this group

Welcome to the partners by Ulrike Thiel

- What is the aim of this group according to the project targets?
- What Ulrike and Michaela have done to prepare this meeting.
- What we have to do in future to reach our goals?
- Points in LDV project, which have to be followed and are connected to our thematic group.

Thanks to everybody who could make it, even at the last moment. The Dutch coordinator brought with her two assisting students and a member of the working group Definitions, Agnes de Groot, because she could be introduced to her coordinator of this working group, Stephanie.. Further Agnes, as from polish origin , offered her help to assist Stana in this group with data collection (Questionnaire, Internet Research and translations) .

A lot had to be done to prepare this meeting. Ivana (Slovakia) has spent three days with Ulrike in order to clear up the situation with questionnaire survey, look at the data etc. NL had already prepared an SPSS file in English for all the data (variables and labels) to be inserted but we found out, that unfortunately we need a second round of survey because at the moment only the information collected by Gemany and the Netherlands is directly comparable and possible to be analysed further. Ivana gives an explanation of problems and Ulrike and Ivana will make a proposal to solve this problem later on.

Further they have worked out some proposals for a timetable, how to do tasksharing, and a proposal for a efficient communication structure for this group to be discussed further with partners in this group. But first we wanted to get an idea of the standpoint of the groups-members and partner countries

Standpoint of each partner:

- What do you think:
- What is the goal of this group, what do you expect?
- What does your organization expect for itself from this project?
- What do you want and can offer for yourself and your organization?

First of all we wanted to get an idea of the standpoint of each partner, his opinion and expectations of project, methods etc.. After that we will try to find a compromise. Chance to let everybody speak their minds. :

BELGIUM/Fabienne: It is not clear: do we need all the data and for what? Big question, difference of motivation between partners. IN the project plan a survey of the situation hat ist place and seems to be important, yet because of lack of time there is the question what do we have to do, how much time does it take? And who wants to do what? Fabienne does what she cans on her own. Feels alone.in

her organization. She had asked members to spread the questionnaire. Received only 1 or 2 from each region. The Dutch speaking region: organized a congress and distributed the questionnaire, there. Fromthis event they had most replies. Received 25 questionnaires back. French, English and Dutch. Workload bigger because of expectation of workload and work sharing. Not clear what the goal was. Ulrike agrees: wants to change it to the way of working how it used to be.

Fabienne states that she is asked by the coordinator to meet people (polititians) at Brussel, but she asks herself what to tell them? We need hard facts first. A lot of people to meet, but no concrete things to say. The need are real facts (from the survey from our group) and a folder (from the pr group) and definitions (Definition group) to know what to speak about with those contacts and to make a plan for dissemination. What do we expect from them? Point for following meeting. First surveu than exchange then share with politicians.

GERMANY/Stephanie: It is necessary to collect data. What do practitioners need, want and expect, what exists, where are problems? It was disappointing that there where only 24 questionnaires that came back in Germany. Stephanie had expected that the practitioners understood that this survey was also important for them and their future position. She thought they would understand and help. They even do not want a qualification framework, maybe they are afraid of consequences, In Germany a lot of people with some education in something else are partitioning AMAT. Even if they have second education as riding therapist. There are trainings of 1 of 2 weekend, after that they call themselves a horse therapists. We have to bring this into our report.

How can i motivate the people to answer? At the moment i started to make a list of the people working with AMAT. How to motivate these people, to answer the important questions. Agreement on this point by all others. . That also what i can offer. She was also disappointed about German partners in her own organization, maybe 10 people who wanted to participate first, now there where no answers on the questions of help, not even students, if not paid. Noone wants to do real work for.

SLOVAKIA/Ivana: Goal: is the framework. For my organization to improve education in our county. Own expectation: modernise. It was frustrating that a lot of people dropped out after saying yes to this project. Organization says we can make a list of people. They went away because they backed out because of the chaos at the beginning. But it has cleared up now. We can find students and involve they for the "dirty jobs" as data typing etc.. She can offer data from my country and my work and the scientific links, analysis. She'll send a link to get into a literature site. Library database, practical research, not only equine research. Not all in connection to horses, animals. We have to search well(keywords). Guarantee that it'll work. We can contact the researches for evidence and results. I can put it on one student. For translation, summaries on internet.

NETHERLAND/UIrike: Her organisation was asked before beginning by Margueriet for cocoordinator. We thought, that we had to do it because there is a big need, for clarity from clients, practitioners and paving organisations. And we think that certified therapists in AMAT which we train according to their task profile have to be recognized and paid for what they do and for what they have been trained and certified. . Different work and different training. Who is trained for what and what can you expect from him as a client. Same problem in own organization as in Germany. We have a good working system, people don;t realize its helpful to go for it, they don't think its necessary do do something for their function and future position. It is not easy to mobilize them to go for their qualifications. As we as an organization offer the training we as organization have to do something for the position of our trainees in Europe. We therefore also engaged for 12 years in FATP organisation)German speaking countries in Europe) (also difficult there). We where first very enthusiast to participate in this project. We made a clear plan together with Margueriet. When the project started, we where disappointed by the chaos at the beginning. After first meeting, i was broken. But then some partners talked and corresponded a lot by phone and Skype and there started to come some lines into it. Unfortunately there were some problems with forum LDV list and materials really spread to all participants. Nor Ivana nor I could reconstruct how it went that suddenly the first accepted questionnaire with all criteria talked about at the first meeting could disappear. (herover later) After second meeting and a lot of personal contacts, thought well we can reach it, after third meeting, hope was partitially gone.

At the moment hope in this working group Together we can improve, we are further in development, exchange. If we succeed, get accredited, people have a better position in future. Also the money is reduced for AMAT and Health Services in al countries, so not a good time. Bus we belief in AMAT as an effective and efficient therapy. We want to offer whgat we can, we are willing to do a lot, because

it's worth while. Up to now not rewarding. Communication needs to improve, we can help to get on a working standard to produce, and to win some time lost. Willing to offer people, communication system at our homepage for this group in order to avoid misunderstandings and problems we gha=had in the past. . Important

Staphanie: are there other organization who train other therapists in NL?

Ulrike: yes, in the questionnaire we already found some we did not know and others we already knew before. They can help build framework. Because people don't work together, do their own thing, in each country. Different motivations from all countries. Recognition, for yourself or for your work. But mainly in whole Europe. No sharing of information, happy with situation. Very personal. We have to get this on a card, with which people, countries, motivations do people work and what they need. Goal of survey. This was not clear to everybody because a lot of communication- and organisation problems before. It's our chance now to do something about it.

Look at the tables for the first beginning of building a description of what there exists and how different trainings and models can be compared to each other and between different countries. At the FATP we made some sort of survey by comparing our trainings in the same way. This coasted a lot of time . Coasted a lot of energy to communicate and trust each other and for first framework and common definitions. Success in getting colleagues of FATP who have already standards to put down criteria for training. The Table I introduced to the project at the first meeting coasted 3 years to make. It proved to give a good oversight. Therefore I suggested at the first meeting to take it as a first draft to build the intended framework around it filled up by the impact of all partners in this project. The first step was done at the first meeting where all partners agreed to a list of criteria to have in the survey of the State of the Art for Organisations, practitioners and trainings organisations in AMAT within the partner countries. This was a good start, but then it went wrong.

Questionnaire and survey for the state of the art of AMAT in the partner countries

- What we decided to do and what we have done and what we still have to do.
- Points and decisions discussed and accept on the 1st meeting in September in France about items needed in questionnaire.
- Excell with standpoints of each partner discussed on skype about features of questionnaire.
- Mail documentation of discussion about questionnaire.
- Lost` and `found` Dutch-German proposal

We where very disappointed when we found out that the questionnaires used by the countries but the Netherlands and Germany do not contain information of the criteria we decided to have in the survey at the first meeting.

Why do we have different criteria? It seems to have happened after Margueriet suddenly introduced a new questionnaire by personal interview with all different standards. Tables (mentioned above) were taken as starting point. First meeting, we defined a lot of criteria for survey. To get to comparison table at the end. Ulrike and Stephanie had produced an introduction to questionnaire. Never was put on Forum Fitram or Homepage. A synthesis of both approaches should be used if countries wanted to do personal interview instead of questionnaire on paper or internet. The questionnaire published on Fitram page was not covering the intended synthesis. A lot of criticism. A lot of difference between.

Ivana: This questionnaire gives very little info about system of AMAT in countries. This questionnaire is confusing because he was made for personal interview. Sometimes answers were different in perception of the question. Because of that there are, a lot of missing data. From list of items questionnaire was made we get all the data we really need, but we also need enough cases. We need to discuss about what the questionnaire should look like with a minimum of variables covering our intended criteria. We have to improve dissemination of questionnaire. We send it to everybody, people told us they never received it. big problem. Propose to go though list, choose basic questions, how to do it now, to go though it again. We could do detailed analysis. Add information, but it's not possible.

There were data from Luxembourg, How did we get them? Doris gathered them . They had their Education in Germany or Holland.

Fabienne: want to gather all info from Europe and work together? we succeed.

Do we only doing this with countries now present of more. There are more countries then before. Not enough time, so must limit the partners. Who and why do we ask. It's intresting for the future, not for now

Marie Therese: Write in report, that it's interesting. It's like an onion, the start is small, more layers come on.

Decision: Not more countries than partners in this project yet, but in the following project

Ulrike: proposes internet research to fill up the data collection by questionnaire.. Look at homepages of Organizations, practitioners and trainings institutes, if necessary contact them and ask questions.

How to go further with the data we have now.

We could make a detailed report what we received from the Dutch. But then one country is overrepresented, other under. Idea was to get more info from research and collect other form of questionnaire, to get more valid data from other countries.

Over 400 people were contacted about the questionnaire in Holland. We carried out a real distributing plan. A lot of interested people got a mailing . Then more details on homepage, more visits. So this in combination with more internet research will be good. We want to produce a framework, but on which facts. Other questionnaires were a shock. Holland is further in development.

Ivana: we need to make a new questionnaire or fill the questionnaire up.

A lot of variability in the questions we have now in the other countries (not NL) and Germany needs more cases. We need to make a second step. Tell what happened. To collect data we need, but only the needed data. We need a dead line.

Decision:

There is agreement to start a second round of survey with the Dutch/German questionnaire in a revised (shorted) form so that we can make detailed analyses with Germany and The Netherlands but minimum analyses with the other countries and that we can compare results.

Ivana and Ulrike will do proposal which variables should be in the analysis at all.

With the knowledge of the Data they have seen till now they can do this and can ask group afterwards for agreement.

They *(with the help of others) analyse the answers on the open questions to put a lot of them in categories and multiple juice (which makes things easier in the second attempt of data collection)

The open answers of the (not English) questionnaires have to be translated.

Marie Therese, Do we only focus on horses?

Decision to Marie-Terese's question: We only focus on horses, not other animals, other organization disappeared.

How to get a list of data? How to distribute the tasks?

Internet survey, literature and science collection

Fabienne: a lot of literature in fitram. A none government organization. Margaret (secretary's at fitram) has started up the project. Art therapy and animal therapy. Names of connection will be put into a system. Belgium is a partner of fitram. Holland thought about it, wants to think about it longer.

Dissemination of results

Working appointments. Dissemination, because of introduction and engaging people wanted to receive the report. There is dissemination on the people in the field, organizations, press. We can collect addresses we can disseminate later. Fabienne: send what?

Ulrike: make groups, first group: people or organizations who answered the questionnaire. We can talk about in October, for now we can start collecting addresses.

Ivana: What about the group of scientists?

Ulrike: we want to get in to contact with people from universities. Then we can make a form, what info can we give them? The list of all partners as far as they're ready now will be on the new forum. Ulrike: should i make a form to fill in for info? So we have something to present. And then look at what we need to go on.

Ulrike makes a submission form for addresses on the internal communication system.

Maybe it's possible to make a shorter questionnaire with a link on the site og each partner? .

Ivana

It's possible to make a questionnaire on google docx. Easy to make questions. Deadlines for the people for when they'll get back the information, how long will the analysis take. If the questionnaire lasts too long people will postpone. Good idea to send a mail three days before closing questionnaire. Online questionnaire is a good idea, people don't like opening, reading, writing and sending back, on the computer takes less time.

Fabienne: wants to know what to do with her data, because she started, but hasn't finished. Stephanie: is afraid of the same situation that no one will answer. Wants a list with basic information of important info so she can continue with her work. We will look at this after lunch.

We will need 2 or 3 sorts of questionnaires. In Holland we can start a new round of data collection. With the same questions. Maybe the contact can't be made, maybe they don't want to answer. Maybe forward the information. Ask if they want to fill it in again. The introduction is very important. We have to offer the people something. Like the photo shoot Annet offered. To be informed about the outcomes is to some very interesting. It is not money-consuming. We can see where people were directed to on the page, how many times, from where did people look at us.

Handhippo is going to take the person responsible for the website to the next meeting on 16 October to talk over possibilities for linking and other technical facilities. 6-9 October meeting, ivana cannot attend, but a student of hers is substituting her, ulrike is going to meet with ivana and het student on forehand and they're preparing together the submission for the meeting in October.

Communication structure and facilities proposal, inclusive reporting

lvana[.]

Need a clear structured communication system to rely on within this group. Couldn't find documents on fitram page. There need to be a small page for sharing for people who need it. Problem is that nobody does it or problems with internet. If possible a medium for sharing. Limited time, if we collect now, less work for report. Exchange things with other working groups, definitions and pr as well. We need a place we can share.

Ulrike does a proposal worked out with Ivana. Need to be read by all partners. System for different stages: 1 submitting, 2 put in a report(accessible to coordinator and other members).

First finish in group, then submit to other LDV partners and coordinator

Communication by structured mail forms. There needs to be a label on it, what is it? Are reactions needed? Till when etc. Needs structure and clarity.

Reports about state of the art always accessible for everybody.

Discussions in groups forum.

Material for report for questionnaires and tables.

Form to submit: is it private, or for all, what does it mean?

Also a group mailing. Make appointment to send this every Monday and Friday.

Fabienne: Money?

Ulrike: We (SHP) offer it to the group for free. We pay for the homepage. It's just extra work for me and SHP webmaster, which he has to do for SHP.. We save a lot of problems, that's my motivation for this extra work.

There is no LDV homepage yet. Maybe later.

Till one o'clock: showing the homepage. You can choose, English, German or Dutch. English is not much on it. you can look at photo's. to internal page, you can register and get a password or log in immediately. Then you can choose what you want to look at or send around. Can fill in a form for a standardized memo.

In October ulrike can explain it better with password

Dissemination, network and addresses

There will be a form for submitting Addresses for dissemination in the communication stystem constructed by ULrike

Connection with two other thematic groups

Can be made by our system as well, if it proves necessary and the others want it. Personal exchange via Stephanie and Agnes,

Proposal worked out by group for time schedule and task sharing (action-list)

After lunch: thanks to the host for the atmosphere. Great we've come this far.

- We need to decide on the time we need to produce things.
- Next meeting the rest will be handled.

Communication system will be online next week 3 september 2011, hopefully.

Talking and communication is very important, for understanding, offering and sharing. 9 to 23 September

Fabienne will be on holiday. From 14-24th September Ivana will be on holiday.'

T/m 25th September Marie-Therese will be "out".

Ulrike says that if anything will happen to her mother she will not be able to Skype.

Ulrike puts the agenda and dates on the page. Of our communication system.

7th September 20:00 first Skype conference.

28th September second Skype conference also 20:00. About use of communication system, questionnaire, addresses.

Not time enough for variables. Opinion about highlighted variables. A mail will be send when the new site is online. Till then brainstorm about an internet research, make appointments in our country to have a look at the internet possibilities. Info from homepages. Use special keywords, make lists of what you found with what keywords. Info from organizations/people(political/scientific). Look at which groups we need in our country for disseminations.

Deadlines:

- For searching out which query system of interview and variables: 11th September Post highlighted variables to the system: 11th September English translation of the Dutch open answers on questionnaire: before 28th September English translation of the French open answers on questionnaire: 7th September Ulrike puts text of the open answers or categories in the system so that the colleagues can have a look what is to do and then that can propose on what they want to do.
- Hopefully end this week (4th September).

- Stephanie is doing the translation of the French(Belgian) open answers to English till 2nd September
- Fabienne will send the English translation of the open Dutch answers in het Belgian questionnaires to Ivana before the 4th of September.
- We ask France who will be the responsible person to submit the data each partner has to submit to do the internet research each partner has to do.

Information flow and communication of the group with coordinator considering the notes sent by Marguerite 24th of August and needs of the group

The group will read it and there will be reaction by mail and at the coming meeting there can be some time reserved for this topic.

Position of Spanish participant and data in this group

We decided to stop the collaboration with the not official partner of Spain because of accidents his actions on LDV list and destructive and insulting behaviour. We are not using his data, because we cannot use them (missing values and labels) and because Spain is no partner in this project.

Action List:

Topics for the following meeting in the Netherlands

• The need are real facts (from our group) and a folder (from the pr group) and definitions (Definition group) to know what to speak about with those contacts and to make a plan for dissimination. What do we expect from them? Point for following meeting. First exchange then share.

Mail from Ulrike to complete action list.

Dear Colleagues,

Distribution of this mail

This mail is going to all participants of the working group Data Collection, who are on the official list and who have been present for assistance at the meeting itself.

Margueriet as a "part member" will receive the complete report (to the coordinator) as soon as it is ready and has been seen by the whole group.

Tired but very happy about our work and the whole meeting I arrived at home. Ivana has had a good flight and is at home as well.

First I want to thank you all for your contributions and the very positive and harmonious sphere in which we could do our work.

Thank to our host who had made this possible!!!!!

Please give me some time to send you the notes and to make our communication system ready, but I will start today after having managed a lot of things waiting for me.

Therefore I have to make it short.

Communication of our results

I have sent our decision with respect to the position of Lorenzo to Margueriete and Lorenzo as well as to the other partners

The notes of our meeting and the report of it to the rest and the coordinator you will receive before I am sending it further.

Contacts I want to make this week with members of our group

- I will contact Stephanie this week for some points and material she may need for her group definitions.
- Ivana and I will have contact for going further with the categorisation of the second phase of our survey and the method
- I will contact Agnes to help Stana with the questionnaire and internet survey in Poland
- Stana will be informed about our meeting by Ivana before Agnes is going to contact her
- Tessa will prepare the translation of our open questions with me and we have a look how to distribute the work within the Dutch participants

Contacts I want to have about our meeting

 I want to inform Marie Jose as the other working group coordinator per phone about our meeting and the contacvt possibilities with the oither working groups.

I hope, that this will be one of the last communication by mail and that we can use our system very soon.

If you do have questions please feel free to contact me, we can skype if we need a longer talk.

Kind Regards

Ulrike

Attachments

- Find below the photos of our meeting
- Find as an attachment the list of partners Stephanie and I tried to make as I promised