

# 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. *Stanislava 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 1<sup>st</sup> meeting)*
- *Table to compare AMAT measures and trainings for AMAT (submitted by Ulrike at the 1<sup>st</sup> 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 accepted on the 1<sup>st</sup> 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 24<sup>th</sup> of August and 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 Stanislava in this group with data collection (Questionnaire, Internet Research and translations).

A lot had to be done to prepare this meeting. Michaela (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 Germany and the Netherlands is directly comparable and possible to be analyzed further. Michaela gives an explanation of problems and Ulrike and Michaela 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 an 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 group-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. :

Partners were expressing their disappointment that there were not enough people in their own organizations to help with doing the work and that there was a lot of misunderstanding in coordination of starting up the first survey by the coordinator.

Partners also expressed their disappointment with the coordination and communication of the project.

**Synthesis**

We need first data about the situations of practitioners, organizations and legal framework of AMAT measures within the partner countries.

We need scientific research on evidence base of AMAT.

We have to compare the situation.

We have to build a framework of criteria defining different measures and trainings for AMAT.

This all before contacting politicians, because otherwise we don't have facts.

The PR Folder will be necessary as well, but facts are the same important because we have to propose a framework of good practice.

It is necessary to collect sufficient data. What do practitioners need, want and expect, what exists, where are problems. And this compared over all partner countries.

Another goal of this project is to improve the education in some partner countries and to learn from each other. Therefore data collection has to cooperate on this point with definitions. And there has to be visits to get to know the different education systems personally.

All partners were very disappointed about the fact that most partners did not get enough responses (valid cases) but also that most questionnaires were not usable, because of they were lacking criteria we have to include and the questions were not posed in an efficient way.

Country	Sufficient cases	All criteria in questionnaire	All types of respondents join questionnaire
Germany	No	Yes	No
Netherlands	Yes	Yes	Probably
France	No	No	No
Belgium	No	No	No
Poland	No	No	No
Slovakia	No	No	No

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

On the 1<sup>st</sup> meeting was accepted a list of criteria (based on Dutch pre-survey), from which should be developed questionnaire. There emerged two versions of questionnaire (Dutch and French one). On skype conferences in January and february 2011 was decided, that it would be the best to do a synthesis of them. But afterwards the Dutch version disappeared (Ulrike and Michaela weren't able to find out, why it happened). Unfortunately the French one hadn't implement above mentioned criteria.

Later prepared German and Dutch partners English introduction, but expect these countries, it was not used.

We try to solve this problem by starting a second phase of survey and by completing our data base by internet research in all countries.

**NETHERLAND/Ulrike:**

Before beginning of project was Dutch SHP asked by Marguerite to coordinate. Ulrike agreed, because of big need for clarity for clients (to know helpfulness of certified practitioners and what to expect of different therapists orientation), practitioners (to get recognized as professionals) and organizations (help for recognition of trainees in EU). It was planned a lot, but after first meeting and chaos seen there, was coordinator for the Netherlands Ulrike Thiel disappointed. Things changed, when other partners got into activities and some lines came into it. Unfortunately there were some problems with forum LDV list and materials really spread to all participants.

If we will get the aim of project and AMAT will get accredited, professionals will have better position in the future. Many people in each country are still satisfied with state of things and don't share their knowledge to other. It is a partial goal of project to realize, what is motivation for work and what are needs of different people. In the Netherlands was done an overview of factors in trainings offered by different organizations. In the 1<sup>st</sup> meeting it was used for creating a list of factors in the future questionnaire.

For better work we need improve communication and the Dutch partners offer us their homepage to avoid misunderstandings and problems we had in the past.

## **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 1<sup>st</sup> 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 were very disappointed when we found out that the questionnaires used by the countries except Netherlands and Germany do not contain information on all the criteria we decided to have in the survey at the first meeting.

On the 1<sup>st</sup> meeting was accepted a list of criteria (based on Dutch pre-survey), from which should be developed questionnaire. There emerged two versions of questionnaire (Dutch and French one). On skype conference on **(Termin!!!! – du hast es vielleicht in Deinen Papieren. Bitte fuege es hinzu.)** was decided, that it would be the best to do a synthesis of them. But afterwards the Dutch version disappeared (Ulrike and Michaela weren't able to find out, why it happened). Unfortunately the French one hadn't implement above mentioned criteria and was more oriented on personal interviews (but it is not possible to get many answers).

Later prepared German and Dutch partners English introduction, but expect these countries, it was not used.

We try to solve this problem by starting a second phase of survey and by completing our data base by internet research in all countries.

From above mentioned state with the two versions of questionnaire emerged this situation, as Michaela described:

This questionnaire gives only little information about system of AMAT in countries. We have a lot of missing data, because the questions didn't have clear formulation, so people interpret them in different ways or didn't understand anyway.

Item decided on the 1<sup>st</sup> meeting can give us much important information. We need a lot of information in the smallest number of questions.

Our next task is to improve dissemination of questionnaire, what was in many countries a big problem. Michaela's proposition was to go through the list of items, choose basic question.

We also got some information from Luxemburg, but it is the question, if we need them. These information sent us German partner Doris Russig in mind, that therapist from Luxemburg do parts of their education also in Germany and the Netherlands.

From Belgien (Fabienne) came question, if we want to gather information from whole Europe and work it together or only with data from partners' countries. There are now more countries in mind than before. We don't have enough time, so we should stay by partners' countries. Marie Therese proposed, that we can write down in report our proposition to broad the area of examined countries. And the next project can be focused on other EU countries.

**Decision:** *In this project we focus only on partner countries, the following project can be dedicated to others.*

Ulrike proposed to do internet research for filling up the data collection by questionnaire (collecting of information on homepages of organizations, practitioners and trainings institutions). If it was necessary, then contact the contact persons for further asking.

One possibility, how to go further with the data we have now, is to elaborate a detailed report what was received from Dutch questionnaire, but then would be one country overrepresented. We need to ask more people except the Netherlands. We will get many data from internet research, that can be replenished by other form of questionnaire.

For framework-creating we need some facts.

**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*

**Michaela and Ulrike** will do proposal which variables should be in the analysis at all. With the knowledge of our existing data they are able to do this and afterwards they ask group for agreement or new proposals.

From still reached open questions they will (with the help of others) create categories for multiple-choice answers in the second round of questionnaire.

Belgian and German partners accepted to translate some questionnaires to English to simplify the analysis.

**Decision** to Marie-Therese's question: *We only focus on horses and EAT and EAA, not other animals.*

**How to get a list of data?**

**How to distribute the tasks?**

## **Internet survey, literature and science collection**

In FITRAM's library is collected a lot of literature. But we still need other sources.

### **Dissemination of results**

We can offer to people, who we want to answer the questionnaire, to send them the report and summary of results. It can be motivation for them and it is a kind of informing public and professionals with our project.

We can start with collecting of contacts and addresses of organizations, practitioners, scientists, decision makers, media. The list of all partners as far as they're ready now will be on the new forum.

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

For creating and disseminating of questionnaire we can use Google docs. Using and filling up an online questionnaire is for many people much comfortable.

Also will be good to give people deadlines (we can send them a reminder ca 3 days before the closing of collecting answers), there will be also for us deadline until when we will send them the summary of results.

We will research 2 or 3 sorts of questionnaire presentation so that we can offer a simple electronic form which can easily be handled when doing the translation and analysis. In Holland we can start a new round of data collection with the same questions. The introduction and some offer for participants is very important. To be informed about the outcomes is to some very interesting.

## **Communication structure and facilities proposal, inclusive reporting**

From need of clear structured communication system within this group (clear communication, documents library, exchanging of documents, materials, contacts, ... within the TG Data collection, also between other TGs, if they are interested) developed proposal from Ulrike, that she can give some space on her homepage for LDV group Data collection for free. Later, if this group will be satisfied, can be offered to other TGs.

Communication between group members will run in structured mailing forms. Reports and state of the art will be always accessible for everybody on the homepage. We can also use the page for sharing materials and documents to build up a library. We will see, if there is a need of group forum. If so, it should be bought into the homepage and paid by all using partners.

There is no LDV homepage yet. Maybe later.

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

7<sup>th</sup> September Skype conference – how does the homepage work, how to orientate in it...

28<sup>th</sup> September Skype conference – possible answers from open questions, using the form for contacts collection.

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 and French open answers from questionnaire: before 4<sup>th</sup> 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.

- 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 24<sup>th</sup> 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 behavior. 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 dissemination. What do we expect from them? Point for following meeting. First exchange then share.

### **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.
  - Michaela and I will have contact for going further with the categorization 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 Michaela 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
- Literature and contact addresses for dissemination of the results and networking have to be gathered in an efficient way.
  - We need a communication and information gathering system within our group apart from Forum, LDV because of problems and not official members included. Assess (or access) is not save.
  - We need a Data Base for the incoming address and other information.
  - Links to scientific literature libraries have to be exchanged.
  - Contacts to Fachhochschulen and universities in Germany necessary because a lot of Diploma thesis are not in systems.
  - Keywords and criteria for internet search have to be developed and distributed to all team members.
  - All the data have to be collected in SPSS analysis.
  - Open questions have to be translated and categorized for the second phase survey
  - Contact as well on personal level (networking) is very important.
  - Agnes can help Stana

- A lot of work was distributed among the members and we planned two skype conferences before the meeting in October.