

EVALUATION OF HOME/2014/JDRU/AG/DRUG/7092 -Triple R: Rehabilitation for Recovery and Reinsertion

Elisa Rubini and Antonio Jesús Molina Fernández
Social Psychology Department, Faculty of Psychology.

Universidad Complutense de Madrid

antmolin@ucm.es



Evaluation of Triple R project

1. Evaluation: Participative process

Different ways of evaluation will be used:

- Personal interviews of stakeholders.
- Visits to centers and programs
- Focal groups of stakeholders.

2. Readings and revision of materials

Revisions of reports and publications: Triple R Handbooks and materials.

3. Selection of Criteria

Efficacy/Visibility/Feasibility/Social impact (European context)

Evaluation of Triple R project

4. Draft report (F1 – F2-F3)

Document about Processes+ Results+ Impact of Triple R project, reported by Evaluation Criteria.

5. Internal discussion about Dissemination of results and processes:

Triple R management+Triple R partners+Evaluators

6. Final Evaluation report (F4 – F5)

To be presented in Project Final Report

Evaluation of Triple R project

1. Evaluation: Participative process

Different ways of evaluation will be used:

- Personal interviews of stakeholders.
- Visits to centers and programs
- Focal groups of stakeholders.

2. Readings and revision of materials

Revisions of reports and publications: Triple R Handbooks and materials.

3. Selection of Criteria

Efficacy/Visibility/Feasibility/Social impact (European context)



Evaluation of Triple R project

4. Draft report (F1 – F2-F3)

Document about Processes+ Results+ Impact of Triple R project, reported by Evaluation Criteria.

5. Internal discussion about Dissemination of results and processes:

Triple R management+Triple R partners+Evaluators

6. Final Evaluation report (F4 – F5)

To be presented in Project Final Report

Evaluation of Triple R project

- 1) Evaluation: Participative process
(March&April-17)
- 2) Readings and revision of materials (May-17)
- 3) Selection of Criteria (May-17)
- 4) Draft report (September-17)
- 5) Internal discussion about Dissemination of
results and processes (October-17)
- 6) Final Evaluation report (Project Final Report,
November-17)



Co-funded by the European Union

Methodology: Quantitative sources of information/ Methodology

The evaluation of Phase I of the Triple R project has been based on the creation, dissemination and analysis of **feedback questionnaires completed by project partners.**

Participant organizations have been presented with specific questionnaires after the completion of each project activities. The surveys have been submitted both in paper and electronic versions to facilitate completion. Since 2016 all the surveys have been organized and fill in electronically via **Survey Monkey**, which had been identified as the most practical way to handle the evaluation.

Methodology: Quantitative sources of information/ Criteria

Efficacy: ability of the best practice to reach the program goal.

Visibility: relevance and recognition of the best practice in its local and/or national context.

Sustainability: ability of the best practice to secure the necessary funds and support to undertake its work and run its program.

Social impact: ability of the best practice to make the difference for their residents or clients and for the community as a whole.

Methodology: Quantitative sources of information/ Tools

- Project exchange questionnaires
- Key Evaluation Questions Survey
- Event questionnaires (Dissemination activities)
- Publication feedback questionnaires

Conclusions

All three publications got a very positive feedback. 62% of the respondent shared that they are **interested in all of them**, **23%** express a **particular interest respectively in the Manual on rehabilitation and recovery and the Handbook on justice interventions and alternatives to incarceration**, while **8%** preferred the **Handbook on social reintegration**.

Overall rating of the study visit activities.

The overall rating of the study visits has been quite positive: 44% of the respondents considered them excellent, 44% positive and 11% satisfactory.

The Belgian best practice was assessed as excellent by 55% of the interviewed, 33% considered it good and 11% satisfactory.

The Spanish best practice was evaluated by 55% of the respondents as good, 33% assessed it as excellent and 11% as partially satisfactory.

The Swedish best practice was considered excellent by 44% of the partners, 44% evaluated as good and 11% as satisfactory.

Conclusions

Few suggestions were also shared on the **aspects that were missing**:

- Lack of a more organized structure to compile and share the information, which could have guarantee a better uniformity to the project exchange
- Importance of the activities being more explicitly articulated around the project thematic pillars.
- Difficulties in the implementation related to the language problem. English knowledge level differs a lot among the partners and sometime the lack of local experts that could fluently speak in English led to the need of translation and therefore slow down the activities during the visits.

**¿Questions?
Lot of thanks, anyway**

antmolin@ucm.es

