




HEALING
Art Therapy Diploma



July 14, 2022

WP5.3 Quality and Monitoring report

Project acronym:	HEALING
Project full title:	Developing a Multidisciplinary Diploma on Art Therapy in Health Education
WP No & Title	WP5. Quality Control and Monitoring
Responsible partner:	NKUA
Contributing partners:	JUST, UNIVGB
Author(s):	Sofia Papakonstantinou
Distribution level:	Partnership
Total number of pages:	33
Version:	1
Language	English
Reviewed by:	External review
Status:	Final

Revision History

Version	Date	Description	Action	Page(s)
1	14/07/2022	Original document	C	38

(*) Action: C = Creation, I = Insert, U = Update, R = Replace, D = Delete

Disclaimer

This project has been co-funded by the Erasmus+ Programme of the European Union.

The information and views set out in this publication are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the official opinion of the European Union. Neither the European Union institutions and bodies nor any person acting on their behalf may be held responsible for the use which may be made of the information contained therein.

Reproduction is authorised provided the source is acknowledged.

All rights are reserved.

Copyright © HEALING Consortium, 2020-2023

CONTENTS

1.	INTRODUCTION.....	3
2.	PROJECT PERFORMANCE	4
2.1	2 nd Internal Evaluation (2 nd year, February 2022)	4
	Scaled questions	5
	Open-ended question.....	13
2.2	Meetings' evaluation	13
2.2.1	13 th Management meeting (online, 26.01.2022)	13
3.	PROJECT QUALITY CONTROL: Training workshops' evaluation.....	17
3.1	Skills Development (online, 16/03/2022).....	17
3.2	Dementia & Arts (online, 29/03/2022).....	23
3.3	Inhibitory control of voluntary Arm Movements: A doorway to free won't (online, 30/03/2022) 28	
3.4	Training Workshop in Music Therapy on 16-27 May 2022 (Osijek, Croatia)	33


1. INTRODUCTION

As foreseen in the project description, 6 internal Quality and Monitoring Reports will be issued, one every 6 months of the HEALING project. In these reports we will accumulate, analyse and summarise the results from the quality evaluations done in the previous 6 months of the project.

According to the Quality Plan, the elements that will be regularly collected and evaluated are findings from:

- Regular Internal measurement of satisfaction among partners
- Partnership Meetings
- Deliverable Evaluation
- Monitoring details

The structure of this report follows the structure as shown in the graphic below:



For this issue of the Quality and Monitoring Report, which covers the 5th semester of the project, i.e. From January, 2022 until July, 2022, we have identified and collected information from project partners for the evaluation of 2nd project performance, 1 meeting and 3 training workshops.

All internal surveys were conducted via Google Forms. This ensured an easy access for all partners to submit their responses and have them all in an organised manner.

2. PROJECT PERFORMANCE

2.1 2nd Internal Evaluation (2nd year, February 2022)

The internal evaluations among project partners, aim to measure the project management, internal communication, collaboration with external stakeholders and the overall evaluation of the project, are meant to be conducted at the end of each project year.

In each survey, each partner's project representatives rate the performance of the partnership in a questionnaire, using Google Forms.

The questionnaire used for the surveys consisted of a total of 22 questions, grouped in 4 sections: Project management, Internal communication, Communication/Dissemination strategy and Overall evaluation of the project progress. The questions were closed questions on 5-point Likert scale, where respondents have to give a grade between 1 and 5, with 5 being the highest (Strongly Agree) and 1 the lowest (Strongly Disagree); one open-ended question for remarks, comments and suggestions was also included.

At the end of the questionnaire respondents are asked to declare their organisation, for the purpose of ascertaining partner participation.

The 2nd internal evaluation was conducted between 8-15 February 2022.

All partners' representatives were invited to participate; 28 responses were received. The participation per partner is illustrated in the following figure.




Figure 1. Number of surveys submitted (N=28)

Scaled questions

The responses received can be found below.

The average of approval based on all responses, from all 4 sections, is 87%, above the threshold of 70%.

Project Management

This section received on average 88% rate of approval (92% in the previous evaluation). The lowest rated statement, with 83% was: “Issues are resolved quickly and effectively” (previously 91%). The highest rated statement (91%) was “I know what the project aims to achieve” (previously 97%).

Overall, partners seem satisfied with the management of the project. The perception of the speed of issues’ resolution has improved since the last evaluation and overall, there seem to be no issues with the project management.

No further comments were received in this section.

Internal Communication

This section has received 85% rate of agreement, on average (previously was 92%), ranging between 80% “All partners provide regular updates on their work package activities” (was 90%) and 89% “There is a good level of communication among all partners” (was 93%). The responses show that internal communication among partners can be improved; although the communication with the lead partner is satisfactory, there is a lack of communication among partners, something that can be explained by the lack of face-to-face meetings with all partners’ attendance which has prevented them from getting to know each other. In any case, the lead partner should make efforts to stimulate communication among partners from this point on as well as ask

partners to submit more frequent updates on their activities in order all consortium to be able to informed about the project's progress.

The comments that have been received in this section are the following:

- *Some issues with the GDrive folders created some confusion for content development.*
- *The management for the production of lecture material was suboptimal. It required too much time, too many meetings, and still, some partners did not fulfill the requests (in my cluster, there are still three lectures missing).*

Communication / Dissemination strategy

In this section, there was a 88% average agreement to the statements; somewhat in the same levels from the previous evaluation (89%). All five statements were rated similarly, ranging between 87-90%. A conclusion from the section is that the process of finding, and effectively engaging, stakeholders still has room for improvement.

One comment has been received in this section stating that the French version on the website is missing.

Overall Project Progress

This section has received 88% average rate of approval; a little bit lower from the previous evaluation (91%). Of the 6 statements, the lowest rated were "The project is keeping up with the planned objectives" and "Partners have committed the required time and resources to achieve the objectives" at 87%. The highest rated statement was "My expectations regarding my involvement in the project (effort, time, commitments, etc) were met" at 90%. From these responses it can be deduced that the delays are still a source of concern for the partners and the effects that covid as well as the implementation of WP1 has on the workplan of the project.


One comment has been received in this section stating that all partners should fulfill the tasks that they are responsible for and inform all partners about.

Table 1. Analysis of responses on 1-5 scale for the 2nd project evaluation

		Count	1- Strongly Disagree	2- Disagree	3- Neutral	4- Agree	5-Strongly Agree	weighted average
Section 1. Project Management								
Q1	I know what the project aims to achieve.	14	0%	0%	0%	43%	57%	91%
Q2	The responsibilities for each partner are stated clearly.	14	0%	0%	0%	57%	43%	89%
Q3	I am aware what tasks my organisation has to do in the	14	0%	0%	0%	64%	36%	87%


		Count	1-Strongly Disagree	2-Disagree	3-Neutral	4-Agree	5-Strongly Agree	weighted average
	coming months.							
Q4	Feedback from the lead partner is received when a query is raised from a partner.	14	0%	0%	7%	43%	50%	89%
Q5	Issues are resolved quickly and effectively.	14	0%	7%	14%	36%	43%	83%
Q6	We receive instructions about meetings well in advance.	14	0%	0%	7%	43%	50%	89%
		Avg.1	0%	1%	5%	48%	46%	88%
	Section 2. Internal Communication							
Q7	I'm satisfied with the file-sharing tool used and the method that is used for Project internal communications.	14	0%	0%	7%	50%	43%	87%
Q8	Response from partners on raised issues is satisfactory.	14	0%	0%	14%	57%	29%	83%
Q9	All partners provide regular updates on their work package activities.	14	0%	7%	21%	36%	36%	80%
Q10	There is a good level of communication with the lead partner.	14	0%	0%	14%	36%	50%	87%
Q11	There is a good level of communication among all partners.	14	0%	0%	7%	43%	50%	89%
		Avg.2	0%	1%	13%	44%	41%	85%
	Section 3. Communication / Dissemination Strategy							
Q12	The materials prepared and used (logo, banner, website) have been appropriate and effective for the promotion of the project objectives and results.	14	0%	0%	0%	50%	50%	90%
Q13	The project partners have addressed and effectively engaged the relevant stakeholders	14	0%	0%	0%	57%	43%	89%
Q14	The project activities so far promote the exploitation of the project findings.	14	0%	0%	7%	50%	43%	87%

		Count	1-Strongly Disagree	2-Disagree	3-Neutral	4-Agree	5-Strongly Agree	weighted average
Q15	The dissemination activities so far are in line with the strategy described in the dissemination plan.	14	0%	0%	0%	57%	43%	89%
Q16	The dissemination strategy depicted in the dissemination plan has been feasible and effectively facilitated the promotion of the project results and objectives.	14	0%	0%	7%	50%	43%	87%
		Avg.3	0%	0%	3%	53%	44%	88%
	Section 4. Overall Project Progress							
Q17	The project is keeping up with the planned objectives.	14	0%	0%	7%	50%	43%	87%
Q18	The workplan of the project is being followed.	14	0%	0%	0%	57%	43%	89%
Q19	Any deviations from the workplan have been well considered and agreed by all.	14	0%	0%	7%	43%	50%	89%
Q20	Partners have committed the required time and resources to achieve the objectives.	14	0%	0%	7%	50%	43%	87%
Q21	I'm satisfied with the deliverables delivered during the 2 nd year of the project.	14	0%	0%	0%	57%	43%	89%
Q22	My expectations regarding my involvement in the project (effort, time, commitments, etc) were met.	14	0%	0%	7%	36%	57%	90%
		Avg.4	0%	0%	5%	49%	46%	88%
		Avg. 1-4	0%	1%	6%	48%	45%	87%




Questions	Count	Strongly Disagree			Strongly Agree			Total	weighted average
		Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree		
<i>Project Management</i>	I know what the project aims to achieve.	14	0%	0%	0%	43%	57%	100%	91%
	The responsibilities for each partner are clearly defined.	14	0%	0%	0%	57%	43%	100%	89%
	I am aware what tasks my organisation must carry out in the coming months.	14	0%	0%	0%	64%	36%	100%	87%
	Feedback from the lead partner is received when a query is raised from a partner.	14	0%	0%	7%	43%	50%	100%	89%
	Issues are resolved quickly and effectively.	14	0%	7%	14%	36%	43%	100%	83%
	We receive instructions about meetings well in advance.	14	0%	0%	7%	43%	50%	100%	89%
			0%	1%	5%	48%	46%	100%	88%
<i>Internal Communication</i>	I am satisfied with the file-sharing tool used and the method that is used for Project internal communications (e-mails).	14	0%	0%	7%	50%	43%	100%	87%
	Response from partners on raised issues is satisfactory.	14	0%	0%	14%	57%	29%	100%	83%
	All partners provide regular updates on their work package activities.	14	0%	7%	21%	36%	36%	100%	80%
	There is a good level of communication with the lead partner.	14	0%	0%	14%	36%	50%	100%	87%
	There is a good level of communication among all partners.	14	0%	0%	7%	43%	50%	100%	89%
			1%	13%	44%	41%	100%	85%	
<i>Communication / dissemination strategy</i>	The materials prepared and used (logo, banner, website) have been appropriate and effective for the promotion of the project objectives and results.	14	0%	0%	0%	50%	50%	100%	90%
	The project partners have addressed and effectively engaged the relevant stakeholders	14	0%	0%	0%	57%	43%	100%	89%
	The project activities so far promote the exploitation of the project findings.	14	0%	0%	7%	50%	43%	100%	87%
	The dissemination activities so far are in line with the strategy described in the dissemination plan.	14	0%	0%	0%	57%	43%	100%	89%
	The dissemination strategy depicted in the dissemination plan has been feasible and effectively facilitated the promotion of the project results and objectives.	14	0%	0%	7%	50%	43%	100%	87%
			0%	0%	3%	53%	44%	100%	88%
<i>Overall Project Progress</i>	The project is keeping up with the planned objectives.	14	0%	0%	7%	50%	43%	100%	87%
	The workplan of the project is being followed.	14	0%	0%	0%	57%	43%	100%	89%
	Any deviations from the workplan have been well considered and agreed by all.	14	0%	0%	7%	43%	50%	100%	89%
	Partners have committed the required time and resources to achieve the objectives.	14	0%	0%	7%	50%	43%	100%	87%
	I'm satisfied with the deliverables delivered during the 2nd year of the project.	14	0%	0%	0%	57%	43%	100%	89%
	My expectations regarding my involvement in the project (effort, time, commitments, etc) were met.	14	0%	0%	7%	36%	57%	100%	90%
			0%	0%	5%	49%	46%	100%	88%
Average			0%	1%	6%	48%	45%	100%	87%


Project Management




Internal Communication



Communication/ Dissemination strategy



Overall Project Progress



Open-ended question

On the question of feedback from improvement, no comments or suggestions were received.

2.2 Meetings' evaluation

The post-meetings evaluations among project partners, aimed to measure mainly the effectiveness of the partnership meetings. After each meeting, a meeting evaluation survey must be conducted. In each survey, each partner's project representatives rate the meeting in a questionnaire, using Google Forms for the distribution to the partners.

The questionnaire used for these surveys consists of 13 questions, grouped into 3 sections, 10 of which are closed questions on 5-point Likert scale, where respondents have to give a grade between 1 and 5, with 5 being the highest (Fully Agree) and 1 the lowest (Fully Disagree), as well as 3 open-ended questions.

At the end of the questionnaire respondents are asked to declare their organisation, for the purpose of ascertaining partner participation.

There is a base questionnaire regarding all meeting evaluations. Nevertheless, depending on the type and purpose of each meeting, some questions might be adjusted.

During the project various online meetings have been organized in order to discuss the monitoring of progress towards completion of the deliverables and of the assigned Tasks. These short meetings that aimed to discuss specific topics have not undergone an evaluation.

2.2.1 13th Management meeting (online, 26.01.2022)

The survey was conducted amongst those who attended the Teleconference meeting that was held on January 26, 2022. A questionnaire was prepared and was delivered to the partners through Google Forms.

Partners submitted their answers during the period from January 26th, 2022 to January 27th, 2022. **11 responses were received**, coming from all partners. This is illustrated in Figure 2.




Figure 2. Number of surveys submitted (N=11)

The responses given by the participants are analysed below.

Analysis of scaled questions

The responses received can be found below. Most participants responded with a positive reply, marking the responses as Agree (39%), and Strongly Agree (60%) overall, for both sections. On average there was 92% agreement with the statements of the 2 sections, well above the appointed 70% threshold, suggesting that participants were overall satisfied with the effectiveness of the project meeting.

In the first section of questions, about the Meeting itself, the answers favour mostly the highest rate (Strongly Agree, 65%) while Agree is at 33%. A very small percentage (2%) is Neutral. The lowest rating received was 91% (“Q3 - The participants received all information about the meeting on time”) and the highest 95% (“Q5- Partners were able to interact with the other project’s partners”).

In the second section of questions about the perception of the Project after the meeting, the average agreement was 90% with response rates mostly at Strongly Agree (52%) and Agree (48%). No question has received Neutral or negative response. For all questions the received rating was 91%, except for Q7 - The timescales proposed are realistic and feasible, in which the rating was 89%.

As we can see from the graphs, in almost all statements, the number of responses “Strongly Agree” statement dominates over the other responses. The only exception is Q7 - The timescales proposed are realistic and feasible, where Agree responses are higher than Strongly Agree responses

In both sections no question has received Disagree or Strongly Disagree responses. Only one question has received one Neutral response. This question is: Q3 - The participants received all information about the meeting on time.

Table 2. Analysis of responses on 1-5 scale for the project meeting evaluation

	Count	1- Strongly Disagree	2- Disagree	3- Neutral	4- Agree	5- Strongly agree	weighted average
Section 1. The meeting							
The meeting was well planned and organised.	11	0%	0%	0%	36%	64%	93%
The agenda was balanced, focusing on all key aspects of the project.	11	0%	0%	0%	36%	64%	93%
The participants received all information about the meeting on time.	11	0%	0%	9%	27%	64%	91%
The presentations by the partners were clear and understandable.	11	0%	0%	0%	36%	64%	93%
Partners were able to interact with the other project’s partners.	11	0%	0%	0%	27%	73%	95%

	Count	1-Strongly Disagree	2-Disagree	3-Neutral	4-Agree	5-Strongly agree	weighted average
The timetable was respected.	11	0%	0%	0%	36%	64%	93%
	Avg. 1	0%	0%	2%	33%	65%	93%
Section2. The project after the meeting							
The timescales proposed are realistic and feasible.	11	0%	0%	0%	55%	45%	89%
The meeting contributed positively to the progress of the project and the scheduling of the next steps.	11	0%	0%	0%	45%	55%	91%
The communication between the partners was effective and clear.	11	0%	0%	0%	45%	55%	91%
The meeting helped with the development of trust and positive attitudes among partners.	11	0%	0%	0%	45%	55%	91%
	Avg. 2	0%	0%	0%	48%	52%	90%
	Avg. 1,2	0%	0%	1%	39%	60%	92%




Figure 3: Analysis of responses on 1-5 scale for the project meeting evaluation ("The Meeting")




Figure 4: Analysis of responses on 1-5 scale for the project meeting evaluation (“The Project after the Meeting”)

Open ended questions

In this section of the questionnaire, we asked partners about their perception of the effectiveness of the meeting to solve problems and questions, as well future obstacles. It must be noted that the following analysis concerns specific responses received, since most questions were either remained unanswered or received a general response. The open-ended question included the following:

The following element is still a major concern to me:

The specific received responses are the following:

- *Implementation in the partner countries*
- *Travelling during the pandemic*

Suggestions and aspects to be improved:

No suggestions were received.

Are there any additional comments you would like to make regarding the project?

The only closing additional comment received, repeated the need of physical meetings as it was stated also in previous meeting’s evaluation reports.

3. PROJECT QUALITY CONTROL: Training workshops' evaluation

All Training workshops/seminars undergo an internal evaluation process by the participants/trainees. After the end of the training, each participant is asked to rate several aspects of the training in a questionnaire (using hardcopies or Google Forms). The questionnaires include closed questions as well as open-ended questions for remarks, comments and suggestions.

The questionnaire used consists of 4 sections. The 1st section (Overall training experience) contains 13 closed questions (in case of online training the questions are 10) on 5-point Likert scale, where respondents have to give a grade between 1 and 5, with 5 being the highest (Fully Agree) and 1 the lowest (Fully Disagree). The 2nd section (Opinion of the Trainers) contains 5 closed questions on 5-point Likert scale, where respondents have to give a grade between 1 and 5, with 5 being the highest (Fully Agree) and 1 the lowest (Fully Disagree). The 3rd section contains one closed Yes/No question asking if the training was appropriate for the level of experience of the participant. The 4th section contains 3 open-ended questions regarding: Topics that were not or insufficiently covered – Topics not relevant to the training – Best part of the training.

Room for suggestions or comments for making the program more effective was also made available.

Respondents are asked to declare their organisation, for the purpose of ascertaining partner participation.

3.1 Skills Development (online, 16/03/2022)

A questionnaire was prepared and was delivered to all the participants through Google Forms after the “Skills Development” training workshop that was held online on March 16, 2022 by the National and Kapodistrian University of Athens (NKUA).

40 responses were received coming from the following universities:




Figure 5. Number of surveys submitted (N=40)

The position of the participants according to their responses is the following:




Figure 6. Position of participants (N=40)

The responses given by the participants are analysed below.

Analysis of scaled questions

The responses received can be found below. Most participants responded with a positive reply, marking the responses as Agree (40%), and Strongly Agree (27%) overall, for both sections. On average there was 71% agreement with the statements of the 2 sections, not much above the appointed 70% threshold, suggesting that the consortium should take measures for improvement.

In the first section of questions, about the overall experience about training, the majority of the answers are Strongly Agree (25%) and Agree (40%), while a percentage (13%) is Neutral. Also a 4% percentage Disagree and a 19% Strongly Disagree.

In the second section of questions about the participants' opinion of the trainers/presenters, the response rates are mostly Strongly Agree (31%) and Agree (38%) responses, while a 10% percentage is Neutral. Also in this section we have a 6% percentage Disagree and a 16% Strongly Disagree.

It is significant to be mentioned that 22% - 23% of the same participants rated negative (Disagree, Strongly Disagree) all questions in both sections.

Finally, 95% participants agreed that the training was appropriate for their level of experience.

Table 3. Analysis of responses on 1-5 scale for the Training workshop

	Count	1- Strongly Disagree	2- Disagree	3- Neutral	4- Agree	5- Strongly agree	weighted average
Section 1. Overall Training experience							
The training was well planned and organized	40	20%	3%	15%	45%	18%	68%
The chosen teleconference platform was suitable	40	20%	0%	23%	30%	28%	69%
The objectives of the training were	40	20%	3%	13%	45%	20%	69%

	Count	1-Strongly Disagree	2-Disagree	3-Neutral	4-Agree	5-Strongly agree	weighted average
clearly defined and met							
The training content was well organized	40	20%	8%	10%	38%	25%	68%
The topics of the training were clear and easy to follow	40	15%	5%	8%	43%	30%	74%
The length of training was sufficient	40	18%	5%	15%	45%	18%	68%
The training enhanced my understanding on the subject	40	15%	5%	8%	48%	25%	73%
The training was relevant to my needs	40	20%	3%	10%	40%	28%	71%
The training will be useful to me and my professional growth.	40	18%	3%	15%	25%	40%	74%
Training met my expectations.	40	20%	5%	13%	45%	18%	67%
	Avg. 1	19%	4%	13%	40%	25%	70%
Section 2. Opinion of the trainers/presenters							
The trainer was knowledgeable about the training topic.	40	20%	0%	10%	35%	35%	73%
The trainer succeeded to explain and illustrate concepts	40	15%	5%	10%	40%	30%	73%
The topics were presented in a clear and understandable manner.	40	13%	10%	8%	45%	25%	72%
The trainer encouraged participation, interaction and answered questions clearly.	40	15%	5%	13%	35%	33%	73%
The trainer's communication style kept me focused and interested.	40	15%	8%	10%	35%	33%	73%
	Avg. 2	16%	6%	10%	38%	31%	73%
	Avg. 1,2	18%	4%	12%	40%	27%	71%




Figure 7. Analysis of responses on 1-5 scale for the Overall Training experience




Figure 8. Analysis of responses on 1-5 scale for the opinion of the trainers/presenters



Figure 9. Analysis of responses on Yes-No scale for the appropriateness of the training according to the level of participants' experience

By analyzing the rates the questions received, we observe that all questions have a range from 1-5.

By analysing the weighted averages for each question on both sections, we observe that the lowest rated question was “The training met my expectations.” (67%), whereas the highest result came for the question “The topics of the training were clear and easy to follow” and “The training will be useful to me and my professional growth” (74%).

In the second section all five statements were rated similarly, ranging between 72-73%.

Open ended questions

In this section of the questionnaire, participants were asked to write suggestions or opinions about any of the aspects covered in the other questions or about issues not yet analysed. It must be noted that the following analysis concerns specific responses received, since most questions were either remained unanswered or received a general response. The open-ended questions included the following:

Which topics were not covered or insufficiently covered, in your opinion?

The (specific) responses on this question are the following:

- *How to apply soft skills in a practical way in art therapy sessions*
- *Empathy*
- *The relationship between soft skills and Art therapy*
- *Creative thinking*

Which topics were not relevant in your opinion?

The one specific response on this question stated that the topic that were not relevant was the Emotional Intelligence.

What did you like best about the training?

The specific received responses are the following:

- *The simplified information and the professors’ way of giving the lecture and the lecture was very light hearted.*
- *Trainers’ style and communication (7 responses)*
- *The applications of art therapy*
- *Exchanging experiences*
- *The circles training, that we have to think how we can connect between them without getting the line out or repeated*
- *I liked how the topics were illustrated very smooth*
- *Learning about empathy and sympathy*
- *The topics that were raised and focused on*
- *It was excellent in all respects (5 responses)*

- *The subject, the interaction with the participants and the video illustrations (3 responses)*
- *In this course I have more information about types of art and how can i use it in therapy*

What suggestions or comments do you have for making the program more effective?

The specific answers that we received are the following:

- *Doing exercises during the training*
- *Organisation: Find a suitable timing and make a united website for the schedule and any questions with the actual course organiser (8 responses)*
- *Arabic speaking trainers*
- *Focusing more on how to apply the concepts*
- *There must be some really cases for applications*
- *Make a time longer to discuss the subjects after the meet*
- *Face to face lectures can be more effective (5 responses)*
- *To have sessions that are directly helpful and relevant to our profession and our training*
- *If the lecture is translated into Arabic, because not everyone is at the same level*
- *Maybe work of more topics practice rather than topics theoretically*

3.2 Dementia & Arts (online, 29/03/2022)

A questionnaire was prepared and was delivered to all the participants through Google Forms after the “Dementia & Arts” training workshop that was held online on March 29, 2022 by the University College Limburg (UCLL).

18 responses were received coming from the following organisations:




Figure 10. Number of surveys submitted (N=18)

The position of the participants according to their responses is the following:




Figure 11. Position of participants (N=18)

The responses given by the participants are analysed below.

Analysis of scaled questions

The responses received can be found below. Most participants responded with a positive reply, marking the responses as Agree (37%), and Strongly Agree (33%) overall, for both sections. On average there was 77% agreement with the statements of the 2 sections, not much above the appointed 70% threshold, suggesting that the consortium should take measures for improvement.

In the first section of questions, about the overall experience about training, the majority of the answers are Strongly Agree (33%) and Agree (38%), while a percentage (19%) is Neutral. Also a 2% percentage Disagree and a 8% Strongly Disagree.

In the second section of questions about the participants' opinion of the trainers/presenters, the response rates are mostly Strongly Agree (33%) and Agree (36%) responses, while a 21% percentage is Neutral. Also in this section we have a 3% percentage Disagree and a 7% Strongly Disagree.

Finally, all participants agreed that the training was appropriate for their level of experience.

Table 4. Analysis of responses on 1-5 scale for the Training workshop

	Count	1- Strongly Disagree	2- Disagree	3- Neutral	4- Agree	5- Strongly agree	weighted average
Section 1. Overall Training experience							
The training was well planned and organized	18	11%	0%	11%	44%	33%	78%
The chosen teleconference platform was suitable	18	11%	0%	11%	61%	17%	74%
The objectives of the training were clearly defined and met	18	0%	11%	33%	28%	28%	74%
The training content was well organized	18	6%	6%	22%	22%	44%	79%
The topics of the training were clear and easy to follow	18	11%	0%	17%	39%	33%	77%

	Count	1-Strongly Disagree	2-Disagree	3-Neutral	4-Agree	5-Strongly agree	weighted average
The length of training was sufficient	18	6%	0%	22%	44%	28%	78%
The training enhanced my understanding on the subject	18	11%	0%	17%	39%	33%	77%
The training was relevant to my needs	18	6%	0%	28%	39%	28%	77%
The training will be useful to me and my professional growth.	18	6%	6%	11%	33%	44%	81%
Training met my expectations.	18	11%	0%	17%	33%	39%	78%
	Avg. 1	8%	2%	19%	38%	33%	77%
Section 2. Opinion of the trainers/presenters							
The trainer was knowledgeable about the training topic.	18	11%	0%	22%	28%	39%	77%
The trainer succeeded to explain and illustrate concepts	18	6%	11%	17%	33%	33%	76%
The topics were presented in a clear and understandable manner.	18	6%	0%	22%	50%	22%	77%
The trainer encouraged participation, interaction and answered questions clearly.	18	6%	0%	17%	44%	33%	80%
The trainer's communication style kept me focused and interested.	18	6%	6%	28%	22%	39%	77%
	Avg. 2	7%	3%	21%	36%	33%	77%
	Avg. 1,2	7%	3%	20%	37%	33%	77%




Figure 12. Analysis of responses on 1-5 scale for the Overall Training experience




Figure 13. Analysis of responses on 1-5 scale for the opinion of the trainers/presenters



Figure 14. Analysis of responses on Yes-No scale for the appropriateness of the training according to the level of participants' experience

By analyzing the rates the questions received, we observe that all questions have a range from 1-5.

By analysing the weighted averages for each question on both sections, we observe that the lowest rated question was "The chosen teleconference platform was suitable" and "The objectives of the training were clearly defined and met" (74%), whereas the highest result came for the question "The training will be useful to me and my professional growth" (81%).

In the second section all five statements were rated similarly, ranging between 76-80%.

Open ended questions

In this section of the questionnaire, participants were asked to write suggestions or opinions about any of the aspects covered in the other questions or about issues not yet analysed. It must be noted that the following analysis concerns specific responses received, since most questions were either remained unanswered or received a general response. The open-ended questions included the following:

Which topics were not covered or insufficiently covered, in your opinion?

The (specific) responses on this question are the following:

- *The difference between dementia and Alzheimer*
- *Autism& art therapy*

Which topics were not relevant in your opinion?

The nine specific responses on this question stated that all the topics were relevant and that the training was comprehensive.

What did you like best about the training?

Almost all participants replied on this question (16/18). Responses here referred to:

- *The exercises/ practical part of training (3 responses)*
- *Provided examples audiovisual/written / multimedia material/ video illustrations (5 responses)*
- *The effectiveness of music with people with dementia (5 responses)*
- *The questions part (3 responses)*

What suggestions or comments do you have for making the program more effective?

This question received answers by participants that referred to issues that were also mentioned to the previous training: a) the need of more training exercises, b) Arabic speaking trainers, c) more interactive trainings and d) more suitable time for the training.

3.3 Inhibitory control of voluntary Arm Movements: A doorway to free won't (online, 30/03/2022)

A questionnaire was prepared and was delivered to all the participants through Google Forms after the "Inhibitory control of voluntary Arm Movements: A doorway to free won't" training workshop that was held online on March 30, 2022 by the University of Brescia (UNIBS).

10 responses were received coming from the following organisations:




Figure 15. Number of surveys submitted (N=10)

All the participants according to their responses are students. The responses given by the participants are analysed below.

Analysis of scaled questions

The responses received can be found below. Most participants responded with a positive reply, marking the responses as Agree (41%), and Strongly Agree (27%) overall, for both sections. On average there was 76% agreement with the statements of the 2 sections, not much above the appointed 70% threshold, suggesting that the consortium should take measures for improvement.

In the first section of questions, about the overall experience about training, the majority of the answers are Strongly Agree (21%) and Agree (43%), while a percentage (20%) is Neutral. Also a small percentage (2%) Disagree and a 4% Strongly Disagree.

In the second section of questions about the participants' opinion of the trainers/presenters, the response rates are mostly Strongly Agree (38%) and Agree (36%) responses, while a 21% percentage is Neutral. Also in this section we have a 3% percentage Disagree and a 7% Strongly Disagree.

Finally, 70% of the participants agreed that the training was appropriate for their level of experience.

Table 5. Analysis of responses on 1-5 scale for the Training workshop

	Count	1- Strongly Disagree	2- Disagree	3- Neutral	4- Agree	5- Strongly agree	weighted average
Section 1. Overall Training experience							
The training was well planned and organized	10	0%	40%	10%	30%	20%	66%
The chosen teleconference platform was suitable	10	0%	0%	20%	50%	30%	82%
The objectives of the training were clearly defined and met	10	0%	20%	20%	40%	20%	72%
The training content was well organized	10	0%	10%	10%	60%	20%	78%
The topics of the training were clear and easy to follow	10	10%	0%	20%	40%	30%	76%
The length of training was sufficient	10	0%	20%	30%	40%	10%	68%
The training enhanced my understanding on the subject	10	10%	0%	10%	60%	20%	76%
The training was relevant to my needs	10	0%	10%	30%	40%	20%	74%
The training will be useful to me and my professional growth.	10	0%	0%	40%	40%	20%	76%
Training met my expectations.	10	10%	10%	30%	30%	20%	68%
	Avg. 1	3%	11%	22%	43%	21%	74%
Section 2. Opinion of the trainers/presenters							
The trainer was knowledgeable about the training topic.	10	0%	0%	10%	40%	50%	88%

	Count	1- Strongly Disagree	2- Disagree	3- Neutral	4- Agree	5- Strongly agree	weighted average
The trainer succeeded to explain and illustrate concepts	10	0%	0%	20%	40%	40%	84%
The topics were presented in a clear and understandable manner.	10	10%	0%	20%	30%	40%	78%
The trainer encouraged participation, interaction and answered questions clearly.	10	10%	0%	30%	30%	30%	74%
The trainer's communication style kept me focused and interested.	10	0%	10%	20%	40%	30%	78%
	Avg. 2	4%	2%	20%	36%	38%	80%
	Avg. 1,2	3%	8%	21%	41%	27%	76%




Figure 16. Analysis of responses on 1-5 scale for the Overall Training experience




Figure 17. Analysis of responses on 1-5 scale for the opinion of the trainers/presenters




Figure 18. Analysis of responses on Yes-No scale for the appropriateness of the training according to the level of participants' experience

By analyzing the rates the questions received, we observe that 5 out of 15 questions have a range from 1-5.

By analysing the weighted averages for each question on both sections, we observe that the lowest rated question was "The training was well planned and organized" (66 %), whereas the highest result came for the question "The trainer was knowledgeable about the training topic" (88%).

Open ended questions

In this section of the questionnaire, participants were asked to write suggestions or opinions about any of the aspects covered in the other questions or about issues not yet analysed. It must be noted that the following analysis concerns specific responses received, since most questions were either remained unanswered or received a general response. The open-ended questions included the following:

Which topics were not covered or insufficiently covered, in your opinion?

No (specific) responses were received on this question.

Which topics were not relevant in your opinion?

No (specific) responses were received on this question.

What did you like best about the training?

No (specific) responses were received on this question.

What suggestions or comments do you have for making the program more effective?

The responses of participants on this question are the following:

- *I think the meetings should be more organized in next time. To be honest the environment of the online meetings did not encourage me to interact. I wish if they were face to face, it makes me feel more comfortable to interact and understand the lecture clearly.*
- *Timing*
- *Exercises*

3.4 Training Workshop in Music Therapy on 16-27 May 2022 (Osijek, Croatia)

A questionnaire was prepared and was delivered to all the participants through Google Forms after the “Music Therapy” training workshop.

29 responses were received coming from the following organisations:




Figure 19. Number of surveys submitted (N=29)

All the participants according to their responses are staff and students. The responses given by the participants are analysed below.

Analysis of scaled questions

The responses received can be found below in Figures 20, 21 and 22 and Table 6. Most participants responded with a positive reply, marking the responses as Agree (40%), and Strongly Agree (50%) overall, for both sections. On average there was 88% agreement with the statements of the 2 sections, well above the appointed 70% threshold, suggesting that participants were overall satisfied with the effectiveness of the training webinar and the trainers.

In the first section of questions, about the overall experience about training, the majority of the answers are Fully Agree (44%) and Agree (45%). The majority of questions have received “Neutral” responses, while the questions regarding the suitability of the chosen teleconference platform and the sufficiency of the length of the training received “Disagree” response by one participant.

In the second section of questions about the participants’ opinion of the trainers/presenters, the response rates are mostly Fully Agree (62%) and Agree (31%) responses, while a very small percentage (5%) is Neutral and Disagree (2%). The questions that received one Disagree response are: “The trainer succeeded to explain and illustrate concepts” and “The topics were presented in a clear and understandable manner”.

18 participants agreed that the training was appropriate for their level of experience, while one participant replied negative.

Table 6. Analysis of responses on 1-5 scale for the Training workshop

	Count	1-Fully Disagree	2-Disagree	3-Neutral	4-Agree	5-Fully agree	weighted average
Section 1. Overall Training experience							
The training was well planned and organized.	29	0%	0%	0%	47%	53%	91%
The chosen teleconference platform was suitable.	29	0%	5%	11%	42%	42%	84%
The objectives of the training were clearly defined and met.	29	0%	0%	16%	42%	42%	85%
The training content was well organised.	29	0%	0%	0%	58%	42%	88%
The topics of the training were clear and easy to follow.	29	0%	0%	11%	37%	53%	88%
The length of training was sufficient.	29	0%	5%	16%	42%	37%	82%
The training enhanced my understanding on the subject.	29	0%	0%	16%	42%	42%	85%
The training was relevant to my needs.	29	0%	0%	11%	37%	53%	88%
The training will be useful to me and my professional growth.	29	0%	0%	11%	42%	47%	87%
Training met my expectations.	29	0%	0%	11%	58%	32%	84%
	Avg. 1	0%	1%	10%	45%	44%	86%
Section 2. Opinion of the trainers/presenters							
The trainer was knowledgeable about the training topic.	29	0%	0%	5%	26%	68%	93%
The trainer succeeded to explain and illustrate concepts	29	0%	5%	5%	32%	58%	88%
The topics were presented in a clear and understandable manner.	29	0%	5%	5%	42%	47%	86%
The trainer encouraged participation, interaction and answered questions clearly.	29	0%	0%	5%	26%	68%	93%
The trainer's communication style kept me focused and interested.	29	0%	0%	5%	26%	68%	93%
	Avg. 2	0%	2%	5%	31%	62%	91%
	Avg. 1,2	0%	1%	8%	40%	50%	88%




Figure 20. Analysis of responses on 1-5 scale for the Overall Training experience




Figure 21. Analysis of responses on 1-5 scale for the opinion of the trainers/presenters




Figure 22: Analysis of responses on Yes-No scale for the appropriateness of the training according to the level of participants' experience

As we can see from the graphs, the number of responses “Fully Agree” and “Agree” statement dominate over the other responses. All questions received “Disagree” and “Neutral” responses, except the question “The training was well planned and organized”, which received only positive responses. The question with the lower weighted average (82%) was “The length of training was sufficient” while questions with the highest weighted average (93%) were about the opinion of the trainer: “The trainer was knowledgeable about the training topic”, “The trainer encouraged participation, interaction and answered questions clearly” and “The trainer’s communication style kept me focused and interested”.

Open ended questions

In this section of the questionnaire, participants were asked to write suggestions or opinions about any of the aspects covered in the other questions or about issues not yet analysed. It must be noted that the following analysis concerns specific responses received, since most questions were either remained unanswered or received a general response. The open-ended questions included the following:

Which topics were not covered or insufficiently covered, in your opinion?

The following (specific) responses were received on this question:

- *How to use instruments. I know the training wasn't about it but we were able to learn a lot in only one session .. can you imagine what could we do in 2 weeks of training how to use instruments.*
- *Piano lessons*
- *I would have loved to know more about visual arts therapy.*

Which topics were not relevant in your opinion?

The (specific) response received was:

- *Percussion*

What did you like best about the training?

Responses received:

- *The interactive and practical part*
- *The rhythm section and meditation*
- *The way how they train us and the ease and comfort communication between the students(us) and the trainers.*
- *The variety of exercises and sessions*
- *The trainers had a style that make you participate.*
- *The variety of subjects and the mix between theoretical and practical sessions*
- *training about the horse*

What suggestions or comments do you have for making the program more effective?

The responses of participants on this question are the following:

- *Longer period of training*
- *Timing was limited.*
- *More visits to view how these topics can be used with actual parties.*
- *The trainers were passionate about what the topic and that made it special and fun*