

REPORT

ON THE OUTCOMES OF THE SHORT-TERM EVALUATION QUESTIONNAIRES

Test-the-Training Sessions

No. 1 (DAY 1 and DAY 2)

Vilnius (Lithuania), 17-18 September 2018

drafted by Partner TEISE

No. 2 (DAY 1 and DAY 2)

Braga (Portugal), 26-27 November 2018

drafted by Partner UMINHO

Test-the-Training Session No. 1 (DAY 1 and DAY 2)
Vilnius (Lithuania), 17-18 September 2018
 drafted by Partner TEISE

Report on the outcomes of the Short-Term Evaluation Questionnaire

I. INTRODUCTION

Test the Training Session No 1 (hereinafter - "Training 1") took place on 17–18 of September, 2018, in Vilnius, Lithuania. It was dedicated to jurisdiction and applicable law in cross-border divorce and maintenance cases (for details please see the Program of the training).

Organization of the event was administered and managed by hosting partner of the project, Law Institute of Lithuania (TEISE). For the location of the event, conference hall of "Ratonda" hotel was chosen. The same hotel offered special price for accommodation and organized catering of the event.

II. PARTICIPANTS

Details regarding the number, profession and origin of the participants are provided in the table below:

Date		PARTICIPANTS					
		Lithuania	Hungary	Italy	Portugal	External evaluator	Total
17-09-2018 (Monday)	Participants	30	3	3	3	1	40
		L* – 21 SW** – 5 O*** – 4	L – 3	L – 2 SW – 1	L – 3	N/A	L – 29 SW – 6 O – 4
	Trainers	2	2	4	3	N/A	11
18-09-2018 (Tuesday)	Participants	28	3	3	3	1	38
		L – 21 SW – 5 O – 2	L – 3	L – 2 SW – 1	L – 3	N/A	L – 29 SW – 6 O – 2
	Trainers	2	2	4	3	N/A	11
TOTAL		62	10	14	12	2	100

* L – lawyers;

** SW – social workers.

*** O – others.

Participants were selected from candidates who applied for the training by submitting applications to the partner in each country, and through the selection procedure run in cooperation with social partners (Lithuanian Bar Association, Service for Protection of Children Rights of Lithuania, Budapest Bar Association, etc.)

III. SURVEY AND ITS RESULTS

For getting instant feedback about the Training 1, participants were invited to fill-in the short-term evaluation questionnaire where they were asked to evaluate statements in the scale from 1 to 5 (where 1 is the low rate, dissatisfaction, and 5 – high rate, high satisfaction), grouped into six sections, each dedicated to:

- 1) general information about participants (country of origin, profession);
- 2) organisation and logistics of the event;
- 3) overall evaluation of the training;
- 4) trainers;
- 5) self-evaluation and benefit for the trainees;
- 6) evaluation of each presentation individually.

Participants were also welcome to leave their own comment, feedback or share any other ideas.

Further, based on the participants' responses, general comments are provided by summing up the responses to the questions of each section. Exact evaluations are provided in the charts, which can be found in the Annex 1 to this Report.

In total, 32 filled-in questionnaires were received (i.e. 84 % of trainees, which attended both days of the Training 1 – 38). Most of questionnaires were returned with all or almost all statements evaluated, however some questionnaires contained only some responses. Only few participants took an opportunity to leave a comment (in total, nine).

ANALYSIS OF THE RESPONSES

1) General information about participants

Mainly, participants came from Lithuania. Three participants from each of the partners' countries (in total, nine) attended the Training 1. Most of them were lawyers (or associates, as the case may be in Lithuania), two participants from Hungary indicated they held PhD degree in law. Almost all trainees attended both days of the Training 1 (first day – 40, second day – 38).

2) Organisation and Logistics of the Event

Participants gave a strongly positive feedback as to organisational and logistics aspects of the event. They felt comfortable with the overall schedule of the event (timing, length of the pauses, lunch breaks, etc.).

84 % of respondents were extremely satisfied with the location, choice of premises for the event, and equipment available. Almost 80 % of participants rated overall schedule at the highest rate of 5, 1 person out of 32 totally disliked it. Not all participants had to travel and needed accommodation for attending the trainings, therefore 22 respondents answered the relevant question, by evaluating organisation of travelling and accommodation at high rate, 77 % giving the highest mark of 5.

3) Overall evaluation of the training

At evaluating the Training 1 in general, 90 % of participants gave the highest mark of 5, and the remaining 10 % rated the training at the mark 4. Similarly, close to 90 % of respondents thought that the training was very effective, supporting materials provided were very helpful, and teaching methods and the content of the training was at very good level. 1 person out of 32 respondents thought that content of the training was at inappropriate level (evaluated by 2), and 2 persons marked that usefulness of training in a foreign language and the interaction with colleagues from other countries was at the middle level.

Despite highly positive general feedback in general, participants commented that the training could be more interactive, allowing for interaction of participants, sharing experience in different countries, having a dialogue between representatives of different legal professions (lawyers – social workers).

Several respondents suggested that case studies should be done in small groups. This is an interesting observation given that doing the case studies the audience was extremely silent, and mostly all participants worked individually. This leads to a thought that speakers should consider techniques of facilitation of work in groups. It might also be important that the space could be organized in the way allowing for teams to sit comfortably in groups (tables allowing for more than 2 persons to sit together, etc.).

4) Trainers

Participants were asked to share their opinion on preparation level of the speakers, structure and effectiveness of presentations, the extent of addressing the issues important for particular legal profession, speakers' engagement in discussion and its facilitation.

Generally, participants' feedback is highly positive, with around 80 % rate of 5 for all questions. However, one participant regarded that presentations and actuality of the issues were addressed at middle level.

5) Self-evaluation and benefit for the trainees

Almost half of all trainees evaluated their knowledge as of middle level. 3 participants sated their knowledge was basic, and 6 participants evaluated having deep knowledge of the subject. It is worth to note that 75 % of participants, including both basic and advanced learners, felt that they strongly advanced in the EU family law and improved professional skills

during the Training 1. Slightly lower percentage responded that knowledge gained would be useful in their daily work.

6) Evaluation of each presentation individually

For each presentation, participants were asked to evaluate separately clarity and effectiveness of explanation of the topic and case studies. Almost all presentations were scored 5 by around 80 % of participants for speaker's presentation on the subject matter. Similar (or slightly lower) scores were given for case studies.

IV. SUMMARY AND PROPOSALS FOR IMPROVEMENTS

In general, participants' feedback was highly positive in all aspects. For the trainer's module creation partners should consider further testing/ improving following aspects:

- Split of time between presentation (passive listening of participants) and case studies;
- Case studies on groups – techniques of forming groups, facilitating work in groups, adapting case studies to such work model, etc.;
- Facilitation of interaction between counterparties, including during coffee breaks and/ or lunch;
- Consider preparing name cards for participants and trainers, for easier interaction.

Vilnius, October 2018

(ANNEX: Summaries of the responses)

II) PROFESSIONAL BACKGROUND													
		Social service staff		Academic		Other							
	Lawyer	28	4	2	0	34							
Total		82,33%	11,76%	5,88%	0,00%	100,00%							
PERCENTAGE													
III) BACKGROUND - country of residence													
		Italy		Lithuania		Portugal		Other					
	Hungary	3	22	4	0	32							
Total		9,38%	68,75%	12,50%	0,00%	100,00%							
PERCENTAGE													
III) ORGANISATION AND LOGISTICS OF THE EVENT													
a) OVERALL SCHEDULE													
		1		2		3		4		5			
	1	0	0	0	6	25	32	0	0	0	5	17	22
Total		3,13%	0,00%	0,00%	6,25%	9,38%	84,38%	0,00%	0,00%	0,00%	22,73%	77,27%	100,00%
PERCENTAGE													
b) LOCATION AND EQUIPMENT													
		1		2		3		4		5			
	1	0	0	2	3	27	32	0	0	0	5	17	22
Total		0,00%	0,00%	6,25%	9,38%	84,38%	100,00%	0,00%	0,00%	0,00%	22,73%	77,27%	100,00%
PERCENTAGE													
c) TRAINING CONTENT													
		1		2		3		4		5			
	1	0	0	1	1	4	24	30	0	0	6	25	31
Total		0,00%	0,00%	3,33%	3,33%	23,33%	80,00%	100,00%	0,00%	0,00%	19,35%	80,65%	100,00%
PERCENTAGE													
d) FOREIGN LANGUAGE TRAINING													
		1		2		3		4		5			
	1	0	0	2	3	25	30	0	0	1	4	24	30
Total		0,00%	0,00%	6,67%	10,00%	83,33%	100,00%	0,00%	0,00%	3,33%	23,33%	80,00%	100,00%
PERCENTAGE													
e) TRAINING MATERIALS													
		1		2		3		4		5			
	1	0	0	0	0	6	25	31	0	0	0	4	27
Total		0,00%	0,00%	0,00%	0,00%	19,35%	80,65%	100,00%	0,00%	0,00%	0,00%	12,90%	87,10%
PERCENTAGE													
f) DIDACTIC TOOLS AND METHODS													
		1		2		3		4		5			
	1	0	0	0	0	0	27	31	0	0	0	4	27
Total		0,00%	0,00%	0,00%	0,00%	0,00%	87,10%	100,00%	0,00%	0,00%	0,00%	12,90%	87,10%
PERCENTAGE													
IV) TRAINERS													
a) WELL-PREPARED													
		1		2		3		4		5			
	1	0	0	0	2	30	32	0	0	1	5	26	31
Total		0,00%	0,00%	0,00%	6,25%	93,75%	100,00%	0,00%	0,00%	3,13%	15,63%	81,25%	100,00%
PERCENTAGE													
b) PRESENTATIONS													
		1		2		3		4		5			
	1	0	0	1	1	5	26	32	0	0	7	22	30
Total		0,00%	0,00%	3,13%	3,13%	15,63%	81,25%	100,00%	0,00%	0,00%	23,33%	73,33%	100,00%
PERCENTAGE													
c) MAIN ISSUES													
		1		2		3		4		5			
	1	0	0	0	1	7	22	30	0	0	4	27	31
Total		0,00%	0,00%	0,00%	3,33%	23,33%	73,33%	100,00%	0,00%	0,00%	12,90%	87,10%	100,00%
PERCENTAGE													
d) ENGAGE IN DISCUSSION													
		1		2		3		4		5			
	1	0	0	0	0	0	4	27	31	0	0	4	27
Total		0,00%	0,00%	0,00%	0,00%	0,00%	12,90%	87,10%	100,00%	0,00%	0,00%	12,90%	87,10%
PERCENTAGE													
V) SELF-EVALUATION AND BENEFIT													
a) LEVEL OF YOUR KNOWLEDGE													
		1		2		3		4		5			
	1	3	1	15	7	6	32	0	1	1	8	22	32
Total		9,38%	3,13%	46,88%	21,88%	18,75%	100,00%	0,00%	3,13%	3,13%	25,00%	68,75%	100,00%
PERCENTAGE													
b) IMPROVE KNOWLEDGE													
		1		2		3		4		5			
	1	0	0	1	1	6	24	32	0	1	1	8	22
Total		0,00%	0,00%	3,13%	3,13%	18,75%	75,00%	100,00%	0,00%	3,13%	25,00%	68,75%	100,00%
PERCENTAGE													
c) IMPROVE PROFESSIONAL SKILLS													
		1		2		3		4		5			
	1	0	0	1	1	8	22	32	0	1	6	13	11
Total		0,00%	0,00%	3,13%	3,13%	25,00%	68,75%	100,00%	0,00%	3,23%	13,35%	41,94%	35,48%
PERCENTAGE													
d) KNOWLEDGE IN YOUR DAILY WORK LIFE													
		1		2		3		4		5			
	1	0	0	1	6	13	11	31	0	1	6	13	11
Total		0,00%	0,00%	3,23%	13,35%	41,94%	35,48%	100,00%	0,00%	3,23%	13,35%	41,94%	35,48%
PERCENTAGE													
VI) SPECIFIC QUESTIONS													
1) Warming up session													
		1		2		3		4		5			
	1	0	0	2	4	25	31	0	0	0	5	26	31
Total		0,00%	0,00%	6,46%	12,90%	80,65%	100,00%	0,00%	0,00%	0,00%	16,13%	83,87%	100,00%
PERCENTAGE													
2) Jurisdiction matrimonial matters													
		1		2		3		4		5			
	1	0	0	0	0	0	30	31	0	0	1	0	31
Total		0,00%	0,00%	0,00%	0,00%	0,00%	100,00%	100,00%	0,00%	0,00%	3,23%	0,00%	96,77%
PERCENTAGE													
3) Prorogation and lis pendens													
		1		2		3		4		5			
	1	1	2	3	4	5	5	31	0	0	1	5	25
Total		3,23%	6,46%	9,69%	12,90%	16,13%	83,87%	100,00%	0,00%	0,00%	3,23%	16,13%	80,65%
PERCENTAGE													

f) CASE STUDIES						e) CASE STUDIES AND TRAINING NEEDS					
1	2	3	4	5		1	2	3	4	5	
0	0	0	5	25	30	0	0	0	6	25	31
0,00%	0,00%	0,00%	16,67%	83,33%	100,00%	0,00%	0,00%	0,00%	19,35%	80,65%	100,00%

4) Recognition and enforcement in matrimonial cases											
a) CONTENTS						b) CASE STUDIES					
1	2	3	4	5		1	2	3	4	5	
0	0	3	7	21	31	0	1	3	5	22	31
0,00%	0,00%	9,68%	22,58%	67,74%	100,00%	0,00%	3,23%	9,68%	16,13%	70,97%	100,00%

5) Law applicable in divorce cases											
a) CONTENTS						b) CASE STUDIES					
1	2	3	4	5		1	2	3	4	5	
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	28	31
0,00%	0,00%	0,00%	0,00%	0,00%	0,00%	0,00%	0,00%	0,00%	9,68%	90,32%	100,00%

		6) Maintenance obligations and jurisdiction					7) Law applicable in maintenance cases					8) Recognition and enforcement in maintenance cases											
		a) CONTENTS					b) CASE STUDIES					a) CONTENTS					b) CASE STUDIES						
1	2	3	4	5		1	2	3	4	5		1	2	3	4	5		1	2	3	4	5	
0	1	1	3	26	31	0	1	0	2	28	31	0	1	1	3	26	31	0	1	1	3	26	31
0.00%	3.23%	3.23%	9.68%	83.87%	100.00%	0.00%	3.23%	0.00%	6.45%	90.32%	100.00%	0.00%	3.23%	3.23%	9.68%	83.87%	100.00%	0.00%	3.23%	3.23%	9.68%	83.87%	100.00%
		6) Maintenance obligations and jurisdiction					7) Law applicable in maintenance cases					8) Recognition and enforcement in maintenance cases											
		a) CONTENTS					b) CASE STUDIES					a) CONTENTS					b) CASE STUDIES						
1	2	3	4	5		1	2	3	4	5		1	2	3	4	5		1	2	3	4	5	
0	1	1	3	26	31	0	1	0	2	28	31	0	1	1	3	26	31	0	1	1	3	26	31
0.00%	3.23%	3.23%	9.68%	83.87%	100.00%	0.00%	3.23%	0.00%	6.45%	90.32%	100.00%	0.00%	3.23%	3.23%	9.68%	83.87%	100.00%	0.00%	3.23%	3.23%	9.68%	83.87%	100.00%

Test-the-Training Session No. 2 (DAY 1 and DAY 2)
Braga (Portugal), 26-27 November 2018
 drafted by Partner UMINHO

Report on the outcomes of the Short-Term Evaluation Questionnaire

I. INTRODUCTION

Test the Training Session No 2 (hereinafter - “Training 2”) took place on 26-27 November, 2018, in Braga, Portugal. It was dedicated to parental responsibility and international child abduction (for details please see the Program of the training).

Organization of the event was administered and managed by hosting partner of the project, University of Minho (Uminho). For the location of the event, room 0.01 of School of Law of the University of Minho. The coffee break and lunch were offered by the organization of the event. The coffee break took place in the School of Law and the lunch in Panoramic Restaurant, both at the University of Minho.

II. PARTICIPANTS

Details regarding the number, profession and origin of the participants are provided in the table below:

Date		PARTICIPANTS					
		Lithuania	Hungary	Italy	Portugal	External evaluator	Total
26-09-2018 (Monday)	Participants	2	3	3	14	0	22
	Trainers	L* – 1 SW** – 1	L – 3	L – 2 SW – 1	L – 8 SW* - 2 O*** -3 A**** - 1	N/A	L – 14 SW – 4 O – 3 A- 1
27-09-2018 (Tuesday)	Participants	2	3	3	15	0	23
	Trainers	L – 1 SW – 1	L – 3	L – 2 SW – 1	L – 9 SW* - 2 O*** -3 A**** - 1	N/A	L – 15 SW – 4 O – 3 A- 1

TOTAL	8	10	12	35	0	65
--------------	----------	-----------	-----------	-----------	----------	-----------

* L – lawyers;

** SW – social workers.

*** O – others.

**** A – academic

Participants were selected from candidates who applied for the training by submitting applications to the partner in each country, and through the selection procedure run in cooperation with social partners (Portuguese Bar Association, Lithuanian Bar Association, Service for Protection of Children Rights of Lithuania, Budapest Bar Association, etc.)

III. SURVEY AND ITS RESULTS

For getting instant feedback about the Training 2, participants were invited to fill-in the short-term evaluation questionnaire where they were asked to evaluate statements in the scale from 1 to 5 (where 1 is the low rate, dissatisfaction, and 5 – high rate, high satisfaction), grouped into six sections, each dedicated to:

- 1) general information about participants (country of origin, profession);
- 2) organisation and logistics of the event;
- 3) overall evaluation of the training;
- 4) trainers;
- 5) self-evaluation and benefit for the trainees;
- 6) evaluation of each presentation individually.

Participants were also welcome to leave their own comment, feedback or share any other ideas.

Further, based on the participants' responses, general comments are provided by summing up the responses to the questions of each section. Exact evaluations are provided in the charts, which can be found in the Annex 1 to this Report.

In total, 23 filled-in questionnaires were received (100 % of trainees, which attended both days of the Training 2 – 23). Most of questionnaires were returned with all or almost all statements evaluated, however some questionnaires contained only some responses. Only two participant took an opportunity to leave a comment.

ANALYSIS OF THE RESPONSES

1) General information about participants

Mainly, participants came from Portugal. Two/Three participants from each of the partners' countries (in total, eight) attended the Training 2. Most of them were lawyers (or trainee lawyers, as the case may be in Portugal), four participants were service social workers,

and one participant is a PhD candidate (from Portugal). Almost all trainees attended both days of the Training 2 (first day – 22, second day – 23).

2) Organisation and Logistics of the Event

Participants gave a strongly positive feedback as to organisational and logistics aspects of the event. They felt comfortable with the overall schedule of the event (timing, length of the pauses, lunch breaks, etc.).

91,30 % of respondents were extremely satisfied with the location, choice of premises for the event, and equipment available. Almost 82,61 % of participants rated overall schedule at the highest rate of 5. Not all participants had to travel and needed accommodation for attending the trainings, therefore only 19 respondents answered the relevant question, by evaluating organisation of travelling and accommodation at high rate, (84,21% giving the highest mark of 5).

3) Overall evaluation of the training

At evaluating the Training 2 in general, 65,22 % of participants gave the highest mark of 5, and the remaining 34,78 % rated the training at the mark 4. 73,91 % of respondents thought that the training was very effective, supporting materials provided were very helpful, and teaching methods and the content of the training was at very good level. 1 person out of 23 respondents thought that content of the training was at inappropriate level (evaluated by 2), and 1 person marked that usefulness of training in a foreign language and the interaction with colleagues from other countries was at the middle level.

4) Trainers

Participants were asked to share their opinion on preparation level of the speakers, structure and effectiveness of presentations, the extent of addressing the issues important for particular legal profession, speakers' engagement in discussion and its facilitation.

Generally, participants' feedback is highly positive, with around 78,26 % rate of 5 for all questions. However, one participant regarded that presentations and actuality of the issues were addressed at middle level.

5) Self-evaluation and benefit for the trainees

Almost half of all trainees evaluated their knowledge as of middle level (evaluated by 3) or advanced level (evaluated by 4). 4 participants stated their knowledge was basic (evaluated by 1 and 2), and 4 participants evaluated having deep knowledge of the subject. It is worth noticing that 56,52 % of participants, including both basic and advanced learners, felt that they strongly advanced in the EU family law and improved professional skills during the Training 2. Slightly lower percentage responded that knowledge gained would be useful in their daily work (only 5 participants).

6) Evaluation of each presentation individually

For each presentation, participants were asked to evaluate separately clarity and effectiveness of explanation of the topic and case studies. Almost all presentations were scored 5 by around 60-75% of participants for speaker's presentation on the subject matter (two presentation were scored 95%). Similar (or slightly lower) scores were given for case studies.

IV. SUMMARY AND PROPOSALS FOR IMPROVEMENTS

In general, participants' feedback was highly positive in all aspects. For the trainer's module creation partners should consider further testing/ improving following aspects:

- Case studies on groups – techniques of forming groups, facilitating work in groups, adapting case studies to such work model, etc.;
- Start the presentation with a real case study.

Braga, December 2018

(ANNEX 1: Summaries of the responses)

I) a) Professional background												
	Lawyer	15	65,22%	Social service staff	4	17,39%	Academic	1	4,35%	Other	3	13,04%
Total		15	65,22%		4	17,39%		1	4,35%		3	13,04%
Total		15	65,22%		4	17,39%		1	4,35%		3	13,04%
PERCENTAGE												
I) b) Background - country of residence												
	Hungary	3	13,04%	Italy	3	13,04%	Lithuania	2	8,70%	Portugal	15	65,22%
Total		3	13,04%		3	13,04%		2	8,70%		15	65,22%
Total		3	13,04%		3	13,04%		2	8,70%		15	65,22%
PERCENTAGE												
II) ORGANISATION AND LOGISTICS OF THE EVENT												
a) OVERALL SCHEDULE												
	1	2	3	4	5	23	100,00%	1	2	3	4	5
Total	0	0	1	3	19	23	100,00%	0	0	2	21	23
Total	0	0	1	3	19	23	100,00%	0	0	2	21	23
PERCENTAGE												
b) LOCATION AND EQUIPMENT												
	1	2	3	4	5	23	100,00%	1	2	3	4	5
Total	0	0	0	0	2	21	100,00%	0	0	0	3	16
Total	0	0	0	0	2	21	100,00%	0	0	0	3	16
PERCENTAGE												
c) TRAVEL AND ACCOMMODATION												
	1	2	3	4	5	19	100,00%	1	2	3	4	5
Total	0	0	0	0	3	16	100,00%	0	0	0	3	16
Total	0	0	0	0	3	16	100,00%	0	0	0	3	16
PERCENTAGE												
III) OVERALL EVALUATION OF THE TRAINING												
a) OVERALL EVALUATION												
	1	2	3	4	5	23	100,00%	1	2	3	4	5
Total	0	0	0	8	15	23	100,00%	0	1	1	4	16
Total	0	0	0	8	15	23	100,00%	0	1	1	4	16
PERCENTAGE												
b) FOREIGN LANGUAGE TRAINING												
	1	2	3	4	5	23	100,00%	1	2	3	4	5
Total	0	0	0	1	4	16	100,00%	0	0	0	5	17
Total	0	0	0	1	4	16	100,00%	0	0	0	5	17
PERCENTAGE												
c) TRAINING CONTENT												
	1	2	3	4	5	23	100,00%	1	2	3	4	5
Total	0	0	0	0	5	17	100,00%	0	0	0	5	17
Total	0	0	0	0	5	17	100,00%	0	0	0	5	17
PERCENTAGE												
d) TRAINING MATERIALS												
	1	2	3	4	5	23	100,00%	1	2	3	4	5
Total	0	0	0	0	6	17	100,00%	0	0	0	6	17
Total	0	0	0	0	6	17	100,00%	0	0	0	6	17
PERCENTAGE												
IV) TRAINERS												
a) WELL-PREPARED												
	1	2	3	4	5	23	100,00%	1	2	3	4	5
Total	0	0	1	4	18	23	100,00%	0	0	1	7	15
Total	0	0	1	4	18	23	100,00%	0	0	1	7	15
PERCENTAGE												
b) PRESENTATIONS												
	1	2	3	4	5	23	100,00%	1	2	3	4	5
Total	0	0	1	7	15	23	100,00%	0	0	1	7	15
Total	0	0	1	7	15	23	100,00%	0	0	1	7	15
PERCENTAGE												
c) MAIN ISSUES												
	1	2	3	4	5	23	100,00%	1	2	3	4	5
Total	0	0	0	4	5	14	100,00%	0	0	0	4	14
Total	0	0	0	4	5	14	100,00%	0	0	0	4	14
PERCENTAGE												
d) ENGAGE IN DISCUSSION												
	1	2	3	4	5	23	100,00%	1	2	3	4	5
Total	0	0	0	3	4	16	100,00%	0	0	0	3	16
Total	0	0	0	3	4	16	100,00%	0	0	0	3	16
PERCENTAGE												
V) SELF-EVALUATION AND BENEFIT												
a) LEVEL OF YOUR KNOWLEDGE												
	1	2	3	4	5	23	100,00%	1	2	3	4	5
Total	2	3	7	7	4	23	100,00%	0	2	1	7	13
Total	2	3	7	7	4	23	100,00%	0	2	1	7	13
PERCENTAGE												
b) IMPROVE KNOWLEDGE												
	1	2	3	4	5	23	100,00%	1	2	3	4	5
Total	8,70%	13,04%	30,43%	30,43%	17,39%	23	100,00%	0,00%	8,70%	13,04%	39,13%	39,13%
Total	8,70%	13,04%	30,43%	30,43%	17,39%	23	100,00%	0,00%	8,70%	13,04%	39,13%	39,13%
PERCENTAGE												
c) IMPROVE PROFESSIONAL SKILLS												
	1	2	3	4	5	23	100,00%	1	2	3	4	5
Total	0	0	0	0	9	23	100,00%	0	2	3	9	14
Total	0	0	0	0	9	23	100,00%	0	2	3	9	14
PERCENTAGE												
d) KNOWLEDGE IN YOUR DAILY WORK LIFE												
	1	2	3	4	5	23	100,00%	1	2	3	4	5
Total	0	0	0	3	5	23	100,00%	0	0	0	3	13
Total	0	0	0	3	5	23	100,00%	0	0	0	3	13
PERCENTAGE												
VI) SPECIFIC QUESTIONS												
1) Parental Responsibility: General Overview												
	1	2	3	4	5	23	100,00%	1	2	3	4	5
Total	0	0	4	6	12	22	100,00%	0	0	1	8	14
Total	0	0	4	6	12	22	100,00%	0	0	1	8	14
PERCENTAGE												
2) Jurisdiction in parental responsibility matters												
	1	2	3	4	5	23	100,00%	1	2	3	4	5
Total	0	0	0	3	7	13	100,00%	0	0	3	7	13
Total	0	0	0	3	7	13	100,00%	0	0	3	7	13
PERCENTAGE												
3) Law applicable in parental responsibility matters (1996 Hague Convention)												
	1	2	3	4	5	23	100,00%	1	2	3	4	5
Total	0	0	0	2	7	14	100,00%	0	0	0	2	7
Total	0	0	0	2	7	14	100,00%	0	0	0	2	7
PERCENTAGE												

e) DIDACTIC TOOLS AND METHODS						f) CASE STUDIES					g) CASE STUDIES AND TRAINING NEEDS					
1	2	3	4	5		1	2	3	4	5		1	2	3	4	5
0	0	0	8	15	23	0	0	1	11	11	23	0	0	2	8	13
0,00%	0,00%	0,00%	34,78%	65,22%	100,00%	0,00%	0,00%	4,35%	47,83%	47,83%	100,00%	0,00%	0,00%	8,70%	34,78%	56,52%
						4) Recognition and Enforcement of Decisions in Parental Responsibilities Matters										
						a) CONTENTS					b) CASE STUDIES					
						1	2	3	4	5		1	2	3	4	5
						0	0	0	6	15	21	0	0	1	6	14
						0,00%	0,00%	0,00%	28,57%	71,43%	100,00%	0,00%	0,00%	4,76%	28,57%	66,67%
						5) International Child Abduction: General Overview										
						a) CONTENTS										
						1	2	3	4	5		1	2	3	4	5
						0	0	0	1	22	23	0	0	0	1	22
						0,00%	0,00%	0,00%	4,35%	95,65%	100,00%	0,00%	0,00%	0,00%	4,35%	95,65%

										6) Return Proceedings and Exceptions to Return					7) International Child Abduction in Brussels Ia Regulation (Articles 10 and 11)					8) Enforcement of return decisions in international child abduction														
										a) CONTENTS					a) CONTENTS					a) CONTENTS														
										b) CASE STUDIES					b) CASE STUDIES					b) CASE STUDIES														
										1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5					
										0	0	1	7	15	23	0	0	0	1	21	22	0	0	0	1	0	21	22	0	0	0	5	15	20
										0.00%	0.00%	4.35%	30.43%	65.22%	100.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	4.55%	95.45%	100.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	4.55%	95.45%	100.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	25.00%	75.00%	100.00%	
										0.00%	0.00%	4.35%	30.43%	77.33%	100.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	4.55%	95.45%	100.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	4.55%	95.45%	100.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	5.00%	25.00%	70.00%	