JUST/2011/JPEN/AG2943

EVALUATION OF JCN WORKSHOP

Name *(optional)*

Place **Country** Estonia **Date** 15.03.

Profession probation officer **Affiliation**

Sex: ☐ Male ☒ Female

1. ORGANISATIONAL ASPECTS

1.1 Organisation of the facilities used for the workshop was...
Not suitable ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Suitable

1.2 The technical equipment used during the workshop was...
Not suitable ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Suitable

2. CONTENTS

2.1 The workshop's content were...
Not Interesting ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Interesting

2.2 The structure of the workshop programme was...
Not Suitable ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Suitable

2.3 Were the workshop's content consistent with your expectations?
Inconsistent ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Consistent

2.4 Were the workshop's content consistent with your needs?
Inconsistent ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Consistent

2.5 Were the workshop's contents well developed?
Not well developed ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Well developed

3. METHODOLOGIES

3.1 The tools and materials used during the workshop were...
Not appropriate ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Appropriate

3.2 The methodologies used were...
Not appropriate ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Appropriate

3.3 The activities organized were...
Not useful ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Useful

JUST/2011/JPEN/AG2943

4. Skills of the Experts in charge of the Workshop

4.1 Capability of moderating the workshop
Poor ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Excellent

4.2 The interaction between experts and participants was...
Non existent ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Stimulating

4.3 Your level of involvement and active participation was:
Very low ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Very high

5. Atmosphere in the Workshop room

5.1 Communication inside the groups has been...
Poor ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Excellent

5.2 Interaction between the workshop participants was...
Poor ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Excellent

5.3 How useful do you feel that the contacts you made with the other workshop participants will be for future collaborations?
Not very useful ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Useful

6. General Evaluation

6.1 The workshop programme was...
Not Interesting ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Interesting

6.2 The workshop programme was...
Not involving ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Involving

6. Comments:

_____
_____
_____
_____
_____

JUST/2011/JPEN/AG2943

EVALUATION OF JCN WORKSHOP

Name *(optional)* Kirsti Leivajärvi

Place **Country** **Date**

Profession **Affiliation**

Sex: ☐ Male ☒ Female

1. ORGANISATIONAL ASPECTS

1.1 Organisation of the facilities used for the workshop was...
Not suitable ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Suitable

1.2 The technical equipment used during the workshop was...
Not suitable ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Suitable

2. CONTENTS

2.1 The workshop's content were...
Not Interesting ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Interesting

2.2 The structure of the workshop programme was...
Not Suitable ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Suitable

2.3 Were the workshop's content consistent with your expectations?
Inconsistent ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Consistent

2.4 Were the workshop's content consistent with your needs?
Inconsistent ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Consistent

2.5 Were the workshop's contents well developed?
Not well developed ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Well developed

3. METHODOLOGIES

3.1 The tools and materials used during the workshop were...
Not appropriate ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Appropriate

3.2 The methodologies used were...
Not appropriate ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Appropriate

3.3 The activities organized were...
Not useful ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Useful

JUST/2011/JPEN/AG2943

4. Skills of the Experts in charge of the Workshop

4.1 Capability of moderating the workshop
Poor ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Excellent

4.2 The interaction between experts and participants was...
Non existent ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Stimulating

4.3 Your level of involvement and active participation was:
Very low ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Very high

5. Atmosphere in the Workshop room

5.1 Communication inside the groups has been...
Poor ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Excellent

5.2 Interaction between the workshop participants was...
Poor ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Excellent

5.3 How useful do you feel that the contacts you made with the other workshop participants will be for future collaborations?
Not very useful ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Useful

6. General Evaluation

6.1 The workshop programme was...
Not Interesting ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Interesting

6.2 The workshop programme was...
Not involving ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Involving

6. Comments:

_____
_____
_____
_____
_____

JUST/2011/JPEN/AG2943

EVALUATION OF JCN WORKSHOP

Name *(optional)*

Place **Country** FINLAND **Date** 15.3.2013

Profession Supervising senior coordinator **Affiliation** Criminal sanctions agency

Sex: ☐ Male ☐ Female

1. ORGANISATIONAL ASPECTS

1.1 Organisation of the facilities used for the workshop was...
Not suitable ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Suitable

1.2 The technical equipment used during the workshop was...
Not suitable ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Suitable

2. CONTENTS

2.1 The workshop's content were...
Not Interesting ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Interesting

2.2 The structure of the workshop programme was...
Not Suitable ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Suitable

2.3 Were the workshop's content consistent with your expectations?
Inconsistent ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Consistent

2.4 Were the workshop's content consistent with your needs?
Inconsistent ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Consistent

2.5 Were the workshop's contents well developed?
Not well developed ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Well developed

3. METHODOLOGIES

3.1 The tools and materials used during the workshop were...
Not appropriate ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Appropriate

3.2 The methodologies used were...
Not appropriate ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Appropriate

3.3 The activities organized were...
Not useful ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Useful

JUST/2011/JPEN/AG2943

4. Skills of the Experts in charge of the Workshop

4.1 Capability of moderating the workshop
Poor ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Excellent

4.2 The interaction between experts and participants was...
Non existent ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Stimulating

4.3 Your level of involvement and active participation was:
Very low ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Very high

5. Atmosphere in the Workshop room

5.1 Communication inside the groups has been...
Poor ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Excellent

5.2 Interaction between the workshop participants was...
Poor ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Excellent

5.3 How useful do you feel that the contacts you made with the other workshop participants will be for future collaborations?
Not very useful ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Useful

6. General Evaluation

6.1 The workshop programme was...
Not Interesting ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Interesting

6.2 The workshop programme was...
Not involving ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Involving

6. Comments:

_____
_____
_____
_____
_____

JUST/2011/JPEN/AG2943

EVALUATION OF JCN WORKSHOP

Name *(optional)* ANN HALLIKA

Place Tallinn **Country** Estonia **Date** 14-15.03.2013

Profession Social worker **Affiliation** Tallinn Prison

Sex: ☐ Male ☒ Female

1. ORGANISATIONAL ASPECTS

1.1 Organisation of the facilities used for the workshop was...

Not suitable ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ **⑩** Suitable

1.2 The technical equipment used during the workshop was...

Not suitable ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ **⑨** ⑩ Suitable

2. CONTENTS

2.1 The workshop's content were...

Not Interesting ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ **⑧** ⑨ ⑩ Interesting

2.2 The structure of the workshop programme was...

Not Suitable ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ **⑩** Suitable

2.3 Were the workshop's content consistent with your expectations?

Inconsistent ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ **⑧** ⑨ ⑩ Consistent

2.4 Were the workshop's content consistent with your needs?

Inconsistent ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ **⑦** **⑧** ⑨ ⑩ Consistent

2.5 Were the workshop's contents well developed?

Not well developed ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ **⑨** ⑩ Well developed

3. METHODOLOGIES

3.1 The tools and materials used during the workshop were...

Not appropriate ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ **⑧** ⑨ ⑩ Appropriate

3.2 The methodologies used were...

Not appropriate ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ **⑩** Appropriate

3.3 The activities organized were...

Not useful ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ **⑨** ⑩ Useful

JUST/2011/JPEN/AG2943

4. Skills of the Experts in charge of the Workshop

4.1 Capability of moderating the workshop
Poor ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Excellent

4.2 The interaction between experts and participants was...
Non existent ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Stimulating

4.3 Your level of involvement and active participation was:
Very low ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Very high

5. Atmosphere in the Workshop room

5.1 Communication inside the groups has been...
Poor ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Excellent

5.2 Interaction between the workshop participants was...
Poor ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Excellent

5.3 How useful do you feel that the contacts you made with the other workshop participants will be for future collaborations?
Not very useful ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Useful

6. General Evaluation

6.1 The workshop programme was...
Not Interesting ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Interesting

6.2 The workshop programme was...
Not involving ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Involving

6. Comments:

_____
_____
_____
_____
_____

JUST/2011/JPEN/AG2943

EVALUATION OF JCN WORKSHOP

Name *(optional)*

Place **Country** Estonia **Date** 15.02.13

Profession **Affiliation**

Sex: ☐ Male ☒ Female

1. ORGANISATIONAL ASPECTS

1.1 Organisation of the facilities used for the workshop was...
Not suitable ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Suitable

1.2 The technical equipment used during the workshop was...
Not suitable ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Suitable

2. CONTENTS

2.1 The workshop's content were...
Not Interesting ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Interesting

2.2 The structure of the workshop programme was...
Not Suitable ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Suitable

2.3 Were the workshop's content consistent with your expectations?
Inconsistent ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Consistent

2.4 Were the workshop's content consistent with your needs?
Inconsistent ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Consistent

2.5 Were the workshop's contents well developed?
Not well developed ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Well developed

3. METHODOLOGIES

3.1 The tools and materials used during the workshop were...
Not appropriate ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Appropriate

3.2 The methodologies used were...
Not appropriate ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Appropriate

3.3 The activities organized were...
Not useful ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Useful

JUST/2011/JPEN/AG2943

4. Skills of the Experts in charge of the Workshop

4.1 Capability of moderating the workshop
Poor ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Excellent

4.2 The interaction between experts and participants was...
Non existent ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Stimulating

4.3 Your level of involvement and active participation was:
Very low ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Very high

5. Atmosphere in the Workshop room

5.1 Communication inside the groups has been...
Poor ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Excellent

5.2 Interaction between the workshop participants was...
Poor ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Excellent

5.3 How useful do you feel that the contacts you made with the other workshop participants will be for future collaborations?
Not very useful ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Useful

6. General Evaluation

6.1 The workshop programme was...
Not Interesting ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Interesting

6.2 The workshop programme was...
Not involving ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Involving

6. Comments:

_____
_____
_____
_____
_____

JUST/2011/JPEN/AG2943

EVALUATION OF JCN WORKSHOP

Name *(optional)* [illegible]

Place **Country** **Date**

Profession **Affiliation**

Sex: ☐ Male ☐ Female

1. ORGANISATIONAL ASPECTS

1.1 Organisation of the facilities used for the workshop was...
Not suitable ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Suitable

1.2 The technical equipment used during the workshop was...
Not suitable ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Suitable

2. CONTENTS

2.1 The workshop's content were...
Not Interesting ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Interesting

2.2 The structure of the workshop programme was...
Not Suitable ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Suitable

2.3 Were the workshop's content consistent with your expectations?
Inconsistent ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Consistent

2.4 Were the workshop's content consistent with your needs?
Inconsistent ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Consistent

2.5 Were the workshop's contents well developed?
Not well developed ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Well developed

3. METHODOLOGIES

3.1 The tools and materials used during the workshop were...
Not appropriate ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Appropriate

3.2 The methodologies used were...
Not appropriate ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Appropriate

3.3 The activities organized were...
Not useful ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Useful

JUST/2011/JPEN/AG2943

4. Skills of the Experts in charge of the Workshop

4.1 Capability of moderating the workshop
Poor ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Excellent

4.2 The interaction between experts and participants was...
Non existent ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Stimulating

4.3 Your level of involvement and active participation was:
Very low ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Very high

5. Atmosphere in the Workshop room

5.1 Communication inside the groups has been...
Poor ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Excellent

5.2 Interaction between the workshop participants was...
Poor ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Excellent

5.3 How useful do you feel that the contacts you made with the other workshop participants will be for future collaborations?
Not very useful ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Useful

6. General Evaluation

6.1 The workshop programme was...
Not Interesting ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Interesting

6.2 The workshop programme was...
Not involving ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Involving

6. Comments:

_____
_____
_____
_____
_____

JUST/2011/JPEN/AG2943

EVALUATION OF JCN WORKSHOP

Name *(optional)*

Place Tallin Sokos Hotel **Country** Estonia **Date** 13-16.3.13

Profession **Affiliation** Ministry of Justice

Sex: ☐ Male ☒ Female

1. ORGANISATIONAL ASPECTS

1.1 Organisation of the facilities used for the workshop was...
Not suitable ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Suitable

1.2 The technical equipment used during the workshop was...
Not suitable ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Suitable

2. CONTENTS

2.1 The workshop's content were...
Not Interesting ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Interesting

2.2 The structure of the workshop programme was...
Not Suitable ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Suitable

2.3 Were the workshop's content consistent with your expectations?
Inconsistent ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Consistent

2.4 Were the workshop's content consistent with your needs?
Inconsistent ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Consistent

2.5 Were the workshop's contents well developed?
Not well developed ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Well developed

3. METHODOLOGIES

3.1 The tools and materials used during the workshop were...
Not appropriate ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Appropriate

3.2 The methodologies used were...
Not appropriate ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Appropriate

3.3 The activities organized were...
Not useful ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Useful

JUST/2011/JPEN/AG2943

4. Skills of the Experts in charge of the Workshop

4.1 Capability of moderating the workshop
Poor ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Excellent

4.2 The interaction between experts and participants was...
Non existent ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Stimulating

4.3 Your level of involvement and active participation was:
Very low ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Very high

5. Atmosphere in the Workshop room

5.1 Communication inside the groups has been...
Poor ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Excellent

5.2 Interaction between the workshop participants was...
Poor ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Excellent

5.3 How useful do you feel that the contacts you made with the other workshop participants will be for future collaborations?
Not very useful ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Useful

6. General Evaluation

6.1 The workshop programme was...
Not Interesting ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Interesting

6.2 The workshop programme was...
Not involving ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Involving

6. Comments:

More microphones needed

JUST/2011/JPEN/AG2943

EVALUATION OF JCN WORKSHOP

Name *(optional)* ANNELI NAHK

Place SOKOS HOTEL VIRU **Country** ESTONIA **Date** 14-15.03

Profession PROBATION OFFICER **Affiliation** TALLINNA VANGLA

Sex: ☐ Male ☒ Female

1. ORGANISATIONAL ASPECTS

1.1 Organisation of the facilities used for the workshop was...
Not suitable ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Suitable

1.2 The technical equipment used during the workshop was...
Not suitable ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Suitable

2. CONTENTS

2.1 The workshop's content were...
Not Interesting ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Interesting

2.2 The structure of the workshop programme was...
Not Suitable ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Suitable

2.3 Were the workshop's content consistent with your expectations?
Inconsistent ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Consistent

2.4 Were the workshop's content consistent with your needs?
Inconsistent ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Consistent

2.5 Were the workshop's contents well developed?
Not well developed ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Well developed

3. METHODOLOGIES

3.1 The tools and materials used during the workshop were...
Not appropriate ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Appropriate

3.2 The methodologies used were...
Not appropriate ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Appropriate

3.3 The activities organized were...
Not useful ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Useful

JUST/2011/JPEN/AG2943

4. Skills of the Experts in charge of the Workshop

4.1 Capability of moderating the workshop
Poor ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Excellent

4.2 The interaction between experts and participants was...
Non existent ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Stimulating

4.3 Your level of involvement and active participation was:
Very low ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Very high

5. Atmosphere in the Workshop room

5.1 Communication inside the groups has been...
Poor ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Excellent

5.2 Interaction between the workshop participants was...
Poor ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Excellent

5.3 How useful do you feel that the contacts you made with the other workshop participants will be for future collaborations?
Not very useful ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Useful

6. General Evaluation

6.1 The workshop programme was...
Not interesting ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Interesting

6.2 The workshop programme was...
Not involving ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Involving

6. Comments:

_____
_____
_____
_____
_____

JUST/2011/JPEN/AG2943

EVALUATION OF JCN WORKSHOP

Name *(optional)* Tiina Vogt-Airaksinen

Place **Country** Finland **Date** 15.3.2013

Profession senior specialist **Affiliation**

Sex: ☐ Male ☒ Female

1. ORGANISATIONAL ASPECTS

1.1 Organisation of the facilities used for the workshop was...
Not suitable ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Suitable

1.2 The technical equipment used during the workshop was...
Not suitable ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Suitable

2. CONTENTS

2.1 The workshop's content were...
Not Interesting ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Interesting

2.2 The structure of the workshop programme was...
Not Suitable ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Suitable

2.3 Were the workshop's content consistent with your expectations?
Inconsistent ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Consistent

2.4 Were the workshop's content consistent with your needs?
Inconsistent ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Consistent

2.5 Were the workshop's contents well developed?
Not well developed ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Well developed

3. METHODOLOGIES

3.1 The tools and materials used during the workshop were...
Not appropriate ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Appropriate

3.2 The methodologies used were...
Not appropriate ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Appropriate

3.3 The activities organized were...
Not useful ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Useful

JUST/2011/JPEN/AG2943

4. Skills of the Experts in charge of the Workshop

4.1 Capability of moderating the workshop
Poor ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Excellent

4.2 The interaction between experts and participants was...
Non existent ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Stimulating

4.3 Your level of involvement and active participation was:
Very low ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Very high

5. Atmosphere in the Workshop room

5.1 Communication inside the groups has been...
Poor ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Excellent

5.2 Interaction between the workshop participants was...
Poor ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Excellent

5.3 How useful do you feel that the contacts you made with the other workshop participants will be for future collaborations?
Not very useful ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Useful

6. General Evaluation

6.1 The workshop programme was...
Not Interesting ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Interesting

6.2 The workshop programme was...
Not involving ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Involving

6. Comments:

_____
_____
_____
_____
_____

JUST/2011/JPEN/AG2943

EVALUATION OF JCN WORKSHOP

Name *(optional)* Lilla Kari

Place **Country** **Date** 15.3.2013

Profession **Affiliation**

Sex: ☐ Male ☒ Female

1. ORGANISATIONAL ASPECTS

1.1 Organisation of the facilities used for the workshop was...

Not suitable ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Suitable

1.2 The technical equipment used during the workshop was...

Not suitable ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Suitable

2. CONTENTS

2.1 The workshop's content were...

Not Interesting ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Interesting

2.2 The structure of the workshop programme was...

Not Suitable ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Suitable

2.3 Were the workshop's content consistent with your expectations?

Inconsistent ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Consistent

2.4 Were the workshop's content consistent with your needs?

Inconsistent ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Consistent

2.5 Were the workshop's contents well developed?

Not well developed ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Well developed

3. METHODOLOGIES

3.1 The tools and materials used during the workshop were...

Not appropriate ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Appropriate

3.2 The methodologies used were...

Not appropriate ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Appropriate

3.3 The activities organized were...

Not useful ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Useful

JUST/2011/JPEN/AG2943

4. Skills of the Experts in charge of the Workshop

4.1 Capability of moderating the workshop

Poor ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Excellent

4.2 The interaction between experts and participants was...

Non existent ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Stimulating

4.3 Your level of involvement and active participation was:

Very low ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Very high

5. Atmosphere in the Workshop room

5.1 Communication inside the groups has been...

Poor ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Excellent

5.2 Interaction between the workshop participants was...

Poor ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Excellent

5.3 How useful do you feel that the contacts you made with the other workshop participants will be for future collaborations?

Not very useful ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Useful

6. General Evaluation

6.1 The workshop programme was...

Not Interesting ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Interesting

6.2 The workshop programme was...

Not involving ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Involving

6. Comments:

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

JUST/2011/JPEN/AG2943

EVALUATION OF JCN WORKSHOP

Name *(optional)*

Place Greifswald **Country** Germany **Date** 15/03/13

Profession Researcher **Affiliation** University of Greifswald

Sex: ☒ Male ☐ Female

1. ORGANISATIONAL ASPECTS

1.1 Organisation of the facilities used for the workshop was...

Not suitable ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Suitable

1.2 The technical equipment used during the workshop was...

Not suitable ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Suitable

2. CONTENTS

2.1 The workshop's content were...

Not Interesting ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Interesting

2.2 The structure of the workshop programme was...

Not Suitable ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Suitable

2.3 Were the workshop's content consistent with your expectations?

Inconsistent ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Consistent

2.4 Were the workshop's content consistent with your needs?

Inconsistent ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Consistent

2.5 Were the workshop's contents well developed?

Not well developed ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Well developed

3. METHODOLOGIES

3.1 The tools and materials used during the workshop were...

Not appropriate ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Appropriate

3.2 The methodologies used were...

Not appropriate ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Appropriate

3.3 The activities organized were...

Not useful ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Useful

JUST/2011/JPEN/AG2943

4. Skills of the Experts in charge of the Workshop

4.1 Capability of moderating the workshop
Poor ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Excellent

4.2 The interaction between experts and participants was...
Non existent ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Stimulating

4.3 Your level of involvement and active participation was:
Very low ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Very high

5. Atmosphere in the Workshop room

5.1 Communication inside the groups has been...
Poor ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Excellent

5.2 Interaction between the workshop participants was...
Poor ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Excellent

5.3 How useful do you feel that the contacts you made with the other workshop participants will be for future collaborations?
Not very useful ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Useful

6. General Evaluation

6.1 The workshop programme was...
Not Interesting ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Interesting

6.2 The workshop programme was...
Not involving ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Involving

6. Comments:

_____
_____
_____
_____
_____

JUST/2011/JPEN/AG2943

EVALUATION OF JCN WORKSHOP

Name *(optional)* EPP SEPRI

Place SOKOS HOTEL VIRU **Country** ESTONIA **Date** 14. - 15.03.13

Profession PROBATION OFFICER **Affiliation** PRISON OF TALLINN

Sex: ☐ Male ☐ Female

1. ORGANISATIONAL ASPECTS

1.1 Organisation of the facilities used for the workshop was...
Not suitable ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ (⑩) Suitable

1.2 The technical equipment used during the workshop was...
Not suitable ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ (⑨) ⑩ Suitable

2. CONTENTS

2.1 The workshop's content were...
Not Interesting ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ (⑨) ⑩ Interesting

2.2 The structure of the workshop programme was...
Not Suitable ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ (⑧) ⑨ ⑩ Suitable

2.3 Were the workshop's content consistent with your expectations?
Inconsistent ① ② ③ ④ (⑤) ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Consistent

2.4 Were the workshop's content consistent with your needs?
Inconsistent ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ (⑦) ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Consistent

2.5 Were the workshop's contents well developed?
Not well developed ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ (⑧) ⑨ ⑩ Well developed

3. METHODOLOGIES

3.1 The tools and materials used during the workshop were...
Not appropriate ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ (⑩) Appropriate

3.2 The methodologies used were...
Not appropriate ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ (⑨) ⑩ Appropriate

3.3 The activities organized were...
Not useful ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ (⑨) ⑩ Useful

JUST/2011/JPEN/AG2943

4. Skills of the Experts in charge of the Workshop

4.1 Capability of moderating the workshop
Poor ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Excellent

4.2 The interaction between experts and participants was...
Non existent ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Stimulating

4.3 Your level of involvement and active participation was:
Very low ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Very high

5. Atmosphere in the Workshop room

5.1 Communication inside the groups has been...
Poor ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Excellent

5.2 Interaction between the workshop participants was...
Poor ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Excellent

5.3 How useful do you feel that the contacts you made with the other workshop participants will be for future collaborations?
Not very useful ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Useful

6. General Evaluation

6.1 The workshop programme was...
Not Interesting ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Interesting

6.2 The workshop programme was...
Not involving ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Involving

6. Comments:

_____
_____
_____
_____
_____

JUST/2011/JPEN/AG2943

EVALUATION OF JCN WORKSHOP

Name *(optional)*

Place Tallinn **Country** ESTONIA **Date** 15.03.13

Profession Director **Affiliation** Tallinn Prison

Sex: ☐ Male ☐ Female

1. ORGANISATIONAL ASPECTS

1.1 Organisation of the facilities used for the workshop was...

Not suitable ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Suitable

1.2 The technical equipment used during the workshop was...

Not suitable ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Suitable

2. CONTENTS

2.1 The workshop's content were...

Not Interesting ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Interesting

2.2 The structure of the workshop programme was...

Not Suitable ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Suitable

2.3 Were the workshop's content consistent with your expectations?

Inconsistent ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Consistent

2.4 Were the workshop's content consistent with your needs?

Inconsistent ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Consistent

2.5 Were the workshop's contents well developed?

Not well developed ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Well developed

3. METHODOLOGIES

3.1 The tools and materials used during the workshop were...

Not appropriate ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Appropriate

3.2 The methodologies used were...

Not appropriate ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Appropriate

3.3 The activities organized were...

Not useful ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Useful

JUST/2011/JPEN/AG2943

4. Skills of the Experts in charge of the Workshop

4.1 Capability of moderating the workshop

Poor ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Excellent

4.2 The interaction between experts and participants was...

Non existent ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Stimulating

4.3 Your level of involvement and active participation was:

Very low ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Very high

5. Atmosphere in the Workshop room

5.1 Communication inside the groups has been...

Poor ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Excellent

5.2 Interaction between the workshop participants was...

Poor ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Excellent

5.3 How useful do you feel that the contacts you made with the other workshop participants will be for future collaborations?

Not very useful ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Useful

6. General Evaluation

6.1 The workshop programme was...

Not Interesting ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Interesting

6.2 The workshop programme was...

Not involving ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Involving

6. Comments:

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

JUST/2011/JPEN/AG2943

EVALUATION OF JCN WORKSHOP

Name *(optional)*

Place **Country** **Date**

Profession **Affiliation**

Sex: ☐ Male ☐ Female

1. ORGANISATIONAL ASPECTS

1.1 Organisation of the facilities used for the workshop was...
Not suitable ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Suitable

1.2 The technical equipment used during the workshop was...
Not suitable ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Suitable

2. CONTENTS

2.1 The workshop's content were...
Not Interesting ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Interesting

2.2 The structure of the workshop programme was...
Not Suitable ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Suitable

2.3 Were the workshop's content consistent with your expectations?
Inconsistent ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Consistent

2.4 Were the workshop's content consistent with your needs?
Inconsistent ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Consistent

2.5 Were the workshop's contents well developed?
Not well developed ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Well developed

3. METHODOLOGIES

3.1 The tools and materials used during the workshop were...
Not appropriate ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Appropriate

3.2 The methodologies used were...
Not appropriate ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Appropriate

3.3 The activities organized were...
Not useful ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Useful

JUST/2011/JPEN/AG2943

4. Skills of the Experts in charge of the Workshop

4.1 Capability of moderating the workshop
Poor ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Excellent

4.2 The interaction between experts and participants was...
Non existent ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Stimulating

4.3 Your level of involvement and active participation was:
Very low ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Very high

5. Atmosphere in the Workshop room

5.1 Communication inside the groups has been...
Poor ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Excellent

5.2 Interaction between the workshop participants was...
Poor ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Excellent

5.3 How useful do you feel that the contacts you made with the other workshop participants will be for future collaborations?
Not very useful ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Useful

6. General Evaluation

6.1 The workshop programme was...
Not Interesting ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Interesting

6.2 The workshop programme was...
Not involving ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Involving

6. Comments:

_____
_____
_____
_____
_____

JUST/2011/JPEN/AG2943

EVALUATION OF JCN WORKSHOP

Name *(optional)*

Place **Country** **Date**

Profession **Affiliation**

Sex: ☐ Male ☐ Female

1. ORGANISATIONAL ASPECTS

1.1 Organisation of the facilities used for the workshop was...
Not suitable ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Suitable

1.2 The technical equipment used during the workshop was...
Not suitable ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Suitable

2. CONTENTS

2.1 The workshop's content were...
Not Interesting ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Interesting

2.2 The structure of the workshop programme was...
Not Suitable ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Suitable

2.3 Were the workshop's content consistent with your expectations?
Inconsistent ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Consistent

2.4 Were the workshop's content consistent with your needs?
Inconsistent ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Consistent

2.5 Were the workshop's contents well developed?
Not well developed ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Well developed

3. METHODOLOGIES

3.1 The tools and materials used during the workshop were...
Not appropriate ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Appropriate

3.2 The methodologies used were...
Not appropriate ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Appropriate

3.3 The activities organized were...
Not useful ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Useful

JUST/2011/JPEN/AG2943

4. Skills of the Experts in charge of the Workshop

4.1 Capability of moderating the workshop
Poor ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Excellent

4.2 The interaction between experts and participants was...
Non existent ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Stimulating

4.3 Your level of involvement and active participation was:
Very low ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Very high

5. Atmosphere in the Workshop room

5.1 Communication inside the groups has been...
Poor ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Excellent

5.2 Interaction between the workshop participants was...
Poor ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Excellent

5.3 How useful do you feel that the contacts you made with the other workshop participants will be for future collaborations?
Not very useful ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Useful

6. General Evaluation

6.1 The workshop programme was...
Not Interesting ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Interesting

6.2 The workshop programme was...
Not involving ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Involving

6. Comments:

_____
_____
_____
_____
_____

JUST/2011/JPEN/AG2943

EVALUATION OF JCN WORKSHOP

Name *(optional)* Jesse, Jörg

Place Ministry of Justice **Country** Germany **Date** 15.3.13

Profession **Affiliation**

Sex: ☒ Male ☐ Female

1. ORGANISATIONAL ASPECTS

1.1 Organisation of the facilities used for the workshop was...

Not suitable ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Suitable

1.2 The technical equipment used during the workshop was...

Not suitable ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Suitable

2. CONTENTS

2.1 The workshop's content were...

Not Interesting ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Interesting

2.2 The structure of the workshop programme was...

Not Suitable ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Suitable

2.3 Were the workshop's content consistent with your expectations?

Inconsistent ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Consistent

2.4 Were the workshop's content consistent with your needs?

Inconsistent ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Consistent

2.5 Were the workshop's contents well developed?

Not well developed ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Well developed

3. METHODOLOGIES

3.1 The tools and materials used during the workshop were...

Not appropriate ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Appropriate

3.2 The methodologies used were...

Not appropriate ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Appropriate

3.3 The activities organized were...

Not useful ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Useful

JUST/2011/JPEN/AG2943

4. Skills of the Experts in charge of the Workshop

4.1 Capability of moderating the workshop
Poor ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Excellent

4.2 The interaction between experts and participants was...
Non existent ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Stimulating

4.3 Your level of involvement and active participation was:
Very low ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Very high

5. Atmosphere in the Workshop room

5.1 Communication inside the groups has been...
Poor ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Excellent

5.2 Interaction between the workshop participants was...
Poor ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Excellent

5.3 How useful do you feel that the contacts you made with the other workshop participants will be for future collaborations?
Not very useful ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Useful

6. General Evaluation

6.1 The workshop programme was...
Not Interesting ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Interesting

6.2 The workshop programme was...
Not involving ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Involving

6. Comments:

_____
_____
_____
_____
_____

JUST/2011/JPEN/AG2943

EVALUATION OF JCN WORKSHOP

Name *(optional)* Grit-Christin Ladwig

Place **Country** **Date**

Profession probation officer **Affiliation** Ministry of justice – Mecklenburg-Western Pomerania

Sex: ☐ Male ☒ Female

1. ORGANISATIONAL ASPECTS

1.1 Organisation of the facilities used for the workshop was...
Not suitable ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Suitable

1.2 The technical equipment used during the workshop was...
Not suitable ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Suitable

2. CONTENTS

2.1 The workshop's content were...
Not Interesting ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Interesting

2.2 The structure of the workshop programme was...
Not Suitable ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Suitable

2.3 Were the workshop's content consistent with your expectations?
Inconsistent ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Consistent

2.4 Were the workshop's content consistent with your needs?
Inconsistent ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Consistent

2.5 Were the workshop's contents well developed?
Not well developed ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Well developed

3. METHODOLOGIES

3.1 The tools and materials used during the workshop were...
Not appropriate ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Appropriate

3.2 The methodologies used were...
Not appropriate ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Appropriate

3.3 The activities organized were...
Not useful ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Useful

JUST/2011/JPEN/AG2943

4. Skills of the Experts in charge of the Workshop

4.1 Capability of moderating the workshop
Poor ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Excellent

4.2 The interaction between experts and participants was...
Non existent ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Stimulating

4.3 Your level of involvement and active participation was:
Very low ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Very high

5. Atmosphere in the Workshop room

5.1 Communication inside the groups has been...
Poor ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Excellent

5.2 Interaction between the workshop participants was...
Poor ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Excellent

5.3 How useful do you feel that the contacts you made with the other workshop participants will be for future collaborations?
Not very useful ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Useful

6. General Evaluation

6.1 The workshop programme was...
Not Interesting ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Interesting

6.2 The workshop programme was...
Not involving ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Involving

6. Comments:

_____
_____
_____
_____
_____

JUST/2011/JPEN/AG2943

EVALUATION OF JCN WORKSHOP

Name *(optional)*

Place Tallinn **Country** Estonia **Date** 15.03.2013

Profession Case manager **Affiliation** Tallinn Prison

Sex: ☑ Male ☐ Female

1. ORGANISATIONAL ASPECTS

1.1 Organisation of the facilities used for the workshop was...
Not suitable ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ (⑩) Suitable

1.2 The technical equipment used during the workshop was...
Not suitable ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ (⑧) ⑨ ⑩ Suitable

2. CONTENTS

2.1 The workshop's content were...
Not Interesting ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ (⑨) ⑩ Interesting

2.2 The structure of the workshop programme was...
Not Suitable ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ (⑧) ⑨ ⑩ Suitable

2.3 Were the workshop's content consistent with your expectations?
Inconsistent ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ (⑨) ⑩ Consistent

2.4 Were the workshop's content consistent with your needs?
Inconsistent ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ (⑨) ⑩ Consistent

2.5 Were the workshop's contents well developed?
Not well developed ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ (⑦) ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Well developed

3. METHODOLOGIES

3.1 The tools and materials used during the workshop were...
Not appropriate ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ (⑩) Appropriate

3.2 The methodologies used were...
Not appropriate ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ (⑧) ⑨ ⑩ Appropriate

3.3 The activities organized were...
Not useful ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ (⑩) Useful

JUST/2011/JPEN/AG2943

4. Skills of the Experts in charge of the Workshop

4.1 Capability of moderating the workshop
Poor ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Excellent

4.2 The interaction between experts and participants was...
Non existent ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Stimulating

4.3 Your level of involvement and active participation was:
Very low ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Very high

5. Atmosphere in the Workshop room

5.1 Communication inside the groups has been...
Poor ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Excellent

5.2 Interaction between the workshop participants was...
Poor ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Excellent

5.3 How useful do you feel that the contacts you made with the other workshop participants will be for future collaborations?
Not very useful ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Useful

6. General Evaluation

6.1 The workshop programme was...
Not Interesting ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Interesting

6.2 The workshop programme was...
Not involving ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Involving

6. Comments:

_____
_____
_____
_____
_____

JUST/2011/JPEN/AG2943

EVALUATION OF JCN WORKSHOP

Name *(optional)*

Place TALLINN **Country** EST **Date** 15.03.13

Profession **Affiliation**

Sex: ☒ Male ☐ Female

1. ORGANISATIONAL ASPECTS

1.1 Organisation of the facilities used for the workshop was...
Not suitable ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ [⑩] Suitable

1.2 The technical equipment used during the workshop was...
Not suitable ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ [⑦] ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Suitable

2. CONTENTS

2.1 The workshop's content were...
Not Interesting ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ [⑨] ⑩ Interesting

2.2 The structure of the workshop programme was...
Not Suitable ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ [⑨] ⑩ Suitable

2.3 Were the workshop's content consistent with your expectations?
Inconsistent ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ [⑨] ⑩ Consistent

2.4 Were the workshop's content consistent with your needs?
Inconsistent ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ [⑦] ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Consistent

2.5 Were the workshop's contents well developed?
Not well developed ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ [⑨] ⑩ Well developed

3. METHODOLOGIES

3.1 The tools and materials used during the workshop were...
Not appropriate ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ [⑨] ⑩ Appropriate

3.2 The methodologies used were...
Not appropriate ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ [⑧] ⑨ ⑩ Appropriate

3.3 The activities organized were...
Not useful ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Useful

JUST/2011/JPEN/AG2943

4. Skills of the Experts in charge of the Workshop

4.1 Capability of moderating the workshop
Poor ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Excellent

4.2 The interaction between experts and participants was...
Non existent ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Stimulating

4.3 Your level of involvement and active participation was:
Very low ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Very high

5. Atmosphere in the Workshop room

5.1 Communication inside the groups has been...
Poor ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Excellent

5.2 Interaction between the workshop participants was...
Poor ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Excellent

5.3 How useful do you feel that the contacts you made with the other workshop participants will be for future collaborations?
Not very useful ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Useful

6. General Evaluation

6.1 The workshop programme was...
Not Interesting ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Interesting

6.2 The workshop programme was...
Not involving ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Involving

6. Comments:

_____
_____
_____
_____
_____

JUST/2011/JPEN/AG2943

EVALUATION OF JCN WORKSHOP

Name *(optional)*

Place Tallinn **Country** Estonia **Date** 15.03

Profession social worker/ **Affiliation** Tallinn Prison

Sex: ☐ Male ☒ Female

1. ORGANISATIONAL ASPECTS

1.1 Organisation of the facilities used for the workshop was...
Not suitable ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Suitable

1.2 The technical equipment used during the workshop was...
Not suitable ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Suitable

2. CONTENTS

2.1 The workshop's content were...
Not Interesting ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Interesting

2.2 The structure of the workshop programme was...
Not Suitable ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Suitable

2.3 Were the workshop's content consistent with your expectations?
Inconsistent ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Consistent

2.4 Were the workshop's content consistent with your needs?
Inconsistent ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Consistent

2.5 Were the workshop's contents well developed?
Not well developed ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Well developed

3. METHODOLOGIES

3.1 The tools and materials used during the workshop were...
Not appropriate ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Appropriate

3.2 The methodologies used were...
Not appropriate ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Appropriate

3.3 The activities organized were...
Not useful ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Useful

JUST/2011/JPEN/AG2943

4. Skills of the Experts in charge of the Workshop

4.1 Capability of moderating the workshop
Poor ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Excellent

4.2 The interaction between experts and participants was...
Non existent ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Stimulating

4.3 Your level of involvement and active participation was:
Very low ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Very high

5. Atmosphere in the Workshop room

5.1 Communication inside the groups has been...
Poor ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Excellent

5.2 Interaction between the workshop participants was...
Poor ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Excellent

5.3 How useful do you feel that the contacts you made with the other workshop participants will be for future collaborations?
Not very useful ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Useful

6. General Evaluation

6.1 The workshop programme was...
Not Interesting ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Interesting

6.2 The workshop programme was...
Not involving ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Involving

6. Comments:

Very Well done! Thanks!

JUST/2011/JPEN/AG2943

EVALUATION OF JCN WORKSHOP

Name *(optional)*

Place Tallinn **Country** Estonia **Date** 15.03

Profession Probation officer **Affiliation** Prison

Sex: ☐ Male ☐ Female

1. ORGANISATIONAL ASPECTS

1.1 Organisation of the facilities used for the workshop was...
Not suitable ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Suitable

1.2 The technical equipment used during the workshop was...
Not suitable ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Suitable

2. CONTENTS

2.1 The workshop's content were...
Not Interesting ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Interesting

2.2 The structure of the workshop programme was...
Not Suitable ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Suitable

2.3 Were the workshop's content consistent with your expectations?
Inconsistent ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Consistent

2.4 Were the workshop's content consistent with your needs?
Inconsistent ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Consistent

2.5 Were the workshop's contents well developed?
Not well developed ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Well developed

3. METHODOLOGIES

3.1 The tools and materials used during the workshop were...
Not appropriate ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Appropriate

3.2 The methodologies used were...
Not appropriate ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Appropriate

3.3 The activities organized were...
Not useful ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Useful

JUST/2011/JPEN/AG2943

4. Skills of the Experts in charge of the Workshop

4.1 Capability of moderating the workshop
Poor ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Excellent

4.2 The interaction between experts and participants was...
Non existent ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Stimulating

4.3 Your level of involvement and active participation was:
Very low ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Very high

5. Atmosphere in the Workshop room

5.1 Communication inside the groups has been...
Poor ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Excellent

5.2 Interaction between the workshop participants was...
Poor ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Excellent

5.3 How useful do you feel that the contacts you made with the other workshop participants will be for future collaborations?
Not very useful ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Useful

6. General Evaluation

6.1 The workshop programme was...
Not Interesting ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Interesting

6.2 The workshop programme was...
Not involving ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Involving

6. Comments:

_____
_____
_____
_____
_____

JUST/2011/JPEN/AG2943

EVALUATION OF JCN WORKSHOP

Name *(optional)* TATJANA ZUEFTSIANKOU

Place SOKOS VIRU HOTEL **Country** ESTONIA **Date** 15.03.2013

Profession PROBATION OFFICER **Affiliation** THE PRISON OF TALLINN

Sex: ☐ Male ☒ Female

1. ORGANISATIONAL ASPECTS

1.1 Organisation of the facilities used for the workshop was....
Not suitable ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Suitable

1.2 The technical equipment used during the workshop was...
Not suitable ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Suitable

2. CONTENTS

2.1 The workshop's content were...
Not Interesting ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Interesting

2.2 The structure of the workshop programme was...
Not Suitable ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Suitable

2.3 Were the workshop's content consistent with your expectations?
Inconsistent ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Consistent

2.4 Were the workshop's content consistent with your needs?
Inconsistent ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Consistent

2.5 Were the workshop's contents well developed?
Not well developed ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Well developed

3. METHODOLOGIES

3.1 The tools and materials used during the workshop were...
Not appropriate ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Appropriate

3.2 The methodologies used were...
Not appropriate ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Appropriate

3.3 The activities organized were...
Not useful ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Useful

JUST/2011/JPEN/AG2943

4. Skills of the Experts in charge of the Workshop

4.1 Capability of moderating the workshop
Poor ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Excellent

4.2 The interaction between experts and participants was...
Non existent ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Stimulating

4.3 Your level of involvement and active participation was:
Very low ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Very high

5. Atmosphere in the Workshop room

5.1 Communication inside the groups has been...
Poor ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Excellent

5.2 Interaction between the workshop participants was...
Poor ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Excellent

5.3 How useful do you feel that the contacts you made with the other workshop participants will be for future collaborations?
Not very useful ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Useful

6. General Evaluation

6.1 The workshop programme was...
Not Interesting ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Interesting

6.2 The workshop programme was...
Not involving ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Involving

6. Comments:

THANK YOU FOR INVITATION

JUST/2011/JPEN/AG2943

EVALUATION OF JCN WORKSHOP

Name *(optional)*

Place Tallinn **Country** Estonia **Date** 14+15/3/2013

Profession Civil Servant **Affiliation** Prison Service, Ireland.

Sex: ☒ Male ☐ Female

1. ORGANISATIONAL ASPECTS

1.1 Organisation of the facilities used for the workshop was...
Not suitable ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Suitable

1.2 The technical equipment used during the workshop was...
Not suitable ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Suitable

2. CONTENTS

2.1 The workshop's content were...
Not Interesting ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Interesting

2.2 The structure of the workshop programme was...
Not Suitable ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Suitable

2.3 Were the workshop's content consistent with your expectations?
Inconsistent ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Consistent

2.4 Were the workshop's content consistent with your needs?
Inconsistent ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Consistent

2.5 Were the workshop's contents well developed?
Not well developed ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Well developed

3. METHODOLOGIES

3.1 The tools and materials used during the workshop were...
Not appropriate ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Appropriate

3.2 The methodologies used were...
Not appropriate ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Appropriate

3.3 The activities organized were...
Not useful ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Useful

JUST/2011/JPEN/AG2943

4. Skills of the Experts in charge of the Workshop

4.1 Capability of moderating the workshop
Poor ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Excellent

4.2 The interaction between experts and participants was...
Non existent ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Stimulating

4.3 Your level of involvement and active participation was:
Very low ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Very high

5. Atmosphere in the Workshop room

5.1 Communication inside the groups has been...
Poor ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Excellent

5.2 Interaction between the workshop participants was...
Poor ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Excellent

5.3 How useful do you feel that the contacts you made with the other workshop participants will be for future collaborations?
Not very useful ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Useful

6. General Evaluation

6.1 The workshop programme was...
Not interesting ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Interesting

6.2 The workshop programme was...
Not involving ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Involving

6. Comments:

Well run and organised workshops
Ran on time and kept to agenda.
Everyone had opportunity to participate

JUST/2011/JPEN/AG2943

EVALUATION OF JCN WORKSHOP

Name *(optional)*

Place Tallinn **Country** Estonia **Date** 15.03.2013

Profession probation officer **Affiliation**

Sex: ☐ Male ☒ Female

1. ORGANISATIONAL ASPECTS

1.1 Organisation of the facilities used for the workshop was...
Not suitable ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ **⑩** Suitable

1.2 The technical equipment used during the workshop was...
Not suitable ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ **⑧** ⑨ ⑩ Suitable

2. CONTENTS

2.1 The workshop's content were...
Not Interesting ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ **⑨** ⑩ Interesting

2.2 The structure of the workshop programme was...
Not Suitable ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ **⑨** ⑩ Suitable

2.3 Were the workshop's content consistent with your expectations?
Inconsistent ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ **⑨** ⑩ Consistent

2.4 Were the workshop's content consistent with your needs?
Inconsistent ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ **⑦** ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Consistent

2.5 Were the workshop's contents well developed?
Not well developed ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Well developed

3. METHODOLOGIES

3.1 The tools and materials used during the workshop were...
Not appropriate ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ **⑨** ⑩ Appropriate

3.2 The methodologies used were...
Not appropriate ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ **⑧** ⑨ ⑩ Appropriate

3.3 The activities organized were...
Not useful ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ **⑦** ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Useful

JUST/2011/JPEN/AG2943

4. Skills of the Experts in charge of the Workshop

4.1 Capability of moderating the workshop
Poor ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Excellent

4.2 The interaction between experts and participants was...
Non existent ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Stimulating

4.3 Your level of involvement and active participation was:
Very low ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Very high

5. Atmosphere in the Workshop room

5.1 Communication inside the groups has been...
Poor ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Excellent

5.2 Interaction between the workshop participants was...
Poor ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Excellent

5.3 How useful do you feel that the contacts you made with the other workshop participants will be for future collaborations?
Not very useful ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Useful

6. General Evaluation

6.1 The workshop programme was...
Not Interesting ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Interesting

6.2 The workshop programme was...
Not involving ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Involving

6. Comments:

_____
_____
_____
_____
_____

JUST/2011/JPEN/AG2943

EVALUATION OF JCN WORKSHOP

Name *(optional)* LEANA SEPA

Place TALLINN **Country** ESTONIA **Date** 15.03.13

Profession SOCIAL WORKER **Affiliation** TALLINN PRISON

Sex: ☐ Male ☒ Female

1. ORGANISATIONAL ASPECTS

1.1 Organisation of the facilities used for the workshop was...
Not suitable ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Suitable

1.2 The technical equipment used during the workshop was...
Not suitable ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Suitable

2. CONTENTS

2.1 The workshop's content were...
Not Interesting ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Interesting

2.2 The structure of the workshop programme was...
Not Suitable ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Suitable

2.3 Were the workshop's content consistent with your expectations?
Inconsistent ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Consistent

2.4 Were the workshop's content consistent with your needs?
Inconsistent ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Consistent

2.5 Were the workshop's contents well developed?
Not well developed ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Well developed

3. METHODOLOGIES

3.1 The tools and materials used during the workshop were...
Not appropriate ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Appropriate

3.2 The methodologies used were...
Not appropriate ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Appropriate

3.3 The activities organized were...
Not useful ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Useful

JUST/2011/JPEN/AG2943

4. Skills of the Experts in charge of the Workshop

4.1 Capability of moderating the workshop
Poor ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Excellent

4.2 The interaction between experts and participants was...
Non existent ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Stimulating

4.3 Your level of involvement and active participation was:
Very low ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Very high

5. Atmosphere in the Workshop room

5.1 Communication inside the groups has been...
Poor ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Excellent

5.2 Interaction between the workshop participants was...
Poor ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Excellent

5.3 How useful do you feel that the contacts you made with the other workshop participants will be for future collaborations?
Not very useful ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Useful

6. General Evaluation

6.1 The workshop programme was...
Not Interesting ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Interesting

6.2 The workshop programme was...
Not involving ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Involving

6. Comments:

_____
_____
_____
_____
_____

JUST/2011/JPEN/AG2943

EVALUATION OF JCN WORKSHOP

Name *(optional)* ESTHER GAVIN

Place Tallinn **Country** Estonia **Date** 15.3.13.

Profession Governor 3 **Affiliation** Minister of Justice Ireland.

Sex: ☐ Male ☑ Female

1. ORGANISATIONAL ASPECTS

1.1 Organisation of the facilities used for the workshop was...
Not suitable ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Suitable

1.2 The technical equipment used during the workshop was...
Not suitable ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Suitable

2. CONTENTS

2.1 The workshop's content were...
Not Interesting ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Interesting

2.2 The structure of the workshop programme was...
Not Suitable ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Suitable

2.3 Were the workshop's content consistent with your expectations?
Inconsistent ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Consistent

2.4 Were the workshop's content consistent with your needs?
Inconsistent ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Consistent

2.5 Were the workshop's contents well developed?
Not well developed ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Well developed

3. METHODOLOGIES

3.1 The tools and materials used during the workshop were...
Not appropriate ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Appropriate

3.2 The methodologies used were...
Not appropriate ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Appropriate

3.3 The activities organized were...
Not useful ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Useful

JUST/2011/JPEN/AG2943

4. Skills of the Experts in charge of the Workshop

4.1 Capability of moderating the workshop
Poor ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Excellent

4.2 The interaction between experts and participants was...
Non existent ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Stimulating

4.3 Your level of involvement and active participation was:
Very low ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Very high

5. Atmosphere in the Workshop room

5.1 Communication inside the groups has been...
Poor ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Excellent

5.2 Interaction between the workshop participants was...
Poor ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Excellent

5.3 How useful do you feel that the contacts you made with the other workshop participants will be for future collaborations?
Not very useful ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Useful

6. General Evaluation

6.1 The workshop programme was...
Not interesting ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Interesting

6.2 The workshop programme was...
Not involving ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Involving

6. Comments:

Very good workshop – gained a lot of information

JUST/2011/JPEN/AG2943

EVALUATION OF JCN WORKSHOP

Name *(optional)* MARJU KUUSE

Place PRISON TALLINN **Country** ESTONIA **Date** 15.03.2013

Profession PRISON OFICER **Affiliation** PRISON

Sex: ☐ Male ☒ Female

1. ORGANISATIONAL ASPECTS

1.1 Organisation of the facilities used for the workshop was...
Not suitable ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Suitable

1.2 The technical equipment used during the workshop was...
Not suitable ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Suitable

2. CONTENTS

2.1 The workshop's content were...
Not Interesting ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Interesting

2.2 The structure of the workshop programme was...
Not Suitable ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Suitable

2.3 Were the workshop's content consistent with your expectations?
Inconsistent ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Consistent

2.4 Were the workshop's content consistent with your needs?
Inconsistent ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Consistent

2.5 Were the workshop's contents well developed?
Not well developed ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Well developed

3. METHODOLOGIES

3.1 The tools and materials used during the workshop were...
Not appropriate ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Appropriate

3.2 The methodologies used were...
Not appropriate ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Appropriate

3.3 The activities organized were...
Not useful ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Useful

JUST/2011/JPEN/AG2943

4. Skills of the Experts in charge of the Workshop

4.1 Capability of moderating the workshop
Poor ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Excellent

4.2 The interaction between experts and participants was...
Non existent ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Stimulating

4.3 Your level of involvement and active participation was:
Very low ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Very high

5. Atmosphere in the Workshop room

5.1 Communication inside the groups has been...
Poor ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Excellent

5.2 Interaction between the workshop participants was...
Poor ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Excellent

5.3 How useful do you feel that the contacts you made with the other workshop participants will be for future collaborations?
Not very useful ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Useful

6. General Evaluation

6.1 The workshop programme was...
Not Interesting ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Interesting

6.2 The workshop programme was...
Not involving ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Involving

6. Comments:

It was very useful for my work, and will be

JUST/2011/JPEN/AG2943

EVALUATION OF JCN WORKSHOP

Name *(optional)* KÄTLIN LEPPIK

Place TALLINN **Country** ESTONIA **Date** 15.03.2013

Profession CASE MANAGER **Affiliation** -

Sex: ☐ Male ☒ Female

1. ORGANISATIONAL ASPECTS

1.1 Organisation of the facilities used for the workshop was...

Not suitable ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ (⑧) ⑨ ⑩ Suitable

1.2 The technical equipment used during the workshop was...

Not suitable ① ② ③ (④) ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Suitable

2. CONTENTS

2.1 The workshop's content were...

Not Interesting ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ (⑨) ⑩ Interesting

2.2 The structure of the workshop programme was...

Not Suitable ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ (⑨) ⑩ Suitable

2.3 Were the workshop's content consistent with your expectations?

Inconsistent ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ (⑦) ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Consistent

2.4 Were the workshop's content consistent with your needs?

Inconsistent ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ (⑧) ⑨ ⑩ Consistent

2.5 Were the workshop's contents well developed?

Not well developed ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ (⑥) ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Well developed

3. METHODOLOGIES

3.1 The tools and materials used during the workshop were...

Not appropriate ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ (⑨) ⑩ Appropriate

3.2 The methodologies used were...

Not appropriate ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ (⑨) ⑩ Appropriate

3.3 The activities organized were...

Not useful ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ (⑩) Useful

JUST/2011/JPEN/AG2943

4. Skills of the Experts in charge of the Workshop

4.1 Capability of moderating the workshop
Poor ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Excellent

4.2 The interaction between experts and participants was...
Non existent ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Stimulating

4.3 Your level of involvement and active participation was:
Very low ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Very high

5. Atmosphere in the Workshop room

5.1 Communication inside the groups has been...
Poor ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Excellent

5.2 Interaction between the workshop participants was...
Poor ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Excellent

5.3 How useful do you feel that the contacts you made with the other workshop participants will be for future collaborations?
Not very useful ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Useful

6. General Evaluation

6.1 The workshop programme was...
Not Interesting ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Interesting

6.2 The workshop programme was...
Not involving ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Involving

6. Comments:

FOR GRUP WORKS WAS NEEDED MORE TIME FOR TO DISCUSS TIME WAS VERY LESS TO SOLVE THE PROBLEMS WITH TERMS LIKE „HIGH RISK OFFENDER" AND „DANGEROUSNESS"

COMMON UNDERSTANDING

JUST/2011/JPEN/AG2943

EVALUATION OF JCN WORKSHOP

Name *(optional)* MARIKA LAANEMÄE

Place VIRU VANGLA **Country** EESTI **Date** 15.03.13

Profession senior probation officer **Affiliation**

Sex: ☐ Male ☒ Female

1. ORGANISATIONAL ASPECTS

1.1 Organisation of the facilities used for the workshop was...

Not suitable ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ (⑧) ⑨ ⑩ Suitable

1.2 The technical equipment used during the workshop was...

Not suitable ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ (⑧) ⑨ ⑩ Suitable

2. CONTENTS

2.1 The workshop's content were...

Not Interesting ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ (⑨) ⑩ Interesting

2.2 The structure of the workshop programme was...

Not Suitable ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ (⑨) ⑩ Suitable

2.3 Were the workshop's content consistent with your expectations?

Inconsistent ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ (⑧) ⑨ ⑩ Consistent

2.4 Were the workshop's content consistent with your needs?

Inconsistent ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ (⑨) ⑩ Consistent

2.5 Were the workshop's contents well developed?

Not well developed ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ (⑧) ⑨ ⑩ Well developed

3. METHODOLOGIES

3.1 The tools and materials used during the workshop were...

Not appropriate ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ (⑧) ⑨ ⑩ Appropriate

3.2 The methodologies used were...

Not appropriate ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ (⑧) ⑨ ⑩ Appropriate

3.3 The activities organized were...

Not useful ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ (⑧) ⑨ ⑩ Useful

JUST/2011/JPEN/AG2943

4. Skills of the Experts in charge of the Workshop

4.1 Capability of moderating the workshop
Poor ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Excellent

4.2 The interaction between experts and participants was...
Non existent ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Stimulating

4.3 Your level of involvement and active participation was:
Very low ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Very high

5. Atmosphere in the Workshop room

5.1 Communication inside the groups has been...
Poor ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Excellent

5.2 Interaction between the workshop participants was...
Poor ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Excellent

5.3 How useful do you feel that the contacts you made with the other workshop participants will be for future collaborations?
Not very useful ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Useful

6. General Evaluation

6.1 The workshop programme was...
Not Interesting ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Interesting

6.2 The workshop programme was...
Not involving ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Involving

6. Comments:

_____
_____
_____
_____
_____

JUST/2011/JPEN/AG2943

EVALUATION OF JCN WORKSHOP

Name *(optional)* Maarja Grünberg

Place Tartu Prison **Country** Estonia **Date** 15.03.13

Profession **Affiliation**

Sex: ☐ Male ☒ Female

1. ORGANISATIONAL ASPECTS

1.1 Organisation of the facilities used for the workshop was...
Not suitable ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ (10) Suitable

1.2 The technical equipment used during the workshop was...
Not suitable ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ (10) Suitable

2. CONTENTS

2.1 The workshop's content were...
Not Interesting ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ (10) Interesting

2.2 The structure of the workshop programme was...
Not Suitable ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ (9) ⑩ Suitable

2.3 Were the workshop's content consistent with your expectations?
Inconsistent ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ (9) ⑩ Consistent

2.4 Were the workshop's content consistent with your needs?
Inconsistent ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ (9) ⑩ Consistent

2.5 Were the workshop's contents well developed?
Not well developed ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ (9) ⑩ Well developed

3. METHODOLOGIES

3.1 The tools and materials used during the workshop were...
Not appropriate ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ (9) ⑩ Appropriate

3.2 The methodologies used were...
Not appropriate ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ (10) Appropriate

3.3 The activities organized were...
Not useful ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ (10) Useful

JUST/2011/JPEN/AG2943

4. Skills of the Experts in charge of the Workshop

4.1 Capability of moderating the workshop
Poor ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Excellent

4.2 The interaction between experts and participants was...
Non existent ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Stimulating

4.3 Your level of involvement and active participation was:
Very low ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Very high

5. Atmosphere in the Workshop room

5.1 Communication inside the groups has been...
Poor ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Excellent

5.2 Interaction between the workshop participants was...
Poor ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Excellent

5.3 How useful do you feel that the contacts you made with the other workshop participants will be for future collaborations?
Not very useful ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Useful

6. General Evaluation

6.1 The workshop programme was...
Not Interesting ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Interesting

6.2 The workshop programme was...
Not involving ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Involving

6. Comments:

I'm satisfied!

JUST/2011/JPEN/AG2943

EVALUATION OF JCN WORKSHOP

Name *(optional)* Jana Jõgiste

Place Tartu Ülikool **Country** Eesti **Date** 14.-15.03.13

Profession **Affiliation**

Sex: ☐ Male ☒ Female

1. ORGANISATIONAL ASPECTS

1.1 Organisation of the facilities used for the workshop was...
Not suitable ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Suitable

1.2 The technical equipment used during the workshop was...
Not suitable ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Suitable

2. CONTENTS

2.1 The workshop's content were...
Not Interesting ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Interesting

2.2 The structure of the workshop programme was...
Not Suitable ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Suitable

2.3 Were the workshop's content consistent with your expectations?
Inconsistent ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Consistent

2.4 Were the workshop's content consistent with your needs?
Inconsistent ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Consistent

2.5 Were the workshop's contents well developed?
Not well developed ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Well developed

3. METHODOLOGIES

3.1 The tools and materials used during the workshop were...
Not appropriate ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Appropriate

3.2 The methodologies used were...
Not appropriate ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Appropriate

3.3 The activities organized were...
Not useful ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Useful

JUST/2011/JPEN/AG2943

4. Skills of the Experts in charge of the Workshop

4.1 Capability of moderating the workshop
Poor ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Excellent

4.2 The interaction between experts and participants was...
Non existent ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Stimulating

4.3 Your level of involvement and active participation was:
Very low ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Very high

5. Atmosphere in the Workshop room

5.1 Communication inside the groups has been...
Poor ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Excellent

5.2 Interaction between the workshop participants was...
Poor ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Excellent

5.3 How useful do you feel that the contacts you made with the other workshop participants will be for future collaborations?
Not very useful ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Useful

6. General Evaluation

6.1 The workshop programme was...
Not Interesting ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Interesting

6.2 The workshop programme was...
Not involving ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Involving

6. Comments:

_____
_____
_____
_____
_____

JUST/2011/JPEN/AG2943

EVALUATION OF JCN WORKSHOP

Name *(optional)*

Place **Country** **Date**

Profession **Affiliation**

Sex: ☐ Male ☐ Female

1. ORGANISATIONAL ASPECTS

1.1 Organisation of the facilities used for the workshop was...
Not suitable ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Suitable

1.2 The technical equipment used during the workshop was...
Not suitable ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Suitable

2. CONTENTS

2.1 The workshop's content were...
Not Interesting ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Interesting

2.2 The structure of the workshop programme was...
Not Suitable ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Suitable

2.3 Were the workshop's content consistent with your expectations?
Inconsistent ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Consistent

2.4 Were the workshop's content consistent with your needs?
Inconsistent ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Consistent

2.5 Were the workshop's contents well developed?
Not well developed ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Well developed

3. METHODOLOGIES

3.1 The tools and materials used during the workshop were...
Not appropriate ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Appropriate

3.2 The methodologies used were...
Not appropriate ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Appropriate

3.3 The activities organized were...
Not useful ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Useful

JUST/2011/JPEN/AG2943

4. Skills of the Experts in charge of the Workshop

4.1 Capability of moderating the workshop
Poor ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Excellent

4.2 The interaction between experts and participants was...
Non existent ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Stimulating

4.3 Your level of involvement and active participation was:
Very low ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Very high

5. Atmosphere in the Workshop room

5.1 Communication inside the groups has been...
Poor ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Excellent

5.2 Interaction between the workshop participants was...
Poor ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Excellent

5.3 How useful do you feel that the contacts you made with the other workshop participants will be for future collaborations?
Not very useful ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Useful

6. General Evaluation

6.1 The workshop programme was...
Not Interesting ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Interesting

6.2 The workshop programme was...
Not involving ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Involving

6. Comments:

_____
_____
_____
_____
_____