

SUMMARY OF THE EVALUATION REPORT OF THE PROJECT

Recognizing and treating victims of domestic violence in health care settings: Guidelines and training for health professionals (POND_SiZdrav)

Author: Urška Smrke

Research Centre of the Slovenian Academy of Sciences and Arts,
Sociomedical Institute

Novi trg 2, 1000 Ljubljana

Ljubljana, June 2016

During the project Recognizing and treating victims of domestic violence in health care settings: Guidelines and training for health professionals (POND_SiZdrav) the project group aimed to enhance the recognition and treatment of victims of domestic violence by health care professionals, which was being realized through a number of trainings, events and other results generated during the project. All outputs of the project were the result of guidance and coordination by the project's steering committee and the activities of six work groups. One of these groups was a work group for evaluation. Its task was to monitor and evaluate the progress and results of the project. In this summary of the final evaluation report the main results of evaluation of the project are presented.

During the project work group for evaluation evaluated six areas of the project, namely meetings of project partners, meetings and workflow of working groups, project management, website, training and events carried out within the project.

Meeting of project partners

During the project, the steering committee of the project had 11 meetings. At each meeting participants completed evaluation questionnaire. Average scores¹ of all meetings by the individual categories are presented in the following table.

Category of evaluation	Average of all meetings
Organisation of a meeting	
1.1 Information provided before the meeting was:	4,3
1.2 I evaluate the organisation of a meeting as:	4,6
1.3 Time slot and duration of a meeting was:	4,4
1.4 The meeting was held in accordance with the agenda:	4,6
The content of the meeting	
2.1 Content discussed at the meeting was:	4,6
2.2 Presentation of content, discussed at the meeting, was:	4,6
2.3 The content of a meeting contributed to the objectives of the project:	4,7
Own involvement in the meeting	
3.1 I was included in the meeting:	4,4
3.2 At the meeting I was able to express my expert opinion:	4,4
3.3 At the meeting I was able to express my doubts, uncertainties and critiques:	4,5
Technical aspects / infrastructure of the meeting	
4.1 The room in which the meeting took place was appropriate:	4,3
4.2 Internet access in the room where the meeting took place was:	4,0
Overall impression of the meeting	
5.1 My general opinion of the meeting:	4,7

Meetings of the steering committee were evaluated as very good in all of the evaluated aspects.

Meetings and workflow of work groups

Within the project POND_SiZdrav six work groups were active. Meetings of these groups and workflow within the each group was evaluated. Work group 1 (WG1: Information and publicity, public events, organisation of trainings) met five times, work group 2 (WG2: Evaluation of project implementation and results) seven times, work group 3

¹ All categories in all areas of evaluation were evaluated on a 5-point scale, where 1 represented the least good score and 5 represented the best.

(WG3: Analysis of situation and research) three times, as well as the work group 4 (WG4: Vulnerable groups and addressing domestic violence) and work group 5 (WG5: Development of educational content and tools), while the work group 6 (WG6: Formation of educational teams and implementation of training) met eleven times. Average ratings of all meetings by the individual categories of evaluation by individual work groups are presented in the following table.

Category of evaluation	Average of all meetings by the individual working groups					
	WG 1	WG2	WG 3	WG 4	WG 5	WG 6
Organisation of a meeting						
1.1 Information provided before the meeting was:	4,6	4,6	4,3	4,5	4,4	4,3
1.2 I evaluate the organisation of a meeting as:	4,8	4,8	4,3	4,4	4,4	4,5
1.3 Time slot and duration of a meeting was:	4,8	4,8	4,3	4,4	4,1	4,1
1.4 The meeting was held in accordance with the agenda:	4,8	4,8	4,6	4,6	4,4	4,4
The content of the meeting						
2.1 Content discussed at the meeting was:	4,6	4,9	4,6	4,6	4,6	4,6
2.2 Presentation of content, discussed at the meeting, was:	4,4	4,8	4,6	4,6	4,5	4,5
2.3 The content of a meeting contributed to the objectives of the project:	4,6	4,9	4,7	4,6	4,6	4,5
Own involvement in the meeting						
3.1 I was included in the meeting:	4,5	4,8	4,3	4,3	4,2	4,4
3.2 At the meeting I was able to express my expert opinion:	4,4	4,7	4,2	4,5	4,3	4,5
3.3 At the meeting I was able to express my doubts, uncertainties and critiques:	4,4	4,8	4,3	4,5	4,4	4,4
Technical aspects / infrastructure of the meeting						
4.1 The room in which the meeting took place was appropriate:	4,6	4,7	4,4	4,5	4,6	4,8
4.2 Internet access in the room where the meeting took place was:	4,2	4,5	3,6	4,1	4,3	4,8
Overall impression of the meeting						
5.1 My general opinion of the meeting:	4,6	4,7	4,6	4,5	4,5	4,5
Workflow in the working group						
6.1 I am familiar with the objectives of the working group:	4,4	4,9	4,5	4,7	4,6	4,7
6.2 I am familiar with the current results of the working group:	4,3	4,7	4,4	4,6	4,4	4,5
6.3 I am aware of my obligations within the working group:	4,3	4,9	4,6	4,7	4,5	4,6
6.4 I am able to access all materials and information related to the work of the working group:	4,5	4,9	4,6	4,6	4,6	4,6
6.5 Cooperation with other members of the working group is:	4,4	4,4	4,2	4,4	4,1	4,3
6.6 We are facing problems in the working group:	2,2	2,8	2,3	2,1	2,6	2,9
Overall impression of the current workflow of the working group:						
7.1 My general opinion of the current work of the working group is:	4,4	4,6	4,6	4,6	4,3	4,4

Meetings and workflow of working groups was evaluated as good or very good from the several points.

Project management

At the end of the project, members of the project group received a questionnaire on various aspects of the management of the project, which was completed by 65,1 % of the project group members. High average ratings from 4,1 to 4,5 show that they were satisfied with various aspects of project management. Also with average ratings of good and very good the work of steering committee was evaluated and similarly the work of individual work groups (M from 4.4 to 4.7). Cooperation between the partners of the project was in terms of communication evaluated as good (M from 4.0 to 4.1), and similarly also various aspects of administrative support in terms of adequate financial information, contractual obligations and coordination of activities (M from 4.2 to 4.3). The general impression of the project management was very good (M = 4,6), which represents (together with the area of management and organisation of work of individual working groups) best rated area in this context.

Website

As one of the results of the project POND_SiZdrav, website www.prepoznajnasilje.si was established. It was evaluated twice, first in the time period from 25. 9. 2015 to 11. 11. 2015, and second in the time period from 24. 3. 2016 to 26. 4. 2016. Website users were invited to complete evaluation questionnaire (N = 87 completed questionnaires in the first evaluation, and N = 115 in the second), and the website was also evaluated through the data provided by the Google Analytics.

Approximately half (1. evaluation: 59.8 %, 2. evaluation: 48.2 %) of participants did already know the website before completing the questionnaire. In the 1. period of evaluation most of the participants found the website through being involved in the project (29,9 %), oral information from others (25,3 %) and invitation for completing evaluation questionnaire through e-mail (25,3 %), while in the 2. evaluation most of them found the website through invitation for completing the questionnaire (54,8 %). In both periods of evaluation most of the participants (1.: 56,3 %, 2.: 62,3 %) visited the website for the first time.

Most of the participants (1.: 82,8 %, 2.: 91,3 %) instantly recognized the aim of the website, and they also reported the aim of the project was clearly presented (1.: 80,5 %; 2.: 91,3 %). Most of the participants (1.: 78,2 %; 2.: 82,5 %) quickly and easily found the information they were looking for. According to participants, the website is clearly organised (1.: M = 4,2; 2.: 4,3), and has a pleasant appearance (1.: M = 4,4; 2.: M = 4,4). Also the speed (1.: M = 4,4; 2.: M = 4,4) and reliability (1.: M = 4,5; 2.: M = 4,6) of functioning of the website have been assessed as good or very good. Only small proportion of participants (1.: 8,0 %, 2.: 5,2 %) encountered a problem while using the website.

According to participants, references and information about the website owner were quickly and easily recognizable. Among the evaluated aspects, the most easily recognizable was the name of the project (1.: 79,3 %; 2.: 81,6 %), most of the participants also instantly recognized project partners (1.: 65,6 %; 2.: 58,3 %). Slightly more than half of the participants (1.: 54,0 %; 2.: 52,2 %) also quickly and easily found the legal notice.

Within the website there was also the possibility to apply to the POND_SiZdrav trainings. From the participants of 1. evaluation, the majority (67,8%) of them applied to the training, approximately one fifth of them (21,4 %) applied through the website form. In the second period only about a quarter (26,3 %) of participants applied to the trainings, of those more than half (58,8 %) applied through the website form.

Participants also provided their feedback on overall impression of the website. In both evaluations, general satisfaction with the website was rated highly (1.: M = 4,3; 2.: M = 4,2), while they also, on average, strongly agreed they would recommend the website (1.: M = 4,6; 2.: M = 4,6) and the likelihood of continued monitoring of the content and use of the website (1.: M = 4,2; 2.: M = 4,1).

In the addition to the evaluation questionnaire, the website was also evaluated through the data provided by Google Analytics.

In the first period of the evaluation there were 8918 visits recorded, of which slightly more than one half (55,2 %) of them was by new visitors. Total number of sites' or sub-sites' views in this period was 27986, on average visitors viewed 3,1 sites. The average visit lasted 4 minutes and 3 seconds. Data for the second period are similar. In this time there were 9892 visits recorded, of which slightly more than one half (55,0 %) of visits was by new visitors. Total number of sites' views was 27103, an average of 2,7 per visitor. The average visit lasted 3 minutes and 8 seconds. In may 2016, 2028 visits were recorded, 58,1 % of them were by new visitors. The number of viewed sites was 4330, on average 2,1 per visit. Average visit lasted for 2 minutes and 31 seconds. In June 2016 there was an approximately half less visits recorded (1066), 58,3 % by new visitors. Also the number of viewed sites was smaller (2873), while the average number of viewed sites during one visit increased ($M = 2,7$), as well as the time of average visit did (3 minutes and 8 seconds).

During the entire time period from the formation of the website to the end of the project (1. 5. 2015 – 30. 6. 2016), there was 22426 visits recorded, of which 55,4 % were by new visitors. The total number of sites viewed was 64431, on average 2,9 per visit. The average visit lasted 3 minutes and 39 seconds.

From the results of the evaluation of the website we can conclude that the findings of first and second evaluation are very similar. Already in the first period of evaluation, the website was very positively rated, which was also the case in the second period. This can be attributed to the fact that due to positive feedbacks from the first evaluation nothing at the website was systematically changed. According to the data on recorded visits of the website, the website was visited more often in the second period. Based on the information collected we estimate that the purpose of the website was achieved and that it is a useful tool, used by a large number of people.

Trainings

2093 participants attended trainings of the POND project, of which the majority (87 %) were female. The majority of participants came from the *Osrednjeslovenska* region (55,1 %) and the least from the *Notranjsko-kraška* region (0,1 %) in respect to their workplace location. Among the participants, nursing staff was most represented (47 %), followed by doctors and dentists (33 %), while one fifth (20 %) of the participants were of other professions. In the group of doctors and dentists, the most represented specialization was the one of dental medicine (22 %) and of family medicine (14 %), while a large part of doctors (14 %) did not define their specialization.

Participants of the trainings completed evaluation questionnaires at the end of both days or modules of the training. They provided their feedback on the organization, content, acquired knowledge and involvement of the participants. All of the trainings ($N = 20$) were evaluated. In the following section average ratings for all trainings together are presented (by module).

The overall impression of Module 1 was very good ($M = 4,9$), while almost all participants (99,3 %) who answered the question would recommend the training to others. The venue of the lectures was rated as good or very good ($M = 4,5$), similarly also the time structure and duration of training ($M = 4,3$). Highly rated was also the content of the lectures ($M = 4,4$) and the opportunity to participate in the discussion ($M = 4,4$). According to participants' feedbacks, lectures contributed to their broader understanding of domestic violence ($M = 4,3$), they gained a lot of new knowledge on domestic violence ($M = 4,2$), and lectures also served them well in improving their skills and competences on the field of domestic violence ($M = 4,2$). Participants felt well engaged in the lectures ($M = 4,2$) and were able to express their doubts, concerns or critiques during the lectures ($M = 4,3$).

Similarly to the Module 1, Module 2 (the second day of training) was rated. The overall impression of all four workshops was good or very good (M from 4,4 to 4,5). The majority of participants (89,4 %) would recommend the training to others. The venue of the workshops was rated as good ($M = 4,4$), as were also the time structure and

duration of the workshops (M = 4,2). The content of presentations (M = 4,5) as also the methods used by the lecturers during workshops (M = 4,5) were rated as good or very good. Similarly evaluated was also the opportunity to participate in the discussion (M = 4,6). According to participants, the workshops contributed well or very well (M = 4,5) to their broader understanding of domestic violence, they also gained new knowledge (M = 4,5) and were able to improve their skills and competences on the field of domestic violence (M = 4,5). Participants felt well engaged in the workshops (M = 4,6), while they also reported they were able to express their doubts, concerns or critiques (M = 4,6).

Events

During the project, two public events were organized, namely introductory conference entitled Violence is a public health problem (15. 9. 2015), and final project conference entitled Health care – an important link in prevention of domestic violence. At the end of both events, participants were invited to provide their feedback by completing evaluation questionnaires.

For the introductory conference, 88 participants completed the evaluation questionnaire. Most of them (47,7 %) completed the specialization of the higher education programs, university or professional master's degree (2nd bologna cycle). Among occupational groups, the most represented was the one of doctors and dentists (18,2 %), followed by social workers (17,0 %). Participants rated the general impression of the conference as very good (M = 4,6). The venue of the conference was rated as very appropriate (M = 4,7), well rated were also the time structure and the duration of the conference (M = 4,4). The content of the lectures was rated as very appropriate / relevant (M = 4,6), slightly lower but still good (M = 4,0) the possibility to participate in discussion was rated. Participants reported that the event contributed to their broader understanding of domestic violence well (M = 4,0), that they gained new knowledge on domestic violence (M = 3,8), and also that the event served to improve their skills and competences with regard to domestic violence (M = 3,7). Participants on average felt engaged in the event (M = 3,9), and in general agreed, that at the event they were able to express their doubts, concerns and critiques (M = 3,8).

In the evaluation of the final project conference, 53 people participated, of which most were women (92,5 %). Most of the participants (79,2 %) completed the specialization of the higher education programs, university or professional master's degree (2nd bologna cycle). Among the occupational groups, the most represented was the one of doctors and dentists (51,0 %), followed again by social workers (17,0 %). Participants rated the general impression of the conference as good or very good (M = 4,5). The venue of the conference was rated as appropriate or very appropriate (M = 4,5), as also was the time structure and duration of the conference (M = 4,9). Lectures at the final conference were rated as appropriate also from the content perspective (M = 4,5), well rated was also the possibility to participate in discussion (M = 4,0). According to the participants, the event contributed well (M = 4,2) to their broader understanding of domestic violence, and also served well to improve their skills and competences with regard to domestic violence (M = 3,9). On average, participants felt well engaged in the event (M = 3,9), and agreed, that they were able to express their doubts, concerns and critiques (M = 4,0) at the event.

Conclusion

During the project POND_SiZdrav with the purpose to increase knowledge and competencies in the field of domestic violence aiming at more successful recognition and more appropriate treatment of victims in the health care context, numerous trainings and events were organised, and also many other results of the project. All of the evaluated areas of the project, both those at the level of individual working groups and on the level of their outputs, were very well received and positively evaluated from the perspective of the project group members as well as from the perspective of external participants of the project activities. We can conclude, that the project was very succesful from the aspect of management and work of working groups, as well as in terms of acceptance of the results formed during the project.