



**Prevention of and fight against crime:
a new initiative to identify best practices
in the alternative measures & treatment
programs and to organize a
European prevention campaign for youth - SPRING**

Final evaluation report on interviews

Deliverable 13





**Prevention of and fight against crime:
a new initiative to identify best practices
in the alternative measures & treatment
programs and to organize a
European prevention campaign for youth - SPRING**

1. Project summary.....	3
2. Evaluation Methodology.....	3
3. <i>Evaluation of the partnership</i>	4
4. <i>Evaluation of Project Activities Implementation</i>	9
4.1 <i>Evaluation of Workshop on EU polices on prevention of drug-related crimes (implemented in Sofia, Bulgaria on 20-21 May 2014)</i>	9
4.2 <i>Evaluation of Final SPRING Conference</i>	12
4.3 <i>Evaluation Music Therapy</i>	12
4.4 <i>SWOT ANALYSIS</i>	14





**Prevention of and fight against crime:
a new initiative to identify best practices
in the alternative measures & treatment
programs and to organize a
European prevention campaign for youth - SPRING**

1. Project summary

The Project SPRING was implemented within 36 months on the territory of three countries – Italy, Cyprus and Bulgaria. The project target group consist of youngest adults (15-24 years old) drug offenders under alternative measures & treatment programs, and of young adults in urban contexts and the project aims at preventing drug use and sensitizing national authorities and NGOs operating directly with drug law offenders.

The project leader was Comunità Fanelli (Italy) in cooperation with ISES (Italy), Bulgarian Gender Research Fundation (Bulgaria) and Interfusion Services (Cyprus).

The project started on 19 October 2011 and ended on 19 October 2014.

2. Evaluation Methodology

The Evaluation covers 36 months – the period of implementation and combines the work of internal and external evaluators. The evaluation report has the following purposes:

- To assess and inform about the effectiveness of the project management and identify activities and critical issues of management activity, refer any risk/critical aspects and define possible solutions to the risks identified;
- To assess and inform about the quality of project products – international seminar implemented in Sofia, Bulgaria, music therapy sessions and final international conference implemented in Alessandria, Italy.

Evaluation area	Main evaluation targets
1. Evaluation of Processes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Management efficiency; • Project effectiveness (level of achievement of results).
2. Evaluation of Products	SPRING comparative research SPRING pilot action and methodology evaluation in terms of





**Prevention of and fight against crime:
a new initiative to identify best practices
in the alternative measures & treatment
programs and to organize a
European prevention campaign for youth - SPRING**

	effectiveness/efficacy and impact on the target groups. SPRING International Seminar in Sofia, Bulgaria SPRING International Conference in Alessandria, Italy
--	---

Indicators/Criteria

4

The assessment of the management activity took into consideration some categories of indicators such as:

- Coordination/WP leadership;
- Time Management;
- Partnership;
- Meetings;
- Quality of the means of communication;

For evaluating the project working meetings the following indicators/criteria have been taken into account:

- Planning;
- Organisation;
- Participation;
- Value;
- Attitude;
- Agenda/content.

The assessment of the inputs took into consideration the following indicators :

- Correspondence b/n goals and achievements
- Effectiveness and sufficiency of information

3. Evaluation of the partnership





**Prevention of and fight against crime:
a new initiative to identify best practices
in the alternative measures & treatment
programs and to organize a
European prevention campaign for youth - SPRING**

The project evaluation team interviewed the project staff in the three countries through questionnaires after the end of the 18th and of the 36th month of project implementation. The main aim was assessment of the degree of satisfaction of the staff from the project management. The evaluation at the end of the 18th month aimed also to collect suggestions for the time remaining before the end of the project.

The first round of evaluations of indicators was gathered by questionnaires provided by the three partners up to the end of November 2012 and through random additional interviews of representatives of some Italian and Bulgarian partners until January 2013. It actually covers the assessment by three persons from Cyprus and three from Bulgaria. From Italy and the two Italian partners, 9 persons participated as a whole. It is not within the task of the BGRF to additionally assess the evaluations, just for the sake of preparing the first portion of assessment of these indicators, a brief summary follows. In order to diversify the methods at the first stage, the BGRF conducted at its own initiative random interviews with some Italian and Bulgarian partners. In the course of the finalization of this round of assessments of the said indicators, the responsible partner BGRF decided not to conduct additional interviews with all the representatives of project partners. This was not included explicitly in the methodology and the outcomes, anyway. The preliminary analysis of the Qaires and the interviews contributed to this decision- there was a high degree of uniformity and agreement among the representatives of the partners in each country, with so minor differences that it would be useless to ask similar questions more in detail- the results would be the same., Just in case, the response from additional interviews from Italy and Bulgaria , they are also briefly summarized below.

The summary that follows and the Qaires themselves are part of the whole evaluation package which will be sent to partners .

It will be up for the final evaluation to assess all the results, also in light of the other elements of the evaluation which will be provided shortly. And also bearing in mind, that all of our / of the partners/ assessments and judgments may be biased and subjective, as we are involved directly in the project implementation, implying, inevitably, difficulties and problems.

Summary of Questionnaires

The evaluation of the Cyprus team (3 people) for the period month 1-18 of the project Spring shows that the team is satisfied by the Communication led by the Manager/Coordinator and evaluates it as very useful (two people ranked it as very useful, and one person as useful) as a whole. The Communication interest varies from very useful to good. The discussion were generally good but 2 people ranked them as “not bad” (the second option after rank 5, which is 4), the team expresses that there were very good managed and merely good use of the staff’s time (but two people ranked it as “not bad”).

The coordination of the project is also good (1 person finds it very good). The coordinators explained and distributed the tasks among the partners according to their roles in the project and supervised well their implementation.

The coordinator provided very good and timely responses and very clear explanation of the financial rules (3 people fully agree). The guidance of the staff was assessed as good, as well as the messages were clear. At the question about suggestion for improvement of the management and coordination, there are quoted examples as follows:

- Provision of more information (neutral positions)
- Better clarification of objectives (neutral positions)





**Prevention of and fight against crime:
a new initiative to identify best practices
in the alternative measures & treatment
programs and to organize a
European prevention campaign for youth - SPRING**

Better clarification of tasks – two persons have neutral positions, and one considers that it is not necessary

Matters covered - two persons have neutral positions, and one considers that it is not necessary

Complexity of the objectives/ tasks (neutral positions)

Quality and frequency of the discussions (neutral positions)

Discussions in general (neutral positions)

The evaluation of the Italian team (2 people) for the period month 1-18 of the project Spring shows that the team is satisfied by the Communication led by the Manager/Coordinator and evaluates it as useful as a whole. The Communication interest was evaluated as good. The discussions were assessed between good and “not bad” (the second option after rank 5, which is 4), the team expresses that the communication was managed well and there was good use of the staff’s time (“not bad”). The communication was “interactive enough”.

The coordination of the project is also good. The staff considers that the coordinators explained and distributed the tasks among the partners according to their roles in the project and supervised well their implementation.

The coordinator provided good and timely responses and very clear explanation of the financial rules. The guidance to the staff and the partners and the messages of the coordinator to them were assessed from the scale from very good and good.

At the question about suggestion for improvement of the management and coordination, there are quoted examples as follows:

Provision of more information (neutral positions)

Better clarification of objectives (neutral positions)

Better clarification of tasks – (neutral positions)

Matters covered – (neutral positions)

Complexity of the objectives/ tasks (neutral positions)

Quality and frequency of the discussions (neutral positions)

Discussions in general (neutral positions)

The evaluation of the Italian team (7 people) for the period month 1-18 of the project Spring shows the following level of satisfaction about the *usefulness of the communication* of the Coordinator to the team: 2 people agree that the team is very satisfied by the Communication led by the Manager/Coordinator, 3 people evaluate it as useful and 2 people have neutral statements.

The Communication interest was evaluated as interesting by the majority of the staff (4 people), however 2 people find it very interesting and 2 persons are neutral.

Further in the evaluation to assess the communication process, the project evaluation team used a 5-points scale for the 3 questions “Do you think that the discussions have been managed in a good way, that the discussions have been good and did you make a good use of your time in this process”. The answers vary from the points 5 to 1 (excellent, above average, average, below average, poor)

The discussions were assessed as “not bad” (the second option after rank 5, which is 4) by 4 members of the staff, two other people find them generally good and one person was not satisfied. The team expresses that the communication was managed well and there was good use of the staff’s time (“not bad”). The communication was “interactive enough”.

The coordination of the project is also good. The staff considers that the coordinators explained and distributed the tasks among the partners according to their roles in the project and supervised well their implementation.





**Prevention of and fight against crime:
a new initiative to identify best practices
in the alternative measures & treatment
programs and to organize a
European prevention campaign for youth - SPRING**

The coordinator provided good and timely responses and very clear explanation of the financial rules. The guidance to the staff and the partners and the messages of the coordinator to them were assessed from the scale form very good and good.

At the question about suggestion for improvement of the management and coordination, there are quoted examples as follows:

Provision of more information (neutral positions)

Better clarification of objectives (neutral positions)

Better clarification of tasks – (neutral positions)

Matters covered – (neutral positions)

Complexity of the objectives/ tasks (neutral positions)

Quality and frequency of the discussions (neutral positions)

Discussions in general (neutral positions)

The evaluation of the Bulgarian team/ three persons/ is very similar to the one provided by the Cypriot colleagues but more moderate. In fact for the same period, the coordination was found as good, the communication – useful most of the time and the communication interest- good. The level of discussion is on the average good but also, in some instances, “ not too bad”.

The coordinator provided good and timely responses and clear explanation of the financial rules (3 people fully agree). The guidance of the staff was assessed as good, as well as the messages were clear.

Despite that, in the Bulgarian evaluations from the end of last year there are suggestions about a better discussion in terms of frequency and quality and the need for better clarification of tasks, in view of the very concrete focus of the project and its target group. The need to clarify the scope and out- of- scope issues to be covered, in relation to what and why it should be done is also stressed. And also. “....*national situations and difficulties should be taken into account.....*”. The need for Bulgaria for passing the earlier possible to the practical phase was emphasized.

Brief notes on the random interviews

The conducted interviews pay very much attention to the communication- timeliness, clarity, openness and the preference to communication via skype, or telephone, where needed, rather than by other means, like just e- mails, which have the potential to distort and damage messages and even relations sometimes. Timely consideration of arguments, questions, problems was suggested.

We note that recommendations in the field of better communication are both for the coordination and management and for the partners as a whole.

Suggestions for concrete methodology of processing the Qaires.

Here is an example of scales about evaluation of Qaires, even if this is valid when more respondents are involved. It can be used by further evaluators, along with their specific methods.

Trends in that kind of project relations are much more important than just simple technical processing.





**Prevention of and fight against crime:
a new initiative to identify best practices
in the alternative measures & treatment
programs and to organize a
European prevention campaign for youth - SPRING**

	Question	5	4	3	2	1
Satisfaction	<i>How satisfied are you with...?</i>	Very Satisfied	Satisfied	Neither Satisfied nor Dissatisfied	Dissatisfied	Very Dissatisfied
Agreement	<i>Please state your level of agreement with...</i>	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
Extent	<i>To what extent do you...?</i>	To a large extent	To a moderate extent	To some extent	To little extent	Not at all
Helpfulness	<i>How helpful is...?</i>	Very helpful	Somewhat helpful	Neither	No so helpful	Not at all helpful
Interest	<i>Please indicate your degree of interest in...</i>	Considerable interest	Moderate interest	Some interest	Little interest	No interest
Relative Quantity	<i>Should... do less or more of...?</i>	Much more	Somewhat more	Fine as is	Somewhat less	Much less
Importance	<i>How important to you is...?</i>	Very Important	Somewhat Important	Neither Important nor Unimportant	Somewhat Unimportant	Very Unimportant
Quality Rating	<i>Please rate the quality of...</i>	Excellent	Above Average	Average	Below Average	Poor

Level of Frequency– 7 points

- 1 – Never
- 2 – Rarely, in less than 10% of the chances when I could have
- 3 – Occasionally, in about 30% of the chances when I could have
- 4 – Sometimes, in about 50% of the chances when I could have
- 5 – Frequently, in about 70% of the chances when I could have
- 6 – Usually, in about 90% of the chances I could have.
- 7 – Every time

Level of Quality – 5 points

- 1 – Poor
- 2 – Fair
- 3 – Good
- 4 – Very good
- 5 – Excellent

Level of Satisfaction – 5 points

- 1 – Not at all satisfied
- 2 – slightly satisfied
- 3 – moderately satisfied
- 4 – Very satisfied
- 5 – Extremely satisfied

Level of Satisfaction – 7 points

- 1 – Completely dissatisfied
- 2 – Mostly dissatisfied
- 3 – Somewhat dissatisfied
- 4 – neither satisfied or dissatisfied
- 5 – Somewhat satisfied





**Prevention of and fight against crime:
a new initiative to identify best practices
in the alternative measures & treatment
programs and to organize a
European prevention campaign for youth - SPRING**

- 6 – Mostly satisfied
- 7 – Completely satisfied
- Level of Quality – 5 points**
- 1 – Poor
- 2 – Fair
- 3 – Good
- 4 – Very good
- 5 – Excellent

The second round of evaluation was implemented after the 36th month. The overall results are that the partners reveal a very high level of satisfaction about components as communication, definitions of the tasks, task sharing, definition and respect to deadlines and mutual understanding. During the second evaluation the results are even more positive and vary in the scale of high level of satisfaction. The total number of respondents are 8 people – 3 respondents from Italy, 2 respondents from Cyprus and 3 respondents from Bulgaria.

The evaluation of the Italian team (3 respondents) for the period month 18-36 of the project Spring shows that the team is very satisfied by the Communication led by the Manager/Coordinator and evaluates it as very useful (3 people ranked it as very useful) as a whole. The coordination of the project is very good (3 persons find it very good). The coordinators explained and distributed the tasks among the partners according to their roles in the project and supervised well their implementation. The coordinator provided very good and timely responses and very clear explanation of the financial rules (3 people fully agree). The guidance of the staff was assessed as good, as well as the messages were clear.

The evaluation of Cyprus team (2 respondents) for the period month 18-36 of the project Spring shows very high level of satisfaction – very good communication (2 people assessed as very good), coordination is also evaluated as very useful. The distribution of tasks is evaluated with 5 (the highest rate). The highest rate is given for the coordinator, who “responded in a prompt and timely manner to the issues raised and to the problems and explained clearly the financial and other rules and agreements”. The highest rate is given also for provided continuous guidance to the partners and their staff for the implementation of the tasks.

The evaluation of Bulgarian team (3 respondents) for the period month 18-36 of the project Spring shows that the team is very satisfied by the Communication lead by the Manager/Coordinator and evaluates it as very useful (3 people ranked it as very useful) as a whole. The coordination of the project is very good (3 persons find it very good). The coordinators explained and distributed the tasks among the partners according to their roles in the project and supervised well their implementation. The coordinator provided very good and timely responses and very clear explanation of the financial rules (3 people fully agree). The guidance of the staff was assessed as good, as well as the messages were clear.

4. Evaluation of Project Activities Implementation

4.1 Evaluation of Workshop on EU polices on prevention of drug-related crimes (implemented in Sofia, Bulgaria on 20-21 May 2014)





**Prevention of and fight against crime:
a new initiative to identify best practices
in the alternative measures & treatment
programs and to organize a
European prevention campaign for youth - SPRING**

The international workshop devoted on the topic of EU polices on prevention of drug-related crimes was held in Sofia on 20-21 May, 2014 within the project SPRING. The general evaluation of the participants in the workshop is very positive. One of the indicators was the high level of attendance in both days of all participants and strong interest towards the issues addressed. After the workshop the BGRF received requests for cooperation and official letters from Bulgarian institutions.

Profile of participants

The participants in the workshop were from Bulgaria, Greece, Italy, Cyprus, Romania and Lithuania and their total number for the 2 days is 62. The attendees from Bulgaria are 19, from Italy 8, Greece -2, Romania – 1 and Cyprus – 1. They are representatives of non-governmental organizations and state institutions that work in the field of drugs and drug addiction policies, research and provision of services. People who have been directly affected by drug use (family members of drug-users) also attended and there was a space for sharing personal stories and promotion of information materials.

20 May 2014

Below is the evaluation of the participants regarding:

The issues addressed

Drug addiction: a complex problematic in Bulgaria, Cyprus and Italy	44% defined as very satisfied, 50 % as satisfied and 5,8% as neutral
The social costs of drug addiction: A European vision	64 % defined as very satisfied, 10.7 % as satisfied and 2% as neutral
European initiatives in prevention and fighting against drug-related crimes of youths (Greece, EUPCN and Romania)	35 % defined as very satisfied, 58,8% as satisfied and 5,8 % as neutral
Training session 1: Integrated intervention for drug users in alternative measures to detention: the experience of the Campania Region	50% defined as very satisfied, 44 % as satisfied and 5,8 % as neutral
Training session 2: Stigma and vulnerable population	44 % defined as very satisfied, 44 % as satisfied and 5,8% as neutral
Training session 3: Social Therapy for Alcohol and Drug Addicted	41 % defined as very satisfied, 32% as satisfied and 8,8 % as neutral

The benefits respondents received from the workshop

Knowledge about the main legal framework and drug use	32 % defined as very satisfied, 61,7 % as satisfied and 5,8% as neutral and dissatisfied – 5,8%
Knowledge about EU Policies on prevention of drug use	38 % defined as very satisfied, 61,7 % as satisfied and 5,8% as neutral
Better understanding of specificity of the	38% defined as very satisfied, 50% as





**Prevention of and fight against crime:
a new initiative to identify best practices
in the alternative measures & treatment
programs and to organize a
European prevention campaign for youth - SPRING**

problem drug addiction and young people	satisfied and 8,8 % as neutral
Better knowledge for good practices in prevention	44 % defined as very satisfied, 38% as satisfied and 14,7 % as neutral and dissatisfied - 2,9%

Conclusions:

There was a very good moderation of the workshop and it was an opportunity for meeting and discussion with representatives from different countries, people with different points of view. One of the valuable points was sharing good practices from other EU countries and also highlighting the aspect of social price of drugs and drug addiction.

21 May 2014

Below is the evaluation of the participants regarding:

The issues addressed:

Treatment for drug addicts in alternative measures to detention: comparison of European experiences	57 % defined as very satisfied, 35 % as satisfied and 7% as neutral
Pilot Action: experiences and good practices in Bulgaria, Cyprus and Italy	64 % defined as very satisfied, 10.7 % as satisfied and 3,5% as neutral and dissatisfied -14%
Music therapy experience as part of intervention with drug users – Italy, Bulgaria and Cyprus	64% defined as very satisfied, 28 % as satisfied and 3,5% as neutral and dissatisfied - 3,5%

The benefits respondents received from the workshop

Better knowledge for alternative measures for treatment of drug addicts	53 % defined as very satisfied, 28% as satisfied and 10,7% as neutral and 3.5% dissatisfied
Comparative view about the treatment of drug addicts	53 % defined as very satisfied, 32 % as satisfied and 3,5% as neutral and 7% dissatisfied
Music therapy as treatment intervention for drug addicts	64% defined as very satisfied, 17,8% as satisfied and 7 % as neutral

Conclusions:





**Prevention of and fight against crime:
a new initiative to identify best practices
in the alternative measures & treatment
programs and to organize a
European prevention campaign for youth - SPRING**

One of the most valuable components was the sessions focused on music therapy and also the opportunities for contacts with potential partners; opportunity for sharing good practices from Bulgaria.

Participants made recommendations for more time for discussions.

4.2 Evaluation of Final SPRING Conference

(implemented in Alessandria, Italy on 11 October 2014)

The final conference was implemented in Alessandria with 43 participants from Italy, Bulgaria, Cyprus, Greece and Slovenia. All project results were presented and discussed in open formal debate and every partner/country (Italy, Greece and Bulgaria) presented the implemented activities.

The used method for measuring was an evaluation questionnaire and 37 people responded. The general attitude is positive – the most highlighted points were: opportunity to compare 3 different countries, and also with good practices in Europe as a whole.

Below is the evaluation of the participants regarding:

Conference topics	Level of satisfaction
The Italian Situation in the fight against drugs and related crimes: a comparison between North-South Italy and the rest of Europe	15% are very satisfied; 65% of respondents are satisfied; 10% are neutral
Comparative View: European Initiatives in the field of prevention and eradication of the drug phenomena: Bulgaria, Cyprus, Greece and Slovenia	10% are very satisfied; 60 % of respondents are satisfied; 25% are neutral and 5 % are dissatisfied
Pilot Action: experiences and good practices in Bulgaria, Cyprus and Italy	25% are very satisfied; 45% of respondents are satisfied; 39% are neutral
Music therapy experience as part of intervention with drug users – Italy, Bulgaria and Cyprus	25% are very satisfied; 45% of respondents are satisfied; 39% are neutral

4.3 Evaluation Music Therapy

Music therapy sessions were implemented in Italy, Bulgaria and Cyprus. The target group is formed by young drug addicts – only in Bulgaria the sessions were implemented in the prisons among young offenders. Music therapy was assessed as excellent by 85% of all participants from all targeted countries, 10% of participants evaluated it as good and 5% as adequate and 2% as inadequate. The respondents defined the therapy as something very positive and as good way for expression of emotions, imagination and creativity and the therapy was accepted as a way out of the daily routine and depression. The negative reactions and suspicion is very low as percentage in the three countries.





**Prevention of and fight against crime:
a new initiative to identify best practices
in the alternative measures & treatment
programs and to organize a
European prevention campaign for youth - SPRING**

The total number of respondents is 38 – from Italy 7, from Bulgaria – 12 and from Cyprus 19

Bulgaria

12 males, Bulgarian origin

All respondents are drug addicted young offenders at age between 20-24 years who are prisoners.

Level of satisfaction (1 – Inadequate; 2 - Adequate; 3 - Good; 4 – Excellent)	7 respondents defined as excellent; 3 respondents defined as good and 1 as adequate and 1 as inadequate
The most helpful for you from the sessions	1) Opportunity to communicate and to be in contact with others; 2) The sessions helps you to feel that you are not in the terrible situation in the prison; 3) The most helpful were conversations and music; 4) The sessions helped to start to think about better days and future plans;
Dislike (What you did not like)	1) The sessions are not every day but we need such kind of occupation every day 2) The sessions were a kind of entertainment in the dull life in the prison
Do you think that music therapy could be helpful to you in the future	8 respondents answered positively that they would continue with music therapy sessions after serving their judgement in the prison and it would be helpful and positive for them and even; 3 respondents answered that music sessions will not help them;

Cyprus

19 males, Cypriot nationals,

Young drug addicted people aged between 17-24 years

Level of satisfaction (1 – Inadequate; 2 - Adequate; 3 - Good; 4 – Excellent)	12 respondents defined as excellent; 4 respondents defined as good and 2 as adequate and 1 as inadequate
The most helpful for you from the sessions	1) Musical interests and discussions with others; 2) The instructor was helpful with the advices; 3) The conversations and relaxation; 4) Listening and playing music;
Dislike (What you did not like)	1) The sessions were too long





**Prevention of and fight against crime:
a new initiative to identify best practices
in the alternative measures & treatment
programs and to organize a
European prevention campaign for youth - SPRING**

	2) The size of the groups was small
Do you think that music therapy could be helpful to you in the future	11 respondents answered positively that they would continue with music therapy sessions; 3 respondents answered that listening to music and playing music is very positive and helpful;

Italy

7 males, **Italians**

Drug addicted young people at the age 16-24 years

Level of satisfaction (1 – Inadequate; 2 - Adequate; 3 - Good; 4 – Excellent)	7 respondents defined as good;
The most helpful for you from the sessions	1) Music therapy helps to express emotions and creativity; 2) This therapy helps me to manage my anger; 3) Helps me to fight my shines;
Dislike (What you did not like)	1) The noise is the problem 2) The size of the groups was small
Do you think that music therapy could be helpful to you in the future	All 7 respondents expressed opinion that this therapy helps them to express their emotions and they would like to continue with it.

Conclusions:

The pilot action music therapy is assessed as very positive in all targeted countries and necessary for people who have addiction to drugs. It helps to set goals on individual base and develops communication and cognitive and emotional skills. It opens new window of opportunity for people in depression or increased anxiety and guide them to manage their anger and feeling of loneliness and connection with the world. Some of the respondents from the prison in Bulgaria recommended this program to be one of obligatory programs for prisoners.

4.4 SWOT ANALYSIS

STRENGTHS

The project teams in the three countries evaluated the Strengths, the Weaknesses, the Opportunities and Threats (the so called SWOT analysis) in relation to the project in order to provide more clear and fair analysis of the implementation. SWOT is part often of the situation analysis, where the team determines where it stands on the key strategic project areas and to better determine what changes to make.





**Prevention of and fight against crime:
a new initiative to identify best practices
in the alternative measures & treatment
programs and to organize a
European prevention campaign for youth - SPRING**

The results of the SWOT can be summarized as follows (see below):

The team of the project firstly answered to the question what are the *characteristics of the project that gave it an advantage over others projects/activities*:

Comunità *Maria Fanelli – Italy*

1. The project stressed the attention on a very important issue, drug addiction and drug related crimes, which have relevant dangerous effects on EU countries both in term of health and social security;
2. Drug addiction and drug related crimes are very complex issues which have been tackled by the project activities with a multidimensional approach; indeed, diverse kinds of activities as data and information collection, analysis of the most relevant practices, implementation of an innovative intervention with drug offenders, prevention activities, have been scheduled by the project, in order to meet the complexity of the phenomenon;
3. The possibility of know and comprehend the local contexts of the project partners and exchange knowledge, doubts and reflections on our work on the project activities has been a very meaningful experience from a personal and professional point of view;
4. The opportunity to test a music therapy path in the treatment of drug offenders is a very useful activity, since there is a lack of studies or researches on innovative treatment like music therapy in this field.
5. The exchange of knowledge and best practices on prevention and treatment of drug abuse in EU countries thanks to the International Workshop in Sofia has been an important starting point for further collaborations.
6. The Fanelli team has consolidated its own expertise on the issues of the project.

ISES – Italy

1. The project is dealing with relevant health prevention topics: drug abuse and importance of treat youth are at the center of project main goals
2. It creates real opportunity for good practices exchange among partners and is a strong mixture of state structures, NGOs and academics
3. The project developed strong training tools and conducted rich and balanced training in all the countries that later on was multiplied in project countries
4. Project deliverables will have a strong impact





**Prevention of and fight against crime:
a new initiative to identify best practices
in the alternative measures & treatment
programs and to organize a
European prevention campaign for youth - SPRING**

5. The prevention campaign has chances to enhance screenings to be included in public health provisions at country level based on SPRING outcomes

BGRF – Bulgaria

1. The project combines research, information campaign and music therapy for people who committed drug related crimes – all those enumerated are new approaches for the project theme and for the project target group in Bulgaria (there is no music therapy practices in Bulgarian prisons and the project tests it).
2. The research is comprehensive, it is for the three participating countries (Italy, Cyprus and Bulgaria), contains the newest and most relevant data and is a very good starting point, also a resource for lobbying and will be used by the partners also after the end of the project.
3. Thanks to the workshop in Sofia new cooperation activities and possible future partnerships with the relevant institutions/NGOs could be envisaged and initiated. After the workshop the BGRF was invited to an event on the issue.
4. The BGRF strengthened its research capacities on the issues, planned in the project SPRING and implemented pilot music therapy sessions, which gives us a competitive advantage.
5. The BGRF is already known for its work on the project issues and on the project as a whole is a unique track-record for the team.

16

INTERFUSION – Cyprus

The members of the two teams taking part during the Pilot Stage shared a number of characteristics which resulted in a relatively approachable and responsive to the practice of Music Therapy group of young people.

The majority of the (voluntary) participants were around their twenties and did not suffer from a serious addiction and subsequently from an intense withdrawal syndrome. That factor alone resulted in a more receptive sample for which the practice of Music Therapy could be implemented with considerably fewer difficulties and unexpected complications. Plus, it meant that participants could be more easily intrigued by the musical element of the process and some generally spirited gatherings than they would have in a more traditional kind of intervention.





**Prevention of and fight against crime:
a new initiative to identify best practices
in the alternative measures & treatment
programs and to organize a
European prevention campaign for youth - SPRING**

It should also be noted among the strengths of the Pilot Stage, that most of the young persons who took part, did not previously serve time in prison. With that in mind, the work of the Music Therapist and the psychologist was more manageable than it would have been in the case of a group by young people that previously had the detrimental experience of imprisonment. That is because in Cyprus's (only) prison there is at the moment a considerable lack of qualified staff in order to implement rehabilitative programmes whilst no substitution services are available, resulting in the discontinuation of treatment for inmates(especially for those previously on methadone or buprenorphine). With that mind and the fact that there is no mechanism in place for assuring treatment continuation upon prison release, alternative rehabilitative practices to imprisonment hold certain gravity for addictive groups of the population and especially for younger ones.

Furthermore, under the section of strengths it should be noted that most of the participants did not come from divorced/problematic families. That meant they had the full support of their closed ones (especially parents) during their rehabilitative period which in a sense provided them with a feeling of secure stability whilst planning their future away from addictions. Their ability and willingness to plan their future after their current stage was noted by both the Music Therapy and the Psychologist as one of the most encouraging rehabilitative signs.

At second place the team made an evaluation about the:

WEAKNESSES

(please, describe here the characteristics that placed the project at a disadvantage relative to others):

Comunità **Maria Fanelli – Italy**

1. Lack of fresh and systematic data on the specific treatments programs administered in alternative measures to detention in the performing of the analysis of the Italian local context;
2. Due to the target group age (15-24 years old) it has been hard to find drug addicts offenders in alternative measure to detention for the test of the pilot action in residential setting;





**Prevention of and fight against crime:
a new initiative to identify best practices
in the alternative measures & treatment
programs and to organize a
European prevention campaign for youth - SPRING**

3. Very limited data on the outcomes of treatment programs in alternative measures to detention which made difficult the identification of the best practices;
4. Very limited bibliography on music therapy in the treatment of drug addicts and lack of data on the efficacy of this kind of treatment;
5. It would be important to evaluate the clinical and social long-term effects of the music therapy path through a follow-up intervention.

18

ISES – Italy

1. There is a need of external advocacy support in order to make governments take measures for supporting national prevention initiatives

BGRF – Bulgaria

The research showed that in Bulgaria the measures alternative to detention in the frame of drug related crimes are not developed (enough). In this field the Bulgarian examples found are not promising and they differ from the existing practices in Cyprus and Italy. This is a specific weak point for the project implementation.

1. In Bulgaria there is a lack of specialists/experts of music therapy (less than 10 certified experts), as well as lack of other experts engaged with social work with offenders.
2. The project theme is very specific and is intersection between legal, medical and social sciences/fields and this makes the project very innovative. It was difficult to find information for the research and to explain and justify that in Bulgaria some fields are missing (specific services for drug addicted, publicly available information and data on drug related crimes, innovative services such as music therapy are missing).
3. Due to the lack of funding and sustainability of the existing interactions, most of the activities with drug related offenders are sporadic, they are based often on projects that have a beginning and an end and there is no monitoring on the efficiency of the implemented interventions with drug-related offenders. All these factors make the context of implementation of the project difficult.
4. There are no perspectives for introduction of music-therapy program for drug-related offenders soon because of financial reasons and lack of will for this.

INTERFUSION – Cyprus

Whilst addiction in general represents a complex and often unidentified problematic phenomenon in Cyprus, drug use falls under a relatively recent realization for which synchronized action was





**Prevention of and fight against crime:
a new initiative to identify best practices
in the alternative measures & treatment
programs and to organize a
European prevention campaign for youth - SPRING**

initially launched, quite recently, in 2002 with the establishment of the National Center for Documentation and Information on Drugs under the administrative authority of the Council and the National Agency of European Monitoring Centre for Drugs and Drug Addiction(EMCDDA). Even so, locally internal synergies of importance in terms of full resource utilization (human and financial), are established quite difficult. Plus, finding the necessary resources can be rather difficult or even impossible whilst there is an evident pressing need to strengthen the networking synergies, either through informal processes or statutory memoranda of understanding aimed to assist in highlighting actions for the identification of gaps and weaknesses in politically supported interventions.

With all the above in mind, the environment in which non-traditional practices just as the one implemented within the Pilot Stage (Music-Therapy) can be perceived as unfavorable by the established authorities responsible. Hence, the implementation of such methods under public facilities and establishments (e.g. Prison) can be quite difficult or close to impossible. That results in certain restrictions/weaknesses concerning the sample group available for similar actions and the generation of conclusions that can ease the application process for additional scientifically based preventive interventions at the local context.

As for actual weaknesses within the application environment of the Pilot Stage, these included:

- i. an initial hesitation of participants experimenting with music, considering that most of them did not have any previous musical knowledge/experience,
- ii. the fact that as a group of people they were not acquainted much with each other was also a factor for initial hesitation and reluctance, mostly at the first sessions, and
- iii. the relatively short implementation period of the Pilot Stage. The application of Music Therapy, at least for the sample groups in Cyprus, indicated encouraging results that could be exhilarated even higher if the sessions continued further, thus improving the mood state of the participants and establishing even deeper the notion of expressiveness without drugs which was evident through the evaluation tests conducted.

At third place the team s evaluated the:





**Prevention of and fight against crime:
a new initiative to identify best practices
in the alternative measures & treatment
programs and to organize a
European prevention campaign for youth - SPRING**

Opportunities

(please, describe here the elements that the project could exploit to advantage the project partners):

Comunità *Maria Fanelli – Italy*

1. Through the project activities Fanelli Association has enhanced the partnership with national stakeholders and NGOs and laid the foundation for future collaboration with the project partners ISES, BGRF and Interfusion;
2. Fanelli team has improved its knowledge about legal and social aspects related to drug abuse phenomenon; the project gave the team the opportunity to test innovative intervention which improve the quality of its Therapeutic Community treatment program; the activities of analysis and data collection provided a permanent national and international database on the issue of drug abuse;
3. The Therapeutic Community is going to adopt music therapy as a permanent rehabilitation tool within the treatment program.
4. The prison overcrowding and the resortation to alternative measures to detention is currently a pressing issue in Italy, and the project aims and activities meet adequately to these needs.

20

ISES – Italy

1. To continue keeping the project website alive with all deliverables available after project ending
2. To continue with the pilot action and promote it to other organisations working in the project field
3. To end the project with a declaration by project partners stating the importance of prevention/education as essential tool for combating drug abuse at European level and beyond
4. To disseminate project results and conclusions to other countries that are not part of the project yet. Countries may be not necessarily EU members, even not necessarily from Europe; start can be given with neighboring countries

BGRF – Bulgaria





**Prevention of and fight against crime:
a new initiative to identify best practices
in the alternative measures & treatment
programs and to organize a
European prevention campaign for youth - SPRING**

1. The project creates opportunities for partnership of the BGRF with national stakeholders and NGOs in future, as well as for continuing exchange of good practices with ISES, Maria Fanelli and Italy in general.
2. The good results from music therapy in Bulgaria will be disseminated among the national stakeholders and used as a resource for lobbying.
3. The multi-disciplinarity of the project provides opportunities for cooperation in Bulgaria and abroad with various organizations: NGO's, local authorities, national authorities, professionals in the medical, social and legal field.
4. The BGRF team hopes that after the end of the project there will be favourable opportunities for follow-up, either for a future European project, or for a national cooperation initiative.
5. The expertise gathered and combined by the three project countries is very specific and is a valuable resource that could be used for future trainings and for proposal of services for offenders who committed drug related crimes.

INTERFUSION – Cyprus

The current situation/environment in Cyprus can be considered as an opportunity for similar interventions, targeting younger ones, addicted to illegal substances. Accordingly, traditional interventions are the ones dominating the rehabilitative environment in the island whilst the younger population indicates an increasingly incline shift towards the experimentation/recreational use of illegal substances (as seen through the latest EMCDDA reports for the country).

With today's younger generation being highly vulnerable to drugs, rehabilitative interventions, as well as preventative actions, should be able to adapt themselves to the needs, the background characteristics and the cultural specificities to their target group.

An experimental user that was sentenced to follow a rehabilitative measure as an alternative to prison does not necessarily constitute an addict. From that perspective and only a practice





**Prevention of and fight against crime:
a new initiative to identify best practices
in the alternative measures & treatment
programs and to organize a
European prevention campaign for youth - SPRING**

targeting such a group of youngsters, owes to be fundamentally contrasting to interventions considering older people with a long and serious addiction.

As the results of the Pilot Stage in Cyprus have showcased, an opportunity arises in rehabilitating younger people with an early/experimental drug habit, by employing interventions such as Music Therapy.

Early stage addicts and especially younger ones tend to be more open and less hesitated as a group, especially if before they didn't experience the unfortunate reality of incarceration.

Accordingly, the creative involvement of those participants through the notion of expression and without the boundaries of hesitation is able to provide the opportunity of exploiting non-verbal communicational routes within a dynamic group and enable the individual to reinforce his/her sense of identity through a personal experience whilst inspiring a greater realization of their self and their surroundings.

At last forth place the teams quote what are the threats:

THREATS

(please describe here the external elements that caused troubles to the project implementation):

Comunità *Maria Fanelli* – Italy

1. The different legal frameworks and social and health services organizations in each participating country have made it difficult to implement the pilot action in the same setting;
2. The application of alternative measures to detention involves several agencies with different means of communication and backgrounds, which makes sometimes it difficult to integrate judicial, health and psycho-social aspects;
3. Due to the economic crisis it has been a reduction of public social services funding which has causing significant economic hardship for the NGOs and association of the Third Sector which operate in the field of drug addiction.

ISES – Italy

1. Financial crisis – government not in a position to take the lead of national initiatives

BGRF – Bulgaria





**Prevention of and fight against crime:
a new initiative to identify best practices
in the alternative measures & treatment
programs and to organize a
European prevention campaign for youth - SPRING**

1. There was a lack of enough cooperation and of enough information/data on behalf of the institutions and NGOs that the BGRF contacted for the needs of the research. This is due also as stated above because the measures alternative to detention in the frame of drug related crimes are not developed (enough) and as a whole the services and special policies towards the project target group are missing.
2. From the beginning of the year 2013 until the present moment Bulgaria is in a political crisis and the contextual environment for is not promising for stable engagement of Bulgarian institutions in relation to the project goals. And in Bulgaria for example the government at some point took a decision to close an important institution related to the topic – National Center for Drug Addiction.
3. The existing policies, measures and services for the target groups that are available in the three countries differ in their content, availability, funding etc. and it was difficult to compare them in the research. To some extent, this made difficult the development of the agenda for the workshop in Sofia. Italy is the country with the most developed measures and good practices.

INTERFUSION – Cyprus

While the necessity for specialized intervention targeting younger/early addicts is evident, there is still much road ahead within the local context for the authorities in place to recognize the importance of encouraging “less traditional” rehabilitative practices. This realization becomes quite significant, if we take under consideration the economic instability and the subsequent budgetary cuts for combating the phenomenon.

Whilst the economic crisis is an inevitable threat for the whole therapeutic continuum in Cyprus, it is also an undeniable obstacle for deploying relatively unfamiliar practices such as Music Therapy. The loss of valuable resources immediately translates into a direct fix of available funds in combatting only the most serious and necessary consequences of drug addiction.

As a result, relatively independent communities are expected to be more resourceful in order to survive whilst their needs are being prioritized in a strictly rational manner, leaving limited space for implementing or exploring new and “unknown” interventions and practices such is the one of Music Therapy.





SPRING

**Prevention of and fight against crime:
a new initiative to identify best practices
in the alternative measures & treatment
programs and to organize a
European prevention campaign for youth - SPRING**

