

Project for Development of Social Work in St Petersburg 1998–2000

**Nils Öström
Dmitri Gavra**

**Department for Central and
Eastern Europa**

Project for Development of Social Work in St Petersburg 1998–2000

**Nils Öström
Dmitri Gavra**

Sida Evaluation 01/02

**Department for Central and
Eastern Europa**

This report is part of *Sida Evaluation*, a series comprising evaluations of Swedish development assistance. Sida's other series concerned with evaluations, *Sida Studies in Evaluation*, concerns methodologically oriented studies commissioned by Sida. Both series are administered by the Department for Evaluation and Internal Audit, an independent department reporting directly to Sida's Board of Directors.

Reports may be *ordered* from:

Infocenter, Sida
S-105 25 Stockholm
Telephone: (+46) (0)8 795 23 44
Telefax: (+46) (0)8 760 58 95
E-mail: info@sida.se,

Reports are also available to *download* at:

<http://www.sida.se/evaluation>

Authors: Nils Öström, Dmitri Gavra.

The views and interpretations expressed in this report are the authors and do not necessarily reflect those of the Swedish International Development Cooperation Agency, Sida.

Sida Evaluation 01/02

Commissioned by Sida, Department for Central and Eastern Europa

Copyright: Sida and the authors

Registration No.: 2000-003276

Date of Final Report: January 2001

Printed in Stockholm, Sweden 2001

ISBN 91-586-8886-2

ISSN 1401-0402

SWEDISH INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT COOPERATION AGENCY

Address: S-105 25 Stockholm, Sweden. Office: Sveavägen 20, Stockholm

Telephone: +46 (0)8-698 50 00. Telefax: +46 (0)8-20 88 64

Telegram: sida stockholm. Postgiro: 1 56 34-9

E-mail: info@sida.se. Homepage: <http://www.sida.se>

Table of Contents

Executive summary	1
1. Background	3
2. Evaluation methodology	3
3. Findings	4
3.1 Results in relation to objectives	4
3.2 Organisation and implementation of the project	9
3.3 Costs	10
3.4 External factors	12
3.5 Gender aspects	12
3.6 Reporting	13
4. Conclusions	14
5. Recommendations for future cooperation	15
6. Lessons learned	17
Annex 1 Terms of Reference	18
Annex 2 List of documents	20
Annex 3 Number of participants taking part in training courses	21
Annex 4 Questionnaire Sida – 2000	22
Annex 5 Selected summary of weighted results of the Questionnaire survey	31
Annex 6 List of persons interviewed	35
Annex 7 Budget and Disbursement (TSEK)	36

Executive summary

In 1997, Sida appointed the Department of Social Work to implement a three year project aiming at development of social work in St Petersburg in cooperation with local authorities. In 2000, Sida decided to perform an independent evaluation of the project before deciding on further support during 2001. The evaluation, including a survey of participants in training activities, study of main documents and interviews in Stockholm and St Petersburg, was performed during the period October–December 2000.

The activities performed in the project refers to four components – advice on legislation for social work; – training courses for leading staff involved with social work at central and district level; – conferences for exchange of experiences; and – pilotprojects for implementation of new ideas and methods for social work. During the period December 1997–December 2000, 423 persons participated in 18 training courses, three conferences were held and 4 pilotprojects started. Advice on legislation was given on several occasions during 1998.

Regarding the results achieved, the evaluation found that Swedish experiences had had some influence on federal legislation and the City Government program for Addressed Social Support in St Petersburg. The training courses had exposed most of the leading staff of different categories in the social services in St Petersburg for Swedish experiences and know-how. This exposure had led to the result that the majority of the participants had improved their knowledge and practical professional skills and were practically implementing the new knowledge in the form of changed methods and new activities.

The conferences were perceived by the Russian participants to have strengthened cooperation and exchange of experiences within the social services in St Petersburg as well as with representatives from the social services in Stockholm. The pilotprojects had just started to give possibilities to implement new ideas, but it is still too early to assess their effects as models for the spreading of these ideas and for their influence in the form of change of practise. It was further noted that, a part from the pilot projects, the training courses had influenced the start up of new activities at a smaller scale in many parts of St Petersburg.

The organisation and implementation of the project was found to have been appropriate and functioned reasonably well. The competence of Swedish lecturers and resource persons had been appreciated, and the costs of the project were considered to be reasonable in relation to the results achieved.

The evaluation concludes that the results achieved mainly coincides with the expected results defined in 1997 and that the immediate objective (purpose) of the project – to increase capacities and skills of social workers, policy makers and social sector administrators – have been achieved. It is also concluded that the project has made contributions towards the fulfilment of the overall objectives regarding open services close to the clients and thereby reducing the need for care at institutions, as well as to the discussion and gradual change of attitudes and values in relation to social work.

The evaluation recommends a continued support in order to implement the 6 pilotprojects presently started and planned. Regarding the contents of future support for social work, it will be important to continue contributing to the change of attitudes towards the clients, to the establishment of open services near to the client that reduces the need for institutional care, to the introduction of systems for addressed support based needs assessment, and to the cooperation between different areas of social work.

It is also recommended that future Swedish cooperation is focused on different kinds of training of trainers, in order to promote the domestic Russian capacity for change and development, rather than

the direct transfer of specific knowledge and ideas. Furthermore, the systematic preparation of Swedes involved as advisors regarding culture, history, economic and political situation of the cooperating country was recommended.

A general lesson learned from the project is the importance of combining general training activities with implementation of pilotprojects. A specific lesson is the utilisation and mobilisation of newly gained knowledge in competitive processes for the selection of district to implement pilotprojects. Another lesson learnt is the importance of setting realistic objectives and to clearly state external factors influencing support for legislative change.

1. Background

Support for a sustainable social and economic transition is one of the main goals for Swedish cooperation with Central and Eastern Europe. The area of social welfare is identified as one of the priorities for social sector cooperation. When the cooperation with Russia and St Petersburg started (1995), discussions were taking place regarding the focus of the social sector cooperation. The initial requests from the Russian side referred to the need to rehabilitate existing institutions and were not focused on the structural change. Swedish experts on health care were engaged for the identification of possible projects for cooperation. These experts found a situation with weak structures for both preventive primary health care and social welfare support, and especially a lack of cooperation and coordination between these areas of social services.

Initial discussions were held on the establishment of a joint health and social welfare project. This idea was, however, deemed to be too complicated in the actual situation in Russia, with strict division of responsibilities between health care and social welfare authorities. Following these discussions, separate projects for health care and social welfare were identified by Sida. For the social welfare support, the Department of Social Work at the Stockholm University was considered to be a suitable partner based on their experiences from the implementation of a similar project in Lithuania. The identification of a Swedish partner for social welfare cooperation also coincided with an initial step towards structural change and development of the social welfare work in Russia, which was the introduction of the idea of social support based on needs assessments.

In 1997, Sida appointed the Department of Social Work to implement a three year project aiming at development of social work in St Petersburg in cooperation with local authorities. In December 1997 Sida decided to support Phase I of the project (Dec 1997–Jan 1999), and in February 1998 a contract was signed between Stockholm University and the Committee for Labour and Social Security in St Petersburg. In March 1999, Sida decided on the support for Phase II (implemented during the period Feb 1999–June 2000). Phase III of the project was planned to cover the period July 2000–Dec 2001. In August 2000, Sida decided on the support for the first six month of this period (July–Dec 2000), and to perform an independent evaluation of the project before deciding on further support during 2001.

2. Evaluation methodology

For the evaluation, Sida contracted Nils Öström, Stockholm Group for Development Studies AB, and Professor Dmitri Gavra, Department of Sociology, St Petersburg University, in accordance with the Terms of Reference dated 2000-07-21 (see Annex 1). A survey of Russian participants taking part in training courses in Sweden organised by the project was conducted during the period October–December 2000. Study of documents and interviews with main actors in Stockholm and St Petersburg was performed during December 2000.

The survey of participants was performed as interviews following a pre-designed questionnaire with both structured and open-ended questions. The survey was performed by the Center for Sociological Studies of St Petersburg State University and included 387 persons out of a total of 423 participants in the training courses (see summary of course participants and interviewed in Annex 3). The reasons for

not reaching all who had participated in courses were that, either these persons were no longer employed by the City Government or involved in social work, or they were not possible to reach for interviews during October–November.

For the purpose of the survey, 5 questionnaires were designed (one for each type of training course) containing common questions concerning general course evaluation and specific questions devoted to the assessment of the particular course (see Questionnaire for the General course in Annex 4). The method used for the survey was face-to-face interviews at the working places of the training course participants. The survey was carried out by 25 professional interviewers during October–November 2000. For statistical interpretation of the survey results the SPSS 8.0 package was used.

Nils Öström studied the main proposals, decisions and reports regarding the project available at Sida and the Department of Social Work (see List of documents in Annex 2), and interviewed the main Swedish actors in the project. Nils Öström and Dmitri Gavra together met with main actors and a sample of participants in St Petersburg (see List of persons interviewed in Annex 6).

The interviews of the main actors in Stockholm and St Petersburg were focused on similarities and differences between social work in Sweden and Russia, the results and effects of project activities and mutual contacts, the organisation and performance of the different components of the cooperation, as well as the most important experiences learnt so far and challenges for future cooperation.

3. Findings

3.1 Results in relation to objectives

The *overall objective* of the project¹ is to support the long term development and establishment of social work in St Petersburg in a way that meets the needs of the population.

For Phase II and III, the overall objective was further defined as supporting development of open services close to the clients and thereby reducing the need for care at institutions. The presentation and discussion of values and attitudes were also stressed.

The *immediate objective* (purpose) of the project² is to increase the skills and capacities of social workers, policy-makers and social sector administrators through the provision of theoretical and practical transfer of knowledge and training.

The *objectives* and *expected results* of the components of the project are defined as³:

- *Legislation*: Present Swedish experiences and give advice regarding legislation on social support based on assessment of needs, in order to influence new legislation.
- *Training courses*: Present Swedish experiences of social work to staff in the central administration and institutions, as well as to leading district officials and social workers, in order to improve efficiency of ongoing social service reforms. The five areas of training courses are General Social Work, Elderly care, Disabled, Children and Family, Alcohol and Drug Abuse.

¹ As defined in the proposal for Phase I.

² As defined in the Terms of Reference for the evaluation.

³ In the proposal for Phase I.

- *Conferences:* Strengthen cooperation in area of social work between the cities of St Petersburg and Stockholm, as well as within St Petersburg, through discussions of common problems and of different ways of organisation and administration of the work.
- *Pilotprojects:* Give possibilities to implement new ideas for social work in practise and to give models for further spreading and development of these ideas. (This component is proposed in the initial project document, but not started and budgeted for until Phase II.)

Activities performed during the three phases of the project from December 1997 up to the end of December 2000 are summarised below.

Legislation	Study visit to Stockholm Advice to the legislative working group	September 1998 5-6 times during 1998
Training courses	General Social Work	Courses Participants
	Elderly care	4 81
	Handicapped	4 95
	Children and Family	4 98
	Alcohol and Drug Abuse	4 100
		2 49
	18 423	
Conferences	Children and Youth	Stockholm, May 1998
	Elderly care	St Petersburg, Sept 1999
	Disabled	St Petersburg, Nov/Dec 2000
Pilotprojects	Mentally retarded youth	Started Jan 2000
	Elderly care	Started June 2000
	Social Service Centre	Planned to start Jan 2001
	Children and Family	Planned to start Feb 2001
	Documentation system for pilotprojects	Planning started Feb 2000
	(Children to Alcohol abusers)	(Planning to be started)
	(Drug abusers)	(Planning to be started)

Legislation

Support for legislation have consisted in advice from Swedish experts, including the Swedish project management, on the drafting of a Bill on Social Protection for St Petersburg regarding social support based on the assessment of needs ("addressed social support"). The Bill was, however, delayed and not approved by the St Petersburg Legislative Assembly, partly due to the fact that a federal law on addressed social support (giving the framework for regional laws) was being prepared. This federal law, approved in 2000, has been influenced by the proposal for regional law in St Petersburg, e.g. through presentations in the federal Duma by representatives of the Regional Assembly and the City Government of St Petersburg.

Although the proposed regional Bill on Social Protection was not approved by the Legislative Assembly, the City Government of St Petersburg adopted an even more detailed program of Addressed Social Support. Furthermore, it could be noted that the proposal for regional law has recently been presented to, and then approved by, the Regional Assembly in Murmansk.

The Swedish advice on legislation initially included support for the design and establishment of a social register, needed as a basis for giving addressed social support. There are some steps taken in St Petersburg towards establishing such a register. However, this work has to be connected to the broader plans of establishing a general population register, which is only slowly progressing. For this reason, few

specific activities have been performed with this aim within the project, and then only as an integrated part of the advice on legislation.

With regard to the immediate objective and expected result of this component, it could be *concluded* that Swedish experiences have had some influence on the legislation, mainly regarding the federal law on Social Protection. Mainly due to the fact that the regional law was delayed and not approved, there have been less support activities than initially planned. The fact that the proposed regional law was not approved did, however, not have any negative influence on other activities or results of the project.

Training courses

The training courses have generally been performed in line with the plans for the different phases. A total of 423⁴ persons have taken part in these courses, which means that most of the leading officials and social workers responsible for the main areas of social work in all the 20 districts of St Petersburg have been reached by the training courses.

Each of the 18 courses have had about 25 participants and been organised with a preparatory seminar (three days) in St Petersburg, two weeks of study visits and lectures in Stockholm and a follow up seminar (three days) in St Petersburg. At the follow up seminars, the participants have been requested to present how they are utilising the experiences and knowledge acquired in Sweden. Ideas for the pilotprojects have also been identified and discussed at these seminars.

The distribution of participants coming from different levels of administration is as follows:

· District administrations	179	42%
· Central committees	101	24%
· Central institutions	91	22%
· Universities	38	9%
· Voluntary organisations	9	2%
· Media	5	1%
	423	

The results of the *questionnaire survey* (see Annex 4) shows that the general evaluation of the training is very positive, with 77% giving the mark excellent, and 22% giving the mark good. A majority of the interviewed (87%) think that the training courses were designed to meet their professional needs and that they included new information which was of practical utility for their work (52% excellent, 35% good). The evaluation of the quality of the lecturers (70% excellent, 27% good) and quality of translation (83% excellent, 15% good) is also very positive.

An important result of the survey is that the majority of the participants (69%) are sure that the knowledge and experience they have got during the training in Stockholm could be used in their practical professional activities for the improvement of the social services in St Petersburg. Another 27% think that the Swedish experience can be used in St Petersburg to some extent. The proportion of the respondents who don't think that they could apply Swedish experiences is only 3%.

The evaluation of the courses shows that in general they have been designed in a good way. Two thirds of the participants answer that theory and practice were well balanced. 27% thought that there was too much theoretical lectures and in relation to study of practical implementation. Among the answers

⁴ Another 30 persons were initially listed as participants, but did not take part in the full course.

to open-ended questions, there are also proposals to have more study visits regarding services in different districts, rather than theoretical presentations.

The survey shows some critical comments on the selection of participants. 52% of the respondents consider that the level of knowledge and preparation among the participants in their groups was uneven. 28% of the interviewed also mention that some members of the groups were not really interested in the content of the courses.

Summarizing the answers to the open-ended questions, the courses seem to have had the following general effects:

- Created a common view on the prospects of social policy in St Petersburg among different levels of the administration of social work.
- Made the participants convinced that it is possible to change the situation in the social sector, in order to create an ethical attitude towards the persons supported.
- Helped the participants to get confidence in the direction of ongoing changes.
- Stimulated participants to start new activities.
- Brought together staff from different areas of work, different levels and different districts for discussions and exchange of experiences.
- Created a common view among staff in the same district.

Examples of newly established projects and activities in one or more districts that could be linked with the training in Stockholm are:

- Rehabilitation center for families with the handicapped children.
- New activities regarding street children.
- New center for social help for families with children.
- Social-rehabilitation center for youth.
- New service centers for elderly and handicapped.

The above information from the questionnaire survey coincides in general with the opinions expressed in the course evaluations made after each course as presented in half-year reports⁵ and in examples of course evaluations studied.

Course participants interviewed directly by the evaluation team in St Petersburg in December 2000 also confirm the above results. The experiences of integrated social work with old people and with children and families, as well as the attitude of social workers towards their clients are mentioned as the most important things learnt by the participants interviewed. All of the interviewed also mention concrete examples of how they try to implement these experiences. A further important result mentioned is the adoption by the city government of new programmes for the care of elderly and for the care of handicapped, which emphasize cooperation between the social services and health care. They further note that staff involved in ongoing change processes and those wanting to promote new initiatives have got confirmation and increased confidence in their work. In other cases, new aspects, ideas and methods have been acquired, which have increased the motivation of the staff.

An important indirect result of the project to be mentioned, is the establishment in St Petersburg of a special Training Center for continued education for social workers. This Center is being organized on the basis of the Department of Social Work at St Petersburg State university with the support of

⁵ From Department of Social Work to Sida.

European Union (TEMPUS-TACIS program for 2000–2002). The Department of Social Work in St Petersburg is a collaborating partner with the Department of Social Work at Stockholm University. This partnership was established within the framework of the project and has resulted in student and faculty exchange, collaborative research projects and joint conferences. This cooperation has helped to develop the Department of Social Work in St Petersburg, and was one of the reasons for getting the EU support to the continued education program.

Based on the above, it could be *concluded* that the training courses have basically achieved the expected results of exposing most leading staff of different categories in the social services in St Petersburg for Swedish experiences and know-how. This exposure has had as result that the majority of the participants perceive that they have improved their knowledge and practical professional skills and are practically implementing the new knowledge in the form of changed methods and new activities. Furthermore, continued education of social workers has indirectly been promoted by the project, thereby contributing to the domestic capacity for training and methodology development.

Conferences

The initial idea was to have conferences alternatively in Stockholm and St Petersburg. However, after the first conference in Stockholm in 1998, it was decided hold future conferences in St Petersburg. The reason was to increase the possibilities for Russian participation (250–300 per conference held in St Petersburg, instead of 50 in the conference held in Stockholm). The main result of the conferences, according to the project reports and interviews, have been to give a possibility for meeting and exchanging experiences among the social sector staff at different levels and from different districts in St Petersburg. These possibilities are otherwise not frequent. The conferences in St Petersburg have also promoted know-how and experiences on how to arrange conferences in general.

From the above it could be *concluded* that the city conferences have fulfilled their expected result, especially regarding strengthening the cooperation for social work within St Petersburg.

Pilotprojects

Six pilotprojects have been defined in areas following the themes of the training courses (handicapped, elderly, children and family, alcohol and drug abuse and general social service provision). These projects are at present in different stages of planning and implementation.

One project started regular activities in February 2000 (Daily activities for mentally retarded youth). Another project (Daycare centre for elderly) started with training of staff in June and with regular activities in November 2000. Two projects have just finished the planning stage and will start with staff training in early 2001. The total time estimated for each pilotproject is two years, of which about six month is required for the detailed planning and training of staff. Each project has a designated project advisor from Sweden, with special competence and experiences in the theme of the pilotproject and a project manager from the administration of the district where the project is being implemented.

The identification and planning of the pilotprojects have required more time than initially estimated, and therefore the start up of these projects have taken place, or will take place, later than planned. The reason for this is mainly the time needed for selecting the district of implementation and for the detailed formulation of plans for the projects, due to the fact that these projects regards the introduction of new ideas and methods in the regular social work in St Petersburg. Therefore the planning and start up of the projects have required more time and more regular visits from the Swedish project advisors than initially planned.

Each project is implemented in one district, but all districts have had the possibility to compete with proposals for starting the pilotprojects. In the case of the projects recently started, or soon to be started,

some 8–10 districts have presented proposal for each project. These proposals are based on a brief outline of the main objective and the framework for possible activities to be implemented, which have been established by the Swedish and Russian project management. From the proposals made by the different districts, the project managers have jointly selected three proposals for further scrutiny. This scrutiny includes visits to, and discussions with, the three district administrations. After a further evaluation of the three proposals, one of them has been selected for implementation.

It could be noted that in order to be able to get good proposal, it was necessary to have a critical number of staff from the district that already had attended training courses in Stockholm. All the proposals received for the pilotprojects do also indicate a good understanding and adoption of new knowledge and ideas, as well as a widespread wish to implement these ideas and to mobilise local resources for this purpose. Furthermore as noted above, there are a number of similar projects and activities being initiated in many districts, a part from the pilotprojects directly supported.

With regard to the project for mentally retarded youth, it could be noted that it had already had clear positive effects on the participating youth themselves and on their families (making them more independent). The Centre has also already received its own budget allocation in the city government budget and has therefore good prospects with regard to longer term sustainability. Activities regarding the spreading and discussion of experiences made within the pilotprojects are presently being planned, e.g. regular meetings of the group of heads of the pilotprojects and the Department of Planning at the Committee for Social Work.

In comparison with the expected results, it could be *concluded* that the pilotprojects have just started to give possibilities to implement new ideas in four main areas of social work. It is, however, still too early to assess their effects as models for spreading of ideas and to influence change of practise. These effects will be dependent on the efforts from the leading district staff responsible for each project to promote the experiences made, as well as on the efforts of the central level to follow up the experiences and to formulate new strategies and guidelines on their basis.

3.2 Organisation and implementation of the project

On the Swedish side, the project has been coordinated and managed by a project manager and project assistant (with administrative support) at the Department of Social Work. The main Swedish collaborating partners to the Department of Social Work has been the City of Stockholm (the municipal district administration of Maria/Gamla stan) and Strong Development (consultant Birger Stark). Specific Swedish staff and experts have been contracted and financed by the project for the different activities, such as lecturers at seminars in St Petersburg and in Sweden and advisors to pilotprojects.

On the Russian side, the Head of the project is the Vice-Governor and Chairman of the Committee on Labour and Social Work and the project coordinator is the Head of the Planning and Development Department of the Committee. For practical administration and communications with Stockholm, the project finances a local assistant at the Stockholm City Liaison Office in St Petersburg.

The Swedish and Russian project coordinators meets regularly (at least monthly) for planning and follow up of activities. The selection of participants for the training courses had mainly been made by the Russian project management, whereas the identification of pilotprojects and selection of implementing districts have been done jointly by the Russian and Swedish project managers.

Regarding the selection of participants, the survey results indicate some critic of the differences in background knowledge and the motivation of the participants. Some of the Swedish actors interviewed also note that sometimes there seemed to have been an overrepresentation in the courses of higher

level managers in relation to staff directly responsible for the social work. It is possible that the situation with regard to these aspects could have been improved with a joint Russian and Swedish selection of participants (e.g. based on initial proposals from committees, districts, voluntary organisations, etc revised jointly by the Russian and Swedish project managers).

The survey shows that there is a good appreciation of the lecturers and other Swedish staff involved in the training courses. Only in a few cases there are critical comments on the performance of lecturers. The Swedish advisors interviewed note that knowledge about Russian history, culture and present situation is important in order to understand and communicate with the Russian colleagues, and that this ought to have been further promoted as preparation of Swedes actively involved in the project.

Apart from the general appreciation of the Swedish staff involved in the project, the Russian project management highly values the cooperation with, and the competence of, the Department of Social Work. This judgement is made in relation to experiences with other cooperation partners from Sweden and other countries.

Due to the fact that few Russians have sufficient knowledge of English, all training and other contacts have had to be done with the help of interpreters. Although there is a general appreciation of the work of interpreters in the survey and in interviews, it is a limiting factor for the communication and understanding. The survey indicates that there is a general request for more printed material in Russian language. In this connection, some valuable initiatives of the project could be noted, such the production of a Swedish-Russian dictionary on social service terminology and printing of booklet in Russian on social work with children.

Regarding the distribution of the participants in training courses, it could be noted that only 2% were representatives of voluntary organisations. Although the main objective of the project has been to reach leading staff within the City Government administration, the voluntary organisations could have an important role to play in collaboration with the public services. The participation of representatives of voluntary organisations could therefore promote a mutual understanding of their potential complementary role to the public services.

Based on the survey results and other interviews it could be *concluded* that the overall organisation of project has been appropriate and functioned reasonably well. The competence of the Department of Social Work and the Swedish lecturers and resource persons have been highly appreciated. However, the selection of participants for the courses could possibly have been further improved by using a joint selection process.

3.3 Costs

The costs of the project up to the end of November 2000 in MSEK are:

· Fees (Swedish project management, Swedish experts and interpreters in St Petersburg and Stockholm).	8,8
· Other costs (travelling and stay in Stockholm and St Petersburg)	9,7
TOTAL	18,5

The distribution of costs between the different components of the project are:

· Project management	31%
· Legislation and social register	3%
· Training courses	49%
· Conferences	5%
· Pilotprojects	12%

It could be noted that an average of 40% of the fees for training courses and conferences relates to fees for interpreters. For the pilotprojects, the percentage of fees for interpreters is about 25%. The project has used a maximum fee for Swedish experts contracted of SEK

3.000/day. However, some of the Swedes utilised as lecturers in Stockholm and St Petersburg have not requested the payment of fees, either because they have done the work as part of their regular work and salary, or they have only requested the payment of costs for travel and accommodation. The fees for interpreters follow generally agreed rates in Stockholm and St Petersburg.

If the total fees for Swedish experts engaged for training courses are distributed on the number of persons trained (423), the cost per person is SEK 3.000. The total fees for Swedish experts engaged for the pilotprojects represents about 240 days of work (at SEK 3.000/day) during two years on the four pilotprojects. This includes training in Sweden of Russian staff for the pilotprojects and monthly visits during the start up and initial phase of the pilotprojects

Project management includes fees, not only for the project manager and project assistant at the Department of Social Work (see under 3.2 above), but also for the representative of the City of Stockholm (about 3 month/year). Furthermore, 60–70% of the project manager's work is estimated to be devoted to activities regarding planning and implementation of courses and pilotprojects. This means that about half of the costs for project management are related to planning and implementation and the other half refers to costs for administration of the project. The costs for administration, therefore represents about 15% of total project costs.

The actual costs disbursed for the project represents 95% of the budgeted costs approved for Phase I and II. The costs disbursed so far for Phase III, which do not include costs related to activities during December 2000, represents 70% of the budget.

(For further details on budgets and disbursements, see Annex 7.)

According to the Russian project manager, who is also responsible for contacts with donor agencies from other countries, the total costs of the Swedish project are somewhat higher or similar to the costs of other projects. However, the important difference is that this project has reached and affected a large number of social service staff in whole city of St Petersburg, whereas the projects of other donor countries have a much more narrow focus, mainly on specific institutions and their activities. The costs of these projects often include investments in buildings and equipment.

Regarding the costs of the project it could *concluded* that the total amount of fees and other costs, as well as the level of daily fees, ought to be considered reasonable in relation to the results achieved. The percentage of the costs for project administration are also reasonable in comparison with normal levels of project administration costs of 10–20%. The costs for travel and accomodation in Stockholm and St Petersburg are more or less given and follow the number of travels made. The alternative of reducing the number of travels and spending more time per travel in St Petersburg is probably not possible in realty, due to the regular work of the Swedish staff involved. In about one years time when all

pilot projects have been initiated, it ought to be possible to reduce the percentage of costs for general project management.

3.4 External factors

An external factor influencing the implementation of the project has been the possibility for higher level managers and members of the Legislative Assembly to actually take part in training courses in Sweden and also in the seminars for preparation and follow up in St Petersburg. In some cases, participants enlisted for training courses have not been able to attend the course in Sweden or have after the course not attended the corresponding follow up seminar in St Petersburg. Attendance of all parts of training course has been a prerequisite for the project in issuing certificates of participation.

Another external factor with potential influence on the project was the election of governor for St Petersburg, which took place in 1999. This election resulted indirectly in the promotion of the Russian Head of the Project to become Vice-Governor at the same time as continuing in his position as Chairman of the Committee on Labour and Social Work. The effect of this, if any, is a strengthened position for the project within the administration. However, at the same time, the new Governor reorganised responsibilities between the Vice-Governors. This reorganisation means that issues regarding social work, children and health care are now divided between three Vice-Governors instead of being handled by the same Vice-Governor, as before. The election for the Legislative Assembly in December 1998 had also an influence on the work of the regional law on Social Protection, by delaying discussions on the proposal made.

In this connection, it should be noted that the support for new or revised legislation is sensitive to political and administrative obstacles, which are beyond the control of the parties responsible for the project implementation. It is also difficult to define the direct influence of the project and to distinguish it from other factors. Therefore, the risk of not achieving the intended changes should be clearly spelt out in the project proposals and Sidas appraisal memos.

In the case of the legislation component of this project, the objective was reasonably well formulated as to "give advice and influence legislation". Although the intended regional law was not approved, the objective of "influencing" legislation and government regulations in general was clearly achieved. However, the risks for not achieving this objective and the expected results were not discussed, neither in the project proposal of the Department of Social Work, nor in the appraisal memo of Sida.

3.5 Gender aspects

Sida guidelines on gender equality for the support to Central and Eastern Europe includes the objective of supporting the situation of women affected by the lack of gender equality e.g. by development of social welfare and protection. With respect to this objective, it could be noted that the project possibly has an indirect influence in so far as improvements of the social services will primarily benefit women, who are the ones presently carrying the burden of care of home, children and old parents.

According to Swedish staff interviewed, gender aspects have been taken up as part of the contents in most of the training courses, which has been appreciated by most participants. With regard to the gender balance among the staff within the social services, it could be noted that the great majority are women. However, the higher level managers are more often men. The gender balance among the participants in the training in Sweden is 74% women (314) and 26% men (109). This balance varies for the different groups of participants with 85/15 for the participants from the districts; 79/21 for those from the central committees; 64/36 from central institutions and 58/42 from the universities.

3.6 Reporting

The Department of Social Work has been reporting regularly to Sida for each half year period of the project. This includes both a narrative report on activities performed and the results achieved, and a financial report as a basis for disbursement of funds from Sida. The reports seems in general to have been presented on time and with sufficient and adequate information.

However, the reporting could have been somewhat further improved by following the structure of the application to Sida for support for Phase I of the project (Ansökan 1997-11-28), with subheadings for Objective, Implementation, Timeplan and Costs for each of the components of the project. The follow up of the project would have been facilitated if the reports have had similar subheadings, under which comments were given on the results, the implementation, time and costs for each course or pilotproject.

Another aspect influencing both reporting, follow up and evaluation of the project is the formulation of the immediate objective of the project and of the results/objectives of the different components. In the available documentation (Proposals and Applications to Sida and Sida's Decision Memos), the formulation of overall objectives, immediate objectives and expected results varies in formulation between the three phases (see under 3.1 above). A clear formulation of the immediate objective (purpose) of the project, as well as of the expected results of the different components adhered to, or changed more explicitly, during the three phases, would have facilitated both internal and external follow up and evaluation of the results achieved. Summary tables of financial reporting of disbursements in relation to budget (similar to the ones produced in Annex 7 to this report) would also facilitate internal and external follow up.

It would also be important to formulate clear immediate objectives, expected results and indicators for the pilotprojects, e.g. on number of persons reached by the projects, improvements of the capacity for mentally retarded youth, to what extent the situation of elderly could be improved or stabilised etc. This formulation should, if not already the case, be part of the development of the documentation system for the pilotprojects.

With regard to reporting it could be *concluded* that it has been reasonably good, but could be further improved by clearly expressed and consistently used objectives, expected results and indicators of achievement.

4. Conclusions

Initially it could be concluded that the project had been highly relevant in relation to Sida general objectives for cooperation with Central and Eastern Europe, supporting a sustainable social and economic transition, and the needs for improved efficiency in the social work in St Petersburg. The project has supported and promoted changes introduced by the federal and regional governments towards addressed social support based on the assessment of needs. The project has also combined a broad spreading of knowledge through training activities with pilotprojects for implementation of this knowledge, as well as with activities influencing the legislation and City Government programs guiding the social work.

The achievement of the expected result of the different components of the project, presented under 3.1 above, could be summarised as follows:

Expected results Dec 1997	Achievements Dec 2000
<i>Legislation</i> Present Swedish experiences and give advice regarding legislation on social support based on assessment of needs, in order to influence new legislation.	The Swedish experiences have influenced the federal legislation and the City Government program for Addressed Social Support in St Petersburg.
<i>Training courses</i> Present Swedish experiences of social work to staff in the central administration and institutions, as well as to leading district officials and social workers, in order to improve efficiency of ongoing social service reforms.	The training courses have reached most leading staff (423), resulting in improved knowledge and practical professional skills, as well as changed attitudes and working methods and the implementation new activities.
<i>Conferences</i> Strengthen cooperation in area of social work between the cities of St Petersburg and Stockholm, as well as within St Petersburg, through discussions of common problems and of different ways of organisation and administration of the work.	The conferences are perceived by the Russian participants to have strengthened cooperation and exchange of experiences within the social services in St Petersburg as well as with representatives from the social services in Stockholm.
<i>Pilotprojects</i> Give possibilities to implement new ideas for social work in practise and to give models for further spreading and development of these ideas. (This component is proposed in the initial project document, but not started and budgeted for until Phase II.)	The pilotprojects have just started to give possibilities to implement new ideas, but it is still too early to assess their effects as models for the spreading of these ideas and for their influence in the form of change of practise. The training courses have, however, influenced the start up of new activities at a smaller scale in many parts of St Petersburg.

With regard to the organisation and implementation of the project it has been concluded (under 3.2 above) that the overall organisation of project has been appropriate and functioned reasonably well and that the competence of the Department of Social Work and the Swedish lecturers and resource persons have been appreciated. However, the selection of participants for the courses could possibly have been improved by using a joint selection process. Regarding the costs of the project the total amount of fees and other costs, as well as the level of daily fees, are considered most reasonable in relation to the results achieved, also in comparison with other donor financed projects.

From the above summary it could be concluded that the *immediate objective* (purpose) of the project – increased capacities and skills of social workers, policy makers and social sector administrators – have been achieved.

It could also be concluded that the project has made contributions, through different activities initiated by the pilotprojects and in other forms, towards the fulfilment of the *overall objectives* regarding open services close to the clients, as well as through the training courses and conferences, to the discussion and gradual change of attitudes and values in relation to social work.

5. Recommendations for future cooperation

Next phase of the ongoing project (2001–2002)

- With regard to the present project, the evaluation recommends a continued support in order to implement the 6 pilotprojects presently started and planned, corresponding to the themes treated in the training courses. In this implementation, it will be important to continue to select and support the districts and staff that are on the forefront of pursuing and willing to develop new methods and ideas. In order to do so, it is important to continue the competitive process and joint selection of implementing districts for the pilotprojects in accordance with clearly formulated criteria and objectives for the projects. Regular visits of the Swedish advisors to St Petersburg, as well as study visits to Sweden by the staff from the pilotprojects are necessary parts of the preparation and implementation of the projects.
- It is recommended that the project should present methods for how the experiences and results of the pilotprojects are being spread and fed into the strategic development of the social services in St Petersburg. In relation to this, indicators for measuring the results of the spreading the experiences should be identified, such as the number of districts utilising new methods developed in pilotprojects, regulations and guidelines revised in the light of experiences from pilotprojects, etc.
- It is further recommended that the project formulates clear immediate objectives, expected results and indicators for the pilotprojects, e.g. on number of persons reached by the projects, improvements of the capacity for mentally retarded youth, to what extent the situation of elderly could be improved or stabilised etc. This formulation should, if not already the case, be part of the development of the documentation system for the pilotprojects.
- The evaluation recommends that the proposed conference on “Conditions for social work in St Petersburg” is being supported. This conference gives a possibility to sum up and discuss the what the overall development and achievement of reform in social work actually is, what the obstacles to, as well as possibilities for, future change are. This will also give a further indication of the how the Swedish experiences have been influencing the process of change towards more holistic and integrated social services.

- The project ought to be able to reduce the percentage of costs for general project management, during the coming year when all pilotprojects have been initiated.

Future cooperation in similar projects in general

- Regarding the contents of future support for social work, it will be important to continue contributing to the change of attitudes towards the clients, open services near to the client that reduces the need for institutional care, systems for addressed support based needs assessment and the cooperation between different areas of social work. One example of integration and cooperation to be further promoted in the social work in St Petersburg, as well as other parts of Russia, is the integrated support for the whole family, instead of treating the individual child or parent for his or her problem. Another example is the cooperation and coordination between the actors in the social sector – health care, schools, police, social welfare and voluntary organisations.
- In order to promote these kind of changes, it will be important to create possibilities for discussion and exchange of experiences, for implementation of new ideas and ways of working, and also for the mutual understanding of the situation and the conditions for future changes both in Russia and Sweden.
- An important aspect for long term development and continued mutual exchange of experiences is the capacity for both basic and continued training and professional development of social workers in Russia. It is recommended that future Swedish cooperation is focused on different kinds of training of trainers, in order to promote the domestic Russian capacity for change and development, rather than the direct transfer of specific knowledge and ideas. In this connection it would be important to follow up on how the EU support for continued education of social workers is integrating knowledge and experiences generated by the training and pilotprojects supported by Sweden.
- A specific aspect of capacity building and continued education is the use of Internet for presentation and distribution of training material. It is recommended that the utilisation of Internet for distant learning and training is being explored as part of future support for the development of the social services.
- A clear formulation of the immediate objective (purpose) of the project, as well as of the expected results of the different components adhered to, or changed more explicitly, during the different phases of a project, would facilitate both internal and external follow up and evaluation of the results achieved. Summary tables of financial reporting of disbursements in relation to budget (similar to the ones produced in Annex 7 to this report) would also facilitate internal and external follow up.

6. Lessons learned

- The result of this project supports the lesson learned in other projects on the positive effects of combining general training activities with implementation of new knowledge and skills gained in the form of pilotprojects.
- A specific lesson learned from this project is that selection of districts and institutions for implementation of pilotprojects could be done in a competitive way, by inviting a number of actors (in this case districts in the City administration) to present proposals for implementation of a specific project. This competition is promoting both the use of new knowledge and methods learnt in the training and the creativity of the participants.
- A lesson learned with regard to the design of the training, is that the focus of activities in Sweden should preferably be on studying, or even if possible taking part, in the practical implementation of social services. The theoretical presentations and discussions should, as far as possible, be concentrated to seminars in the cooperating country.
- The selection of the participants for training courses should preferably be done jointly by the implementing partners in Sweden and the cooperating country, in accordance with agreed criteria, and possibly following a process of briefly testing the level of knowledge and preparations of the participants (e.g. at preparation seminars).
- A lesson learned with regard to external factors, is that the support for new or revised legislation is sensitive to political and administrative obstacles, which are beyond the control of the parties responsible for the project implementation. Therefore, the risk of not achieving the intended changes should be clearly spelt out in the project proposals and Sidas appraisal memos.
- A lesson learned in general in the development cooperation and also noted in this project, is that communication and mutual understanding could be strengthened by a systematic preparation of Swedes involved in the projects regarding main features of culture, history, economic situation, political organisation, etc of the cooperating country.

Annex 1

Terms of reference for the evaluation of the project "Development of the social sector in St Petersburg" implemented by the Department of Social Work at Stockholm University

1 BACKGROUND

In 1997, Sida appointed the Department of Social Work at Stockholm University to implement a three year project aiming to develop the social sector in St Petersburg in cooperation with relevant local authorities. The purpose of the project is to increase the skills and capacities of Russian social workers, policy-makers and social sector administrators through provision of theoretical and practical transfer of knowledge and training. The overall aim is to reform the system of social services and hence improve the situation of the most vulnerable people in the city of St Petersburg.

2 PURPOSE AND SCOPE OF THE EVALUATION

The purpose of the evaluation is to examine the results of the on-going project and find out how the activities have been formulated, conducted, reported and received by the counterparts. The evaluation should focus on the performance and competence of the Department of Social Work at Stockholm University, their sub-contractors whom are assigned responsibility to carry out specific activities within the framework of the project as well as on the results of the project.

The evaluation should give recommendations for future cooperation in the field of transfer of knowledge within the social sphere.

3 THE ASSIGNMENT

The issues to be covered and discussed in the evaluation are the following:

- An overview of the cooperation; What results have been achieved?
- The relevance of the project, taking Sida's goals and the needs from the Russian side into consideration.
- Whether and to what extent the objectives of the project have been achieved. What are the reasons for high or low achievement of the objectives? Are the objectives well formulated and reasonable? Which are the main obstacles encountered in the cooperation?
- The effect of the educational courses and training on the participants. To what degree have the participants been able to use their knowledge in their practical work? Have the relevant participants been selected? Has the training targeted the appropriate participants?
- The effect of the training and project activities on the social sector in St Petersburg. Are there any tangible results and or changes observed in the social service sector in St Petersburg? Are there outputs achieved that can be directly attributed to the project?
- The organizational structure of the project. Has the organization of the counterparts been functional/optimal for the cooperation? Has the received knowledge been administered/managed in a proper way?
- The competence of the Department of Social Work. Has the amount and skills of the consultancy in different areas been reasonable? Have the experts/personnel involved in the project carried out their tasks in a professional manner?

- The cost-effectiveness of the project. Could the same results have been achieved at lesser cost and with less human and financial resources? Have the administrative costs been kept at an acceptable level? Is the relation between the amount of funding from Sida and achieved results reasonable?
- External factors. To what extent have external factors, such as the adoption or lack of adoption of certain laws affected project implementation and results? Has the risk analysis been realistic? How should future project activities take external factors and potential mishaps into consideration?
- Reporting. What has been the quality of reports and evaluations submitted to Sida? Have the reports adequately reflected project successes and setbacks?
- Gender equality. How has the cooperation been related to gender equality? Have gender issues been taken into consideration in the contents of the training programmes?
- Sida's handling of the project and the relations with the Department of Social Work and the counterparts.

The consultants should, based on the findings of the evaluation, give recommendations on how the Swedish support to the project itself as well as to similar projects in the social sector as a whole, ought to be continued.

4 METHODOLOGY, EVALUATION TEAM AND TIME SCHEDULE

The consultant should gather information from the Department of Social Work at Stockholm University and its Swedish counterparts, the project counterpart in St Petersburg, the Russian participants in the project and Sida through written documentation (project proposals, Sida decisions, contracts, reports, internal evaluations etc), questionnaires and interviews with Swedish and Russian staff and project managers as well as randomly selected participants in the seminars, study tours, training courses and pilot projects.

It is estimated that the assignment will require a total of 50 working days.

The assignment will be carried out jointly by of one Swedish and one Russian consultant.

5 REPORTING

The evaluation report shall be written in English and not exceed 10 pages, excluding annexes. Two copies of the draft report shall be submitted to Sida no later than January 31, 2001. Within four weeks after receiving Sida's comments on the draft report, a final version in two copies and on diskette shall be submitted to Sida. Subject to decision by Sida, the report will be published and distributed as a publication within the Sida Evaluations series. The evaluation report shall be written in Word 6.0 for Windows (or in a compatible format) and should be presented in a way that enables publication without further editing.

The consultant shall, in connection with the report, submit to Sida a manuscript to Sida Evaluations Newsletter (in accordance to Annex 2) and complete the Sida Evaluations Data Work Sheet (Annex 3)

Annex 2

List of documents

Project Proposal, Dept of Social Work, 1997-10-20 (Projektförslag – Samarbete rörande utveckling av det sociala arbetet i St Petersburg 1997–2000).

Application to Sida for Phase I, 1997-11-28 (Ansökan - Samarbete kring utveckling av socialt arbete i St Petersburg, Etapp 1, insatser dec 1997–1998).

Decision by Sida, Phase I, 1997-12-08 (Beslut 387/97 – Utveckling av socialt arbete i St Petersburg, Fas 1, dec 1997–jan 1999).

First Report Phase I, 1998-06-16 (Delrapport 1 – Fas 1, dec 1997– maj 1998).

Second Report Phase I, 1998-10-14 (Delrapport 2 - Fas1, juni 1998–sept 1998).

Final Report Phase I, 1999-03-04 (Slutrapport Fas 1)

Application to Sida for Phase II, 1999-02-09 (Ansökan – Samarbetsprojektet Utveckling av socialt arbete i St Petersburg).

Decision by Sida, Phase II, 1999-03-22 (Beslut 136/99 – Socialt arbete i St Petersburg, Fas 2 april 1999–juni 2000).

First Report Phase II, 1999-06-30 (Delrapport 1 – Fas 2, feb 1999–maj 1999).

Second Report Phase II, 2000-02-24 (Delrapport 2 – Fas2, juni 1999–nov 1999).

Final Report Phase II, 2000-06-15 (Slutrapport Fas 2, dec 1999–mars 2000).

Complementary Final Report Phase II, 2000-08-14 (Komplettering Slutrapport – Fas 2, april 2000–juni 2000).

Application to Sida for Phase III, 2000-05-15 (Ansökan – Samarbetsprojektet Utveckling av socialt arbete i St Petersburg, Fas 3).

Complementary Applications to Sida for Phase III, 2000-06-14, 2000-08-04
(Ansökan – Fas 3, Reviderad version, Reviderad budget).

Decision by Sida, Phase III, 2000-08-22 (Beslut 370/00 – St Petersburg: Socialt arbete, Inledning till Fas 3, juli – dec 2000).

Report Phase III, 2000-12-12 (Rapport Fas 3, juli–dec 2000).

Application to Sida for 2001, 2000-12-07 (Ansökan – Samarbetsprojektet Utveckling av socialt arbete i St Petersburg, år fyra, 2001).

Annex 3

Number of participants taking part in training courses

Participants coming from	Type of training course					
	General	Elderly	Handicap	Children	Abuse	Total
Legislative assembly	1			1	1	3
Committee on Social Security	19	11	7	7	2	46
Committee on Family and Youth				8		8
Committee on Health care	3	5	3	3	1	15
Committee on Education	1		1	4	5	11
Committee on Justice		1	1	3		5
Other committees etc	5	1	3	2	2	13
Districts	41	53	30	43	12	179
Central institutions	3	17	40	12	19	91
Universities	7	6	9	10	6	38
Voluntary organisations			3	6		9
Media	1	1	1	1	1	5
Total	81	95	98	100	49	423

Number of interviewed participants

(Face-to-face interviews October-December 2000 St.-Petersburg)

Participants coming from	Type of training course					
	General	Elderly	Handip	Childn	Abuse	Total
Legislative assembly	1			1	1	3
Committee on Social Security	18	11	6	4	2	41
Committee on Family and Youth				6		6
Committee on Health care	3	5	3	3	1	15
Committee on Education	1			4	4	9
Committee on Justice			1	3		4
Other committees etc	5	1	3	2	2	13
Districts	38	51	28	43	12	172
Central institutions	3	14	39	12	16	84
Universities	3	2	8	10	6	29
Voluntary organisations			3	6		9
Media		1	1			2
Total	72	85	92	94	44	387

Annex 4

CENTRE FOR SOCIOLOGICAL STUDIES

Faculty of sociology

St-Petersburg state University

Ul. Smolnogo 1-3 St.-Petersburg, Russia

ph. 2719688 e-mail bel.soc.pu.ru

Questionnaire Sida – 2000 General course on social work

1. SURNAME, NAME, PATRONYMIC _____
2. PROFESSIONAL POSITION, PLACE OF WORK _____
3. AGE _____
4. SEX _____
5. YOUR BASIC (FIRST UNIVERSITY) EDUCATION (WHICH UNIVERSITY DID YOU GRADUATE FROM?) _____
6. PROFESSION ACCORDING TO THE BASIC EDUCATION _____
7. DO YOU HAVE A UNIVERSITY DEGREE IN A FIELD OF SOCIAL WORK, SOCIAL POLICY, STATE OR MUNICIPAL ADMINISTRATION?

0 - No, I don't

IF YES, NAME YOUR SPECIALISATION _____
8. WHEN DID YOU TAKE PART IN A PROJECT AND HAD AN EDUCATIONAL COURSE (NAME YEAR AND MONTH) _____
9. TYPE OF THE COURSE YOU TOOK PART IN
 - 1 – general course
 - 2 – Course «Work with families and children»
 - 3 – course «Work with the handicapped»
 - 4 – course «Work with the elderly»
 - 5 – course «Problems of the drug addicted»

10. PLEASE GIVE AN INTEGRAL EVALUATION OF IMPORTANCE AND USEFULNESS OF THE EDUCATIONAL COURSE YOU TOOK PART IN GENERAL AND ACCORDING TO THE TRADITIONAL SCHOOL SCALE (FROM 1 TO 5).

N	PARAMETER OF THE EVALUATION	Evaluation				
A	GENERAL ASSESSMENT	1	2	3	4	5
B	CORRESPONDENCE OF THE EDUCATIONAL PROGRAMME TO YOUR PROFESSIONAL NEEDS IN INFORMATION	1	2	3	4	5
C	NOVELTY OF THE INFORMATION ACQUIRED	1	2	3	4	5
D	USEFULNESS OF THE ACQUIRED INFORMATION FOR YOUR EVERYDAY PRACTICAL WORK	1	2	3	4	5
E	QUALITY OF TEACHING (LECTURES, PRACTICAL WORK)	1	2	3	4	5
F	QUALITY OF THE TRANSLATION	1	2	3	4	5
G	QUALITY AND QUANTITY OF THE GIVEN MATERIALS	1	2	3	4	5
H	CONDITIONS OF ACCOMMODATION, LIVING CONDITIONS, FOOD	1	2	3	4	5

Let's now talk about the structure of the educational programme, about knowledge and practical information that you acquired during the study. Please, evaluate every theme of the course according to several parameters listed below

The first parameter. **Importance.**

11. HOW IMPORTANT WAS EVERY LISTED BELOW (LECTURE, SEMINAR, EXCURSION) THEME FOR PROMOTION OF YOUR PROFESSIONAL COMPETENCE AS A SPECIALIST IN SOCIAL FIELD AT A PRESENT (OR PAST) WORKING PLACE? PLEASE GIVE AN ANSWER TO EACH THEME OF THE COURSE.

Themes	I don't Remember this	It's important & necessary	Rather important	Most likely, unimportant	Completely useless	It's hard to say
A Course in general	0	1	2	3	4	5
B Lecture. The governing of Sweden. State, landstings and communes. Financing. Taxation.	0	1	2	3	4	5
C Lecture. System of social insurance in Sweden. Medical insurance. Children's benefits, housing allowances.	0	1	2	3	4	5
D Lecture. Municipal planning.	0	1	2	3	4	5
E Lecture. Financing of municipalities.	0	1	2	3	4	5
F Lecture. System of city's administration in Sweden. Structure of administration, distribution of authorities. Process of making a decision in a administration region.	0	1	2	3	4	5

G	Lecture. Legal regulation of social work in Sweden. Legislation in social policy and social work.	0	1	2	3	4	5
H	Lecture. Official secret and publicity in social work. Conducting of documentation in social work.	0	1	2	3	4	5
I	Lecture. Social security and social work with the elderly.	0	1	2	3	4	5
J	Educational excursion to the centre of equipment and facilities for the handicapped.	0	1	2	3	4	5
K	Lecture. Social work with families with children.	0	1	2	3	4	5
L	Educational excursion to the family care -house – institution that takes care of drug and alcohol addicted parents and their children.	0	1	2	3	4	5
M	Educational excursion to the centres of daily care and professional education for mentally retarded youth.	0	1	2	3	4	5
N	Lecture. Social work and social security of people with physical and psychical disabilities.	0	1	2	3	4	5
O	Lecture. Financial aids in Sweden: history, functions, role, practice of distribution.	0	1	2	3	4	5
P	Lecture. Nursing and treatment of people with alcohol and drug abuse.	0	1	2	3	4	5
Q	Lecture. Prophylactics of drug addiction among the minors (teenagers).	0	1	2	3	4	5
R	Lecture. Social work in a city district	0	1	2	3	4	5
S	Lecture. Social work in a city district and social security of the old and handicapped.	0	1	2	3	4	5
T	Lecture. Social work and helping measures towards kids, youth and their families.						

The second parameter – **Practical usefulness.**

12. PLEASE, EVALUATE TO WHAT EXTENT IS IT POSSIBLE TO USE YOUR KNOWLEDGE AND EXPERIENCE, ACQUIRED DURING THE COURSE IN SWEDEN, IN PRACTICAL FULFILMENT IN ST. PETERSBURG?

Themes	Possible actually in the whole capacity	In general, possible	Possible to limit. extent	Impossible	It's Hard to say
A Course in general	1	2	3	4	5
B Lecture. The governing of Sweden. State, landstings and communes. Financing. Taxation.	1	2	3	4	5
C Lecture. System of social insurance in Sweden. Medical insurance. Children's benefits , housing allowances.	1	2	3	4	5
D Lecture. Municipal planning.	1	2	3	4	5
E Lecture. Financing of municipalities.	1	2	3	4	5
F Lecture. System of city's administration in Sweden. Structure of administration, distribution of authorities. Process of making a decision in a administration region.	1	2	3	4	5
G Lecture. Legal regulation of social work in Sweden. Legislation in social policy and social work.	1	2	3	4	5
H Lecture. Official secret and publicity in social work. Conducting of documentation in social work.	1	2	3	4	5
I Lecture. Social security and social work with the elderly.	1	2	3	4	5
J Educational excursion to the centre of equipment and facilities for the handicapped.	1	2	3	4	5
K Lecture. Social work with families with children.	1	2	3	4	5
L Educational excursion to the family care -house – institution that takes care of drug and alcohol addicted parents and their children.	1	2	3	4	5
M Educational excursion to the centres of daily care and professional education for mentally retarded youth.	1	2	3	4	5
N Lecture. Social work and social security of people with physical and psychical disabilities.	1	2	3	4	5
O Lecture. Financial aids in Sweden: history, functions, role, practice of distribution.	1	2	3	4	5
P Lecture. Nursing and treatment of people with alcohol and drug abuse.	1	2	3	4	5
Q Lecture. Prophylactics of drug addiction among the minors (teenagers).	1	2	3	4	5
R Lecture. Social work in a city district	1	2	3	4	5
S Lecture. Social work in a city district and social security of the old and handicapped.	1	2	3	4	5
T Lecture. Social work and helping measures towards kids, youth and their families.					

13. ORDER ACCORDING TO THE IMPORTANCE FOR YOUR PRACTICAL WORK ALL THEMES OF LECTURES, VISITS, PRACTICAL TRAININGS, THAT YOU HAD DURING THE SEMINARS IN SWEDEN. (EVALUATION ACCORDING TO THE IMPORTANCE FROM 5 TO 0, 5 – VERY IMPORTANT, 0 – UNIMPORTANT)

Themes	Range	It's hard to say
A Lecture. The governing of Sweden. State, landstings and communes. Financing. Taxation.		6
B Lecture. System of social insurance in Sweden. Medical insurance. Children's benefits, housing allowances.		6
C Lecture. Municipal planning.		6
D Lecture. Financing of municipalities.		6
E Lecture. System of city's administration in Sweden. Structure of administration, distribution of authorities. Process of making a decision in a administration region.		6
F Lecture. Legal regulation of social work in Sweden. Legislation in social policy and social work.		6
G Lecture. Official secret and publicity in social work. Conducting of documentation in social work.		6
H Lecture. Social security and social work with the elderly.		6
I Educational excursion to the centre of equipment and facilities for the handicapped.		6
J Lecture. Social work with families with children.		6
K Educational excursion to the family care -house – institution that takes care of drug and alcohol addicted parents and their children.		6
L Educational excursion to the centres of daily care and professional education for mentally retarded youth.		6
M Lecture. Social work and social security of people with physical and psychical disabilities.		6
N Lecture. Financial aids in Sweden: history, functions, role, practice of distribution.		6
O Lecture. Nursing and treatment of people with alcohol and drug abuse.		6
P Lecture. Prophylactics of drug addiction among the minors (teenagers).		6
Q Lecture. Social work in a city district		6
R Lecture. Social work in a city district and social security of the old and handicapped.		6
S Lecture. Social work and helping measures towards kids, youth and their families.		6

14. PLEASE, EVALUATE THE WHOLE DURATION OF THE COURSE

- 1 – it was too long, it could be shorter
- 2 – normal duration, exactly what was needed
- 3 – it was too short, more time and material is necessary
- 4 – it's hard to say

15. PLEASE, EVALUATE THE AMOUNT (BULK) OF INFORMATION YOU GOT DURING EACH SEMINAR. WE WOULD LIKE TO KNOW, ON WHICH TOPICS THERE WAS EXCESS OF INFORMATION AND WHICH OF THE TOPICS REQUIRE MORE DETAILED STUDY.

Themes	Information was not enough, should be more	I got all necessary information	The amount of information was	It's hard to say excess
A Lecture. The governing of Sweden. State, landstings and communes. Financing. Taxation.	1	2	3	4
B Lecture. System of social insurance in Sweden. Medical insurance. Children's benefits , housing allowances.	1	2	3	4
C Lecture. Municipal planning.	1	2	3	4
D Lecture. Financing of municipalities.	1	2	3	4
E Lecture. System of city's administration in Sweden. Structure of administration, distribution of authorities. Process of making a decision in a administration region.	1	2	3	4
F Lecture. Legal regulation of social work in Sweden. Legislation in social policy and social work.	1	2	3	4
G Lecture. Official secret and publicity in social work. Conducting of documentation in social work.	1	2	3	4
H Lecture. Social security and social work with the elderly.	1	2	3	4
I Educational excursion to the centre of equipment and facilities for the handicapped.	1	2	3	4
J Lecture. Social work with families with children.	1	2	3	4
K Educational excursion to the family care -house – institution that takes care of drug and alcohol addicted parents and their children.	1	2	3	4
L Educational excursion to the centres of daily care and professional education for mentally retarded youth.	1	2	3	4
M Lecture. Social work and social security of people with physical and psychical disabilities.	1	2	3	4
N Lecture. Financial aids in Sweden: history, functions, role, practice of distribution.	1	2	3	4
O Lecture. Nursing and treatment of people with alcohol and drug abuse.	1	2	3	4
P Lecture. Prophylactics of drug addiction among the minors (teenagers).	1	2	3	4
Q Lecture. Social work in a city district	1	2	3	4
R Lecture. Social work in a city district and social security of the old and handicapped.	1	2	3	4
S Lecture. Social work and helping measures towards kids, youth and their families.	1	2	3	4

16. ESTIMATE THE RATIO BETWEEN THE THEORY (LECTURES) AND PRACTICAL VISITS TO SOCIAL OBJECTS

- 1 – there was too much theory, and lack of the practical visits, study of practical experience
- 2 – theory and practice were well balanced
- 3 – there was too much visits and practice and lack of theory
- 4 – it's hard to say, another variant

17. DO YOU AGREE WITH THE STATEMENT THAT COURSE THAT YOU HEARD IN SWEDEN COULD BE IMPROVED AND COULD BECOME MORE EFFECTIVE?

- 1 – yes
- 2 – more likely, yes
- 3 – more likely, no
- 4 – of course not
- 5 – it's hard to say

18. WHAT FACTORS COULD MAKE THE COURSE BETTER?

NOW SEVERAL QUESTIONS ABOUT THE GROUP YOU WERE THE MEMBER OF DURING YOUR STUDY TRIP

19. DO YOU THINK THE SIZE OF THE GROUP WAS TOO BIG, TOO SMALL, OR CLOSE TO THE OPTIMAL ?

- 1 – it was too big
- 2 – close to the optimal
- 3 – it was too small
- 4 – different variant

20. PLEASE EVALUATE THE LEVEL OF THE KNOWLEDGE (PROFESSIONAL EDUCATION AND QUALIFICATION) OF THE GROUP: WAS IT EVEN, OR WAS THERE ANYBODY, PREPARED MUCH BETTER (WORSE) OF THE AVERAGE STANDARD?

- 1 – the level of the groups' grounding was even
- 2 - the level of the groups' grounding was uneven
- 3 – it's hard to say
- 4 – different variant

21. PLEASE, EVALUATE YOUR OWN KNOWLEDGE LEVEL BEFORE THE COURSE IN COMPARISON WITH THE AVERAGE LEVEL OF THE GROUP?

- 1 – my level was higher
- 2 – my level corresponded with the average in the group
- 3 – my level was lower
- 4 – different variant, it's hard to say

22. WERE THERE SUCH PARTICIPANTS OF THE SEMINARS, WHOSE WORK WASN'T DIRECTLY CONNECTED WITH THE PROGRAMME OF THE SEMINAR?

- 1 – Yes
- 2 – No
- 3 – It's hard to say

23. WERE THERE SUCH PARTICIPANTS IN THE GROUP, FOR WHOM THE PROGRAMME OF THE SEMINAR WAS NEITHER INTERESTING, NOR IMPORTANT ?

- 1 – Yes
- 2 – No
- 3 - It's hard to say

24. WERE ALL OF THE PARTICIPANTS EQUALLY INTERESTED IN THE INFORMATION PRESENTED ON THE SEMINAR?

1 – Yes

2 – No

3 – It's hard to say

25. WERE THERE SUCH PARTICIPANTS IN A GROUP FOR WHOM THE STUDY OF NEW MATERIAL WAS NOT AS EASY AS FOR THE REST OF THE GROUP?

1 – Yes

2 – No

3 – It's hard to say

26. IF SO, HOW DID IT REVEAL ITSELF?

27. WHAT WAS THE MOST USEFUL FOR YOU DURING THE COURSE PROGRAMME?

28. WHAT DO YOU THINK WAS OF NO IMPORTANCE WITHIN THE COURSE, THAT COULD BE NEGLECTED IN THE FUTURE?

NOW TRY TO EVALUATE HOW DO YOU USE KNOWLEDGE AND PRACTICAL SKILLS ACQUIRED DURING THE TRAINING COURSES

29. DID THE PARTICIPATION IN RUSSIAN – SWEDISH PROGRAMME MAKE ANY INFLUENCE UPON YOUR PROFESSIONAL ACTIVITY?

1 – Yes

2 – No

30. IF SO, WHAT WAS THE INFLUENCE OF YOUR PARTICIPATION IN THE PROGRAMME ON THE PROFESSIONAL ACTIVITIES?

31. COULD YOU SAY THAT PARTICIPATION IN THE PROGRAMME ENLARGED THE AMOUNT OF YOUR THEORETICAL KNOWLEDGE IN A FIELD OF SOCIAL POLICY AND SOCIAL WORK?

1 – Yes, by all means

2 – More likely, yes

3 – More likely, no

4 – Of course not

5 – It's hard to say

32. WHAT MOST IMPORTANT FOR YOU THEORETICAL KNOWLEDGE DID YOU ACQUIRE DURING YOUR STUDY AT THE SEMINAR?

33. COULD YOU SAY THAT PARTICIPATION IN A PROGRAMME, STUDY AT THE SEMINAR IMPROVED YOUR PRACTICAL QUALIFICATION, DEVELOPED YOUR ABILITIES AND SKILLS, WHICH ARE NECESSARY IN IMPLEMENTING YOUR WORK?

1 – Yes, by all means

2 – More likely, yes

3 – More likely, no

4 – Of course not

5 – It's hard to say

34. TO WHAT EXTENT DO YOU USE NEW KNOWLEDGE AND PRACTICAL SKILLS, ACQUIRED AT THE TRAINING COURSES IN YOUR PRACTICAL WORK?
IF THE COMPLETE, FULL USAGE WE TAKE AS 100%, THEN YOU USE ACQUIRED KNOWLEDGE AND SKILLS AT __%

35. PLEASE, COMMENT UPON YOUR USAGE OF THEORETICAL AND PRACTICAL KNOWLEDGE ACQUIRED IN SWEDEN IN YOUR WORK?

36. WHAT DO YOU THINK, TO WHAT EXTENT IS IT GENERALLY POSSIBLE TO USE SWEDISH EXPERIENCE IN A FIELD OF SOCIAL POLICY AND SOCIAL WORK IN SAINT-PETERSBURG?

- 1- actually it is possible, at 90 – 100 %
- 2- it's possible to use at 60 – 89%
- 3- it's possible to use at 40 – 59%
- 4- it's possible to use at 20 – 39%
- 5- it's possible to use at less than at 20%
- 6- practically impossible

WHAT ARE IN YOUR OPINION, THE MAIN OBSTACLES FOR UTILISATION OF SWEDISH EXPERIENCE IN A FIELD OF SOCIAL POLICY AND SOCIAL WORK IN ST- PETERSBURG? (IF WE TAKE THE SUM OF THE OBSTACLE FACTORS FOR 100%, THEN HOW MANY PERCENTAGES WOULD YOU GIVE TO EACH FACTOR NAMED BELOW?)

	FACTOR	%	
37	DIFFERENCE BETWEEN SWEDISH AND RUSSIAN LEGISLATION		
38	LACK OF THE FINANCIAL SUPPORT		
39	BAD MANAGEMENT IN SOCIAL SECTOR		
40	LOW QUALIFICATION OF SOCIAL WORKERS		
41	THE STATE OF PUBLIC CONSCIOUSNESS NOT READY FOR THE REFORMS		
42	ANOTHER FACTOR		

43. WOULD YOU LIKE TO TAKE PART IN SUCH EDUCATIONAL RUSSIAN-SWEDISH PROGRAMME AGAIN?

- 1 – Yes
- 2 – No

44. IF YES, THAN WHAT PROGRAMME, COURSE, THEORETICAL OR PRACTICAL KNOWLEDGE DO YOU NEED THIS TIME?

45. WHAT COULD YOU SUGGEST FOR THE IMPROVEMENT OF ORGANISATION OF THE COURSES AND SELECTION OF THE PARTICIPANTS?

Annex 5

Selected summary of weighted results of the Questionnaire survey 387 respondents

Question "Please give an integral evaluation of importance and usefulness of the educational course you took part in in general and according to the traditional school scale (from 1 to 5)".

The general assessment	%
3	0,3
4	22,4
5	77,4

Evaluation of correspondence of the educational programme to the professional needs in information	%
1 – very bad	0,5
2 – bad	0,3
3 – intermediate between good and bad	7,0
4 – good	38,3
5 – very good, excellent	53,9

Evaluation of the novelty of the information acquired	%
1	0,2
3	7,8
4	36,4
5	55,6

Evaluation of the usefulness of the acquired information for your everyday practical work	%
1	0,3
2	1,6
3	13,6
4	31,3
5	53,3

Evaluation of quality of teaching (lectures, practical work)	%
3	2,6
4	27,3
5	70,1

Evaluation of quality of the translation	%
3	1,3
4	15,3
5	83,4

Evaluation of quality and quantity of the given printed materials	%
2	0,3
3	4,2
4	17,9
5	77,7

How important was the whole course for promotion of your professional competence as a specialist in social field at your present working place?	%
it's very important and necessary	59,1
rather important	29,6
most likely, unimportant	8,9
completely useless	0,4
it's hard to say	1,9

Please, evaluate to what extent is it possible to use your knowledge and experience, acquired during the course in Sweden, in practical fulfilment in St. Petersburg?	%
Possible actually in the whole capacity	12,4
In general, possible	56,2
Possible to limited extent	27,1
Impossible	2,8
It's hard to say	1,4

Please, evaluate the whole duration of the course	%
it was too long, it could be shorter	9,8
normal duration, exactly what was needed	75,4
it was too short, more time and material is necessary	13,5
it's hard to say	1,4

Estimate the ratio between the theory (lectures) and practical visits of social objects	%
there was too much theory, and lack of the practical visits, study of practical experience	26,7
theory and practice were well balanced	66,1
there was too much visits and practice and lack of theory	4,4
it's hard to say, another variant	2,8

Do you agree with the statement that course that you took part in Sweden could be improved and could become more effective?	%
yes	22,4
more likely, yes	37,3
more likely, no	21,1
no	1,1
it's hard to say	18,2

How do you think the size of the group was too big, too small, or close to the optimal ?	%
it was too big	26,4
close to the optimal	70,2
it was too small	2,3
different variant	1,0

Please evaluate the level of the knowledge (basic education and qualification) of the group: was it even, or was there anybody, prepared much better (worse)?	%
the level of the groups' grounding was even	35,7
the level of the groups' grounding was uneven	51,8
it's hard to say	7,6
different variant	4,9

Please, evaluate your own knowledge before the course in comparison with the average level of the group?	%
my level was higher	19,2
my level corresponded with the average in the group	65,8
my level was lower	10,1
different variant, it's hard to say	4,9

Were there such participants of the seminars, whose professional activities weren't directly connected with the programme of the seminar?	%
yes	27,6
no	44,4
it's hard to say	27,9

Were there such participants in the group, for whom the programme of the seminar was neither interesting, nor important ?	%
yes	28,2
no	38,8
it's hard to say	33,1

Were all of the participants equally interested in the content of the training courses?	%
yes	37,3
no	29,5
it's hard to say	33,2

Were there such participants in a group for whom the study of new material was not as easy as for the rest of the group?	%
yes	29,5
no	35,1
it's hard to say	35,4

Did the participation in Russian – Swedish programme make any influence upon your professional activity?	%
yes	88,3
no	11,7

Could you say that participation in the programme enlarged the amount of your theoretical knowledge in a field of social policy and social work?	%
of course yes	65,6
more likely, yes	14,1
more likely, no	1,0
of course no	0,3
it's hard to say	9,0

Could you say that participation in a programme, study at the seminar improved your practical qualification, developed your abilities and skills, which are necessary in implementing your work?	%
of course, yes	53,0
more likely, yes	25,8
more likely, no	10,1
of course no	6,2
it's hard to say	4,9

What do you think, to what extend is it generally possible to use Swedish experience in a field of social policy and social work in Saint-Petersburg?	%
actually the complete usage of Swedish experience is possible, at 90 – 100 %	5,1
it's possible to use at 60 – 89%	20,9
it's possible to use at 40 – 59%	28,9
it's possible to use at 20 – 39%	32,2
it's possible to use less than at 20%	10,6
practically impossible	2,2

Would you like to take part in such educational Russian-Swedish programme again?	%
yes	94,9
no	5,1

Annex 6

List of persons interviewed in Sweden

Ronald Penton	Head of International Projects Division, Department of Social Work, Stockholm University
Yvonne Askerlund	Project Manager, International Projects Division, Department of Social Work, Stockholm University
Stina Bergman-Ericsson	Project Manager, Maria-Gamla Stan Municipal District Administration, City of Stockholm
Birger Stark	Director of Social Welfare Emeritus, Strong Development
Cajsa Engdahl	Director of Centre for mentally retarded youth Glasade Gängen, Hägersten Municipal District Administration, City of Stockholm

List of persons interviewed in St Petersburg

Vladimir Derbin	Vice Governor and Chairman of the Committee for Labour and Social Work, St Petersburg
Natalia Lemke,	Head of Dept for Social Development, Committee for Labour and Social Work, Project Coordinator for the cooperation with Dept of Social Work in Stockholm
Janna Dulina	Specialist at the Committee for Family and Children
Vladimir Gerbolinskij	Vice Head of Moskovski District
Andrej Filatov	Vice Head of Kirov District With heads of social depts and health dept,
Tatiana Tomashuk	Head of Social Service Centre in Primorsky district Together with staff responsible for children
Galina Kukulidi	Head of Social Work in the Admiralty district Together with head of Centre for mentally retarded youth “Karlsson”
Natalia Evdokimova	Chairman of the Social Commission of St Petersburg Legislative Assembly

Annex 7

Budget and Disbursement (TSEK)

Budgeted	Phase 1	Phase 2	Phase 3	Total	%
Project management	1 235	2 750	1 249	5 234	26%
Legislation study	470	280	392	1 142	6%
Implementation of legislation	156				0%
Social register	108	110			0%
Conference	245	255	343	843	4%
General course	1 688	645	412	2 745	14%
Course on Elderly	1 214	645		1 859	9%
Course on Handicapped	607	1 290		1 897	9%
Course on Children and Family	606	1 290	67	1 963	10%
Course on Abuse		1 290		1 290	6%
Project on Handicapped		540	519	1 059	5%
Project on Elderly		540	587	1 127	6%
Project on Children and Family		95	215	310	2%
Project on Social Centre		95	216	311	2%
Project on Abuse		95		95	0%
	6 329	9 920	4 000	20 249	100%

Disbursed	Phase 1	Phase 2	Phase 3	Total	%
Project management	1 700	3 054	1 055	5 809	31%
Legislation study	266			266	1%
Implementation of legislation					0%
Social register			101	101	1%
Conference	461	198	196	855	5%
General course	1 380	381	287	2 048	11%
Course on Elderly	1 025	1 050		2 075	11%
Course on Handicapped	495	1 497		1 992	11%
Course on Children and Family	496	1 524	30	2 050	11%
Course on Abuse		1 004		1 004	5%
Project on Handicapped		897	427	1 324	7%
Project on Elderly		237	405	642	3%
Project on Children and Family			167	167	1%
Project on Social Centre			172	172	1%
Project on Abuse					0%
	5 823	9 842	2 840	18 505	100%

	Budgeted			Disbursed			
	Fees	Other costs	Total	Fees	Other costs	Total	
Phase 1							
Project management	1 035	200	1 235	1 550	150	1 700	29%
Legislation study	360	110	470	113	153	266	5%
Implement legislation	105	51	156	0	0	0	
Social register	75	33	108	0	0	0	
Conference	30	215	245	51	410	461	8%
General course (2)	548	1 140	1 688	325	1 055	1 380	24%
Course on Elderly (2)	350	864	1 214	257	768	1 025	18%
Course on Handicap (1)	175	432	607	132	363	495	8%
Course on Children (1)	175	431	606	123	373	496	8%
	2 853	3 476	6 329	2 551	3 272	5 823	100%
Phase 2							
Project management	2 424	326	2 750	2 675	379	3 054	31%
Legislation study	220	60	280	0	0	0	
Social register	80	30	110	0	0	0	
Conference	50	203	253	37	161	198	2%
General course (1)	150	494	644	87	294	381	4%
Course on Elderly (1-2)	150	494	644	259	791	1 050	11%
Course on Handicap (2-3)	300	990	1 290	337	1 160	1 497	15%
Course on Children (2-3)	300	990	1 290	321	1 203	1 524	15%
Course on Abuse (2)	300	990	1 290	206	798	1 004	10%
Project on Handicap	326	216	542	440	457	897	9%
Project on Elderly	326	216	542	160	77	237	2%
Project on Children	65	30	95	0	0	0	
Project on Social Centre	65	30	95	0	0	0	
Project on Abuse	65	30	95	0	0	0	
	4 821	5 099	9 920	4 522	5 320	9 842	100%
Phase 3							
Project management	999	250	1 249	899	156	1 055	37%
Documentation system	315	77	392	90	11	101	4%
Conference	75	268	343	10	186	196	7%
General course (1)	97	315	412	50	237	287	10%
Course on Children (f.up)	15	52	67	5	25	30	1%
Project on Handicap	230	289	519	218	209	427	15%
Project on Elderly	276	311	587	255	150	405	14%
Project on Children	120	95	215	112	55	167	6%
Project on Social Centre	120	96	216	102	70	172	6%
	2 247	1 753	4 000	1 741	1 099	2 840	100%

Recent Sida Evaluations

- 00/34** **When Development Projects go Orphan. Lessons from 20 years of Swedish forestry support to Nicaragua.** Pierre Fröhling
Department for Natural Resources and the Environment
- 00/35** **Rapport från utvärderingen av stödet till de partiknutna organisationerna.** Fredrik Uggla, Li Bennich-Björkman, Axel Hadenius, Fredrik Nornvall, Annika Tamra, Magnus Öhman
Department for Cooperation with Non-Governmental Organisations and Humanitarian Assistance
- 00/36** **The Swedish Consultancy Fund in Mozambique.** Karlis Goppers. Department for Africa
- 00/37** **Assessment of Lessons learned from Sida Support to Conflict Management and Peace Building: Final Report.** SIPU International AB, Stockholm, Centre for Development Research, Copenhagen, International Peace Research Institute, Oslo
Department for Cooperation with Non-Governmental Organisations and Humanitarian Assistance
- 00/37:1** **Assessment of Lessons learned from Sida Support to Conflict Management and Peace Building: State of the Art/Annotated Bibliography.** Ninna Nyberg Sørensen, Finn Stepputat, Nicholas Van Hear
Department for Cooperation with Non-Governmental Organisations and Humanitarian Assistance
- 00/37:2** **Assessment of Lessons learned from Sida Support to Conflict Management and Peace Building: Annex 1-5, Case Studies.** Ivar Evensmo, Hilde Henriksen Waage, Joakim Gundel, Jennifer Schirmer, Björn Bengtson, Barbro Ronnmö, Dan Smith
Department for Cooperation with Non-Governmental Organisations and Humanitarian Assistance
- 00/38** **Fortalecimiento Institucional al Comisionado Nacional de los Derechos Humanos en Honduras: Defensa y protección de los Derechos de la Mujer.** Sonia Marlina Dubón
Department for Latin America
- 00/39** **Programa de Capacitación en Economía para Funcionarios de la República de Cuba.** José Antonio Cuba
Department for Latin America
- 00/40** **Swedish Initiative for Support of Sustainable Management of Water Resources in Southern Africa.** Len Abrams, Lennart Peck, Klas Sandström
Department for Natural Resources and the Environment
- 00/41** **Water and Environment Project in Estonia, Latvia and Lithuania.** Bastiaan de Laat, Erik Arnold, Philip Sowden
Department for Eastern and Central Europe
- 01/01** **Rural Development and Democratisation in Russia and Estonia. An evaluation of Sida's support to the three projects in Russia and Estonia.** Paul Dixelius, Camilla Gramner, Dan Hjalmarsson.
Department for Eastern and Central Europe

Sida Evaluations may be ordered from:

Infocenter, Sida
S-105 25 Stockholm
Phone: +46 (0)8 795 23 44
Fax: +46 (0)8 760 58 95
info@sida.se

A complete backlist of earlier evaluation reports may be ordered from:

Sida, UTV, S-105 25 Stockholm
Phone: +46 (0)8 698 5163
Fax: +46 (0)8 698 5610
Homepage: <http://www.sida.se>



SWEDISH INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT COOPERATION AGENCY

S-105 25 Stockholm, Sweden

Tel: +46 (0)8-698 50 00. Fax: +46 (0)8-20 88 64

Telegram: sida stockholm. Postgiro: 1 56 34-9

E-mail: info@sida.se. Homepage: <http://www.sida.se>