RECOV EU

A participative approach to curriculum development for adults in addiction recovery across the European Union.

www.recoveu.org

Deliverable 7.1:

Pilot Delivery Review

WP7: Pilot Phase

December 2016

Lifelong Learning Programme

Co-funded by the European Union

STAFFORDSHIRE UNIVERSITY

CARDET

St.Dimitrie Program

cooperativa sociale s.saturnino onlus

CONTENTS

RECOVEU: A participative approach to curriculum development for adults in addiction recovery across the European Union
[Project Number: 538955-LLP-1-2013-1-UK-GRUNDTVIG-GMP]

1 INTRODUCTION

The RECOVEU project is aimed at developing a coherent EU approach to adult learning in addiction recovery. Social reintegration is a key factor in addiction recovery. Alongside housing and employment, adult education is a critical measure in supporting social reintegration. However, while there are many programmes focusing on the target group across Europe, many national social inclusion plans do not specifically address the educational needs of drug users (EMCDDA, 2012).

In the first two years of the RECOVEU project, the partners from the United Kingdom, Cyprus, Romania, Italy and Ireland reached several milestones:

- Data was collected regarding policy and practice in the field of addiction treatment, education and social reintegration of adults in drug recovery in all five partner countries (*Del. 3.4: Final Policy and Practice Review*). Despite the critical figure concerning the lack of specific data on the access of adults in recovery to learning resources, a conclusion of the Review is that access to higher education can provide opportunities for people to both re-evaluate and re-establish their lives after addiction.

- A Focus Group Phase of the project was developed and implemented (WP4). This was a undertaken in each country with both adults in recovery and service providers and was aimed at understanding the part played by adult education in an individual's recovery process and the way in which people in recovery could be supported to engage in adult education opportunities (*Del. 4.4: Focus Group Overview*).

- Based on the Focus Group findings, partners produced a set of 'Access to Learning' resources for people in recovery from addiction, together with a Draft Facilitation Pack to be used to support piloting of the materials:

    - *Facilitation Pack Section 1 (Pilot): Delivery Guidelines*.
    - *Facilitation Pack Section 2 (Pilot): Course Pack* – this contained a set of core and culture-specific learning activities that address barriers to learning for recovering drug users.
    - *Facilitation Pack Section 3 (Pilot): Evaluation Toolkit* – this contained a set of Evaluation Tools and module feedback/delivery templates designed to assess the effectiveness and psychological impact of the project, and collect pilot delivery data and feedback data on the pilot process from service users and trainers.

- The Draft Facilitation Pack was piloted with service users and providers in each partner country.

This Review presents qualitative feedback from _trainers_ on the Pilot Phase process. It forms a part of a series of three reviews (the two others being *Del. 7.2: Qualitative Feedback Review* and *Del 7.3: Evaluation Toolkit Feedback Review*) which together give an overview of the effectiveness and impact of the pilot. The findings from these reviews will be used to revise the course materials, Evaluation Tools and Facilitation Pack.

The pilot sections of the Facilitation Pack on which these reports are based can be found on the project website (www.recoveu.org), together with the revised course materials, Evaluation Tools and Final Facilitation Pack.

2 METHODOLOGY AND COURSE PARTICIPANTS

2.1 Pilot Phase Delivery

Each partner country took part in piloting the course materials. Materials were delivered as outlined in the *Facilitation Pack Section 1 (Pilot): Delivery Guidelines*; an overview of materials delivered is presented in the *Facilitation Pack Section 2 (Pilot): Course Pack*.

Participants were selected for participation in the Pilot Phase according to pre-agreed criteria: (1) the target sample was adults in recovery who would like to move towards higher education (although service users were eligible for selection regardless of their education level), (2) participants must be adults over 18 years of age in self-defined recovery from drug use (total abstinence or controlled use), (3) partners would attempt to have a balance in terms of gender, and (4) each partner would aim to recruit 12-18 participants. No inducement was offered for participation.

2.2 Participants' Background Data

Table 2.1 gives an overview of the background data for each partner. Overall, 72 participants took part in the research across the five partner countries. Romania and Italy had the highest number of participants (at 25% and 26.4% respectively of the total; n=18 and n=19); the UK had the fewest participants at 8.3% (n=6; this low level of participation for the UK was because the pilot organisation experienced issues with delivery beyond their control). The age range overall was very wide, from 22 to 67. Romania was the only partner who had participants aged 52 and older (38.9% of Romanian participants were this age group). The gender ratio overall was 81.9% male/18.1% female; this gender imbalance was consistent across all partners and was consistent with the target group demographic within each partner country. A high proportion of participants overall (88.9%) had the ethnicity of the partner country that was being evaluated, and all except seven Cyprus participants were citizens of that country.

There was a wide range of educational levels: 6.9% of participants (n=5) had left school with no educational qualifications; 40.3% held Level 2 qualifications (n=29; an approximately aged-16 qualification), and 36.1% held Level 3 qualifications (n=26, an approximately aged-18 qualification). The rest had Level 5 (college) qualifications or higher with one person having a doctorate (Level 8).

2.3 Data Collection

Data for this Review was collected from trainers who delivered the course. Trainers completed three separate Course Delivery Forms over the Pilot Phase of the project:

D1. TRAINERS: PROFESSIONAL PROFILES – to be completed once.

D2. RECRUITMENT AND INDUCTION SESSION – to be completed once.

D3. TRAINER FEEDBACK FORM – one form to be completed at the end of each module (five forms in total).

These forms record specific information on course delivery – how and when the modules have been delivered, the resources that have been used in their delivery, trainers' feedback on the course content and delivery process, and trainers' perceptions of how participants responded to the course (see the *Facilitation Pack Section 3 (Pilot): Evaluation Toolkit* for copies of the forms and instructions on how to use them).

2.4 Analysis and Data Presentation Strategy

Chapter 3 provides an overview of the pilot organisations and trainers involved in the project. Chapter 4 then describes the role of the facilitator and trainer and the preparation activities between them. Chapter 5 provides a summary of module delivery information in tabular form, whilst Chapter 6 gives summary tables of participants' and trainers' overall satisfaction with the modules, also in tabular form. Chapter 7 then discusses trainers' feedback on course content and delivery – this provides an overview of feedback for each question provided on *D3: Trainer Feedback Form*. Differences are discussed by module and by partner country. This information is then summarised in a *Course Content and Delivery Matrix* (Chapter 8). Finally, some conclusions and action points for moving forward in revising the course materials and Facilitation Pack are presented in Chapter 9.

(Note: see also *Del. 7.2: Qualitative Feedback Review* and *Del. 7.3: Evaluation Toolkit Feedback Review* for additional Action Points and recommendations for revising the course materials and Facilitation Pack.)

Table 2.1   Participants' background data (Total N = 72 participants)

Partner	Number (% of Total N)	Age range	Proportions within partner groups				
			Gender	Ethnicity	Highest educational qualification*	Country of birth	Country of citizenship
P1 – UK	6 (8.3%)	32 – 51	66.7% male (n=4)	66.7% White British (n=4) 16.7% Mixed Black/White British (n=1) 16.7% Black Caribbean (n=1)	16.7% Level 2 City and Guilds (n=1)(L2) 16.7% Level 2 NVQ (n=1)(L2) 16.7% Level 3 (n=1)(L3) 16.7% NVQ (n=1)(L3) 16.7% Level 5 Diploma (n=1)(L5) 16.7% University degree (n=1)(L6)	100% UK (n=6)	100% UK (n=6)
P2 – Cyprus	14 (19.4%)	22 – 46	92.9% male (n=13)	50% Greek-Cypriot (n=7) 42.9% Greek (n=6) 7.1% Bulgarian (n=1)	7.1% Primary school (n=1)(no qual.) 78.6% Secondary school (n=11)(L3) 7.1% Vocational college (n=1)(L3) 7.1% University student (n=1)(L6)	50% Cyprus (n=7) 35.7% Greece (n=5) 7.1% Bulgaria (n=1) 7.1% Russia (n=1)	50% Cyprus (n=7) 42.9% Greece (n=6) 7.1% Bulgaria (n=1)
P3 – Romania	18 (25%)	23 – 67	72.2% male (n=13)	83.3% Romanian (n=15) 16.7% Hungarian (n=3)	5.6% Primary school (n=1)(no qual.) 27.8% Secondary school (n=5)(L2) 27.8% High school (n=5)(L3) 5.6% Professional high school (n=1)(L3) 11.1% University degree (n=2)(L6) 16.7% Master's degree (n=3)(L7) 5.6% PhD (n=1)(L8)	100% Romania (n=18)	100% Romania (n=18)
P4 – Italy	19 (26.4%)	29 – 51	89.5% male (n=17)	89.5% Italian (n=17) 5.3% Ethiopian (n=1) 5.3% Swiss (n=1)	10.5% Elementary school (n=2)(no. qual.) 63.2% Middle school (n=12)(L2) 26.3% Secondary school (n=5)(L3)	89.5% Italy (n=17) 5.3% Africa (n=1) 5.3% Switzerland(n=1)	100% Italy (n=19)
P5 – Ireland	15 (20.8%)	25 – 47	80% male (n=12)	100% White Irish (n=15)	6.7% Primary school (n=1)(no qual.) 66.7% Junior certificate (n=10)(L2) 13.3% Leaving certificate (n=2)(L3) 6.7% College (n=1)(L5) 6.7% College degree (n=1)(L6)	100% Ireland (n=15)	100% Ireland (n=15)

*In order to provide a common metric, educational qualifications have been classified as L1 (Level 1: lowest qualification achieved at middle/secondary/high school) to L8 (Level 8: doctorate). However, education systems differ across partner countries and qualifications gained at school do not map directly across countries; they are therefore only approximations.

3 THE PILOT ORGANISATIONS AND TRAINERS

The organisations involved in the Pilot Phase of the project are given in Table 3.1. Two partners (Romania and Ireland) ran the pilot internally, i.e. within their own organisation. The other three partners arranged for the course to be run at an external organisation that works with and for substances users.

Table 3.1 Pilot organisations			
	Internal	**External**	**Description**
P1 – UK		✓	BADSUF (Bournemouth Alcohol and Drug Service User Forum)
P2 – Cyprus		✓	Agia Skepi Counselling Station
P3 – Romania	✓		Partner organisation – SDP
P4 – Italy		✓	CEIS – Residential service for drug addicts
P5 – Ireland	✓		Partner organisation – Soilse

Information on the pilot organisations and the trainers running the course is given in Sections 3.1 to 3.5 below. All trainers are experts in training and educational processes with marginalised individuals.

3.1 Partner 1 – UK (Staffordshire University)

Pilot Organisation – BADSUF (Bournemouth Alcohol and Drug Service User Forum)

Pilot organisation background

BADSUF is an Independent charitable organisation working with and for people engaged in or wanting to access Treatment Services (and Accommodation) in Bournemouth.

BADSUF aims to engage with Drug and Alcohol Service Users by offering a General and Carers helpline. It offers independent information, support and advocacy. http://www.badsuf.com/

The pilot was delivered to people who access the service once a week. All sessions were delivered by the same trainer for a full day.

Trainers' professional profiles

The trainer is a National Vocational Qualification Assessor, also qualified in Training the Trainer. She has experience of developing, facilitating and delivering group work to service users accessing drug and alcohol rehabilitation units.

3.2   Partner 2 – CYPRUS (CARDET)

Pilot organisation – Agia Skepi Counselling station

Pilot organisation background

'Agia Skepi is a long term Therapeutic Community (TC) for adults. It is a private non-profit organization founded in 1999. It provides services to long term depended substance users and their families in an inpatient and outpatient setting. The main goal of the program is total abstinence from illicit drugs and alcohol.

The TC is perceived as the main therapeutic tool; it assists in promoting growth in an alternative house with an alternate family. Rehabilitation is achieved through the process of differentiation from the other members as well as from the team. The TC operates in a hierarchical way in which members change roles and receive responsibilities. The entry criteria include: (1) willingness to actively participate in the TC and reach abstinence, (2) be at least 18 years old, (3) gone through detoxification prior to admission, and (4) completed a preparation process (which includes various types of evaluations) prior to admission.

Trainers' professional profiles

Dr. Eliza Patouris: Qualification: PhD in Psychology of Substance Use. Professional experience: She is a Research Project manager on Social and Educational European projects. Her work entails successful completion of the projects' intellectual outputs. As part of her PhD she engaged with young people using cannabis and ran several focus groups. She was the lead facilitator of the RECOVEU focus groups during the earlier phase of the project. Her work entails delivery of curriculum training to marginalised individuals (i.e. migrants, young people, adults in addiction recovery).

3.3   Partner 3 – ROMANIA (SDP)

Pilot organisation – SDP

Pilot organisation background

The St Dimitrie Program – Addiction Information and Counselling is a part of *Christiana Medical-Philantropical Association*, Cluj and has been active in Cluj-Napoca since 1995 under the umbrella of the Orthodox Cluj Archdiocese. The programme was initiated at a time when Romania had only 3-4 other services for alcoholics and addicts. Officially registered in 2001, the programme offers information, counselling and training for thousands of addicts and professionals, and has set up seven new recovery programmes and 14 support groups. Their work has been widely disseminated for use in the recovery and professional communities.

Trainers' professional profiles

Nicoleta Amariei: Social worker with a Master's degree in Psychology; from 2001 she has worked as an addiction counsellor certified by Net Institute as a 'trainer for trainers in addictions' since 2003. She is also accredited as a trainer of trainers through the National Centre for Adult Education. She is involved in developing the educational programme for addiction counsellors in Romania, providing face to face and online training for professionals in social field, grant writing, developing clinical tools

in addiction. She has participated in writing a University-level class on Pastoral Counselling in Addictions for Theology Students.

Mihaela Stânceanu: Social worker since 1995, certified trainer since 2008 through the National Centre for Adult Education, worked with addiction services since 2011, managed an Employee Assistance Program for adults with substance abuse. She is involved in administration, grant writing and occupational therapy. She has over 10 years' experience in working and coordinating social programmes and providing training courses in mental health and social work.

Ion Copoeru: Philosophy teacher at Babeş-Bolyai University Cluj-Napoca, PhD in 1999 and is a researcher affiliated with the Centre for Ethics and Health Policies at the University of Medicine and Pharmacy Iasi (Romania). His research interests are located mainly in phenomenology and ethics in professions, with a focus on the professions of law, healthcare, and business. His current research topic (in the framework of the postdoctoral programme Ethics and Health Policies, University of Medicine and Pharmacy Iasi, Romania) is 'Ethics and governance of the medical and social services for substance abusing persons'. Ion has received training for Qualitative Methods in Ethics and Public Health at the University of Medicine and Pharmacy Iasi (Romania). He has been involved in several inter-disciplinary research projects granted by the Romanian Council of Academic Research.

3.4 Partner 4 – ITALY (SANSAT)

Pilot organisation – CEIS, Centro Italiano di Solidarietà (Italian Center of Solidarity)

Pilot organisation background

SANSAT developed the Pilot in a Drug Rehabilitation Community named CEIS – Centro Italiano di Solidarietà (Italian Center of Solidarity). CEIS has many communities in Italy; in the Region, it has several services (residential communities, daily centres, etc.). The community in which the course was developed is in Marino city (near Rome) and is named 'San Carlo'. CEIS promotes activities and interventions to prevent and combat social exclusion. The specific aims of the Centre are:

- Promote appropriate initiatives to raise awareness of specific needs of individuals and private institutions and to raise awareness within society.
- Promote, stimulate and finance in Italy and abroad the foundation of specialised institutions for the care and rehabilitation of various categories of needy people and drug users.
- Promote, urge and support the establishment and activities of local associations of solidarity and 'youth groups of solidarity'.
- Promote lifelong learning, scientific, training of social workers.
- Promote vocational training, civic, relational and cultural development of persons in distress.
- Promote and undertake training and/or retraining of school personnel.
- Help to overcome exclusion through the prevention and the removal of situations of need.
- Promote and undertake training, scientific and applied research, cultural dissemination and promotion and development support which benefits individuals in disadvantaged areas, and at risk of exclusion.
- Design and develop activities of volunteer personnel to disadvantaged groups.

Trainers' professional profiles

Dr. Isabella Cardigliano: Qualification: Psychologist and psychotherapist, expert in conducting groups. Professional experience: She is a member of the San Saturnino Onlus Social Cooperative. She has coordinated projects for the prevention of addiction and guidance for people with social problems, drug addicted or in recovery. She also has specific expertise in the socio-affective educational techniques typical of the psychology of community. She has a wide experience in providing vocational guidance and training courses.

Dr. Silvia Graziano: Qualification: Professional educator, expert in addictions and in conducting groups. Professional experience: She worked for two years as professional for a residential community for people in recovery. She is a member of the San Saturnino Onlus Social Cooperative and has also been working as a professional educator, trainer and mentor with drug addict persons or helping them in the acquisition of new skills and ways of learning aimed at facilitating access to employment.

3.5 Partner 5 – IRELAND (Soilse)

Pilot organisation – Soilse

Pilot organisation background

Soilse was established in 1992 as a drug rehabilitation programme using adult educational methodologies to secure social inclusion for addicts. Soilse is based in Dublin's North Inner City which arguably has the highest level of heroin use in Europe. Soilse has two facilities, one which stabilises active drug abusers and prepares them for detox and a second for social insertion. They work with approximately 150-200 people per year, all of whom have endured prolonged drug dependency and social marginalisation. Soilse has a Service Users Charter and has service users involved with the organisation at all levels.

Soilse offers holistic training assessing the personal and educational needs of the individual, e.g. an adult educational programme to develop personal and social learning competencies and individual capital. Soilse is both operationally and financially governed by, and accountable to, the HSE, Ireland's National Health Service. This has its own internal management structure of which Soilse is a part.

Trainers' professional profiles

Sonya Dillon: Holds a BA in Social Care and a Diploma in Counselling. She has 20 years' experience working in addiction and specialises in working with women and preparing people for Detox. She is an experienced adult educator and has wide experience of working in a multidisciplinary and interagency way.

Gerry McAleenan: Head of Services in Soilse holds a MBA in Health Service Management, a HDip in Adult Education and a BA in Social Science. He has previous experience of working on European programmes. He has worked in the area of Social Inclusion for 30 years, particularly in Addiction Rehabilitation for 20 years. He has extensive experience of adult education processes and initiatives.

4 PREPARATION ACTIVTIES BETWEEN FACILITATOR AND TRAINER

This chapter describes the preparation activities between facilitator and trainer. For the purposes of the pilot it was expected that facilitator would be a member of the RECOVEU Consortium. Their role was to facilitate the organisation of the pilot and be responsible for making sure that the trainer was fully aware of what they needed to do. The trainers' role was to deliver the course to participants. However, the roles of facilitator and trainer could be undertaken by the same person if required (for example, where the partner organisation was also the organisation running the pilot study).

(More specific details about the role of facilitator and trainer are given in the *Facilitation Pack Section 1 (Pilot): Delivery Guidelines.*)

4.1   Partner 1 – UK

The facilitator provided all documentation and the trainer read all documents and commented on the time taken to download and print all the materials in hard copy. This was important as not every participant had a level of digital literacy commensurate with the course requirements. She registered all participants on the digital literacy course and overall found this straightforward. The trainer felt the documents were self-explanatory and clear. She made workbooks for all participants and planned the evaluation process into the lessons – she found this straightforward.

4.2   Partner 2 – CYPRUS

The facilitator and the trainer spoke on the telephone to arrange the dates, venue and method of carrying out the pilot course. The trainer specified the number of participants required and the importance of maintaining their participation throughout. The facilitator ensured that they would confirm the participants' attendance 1.5 months prior to the pilot course.

Once this was confirmed, details as to the module content and activities were provided to the facilitator. Information regarding participants' rights and the overall scope of the project were also provided. The facilitator then complied with the Director of the Treatment Centre to receive confirmation on proceeding with the content and overall structure of the pilot course.

Upon agreement, the trainer and facilitator were in close contact two weeks prior to the beginning of the pilot course in order to ensure that:

- The room was reserved for the days that the pilot would run.
- The time of the pilot was suitable for all participants.
- A projector was provided.
- Paper and pens were provided.
- Participants understood the scope of the project and their role in the pilot course.

4.3   Partner 3 – ROMANIA

Preparation activities included:

- Setting the time and location adequate for the course.
- Preparing the course pack, PowerPoints and handouts – translation from English to Romanian, editing, printing, copying for each module.
- Planning each module according to the guidelines and accomplishing the objectives in the best way.
- Selecting the training group.
- Invite and send the invitations.
- Conducting the interviews.
- Maintaining contact in order to anticipate and solve any obstacles that arose.
- Providing feedback to each other.
- Arranging the training room and prepare the technical support (PC, projector, flipchart).
- Arranging for hospitality.
- Discussing how to apply the Evaluation Toolkit.
- Arranging a 'graduation ceremony' for participants on the course.

4.4   Partner 4 – ITALY

Preparation activities included:

- Networking to find a recovery organisation in which to develop the pilot: phone calls, e-mails, face-to-face meetings.
- Attending a meeting to explain the objectives and the contents of the Pilot with the Coordinator and an Educator of the CEIS – S. Carlo.
- Preparing the Facilitation Pack: translation from English to Italian, editing and printing.
- Several internal meetings with coordinator to analyse the Facilitation Pack and set the work. To facilitate participation, it was decided to use two trainers simultaneously throughout the course, according to the usual methodology adopted by SANSAT.
- Planning each module.
- Agreement with the community to arrange the room and equipment.

The first trainer also played the role of facilitator.

The training team carried out other preparatory meetings at the beginning of the course in February to define the teaching materials to be provided to the participants and the necessary tools to facilitate the training of the classroom (mobile whiteboard, markers, projector).

During the explanation meeting, the Coordinator and the Educator of the community:

- Described the recovery phases faced by the participants of the course.
- Contributed to the programming of the course taking care of the other commitments of the

participants.

- Were engaged in the booking of the room for the days of the course and in the identification of the provided computers.

The trainers provided each participant at the beginning of the course with a folder containing: a pen, a note pad and teaching materials foreseen for each modules (questionnaires, tools and the printed Course Pack).

4.5 Partner 5 – IRELAND

Interviews were carries out to recruit participants in early recovery. Regular meetings were held to plan and manage the learning activities for the project. An introduction and evaluation session occurred before and after the module delivery.

5   MODULE DELIVERY INFORMATION

Module delivery information for each partner country is presented in Tables 5.1 to 5.5. The Course Pack was delivered respecting the programme in each country.

In the main, trainers applied all contents and were able to adapt them to the needs and characteristics of participants; they integrated the modules with specific methodological approaches and additional activities and material where required.

Table 5.1   Module delivery information – UK

Module 1 – Digital Literacy

Date	Unit number and title	No. hours	No. Ps	Trainer/s	Tools/materials adopted*
30/3/16	1.1 Digital Divide and Digital Literacy	1	6	Liz Mullings	As supplied
30/3/16	1.2 Basic Computer Skills	1	6	Liz Mullings	As supplied
30/3/16	1.3 The Internet	1	6	Liz Mullings	As supplied
30/3/16	1.4 Social interactions	1	6	Liz Mullings	As supplied

Module 2 – Recovery and Resilience

Date	Unit number and title	No. hours	No. Ps	Trainer/s	Tools/materials adopted*
6/4/16	2.1 From Active Addiction to Recovery	1	6	Liz Mullings	As supplied
6/4/16	2.2 My Recovery Journey	1	6	Liz Mullings	As supplied
6/4/16	2.3 Building my Recovery Capital	1	6	Liz Mullings	As supplied
6/4/16	2.4 SMART Goals using the Principles of Recovery	1	6	Liz Mullings	As supplied

Module 3 – Learning to Learn

Date	Unit number and title	No. hours	No. Ps	Trainer/s	Tools/materials adopted*
13/4/16	3.1 Recovery-Centred Learning	1	6	Liz Mullings	As supplied
13/4/16	3.2 Challenges for Learners in Recovery	1	6	Liz Mullings	As supplied
13/4/16	3.3 Orientation for Access Education	1	6	Liz Mullings	As supplied
13/4/16	3.4 Learning Using Study skills	1	6	Liz Mullings	As supplied

Module 4 – Recovery and Community

Date	Unit number and title	No. hours	No. Ps	Trainer/s	Tools/materials adopted*
20/4/16	4.1 What is a Recovery Community?	1	6	Liz Mullings	As supplied
20/4/16	4.2 Functions of Recovery Communities	1	6	Liz Mullings	As supplied

Date	Unit number and title	No. hours	No. Ps	Trainer/s	Tools/materials adopted*
20/4/16	4.3 What is a Recovery Coach?	1	6	Liz Mullings	As supplied
20/4/16	4.4 Next steps – Personal Action	1	6	Liz Mullings	As supplied

Module 5 – Recovery and Employability

Date	Unit number and title	No. hours	No. Ps	Trainer/s	Tools/materials adopted*
27/4/16	5.1 People in Recovery and Employability Skills	1	6	Liz Mullings	As supplied
27/4/16	5.2 Understanding the Social Enterprise	1	6	Liz Mullings	As supplied
27/4/16	5.3 Applying the Social Enterprise Model to Recovery	1	6	Liz Mullings	As supplied
27/4/16	5.4 Designing a Recovery Social Enterprise	1	6	Liz Mullings	As supplied

*'As supplied': tools and materials adopted are as the Course Pack; 'Additional': the Course Pack has been supplemented with additional materials.

Table 5.2 Module delivery information – CYPRUS

Module 1 – Digital Literacy

Date	Unit number and title	No. hours	No. Ps	Trainer/s	Tools/materials adopted*
29/3/16	1.1 Digital Divide and Digital Literacy	1	8	Eliza Patouris	As supplied
29/3/16	1.2 Basic computer skills	1	8	Eliza Patouris	As supplied
29/3/16	1.3 The Internet	1	8	Eliza Patouris	As supplied
31/3/16	1.4 Social interactions	1	8	Eliza Patouris	As supplied

Module 2 – Recovery and Resilience

Date	Unit number and title	No. hours	No. Ps	Trainer/s	Tools/materials adopted*
18/2/16	2.1 From Active Addiction to Recovery	1	11	Eliza Patouris	As supplied
18/2/16	2.2 My Recovery Journey	1	11	Eliza Patouris	As supplied + Additional: Discussion questions on 'What is Addiction', ' What is Sobriety', 'How you go from drug use to addiction', 'What is the turning point from addiction to recovery?'
23/2/16	2.3 Building my Recovery Capital	1	11	Eliza Patouris	As supplied
23/2/16	2.4 SMART Goals using the Principles of Recovery	1	11	Eliza Patouris	As supplied

Module 3 – Learning to Learn					
Date	Unit number and title	No. hours	No. Ps	Trainer/s	Tools/materials adopted*
08/3/16	3.1 Recovery-Centred Learning	1	7	Eliza Patouris	As supplied
08/3/16	3.2 Challenges for Learners in Recovery	1	7	Eliza Patouris	As supplied
10/3/16	3.3 Orientation for Access Education	1	7	Eliza Patouris	As supplied + Additional: Sample of short essay written by a university bachelor student (to show introduction, main part, summary, bibliography, appendices); Website tour (offline); University study programme booklet; University student services booklet; University student application website.
10/3/16	3.4 Learning Using Study skills	1	7	Eliza Patouris	As supplied
Module 4 – Recovery and Community					
Date	Unit number and title	No. hours	No. Ps	Trainer/s	Tools/materials adopted*
15/3/16	4.1 What is a Recovery Community?	1	8	Eliza Patouris	Supplied: PowerPoint presentation. Additional: Discussion of differences between a functional and dysfunctional recovery community.
15/3/16	4.2 Functions of Recovery Communities	1	8	Eliza Patouris	Supplied: Boundaries worksheet. Additional: Discussion of roles and responsibilities of a recovery coach.
17/3/16	4.3 What is a Recovery Coach?	1	8	Eliza Patouris	Supplied: PowerPoint (the 'Recovery Coaching Training Manual' was not in the translation checklist and was not used).
17/3/16	4.4 Next steps – Personal Action	1	8	Eliza Patouris	Supplied: Daily Inventory Worksheet. Additional: Discussion on comparison of worksheets amongst them to identify similarities and differences.

Module 5 – Recovery and Employability					
Date	**Unit number and title**	**No. hours**	**No. Ps**	**Trainer/s**	**Tools/materials adopted***
22/3/16	5.1 People in Recovery and Employability Skills	1	7	Eliza Patouris	As supplied + Additional: CV template: Details on format, content and how to best present themselves. Interview preparation and how to answer questions.
22/3/16	5.2 Understanding the Social Enterprise	1	7	Eliza Patouris	As supplied + Additional: PowerPoint on how to upload a job advert on a website.
24/3/16	5.3 Applying the Social Enterprise Model to Recovery	1	7	Eliza Patouris	As supplied
24/3/16	5.4 Designing a Recovery Social Enterprise	1	7	Eliza Patouris	As supplied

Table 5.3 Module delivery information – Romania					
Module 1 – Digital Literacy					
Date	**Unit number and title**	**No. hours**	**No. Ps**	**Trainer/s**	**Tools/materials adopted***
30/3/16	1.1 Digital Divide and Digital Literacy	1	12	Nicoleta Amariei	As supplied
30/3/16	1.2 Basic computer skills	1	12	Nicoleta Amariei	As supplied
30/3/16	1.3 The Internet	1	12	Mihaela Stanceanu	As supplied
30/3/16	1.4 Social interactions	1	12	Nicoleta Amariei	As supplied + Additional: A list of abbreviations used online in Romanian
Module 2 – Recovery and Resilience					
Date	**Unit number and title**	**No. hours**	**No. Ps**	**Trainer/s**	**Tools/materials adopted***
02/3/16	2.1 From Active Addiction to Recovery	1	14	Nicoleta Amariei	As supplied + Additional: Translated and subtitled the movie *Russell Brand: Addiction to Recovery*
02/3/16	2.2 My Recovery Journey	1	14	Nicoleta Amariei	As supplied
02/3/16	2.3 Building my Recovery Capital	1	14	Mihaela Stanceanu	As supplied
02/3/16	2.4 SMART Goals using the Principles of	1	14	Nicoleta Amariei	As supplied

	Recovery				
Module 3 – Learning to Learn					
Date	**Unit number and title**	**No. hours**	**No. Ps**	**Trainer/s**	**Tools/materials adopted***
09/3/16	3.1 Recovery-Centred Learning	1	15	Nicoleta Amariei	As supplied
09/3/16	3.2 Challenges for Learners in Recovery	1	15	Nicoleta Amariei	As supplied
09/3/16	3.3 Orientation for Access Education	1	15	Mihaela Stanceanu	As supplied
09/3/16	3.4 Learning Using Study skills	1	15	Nicoleta Amariei	As supplied
Module 4 – Recovery and Community					
Date	**Unit number and title**	**No. hours**	**No. Ps**	**Trainer/s**	**Tools/materials adopted***
16/3/16	Essay assignment – read and feedback	30 minutes	13	Nicoleta Amariei	Additional
16/3/16	4.1 What is a Recovery Community?	40 minutes	13	Ion Copoeru	As supplied + Additional: Discussion on how we understand the recovering community from the perspective of the 12 steps community.
16/3/16	4.2 Functions of Recovery Communities	35 minutes	13	Ion Copoeru	As supplied + Additional: Why is it relevant for the participants to belong to a recovering community? – short brainstorming.
16/3/16	4.3 What is a Recovery Coach?	1	13	Ion Copoeru	As supplied + Additional: Addiction topic discussion on the role of the 12 step sponsor ('godfather' in Romanian) in support group.
16/3/16	4.4 Next steps – Personal Action	1 hour 5 minutes	13	Ion Copoeru	As supplied
Module 5 – Recovery and Employability					
Date	**Unit number and title**	**No. hours**	**No. Ps**	**Trainer/s**	**Tools/materials adopted***
23/3/16	5.1 People in Recovery and Employability Skills	1	15	Mihaela Stanceanu	As supplied
23/3/16	5.2 Understanding the Social Enterprise	1	15	Mihaela Stanceanu	As supplied + Additional: PowerPoint on types of social enterprise in Romania.
23/3/16	5.3 Applying the Social Enterprise Model to Recovery	1	15	Mihaela Stanceanu	As supplied
23/3/16	5.4 Designing a Recovery Social Enterprise	1 hour 5 minutes	15	Mihaela Stanceanu	As supplied

Table 5.4   Module delivery information – Italy

Module 1 – Digital Literacy

Date	Unit number and title	No. hours	No. Ps	Trainer/s	Tools/materials adopted*
10/3/16	1.1 Digital Divide and Digital Literacy	1	18	Isabella Cardigliano Silvia Graziano	As supplied
10/3/16	1.2 Basic computer skills	1	18	Isabella Cardigliano Silvia Graziano	As supplied
10/3/16	1.3 The Internet	1	18	Isabella Cardigliano Silvia Graziano	As supplied
10/3/16	1.4 Social interactions	1	18	Isabella Cardigliano Silvia Graziano	As supplied

Module 2 – Recovery and Resilience

Date	Unit number and title	No. hours	No. Ps	Trainer/s	Tools/materials adopted*
24/3/16	2.1 From Active Addiction to Recovery	1	15	Isabella Cardigliano Silvia Graziano	As supplied
24/3/16	2.2 My Recovery Journey	1	15	Isabella Cardigliano Silvia Graziano	As supplied
24/3/16	2.3 Building my Recovery Capital	1	15	Isabella Cardigliano Silvia Graziano	As supplied
24/3/16	2.4 SMART Goals using the Principles of Recovery	1	15	Isabella Cardigliano Silvia Graziano	As supplied

Module 3 – Learning to Learn

Date	Unit number and title	No. hours	No. Ps	Trainer/s	Tools/materials adopted*
07/4/16	3.1 Recovery-Centred Learning	1	15	Isabella Cardigliano Silvia Graziano	As supplied
07/4/16	3.2 Challenges for Learners in Recovery	1	15	Isabella Cardigliano Silvia Graziano	As supplied
07/4/16	3.3 Orientation for Access Education	1	15	Isabella Cardigliano Silvia Graziano	As supplied
07/4/16	3.4 Learning Using Study skills	1	15	Isabella Cardigliano Silvia Graziano	As supplied + Additional: A customised grid for each desired profession where is described, step by step, the actions to take in order to improve the profession through new training courses developed on the territory.

Also, an individual test to discover the own personal 'intelligence' and the best way to take advantage of it in the employment |

					reality.

Module 4 – Recovery and Community

Date	Unit number and title	No. hours	No. Ps	Trainer/s	Tools/materials adopted*
14/4/16	4.1 What is a Recovery Community?	1	13	Isabella Cardigliano Silvia Graziano	As supplied
14/4/16	4.2 Functions of Recovery Communities	1	13	Isabella Cardigliano Silvia Graziano	As supplied
14/4/16	4.3 What is a Recovery Coach?	1	13	Isabella Cardigliano Silvia Graziano	As supplied
14/4/16	4.4 Next steps – Personal Action	1	13	Isabella Cardigliano Silvia Graziano	As supplied

Module 5 – Recovery and Employability

Date	Unit number and title	No. hours	No. Ps	Trainer/s	Tools/materials adopted*
20/4/16	5.1 People in Recovery and Employability Skills	1	14	Isabella Cardigliano Silvia Graziano	As supplied
20/4/16	5.2 Understanding the Social Enterprise	1	14	Isabella Cardigliano Silvia Graziano	As supplied + Additional: A grid to facilitate the description of the of formal and informal network resources made available by small groups to each member
20/4/16	5.3 Applying the Social Enterprise Model to Recovery	1	14	Isabella Cardigliano Silvia Graziano	As supplied
20/4/16	5.4 Designing a Recovery Social Enterprise	1	14	Isabella Cardigliano Silvia Graziano	As supplied

Table 5.5 Module delivery information – Ireland

Module 1 – Digital Literacy

Date	Unit number and title	No. hours	No. Ps	Trainer/s	Tools/materials adopted*
04/2/16	1.1 Digital Divide and Digital Literacy	2	13	Michael Russell Sonya Dillon Gerry McAleenan	As supplied + Additional: A large number of participants had no email accounts. This had to be done before getting onto the RECOVEU website. Therefore, we had to use hard copies of the Module Outline for the first session as there was no access to the RECOVEU website. All materials/electronic

					equipment were supplied for each module unit.
08/2/16	1.2 Basic computer skills	2	13	Michael Russell Sonya Dillon Gerry McAleenan	As supplied
18/2/16	1.3 The Internet	2	13	Michael Russell Sonya Dillon Gerry McAleenan	As supplied

Module 2 – Recovery and Resilience

Date	Unit number and title	No. hours	No. Ps	Trainer/s	Tools/materials adopted*
11/2/16	2.1 From Active Addiction to Recovery	1	13	Sonya Dillon Gerry McAleenan	As supplied
11/2/16	2.2 My Recovery Journey	1	13	Sonya Dillon Gerry McAleenan	As supplied
15/2/14	2.3 Building my Recovery Capital	1	13	Sonya Dillon Gerry McAleenan	As supplied
15/2/14	2.4 SMART Goals using the Principles of Recovery	1	13	Sonya Dillon Gerry McAleenan	As supplied + Additional: Copy of the Principles of Recovery added and presented as an overhead.

Module 3 – Learning to Learn

Date	Unit number and title	No. hours	No. Ps	Trainer/s	Tools/materials adopted*
22/2/16	3.1 Recovery-Centred Learning	1	12	Sonya Dillon Gerry McAleenan	As supplied
22/2/16	3.2 Challenges for Learners in Recovery	1	12	Sonya Dillon Gerry McAleenan	As supplied
25/2/16	3.3 Orientation for Access Education	1	12	Sonya Dillon Gerry McAleenan	As supplied + Additional: An on-line psychological test to determine: (a) the learning profile of the participant, (b) aptitude of the learner in terms of career profiles. This was in lieu of a field visit.
25/2/16	3.4 Learning Using Study skills	1	12	Sonya Dillon Gerry McAleenan	As supplied

Module 4 – Recovery and Community

Date	Unit number and title	No. hours	No. Ps	Trainer/s	Tools/materials adopted*
7/3/16	4.1 What is a Recovery Community?	1	11	Sonya Dillon Gerry McAleenan	As supplied
7/3/16	4.2 Functions of Recovery Communities	1	11	Sonya Dillon Gerry McAleenan	As supplied + Additional: Trainers asked a recovery coach to speak about their background, training and obligations being a

STAFFORDSHIRE UNIVERSITY

CARDET

St.Dimitrie Program

cooperativa sociale s.saturnino onlus

Date	Unit number and title	No. hours	No. Ps	Trainer/s	Tools/materials adopted*
					recovery coach as an additional learning input
10/3/16	4.3 What is a Recovery Coach?	1	11	Sonya Dillon Gerry McAleenan	As supplied
10/3/16	4.4 Next steps – Personal Action	1	11	Sonya Dillon Gerry McAleenan	As supplied

Module 5 – Recovery and Employability

Date	Unit number and title	No. hours	No. Ps	Trainer/s	Tools/materials adopted*
14/3/16	5.1 People in Recovery and Employability Skills	1	11	Sonya Dillon Gerry M Aleenan	As supplied
14/3/16	5.2 Understanding the Social Enterprise	1	11	Sonya Dillon Gerry McAleenan	As supplied + Additional: Material of a housing co-op to be applied to a recovery social enterprise; how social enterprises work in Ireland (e.g. credit union/housing co-ops).
21/3/16	5.3 Applying the Social Enterprise Model to Recovery	1	11	Sonya Dillon Gerry McAleenan	As supplied but only used slide 4 to discuss skills, aptitude and behaviours.
21/3/16	5.4 Designing a Recovery Social Enterprise	1	11	Sonya Dillon Gerry McAleenan	As supplied + Additional: Trainers adapted 'The Apprentice' for a business plan from two groups and also did a mock job interview after doing CV's.

6 OVERALL SATISFACTION OF THE MODULES

6.1 Satisfaction Levels in Relation to Module Delivery

Table 6.1 Trainers' overall satisfaction level in relation to module delivery

Module 1 – Digital Literacy

	Poor	Fair	Acceptable	Good	Excellent
P1 – UK				X	
P2 – Cyprus				X	
P3 – Romania				X	
P4 – Italy				X	
P5 – Ireland				X	

Module 2 – Recovery and Resilience

	Poor	Fair	Acceptable	Good	Excellent
P1 – UK				X	
P2 – Cyprus				X	
P3 – Romania					X
P4 – Italy				X	
P5 – Ireland				X	

Module 3 – Learning to Learn

	Poor	Fair	Acceptable	Good	Excellent
P1 – UK				X	
P2 – Cyprus				X	
P3 – Romania				X	
P4 – Italy			X		
P5 – Ireland				X	

Module 4 – Recovery and Community

	Poor	Fair	Acceptable	Good	Excellent
P1 – UK				X	
P2 – Cyprus			X		
P3 – Romania			X		
P4 – Italy			X		
P5 – Ireland			X		

Module 5 – Recovery and Employability

	Poor	Fair	Acceptable	Good	Excellent
P1 – UK				X	
P2 – Cyprus				X	
P3 – Romania				X	
P4 – Italy				X	
P5 – Ireland				X	

Table 6.2 Trainers' perception of the satisfaction level of participants					
Module 1 – Digital Literacy					
	Poor	**Fair**	**Acceptable**	**Good**	**Excellent**
P1 – UK			X		
P2 – Cyprus				X	
P3 – Romania				X	
P4 – Italy				X	
P5 – Ireland				X	
Module 2 – Recovery and Resilience					
	Poor	**Fair**	**Acceptable**	**Good**	**Excellent**
P1 – UK				X	
P2 – Cyprus				X	
P3 – Romania					X
P4 – Italy					X
P5 – Ireland				X	
Module 3 – Learning to Learn					
	Poor	**Fair**	**Acceptable**	**Good**	**Excellent**
P1 – UK				X	
P2 – Cyprus				X	
P3 – Romania				X	
P4 – Italy				X	
P5 – Ireland				X	
Module 4 – Recovery and Community					
	Poor	**Fair**	**Acceptable**	**Good**	**Excellent**
P1 – UK				X	
P2 – Cyprus				X	
P3 – Romania				X	
P4 – Italy				X	
P5 – Ireland			X		
Module 5 – Recovery and Employability					
	Poor	**Fair**	**Acceptable**	**Good**	**Excellent**
P1 – UK			X		
P2 – Cyprus				X	
P3 – Romania					X
P4 – Italy				X	
P5 – Ireland				X	

6.2 Summary Conclusions on Satisfaction of the Modules

Overall, the trainers found the participants satisfied with all the modules and the evaluation is 'good' in relation to modules delivery.

By analysing the different assessments, we can observe that the satisfaction level depends on the specific recovery phase in which the participants are: in the first phase of recovery, people are more interested in Module 2 (Recovery and Resilience) and Module 4 (Recovery and Community); in a recovery phase more oriented to social reintegration, they are interested in the other modules. This means that the course should be adapted taking into account the specific characteristics of the group of participants.

The consortium has delivered a pilot, or rather an experimental course, to understand if the structure and contents are effective. Certainly, it seems preferable to plan more time for the all modules and for specific contents in particular: this was highlighted as an element to be improved.

As reported in *Del. 7.2: Qualitative Feedback Review*, some critical points are related to the organisational elements (i.e. technical resources). Others concern more specific contents and these are discussed in the following chapter.

7 TRAINERS' FEEDBACK ON CONTENT AND DELIVERY

7.1	**Was the Module Outline provided, an adequate foundation for the module? Why/why not? How might it be improved?**

Module 1 – Digital Literacy

UK:
- ✓ Yes. The trainer felt the Module Outline provided comprehensive guidance to the modules as it detailed all the steps they would need to take to deliver the module, what to include and where to locate the information.

CYPRUS:
- ✓ The Module Outline provided an adequate foundation for the module. It was useful to understand the scope of each unit so that relevant discussions could be planned around these.

ROMANIA:
- ✓ The outline gives a short summary and guide for what the training will offer as far as digital literacy, both for trainers and trainees.
- ✓ A time frame could be useful in knowing realistically how much time is needed to cover each unit of the module

ITALY:
- ✓ Topics covered by the module were developed in an appropriate manner in the units.
- ✓ The only weak point was related to the different levels of the digital competences of participants. The module was most appreciated by the participants who already had basic skills: they valued the last two units as boring; people who had no computer skills would have wanted more time and more practical exercises.

IRELAND:
- ✓ The Module Outline was adequate for anyone who already had a foundation in digital literacy.
- ✓ Many participants, however, did not have this level of competence. Indeed, few had an e-mail address which was a requirement to register for the digital literacy module.
- ✓ Some content should be added to the course to identify baseline competencies for undertaking the module.
- ✓ Importantly the module gave us the opportunity to explore issues like privacy and safety on-line whilst also looking at the potential for networking and learning.

Module 2 – Recovery and Resilience

UK:
- ✓ Yes, provided information to take you through the units, it was clear what the unit was designed for.

CYPRUS:

- ✓ The Module Outline provided an adequate foundation for the module. It provided important information that were useful for the trainer to prepare the sessions.
- ✓ Suggestion for improvement would be to include more information about the specific activities in the Module Outline. For example, more guidance was needed on the Cloud and Granfield (2008) study. The course pack did not include information that further explained the study. For example, information like 'participant profile – recovery does not mean complete abstinence' had to be further researched in order to be explained properly. Some questions were raised as to the applicability of this study, i.e. 'can there be addiction recovery without treatment?' Therefore, a follow-up on the study's outcomes and applicability would have highly enriched the discussions and the quality of information provided to the participants.

ROMANIA:
- ✓ It offered a short clear comprehensive imagine of what to be expected and done.

ITALY:
- ✓ The topics covered by the module have been well described and allowed trainers to elaborate interesting teaching units for the participants.
- ✓ To introduce the main concept of capital recovery participants were asked to describe the job they would like to start at the end of their recovery path. In this way, participants had the opportunity to reflect on what they had to realise their dream and to describe their physical, social, capital, recovery etc.
- ✓ Trainers also had to ensure a shared space required by most of the participants after the elaboration of their *life line*. The need to share with the trainers and with the group the participants own personal history helped to create a climate of trust and cooperation for the following modules

IRELAND:
- ✓ The module was adequate. We were well versed in understanding the topic and delivery of same.
- ✓ There was not enough time/space to explore the material in the depth it requires - otherwise it amounts to a superficial scan of the surface of the module.
- ✓ The concept of recovery needs more time. The principles of recovery were not included in the outline but we touched on them as they create a practical vision for what recovery is about.

Module 3 – Learning to Learn

UK:
- ✓ Yes. It allowed for planning activities for visits and enabled us to discuss Further Education and what/how/when to engage. We also had a talk by an NVQ assessor about these courses and what was required.

CYPRUS:
- ✓ The Module Outline was sufficient regarding the content that was covered in the sessions. It was clear and followed a logical structure as to the learning methods used during recovery.

ROMANIA:
- ✓ It offered a short clear comprehensive imagine of what to be expected and done.

ITALY:

- ✓ The structuring of the module was adequate, but the latest units were addressed exclusively to those participants who had previously shown a strong motivation to continue their studies, by increasing their education.
- ✓ To improve the module and involve the entire group a specific session was dedicated to the concept of the 'multiple intelligences' following the theory of Gardner.

IRELAND:

- ✓ The Module Outline was comprehensive and delivered as envisaged apart from the digital piece in lieu for the college visit. We felt this was useful (to profile the learner/to look at possible career options) as people were very unsure of what they wanted to do in the future in terms of studying.
- ✓ We also looked at study skills using a mind map approach and the requirements you needed for second chance learning plus the possible supports on offer.

Module 4 – Recovery and Community

UK:

- ✓ Yes. Very clear structure for explaining recovery communities and the role of a recovery coach.

CYPRUS:

- ✓ The Module Outline overall provided a good idea about the purpose of the module. Some areas were helpful although some others needed improving. For example, Unit 4 and the activities within (Daily Inventory worksheet, Group discussion – Key Learning for Me) lacked information in the Module Outline regarding its scope. This made it difficult to link the activities and materials within the unit to the rest of the module.
- ✓ To improve that section, more information is required on how it is linked to the overall module.

ROMANIA:

- ✓ The overview and the objectives of the module have framed the general learning scope, but the explanations for each unit gave too little information on how the unit should be taught. This would be relevant since much of the information is cultural specific, so it was harder for us to relate the theoretical part with our Romanian reality regarding the recovering communities. We had to go online to search for more information on the NTA acceptance of a 'drug free' community and relate to our participants understanding to the recovering community defined as the social support network and the self-help groups.

ITALY:

- ✓ As noted above, the course was carried out in a recovery residential community and in particular was presented only to those users who had already successfully passed the first stage of recovery, which involves the interruption from addiction for at least one year. To facilitate their participation, the group were asked to identify the characteristics that a good recovery coach (or professional/educator) should have and describe the instruments used within the community to make effective the recovery path.

IRELAND:

- ✓ Could have been better. The Module Outline was limited in scope and applicable content. It was very culturally focused on the UK with knowledge and insight that perhaps was not understandable elsewhere. There could have been more creativity here also in the learning

RECOVEU: A participative approach to curriculum development for adults in addiction recovery across the European Union
[Project Number: 538955-LLP-1-2013-1-UK-GRUNDTVIG-GMP]

transactions. Examples from other kinds of communities (disadvantaged, therapeutic, religious, Traveller-Romany, LGBT, rural, etc.) would have been useful. Prison may also have been a community experience for many of our participants.

✓ In particular, we used the LGBT community campaign in Ireland over the last 30 years to demonstrate how powerful communities can become when people work together around agreed objectives.

✓ A major issue was vigilantes in communities in Dublin historically against drug users. This caused much pain and alienation from communities which needs explored.

✓ Models of recovery community initiatives like housing would be applicable here.

Module 5 – Recovery and Employability

UK:

✓ Yes. The guidelines explained how to deliver the unit, what to include and how to access information.

CYPRUS:

✓ The Module Outline was adequate with regards to how the module should be run and what exercises to use to facilitate learning. It provided detailed guidelines on its overall scope. However, some of the exercises provided (e.g. group exercise: identify risks and rewards of social enterprise – 15 minutes) lacked supplementary information to help guide the trainer on how best to run this exercise.

✓ Also the content of the module was about employability but there were important topics that were left out (e.g. CV writing, interview preparation). The module could be improved with emphasis placed on issues that adults in addiction recovery need help with in order to enable them to 'access learning'.

ROMANIA:

✓ It offered a short clear comprehensive imagine of what to be expected and done.

ITALY:

✓ The module was adequate and the tools provided were recognized as effective and interesting for the participants.

✓ It would be appropriate to increase time to create the CV and provide the techniques to answer to the job requests.

IRELAND:

✓ Yes, the outline was good.

✓ The concept of social enterprise is hard to grasp in a limited timeframe. Language and concepts need to be in plain English. As in all our modules concepts and language need continually reframed and simplified.

7.2 Were the learning objectives of the module clear? Why/why not? How might they be improved?

Module 1 – Digital Literacy

UK:

- ✓ Yes. Outcomes were clear – they signposted the learners to additional resources should they wish to continue learning around each topic.

CYPRUS:

- ✓ The learning objectives were clear. They were reflective of the module content and focused on increasing digital literacy among the participants using interactive methods.

ROMANIA:

- ✓ The objectives are clear, although some participants expected a deeper and more intensive training in using the computer and in acquiring stronger computer skills.
- ✓ A digital literacy course for four hours is not enough for people with fewer abilities. Is very important and requires more work.

ITALY:

- ✓ The objectives were clear.
- ✓ Intermediate activities of verification on the learning achieved could be useful.

IRELAND:

- ✓ Learning objectives were clear.
- ✓ However, many participants could not understand why they would need so much detail in some sections such as file form formats.

Module 2 – Recovery and Resilience

UK:

- ✓ Yes. Participants understood how to build on what they have learnt and how to improve learning in the future.

CYPRUS:

- ✓ The learning objectives were clear. They were reflective of the module content and focused on recovery being a holistic process.

ROMANIA:

- ✓ Yes. Participants were able to understand and integrate in their lives mainly because they are in the recovery process and had been sober for at least six months.

ITALY:

- ✓ The objectives of the module were clear and suitable for the recovery path undertaken by the participants. The units presented allowed the group to increase its level of empowerment and focus on the positive existing resources.

IRELAND:

- ✓ The learning objectives were clear. Time and the intensity of getting through the material made it extremely challenging to meet the learning objectives.
- ✓ We were also conscious not to stray into therapeutic and sensitive personal issues.

Module 3 – Learning to Learn

UK:

- ✓ Yes. Provided good information on learning. The examples - report writing and degree

assignments were challenging for some participants but the trainer steered these individuals to other examples.

CYPRUS:
- ✓ The learning objectives were clear and useful. A suggestion for improvement would be to add techniques for participants to use when dealing with barriers in their learning experience. Although part of the objectives included dealing with positive and negative learning experiences, more information was needed on how to successfully resolve a potential future negative learning experience.
- ✓ Again, part of the learning elements included 'YouTube' videos which I did not have access to due lack of internet at the treatment centre. In order to take this course forward it would be useful to include videos that have been downloaded in advance, so that they can be projected in 'offline' environments.

ROMANIA:
- ✓ Yes. Maybe too ambitious, but good.

ITALY:
- ✓ The objectives of module were clear. However, it was decided to open the meeting with a brainstorming on learning to define more comprehensively the arguments developed in the module.
- ✓ All participants completed the description on the school experience, highlighting the difficulties and limit that led to their failure at school. One thing worth mentioning valid for all the students concerned the fact that all of them had been involved in anti-social and provocative conduct against the teaching staff creating damage to the Institute. The school's long absences and notes of conduct contributed to increasing their school drop-out. Only two out of the 14 users attended the university, but interrupted their studies (Law and Letters); four users took the middle school diploma following night school courses, two had the first school diploma (Accounting and Professional Institute), one had not even completed elementary school, five had the middle school diploma.
- ✓ It was not possible to complete the module due to the lack of interest shown by the group class to continue the studies. Moreover, the absence of an internet connection meant there was no chance to show the provided videos.

IRELAND:
- ✓ The module objectives were clear and understood by participants.
- ✓ As always there are concerns about time to deliver the content properly and to deconstruct and use appropriate language.

Module 4 – Recovery and Community

UK:
- ✓ Yes. Units worked towards creating an understanding of building recovery capital. Participants understood what recovery capital and recovery communities referred to and why this was important knowledge.

CYPRUS:
- ✓ The learning objectives were clear.
- ✓ However, the module content and structure was lacking in some areas regarding the ways

that these objectives could be realised. More materials, more guidance and further information was necessary in order to fully transfer the objectives through the module.

ROMANIA:

✓ The learning objectives were clearly phrased, but we could not correlate them with the unit content, i.e. the understanding of how to become involved in a recovering community & Community engagement worksheet was missing from the training material.

✓ Also the personal action plan was not clearly defined and presented.

ITALY:

✓ The objectives of the module were clear. However, the structuring of the module seemed more addressed at the professionals of the residential communities rather than users.

IRELAND:

✓ Yes, the module objectives were clear but the learning activities such as the Recovery Coach Manual was not particularly pitched at our audience.

Module 5 – Recovery and Employability

UK:

✓ Yes. Participants understood how working in social enterprise could be beneficial to people in recovery.

CYPRUS:

✓ The learning objectives were clear. They helped the trainer understand the overall scope of the module and guide the content accordingly. Some aspects of the learning objectives were slightly ambitious. For example:
   - Discuss employability skills.
   - Understand at a deeper level what is involved in social enterprise.

✓ For the first point there was not much content corresponding to this. Employability skills such as teamwork, communication, problem-solving were not referred to.

✓ Also, although the objective of the module was to understand what is involved in a social enterprise at a deeper level, the trainer felt that the time allocated to this was limited to enable full comprehension.

ROMANIA:

✓ Very good.

ITALY:

✓ The objectives of the modules were clear to the participants from the start of the course.

IRELAND:

✓ Yes. One person struggled with the module but the objectives were clear.

7.3 Were the Core and Culture-Specific Learning Activities for this module clear and useful? Why/why not? How might they be improved?

Module 1 – Digital Literacy

UK:

- ✓ Yes. Participants understood that improved digital literacy enabled people to use online resources to increase learning opportunities and social opportunities.

CYPRUS:

- ✓ Although the activities were clear and useful, it was not possible to run these with the participants. This was due to the absence of computers at the venue which the pilot groups took place. The lack of internet connection meant that this Module had to be run using an offline version which disallowed the link to several important links such as useful websites/online forums on addiction and recovery.
- ✓ It would also be good to improve the content by replacing some aspects such as 'APACHE' and inserting more basic software programmes such as Microsoft Office. In doing so, this will correspond to participants' low digital literacy level and help them start from the very foundation of digital literacy and work their way upwards.

ROMANIA:

- ✓ Although digital literacy had the trait of a core module, we have encountered culture specific issues related to the fact that WWW is mostly used in English and a good share of participants are not English speakers.
- ✓ The 'scenario' type activities worked well for our culture too; we did not encounter any problems regarding them.
- ✓ The presentation form of the activities made it all more interesting, while they had to apply certain skills already acquired (i.e. drag and drop). The online course was very stimulating.

ITALY:

- ✓ The activities proposed were clear but we were not able to develop all of them because:
  - Computers were not sufficient (five PCs only).
  - The Internet connection was very slow.
- ✓ More practical exercises would be very useful.

IRELAND:

- ✓ The learning activities could be understood best by using recovery based conversational sessions. If these were built into the module it would allow participants to communicate with each other in a forum setting.
- ✓ The language needs simplifying and possibly defined in an easy to use glossary.

Module 2 – Recovery and Resilience

UK:

- ✓ Yes. Participants understood that key recovery tools, as used previously in treatment centres are central to building a firm recovery. They felt working with SMART value based objectives as it had been introduced to them previously, in treatment.

CYPRUS:

- ✓ The Russell Brand activity was not used because the centre where the focus groups took place did not have internet.
- ✓ The SMART goals activity could be improved with added questions to help the adults in addiction recovery come up with their goals. Using the S.M.A.R.T. criteria was not clear

enough for them. I found that I had to guide them further with questions like 'How do you plan to do that?', 'What barriers do you expect to find?', 'How do you plan to overcome them?', 'When do you want to do that?', 'Why do you want to do that?', 'How realistic is that using this timeframe?'. These additional questions helped frame the purpose of the SMART goal activity. They found it slightly challenging to understand concepts such as 'MEASURABLE' or 'ATTAINABLE'. So some terms needed further elaboration using additional questions.

✓ So to help participants to form their goals, the SMART method could be used with additional specific questions that serve as extra guidance.

ROMANIA:

✓ Yes. They were applicable and the participants relate to all the ideas (cultural and core).

✓ The terms resilience and recovery capital were new even for the trainer. They asked for more clarification about what moral and social capital is and whether the recovery capital built as a process or as an initial asset in the recovery process?

✓ The public figure of Russell Brand was very charismatic and they related with the way Romanian society sees addiction and recovery too, as being mostly a medical issue.

✓ Also the planning process was a newly term in relation to their recovery.

✓ It was not clear whether the SMART goals to be completed for the period in the past when they began their recovery or to make the chart for the next six or 12 months in advance.

ITALY:

✓ The concepts of core and cultural were clear.

✓ The structuring of experiential activities increased the level of concentration of the group class.

✓ All the participants were brought into play and actively participated in the group discussions and activities.

IRELAND:

✓ Yes. We addressed the topic from both perspectives and this created great interest. The Russell Brand piece worked very well. The reason for this was it is culturally applicable to the experiences of drug users in recovery. Three short clips allowed us to explore all the main issues related to addiction and dependency. Importantly Brand is a well-known face who has authenticity who can challenge the perceived wisdom of the professionals.

✓ Also the module allowed us to look at recovery from an Irish, UK and from an international perspective. We were able to gain insight into the challenges and strengths experienced by all. This was at a service user, organisational and policy level.

Module 3 – Learning to Learn

UK:

✓ Yes. *Core* subjects helped challenge barriers to learning and understand why individuals learn in different ways. Cultural helped with informing learners how to access learning and at what level.

CYPRUS:

✓ The learning activities were useful. A suggestion would be to include videos that are downloadable so that we could use them offline.

✓ Also in relation to the 'Challenges to Learning worksheet' (3.2A), although this was a very

insightful exercise the trainer could benefit from a guidance sheet that helps give the 'appropriate' responses to each of those challenges. For example, one of the challenges presented was how participants would cope with alcohol or drug use if they were to go to a university in the future. Some suggested isolating themselves from these groups, some others suggested lying about their past and others were more keen on being honest and trying to keep control when around these substances. The trainer allowed for all opinions to come through but would have preferred a guidance sheet that complements this activity.

✓ As an assignment, participants were meant to write a short report on the college visit, website visit or meeting with the recovering student, using the 'Structure of a Report' handout (3.3B). This was a homework piece to be brought in and discussed in the next session. This was not possible to accomplish given that Unit 3 and Unit 4 were completed on the same day.

✓ A suggestion would be to have a much shorter report (i.e. a paragraph explaining the summary of the visit/website/meeting).

ROMANIA:

✓ The activities offered a general view on the academic requests and the participants could use this as a template for specific cases.

✓ Participants were very glad to share their school experiences and process the new challenges in the modern society.

✓ Experiential learning was also a new term that was introduced to participants.

✓ The report according to the structure was done using a topic related to recovery, for example, 'Alcoholism as a disease' and 'Using art as a recovery tool'. Probably this was not very adequate, and an 'essay' could have been better.

ITALY:

✓ The module activities were considered useful, although as mentioned above it was not possible to project the videos.

IRELAND:

✓ Yes. The module introduced learners to the concept of experiential learning and brought up a lot of experiential issues that provided good collaborative learning and insight. Ideas and examples of learning in recovery allowed the exploration of personal feelings, stigma, rejection and how to overcome these.

✓ It also gave us an opportunity to look at the individuals learning styles and how to prepare to engage in second chance learning.

✓ Discussing on early school leaving, illiteracy and dyslexia plus childcare amongst other things facilitated looking at barriers to learning but also conversely solutions to learning. Maybe looking at Mezirow's perspective of transformation learning would be useful here.

Module 4 – Recovery and Community

UK:

✓ Yes. Modules were clear and useful in providing participants with an understanding of recovery capital. The recovery coach pack was of particular interest along with specific elements around boundaries and managing relationships.

CYPRUS:

- ✓ The Learning activities were clear and useful. They provided additional information that participants found useful.

- ✓ Additional activities were necessary to complement the overall objectives of the module. For example, discussions were created on what constitutes a good and bad recovery community, as well as what the role of a recovery coach is. This was necessary to help participants understand the scope of the module.

- ✓ A suggestion for improvement would be to include a case study of an adult who went through addiction and their road to becoming a Recovery Coach. This would familiarise them with the process and also help them associate with the learning material.

- ✓ For Unit 4 the Daily Inventory Worksheet seemed like a useful resource to have but it was unclear as to how that linked with the overall module. It was also unclear how the trainers were meant to apply the worksheet in the session. A suggestion would be to explain how and why this worksheet is important for the scope of this module. In addition to give information on why completing this worksheet will help with their recovery, and whether this is a tool that they could use as a Recovery Coach or not.

- ✓ Other materials were necessary to form part of the learning activities. Some ideas include:
  - Case study on a recovery coach.
  - Tools that recovery coach's use.
  - Information on recovery communities around Europe.
  - Challenges of recovery coaches and how they overcome them.

ROMANIA:

- ✓ Our participants relate to the recovering community as the support network of the two steps groups, a network functioning according to the same 12 traditions all over the world. This gives them a constant wherever they might travel inside or outside the country. The learning activities have been redirected in this direction so that the participants could relate better.

- ✓ Also, we think it might have been useful in presenting different types of recovering communities and how they are organised and work, so that we can emphasise according to each country's cultural/financial requirements.

ITALY:

- ✓ The activities proposed have been useful. In the course of the module great importance has been given to discussions and debate; two brainstorming sessions were carried out, the first one about the word 'community' and another on the characteristics that a good professional should have. An additional task in subgroups was also proposed: each group had to represent on a board the effective tools that every recovery community should have in order to permanently overcome the phase of addiction. All these three activities positively animated the class.

IRELAND:

- ✓ Yes. But they need to be more detailed and transfer friendly to other jurisdictions. The issue of a recovery community needs explored in detail as do the social networks and new peer supports that are the lifeline of recovery. Models such as fellowships which are in each partner country fill the vacuum but also give real shape and purpose to recovery. Improved by more appropriate detail and information. Also is it wise to explore the theory of community to set the context? Or what are strengths and assets in regards to communities

Surely we should encourage people in their own communities to tell us what is available for them regarding recovery options?

✓ We used a speaker who has two years' experience of being a recovery coach. This was very effective as the group fully identified with the background, role and opportunity this provided to support people in recovery. It also showed how the individual's recovery can be reinforced and sustained, benefitting the person and others.

Module 5 – Recovery and Employability

UK:

✓ While the learning objectives were clear the participants did question the task of designing a social enterprise and that it was inappropriate to include running a public house as they were all in recovery from alcohol addiction.

CYPRUS:

✓ The power point of potential sources that you can use to find a job was good although as a trainer I found it was necessary to refer to certain country-specific job finding websites. Also participants found it useful when the trainer referred them to several local recruitment services.

✓ Also, the activity on CV making needed much more guidance. As a trainer there is little knowledge on how to construct a CV (layout, content). This stands for role play interview exercise too. It was necessary that the trainer developed a series of questions for the participants to use. Otherwise the trainer relied on the exercise unfolding solely by them, which they do not have the knowledge to do. So an improvement for this exercise would be to:

- Give written guidelines on how to boost a CV.
- Give sample answers on the top ten interview questions.
- Give guidance on how to carry out a role-play interview.

✓ One of the most useful learning activities was the Unit 4 exercise on a business plan example. The group enthusiastically engaged in a discussion on creating, developing a planning a potential enterprise. The participants came together to share their ideas and referred to the business plan example as a way of expanding their planning. This was also a way for them to exercise their team-working and problem-solving skills. The trainer provided feedback on how the exercise was important for their entrepreneurial skill development

ROMANIA:

✓ From the general point of view there too many details about the social cooperative and too few about other opportunities/other types of social enterprises.

✓ I had to go into a deeper study about the Romanian legislation and we added a new PowerPoint about four other types of social enterprise. Still it was just introductive information.

✓ Model was too specific for Italy, that seems to have certain particularities and are not found in other societies.

✓ Participants were very surprised about the 'Cooperativa' model. Our collective memories are not very positive since the communist time, where cooperatives were perceived as an instrument to steal from the people, in favour of the communist party. The participants were

very surprised about the existence of this model still in Romanian society. Social economy is the 'new trend' in Romanian society and there are special grants to sustain this. For surely the participants were offered a motivation to research further opportunities in social economy.

✓ Since it is a completely new way of thinking, the participants related the social enterprise model to the 12 traditions from peer support communities; especially in Unit 3.

ITALY:

✓ The tools provided were sufficient and detailed. However, in order to face the need of a high security level, two additional activities were developed that increased the sense of self-efficacy perceived by the participants: the creation of the network work in small groups and the role playing in the job interview. After the compilation of the personal network, the Group of participants was divided into small groups homogeneous for interests and professional attitudes. The task requested was to make available to the other participants their own network and on the other hand individuate the most relevant contacts to enhance their professional careers.

✓ An activity appreciated by the group was a role play on a possible job interview.

IRELAND:

✓ There were many cultural issues which arose in the module. These include stigma, discrimination and the lack of police clearance. Transgressions during addiction were discussed and the issue of what to reveal or not by inclusion in your CV was of intense interest.

✓ Adopting the idea of social enterprise to recovery provoked great interest, energy, ideas and fun. When it comes to self-help for marginalised groups the idea of linking recovery, empowerment and employment was well received.

✓ Expectations Worksheet could have been more focused around time management, respect and behaviours whilst in a job.

7.4 Please comment on whether the length of the module was adequate and what length might be optimal.

Module 1 – Digital Literacy

UK:

✓ Fine – learning time was relevant to learner's skills – five participants had highly developed digital literacy.

CYPRUS:

✓ Due to the nature of the topic being unfamiliar to most participants more time was needed in order to adequately cover the content. The trainer felt that participants were slightly overwhelmed with the intensity of the sessions. For example, some did not have knowledge of basic software programmes like Microsoft Word. So the trainer devoted some time to give them a brief explanation as to what this was and how it functions.

✓ An optimal length and method of delivery would be to allow an extra hour for every unit so

as to give participants the chance to experiment with the various programmes.

ROMANIA:

- ✓ There is too much material to be covered over a four hours' time length, although it is all important and needs to be covered.
- ✓ We had to skip some of the steps of the module (i.e. making a Skype/Google account), also because some of the trainees already knew how to make those.
- ✓ We spent less time in describing the parts of the computer and internet connection.
- ✓ Due to the technical part of some of the information, more explanations had to be offered to the participants. This has also been a challenge for the trainers who are not IT specialists and had to undergo a deeper preparation.
- ✓ We assess that maybe an added two hours would give more time for a more relaxed course

ITALY:

- ✓ Topics were very complex for participants: more time would be necessary. It would be possible to divide the module into several days, dedicating the first hour of each module to an overall lesson plan and provide for a verification of learning.

IRELAND:

- ✓ The module was potentially huge, so we redefined the length. We extracted the main learning points and focused on them.
- ✓ Time was an issue. The Internet-Social Media unit could have been more expansive and explored as this is the gateway to digital literacy for our participants.

Module 2 – Recovery and Resilience

UK:

- ✓ This unit needs more time, participants were receptive to discussion topics but there is often fear around discussing life stories and reflecting and this needs addressing in sessions.

CYPRUS:

- ✓ The length of the module was adequate as all information was covered and understood by the participants.

ROMANIA:

- ✓ The time length for each unit was too short, from our point view. The information contained in the module was maybe too much to cover in four hours of training, mostly because the information processed was very personal. Time management was a challenge for us, because the participants were very active and needing to address their questions during the course.
- ✓ For the recovery journey, the participants needed more time to write their own story. Some of them chose to work at home and bring it the next time. In this particular case, during the breaks at the next module, the other participants could read their colleagues' recovery story. It was a very 'proud' moment for two people who presented their story as a 'river' and as a 'tree'.
- ✓ In this regard, we also want to mention that the time for group discussions was too short, not everyone was able to present their worksheet (ex. Smart Goals Worksheet), only two or three participants. Every time we had such an assignment we either did a brainstorming on the flipchart or two to three presentations.

ITALY:

- ✓ The length of the module was short; during the provided time it was possible to perform all the four didactical units but without the Russell Brand video. The other aspect that could not be performed in the classroom was the elaboration of the SMART objectives assigned as homework. Just a few of the participants reported in the next meeting, the grid of the SMART objectives completely filled in.
- ✓ It was an important growth experience to understand what are the short-term goals that can be achieved realistically in a short time while other ones require a long planning and need to be spitted into smaller ones.

IRELAND:

- ✓ The length was inadequate. There is a lot more in terms of learning that should be included. One example of this is the 'Principles of Recovery' which contain the main elements of the recovery project.
- ✓ Time is needed to explore and internalise the concepts such as 'Recovery Capital'. Also this needs based in practical exercises and collaboration.

Module 3 – Learning to Learn

UK:

- ✓ Fine. It fitted in with the timeframe and produced reflective thoughts on learning and motivation to do things differently, essential in recovery process.

CYPRUS:

- ✓ The length of this particular module was not adequate. It would have been preferable to have a longer time devoted to this module. 'Learning to learn' is a topic that taps into many social, psychological, academic and recovery-centred issues. These are too many to be covered, discussed and resolved in four hours.
- ✓ For example, a structure report was not conducted due to lack of time. 'Study skills' need more time for the participants to understand what these are and embed a new approach to them, as well as practice them and feel that they have improved on them.

ROMANIA:

- ✓ Considering the content, we should have had at least two modules for *Unit 3: Orientation for Access to Education* and *Unit 4: Study skills*.

ITALY:

- ✓ The time devoted to the learning needs of this group was considered adequate but the length of the total module is not adequate.

IRELAND:

- ✓ Time again was the concern. There is the issue of content.
- ✓ The Kolb example should be reviewed. It needs more time and application to internalise. Some of the questions in exercises are too elongated.
- ✓ The relevance of the structure of a report was also questioned for course placement and time so we did not do it.
- ✓ One of the questionnaires also had 23 questions which took time as many of the questions may not have been seen as being relevant.

Module 4 – Recovery and Community

UK:

✓ Fine – participants could have spent additional time on these units as it related to existing training on volunteer representation. No optimum time referred too.

CYPRUS:

✓ The length of the module was adequate however the material provided was not enough to cover the learning objectives in the depth required. More activities and learning materials were needed in order to fully utilise the 4 hours of the module. For example, Unit 3 was more centred on presenting the Recovery Coaching Training Manual (UK) and presenting the UK Recovery Charity Walk. This information was not utilised given that it was not part of the translation checklist, and also because it was UK-based.

ROMANIA:

No answer

ITALY:

✓ The length of the module was adequate but the available material was not sufficient to cover the scheduled hours and trainers had to structure other activities to make full use of the provided 4-hour module.

IRELAND:

✓ Time due to lack of content was not an issue here. The content and structure could be better. There could be more applicable learning material, collaborative learning and creativity.

Module 5 – Recovery and Employability

UK:

Unit 1: CV Building – participants felt this was valuable and warranted additional time – which could be taken from the other three modules incrementally.

CYPRUS:

✓ Participants expressed that they highly enjoyed this module although they wanted more time on it. They had a lot to say, a lot to ask and needed assistance on specific obstacles related to employability. Some of them required one-to-one time in order to cover all their queries.

✓ The module is quite education-centred, in that there is a lot of information that participants are expected to understand and learn. For example, material related to enterprise and social enterprises, the issues related to the work organisation in a social enterprise, and the rules and the rights of the workers. These topics were highly unfamiliar to most participants, yet the time allocated for them were 15 minutes. This does not allow enough time to introduce and inform adults in addiction recovery about a topic that some of them may have never even heard about.

ROMANIA:

✓ The information was also condensed in this module; especially since it has so many practical exercises. I would make a separate module of four hours on social enterprise and a separate module on employability skills.

ITALY:

✓ All participants expressed the need to have more time to deepen the modules related to the

job research. For lack of time it was not possible to carry out the simulation of the creation of an enterprise. To allow an effective presentation of the prescribed topics it would be desirable to lengthen the module two hours more for a total of six hours.

IRELAND:

- ✓ There was a lot of material which needed processing. Time again was a concern.
- ✓ There was a lot of gaps in people's CVs. People also felt disbarred and deflated with regard to job opportunities because of being long term or permanently unemployed.
- ✓ Ireland does not have a culture of social enterprises or workers' co-ops. Time is needed to explore and promote this valid alternative to the narrow mainstream of our employment system.

7.5 Was the group engaged and fully participated in the training on this module? Why/why not? What might help them to become more engaged?

Module 1 – Digital Literacy

UK:

Yes. They worked together and shared resources creating mutual support.

CYPRUS:

- ✓ The group was not very engaged due to the fact that they could not apply what they were being taught. Not having computers meant that all interactive activities were being carried out by the trainer on her computer.
- ✓ To increase engagement, it would be useful for the module to be carried out in computer rooms and over a longer period of time.
- ✓ It would also be good to include activities that give the participants the opportunity to apply what is being taught. For example, after learning about power point they could be asked to create a short power point after they have received training on it.

ROMANIA:

- ✓ Since we had to share a computer for two participants, we had so much more an interactive atmosphere, with peer support, encouragement and rejoicing the good results.
- ✓ Also, the teams have been paired in such a way that each of them had a more experienced and a beginner participant. This has helped avoiding getting overwhelmed or stuck in moments where some exercise would be too challenging.

ITALY:

- ✓ Participants understood the need to reduce their digital divide.
- ✓ Participants showed a great interest in the units on the programs and asked to put into practice the new skills achieved completing their CV and trying to respond to the online job advertisements. Trainers subdivided the participants in small groups. Participants having more digital skills were the 'leader' of the group and facilitated others in the activity. Each participant had the possibility to create his/her e-mail box.

IRELAND:

- ✓ Concerns are around adequate formation, time and language. Some participants were lost as the language and concepts were new and need adequate time to work through and internalise.
- ✓ It took 24 hours for some activation codes to come in. Hence we had to put in an extra session.
- ✓ Participants were fully engaged in the digital learning. We had three facilitators on hand to address any difficulties which meant we had a good learning support and rhythm going. However, we recognise the difficulty to construct set groups at the same digital learning level.
- ✓ To improve the learning dynamic, we would recommend increased interactivity both on a digital and group level. Also more than one facilitator or one for every five learners to offer practical learning support

Module 2 – Recovery and Resilience

UK:
- ✓ Yes. All participants were engaged fully through this unit.

CYPRUS:
- ✓ The group engaged fully as Module 2 was about recovery which they all could associate with. There were several discussions on the matter drawn from each of their experiences.

ROMANIA:
- ✓ Yes. Especially because the topics were related to recovery and they knew each other from recovery groups. Some topics were more familiar from the counselling and support groups. They had a lot to add and wanting to process more details about recovery journey and their recovery capital. The films brought many comments regarding the recovery road and especially the general attitude in Romanian society regarding the recovery, with a focus on the medical model.

ITALY:
- ✓ The Group of participants actively participated in the proposed activities. Their interest went beyond the course. They asked the trainers for the opportunity to photocopy the compiled tools (the storyboard and the card on the capital recovery) in order to discuss the topics presented individually with their educators and allow additional time for reflection.

IRELAND:
- ✓ The group were fully engaged in the subject which is centrally applicable to their lives. It allowed participants to explore their upbringing, current situation and cultural context. However, to reiterate, we need to break down the language and concepts. The learner centred material worked very well.

Module 3 – Learning to Learn

UK:
- ✓ Yes. The group participated well, they valued the input from a training provider who gave good advice regarding provision and funding.

CYPRUS:
- ✓ Some were engaged and motivated but participation was low due to extraneous

circumstances. For example, death of a parent, interviews, stages of not feeling well and not able to attend.

- ✓ Some others were not engaged and took the initiative to express that the topic of 'learning' creates a negative feeling for them due to past experience. This made them 'shut down' and not be interested in the topic. This was also because they did not have the intention to go back to learning and would rather engage in vocational type of work.

ROMANIA:

- ✓ Participants were very glad to share their school experiences and process the new challenges in the modern society.
- ✓ They felt empowered by this training to present their learning skills.
- ✓ Challenges to learning and study skills are adapted now in the recovery period, when they have to complete assignments and deal with new information.
- ✓ They enjoyed the group exercise with challenges to learning and some aspects were quite humourous.

ITALY:

- ✓ This was the only module that got a negative final feedback from almost all the group. Among the participants only one said he wanted to take a university course to become a journalist, the others kept saying that they already lost too much time and that although they would like to return to school, the objective to be achieved at the end of the community was to find a job.
- ✓ From a first analysis of the school experiences reported by participants it was possible to highlight a low level of education, characterized by a large number of early school leavers. The failure of their education was not only due to a lack of commitment, but often a direct consequence of the teaching system adopted that gives no chance to enhance the skills of each student.

IRELAND:

- ✓ Yes, exercises aimed at collaborative learning, inclusiveness and participation worked.
- ✓ We also tried a few icebreakers to keep the energy up and people animated.
- ✓ The learning environment was good.

Module 4 – Recovery and Community

UK:

- ✓ Yes. Participants rated this unit highly and were very engaged with the concepts presented, many of which they were already familiar with and could develop.

CYPRUS:

- ✓ The group was fully engaged as it was a topic that they could associate with. They had a lot of information to discuss. Although the learning material was at times lacking in their scope and way of application, additional discussions that were happening as a result of the interest in the topic helped the participants' engagement.
- ✓ Suggestions for improvement would be to add discussions centred on the topic, and centred on their experiential perspectives. After trying that myself, I found that it triggered participant's interest to the topic.

ROMANIA:

- ✓ The participants got engaged once the discussion was reinterpreted towards their personal experience with the recovering community. They relate very well to the concept of support group and 12 step sponsors, as another term for 'recovery coach'.

- ✓ They got stimulated after being asked on the benefits of belonging to a recovering community, one of the most relevant ones having to do with getting the constant support for their sobriety and overcoming the stigma of addiction.

- ✓ Also, the topic of sponsorship in the 12 step community got them interested since the big majority of them have a double quality of sponsor and sponsee.

- ✓ Another point of interest was around the Daily inventory which was a familiar worksheet and put them on a familiar group track.

ITALY:

- ✓ Despite seeming to be a module most suitable for community professionals, it was asked the group to collaborate on the project through a series of activities aimed at the experimentation of the Facilitation Pack. The elaboration of the tool provided in *Unit 4.4: A Daily Inventory Worksheet* created an important group discussion and facilitated a personal reflection.

IRELAND:

- ✓ The group was engaged in the learning transaction.

- ✓ In relation to the boundaries worksheet it may be more applicable and effective used in the context of a recovery coach.

Module 5 – Recovery and Employability

UK:

- ✓ Yes. The group engaged with resistance to the work of developing a social enterprise as participants felt that for many people in recovery – the development of a social enterprise would cause additional and unnecessary stress.

CYPRUS:

- ✓ Although the group was interested in the module, the language used for *Unit 2 Understanding the Social Enterprise* was very complicated for their level of understanding. A suggestion would be to simplify the terms and explain them using basic language. The content also included terminology that was very 'business-oriented' (e.g. 'The responsibility to take on some of the cooperative's net losses (if no surplus is made)' or 'The right to one non-transferable share of the worker cooperative').

- ✓ This made it difficult for the trainer to explain as they had to tap into economic concepts which participants found confusing.

ROMANIA:

- ✓ Yes. They were very interested and curious about new information on social enterprise, but also in the practical exercise with a business plan. Some of them were involved in business area and they were recollecting their abilities. It put them into a very real life situation. The team work provided the opportunity to identify leaders of the group. The exercise was started as a competition for the best business plan. At the end of the session everybody received a small gift of appreciation for their effort.

ITALY:

- ✓ The group has shown a lot of interest on all the presented topics, always showing a good level of concentration and intervening with clarifications and requests to the discussed topics. The good level of satisfaction was confirmed by the requiring all the participants of more time to deepen the addressed modules.

- ✓ Out of 14 users five wanted to engage in the simulation activity playing the role of the candidate! The Group was able to observe the dynamics of the talks held by highlighting relative strengths and weaknesses aspects.

IRELAND:

- ✓ Most participants were fully engaged. We used a small group approach to keep everyone involved and animated. Keeping the learning experientially based bought buy-in as did some creative additions.

7.6 Were the Delivery Guidelines (Facilitation Pack Section 1) helpful in managing the training activities on this module? Why/why not? How might they be improved?

Module 1 – Digital Literacy

UK:

Yes. The trainer's notes provided all the information needed. I had a clear understanding of where the course materials were leading the participants.

CYPRUS:

- ✓ Yes, the Delivery Guidelines were helpful.

ROMANIA:

- ✓ The guide has worked well in keeping the trainer on track with the presentation (also a matter of time tracking), as a practical tool in putting the presentation in the context of the module and in evaluating the accomplishment of the objectives.

ITALY:

- ✓ Yes, the Guidelines were very helpful

IRELAND:

- ✓ The Module Outline need to be clearly marked so as to identify what parts they are used for.

- ✓ However, the guidelines did help as there is already a lot of material to wade through and some of the material in the Dropbox was out of date. There are a large number of documents which should be condensed if possible; registration, sign in sheets, end of module evaluations, exercises around learning activities.

Module 2 – Recovery and Resilience

UK:

- ✓ Yes. The notes enabled the structure of the units to bring the participants to an understanding of the unit's goals.

CYPRUS:

- ✓ The Delivery Guidelines (Facilitation Pack Section 1) were helpful regarding the structure of the sessions. They provided clear guidelines that helped the trainer create a logical order by which the training sessions would run. It also helped the trainer understand what materials were needed for each session.
- ✓ The trainer found that it was necessary to have information on the roles and responsibilities as it helped frame the way that the groups were run.

ROMANIA:
- ✓ Yes. Also in the preparation stage, it helps in maintain the trainers close to the guidelines and objectives of the course, but also in the evaluation stage, to see how much we accomplished from the initial objectives.

ITALY:
- ✓ The guidelines have been useful for the course. However, given the delicacy of the covered topics it was possible to support adequately the group thanks to the experience of the trainers who had already conducted group training lessons addressed to users in the recovery phase.

IRELAND:
- ✓ The guidelines were fine. Time was the problem.

Module 3 – Learning to Learn

UK:
- ✓ Yes. This enabled the trainer to achieve the unit guidelines

CYPRUS:
- ✓ Yes, the Delivery Guidelines were helpful.

ROMANIA:
- ✓ Yes. Also in the preparation stage, helps in maintain the trainers close to the guidelines and objectives of the course, but also in the evaluation stage, to see how much we accomplished from the initial objectives.

ITALY:
- ✓ Yes, the Guidelines were very useful.

IRELAND:
- ✓ The Delivery Guidelines were acceptable.

Module 4 – Recovery and Community

UK:
- ✓ Yes. Group understood the concept of recovery community and the benefits of being part of the community – they also stated the need for working on self-awareness and the guidelines aided this process by providing clarity on content delivery.

CYPRUS:
- ✓ Yes, the Delivery Guidelines were helpful.

ROMANIA:
- ✓ The Delivery Guidelines were helpful.

ITALY:

✓ Yes, the Guidelines were effective.
IRELAND:
✓ Yes

Module 5 – Recovery and Employability
UK:
✓ Yes. The timeframe was clear
CYPRUS:
✓ Yes, the Delivery Guidelines were helpful in managing the training activities of the module.
ROMANIA:
✓ The Delivery Guideline were helpful.
ITALY:
✓ Yes, the Guidelines were effective.
IRELAND:
✓ Delivery Guidelines were clear. Just needed more time to build on a very interesting and promising draft.

7.7 Was the Course Pack (Facilitation Pack Section 2) effective for participants' training on this module? Why/why not? How might this be improved?

Module 1 – Digital Literacy
UK:
✓ Yes. In particular, how to use the online elements – very clear.
CYPRUS:
✓ Yes, the Course Pack was effective for participant's training on the module.
ROMANIA:
✓ The Course Pack has been partially translated into Romanian and offered to the participants as a hard copy. We presented at the beginning of each module the objectives so that the participants understand the purpose.
✓ Also, as far as timing, this module did not have a time frame offered in the outline (i.e. presentation of the hardware takes 10 minutes).
ITALY:
✓ Yes, the Course Pack was helpful and effective.
IRELAND:
✓ The Course Pack was given to every participant. However, there was a distinct lack of engagement with this document after we had gone through it at the initial induction. Mostly, this document remained unused in participant's folders. Homework, practice and using supporting material is an ongoing learning challenge from this group after sessions are over.

Module 2 – Recovery and Resilience

UK:

✓ Yes and No. We found the material useful, although planning years ahead was a little intimidating to people in early stages of recovery.

CYPRUS:

✓ The Course Pack (Facilitation Pack 2) was verbally delivered to the participants. At the beginning of each module the trainer would go through the Module Outline and make sure the participants understood the objectives of the module. The reason this was verbally delivered was due to unforeseen obstacles encountered by the translator who did not deliver the requested materials.

✓ In order to ensure we adhered to the time schedule we had to proceed without a written form of the Facilitation Pack. Instead the trainer used this in every session to verbally inform the participants of the content to be covered.

✓ Also, as mentioned above (see Question 3) more information was needed on some content (e.g. Cloud and Granfield study).

ROMANIA:

✓ Yes. They received partially translated in the Romanian language and partially in English. The participants requested more time to be explained the objectives of the course. They were presented in the induction session; it would have been necessary for them to be explained in a separate training session.

ITALY:

✓ Yes. Additional material was delivered.

IRELAND:

✓ As above.

Module 3 – Learning to Learn

UK:

✓ Yes. The participants were able to work through then units effectively.

CYPRUS:

✓ Yes, the Course Pack was helpful in managing the training activities. However, it would have been preferable to have a guidance sheet that suggests possible answers for the activities. For example, the Study Skills sheet (3.4B) could have been complemented with an additional sheet that gives possible answers. These could have facilitated the trainer in terms of helping the participants find ways of improving their skills, rather than leaving it open for them to explore and then not providing potential ways of improving.

ROMANIA:

✓ Yes. They received partially translated in the Romanian language and partially in English. The participants requested more time to be explained the objectives of the course. They were presented in the Induction Session and it would have been necessary for them to be explained in a separate training session.

ITALY:

✓ Yes, even if participants requested more explanations.

IRELAND:
✓ The Course Pack/Facilitation Pack was acceptable.

Module 4 – Recovery and Community

UK:

- ✓ Yes. The discussions and course material were effective in providing an understanding of how individuals can support themselves when supporting others in recovery. They valued the workshops associated with the recovery coaching manual.

CYPRUS:

- ✓ The Course Pack was a useful guideline to the module.
- ✓ However, more details could have been provided regarding the material. Some of the core learning material was UK-centred which made it difficult to apply in the partner countries.
- ✓ For example, it may have been more useful to give European wide information on what constitutes a good recovery coach.

ROMANIA:

- ✓ As already mentioned, we would have needed more materials for this module. Especially, if we compare it to the other modules, the amount of information was a lot more limited.

ITALY:

- ✓ The course pack represented a useful guideline, however some of the material provided seemed to be more centred on UK participants and this made it difficult to enforce in Italy, and in particular in the specific context of the community.

IRELAND:

- ✓ Yes.

Module 5 – Recovery and Employability

UK:

- ✓ No. Participants questioned the inclusion of social enterprise. They felt more appropriate involvement with this type or organisation would be voluntary work or work experience placement.

CYPRUS:

- ✓ The Course Pack was very useful. It proved to be an insightful source of guidance for the trainer with regards to understanding how the materials should be used.
- ✓ Some aspects however required supplementary information. For example, the 'Expectations Worksheet' was a useful source but it was unclear how this fitted with *Unit 3: Social Enterprise and Recovery*. To improve this, it would have been better to have information on what the point of the task was and what take-home message the participants could take from this.

ROMANIA:

- ✓ Yes. Also in the preparation stage, helps in maintain the trainers close to the guidelines and objectives of the course, but also in the evaluation stage, to see how much we accomplished from the initial objectives.

ITALY:

✓ The Course Pack was effective and simple to use.
IRELAND:
✓ Participants had a resistance to using the Course Pack.

7.8 Did the training materials for this module support the learning effectively? Why/why not? How might they be improved?

Module 1 – Digital Literacy
UK:
✓ Yes. The online material allowed us to test knowledge at the end of each section.
CYPRUS:
✓ Most of the training materials supported the learning effectively.
✓ The only suggestion would be to add short classwork activities whereby the participants can try to use one of the programmes being taught to them. This would mean that they can receive direct assistance from the trainer and the initial fear of attempting to use unfamiliar programmes would be eradicated.
ROMANIA:
✓ Partially, the training materials have been used in Romanian, while the application has been presented in English.
✓ The materials are presented in an interactive manner, requiring the full involvement of the participants and were a good stimulant for the effective learning.
✓ For those who did not understand English, the handouts have been very useful.
✓ For most of the participants it has been their first online course and this gave them the courage to try it again.
✓ More explanations and deeper training seemed like could be added in working with Microsoft Office.
ITALY:
✓ Most of materials were suitable to allow the learning. Considering the amount of topics, trainers created a mailing list and sent the Course Pack to participants to allow a re-reading and ensuring an individual study after the pilot.
IRELAND:
✓ In most cases yes. Much of the content is time constrained. The question and answer format did not explain what was wrong and right-it just marked them as percentages.
✓ The learning in the module was much individualised, with no emphasis placed on learning as a collaborative exercise. The opportunity to communicate digitally with each other is absent.
✓ A forum would be added value to the learning.
✓ Learners also had to continually sign back in to the system to access material.
Module 2 – Recovery and Resilience

UK:

- ✓ Yes. They seemed to reflect a combination of ITEP / 12 Step and new approaches. All familiar learning to the participants. Only issue, more sensitivity to those participants who are fearful or uncomfortable with life stories and sharing their experiences.

CYPRUS:

- ✓ The training material supported the learning at a satisfactory level. For example, the Recovery Capital Worksheet was a useful resource that helped participants to obtain a novel understanding of what constitutes recovery. They were able to draw on their experiences from their treatment community, as well as reflect on what they currently have that can help them towards recovery.

- ✓ The training materials could have been improved with the option of presenting videos without the use of internet. For example, the Russell Brand video could be available as a downloadable version in order to present this to the participants. Also, since these videos were in English it would have been useful to have subtitles provided for every partner country.

ROMANIA:

- ✓ The combination of the tools and materials was very good (films, PowerPoints, handouts). The participants were content with them.

- ✓ Still we encountered the problem with the recovery journey. The PowerPoints and the guidelines were discussed and participants needed more time to process how to write their own story. The digital story board was not necessarily an adequate tool. Participants preferred writing on the paper or presenting their story in a more creative way.

ITALY:

- ✓ The training material has been proven effective to promote the learning of the participants. However, it was not possible to see the proposed video due to the reduced time and the need emerged from the group to have a discussion of comparison at the end of each experiential activity.

IRELAND:

- ✓ Learning materials were supportive and developed insight and critical reflection on the themes explored.

- ✓ More time is required to do justice to this module, to explore and internalise themes, principles and concepts on recovery.

- ✓ The module showed the effectiveness of people's recovery journeys and the application of learning to others in the group – a collaborative experience.

Module 3 – Learning to Learn

UK:

- ✓ Yes. Participants were able to use and understand printed material and access online resources

CYPRUS:

- ✓ The training materials supported the learning, yet in order for these to have been fully understood and brought to their best use it would have been better to have a longer time to deliver the module. As mentioned before four hours was too short to tap into the basics of

study skills.

ROMANIA:

- ✓ The whole module was more condensed in content than the others. It was probably the most important module, because it addresses directly the learning. Due to the fact that the time was not optimal for the content, we feel like the training materials were not shown the value.

ITALY:

- ✓ Materials were effective.

IRELAND:

- ✓ Materials were effective.

Module 4 – Recovery and Community

UK:

- ✓ Yes. Training materials were well received; those around boundaries were very well received. The recovery inventory could be replaced with a more generic inventory. Materials regarding recovery coaching were very effective and enabled us to build on peer learning processes.

CYPRUS:

- ✓ The training materials supported the learning. However, they could have been improved with further material in order to provide participants with a full picture of the Recovery and Community module (Module 4). For example, case studies and ideas for further discussion could have been provided to enrich the material and boost their understanding.

- ✓ I think that the Recovery Coaching Training Manual could have also been provided and translated in each partner language. Even if that may have been specific to UK it would have still provided participants a wider perception of how a recovery coach is trained. It would have been an insightful addition to the material already provided.

- ✓ Also, it was unclear how the Daily Inventory Worksheet (4.4A) supported the learning as there were no guidelines on how and why this was applicable to the overall scope of the module. A suggestion for improvement would be to give participants the opportunity to compare their answers in order to fully understand how different/how similar their daily recovery experience is.

- ✓ Furthermore, there was a Group Discussion – 'Key Learning for Me' which had no further information on what needed to be discussed. We were only provided with the title and did not receive further assistance as to how this needed to be delivered. This activity did not take place as there was no information on how to deliver this.

ROMANIA:

- ✓ As already mentioned, we evaluate that we had too little information on implementing the learning activities and we had no materials to process in order to support the learning.

- ✓ The daily inventory worksheet, even we evaluated this as a good tool, was probably not very adequate to this module.

ITALY:

- ✓ Effective but not enough.

IRELAND:

- ✓ Somewhat. However, the main NTA document was too bulky and not broken down. This

needs deconstructing into applicable learning material.

Module 5 – Recovery and Employability

UK:

- ✓ No. Some of the materials did not reflect how the Job Centre Plus (JCP) operates in the UK – processes are online, no job boards, job seeking activity is cross checked by JCP workers to ensure those accessing benefits are engaging in the process.

CYPRUS:

- ✓ Although the module content included: (1) Building a CV, (2) How to write a cover letter, and (3) Job interview: How to Plan, Present and Review the Interview, these were not covered in Unit 1. Participants were very keen on receiving information regarding these topics specifically, yet there was no guidance on the above. The trainer had to develop and provide this material according to their own experience and their own research prior to the session.

ROMANIA:

- ✓ We couldn't use the video`s suggested as they were in Italian. We did not find any online resources. The other materials provided were good.

ITALY:

- ✓ Despite the clearness of the module it would be necessary to perform additional tasks to fill the lack of the participants concerning their skills of job searching. It could be possible to devote an additional space to the elaboration of their curriculum vitae, to the selection of jobs requests also developing small virtual simulation were participants should answer to a job request posted on the web (what to write, how to attach your cv and a cover letter, etc.).

IRELAND:

- ✓ The Expectation Worksheet was unclear.
- ✓ The business plan needed more time and discussion. Some of the business plan was very technical and specialised, e.g. accounts and projections etc. However, the group got on with it.

7.9 Did you deviate in any way from the course materials for this module? If so, please explain why and how.

Module 1 – Digital Literacy

UK:

- ✓ Yes. The group discussed how one section about 'Their Recovery Process' that seemed to stand out against all the other material (no further comment made).

CYPRUS:

- ✓ No, the material was sufficient.
- ✓ The time allocated for the whole module was however quite short as participants expressed the need for longer time to familiarise with the content.

ROMANIA:

- ✓ We did not undergo the account making due to the lack of time and the participants were familiar with it.
- ✓ We had to skip some of the steps of the module (i.e. making a Skype/Google account), also because some of the trainees already knew how to make those.
- ✓ We spent less time in describing the parts of the computer and internet connection.
- ✓ We have used a list of Romanian abbreviation used online to replace the English one.

ITALY:

- ✓ No. The only additional aspect was to devote a specific space to create e-mail and mailing lists group.
- ✓ We simplified the language.

IRELAND:

- ✓ At times we simplified the language and often the facilitators had to provide hands on assistance and supportive examples.
- ✓ Also requiring this treatment was sections like file formats and different operating systems.
- ✓ To explain the digital divide we used culturally appropriate examples from the drug culture. Participants could relate to this.
- ✓ We also got the opportunity from an incident to explore trolling and digital bullying with appropriate safety responses and awareness of both the positive and negative experiences of digital engagement.

Module 2 – Recovery and Resilience

UK:

- ✓ Yes. Discussions around life stories were extended – clarified that this process was not as in depth as those undertaken in residential rehabilitation centres.

CYPRUS:

- ✓ Given that the videos were not available online I expanded on generic recovery related questions such as 'What is addiction?', 'What is becoming clean from addiction?', 'How does the transition from addiction to sobriety happen?'
- ✓ This was in order to generate discussion on the topic of the module and to cover for the time that would be spent watching the video of Russell Brand.

ROMANIA:

- ✓ No.

ITALY:

- ✓ The only change adopted was represented by the compilation of the *lifeline* through an interview in pairs to facilitate the self-narration of the personal life story. The trainers divided the group into six pairs plus a trio (given the odd number of participants). Each participant was given the task of interviewing the other partner and compiling the story board. This made possible to improve the reciprocal knowledge of the participants feeling welcome in small groups.

IRELAND:

- ✓ Yes, but only slightly. We put on a quick review of the 'principles of recovery' as they contain the detail about the recovery vision, goals and the way people can reorganise and take

control of their lives. However, we tried to stay at one with the module so as to test the issues of time/engagement/transfer of learning.

Module 3 – Learning to Learn

UK:
- ✓ Yes. Only to link with the discussions about local voluntary representative roles we are developing with participants as part of our training more broadly.

CYPRUS:
- ✓ Yes, there was deviation from the materials.
- ✓ Participants were provided with examples of a student essay in order for them to practically see what a 'good' essay looks like. This was a useful addition to their process of learning about learning. They were able to see hands-on what an essay looks like, as we had no time for them to write one and receive feedback on it.
- ✓ I also worked with them to create a mind map on a topic of their interest (e.g. football). I showed them step by step how ideas get generated through this mind map and they were able to apply this to understand how this can help in an essay.

ROMANIA:
- ✓ For Unit 3.1 we didn't use the YouTube presentation on experiential learning. It was repetitive with the PowerPoint presentation. It's enough just to use one of them not both. The trainer used many examples from recovery to facilitate understanding.
- ✓ We did not accomplish fully Unit 3.3 as outlined in the Course Pack. The activities required practical implementation, followed by a feedback session. This was discussed as a possible assignment after the completion of the course. 'Do and Don't' worksheet – too much text. Was given to study as homework. The time was used to cover the structure of the report assignment.
- ✓ The report assignment was done on a topic chosen by each participant as an example of writing using a specific format. We spent the time in elaborating one model with the whole group. Others brought back to the next session the written essay and the participants had the chance to quick read it in the beginning of the next module.
- ✓ Unit 3.4 was dedicated completely to study skills.

ITALY:
- ✓ An improvement to the module was to customise the learning path required. The path for each participant was realized moving from the analysis of the desired jobs, of the working or training courses free or not present in the area to upgrade their professional qualifications and be more competent in the labour market.
- ✓ The 'educational failure' allowed trainers to introduce an additional activity that would allow each participant to acquire greater knowledge of themselves: the definition of the 'multiple intelligence' developed by Gardner. Each participant followed with great interest the presentation of the nine planned intelligence and had the opportunity to try an individual test to discover his/her own intelligence most suitable for the employment.

IRELAND:
- ✓ We tried to stay as close to the course materials as outlined. However, there are items such as Kolb which require more time.

- ✓ Also we did not undertake the report homework piece.
- ✓ We also included three very small icebreakers to animate the group.

Module 4 – Recovery and Community

UK:

- ✓ Yes, in that it links with work we have done in respect of training volunteer representatives, discussion regarding supporting others, ethics, boundaries, networking, education, development.

CYPRUS:

- ✓ Yes there was deviation from the course materials. This was because:
  - The material was not enough to cover the full four hours of the module.
  - Discussions were created around the topic in order to engage participants' time.
  - Some of the learning activities were UK centred which made it difficult to explain and apply.
  - The Daily Inventory Worksheet was used, but another activity was added to it in order to make it more applicable to the overall scope of the module. For instance, participants were asked to fill it in, and then compare it with somebody else's worksheet. This was so that they could see that every person's experience is different. I think this activity helped to bring out this learning objective of the module

ROMANIA:

- ✓ We had to redirect the discussion towards a more culturally specific understanding of the recovering community, so to each unit we had to add discussions regarding what a community is about, its functions and the way it works.

ITALY:

- ✓ To address the lack of practical activities the following proposals were made:
  - Brainstorming on the word 'community'.
  - Analysis of values and rules to be respected in the own residential community.
  - Discussion on the characteristics that a good trainer should have.
  - Small group activities on the effective tools that each recovery community should have to permanently overcome the phase of addiction of the welcomed users.

IRELAND:

- ✓ We used extra materials slides and exercises to animate and convey the subject. For example, we employed a quote from Berkman (1976) to generate discussion about recovery coaches in small groups. We use the history of the band 'Aerosmith' to outline where the concept of recovery coach originated from.
- ✓ The recovery community idea is culturally different in Ireland, lacking identity or any vestige of a supportive integrated and wrap around approach from a service point of view.
- ✓ We explored recovery journeys and how this process works in relation to community.
- ✓ We also used a mind map we had used previously in the learning to learn module to explain the role of the recovery coach. We also used a recovery coach speaker.
- ✓ The daily inventory was too long.

✓	There was also the need to use more creativity.

Module 5 – Recovery and Employability

UK:

✓ Yes. Conversations about how Job Centre Plus operates along with the benefits system. What is right for individuals around their own recovery, how everyone is not connected with their communities and how they need to be self-aware about recovery capital.

CYPRUS:

✓ Yes. The trainer deviated from the course materials for the module. For example, Unit 2: Working Social Enterprises was not covered in detail as participants found it difficult to follow the terminology. Instead the trainer devoted one hour on CV formatting, templates and interview techniques (sample questions and answers). These were topics that participants could discuss and felt that they needed more help with. Unfortunately, the content of Unit 2: Understanding the Social Enterprise was over complicated for them to be interested in or want to engage with.

✓ Also, an additional power point was provided on step-by-step guidelines on how to upload a job service on a nation-wide services website. Participants felt this was a useful source, overcoming major obstacles for them (e.g. how to start a service, how to advertise it, how to use the internet to promote your service). This was sent to the recovery coach email address so that he could forward this to the participants.

ROMANIA:

✓ Unit 1, the group exercise in preparing a CV, was a discussion on good and bad things about what kind of information to put in a CV. All the participants were in the situation to prepare their own CV. We didn't have a template to work on.

✓ The job interview was also a group discussion about how to present yourself, how to get dressed, non-verbal communication is very important. Four to five people shared their experiences in a recent job interview.

✓ Unit 2: we didn't use the videos. we included an extra PowerPoint – Types of social enterprise in Romania. It was still not sufficient. They provided general information about the national context and opportunities.

ITALY:

✓ The trainers followed the activities provided in the module. However, two additional activities were developed

 - The creation of the network work in small groups. The group of participants were split into small groups homogeneous for professional interests and aptitudes. The requested task was to make available to the other participants their own network of contacts and to individuate the most relevant contacts to enhance their professional careers.

 Role play on the job interview: each candidate 'volunteer' conducted a job interview on the desired job and the trainer took the role of recruiter. The remaining group observed the role play, noting candidate strengths and weaknesses in that situation. At the end of each role play session, participants could provide (monitored by trainers) recommendations and new strategies to be used to face a new job interview.

IRELAND:

- ✓ We were concerned about time.
- ✓ We gave the groups a homework exercise, to break into two groups to put a business plan together on a recovery social enterprise idea and to present it back to the facilitators and full group. This provoked great discussion and critical reflection but also had a tangible outcome.
- ✓ No videos were used. This was mentioned on the learning objectives but not used as is was in Italian and we did not identify a comparable video in English.

8 COURSE CONTENT AND DELIVERY MATRIX

Table 8.1 presents a *Course Content and Delivery Matrix*. This table presents an overview of the main points presented in Chapter 7. The nine headline questions from Chapter 7 are given for each module, with the main response to each summarised for each partner country. This table, therefore, illustrates both the responses which were shared by all partner countries and those where specific issues were identified which related to one or more individual partner countries. Table 8.1 also presents some suggestions for revisions to course content; these are discussed further in Chapter 9 where a set of overall agreed key changes to the course materials and Facilitation Pack are presented.

Table 8.1 Course Content and Delivery Matrix						
Module	Question (as given in Chapter 7)	Commonality and diversity elements				
		P1 – UK	P2 – Cyprus	P3 – Romania	Italy	Ireland
Module 1 – Digital Literacy	**Adequate foundation of the module outline? (7.1)**	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
	Clarity of learning objectives? (7.2)	YES	YES	YES, but more intensive learning was expected.	YES	YES
	Clarity and usefulness of core and culture-specific learning objectives? (7.3)	YES	YES, but some activities must be reworked.	YES, with some difficulties due to the fact that the participants were not English speakers.	YES, but more practical exercises would be necessary.	Suggestions: use recovery-based, conversational sessions; simplify the language; use a glossary.
	Length of the module? (7.4)	YES	More time is necessary: 1 extra-hour for every unit.	Not long enough	More sessions, more practical activities.	Not long enough
	Engagement of participants? (7.5)	YES	Not very engaged (computers are necessary). Suggestion: to include activities that give the participants the opportunity to apply what is being taught.	YES	YES	Participants not engaged enough
	Helpfulness of the	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES, but it needs to

Module	Question				
Module 1 – Digital Literacy	delivery guidelines? (7.6)					identify what parts are used for. Many documents should be condensed.
	Effectiveness of the course pack? (7.7)	YES	YES	A time frame is necessary	YES	Not effective enough. Homework, practice and using supporting material is an ongoing learning challenge for this group after sessions are over.
	Effectiveness of the training materials? (7.8)	YES	YES. Suggestion: to add short classwork activities.	Partially effective (due to the language problem). More explanation and deeper training is necessary.	For the most part	Effective for the most part. A forum would give added value to the learning.
	Deviations from the course materials? (7.9)	YES	NO	YES	Partially	YES
Module	**Question (as given in Chapter 7)**	**Commonality and diversity elements**				
		P1 – UK	**P2 – Cyprus**	**P3 – Romania**	**Italy**	**Ireland**
Module 2 – Recovery and Resilience	**Adequate foundation of the module outline? (7.1)**	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
	Clarity of learning objectives? (7.2)	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
	Clarity and usefulness of core and culture-specific learning	YES: SMART obj. had been introduced previously in	SMART obj. presented several difficulties. More questions to	YES. More clarification about moral and social capital is needed.	YES	YES

	objectives? (7.3)	treatment.	guide participants are necessary.			
	Length of the module? (7.4)	More time is requested	Length ok	Module too short	Module too short	Length inadequate (too short)
	Engagement of participants? (7.5)	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
Module 2 – Recovery and Resilience	Helpfulness of the delivery guidelines? (7.6)	YES	YES, but it was necessary to have more information on roles and responsibilities.	YES	YES	YES
	Effectiveness of the course pack? (7.7)	YES and NO. Planning years ahead was a little intimidating to people in early stage of recovery.	More information was needed on some content (e.g. Cloud and Granfield, 2008, study)	YES. More explanation was necessary.	YES. Additional material was delivered.	Not effective enough. Homework, practice and using supporting material is an ongoing learning challenge for this group after sessions are over.
	Effectiveness of the training materials? (7.8)	YES. Only issue: more sensitivity to those participants who are fearful or uncomfortable with life stories and sharing their experiences.	Satisfactory. Suggestions: be able to present videos without the use of the internet. E.g., the Russell Brand video could be available as a downloadable version in order to present this to the participants. It would have been useful to have subtitles provided for every	YES. Problem with Recovery Journey (more time is necessary). The digital story board is not necessary: participants preferred writing on paper.	YES. More time would be necessary.	YES. More time is required to do justice to this module, to explore and internalise themes, principles and concepts on recovery.

Module	Question (as given in Chapter 7)	Commonality and diversity elements				
		P1 – UK	P2 – Cyprus	P3 – Romania	Italy	Ireland
	Deviations from the course materials? (7.9)	YES	YES	NO	Partially	Slightly
Module 3 – Learning to Learn	**Adequate foundation of the module outline? (7.1)**	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
	Clarity of learning objectives? (7.2)	YES	YES. Suggestion: add techniques for participants to use when dealing with barriers in their learning experience.	YES, but ambitious.	YES. Suggestion: open with a brainstorming session to define the arguments and learning experience.	YES, when deconstructed and appropriate language used.
	Clarity and usefulness of core and culture-specific learning objectives? (7.3)	YES	YES. Suggestions: include downloadable videos to be used offline; prepare a guidance sheet for trainers that helps give the right responses to the worksheet *Challenges to Learning*; regarding the 'Structure of a Report' handout (3.3B), a shorter report would be an improvement.	YES	YES	YES. Suggestion: use Mezirow's perspective of transformative learning.

Module 3 – Learning to Learn	**Length of the module? (7.4)**	Fine	Not adequate	Not adequate	Not adequate	Not adequate
	Engagement of participants? (7.5)	YES	Some were engaged, others were not because the topic of learning created a negative feelings.	YES	Not enough engagement due to negatives feelings created by negative school experiences.	YES
	Helpfulness of the delivery guidelines? (7.6)	YES	YES	YES	YES	Acceptable
	Effectiveness of the course pack? (7.7)	YES	YES. A guidance sheet for the trainer would be helpful (3.4B *Study Skills*: add in possible answers).	YES, but further explanation was necessary.	YES, but further explanation was necessary.	Acceptable
	Effectiveness of the training materials? (7.8)	YES	YES, but more time is necessary.	YES, but more time is necessary.	YES	YES
	Deviations from the course materials? (7.9)	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
Module	**Question (as given in Chapter 7)**	**Commonality and diversity elements**				
		P1 – UK	**P2 – Cyprus**	**P3 – Romania**	**Italy**	**Ireland**
Module 4 – Recovery and Community	**Adequate foundation of the module outline? (7.1)**	YES	YES	YES, but more explanation for each unit was needed.	Partly adequate	Culturally focused in the UK which was problematic.
	Clarity of learning objectives? (7.2)	YES	YES, but more materials and information is necessary.	YES, but activities were not correlated with the unit content. Personal action plan	YES, but the module seems pitched at professionals and not at the users.	YES, but the Recovery Coach Manual does not seem to be pitched at the

			not clear.		audience.
Module 4 – Recovery and Community	**Clarity and usefulness of core and culture-specific learning objectives? (7.3)**	YES	YES, but additional activities were necessary. Suggestions: introduce a case study of an adult who went through addiction and their road to becoming a recovery coach; other materials are necessary.	YES, but additional activities/explanation are necessary. Suggestion: present different types of recovering communities.	YES, but additional activities are necessary.	YES, but but more details and information are necessary.
	Length of the module? (7.4)	Fine	Adequate	Just right	Adequate	Time due to lack of content was not an issue here.
	Engagement of participants? (7.5)	YES	YES. Suggestion: add discussions on the experiential perspectives.	YES. Once the discussion was reinterpreted towards participants' personal experience with the recovering community.	YES	YES, but the *Boundaries Worksheet* seems applicable in the context of a recovery coach.
	Helpfulness of the delivery guidelines? (7.6)	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
	Effectiveness of the course pack? (7.7)	YES	Yes, but more explanations were necessary (on recovery coach).	More materials would be necessary	YES, but UK-centred.	YES
	Effectiveness of the training materials? (7.8)	YES, but the recovery inventory could be replaced with a more	YES. Further material was delivered in order to provide participants	Not enough	Not enough	Somewhat

64

		generic inventory.	with a full picture of the module.			
	Deviations from the course materials? (7.9)	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES

Module	**Question (as given in Chapter 7)**	**Commonality and diversity elements**				
		P1 – UK	**P2 – Cyprus**	**P3 – Romania**	**Italy**	**Ireland**
Module 5 – Recovery and Employability	**Adequate foundation of the module outline? (7.1)**	YES	YES, but supplementary information is needed.	YES	YES	YES, but concepts and language need to be reframed.
	Clarity of learning objectives? (7.2)	YES	YES, but some aspects seem ambitious.	YES	YES	YES
	Clarity and usefulness of core and culture-specific learning objectives? (7.3)	YES, but more explanation about the social enterprise is needed. Remove the example of the running a public house (due to the alcohol addiction).	YES. Suggestions: give written guidelines on creating a CV; give examples of responses on the interview; give guidance on how to carry out a role-play.	Provide more information about different types of social enterprises (the cooperative is an Italian model).	YES	Taking into account cultural issues is necessary for this module (specifically, what to reveal or not by inclusion in the CV).
	Length of the module? (7.4)	Provide more time for CV creation.	Need more time	Need more time to present the sessions (possibly separate into two 4-hour modules – one on social enterprise and another on employability skills).	Need more time	Need more time
	Engagement of participants? (7.5)	YES, but with resistance towards the	YES, but with difficulties about the	YES	YES	YES

		work to develop a social enterprise.	'economic' concepts.			
Module 5 – Recovery and Employability	**Helpfulness of the delivery guidelines? (7.6)**	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
	Effectiveness of the course pack? (7.7)	NO, participants questioned the inclusion of social enterprise.	YES, but some aspects require supplementary information.	YES	YES	Participants had resistance to use the Course Pack.
	Effectiveness of the training materials? (7.8)	NO. Some of the materials did not reflect how the Job Centre Plus (JCP) operates in the UK.	Need more guidance and information about: (1) Building a CV, (2) How to write a cover letter, and (3) Job interview: how to plan, present and review the interview are necessary.	YES, but could not find online resources	YES, but it would be necessary to perform additional tasks to address participants' concerns about their job searching skills.	The *Expectations Worksheet* was unclear. The business plan needed more time and discussion. Some of the business plan was too technical and specialised.
	Deviations from the course materials? (7.9)	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES

9   CONCLUSIONS

9.1   Overall Conclusions

Some key aspects of the pilot delivery feedback can be taken into account when revising the course materials and preparing the Final Facilitation Pack:

1. Overall, all groups of participants were engaged in the Pilot Phase of the RECOVEU project and fully participated in the training in all modules. The 'Access to Learning' resources seemed to be effective in providing 'a reflective spirit' whilst helping to allay participants' resistance to, and fears of, accessing learning. It is suggested here that part of the reason that the RECOVEU course achieved positive results is because trainers were experts in working with adults in addiction recovery and this is a requirement that should be highlighted in the Final Facilitation Pack.

2. Exercises, practical activities and discussion are essential and should be developed further.

3. Creating a group culture for those taking the course is another important element: this promotes the added value of peer comparison, sharing and support. Specific attention and time should be devoted for this in each module.

9.2   Finalising the Course Materials and Preparing the Final Facilitation Pack

In the next stage (Work Package 8) of the project partners will work together to improve the course materials and Facilitation Pack. To support this process a table of the key points arising from the pilot was compiled. A partner meeting was then held to discuss the pilot feedback and a series of key changes were agreed by all partners as a group. Throughout this process partners were mindful that the contents must be adaptable to the individual service user's education level and their recovery phase.

Table 9.1 presents the key changes to the module content and Module Outlines indicated by the pilot together with the final Action Points as agreed in the partner meeting (presented in Column 5). The text below gives the list of instructions partners followed when making these agreed changes. Table 9.2 presents a list of additional information partners were asked to provide in support of this revision process.

(Note: see also *Del. 7.2: Qualitative Feedback Review* and *Del. 7.3: Evaluation Toolkit Feedback Review* for additional Action Points and recommendations for revising the course materials and Facilitation Pack.)

9.2.1   Instructions for partners concerning key module changes

The following instructions and action points were agreed by all partners and circulated with Tables 9.1 and 9.2.

Please read the following bullet points before you begin to amend your modules:

1. Please note that only the end column in the table (Column 5) identifies the Action Points we have agreed to carry out. Points in the other columns are for your information – they do not indicate that an action has been agreed.

2. Feedback from the pilots suggested that more time was needed for all the modules. However, this is dependent on the participants on the course (e.g. the level of their computer skills in relation to Module 1). It was agreed, therefore, that a note would be added to the Train the Trainers Module and the Delivery Guidelines to suggest trainers allow more time for units depending on the needs of the participants. ACTION: CARDET to add this information to the Train the Trainers Module (Del 9.7); SU to add this information to the *Facilitation Pack Section 1 (Final): Delivery Guidelines* (part of *Del 8.3: Final Facilitation Pack*).

3. ACTION: CARDET to add a note to the Train the Trainers Module that online access is required for the videos.

4. ACTION: All additional information which partners have agreed to provide must be sent to the module leads (see Table 9.2 below).

5. ACTION: Each partner will rewrite/amend their section of the Course Pack (i.e. Course Overview Table, Module Summary, and Module Outline) and amend or provide new learning materials as agreed. All new and amended documents will be sent to SU and CARDET. Please highlight all sections that have been changed.

6. If partners need more in-depth information on the nature of the agreed changes this can be obtained from the *Pilot Delivery Review* (Del 7.1) and the *Qualitative Feedback Review* (Del 7.2).

7. ACTION: Once the module materials have been amended, partners need to revisit their Module Outline and learning objectives to ensure that they are in line with the new content and that they are clear. Translators only need to translate new material and sections. ACTION: Partners should highlight the material which requires translation.

68

Table 9.1 Agreed key changes to the RECOVEU module content and Module Outlines				
Module	**Unit number and title**	**Specific materials to add/remove**	**Key module content and delivery changes**	**Agreed Action Points**
Module 1 – Digital Literacy **(Cyprus – CARDET)**	1.1 Digital Divide and Digital Literacy	N/A	1. Include PDF downloadable sheets regarding 'Initial steps' prior to accessing Module 1. See points below. 2. PDF with e-mail set-up as Activity 1 (so that learners can then register on site). 3. PDF on creating an account on online platform. 4. PDF with creating a group mailing list for learners to share info about course.	**Module Content** 1. Include 'Initial steps' pdf downloadable sheet (Points 1-4, Column 4). 2. Provide a glossary of terms for the Course Pack. **Module Outline** 1. Add note for trainers to allow extra time for those with lower level computer skills and to include more than one trainer in class to attend to students' needs. 2. Ensure access to computer and internet. 3. Start course with pdf sheets 'Initial steps' as a way of helping those with lower level digital skills ease into the module. 4. Ensure that the learning objectives are correctly focused and that the Module Outline instructions are clear on what participants should be learning and should expect from the module. 5. Ensure that the Module Outline clearly identifies which parts of the module activities are to be used for. 6. SDP will provide CARDET with a list of internet abbreviations for Romanian participants to be included in the Train the Trainers Module.
	1.2 Basic computer skills	N/A		
	1.3 Internet	N/A		
	1.4 Social interactions	**To add** 1. List of abbreviations used online in Romanian. 2. PDF with instructions on e-mail set up. 3. How to create an account on online platform. 4. How to create a mailing list for group (so that group can share materials of the course).		

Module	Unit number and title	Specific materials to add/remove	Key module content and delivery changes	Agreed Action Points
Module 2 – Recovery and Resilience **(Ireland – Soilse)**	2.1 From Active Addiction to Recovery	**To add** 1. Translation of Russell Brand video.	1. More time. 2. Translation of videos included 3. Include more discussion questions as this topic was highly familiar and interesting to participants. 4. Include gender-specific information. 5. Include additional guidance questions on SMART Goals exercise to help participants develop own goals.	**Module Content** 1. It is not feasible to translate the Russel Brand video in Unit 2.1. Instead CARDET, SANSAT and SDP will send suggested links to replace this video to Soilse. If no replacement can be found then Soilse will summarise the content of the video. Also add a suggestion to the Train the Trainers Module and module outline that trainers try to find a video in their own language for participants. 2. Include discussion questions as identified in Column 2. 3. Include gender-specific material: Each partner to provide two suggestions on specific groups for women or information on gender specific groups or organisations. 4. Include Principles of Recovery in Unit 2.3. 5. Provide a summary of the Cloud and Granfield (2008) study for Unit 2.3. 6. Provide further explanation of terms in Unit 2.3 (measureable, attainable, moral, social capital, resilience, recovery capital). 7. Provide clarification in Unit 2.3 on whether recovery capital is built as a process or as an initial asset in the recovery process. **Module Outline** 1. Add guidelines on SMART activity in Unit 2.4.
	2.2 My Recovery Journey	**To add** 1. Discussion questions on 'What is Addiction?', 'What is Sobriety?', 'How you go from drug use to addiction?', 'What is the turning point from addiction to recovery?' 2. Include gender-specific discussions on recovery journey (challenges for women).		
	2.3 Building my Recovery Capital	**To add** Copy of the Principles of Recovery added and presented as an overhead.		
	2.4 SMART Goals using the Principles of Recovery	**To add** Include additional questions such as: 'How do you plan to do that?', 'What barriers do you expect to find?', 'How do you plan to overcome them?', 'When do you want to do that?', 'Why do you want to do that?', 'How realistic is that using this timeframe?'. These additional questions helped frame the purpose of the SMART Goals activity. They found it slightly challenging to understand concepts such as 'MEASURABLE' or		

Module	Unit number and title	Specific materials to add/remove	Key module content and delivery changes	Agreed Action Points
		'ATTAINABLE'. So some terms needed further elaboration using additional questions.		(e.g. give the starting point for the time frame for the goals – future goals). 2. Module outline needs to be clearer on what participants should be learning and should expect from the module.
Module 3 – Learning to Learn **(Romania – SDP)**	3.1 Recovery-Centred Learning	**To remove** Remove video on 'experiential learning' as it is repetitive with content.	1. Content needs to include information that is not only about going back to university as that was not a goal for the majority. 2. Include information on vocational education. 3. Include discussion points listed in each module unit. 4. Include 'intelligence' or 'personality' test to explore what employment fits best. 5. Include Guidance Sheet on how to overcome 'Challenges to Learning'.	**Module Content** 1. Adapt material to become less focused on university guidance and more about other types of learning too (experiential, vocational). 2. Remove experiential video (Unit 1). 3. Unit 2: Provide activity to help students to develop ideas of how to overcome future negative learning experiences – complete a table mapping out sources of support in their communities and more generally. SDP to provide this worksheet to CARDET as one of their additional module activities. Partners to provide additional suggestions for sources of support which will be added to the Train the Trainers Module. 4. Include a short vocational orientation test to explore what employment fits best to replace university orientated activity (Unit 3). Partners to suggest additional tests suitable for participants. Remove reference to 'intelligence' or 'personality' tests. 5. Create a power point around a mind map for employment orientations.
	3.2 Challenges for Learners in Recovery	1. Include Guidance sheet on how to overcome 'Challenges to Learning'. 2. Translation of 'Fight or Flight' video (SDP have already translated)		
	3.3 Orientation for Access Education	**To add** 1. Include sample of short university. 2. Add information on vocational education. **To remove** 1. Remove multiple university-related activities and add vocational education activities too.		
	3.4 Learning Using Study Skills	**To add** 1. Add an individual test to discover the own personal 'intelligence' and the best way to take advantage of it in the employment reality. 2. Create mind-map with participants	.	

Module	Unit number and title	Specific materials to add/remove	Key module content and delivery changes	Agreed Action Points
		on topic of interest (e.g. football). 3. Add an additional sheet to go with the Study Skills sheet which gives the answers as this would help improve skills.		6. Study Skills (Unit 4) – retain 'Do's and Don'ts' but revised to relate more to vocational training. Provide a handout with resources for vocational training. Partners to provide SDP with 3 to 5 examples. **Module Outline** 1. Guidance sheet for Train the Trainers Module to show how to help students overcome challenges to learning (Unit 2). 1. Include information on how to guide students through the vocational orientation test (Unit 3).
Module 4 – Recovery and Community **(UK – SU)**	4.1 What is a Recovery Community?	**To add** 1. Discussion of differences between a functional and dysfunctional recovery community. 2. Discussion on understanding recovery community from 12-steps perspective. 3. Include examples from other kinds of communities (disadvantaged, therapeutic, religious, Traveller-Romany, LGBT, prison, etc.).	1. More time 2. Include information on other kinds of communities 3. Much more guidance and information on activities and their scope as there was too little information on implementing the learning activities and we had no materials to process in order to support the learning 4. Less UK-specific information 5. Replace 'Daily inventory' with 'Recovery inventory' 6. Include discussion points as listed in each module unit	**Module Content** 1. Include information on other kinds of communities (Point 3, Column 3 – Unit 1). 2. Remove UK-specific information and adapt to a more European picture of recovery community. Partners to provide a short summary of the kind of recovery communities available in their country, how they are run and what it means for someone to become a recovery coach. This information will form a handout which will also include an EU perspective (Unit 1). 3. Provide additional information on the role of the recovery coach (Unit 3). 4. Replace Daily Inventory with Recovery Inventory (Unit 4).
	4.2 Functions of Recovery Communities	**To add** 1. Discussion of roles and responsibilities of a recovery coach. 2. Brainstorm activity: 'Why is it		

72

RECOVEU: A participative approach to curriculum development for adults in addiction recovery across the European Union
[Project Number: 538955-LLP-1-2013-1-UK-GRUNDTVIG-GMP]

Module	Unit number and title	Specific materials to add/remove	Key module content and delivery changes	Agreed Action Points
		important to belong to recovery community?'	7. Include talk by a recovery coach on his/her experience (case study of recovery coach, the tools they use and challenges they face and how to overcome them)	**Module Outline**
	4.3 What is a Recovery Coach?	**To add** 1. Discussion on the role of the 12-step sponsor. 2. Presentation by a recovery coach to speak about their background, training and obligations being a recovery coach .		1. More specific guidelines on all learning activities and how they fit with module scope. 2. Include discussion questions (Column 3). 3. Recommend talk by a recovery coach. 4. Revise the Module Outline to provide more explanation and guidance on how this module should be taught and how the learning objectives should be realised.
	4.4 Next steps – Personal Action	**To add** 1. Discussion on comparison of worksheets amongst them to identify similarities and differences. 2. Replace 'Daily Inventory' with 'Recovery Inventory'.		
Module 5 – Recovery and Employability **(Italy – SANSAT)**	5.1 People in Recovery and Employability Skills	**To add** 1. CV template: Details on format, content and how to best present themselves. 2. Interview preparation and how to answer questions. 3. How to reply to a job advertisement 4. PowerPoint on how to upload a job advert on a website.	1. More time. 2. Remove social enterprise public house example. 3. Simplify and adapt Unit 2 – Social Enterprise (complicated terms and difficult to understand). 4. Make much more employability-focused: ➢ Include role play activity 'The Apprentice'. ➢ Build CV.	**Module Content** 1. Remove Social Enterprise public house example and replace with more appropriate example (Unit 3). 2. Simplify and adapt Unit 2 - Social Enterprise (complicated terms and difficult to understand). Provide an additional PowerPoint explain what a social enterprise is and a glossary of terms. 3. SU to provide fact sheets for adults on CVs, preparing for job interviews etc. (Unit 1). 4. Information on slide 6 PowerPoint (5.1A) does not reflect the situation in the UK where Job

Module	Unit number and title	Specific materials to add/remove	Key module content and delivery changes	Agreed Action Points
			➢ Prepare for job interview. ➢ Reply to a job advertisement. ➢ Uploading on a job website.	Centre Plus processes are online. There are no job boards and job seeking activity is cross-checked by Job Centre Plus workers to ensure those accessing benefits are engaging in the process. Add something to this slide to make it more relevant to UK (Unit 1).
	5.2 Understanding the Social Enterprise	**To add** 1. Add grid to facilitate the description of the of formal and informal network resources made available by small groups to each member. **To remove** 1. Remove social enterprise technical and complex terms.		5. Add a mind-mapping exercise to help students visualise the resources they have within formal/informal networks (Unit 2). 6. Soilse to provide a handout on doing a role play job interview for the Train the Trainers Module (as one of their additional activities). 7. SDP will provide an additional activity on financial management and dealing with an income for the Train the Trainers Module. This will count as one of their additional activities.
	5.3 Applying the Social Enterprise Model to Recovery	**To remove** 1. Remove social enterprise example of setting up a public house. 2. Remove Expectations Worksheet – was not found to be useful.		8. Make much more employability-focused: a. Building a CV. b. Prepare for job interview (and mock job interview). c. Reply to a job advertisement. d. Uploading on a job website.
	5.4 Designing a Recovery Social Enterprise	**To add** 1. 1.Role-play 'The Apprentice' on business plan		**Module Outline** 1. Include list of job searching sites for each partner country. CARDET – include in Train the Trainers Module. 2. Provide suggestions of video links in English – SU

Module	Unit number and title	Specific materials to add/remove	Key module content and delivery changes	Agreed Action Points
				to send some suggestions. CARDET – emailing Agia Skepi re use of their video. CARDET – add tip to the Train the Trainers Module about using the English language videos. **Train the Trainers Module** 1. Soilse to provide their handout for the role play activity - 'the Apprentice'. 2. Information on the barriers to employment within the different countries, e.g. stigma, declaration of prior offences and police clearance (this information can be drawn from the Policy and Practice Review – WP3).

Table 9.2 Table of information to be shared with partners		
From	**To**	**What**
SDP	CARDET	A list of internet abbreviations for Romanian participants to be included in the Train the Trainers Module.
SDP CARDET SANSAT	SOILSE	**Module 2 – Unit 1** Suggested links to replace the Russell Brand video. If no replacement can be found, Soilse will summarise the content of the video.
ALL	SOILSE	**Module 2 – Unit 2** Suggestions on specific groups for women or information on gender specific groups or organisations.
ALL	SDP	**Module 3 – Unit 2** Students will be asked to complete a table mapping out sources of support in their communities and more generally. SDP will provide this worksheet to CARDET as one of their additional module activities but all partners need to provide additional suggestions for sources of support which will be added to the Train the Trainers Module.
ALL	SDP	**Module 3 – Unit 3** A short vocational orientation test to explore what employment fits best will be included in this module. Partners to suggest additional tests suitable for participants.
ALL	SDP	**Module 3 – Unit 4** SDP will be providing a handout with resources for vocational training. Partners to provide 3 – 5 examples of resources for vocational training.
ALL	SU	**Module 4 – Unit 1** Short summary of the kind of recovery communities available in each partner country, how they are run and what it means for someone to become a recovery coach.
ALL	SANSAT	**Module 5** Examples of job searching sites.
SU	SANSAT	**Module 5** Suggestions of video links in English to add to existing Italian ones.
SU	SANSAT	**Module 5 – Unit 1** Fact sheets for adults on CVs, preparing for job interviews, etc.

10 REFERENCES

Cloud, W. and Granfield, R. (2008). Conceptualising recovery capital: Expansion of a theoretical construct. *Substance Use and Misuse*, 43, 1971-1986.

EMCDDA (European Monitoring Centre for Drugs and Drug Addiction; 2012). EMCDDA INSIGHTS. Social reintegration and employment: Evidence and interventions for drug users and treatment. Lisbon: EMCDDA.

Gardner, F. (1989). Educational implications of the theory of multiple intelligences. *Educational Researcher,* 18(8), 4-10.

Mezirow, J. (1991). *Transformational dimensions of adult learning.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

This document has been produced by the RECOVEU consortium. The lead partner for this phase of the project and the main author of this report was Social Cooperative 'San Saturnino Onlus' (SANSAT).

Institute for Education Policy Research
Staffordshire University (UK)

Kim Slack, Jane Rowley and Amanda Hughes

Centre for the Advancement of Research and Development in Educational Technology (Cyprus)

Sotiris Themistokleous, Eliza Patouris and Maria Solomou

St Dimitrie Program (Romania)

Claudia Varga, Nicoleta Amariei, Ion Copoeru and Mihaela Stanceanu

Soilse, Drug Rehabilitation Programme (Ireland)

Gerry McAlleenan, Sonya Dillon and Patricia Doyle

Social Cooperative 'San Saturnino Onlus' (Italy)

Gabriella Fabrizi and Marilena Nocente