

Peer Review Report

ISIO GUIDANCE CENTRE MURSKA SOBOTA 2012

Authors:

ALBERT ŠTRANCAR

MARJO LIETE

MIHAELA ANCLIN

TANJA MOŽINA

SONJA KLEMENČIČ

Released by: TANJA MOŽINA

1st June, 2012

Contents

1	Data sheet	3
2	Description of the Guidance Centre	6
2.1	Summary: Mission Statement	7
2.2	Summary: Quality Assurance and Development: policies and measures	8
3	Peer Review procedure	8
3.1	Purpose/targets of the Peer Review	8
3.2	Peer Team	8
3.3	Methods for collecting data and sources	9
4	Assessment of Quality Areas	10
4.1	Quality Area 1: GUIDANCE PROCESS	10
4.2	Quality Area 2: PARTNERSHIP	15
4.3	Overall Assessment	19
5	Annex	20
5.1	Guidelines for the analyse of the self-report and preparing questions for the peer review	21
5.2	Guidelines for conducting interviews with questions	27
5.3	Agenda of Peer Visit	34

1. Data Sheet

1) Contact information

Name of Guidance Centre: **ISIO guidance centre Murska Sobota**
Address: Slomškova 33, 9000 Murska Sobota, Slovenia
Telephone, fax, e-mail: 02 536 15 76, 02 536 15 64, svetovalno.sredisce@lums.si

Contact persons	Name	Contact (e-mail)
Manager/Head of Organisation/Unit	Alenka Kučan	alenka.kucan@lums.si
Peer Review Facilitator	Alojz Sraka	svetovalno.sredisce@lums.si
Other persons responsible	Dejan Dravec	dejan.dravec@lums.si

2) Starting point (e.g. prior evaluations, national quality requirements applicable etc.) and decision to conduct the Peer Review (taken when and by whom?)

There are 14 guidance centres operating in Slovenia under the central guidance of Slovenian Institute for Adult Education Ljubljana (SIAE). SIAE had also developed a Model for Evaluating and Developing Quality in Guidance Centres for Adult Education. It is a document that ensures that the standards of quality are being implemented in guidance centres in Slovenia and that are being evaluated and upgraded in time with the help of self-evaluating reports and action plans as standard procedure of the work of guidance centres. The ISIO guidance centre Murska Sobota has been actively pursuing it since 2009. ISIO guidance centre Murska Sobota performs regularly monitoring of their activities and on this basis prepares an annual monitoring report. On that basis, an annual action plan is prepared, in which is decided what activities will be implemented for the improvement. ISIO guidance centre Murska Sobota also regularly conducts self-evaluation, which takes place in a two-year cycle - one year self-assessment activities are conducted in the second year activities for the development are planned and implement into practice. Every four year an external evaluation in selected areas is carried out in all guidance centres in Slovenia. Through the guidance and managing role of SIAE ISIO guidance centre Murska Sobota has become partner in EuroPeerGuid project with three other countries and it was decided for international partners to conduct a peer review among each other. A joint educational session was executed in Portugal at November 2011. After that Slovenian team conducted a peer visit in Finland. In the second phase Finnish team was a guest in Slovenia and together with Slovenian peers conducted a peer visit in ISIO guidance centre Murska Sobota.

It was a chance for the guidance centre to evaluate their work with the help of international colleagues and project partners.

3) Aims and purpose of the Peer Review

*SIAE had joined the EuroPeerGuid project with international partners. The purpose of peer review of ISIO guidance centre Murska Sobota was to evaluate the quality of counselling in guidance centre in two quality areas: **guidance process** and **partnership**. With that, the staff from the guidance centre expected the level of quality of counselling work to increase.*

-
-
- 4) **External organisation**
- Single Peer Review (Peers come from different Guidance Centres)
- Reciprocal Peer Review (Peer Review with one partner institution)
- Peer Review in a Network (more than 2 Guidance centres have a common Peer Team)
-

5) **Internal organisation for the conduct of the Peer Review** (Describe who is responsible for which tasks)

Alojz Sraka carried out the role of the peer visit facilitator.

6) **Overview of the procedure and time schedule:**

Activity	Timeframe and (due) dates
Self-Evaluation	January and February 2012
Self-Report (due 1 month before Visit at the latest)	April 2012
Preparation of Peer Visit	March and April 2012
Peer Visit	May 9 th 2012
Peer Review Report	1 st June 2012
Action Plan and Improvements	Depends on decision of international peer review team, but no later than September 15 th 2012.

7) **Quality Areas**

*There were two quality areas tackled and they were the following: **Guidance process and Partnership.***

7.1) List of special evaluation questions for the Peers

/

8) **List of Peers with names and contact information**

	Name	Institution	E-mail
Peer Coordinator	Dr. Tanja Možina	SIAE Ljubljana	tanja.mozina@acs.si
Peer Facilitator	Alojz Sraka	ISIO Murska Sobota	svetovalno.sredisce@lums.si
National peer	Sonja Klemenčič	Ljubljana	sonja.klemencic@acs.si
National peer	Albert Štrancar	CDI Univerzum Ljubljana	albert.strancar@cdi-univerzum.si
National peer	Mihaela	ISIO Žalec	mihaela.anclin@upi.si

	Anclin		
Special Functions			
Evaluation Expert	/		
Transnational Peer	Marjo Liete	KEUDA, Finland	marjo.liete@keuda.fi

9) Signature(s)

Name dr. Tanja Možina

Position Head of quality and education department, SIAE

Place Ljubljana, Slovenia

Date 1st June 2012

2. Description of the Guidance Centre

ISIO Guidance centre Murska Sobota is based and operating at Adult Education centre Murska Sobota since September 2001. ISIO project (informing and counselling in adult education) within the guidance centre is operating, was developed by Slovenian Institute for Adult Education Ljubljana (SIAE Ljubljana). Today there are 14 guidance centres inside the counselling network. Activity is financed in the framework of life-long learning centres project in part from European Social Fund (85%) and in part from Ministry of Education, Science, Culture and Sports (15%).

The guidance centre is offering informing and counselling before, during and after the education process. They perform guidance in person, by the phone, by e-mail or by ordinary mail. They perform counselling on individual and groups level. The guidance centre is operating in region called Pomurje which measures 1.338km² (6.6% of area of Slovenia). There are 122.068 residents living in the region (6% of all Slovenian population). Pomurje region is located at far northeast of the state and it borders on Hungary, Austria and Croatia. In Pomurje region there are 27 municipalities and each of them contains between 300 and 18.000 residents. 6 municipalities are located on bi-lingual area (Slovenian and Hungarian language). Between 6.300 and 7.700 residents of these 6 municipalities consider themselves as Hungarians. In Pomurje region there are also members of Roma minority (between 3.500 and 4.000). Beside multiethnicity they also have multiculturalism in the region. GDP of the region is the lowest among all twelve of the regions in Slovenia. -Average salary in the region is the lowest and it is 876,17 EUR per month. Unemployment rate is 18% and it is highest in the country. The region is a region of agriculture and working intensive industry with low wages which finds itself in a lot of difficulties lately. Statistics about number of services is the only criteria which doesn't put Pomurje region on the last place in the country. Region residents spend half a year less in school on average comparing to the rest of the country. In the field of life-long learning they are behind as well with formal education as with other forms of education in general.

All arguments point to direction of the guidance centre being on a very important and needed mission because it is generally acknowledged that development of an area is heavily connected to the level of general education of its residents. Counselling is performed in the framework of 1,5 counsellors. Besides working in the guidance centre in Murska Sobota (which is in the largest municipality) they also conduct counselling at 4 permanent dislocations (in other four largest municipalities). They also practice mobile guidance work which operates according to current needs.

Beside general directions, mentioned in the mission statement, the guidance centre also focus on following target groups: population without or with low level of education (less than four years of elementary school), farmers, Roma ethnical minority, Hungarian ethnical minority, adults over 40 years age, elderly adults. In the project document of Life-long learning Centre Pomurje (30.6. 2008) the following target groups are added (page 10): unemployed persons, persons without access to digital technology and with low level of functional literacy, persons employed in working intensive branches of industry, vulnerable groups (school dropouts, disabled persons). Basic activity of guidance centre is offering informing and counselling in the field of adult education, which is free of charge

and in accordance with ISIO model¹ of quality. A lot of time is being invested in the promotion of guidance and in life-long learning².

To achieve the goals that the guidance centre has established for its activities the Strategic Council and Council of Experts were established. It also has the network of supportive partners.

2.1 Summary: Mission Statement

Mission

In the ISIO guidance centre Murska Sobota they ensure kind, confidential, free of charge, quality, holistic and expert informing and guidance to all adults as a support with educating and learning. The counsellors help the clients with making decisions concerning education, organizing and executing of learning, planning of future educational path and development of career. Local institutions for adult education and guidance are assembled in strategic, expert and supporting partners network with the purpose of ensuring holistic and synchronized activities of all subjects which supply the possibilities of education and learning as well as informing and guidance in the field of adult education. The guidance centre promote life-long learning, learning and educational possibilities, and other kind of support. They also promote all three partners networks and all suppliers of adult education in the region.

Vision

Slovenian ISIO guidance centres will become most qualitative and recognizable centres of guidance in the field of adult education at local and at national level.

Values

When conducting guidance, the guidance centre follows seven basic values: accessibility, confidentiality, respectfulness, orientation towards client, objectivity, expertise, quality.

¹ The revised model of information and guidance activities in adult education - ISIO (2001) for the statistical region of Pomurje.

² ISIO form Media - for the year 2011 (January-December)

2.2 Summary: Quality Assurance and Development: policies and measures

In 2009 guidance centres around Slovenia, under the guidance of SIAE, implemented a Model of Evaluating and Developing Quality in Guidance Centres for Adult Education. The model contains areas, standards and indicators of quality. At the end there are criteria of quality which the guidance centre must meet each time. Criteria of quality are those that the guidance centre considers as their goals in individual areas of quality. The model consists of internal and external quality evaluation. External evaluation is conducted by SIAE and internal evaluation is conducted by the counsellors themselves. There are 10 areas of quality in the model: (1) Potential clients, (2) Staff, (3) Resources, Equipment, Databases, Instruments, (4) Guidance process, (5) Partnership, (6) Information and promotion, (7) Quality evaluation and development, (8) Results, (9) Effects, (10) Management, Administration, Organisation. These areas of quality and the criteria are crucial measures of the success of the guidance centre in the field of quality.

3. Peer Review procedure

3.1 Purpose/targets of the Peer Review

The purpose of the peer review of the ISIO guidance centre Murska Sobota was to evaluate the quality of counselling in the guidance centre in two quality areas: **guidance process** and **partnership**. As the method of peer review was used, the guidance centre expected, that with the feedback that they would get from their professional colleagues - peers, would help them to get a deeper insight of the strong and weak points of their work. This would be a good base for the planning and executing improvements into their future work.

3.2 Peer Team

	Name	Institution	E-mail
Peer Coordinator	Dr. Tanja Možina	SIAE Ljubljana	tanja.mozina@acs.si
Peer Facilitator	Alojz Sraka	ISIO Murska Sobota	svetovalno.sredisce@lums.si
National peer	Sonja Klemenčič	Ljubljana	sonja.klemencic@acs.si
National peer	Albert Štrancar	CD Univerzum Ljubljana	albert.strancar@cdi-univerzum.si
National peer	Mihaela Anclin	ISIO Žalec	mihaela.anclin@upi.si
Special Functions			
Evaluation Expert	/		
Transnational Peer	Marjo Liete	KEUDA, Finland	marjo.liete@keuda.fi

3.3 Methods for collecting data and sources

Different methods were used for collecting data and sources.

ANALYSIS OF THE SELF-REPORT

The method of documentation analysis has been used in the first phase as the basis of the data collection was the self-report, prepared by the counsellors in ISIO guidance centre Murska Sobota. The peer team analysed the self-evaluation report, and also the additional documentation, which was provided by the guidance centre as annexes to the self-report.

*METHOD OF WORK IN THE PEER TEAM: Each of the peers had to review the self-evaluation report with the help of a special form **Guidelines for the analyse of the self-evaluation report and preparing questions for the peer review** (see annex 5.1.), prepared by SIAE, and made a first assessment, if the guidance centre achieves quality within the indicators that they have chosen to evaluate. On this basis, each of the peers also prepared a draft of questions that should be additionally asked to different interest groups at the peer visit. A coordinator collected together the assessments of each individual peer. This method allowed us to see the differences between peers. The coordinator also made a proposal of common questions that should be asked to each interviewee. In the last phase some of the prepared questions had to be eliminated because there were too many considering the time we had for executing the interviews. The criterion for the selection of questions was their closeness to the observed indicator, forecasting, which questions are appropriate for each interest group (topic they know) and the content of the questions relating to what in the self-evaluation report was the most ambiguous, indeterminate, etc. It was decided by the peer team that, in order to get additional information, three interest groups would be interviewed: **counsellors, clients, and partners** (stakeholders). For conducting interviews the guidelines with questions were prepared by the peer group (see annex 5.2.).*

PEER REVIEW VISIT

The peer visit took place on 9th of May 2012 in ISIO guidance centre Murska Sobota. (See the Agenda for the Peer Visit in Annex 5.3.)

At the peer visit the **method of interviews** was used. With the help of the interviews with selected interest groups the peer team got additional information's, important for assessing the quality of work of guidance centre. The interviews with the selected interest groups were conducted in a peer visit. We carried out: an interview with three clients, an interview with four partners (one strategic, one professional and two supportive partners), and an interview with two counsellors.

The roles of the peers at the peer visit were divided as follows: two of the peers, conducted the interviews (ask questions to the interviewed group), one peer wrote down the minutes, and two peers carefully monitored the conversation and kept a record of the proposals to create a feedback on the completion of peer visit.

Also the **method of observation** was used, as we had the possibility to observe the place, when guidance is executed.

4. Assessment of Quality Areas

4.1 Quality Area 1: GUIDANCE PROCESS

Indicator 1: Gathering and analysing client's data, important for guidance process

Strengths

Following the strengths that were found out by the peer team are listed:

- It has been found out by the peer team that **the guidance centre regularly monitors the demographic data of its clients** and knows them very well. These data are important as they bring insight in the ways in which the guidance process is executing. This gives counsellors the opportunity to make corrections if needed. For example to carry out more of a specific method of guidance if needed.
- The counsellors care about **the privacy of the clients** when ask for personal and sensitive information. They care a lot also about how to register such kind of personal data. When they enter the data to the internet application that they use for monitoring the guidance process, they are very careful not to expose the more sensitive information about the individual clients (such are: ethnic origin, disabilities, etc.) But they are also aware that this more qualitative information's are the most important regarding the guidance process that follows the data gathering.
- When the clients were asked about how they felt when talking with the counsellors, they said that they felt very comfortable, when counsellors asked them for their personal data, their privacy was assured. The peer group had also the possibility to visit the premises where the guidance process is executed and from the observation it can be assessed that the premises allows enough privacy.
- The guidance centre also monitors **the demographic trends of the population of the region** and has the knowledge to compare them with the trends in guidance. As a result of such monitoring the guidance centre knows the reasons why the structure of the clients is changing (Examples of woman's, unemployed). This can help the counsellors to be active and to include clients from the target groups that have more need for guidance in the region.
- From the explanation that the counsellors gave, about how they cooperate among themselves, when they had to analyse the case of a particular client or solve some very complex or specific problems of the clients, the peer group can determine that the cooperation among the counsellors is good. We noticed that the counsellors cooperate very well in analysing the data gathered from the clients. The flow of experience among the counsellors is very important and we could recognised it when discussing with them.
- At the interviews a good practice was presented to us: counsellors use the cases of good practices of clients as a motivational tool for other clients.

Areas of Improvement

Following the areas of improvement that were found out by the peer team are listed:

- Monitoring and analysing of the demographic characteristics of the clients (the quantitative aspect - that is done in a very systematic way in the guidance centre) is just one of the aspects about how to get to know the client. Of equal importance, or even more important, is to gather and analyse the information from the clients in the individual level - what is the client's problem, what are the circumstances that caused the problem, what resources does the client have to solve the problem. In this aspect the work of the guidance centre should be developed further in the future.
- For example: if the peer team would assess the quality of work of the guidance centre only by reading the self-evaluation report, prepared by the counsellors, it would be very legitimate to come to the conclusion that the counsellors from the guidance centre have a lot of data and information about the clients, but just the demographic one's, nothing more. Following the discussions with the counsellors at the interviews, we could find out that the counsellors pay attention also about the more qualitative data. But what is still missing is the more in-depth qualitative analyse of such data. There were no such qualitative analyses in the self-evaluation report, neither did counsellors convince us, that such qualitative analyses are carried out in a systematic way. The counsellors at the interviews pointed out that they have some problems with time, as in the period when they had to prepare the EuropeerGuid self-report they also had other reports to prepare and a lot of other tasks. We are taking in consideration this issue, when giving the feedback about caring more about the qualitative aspect of such an analyses in the future.
- There's a very rich database of clients characteristic that the guidance centre has, and for the future development, it would be the suggestion of the peer team, to use this data base for more in depth qualitative analyses, which would bring them to the planning of the improvements in the guidance process.
- From the discussions with the partners the peer group found out that different type of partners, would like to have different sorts of information about the characteristics of the clients. That's why it would be good if the guidance centre would discuss this issue with each particular partnership network (strategic, professional, supportive) to find out which are the main data that the partners need and then to prepare the data in the most suitable way for them.

Indicator 2: Guidance process activities

Strengths

Following the strengths that were found out by the peer team are listed:

- It has been found out by the peer team that **the counsellors use different activities of executing the guidance process.**
- From the discussions with counsellors and clients we have observed that all the seven activities that are incorporated in the ISIO concept of guidance were practiced (informing, advising, guidance, education, representing, feedback, evaluating).
- It was very valuable what we found out from the discussion with clients, as when they were explaining how the guidance process was executed we could realised that different activities were carried out when guiding an individual client. It is good that different activities are combined when working with one client.
- When analysing the conversations with the clients, we also find out, that more in depth guidance is also carrying out when needed. The length of the conversation of the counsellor with the client is quite good.
- It is important that “representing”, as one of seven activities, is carried out, as well as “training”, “feedback” and evaluation” which is not so usual in the practice. Regarding the activity of “representing” a very important issue has been pointed out by one counsellor and brings with it the message that the counsellors have to be very well trained when using these activities. They have to be very careful when making the decision, when it is o.k., to do something instead of the client and when their task is to empower the client to take actions by himself or herself.
- Another issue regarding the activity of “representation” that we would like to point out is the following: the counsellors explained that the clients react very good when they see that the counsellor is for example calling some institution (for example school) and ask questions for clients that was provided by the counsellor; This was confirmed also by the clients during the interviews with them. The clients often consider this as a sign that the counsellors care for them.
- We have to point out the information that we got from one client when he explained that he phoned the counsellor when he succeed with his studies in order to inform him about that. The counsellor invited him to come again to the guidance centre to find out if there is a possibility that the financing of his studies can be reimbursed to him. In our opinion this shows the personal engagement of the counsellor and the care that he has for the clients. A good and committed work of the counsellors toward the client has to be pointed out.

Areas of improvements

Following the areas of improvement that were found out by the peer team are listed;

- When we analysed the self-evaluation report we find out a very similar weakness as it was already mentioned at the first indicator. A lot of statistical data have been showed in the self-evaluation report regarding the activities that are used by the counsellors. But we would expect from the counsellors more in depth and qualitative analyse about this activities. For example: what do the clients think of these activities, are they suitable for them, what do the counsellors think about their competences for implementing different activities, what are the results of using different activities, are all the activities used enough etc. It is important to remember that such qualitative analyses help the counsellors to find out what has to be improved in the guidance process.
- That such missing of qualitative assessment was not only the matter of lack of time when preparing the report, we found out when we discussed with the counsellors. Such a qualitative reflection was also in part missing in the discussion that we carried out with counsellors. It seemed to us that the counsellors were more worried about how to write down the proportions of different activities in the internet application than to the more qualitative analyses of how different activities are executed and what are the results. Such an attitude can lead to the instrumental understanding of different activities used in a guidance process, which can affect the quality of work of the counsellors.
- There was an important message brought out by one of the counsellors at the interview. He said that the counsellors would have to discuss about guidance activities in some periods (for example every 2 years), especially when new counsellors join the counsellors team, to find out if all the counsellors understand the goals of each activity. This would be also the suggestion of the peer team.
- If the guidance centre in the future will still carry out peer reviews, it would be good if in the years when they also collect data in the process of self-evaluation, the indicator chosen would be the same for the self-evaluation and for peer-review. This would make the work easier and it would give more possibilities for more in-depth qualitative analyses. This would allow to the guidance centre that that in addition to the results of self-evaluation they would also get the insights and incentives of colleagues.

Overall assessment of the quality area 1: GUIDANCE PROCESS

After assessing different aspects of the quality area **GUIDANCE PROCESS** regarding the two chosen indicators: (1) **GATHERING AND ANALYSING CLIENT'S DATA, IMPORTANT FOR GUIDANCE PROCESS** and (2) **GUIDANCE PROCESS ACTIVITIES**, the peer group pointed out the following most important issues regarding strengths and areas of improvement of the work in the chosen quality area:

STRENGTHS:

- The guidance centre regularly monitors the demographic data of its clients and knows them very well.
- The counsellors care about the privacy of the clients when asking for personal and sensitive information. They care a lot also about how to register such kind of personal data (not to expose the individual client).
- The guidance centre also monitors the demographic trends of the population of the region and has the knowledge to compare them with the trends in guidance. This can help the counsellors to be active and include clients from the target groups that have more need for guidance in the region.
- We noticed that the counsellors cooperate very well in analysing the data gathered from the clients. The flow of experience among the counsellors is very important and we recognised it when discussing with them.
- The counsellors use different activities of executing the guidance process. They also use the statistic monitoring of guidance activities.
- All the seven activities that are incorporated in the ISIO concept of guidance are practiced. Different activities are combined when working with a particular client.
- In addition to “informing”, also more in depth guidance is carrying out when needed. The length of the conversation of the counsellor with the individual client is quite good.
- It is important that “representing” is carried out, also “training”, “feedback” and “evaluation” which is not so usual in the practice.
- We observed a good and committed work of the counsellors toward the clients.

AREAS OF IMPROVEMENTS:

- There's a very rich database which is a result of monitoring the clients characteristic and the guidance process activities that the guidance centre has, but it is not used enough for the systematic **qualitative analyses** that can help the counsellors in improving their work if needed.
- That's why for the future development it would be the suggestion of the peer team to use more this data base for **in depth qualitative analyses**, which would **bring them to the planning and executing of the improvements** of the guidance process.
- The guidance centre should discuss with each particular partnership network (strategic, professional, supportive) to find out which are the main data that the partners need, and then to prepare the data in the most suitable way for them.

4.2 Quality Area 2: PARTNERSHIP

Indicator 1: Defined partnership and content of collaboration with different partners
--

Strengths

Following the strengths that were found out by the peer team are listed:

Existence of partnerships

- The guidance centre has established good partnerships. They have a network of strategic partners and a network of professional partners. Also an innovative approach is implemented with the inclusion of the supportive partners. (<http://www.pomoc.si>)
- Among the strategic partners there are the representatives of almost all the important strategic partners. (E.g. representatives of adult education institutions, municipalities, trade union, development agencies, employment agency ...).
- The network of professional partners is also very strong.

Content and benefits of partnerships

- At the interviews partners pointed out that it is important that they have the possibility to influence the planning of guidance activities and that they get the reports, they can see from them what are the effects of their common activities. The strategic partner also said that it is good that the guidance centre has a quality model, which assures more the quality of work of guidance centre.
- One of the very important issues that were pointed out by the partners is the exchange of information in the partner's networks.
- The partners pointed out that through the cooperation in the networks of ISIO Murska Sobota, they can also pursue the mission and the goals of their organisations.
- Both, the counsellors and the representative of the professional partners, pointed out that good partnership collaboration contributes to more efficient representation of clients to persons who are at certain institution responsible for adult education.
- The peer team got the impression that one of the very important aims is being achieved through the established partnerships: that is, the guidance activities come closer to the clients, to their home environment. This issue is even more important when the guidance centre is dealing with vulnerable groups.
- The concrete examples of good practices that partners explained at the interviews convinced the peer team that the guidance centre Murska Sobota developed very good cooperation with the strategic, professional and supportive partners in the implementation of projects (programs etc.) for different target groups, especially vulnerable groups.

-
- The representatives of the supportive partners that works with such vulnerable groups (for example, people with disabilities), stressed out, that a lot of them would never find the way to education without the help of guidance activities. And the cooperation between the guidance centre and the partners that works with vulnerable groups is crucial in bringing guidance to these groups.
 - The partners stressed out that there was a lot of fear at the beginning, regarding the competitiveness among different partners and the objectivity that the guidance centre can assure to the partners. But when they got the experience that cooperation in such network bring benefits to the clients and also to their institution, the cooperation became stronger. They stressed the personal engagement of the head of guidance centre as being very important for achieving trust in partner's network.

Areas of Improvement

Following the areas of improvement that were found out by the peer team are listed;

- When analysing the self-evaluation report we noticed that some of the partners are in both roles - strategic and professional. During the interview with counsellors the explanation was given to the peer team by the counsellors that this can be a good solution when two persons are working in a same institution, one of them cooperate in the network of professional and another in the network of strategic partners. This allowed them to cooperate among them and to exchange information about guidance activities. This could be one of the positive aspects for keeping such a definition of partnerships.
- It is a suggestion of the peer team to think about this solution again and monitor carefully if there would not be better for the partners not to be in both roles, but to be in the role that is most suitable according to the characteristic of a particular partner.

For the future development of partnerships we suggest to the guidance centres also to take into consideration the following issue;

- With the establishment of the network of "supportive partners" a kind of dividing of partners in already existing networks was implemented. This can lead also to the dividing of partners - for example some of the partners can ask why you carry out some of the activities with some partners and not with others? Is it possible to think about the possibility to invite the "supportive partners" in a network of strategic partners or in a network of professional partners? We do not insist in such a solution, we just think that is important for you to think about all the aspects of such networking.
- Improvements can be made in cooperation with various partners at local level. Consider including partners from local environment where dislocated units operate (for example: not just the head employment offices (območna služba zavoda za zaposlovanje) but also employment agencies (uradi za delo). This would help in getting more clients and would bring the guidance services closer to the clients. Also the partnership cooperation with the Center for social work (Center za socialno delo) could be further developed in the future.

Indicator 2: Level of partnership (local, regional, national, international)

Strengths

Following the strengths that were found out by the peer team is listed;

- The cooperation of guidance centre with different partners at regional level is good.
- The cooperation of the guidance centre in the national network of guidance centre is good.
- It is good that the guidance centre plans to extend the collaboration with similar organisations in other countries in the future.

Areas of Improvement

Following the areas of improvement that were found out by the peer team are listed;

- It would be important for the development of the quality of work of the guidance centres to further develop the partnerships at international level.
- It would be good to apply for the common European project with partners from the neighbouring countries.

Overall assessment of the quality area 2: PARTNERSHIP

After assessing different aspects of the quality area **PARTNERSHIP** regarding the two chosen indicators: (1) **DEFINED PARTNERSHIP AND CONTENT OF COLLABORATION WITH DIFFERENT PARTNERS** and (2) **LEVEL OF PARTNERSHIP** (local, regional, national, international), the peer group pointed out the following most important issues regarding strengths and areas of improvement of the work in the chosen quality area:

STRENGTHS:

- The guidance centre has established good partnerships. They have a network of strategic partners and a network of professional partners. Also an innovative approach is implemented with the inclusion of the supportive partners. (<http://www.pomoc.si>)
- It is important that the partners have the possibility to influence the planning of guidance activities and that they get the reports they can see from them what are the effects of their common activities.
- One of the very important issues that were pointed out by the partners is the exchange of information in the partner's networks. Through the cooperation in the networks of ISIO Murska Sobota, the partners can pursue the mission and the goals of their organisations.
- With the help of partnership the guidance activities came closer to the clients, to their home environment. This issue is even more important when the guidance centre is dealing with vulnerable groups.
- The partners stressed the personal engagement of the head of guidance centre as being very important for achieving trust and good cooperation in partner's network.

-
- The cooperation of guidance centre with different partners at regional level is good.
 - The cooperation of the guidance centre in the national network of guidance centre is good.
 - It is good that the guidance centre plans to extend the collaboration with similar organisations in other countries in the future.

AREAS OF IMPROVEMENTS:

- It is a suggestion of the peer team to think again about this solution that some of the partners are in both roles - strategic and professional again and to monitor carefully if there would not be better for the partners not to be in both roles, but to be in the role that is most suitable according to the characteristic of a particular partner.
- You could think about the possibility to invite the supportive partners in a strategic or professional network of partnership.
- Consider including partners from local environment where dislocated units operate (for example: not just the head employment offices (območna služba zavoda za zaposlovanje) but also employment agencies (uradi za delo).
- Develop further the partnerships at the international level.

4.3 Overall Assessment

Strengths

The most important things that we would like to point out after analysing all the documentation and analysing the interviews that were carried out at the peer visit are that it can be seen that the ISIO guidance centre of Murska Sobota got its recognition by partners at local and regional level. It took a lot of time and effort from the guidance centre to build good partnerships. Now the partner's networks are operating and the guidance centre can focus on their further development. It is important to stress out the personal engagement of the counsellors and their commitment to the clients and to the partners in the networks. A systematic monitoring system was implemented in the guidance centre, and it is upgraded with a systematic model for quality assessment and quality assurance which was implemented recently; it is a combination of internal and external evaluation. The guidance centre monitors very carefully the demographic characteristic of the clients and the demographic characteristics of the population in the region. The counsellors use different activities when working with clients; they also combine them in the guidance process. Also the activities of "representing", "training" and "feedback" were noticed, which is not very often in practice. They care a lot to assure the privacy for the clients.

Areas of improvement

More qualitative analyses of the client's characteristics and the guidance activities should be added to the quantitative monitoring. This would allow the counsellors to get more deep understanding of the clients, the guidance process and of their work. More qualitative analyses would also help them to avoid seeing the data in a too much instrumental way, and to use them more efficiently when planning and executing the guidance process. The already established partnership can be further developed and strengthened with new projects and content collaboration among partners. The guidance centre has to be careful for the future development of partnership to have a very clear conceptual picture about the roles of the different partners in the networks. There is still a lot of potential in the networks for further exchange of information and for planning and executing the projects and common activities which will connect the partners with the final aim to give guidance to different target groups of adult.

5. Annex

5.1 Guidelines for the analyse of the self-report and preparing questions for the peer review

GUIDELINES FOR THE ANALYSE OF THE SELF REPORT AND PREPARING QUESTIONS FOR THE PEER REVIEW

SELF REPORT OF THE GUIDANCE CENTRE MURSKA SOBOTA

Peer team:

ROLES	NAME, SURNAME, ORGANIZATION, TOWN, STATE
Coordinator	TANJA MOŽINA, Slovenian institute for adult education (SIAE), Ljubljana, Slovenia
International peer	MARIJO LIETE, KEUDA, Järvenpää, Finland
National peer 1	ALBERT ŠTRANCAR, ISIO guidance centre Ljubljana, Slovenia
National peer 2	MIHAELA ANCLIN, ISIO guidance centre Žalec, Slovenia
National peer 3	SONJA KLEMENČIČ, Ljubljana, Slovenia

Quality Area 4: GUIDANCE PROCESS

WHAT TO BE ANALYSED: Does the guidance centre guarantee its clients a complete educational and vocational guidance for adults?

	INDICATOR		DETAILED DESCRIPTION OF THE INDICATOR	DOES THE GUIDANCE CENTRE ACHIEVE THIS INDICATOR?				QUESTIONS FOR THE PEER REVIEW
				YES	PARTLY	NO	NO DATA AVAILABLE	
1	Gathering and analysing client's data, important for guidance process	1.1	The guidance centre regularly monitors those characteristics of its clients that are important for decision making in guidance process.					<p>Counsellor (if suitable): Question 1: Question 2: </p> <p>Client (if suitable): Question 1: Question 2: </p> <p>Partner (if suitable): Question 1: Question 2: </p>

	INDICATOR		DETAILED DESCRIPTION OF AN INDICATOR	DOES THE GUIDANCE CENTRE ACHIEVE THIS INDICATOR?				QUESTIONS FOR THE PEER REVIEW
				YES	PARTLY	NO	NO DATA AVAILA- -BLE	
2	Guidance process activities	1.1	The guidance centre offers all the activities of the guidance process: informing, advising, counselling, feed-back etc.					Counsellor (if suitable): Question 1: Question 2: Client (if suitable): Question 1: Question 2: Partner (if suitable): Question 1: Question 2:

ASSESSMENT OF QUALITY AREA 4: GUIDANCE PROCESS**STRENGTHS**

(Highlight the things that the guidance centre has developed and show its good work in this area.)

AREAS OF IMPROVEMENTS

(Record observations about things that could be improved, which require further consideration etc.)

Quality Area 5: PARTNERSHIP

WHAT TO BE ANALYSED: Does the guidance centre collaborate with relevant partners' organisations in regional, national and/or international level?

	INDICATOR		DETAILED DESCRIPTION OF AN INDICATOR	DOES THE GUIDANCE CENTRE ACHIEVE THIS INDICATOR?				QUESTIONS FOR THE PEER REVIEW
				YES	PARTLIY	NO	NO DATA AVAILA- -BLE	
1	Defined partnership and content of collaboration with different partners	1.1	The guidance centre has an established network of relevant partners. The guidance centre has active partnership with the most important subjects that plan and make decisions about local development and development of human resources (e.g. representatives from the city council, employment service office, organisations involved in regional development, regional offices of the Chamber of Commerce and Chamber of Craft and Small Businesses etc.).					<p>Counsellor (if suitable): Question 1: Question 2:</p> <p>Partner (if suitable): Question 1: Question 2:</p>

	INDICATOR		DETAILED DESCRIPTION OF AN INDICATOR	DOES THE GUIDANCE CENTRE ACHIEVE THIS INDICATOR?				QUESTIONS FOR THE PEER REVIEW
1	Defined partnership and content of collaboration with different partners	1.2	The guidance centre has active partnership with organisations that locally work in the field of guidance or adult education (e.g. representatives of adult education institutions, other guidance organisations, etc.).					Counsellor (if suitable): Question 1: Question 2: Partner (if suitable): Question 1: Question 2:
		1.3	The guidance centre is active in building networks of similar guidance centres and actively collaborates in such networks.					Counsellor (if suitable): Question 1: Question 2: Partner (if suitable): Question 1: Question 2:
2	Level of partnership (local, regional, national, international)	1.1	The guidance centre is active in partnerships at local, regional, national and/or international level.					Counsellor (if suitable): Question 1: Question 2: Partner (if suitable): Question 1: Question 2:

ASSESSMENT OF QUALITY AREA 5: PARTNERSHIP

STRENGTHS

(Highlight the things that the guidance centre has developed and show its good work in this area.)

AREAS OF IMPROVEMENTS

(Record observations about things that could be improved, which require further consideration etc.)

OVERALL ASSESSMENT OF QUALITY OF THE OBSERVED AREAS

STRENGTHS

(Highlight the things that the guidance centre has developed and show its good work in this area.)

AREAS OF IMPROVEMENTS

(Record observations about things that could be improved, which require further consideration etc.)

5.2 Guidelines for conducting interviews with questions

INTERVIEW WITH COUNCELLORS

Introduction:

- The person who conduct the interview explain in brief to the counsellors the aim of the interview.
- Explain the content of the interview (quality areas that will be discussed).
- Explain why it is important to get the opinions from the counsellors.

Ice breaking question:

- | | |
|-------------|---|
| Question 1: | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Please, can you explain in brief your role in the guidance centre? For how long you work in the guidance centre? Do you work in a headquarters of the guidance centre or in a dislocation unit etc... |
|-------------|---|

QUALITY AREA	GUIDANCE PROCESS
--------------	------------------

INDICATOR	Gathering and analysing client's data, important for guidance process
DETAILED DESCRIPTION OF AN INDICATOR	The guidance centre regularly monitors those characteristics of its clients that are important for decision making in guidance process.

Introduction: *At first we would like to focus on guidance process, especially on how you **gather and analyse client's data that are important for guidance process**. You already gave as a good insight preparing the self-report. We would like to start from there and discuss some issues further.*

Question 2:	<p><i>It appears from your self-report that the monitoring of the demographic data about your clients (gender, age, education, employment status etc.) is very detailed and of a high quality.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Can you tell us, if you collect also other information's (non demographic) about each client, which are important for deciding what assistance to offer the client?
Question 3:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Do you have any "bad experience" with regard to privacy policy (gathering client's data)?
Question 4:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Which decisions are direct results from monitoring your clients' characteristics?

INDICATOR	Guidance process activities
DETAILED DESCRIPTION OF AN INDICATOR	The guidance centre offers all the activities of the guidance process: informing, advising, counselling, feed-back etc.

*Introduction: In the peer review you also choose to review the **guidance process activities**. We got a lot of information's from your self-report, following we would like to clarify some issues and ask some additional questions.*

Question 5:	<p><i>You showed some interesting information's about what activities of the guidance process you offer.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> We would like to know, how do you estimate, are the results of these different activities good or not?
Question 6:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Are there some activities of guidance that in your opinion should be carried out more often? If yes, what are the reasons and why you are not using it so often now?
Question 7:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Do the clients often expect in-depth guidance from you?

QUALITY AREA	PARTNERSHIP
---------------------	--------------------

INDICATOR	Defined partnership and content of collaboration with different partners
DETAILED DESCRIPTION OF AN INDICATOR	<p>The guidance centre has an established network of relevant partners.</p> <p>The guidance centre has active partnership with the most important subjects that plan and make decisions about local development and development of human resources (e.g. representatives from the city council, employment service office, organisations involved in regional development, regional offices of the Chamber of Commerce and Chamber of Craft and Small Businesses etc.).</p> <p>The guidance centre has active partnership with organisations that locally work in the field of guidance or adult education (e.g. representatives of adult education institutions, other guidance organisations, etc.).</p> <p>The guidance centre is active in building networks of similar guidance centres and actively collaborates in such networks.</p>

*Introduction: We would like to continue our discussion in a quality area of **partnership**. The indicator you have chosen focus on a **defined partnerships** and the **content of collaboration** with different partners.*

Question 8:	<p><i>In a self-report you explained the role of strategic partners in a work of your guidance centre. You mentioned that the strategic council has 13 members.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Do you think that cooperation with strategic partners contributes to the more quality work of the Guidance Centre and if so in what areas?
Question 9:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Do you face any difficulties in working with strategic partners? (Coordination, time, active role of the partners etc.)

Question 10:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>In the self-report you explained also the role of the expert/professional partners in the network.</i> • Can you explain us further how often the expert/professional partners meet and which topics they mainly deal with?
Question 11:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Do you face any difficulties in working with expert partners? (Coordination, time, active role of the partners etc.) How do you motivate the expert partners to cooperate?
Question 12:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Do you think that the cooperation with professional partners contributes to high quality of the guidance work and, if so, in which areas?
Question 13:	<p>In a self-report you also mentioned the network of supportive partners, which is a specific of your guidance centre.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Could you explain us more precisely the role of supportive partners and how it differs from that of other types of partners?
Question 14:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What do you get working in the network with other guidance centres and what do you think you give them?

INDICATOR	Level of partnership (local, regional, national, international)
DETAILED DESCRIPTION OF AN INDICATOR	The guidance centre is active in partnerships at local, regional, national and/or international level.

Introduction: At the end we would like to focus on the level of partnerships.

Question 15:	<p><i>We could see from the self-report that The Guidance Centre is active in partnerships at local, regional and national level.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Would you highlight the cooperation at any of this level as particularly important for you work?
Question 16:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What experiences do you have with the current international cooperation?

Conclusion: The last question....

Question 17	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concluding remarks/questions: Would you like to tell us something else? Something we didn't ask, but you think is important?
-------------	--

THANK YOU VERY MUCH FOR YOUR COOPERATION!

INTERVIEW WITH CLIENTS

Introduction:

- *The person who conduct the interview explain in brief to the clients the aim of the interview.*
- *Explain the content of the interview (quality areas that will be discussed - in a simple way).*
- *Explain why it is important to get the opinions from the clients.*

Ice breaking questions:

Question 1:	• How did you find the guidance centre?
Question 2:	• In which way did you contact the guidance centre? (Personal visit, phone, e-mail, webpages...)
Question 3:	• How many times did you visited (or contacted) the guidance centre? Just ones or more times?

QUALITY AREA	GUIDANCE PROCESS
--------------	------------------

INDICATOR	Gathering and analysing client's data, important for guidance process
DETAILED DESCRIPTION OF AN INDICATOR	The guidance centre regularly monitors those characteristics of its clients that are important for decision making in guidance process.

Introduction: *Please, tell us something about the conversation you had with the counsellor.*

Question 4:	• Did you have to give any data about yourself to the counsellor? (For example: your age, education, employment status etc.)
Question 5:	• Do you think that the counsellors got enough effort to inform him/her self about your problem in a way that they can successfully help you?
Question 6:	• When talking with the counsellor - were you "bothered" by counsellor's questions about your status, level of (in) completed education, age etc.?

INDICATOR	Guidance process activities
DETAILED DESCRIPTION OF AN INDICATOR	The guidance centre offers all the activities of the guidance process: informing, advising, counselling, feed-back etc.

*Introduction: In the peer review you also choose to review the **guidance process activities**. We got a lot of information's from your self-report, following we would like to clarify some issues and ask some additional questions.*

Question 8:	• What kind of personal guidance you got?
Question 9:	• Was the way of conducting the conversation that counsellors used suitable for you? Explain.
Question 10:	• Are you satisfied with the help that you have received in the guidance centre? What else would you need? Or wanted?

Conclusion: The last question....

Question 11:	• Concluding remarks/questions: Would you like to tell us something else? Something we didn't ask, but you think is important?
--------------	--

THANK YOU VERY MUCH FOR YOUR COOPERATION!

INTERVIEW WITH PARTNERS

Introduction:

- The person who conduct the interview explain in brief to the partners the aim of the interview (put it in a broader context of the EuropeerGuid project).
- Explain the content of the interview (quality areas that will be discussed).
- Explain why it is important to get the opinions from the important partners.

Ice breaking question:

- | | |
|-------------|---|
| Question 1: | <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Please, can you introduce yourself and explain in brief how you cooperate with the ISIO guidance centre of Murska Sobota. |
|-------------|---|

QUALITY AREA	GUIDANCE PROCESS
--------------	------------------

INDICATOR	GUIDANCE PROCESS
-----------	------------------

DETAILED DESCRIPTION OF AN INDICATOR	GUIDANCE PROCESS
--------------------------------------	------------------

The guidance centre regularly monitors those characteristics of its clients that are important for decision making in guidance process.

Beginning of the interview... The first quality areas that the guidance centre choose is guidance process. They analysed how data of the clients are gathered, analysed and used in the executing of the guidance process. We would like to know:

- | | |
|-------------|--|
| Question 2: | <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Are there some data about the clients of the guidance centre or other data that you don't have but you would like to have in the future? |
|-------------|--|

QUALITY AREA	PARTNERSHIP
---------------------	--------------------

INDICATOR	Defined partnership and content of collaboration with different partners
DETAILED DESCRIPTION OF AN INDICATOR	The guidance centre has an established network of relevant partners. The guidance centre has active partnership with the most important subjects that plan and make decisions about local development and development of human resources (e.g. representatives from the city council, employment service office, organisations involved in regional development, regional offices of the Chamber of Commerce and Chamber of Craft and Small Businesses etc.).
	The guidance centre has active partnership with organisations that locally work in the field of guidance or adult education (e.g. representatives of adult education institutions, other guidance organisations, etc.).
	The guidance centre is active in building networks of similar guidance centres and actively collaborates in such networks.

*Introduction: We would like to continue our discussion in a quality area of **partnership**. We would like to focus on a **content of collaboration** you have with the ISIO guidance centre of Murska Sobota.*

Question 3:	<p><i>As representatives of different network are presented, we would like you to think to your network when responding to the next question.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What contents are you dealing with within your (strategic, professional, supportive) network?
Question 4:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How do you estimate the role of the <u>strategic partners</u> (or the <u>role of professional partners</u>, or the <u>role of supportive partners</u>) of the Guidance centre? Please, explain. • Do you think that through your participation in the (strategic, professional, supportive) network you can pursuing any of the goals of the organization, you represent?
Question 5:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Would you like to point out some good example of partner cooperation in the network?
Question 6:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In your opinion are there any weaknesses of partnership collaboration in your region?

INDICATOR	Level of partnership (local, regional, national, international)
DETAILED DESCRIPTION OF AN INDICATOR	The guidance centre is active in partnerships at local, regional, national and/or international level.

Introduction: At the end we would like to focus on the level of partnerships.

Question 7:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In your opinion, are there any additional possibilities of partnership cooperation at local or regional level?
Question 8:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What about the cooperation of such networks at national level?
Question 9:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concluding remarks/questions: Would you like to tell us something else? Something we didn't ask, but you think is important?

THANK YOU VERY MUCH FOR YOUR COOPERATION!

5.3 Agenda of Peer Visit

AGENDA OF A PEER VISIT IN ISIO GUIDANCE CENTRE MURSKA SOBOTA

Peer Visit: Wednesday 9. 5. 2012

Adult education centre “Ljudska univerza Murska Sobota”, Guidance centre Murska Sobota, Slomškova 33, Murska Sobota

Time	a) Interviewees or observed units b) Peer Group c) Reserved room
9.30 - 9.50 Preparation of peers	a) Manager & facilitator & coordinator: Alenka Kučan, Alojz Sraka, Tanja Možina
9.50 - 10.15 Welcome of the manager	b) Peer Group: Tanja Možina, Marjo Liete, Sonja Klemenčič, Mihaela Anclin, Albert Štrancar c) Place: Adult education centre “Ljudska univerza Murska Sobota”, Guidance centre Murska Sobota, Slomškova 33, Murska Sobota, room 8
10.15 - 11.00 Interview round 1	a) Clounsellors: Alojz Sraka, Dejan Dravec b) Peer Group: Tanja Možina, Marjo Liete, Sonja Klemenčič, Mihaela Anclin, Albert Štrancar c) Place: Adult education centre “Ljudska univerza Murska Sobota”, Guidance centre Murska Sobota, Slomškova 33, Murska Sobota, room 8
11.00 - 11.30 Analysis in Peer Group, incl. <i>Coffee Break</i>	a) Peer Group: Tanja Možina, Marjo Liete, Sonja Klemenčič, Mihaela Anclin, Albert Štrancar b) Place: Adult education centre “Ljudska univerza Murska Sobota”, Guidance centre Murska Sobota, Slomškova 33, Murska Sobota, room 8
11.30 - 12.15 Interview round 2	a) Clients: Dejan Šernek, Žido Miran, Brigita Gyerek, (optional: Gyerek Tadeja) b) Peer Group: Tanja Možina, Marjo Liete, Sonja Klemenčič, Mihaela Anclin, Albert Štrancar c) Place: Adult education centre “Ljudska univerza Murska Sobota”, Guidance centre Murska Sobota, Slomškova 33, Murska Sobota, room 8

Time	<p>d) Interviewees or observed units</p> <p>e) Peer Group</p> <p>f) Reserved room</p>
12.15 - 12.45 Analysis in Peer Group, incl. Coffee Break	<p>a) Peer Group: Tanja Možina, Marjo Liete, Sonja Klemenčič, Mihaela Anclin, Albert Štrancar</p> <p>b) Place: Adult education centre “Ljudska univerza Murska Sobota”, Guidance centre Murska Sobota, Slomškova 33, Murska Sobota, room 8</p>
12.45 - 13.45 Lunch	Restaurant Hotel Diana
13.45 - 14.30 Interview round 3	<p>a) Stakeholders: mag. Cvetka Sreš - director (Employment office Murska Sobota; Staretegič Council), Zlatka Lebar - principal (Secondary school for health; Professional Committee), Branko Gornjec (Secretary of the Society of the Deaf and Hard of Hearing Pomurje; supportive partner), Janko Rešeta - head (Sonček, VDC Murska Sobota; supportive partner)</p> <p>b) Peer Group: Tanja Možina, Marjo Liete, Sonja Klemenčič, Mihaela Anclin, Albert Štrancar</p> <p>c) Place: Adult education centre “Ljudska univerza Murska Sobota”, Guidance centre Murska Sobota, Slomškova 33, Murska Sobota, room 8</p>
14.30 - 15:00 Analysis in Peer Group, incl. Coffee Break	<p>a) Peer Group: Tanja Možina, Marjo Liete, Sonja Klemenčič, Mihaela Anclin, Albert Štrancar</p> <p>b) Place: Adult education centre “Ljudska univerza Murska Sobota”, Guidance centre Murska Sobota, Slomškova 33, Murska Sobota, room 8</p>
15.00 - 16.30 Analysis in Peer Group and conclusions	<p>a) Peer Group: Tanja Možina, Marjo Liete, Sonja Klemenčič, Mihaela Anclin, Albert Štrancar</p> <p>b) Place: Adult education centre “Ljudska univerza Murska Sobota”, Guidance centre Murska Sobota, Slomškova 33, Murska Sobota, room 8</p>
16.30 - 17.00 Final Meeting	<p>a) Interviewees</p> <p>b) Peer Group: Tanja Možina, Marjo Liete, Sonja Klemenčič, Mihaela Anclin, Albert Štrancar</p> <p>c) Place: Adult education centre “Ljudska univerza Murska Sobota”, Guidance centre Murska Sobota, Slomškova 33, Murska Sobota, room 8</p>