

Prof. i.R. Dr. Carol Hagemann-White

Universität Osnabrück · FB 3 · D-49069 Osnabrück

**Allgemeine Pädagogik/
Frauenforschung**
Kolpingstr. 7
49069 Osnabrück
Telefon (0541) 969 – 4557
E-Mail chageman@uni-osnabrueck.de

January 1017

**Gender Equality Awareness Raising against Intimate Partner Violence II
GEAR against IPV II**

EXTERNAL EVALUATION FINAL REPORT

Project No: JUST/2013/DAP/AG/5408

1) Evaluation methodology and process

As with GEAR against IPV I (GEAR I), the integrated external evaluation in GEAR against IPV II (GEAR II) aimed to provide on-going quality control and assessment of progress throughout the duration of the project. The evaluator followed the methodological principles of formative process evaluation, giving particular attention to the development and success of the collaboration, while offering regular feedback on her observations, so that any potential problems could be addressed.

The evaluation plan thus comprised

- Participant observation in all of the managerial meetings to observe the process of cooperation and implementation and to reflect on developments;
- An evaluator-led session in the agenda of each meeting to facilitate self- reflection on goals, progress, obstacles encountered and possible solutions. At the first meeting; the goal-setting exercise served to clarify the priority goals, to foster a shared awareness of the longer-term and the more immediate goals; and by agreeing on indicators, to ensure that success is measured by criteria that the project partners have set for themselves
- At each further managerial meeting, a session led by the evaluator asked partners to reflect on how far each of their goals have been achieved, the purpose being to help the project stay on track while involved in the details of the work program;
- Writing observations and impressions after each managerial meeting, sent to the co-ordinator and the partners, assessing progress and suggesting possible ways to address difficulties that may have arisen;
- Participation as a speaker, presenting the external evaluation process and its results, and also as an observer in the closing European conference “Building healthy intimate relationships”, Sept. 22-23, 2016, in Athens;
- Writing an overall evaluation based on detailed examination of all the final reports.

2) Overall assessment of the project as a whole

This project, having completed a process of further development and implementation, presents a highly promising and successful approach to violence prevention in the context of gender equality. GEAR II built on the methodology developed and experience garnered in GEAR I; however, the material in the “Master package” was reviewed and updated as well as being translated and culturally adapted for use in Cyprus, Romania, Spain and Catalunya; in the four countries newly implementing GEAR, face validity was again assessed in focus groups of students and of teachers, as well as the national package being evaluated by external experts.

GEAR II expanded the scope of the project in several dimensions, that is, with regard to:

- the number of countries (now seven in total);
- the tasks undertaken: each partners began their work by writing a broadly-based country report, mapping preventive and supportive initiatives for IPV/SV among teens and integrating the prevalence data from the FRA study, thus enriching the existing material for each country, providing additional information and serving as a resource for those working on the issues, including of course teachers;
- the target group: The scope of the project was extended to include high-risk groups: children receiving services or in residential care due to exposure to violence or neglect, many of whom were younger (in particular the age group 11-13) in Greece and Spain, and
- the activities and participation of young people after the workshops, of which the competition for creating art that expressed what they had learned, as their contribution to a national awareness-raising campaign addressing adolescents, was probably the most important.

Each of these “extensions” was challenging, and all of them were highly successful. Especially the application to new target groups and the spaces created for student initiatives succeeded far beyond expectations. Enabling young people to take initiative on this issue and make their art public added a powerful component by giving space and support to adolescents’ own voices and visual images; this creates a context that contributed to sustainable impact.

With this broadened foundation, the GEAR project has confirmed that the philosophy of the project, qualifying and supporting teachers in a method that empowers both girls and boys by way of active experiential learning, is welcomed, appreciated by both teachers and students, and can be implemented successfully in schools, as well as in residential care centers or support services with children who have been exposed to abuse or neglect. All partners carried out teacher training seminars and supported trained teachers’ workshops with adolescents as planned, often more than planned, since demand for the teacher training and volunteering to be implementers was high, and more workshops with students are being carried out after the end of the project. Since all partners also ensured that pre- and post evaluation forms were administered both for teacher training and for students, GEAR II is now able to present a comparative evidence base documenting both the enthusiasm of the participants and the changes in knowledge and awareness for both groups.

The data from GEAR II indicate clearly that this approach has a significant impact towards preventing gender-based violence and enabling young people to understand, affirm and seek to practice gender equality. This contrasts with the widespread use of instructional modules addressing violence (or, indeed, concerns such as smoking or drug use), and of one-off interventions from outside the schools, that have been demonstrated to have a rather modest impact on young people. With the GEAR method, students are not told what they should or should not do, but empowered, through group exercises, to explore their own ideas and values. All the country reports indicate that the students engaged very seriously with the topic and with each other in the workshops. The evaluation questionnaires show both very high satisfaction on the part of both teachers and students, but also changes in their thinking about gender equality and about relationships.

From the country reports it is evident that GEAR II uncovered in each country a very real and urgent need that teachers feel. This was shown in the eagerness to participate, the high number of applications, and in the feedback that teachers gave to the training and to their experience with the

student workshops. Even in Spain, where training on gender-based violence is widely available, the teachers saw the GEAR approach as a valuable new possibility. In all five countries, teachers reported that the workshops not only enabled them to become confident of their own ability to respond to issues of gender inequality or violence, but also empowered them to understand what students think and to relate to them in a more open way. In many cases, the GEAR implementation was a topic of great interest in the school as a whole, among peers of the students and among teachers, and the GEAR method of experiential learning is being considered more widely in some schools.

The evaluation of GEAR I summarized that the project was

- **Innovative:**
 - integrating gender equality education and prevention of relationship violence, ,
 - through a package of fit-for-purpose curricular activities for use in schools;
- **systematic** in its approach, maintaining a solid theoretical and empirical foundation applied consistently throughout;
- **research-based**, with an extensive literature review, peer review by external experts (also done in GEAR II for the new national packages) and a systematic methodology to evaluate implementation;
- **focussed** on striving for **best practice**, giving high priority to the use value of the methods and materials in practice,;
- **comprehensive**, covering all of the steps and levels of action needed to put the prevention work into practice;
- **sophisticated** in its didactic methodology, using a modelling and experiential approach to active learning on several levels:
 - Materials show teachers step by step what to do and how to do it;
 - Training of trainers is oriented to simulating activities;
 - Coordination guided by templates for what to do and how to do it;
- It further attended to **diversity within standardization**.

During GEAR II, the difficulties that hampered consistent implementation in GEAR I were overcome or avoided by skilful planning and preparation as well as strict and supportive coordination; in addition to the above it can now be said that the project additionally presents

- **Evidence-based** practice, evaluated cross-nationally, showing significant impact,
- A wider **research basis** concerning intervention and prevention with adolescents from the country reports,
- New dimensions of **creativity and vibrancy** in the initiatives of adolescents sparked by the workshops, and
- **Transfer to awareness-raising** in schools, communities and society.

To sum up: the GEAR II project has achieved and to a significant extent surpassed its goals, having developed, tested and implemented a comprehensive methodology for violence prevention and

promotion of gender equality in schools, and has delivered a convincing evidence base for the effectiveness of the methods across countries with widely differing histories of policy and practice on these issues. At a time of profound concern about alienation and indifference of young people, the value of an approach towards supporting young people's engagement with key European values cannot be overestimated.

3) Evaluation of structure and cooperation

It was evident already in the first management meeting that in GEAR II, all partners were experienced in offering both direct support and preventive work with young people, that they all had experience working with schools, as well as with training professionals on gender equality and on preventing violence, as well as with dissemination activities such as video campaigns, gender equality festivals and youth forums, theatre projects, online platforms, and others. Thus, the partners had many experiences they could share, as well as being well prepared to carry out GEAR II. This background stood them in good stead, as all partners encountered obstacles and delays in the procedure of permission for teachers to attend the training and then for them to implement the workshops.

For the most part, cooperation flowed very smoothly. Based on what had been learned in GEAR I, where cultural and institutional differences sometimes could not be sufficiently dealt with in the managerial meetings, and reporting progress via questionnaires were felt to be burdensome, in GEAR II the coordinator held two-day bilateral meetings with each partner between the first and the second managerial meeting. In advance of these meetings, the coordinator provided a videotape of the first Greek teacher training seminar with English subtitles, so as to provide a living example for step-by-step discussion of every detail related to implementation of teachers' training seminars and adolescents' awareness raising workshops.

For the managerial meetings, all partners were asked to present their work progress formally, with powerpoint slides and visual images, for example pictures of the teacher training that convey the atmosphere. Given that the meetings had to cover a great deal of ground in limited time, these presentations were very helpful, not only in steering implementation but also in sharing experiences among the partners. Especially in the 2nd managerial meeting partners had lively exchanges about difficulties that they had encountered and ways found to overcome them, thus developing more and more into a joint project. At this point in time it was crucial to clarify how far the activities could meet the timeline of the overall project, and presenting the reports enabled structured management of what emerged as a rather tight time frame until completion of the project. It was all the more impressive to see, at the closing EU conference, that all partners had successfully generated student art work competitions and national closing events where the students presented what they had learned.

The structure of GEAR II was clear, but allowed the partners options, such as the choice which follow-up questionnaires will be used, and whether implementation should also include a control group. These were decisions that depended on the partners' assessment of practicality, and since the planning foresaw them as optional, no problems arose from the differing choices. The core essentials of data collection to measure impact of the training seminars and the student workshops were a constant and were implemented by all partners at the beginning and the end of each seminar/ workshop; the

coordinator carried out statistical analysis of the data, presented at the EU conference and in the final form in the policy briefs. The data clearly show both very high levels of satisfaction and appreciation among both teachers and students as well as significant changes in their knowledge and attitudes.

4) Evaluation of implementation

In an interactive goal-setting exercise in the first meeting of the five partners, the project partners reflected on what each person in the group hoped that the project will achieve. Generally, they hope that the project would contribute to a process of change in the sphere of education within their respective countries and thereby, in the long run, contribute to stopping violence. Their more specific goals agreed:

Awareness: among teachers about violence in adolescent relationships, about the deep links between violence and gender inequality, and about their own possibilities as educators. young people becoming more aware of how gender-based violence has roots in their own attitudes and behavior, as well as offering them alternatives attitudes and ways of behaving, thereby helping them to become more free and equal in their relationships. Societal awareness could increase through the influence of dissemination activities with young people in the wider society. In all three dimensions, the participants were cautious in their expectations.

Knowledge: There were two kinds of knowledge mentioned. One is about knowledge as understanding: It is hoped that the project will increase the knowledge of both teachers and students about violence in intimate relationships, that is, their understanding about its sources, dynamics, impact, and how it can be prevented. The more specific aim is to garner knowledge about how preventive work in schools can be effective. The project can deliver evidence-based good practice toward violence prevention in schools, thus filling a “gap”, since many similar efforts have not been sufficiently documented and evaluated.

Capacity building through tried and tested **tools:** An important goal that participants set for the project was to build the capacity of teachers and of schools to implement preventive interventions. To that end, the project partners seek to equip schools with effective skills and useful material for long-term violence primary prevention programs. If the tools are used, perhaps in a gradually widening circle, this would point to successful capacity building.

Integration summarizes the hope that the GEAR workshops and tools will become integrated into the regular school curriculum, thus involving schools more actively than has been the case until now in dealing with the violence that affects their students. More cautiously, what GEAR II might achieve (and the measure of its success) was phrased as: to start a discussion about integration of such projects into the school curricula. That in itself is a very ambitious goal, but it has a strong foundation in the obligations framed in the Istanbul Convention.

Four indicators were identified at the outset:

1. Successful **implementation and acceptance:** Indicators could be numbers of teachers and of students taking part and their level of involvement and motivation: when teachers carry out good

quality violence prevention sessions in class and are motivated to continue during and even after the project, and encourage other teachers to do; when students participate actively and engage with the creative activities for dissemination; and when the GEAR model meets with increasing interest on the part of relevant actors policy-makers and stakeholders in education.

2. Seeing **real change** happen: The partners looked for signs that new attitudes and understandings have begun to take root' when teachers recognize the potential of their role, and find ways to make gender equality a part of their pedagogy in general, becoming more able to listen and respond when students signal problems with relationship violence. Change would also be visible when students' attitudes shift towards less stereotypical gender norms and less tolerance for violence.
3. Linking the work in school to wider activities in the community, the project partners hoped to see more **youth initiatives**. Success would be evidenced when, through participation in GEAR, young people begin to question gender inequality and the normalization of gender-based violence, and in consequence, are empowered and **become involved in NGO gender equality activities**. This can show when their creative contribution to media campaigns strengthens wider awareness among peers, but also, adolescents themselves can send powerful messages to decision makers in order for their needs to be heard.
4. **Sustainability**: A measure of success will be when the **evaluation results** at different levels indicate that GEAR is effective and stakeholders recognize the effort as a whole, and a discussion begins on how GEAR can impact on the school curriculum and in teachers' education and further training..

The external evaluation promised to track the success of GEAR according to these goals and indicators.

Concerning **implementation and acceptance**: All teams encountered some difficulties slowing down or delaying implementation, and all found ways of managing the ensuing delays. While the work time needed for writing country reports, and for updating and adapting the GEAR material had been underestimated, this did not impede progress seriously. Greater difficulties arose through bureaucratic procedures and slow processing of approval for the work with teachers and in schools; these held the work up, sometimes for quite a long time. This was sometimes due to a familiar but sluggish routine, but sometimes quite unexpected, and usually meant long waiting periods and repeated requests for approval before the authorities gave the necessary permission to hold the workshops with teachers. As a result, in many cases the teachers had to carry out the workshops during the last third of the school year, when there was greater time pressure. Nonetheless, the commitment of all partners to successful implementation made a high level of fulfillment of plans possible despite the workload and the bureaucratic obstacles; and in some cases, the stamp of official approval made it easier for teachers and students to participate.

Acceptance was overall very high; most partners saw a brisk demand from teachers, with far more applicants than places available; especially in Greece and Romania the partners were "flooded with applications", confirming a real need for this project. Croatia also had to select among numerous applications, while the numbers seeking to participate were sufficient in Cyprus and Spain. In the last two countries, which both introduced strong (but quite different) laws on domestic violence early (Cyprus 1997, Spain 2002) it could be seen that the proportion of participating teachers who had previously received training on gender equality (85% / 57%) or on intimate partner violence (39% / 43%) were significantly higher than in the other three countries. Spain stood out with 54% of the teachers

having already been trained regarding dating violence. The Spanish report comments that training on gender-based violence is widely available in Spain, but rarely specifically targeted to teachers and does not offer a specific methodology, and in fact, very few of the Spanish teachers (about 1 in 6) had any experience at all with projects addressing dating violence or IPV. While the GEAR offer did not immediately attract a high demand, the participants were just as enthusiastic as in the other countries and underlined in their responses and comments that they had learned new ways of teaching in this area; societal awareness of the problem does not automatically equip teachers to approach the issue effectively with students. It should be added that in both countries, while the numbers of teachers completing the training were somewhat lower than anticipated, the total number of implementers was the same or (in Spain) only slightly lower than planned.

This points to very successful progress on **capacity-building**, especially since many more teachers were trained than could be supported as implementers, and there are reports of trained teachers discussing with colleagues in their schools their high satisfaction with the method of experiential learning and with the activities provided, considering its potential for wider application. Teachers welcome being supplied with material and working methods, rather than – as so often the case – being confronted by society or the media with demands and expectations that they should solve social problems. Beyond this, teachers reported, and partners could observe indications of this, that the workshops changed the relationship of the implementing teachers to their classes towards a more open and less hierarchical relationship. In their comments, teachers said, for example, that from the workshops they understand better how young people think, that they heard from students who are usually silent, and that they were deeply impressed by the way students listened to each other in these discussions. Several partners reported that teachers have shared what they learned from the workshop methodology with other teachers and even were making plans to have this approach applied in the whole school. Having learned to use the GEAR methodology, these teachers now see themselves as change agents and have the confidence that they can work out ways to apply the GEAR approach to other topics.

The hopes for **youth initiatives** were surpassed. A wealth of art works and activities were created, and the children were very excited about the exhibition of what they had done. The partners remarked on the empowerment effect of giving adolescents a voice. All partners experienced their national conferences, at which the young people presented their campaigns, as highly successful and energizing for teachers, children, and the project partners themselves. Partners reported that the students, invited to disseminate, gained life skills such as public speaking in a safe environment supported by their friends, gaining self-confidence. One could say that there was a process of capacity building for the teenage students, preparing them for active citizenship.

5) Impact and perspectives for wider application, sustainability

Awareness and Knowledge: Although the duration of the project and its resources did not allow a systematic follow-up of changes resulting from the seminars and workshops, the data collected points to a significant impact exactly corresponding to what was defined at the outset as indicators of real change. Both among the teachers, who gained awareness of the many forms of gender inequality, the widespread stereotypes that they themselves sometimes shared, and the forms and sources of gender-

based violence, and among the students, whose responses suggest a deeper understanding of healthy relationships on the one hand, inequality and violence on the other, GEAR was able to set change in motion. More informative perhaps than any follow-up questionnaire could be was the invitation to the participants of each workshop to design and create jointly a piece of art – a painting, a video, a play, or any other creative expression they chose – communicating what they have learned, for an awareness-raising campaign offering a message to their peers. Pedagogy has long known that taking action together deepens learning and makes it more lasting. Discussing the message and the art form in the group and seeking to make something good enough to be presented at a national conference, perhaps even win the competition, led the participants in the workshops quite naturally to engage further with the issues and ideas generated during the workshops. Not only were the young people highly motivated by the invitation to develop projects and activities and engaged with great enthusiasm in taking imaginative approaches to the themes of non-violence and gender equality. The drawings, paintings, videos, and other activities show that the students had grasped the central ideas from the workshops and identified with them in a deep way. Students in all five countries commented that they enjoyed the workshops because they were dealing with issues in their own lives. Awareness of gender violence was thus not raised in the form of concern for unfortunate others, but as a matter that touches how young people will live their lives.

Knowledge was agreed on as a goal of GEAR primarily in a cognitive and analytical sense: Teachers and young people should know more about IPV, and policymakers and schools should know more about how to implement prevention. The work of this project has certainly offered a rich store of such knowledge that can be conveyed in research reports and policy briefs and discussed with regard to its theoretical foundations. But to appreciate fully what GEAR has accomplished, it may be helpful to draw on the finely differentiated concepts offered in the French language: Alongside “*savoir*”, the cognitive knowledge just mentioned, French can distinguish *savoir faire*, *savoir vivre* and *savoir être*.

Savoir faire is knowing how to do things, but not merely in the intellectual sense of knowing, for example, that experiential learning is a more effective way of enabling youth to understand matters that touch their lives than is moral lecturing; *savoir faire* means having acquired through practice the skill to do this kind of non-hierarchical teaching almost without consciously trying. *Savoir vivre* is the art of knowing how to live, not merely (as the casual use of the word sometimes implies) how to enjoy good food, but more deeply, how to relate to others in ways that enrich the lives of both. The concept of “healthy relationships” is a weak term for this kind of knowledge, reminiscent of taking one’s medicine. Knowing how to live is very profoundly a matter of relationships that neither need nor draw on violence of any kind, and allow all involved to flourish. *Savoir être*, finally, is the most difficult concept to translate; it describes knowing how to be a person; in pedagogy, Herbart introduced the concept of *tact* as the crucial virtue of teaching; today we might more often speak of a fundamental attitude of respect, compassion, attentiveness. It is a way of being that can, for example, inspire students to confide in a teacher.

When we call to mind these different kinds of knowledge, we can see that the undertaking of GEAR is an approach to education that can bring all four kinds of knowledge together in a set of activities that are, in themselves, practice sessions in interaction and relationships that exclude violence and empower both girls and boys. It is not surprising that the data on changes from pre- to post-workshop thinking show a stronger change for girls, and girls mostly expressing higher satisfaction, since girls are more

likely to have experienced some form of gender-based violence and to have encountered little understanding or support. But the more important result is that the direction and extent of change is similar for boys and girls in most measures. Indeed, the curves across countries in the charts of assessed usefulness of the workshops were quite similar for boys and girls, while differing by country (highest in Cyprus or Romania, lowest in Spain). Thus, boys and girls profit to an equal degree, on the whole, from the GEAR workshops, but the cultural context, perhaps the national discourse on gender-based violence or on gender equality, or perhaps factors related to the teachers, seems to have an effect. Overall, however, the values for satisfaction and usefulness are very high and the changes in stereotypes and ideas about gender and violence point to significant gains in both knowledge and awareness.

Sustainability: If, at the outset, the partners were hopeful that they would find enough teachers to take on a task that would involve additional work and also challenges dominant gender norms, as well as raising issues that are often loaded with shame, guilt or devaluation of boys and men, in practice all partners met with very high level of interest, willingness, involvement and motivation of teachers. After overcoming bureaucratic inertia, the schools themselves were very open to the ideas, and all partners reported that they encountered no opposition from parents; indeed, parents and local communities were often very happy with the workshops, not least because parents did not feel able to talk about these topics with their adolescent children themselves.

The lower number of teachers trained in CY and ES did not lower the number of workshops or students participating, indeed, the numbers of students were higher than planned in all five countries. The numbers suggest that in countries that have a high level of training offered in the general area, it may be somewhat more difficult to communicate to teachers that GEAR has something specific to offer them. There were some comments to that effect by experts from the Nordic countries in the working group at the EU conference. Thus, when extending the GEAR approach to countries with a strong history of engagement for gender equality and against violence, consideration should be given to how the GEAR approach can best be introduced.

Some steps have been taken towards integrating GEAR into the educational system. Although it was sometimes a struggle for administrative approval, all partners were able to implement the workshops in schools and with teachers currently teaching key subjects (varying by country). In Spain the Education Department of the Government of Catalonia officially validated the GEAR project, allowing teachers to receive certification. The Ministry of Justice in Cyprus and the Ministry of Education in Romania are considering supporting replication of the workshops in a wider range of schools. However, firm commitments to establishing the approach and ensuring that teachers receive the necessary competent and experienced training are not yet in sight. GEAR is not a module that can be marketed without the corresponding training.

The EU conference was a crucial event in the effort to make the GEAR approach sustainable. Attended by 37 experts from 31 EU member, candidate and potential candidate states, with a total audience of 269, the participants expressed a very strong interest in the GEAR approach. Respondents to the conference evaluation questionnaire attached extremely high value to introducing interventions for prevention of IPV and for gender equality in all schools in their countries. Asked if they would, if they could make the decision, integrate the GEAR Against IPV approach in their country, the response of “yes” or “most probably yes” was almost unanimous.

6) Lessons learned

In Greece (with a project partner that supports abused children), Romania and Spain, a total of 16 professionals were trained who work with vulnerable and high-risk girls and boys who have been exposed to violence; 16 workshops with a total of 125 children and teens were carried out. The organisation was difficult, as children are sometimes moved into or out of care at short notice, and the ages of participating children ranged from 7 to 21, with ¼ of them between 11 and 17. Thus, the groups were very heterogeneous, and the data from the questionnaires not comparable to those from the school-based workshops. However, the reports from these workshops were extremely positive; the children seemed to grasp the key issues even more quickly than average school students and appreciated the opportunity to talk about the issues. It could thus be seen that the methodology and the materials can be used successfully with high-risk groups (young people who had experienced child abuse), as well as with younger age groups than originally planned, and could also be used – without changing the material – with adults, such as abused women (tested in Greece). That is to say, GEAR has succeeded in producing material that has wide applicability, because of its approach through experiential learning. It is comprehensive and internally consistent, but flexible, allowing teachers to select the exercises that are appropriate for the group, and giving space for the participants to define the issues from their experience.

Approval of the program by the relevant authorities is often required, but it also facilitates participation. It should be initiated as early as possible, so as to avoid putting teachers under time pressure. Much of the success of GEAR II was made possible by the high motivation and decided approach of the teachers who, after training, were determined to make the workshops happen, some even agreeing with their students to stay after school to do it. It is advisable to begin the process of gaining approval as early as possible.

7) Recommendations

- 1) Given the strong evidence base for the effectiveness of the GEAR approach, and with reference to Article 14 of the Istanbul Convention, it is recommended that the authorities responsible for the education systems in Council of Europe member states, whether these be the national or a regional government, consider approving the introduction of the GEAR approach in schools, with a specialised organisation that has the necessary knowledge and skills entrusted with translation and validation of the Master Package (where necessary) and with providing the indispensable training and support of teachers. Whenever possible, the authorities should form a timely assessment based on one of the existing versions for a preliminary approval, enabling work to begin, so as to be sure the training can commence during the first part of the school year.
- 2) Implementation of GEAR should continue and be expanded in all the countries where it has been tested and validated, with resources provided for the German and Austrian versions to be updated. It should be noted that the GEAR project is quite a low-cost intervention, while the cost to society of gender inequality in general and of intimate partner violence in particular is high.

- 3) For the introduction, updating and adaption of the GEAR material, cooperation with the European Anti-Violence Network (EAVN) in Athens is indispensable. Funding models must be found that can secure ongoing advice and support by the original authors and coordination of the GEAR projects (EAVN). Ideally, a project GEAR III would support a coalition of further partners in countries where GEAR has not yet been introduced, as this would provide an ideal basis for expansion.

A handwritten signature in black ink, reading "Cam Hoge-White". The signature is written in a cursive style with a horizontal line extending from the end.