



ILO-INTI: PROMOTING EQUALITY IN DIVERSITY: INTEGRATION IN EUROPE

*(A project implemented by the International Labour Office and partners
with the financial support of the European Union)*

PRACTICE EVALUATION WORKING GROUP INITIAL MEETING VIENNA, 11-12 FEBRUARY 2005

SUMMARY REPORT AND CONCLUSIONS

1. Participants

Enrico Allasino, Forum for European and International Research on Migration (FIERI) Turin
Tarafa Baghajati, European Network Against Racism (ENAR) Vienna
Dimitria Clayton, Center for Immigration, North Rhine Westphalia, Solingen
August Gachter, Centre for Social Innovation, Vienna
Sarah Isal, Runnymede Trust, London
Heike Klempa European Commission Against Racism and Intolerance (ECRI) Council of Europe, Strasbourg
Patrick Taran, ILO, Geneva
John Wrench, European Union Monitoring Centre on Racism and Xenophobia, Vienna

2) Summary of Project Context and Background

Patrick Taran outlined the context for development of the INTI project and this component:

- a) Practical initiatives to fight discrimination and facilitate integration are a primary component of addressing these issues. Such initiatives are flourishing across Europe, driven both by legal pressures and voluntary initiatives. ILO has already compiled over 100 extensive profiles of such practices and has identified over 60 different types of practice in five general categories. There is a lot of talk of “best practice”, but what is it?
- b) The broader context of immigration has become central to (re)defining European society, its policies and politics and its economic future. As indicated by an ILO projection study, if current trends of population aging and decline, retirement age, female workforce participation, low immigration, and modest economic and productivity growth continue, Europe’s standard of living may be 22% lower by 2050.
- c) Need to combat discrimination and promote integration are increasingly recognized as key policy priorities today by many European governments as well as the EU. This is symbolized by agreement on and some implementation of EU directives ...
- d) ILO conducted national discrimination surveys in five countries, two more currently initiated, since the mid-1990s. A High Level Tripartite Conference in March 2000 set recommendations for developing practical tools, exchange of practice, a website and other measures to enhance efforts of government and social partner constituents.

3) Review of INTI Project Components

Based on this background, ILO developed the proposal and framed activities for this INTI project. The project purpose is: *To support broad community engagement throughout European Union member countries in facilitating integration of and combating discrimination against immigrants by disseminating effective practice, identifying indicators of integration, developing evaluation tools, and convening social partner networking.*

ILO INTI project components are to:

1. Expand the initial European compendium/data base on practice example profiles covering all main categories in the ILO typology. The host for this meeting, Center for Social Innovation, is responsible for carrying forward the profile collection, which will provide a data-base for developing and testing evaluation approaches.
2. Determine evaluative standards, indicators, methodology and tools to assess effectiveness, and viability of integration and anti-discrimination practices: ***this is the task for this working group.***
3. Conduct a comprehensive study of European and other experience in integration, to (a) identify key conditions, factors and measures for success, (b) to distinguish viable and counterproductive approaches, (c) to determine key indicators of integration; FIERI is responsible for this research.
4. Develop tool kits including guidelines, models of practice and practical pamphlets for use by specific constituencies and social groups (small enterprises, trade unionists, migrant groups, etc), as well as a practitioners handbook/manual for use by organizers, specialists and leadership.
5. Convene and facilitate a European social partner forum on integration and discrimination to facilitate exchange of experience and practice and stimulate wider and social partner engagement.
6. Organize a conference to evaluate experiences, share knowledge and consider possibilities for sustained national and European campaign(s) for integration and anti-discrimination.

4) Refinement of terms of reference for task: Evaluation indicators and methodology

The component this working group is responsible for is to elaborate a methodology, indicators and criteria to evaluate the quality of practice activities. A budget was established to permit a set of three consultations among a group of specialists with relevant experience representing concerned institutions. A proposed reference data-base is the ILO-INTI collection of profiles of practice, and other identified practice.

The group was carefully chosen to include specialists in entities with experience and credibility in this arena, to lend both the expertise and 'legitimacy' to approaches that would be formulated by this group. Entities invited included EUMC, ECRI (Council of Europe), ENAR, a German regional immigration monitoring body and an independent specialized body the Runnymede Trust in the UK, and FIERI, the research institution which conducted national discrimination testing in Italy to ensure a breadth of expertise across the wider Europe including the main specialized entities and bodies with direct local practical experience.

This first meeting was intended to identify and review relevant existing approaches to evaluation of social practice, consider initial proposals for criteria, process, approaches, etc. and assign 'homework' to elaborate options and models.

A second meeting is to work through models, proposals, etc to come up with a working framework to be subsequently refined and tested.

A third meeting would review initial application experience, consider refinements and finalize an evaluation 'package.' It is proposed that this package be adopted by working group participants in their expert roles and disseminated as a working model. Further level of endorsement could be considered while at the approaches are used, subject to further evolution.

5) De-limitation of our working area:

Discussion; points raised by participants:

- Question – what can we promote in trans-national practice?
- We need guidelines on what doesn't work, a question of evaluation
- We need criteria, working methodology, instruments and tools.

-Making the case for more effective evaluation strategies - An effective evaluation model:

- Increases the potential for greater efficacy and impact
- improves the management of the projects
- helps NGOs structure their grant proposals in a way that makes them more attractive to potential donors
- helps potential donors evaluate grant proposals

--ZSI did a programme entitled 'voluntary industrial codes of practice for global e-work'. Key question was: *Do multinationals follow the same practices in different countries?* –(given each has different legislation, standards, customs, cultures) They developed a self-evaluation tool, using a database of 250 voluntary industrial codes of practice in different sectors in different countries. They did an assessment of these codes to see if they could be relevant to e-work. See website: www.unomondo.org

--The State government of North Rhine Westphalia seems now to be convinced of the value of ethnic monitoring.

--Runnymede found cases of company discrimination practices where management said the policy was working well and then workers said it was a disaster.

--In Italy, because there is money available for 'cultural mediators', many people start this particular practice, to get the money. This is a distortion – it is a common practice not because it is proved to be good, but because money is available for it.

--We need to establish a method of evaluating practice in both anti-discrimination and integration; they are not the same. Integration activities can have anti-discrimination elements. Can integration always be understood as anti-discrimination in its broadest sense? Should we prioritise the anti-discrimination element?

--The task is to find indicators for "anti-discrimination work" and not for "discrimination"; we are looking for evaluation and *indicators of anti-discrimination activities*.

--Can you judge an integration project by how anti-discrimination it is? For example, the content of a language training course can include specific material to equip the trainee to combat discrimination. Key indicators that might qualify language training as integration activity would include how to operate in the labour market, teaching awareness of rights, how to get assistance as a victim etc.

--Policies will be chosen which 'self-identify as anti-discrimination practices.

--Before any specific anti-discrimination measures can be evaluated we need to look at contextual pressures and preconditions, such as legal barriers or any legal restraint the practice operates in.

--Project Management issue as practice indicator: when looking at models, it will be important to look at both the vision/content of models as well as management issue.

General agreement:

- we focus on racism and discrimination, i.e. immigrants and ethnic minorities.
- we emphasise anti-discrimination measures but noting the continuum between this and measures promoting integration

One should perhaps speak of “judgement” when assessing the outcome/impact of anti-discrimination measures rather than “measurement” as we are unlikely to have the resources to actually measure a project’s outcome/impact....

Nevertheless it should be possible to find indicators that make “measurement” possible.

General agreement: Mandate of this group:

- Establish useful approach to evaluate practice in the field of anti-discrimination
- Identify useful practice to look at (i.e. identify relevant databases that exist)
- Identify premises/sources for content of evaluation package
- Look at specific indicators and evaluation criteria (come up with methodology) including regarding positive and negative aspects
- Come up with methodology that can be applied in anti-discrimination practices
- Carry out initial testing of the methodology on existing practice

6) Identification of useful models and elements / leads to other relevant practice evaluation approaches

Many of the suggestions for criteria collected during the meeting were listed in the “EU Guide to Procedures and Methodology...”. This could be used as a starting point for the development of our own indicators.

Examples evaluation theory from a variety of sources:

- European Commission evaluation (distributed by Heike at meeting)
- European Commission evaluation of Community Action Programme (Sarah)
- Business Case for Diversity: Initial report commissioned by the European Commission (Sarah)
- General books on mechanisms that make some projects succeed and others fail.

Existing Databases

- 2 databases that will be developed in the near future that must not be overlooked in the development of our project:
 - OSCE Database to develop good practice.
 - RAXEN Database

Other examples of useful good practice

- Compendium of good practice (John)
- RAXEN Comparative Employment Report has some good elements of good practice – (John)
- Race for Opportunity (RfO), which works with over 180 private and public sector organisations across the UK to realise their objectives on race, usually as part of their diversity programmes. RfO has a benchmarking programme of self-assessment, where participants carry out a desktop evaluation of the current position of their

organisation against a range of criteria under each of 10 performance indicators (inc. leadership and the business case, resourcing and development, policy & planning etc...) (Sarah)

- ETUC is putting together criteria (John to look into)
- Study by Wrench & Modood on effectiveness of anti-discrimination legislation, strategies and practices in the UK (Patrick)
- Focus Project on the business case for diversity they have to obtain 30 case studies (Sarah)

OSCE/ODIHR is reportedly intending to establish a database of good practice in anti-discrimination.

7) ILO Anti-discrimination Practice Framework

Can these be used as indicators?

1. **Needs identified**
2. **Aims and objectives** – does it specifically address the needs? Relevance, coherence?
3. **Activities** Do activities correspond to the aims? How, and to what extent?
4. **Project period**
5. **Sources of funding** – Is this an indicator of sustainability? Is it incorporated into mainstream budget?
6. **Involvement of migrants/minorities and social partners** – a value judgement, but realistically if not it will be less effective.
7. **Results achieved** – several levels of indicator, e.g. how many were trained, how many got jobs, how many were there one year later, etc.
8. **Innovative elements** – difficult – more subjective
9. **Difficulties** encountered in implementation – scope for emulation.

There was general agreement that these indicators remained a relevant starting point for the collection of useful descriptive data on practice measures and initiatives.

8) Suggestions for Evaluation Criteria ...

Relevant	Does it address recognized issues? Does the activity address racism and discrimination? What kind of discrimination?
Useful	Is it an acknowledged approach? Is it an innovative approach that needs to be acknowledged?
Coherent	How can the measure be described? Does it establish a clear link between the needs and the aims of the activities implemented? Are there measurable indicators?
Sufficient	What are the elements that are required for the activity to be effective? (e.g. a company anti-discrimination policy will only be effective if it is accompanied by some form of enforcement). The kind of elements necessary will vary according to the type of measure...
Effective	Is there some measurable output? Does the output match the intentions?
Impact	Outcomes (???)
Viability	Operational: Management, resources, capacity Contextual: Support (legal, political), Restrains: legal, institutional, ...

9) Homework

What	Who
Review Practice Anti-Discrimination Profiles www.ilo.org/migrant/discrimination	All
Closer review of 1 or 2 activities presented in the case profiles – (e.g. through interview visits) Circulate: Wrench-Modood UK study	Patrick, August
Translation of the profile questionnaires into various languages (e.g. for distribution amongst ENAR member organizations)	INTI coordination team
-Circulate EU “guide to evaluation procedures and methodologies” -Information from P. Simon on statistical integration indicators – France	Heike
Circulate Links to relevant EU evaluation material: e.g. the Business Case for Diversity http://www.stop-discrimination.info/fileadmin/pdfs/CostsBenefExSumEN.pdf	Sarah
Circulate: -Dublin Compendium of Good Practice -Diversity management report - site of the EUMC Comparative Employment Report	John
Circulate Hirschmann (?) study on social indicators (Maintain link with INTI-ILO integration indicator study)	Enrico
Circulate: -Evaluation Report Community Action Programme to Combat Discrimination 1999 (?) -criteria used by UN to award its diversity award	Dimitria
Inform ENAR partners and request cooperation in identifying relevant practice initiatives to include in database.	Tarafa

10) Next Meeting

12-13 May, 2005 – London

Sarah Isal and Runnymede will arrange local hosting of the meeting.

Note: date changed to 9-10 June due to ILO constraints.

11) Evaluation.

Participants generally agreed that the meeting clarified a number of issues and challenges, and set relatively clear direction for subsequent steps by working group participants. It was noted that the convocation succeeded in obtaining a gender balance in participation as well as a relatively wide diversity of experience, both operationally and geographically.

It may be necessary to include representatives of donor organizations in a future meeting – and get their opinion on the feasibility of the model developed.

Compiled by Patrick Taran with notes contributed by Dimitria Clayton, Sarah Isal and John Wrench.

Contact: ILO International Migration Program, tel +41-22 799 8091 e-mail: taran@ilo.org