



## 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 FOURTH MEETING DUBLIN, NOVEMBER 2005

#### (DRAFT) SUMMARY REPORT

##### 1. Participants

Mohammed Abdul Aziz, European Network Against Racism (ENAR), London  
Tiziana Caponio: FIERI, Turin.

Dimitria Clayton, Center for Immigration, North Rhine Westphalia, Solingen

August Gächter, Centre for Social Innovation, Vienna

Sarah Isal, Runnymede Trust, London

Patrick Taran & Serverine Dalban-Moreynas, ILO, Geneva

John Wrench, European Union Monitoring Centre on Racism and Xenophobia, Vienna

##### 2. General Discussion

The Concluding Conference of the ILO INTI project is postponed to May (subsequently to 6-7 June) to coincide with a European Parliamentary session and to accommodate project and partner schedules.

Tiziana asked how evaluation group work would inter-relate with FIERI's work on integration indicators.

John provided information on current activities from the European Commission (EC) in the field of integration and data collection:

- The EC set up a Working Group on data collection to measure the extent and impact of discrimination in Europe (Run by DG Employment and Social Affairs). It is looking at all grounds of discrimination covered by Article 13
- The EC is planning a call for tender to measure the impact of anti-discrimination legislation with a view to develop a methodology.
- It will also produce a handbook on data collection on discrimination. Final draft should be ready in September 2006 and has been commissioned to the Finnish Ministry of Labour. John is on the subgroup set up by the EC on the handbook.  
Suggestion that ILO should be part of the subgroup given its testing work.
- John also mentioned upcoming European Years:
  - 2006: European Year of Movement of Migrant workers
  - 2007: European Year of Equal Opportunities for All
  - 2008: European Year of Intercultural Dialogue

Agreement that it will be important to locate our final products within this European context. Key integrated themes are: rights, representation, recognition (diversity), respect.

Patrick reminded that the final products we would want to have are:

- Draft Evaluation Methodology (including table of criteria)
- Comments about the context of our project and process (including challenges)
- Provide cases and models to highlight our methodology. Will be good to put out the testing model together with the examples we used to test our model. This might produce the finding that our model actually helps identify gaps in the project.
  
- Thanks to all of us for that hard work!

### 3. Action Points and Timetable

<i>November 05</i>	As the current methodology is not actually operational, some of the group members will draw up the methodology.
<i>January 06</i>	August will choose 3-4 profiles from the ILO Profiles. All Members of the Working Group will test the model, using these profiles. This will allow us to see whether we all come up with the same results or different results. To be completed by 15 January 2005
<i>February 2005:</i>	<p>Working Group members to contact key individuals to get them to test the model for themselves. These could include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- People that have projects running or who are planning projects</li> <li>- Experts in evaluation</li> <li>- Funders and Foundations that are providing the money for these projects</li> </ul> <p>Specific examples of contacts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- UNESCO led – Cities Against Racism. <a href="mailto:J.Morohashi@unesco.org">J.Morohashi@unesco.org</a> (preliminary study on “indicators for the evaluation of municipal action against racism)</li> <li>- JRCT (Juliet Prager)</li> <li>- Paul Lappaninen</li> <li>- Patrick Simon</li> <li>- Ken Anderson</li> <li>- Paul Abel</li> <li>- Someone from CRE?</li> <li>- John Kellock (EUMC)</li> </ul>
<i>Early March</i>	Model ready to go out for wider circulation.

### 4. Strategy for Dissemination

- Part of the budget of the project allows for a website where our information could be posted
- Need to disseminate the product to our networks
  - o ENAR Weekly Email
  - o Links from our websites to the website with products
  - o Network of Researchers on Migration and Ethnic Studies (IMISCOE)

### 5. Metropolis Conference Workshop

Agreement that the Working Group would organise a workshop at the next Metropolis conference in Lisbon on 2-6 October. Need to think about what we would provide.

- Could use the structure of report to present various papers (each would take on a bit of it)
  - o Contextual bit (John Wrench)
  - o Content of the report
  - o Process (What we learnt)
- Agreement that this should not create additional work for any member of the group but rather presenting what we are already working on.
- Leader of the workshop: ILO-EUMC lead. John and Patrick to coordinate the organisation of the workshop

## 6. Brainstorming on Conclusions and Recommendations

Little attention to evaluation practices in this particular field. Very incremental process because no real references (apart from management references). Make the point that we are all competent in the field but not real experts in evaluation.

One of the objectives of the project: make it useful for not our institutions but also for practitioners and to further the practice themselves. Emphasise the universal nature of the model (applicable for numerous actors, ranging from 2 staffed community organisation locally to a governmental national action plan against racism).

## 7. Improving the MATRIX

A number of changes and additions were agreed to enhance and complete the Matrix and evaluation description:

The first two columns together are the "criteria." The second two columns, *data collected* and *to be collected*, present the "descriptors." The last column on *data analysis* provides the "measurement" or "measures".

- For criteria 1: drop last sentence under *definition*; drop question "could it be..." and add two points: "goals and objectives of project"; "project activities." Under *data analysis*, add: "What correlation between needs and objectives?"
- For criteria 2, relevance, add for *data collected*: "brief description of context and assertion of project responses/correlation to context issues identified." Insert here point 1) from descriptors, coherence criteria. Under data analysis, "extent of correlations."
- The "usefulness" criteria is dropped.
- Criteria coherence (3), descriptors 2 & 3 become 1 and 2. Note that "grading to be determined" needs to be added to measurement column.
- For these criteria, distinction/line between *data collected currently* and *data to be collected* can be omitted.
- For criteria Inclusion (new # 4?), add "proportionality" to measurement column. There was a question regarding whether other descriptor input could be anticipated
- Criteria *Viability* could be renamed "Management" (or Management viability?) Text after first sentence of definition moved to descriptor column. Definition should refer to both resources and institutional support. Under measurement, add "yes/no; to what degree; how much resources over how much time; what level of management buy in: eg. Individual champion; senior management support; board decision? Grading to be determined."
- Criteria *adaptability*: some questions under definition could be reformulated as descriptors.

Order of criteria might need to be reviewed again to determine what might be most logical sequence for both development and evaluation of practice.

The general Methodology paper will have to be revised to incorporate these changes.

#### **8. Next Meeting**

To be determined, possibly a final meeting together with project coordination team prior to concluding conference if finances and schedules permit.

(Subsequently scheduled for 12 May, 2006 at CCME offices in Brussels.)

Summary prepared by Sarah Isal, with contributions by Patrick Taran