

European Refugee Fund
Annual Output and Outcomes Report
2010 - 2011

NEXUS



Table of Contents

Executive Summary	i
Section 1: Background and Methodology	1
1.1 Background	1
1.2 Methodology	2
1.3 Structure of the Report.....	4
1.4 Project Resources	4
Section 2: Outputs	6
2.1 Output Profile among Projects	6
2.2 Presentation of Output Data	7
2.2.1 Information and advice services	7
2.2.2 Building capacity and education/training of individuals	8
2.2.3 Targeted support for youth	9
2.2.4 Legal and advocacy supports.....	10
2.2.5 Trauma and counselling	10
2.2.6 Intercultural and interfaith dialogue	10
2.2.7 Direct actions to combat racism	11
2.2.8 Building capacity of service providers	11
2.2.9 Mainstreaming and policy development.....	13
2.2.10 Support for other marginalised groups	13
2.3 Key Points and Aggregate Figures	13
2.3.1 What kinds of Outputs are produced?	13
2.3.2 How many Outputs have been produced?	13
Section 3: Outcomes	16
3.1 Overall Focus and Influence	16
3.2 Overview of Outcomes.....	19
Outcome 1: Enhanced life-skills and personal development	20
Outcome 2: Enhanced day-to-day interaction with the community	22
Outcome 3: Participation in social /recreational groups & other activities	23
Outcome 4. Engaging in collective action and NGOs	25
Outcome 5. Seek/obtain training, education, employment	26
Outcome 6. Access to statutory, social and community services	28
Outcome 7. Redress for racism and discrimination	29
Outcome 8. Improved skills/capacities of statutory/community bodies	30
Outcome 9. Collaboration among statutory/community bodies	32
Outcome 10. Inter-culturalism widely embedded	34
Outcome 11. Mainstreaming and replication	35
Outcome 12. Policy/practice changes.....	36
3.3 Aggregate Analysis of Output Influences and Outcomes	37
Annex 1: Outputs and Outcomes	40

List of Tables

Table 1: Outputs by Projects	6
Table 2: Drop-in Centre unique visitors by gender and Target Group end June 2011 ..	7
Table 3: Target Groups completing or ongoing English language training	8
Table 4: Number on accredited and non-accredited training	9
Table 5: Number and Gender mentored	9
Table 6: Number of Young People targeted with support	9
Table 7: Number receiving Advocacy and Legal supports	10
Table 8: Number of One-off events and Ongoing actions and Participants	10
Table 9: Participants in actions to directly combat racism	11
Table 10: Capacity Building Actions for Statutory and Community/Voluntary Orgs ...	12
Table 11: Numbers in Capacity Building Actions for Service Providers	12
Table 12: Summary of Target Groups numbers in Seven Outputs	14
Table 13: Intercultural Dialogue	15
Table 14: Capacity Building for Statutory, Community and Voluntary sectors	15
Table 15: Numbers in Capacity Building Actions for Service Providers	15
Table 16: Outputs and Projects Influencing Outcome 1	20
Table 17: Outputs Influencing Outcome 1 Programme level average	21
Table 18: Outputs and Projects Influencing Outcome 2:	22
Table 19: Outputs Influencing Outcome 2 Programme level average	23
Table 20: Outputs and Projects Influencing Outcome 3	24
Table 21: Outputs Influencing Outcome 3: Programme level average	24
Table 22: Outputs and Projects Influencing	25
Table 23: Outputs Influencing Outcome 4 . Programme level average	26
Table 24: Outputs and Projects Influencing	27
Table 25: Outputs Influencing Outcome 5 . Programme level average	27
Table 26: Outputs and Projects influencing Outcome 6	28
Table 27: Outputs influencing Outcome 6. Programme level average	29
Table 28: Outputs and Projects Influencing Outcome 7	30
Table 29: Outputs and Projects influencing Outcome 8	31
Table 30: Outputs Influencing Outcome 8. Programme level average	31
Table 31: Outputs and Projects influencing Outcome 9	33
Table 32: Outputs Influencing Outcome 9. Programme level average	33
Table 33: Outputs and Projects influencing Outcome 10	34
Table 34: Outputs Influencing Outcome 10 Programme level average	35
Table 35: Outputs and Projects Influencing Outcome 11.	35
Table 36: Outputs Influencing Outcome 11. Programme level average	36
Table 37: Outputs and Projects influencing Outcome 12	37
Table 38: Outputs Influencing Outcome 12.. Programme level average	37

List of Figures

Figure 1: Comparative Focus of effort and resources among Projects on Outcomes	17
Figure 2: Influence on Outcomes, All Projects	18
Figure 3: Comparing Focus and Influence, across Projects	19
Figure 4: The relative contribution of Outputs to Outcomes	38
Figure 5: Outcomes Influenced the Most	38

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Background

In November 2010, Pobal contracted NEXUS Research Co-operative to design a monitoring and evaluation framework for the European Integration Fund (EIF) and European Refugee Fund (ERF) in Ireland, to address a number of weaknesses in the existing arrangements. Following wide consultation, it was finalised in March 2011¹. The Framework incorporates three inter-related levels as follows:

- Final Programme evaluation reports which will be contracted by the Office for the Promotion of Migrant Integration (OPMI) to an independent evaluator(s);
- Programme-level evaluation which will include a focus on programme level outputs and outcomes and , separately on, a thematic evaluation; and
- Project-level monitoring and evaluation with a focus on monitoring of progress, process evaluation, project-level thematic learning and project-level outputs and outcomes evaluation.

The new framework is now being implemented by the 23 groups currently funded under the ERF and EIF.

This report presents the results of the ERF Programme level evaluation as it relates to outputs and outcomes aggregated from Project level for the period July 1st 2010 to June 30th 2011. The data is gathered from Projects through an online evaluation survey, in which they detail their outputs and outcomes. This is the first in a series of three annual reports for the Programme, and a final output and outcomes report will be completed at the end of the current ERF round.

The ten ERF-funded Projects are at somewhat different stages of development. Some began later than others, are some are also a continuation from earlier ERF funding. Both factors influence the extent to which outputs and outcomes might be expected at this stage.

Outputs

Outputs are to be distinguished from outcomes largely in that the former are immediate, tend to be under the direct influence of Projects and comprise means to an end rather than ends in themselves; whereas the latter are longer term, can be influenced by many factors, and confer benefits more directly on the target group.

The ERF Projects have, in terms of sheer volume, produced a large number of outputs in this first year. With perhaps a small amount of duplication in the figures, about 1,650 refugees and 860 asylum seekers have received specific services, two thirds of them male. A further 600 refugees and asylum seekers took part in activities that involve intercultural dialogue, mainly in the form of one off events. In addition, about 360 mainly Irish people were involved in a total of 33 capacity building activities.

However, the key issue is not the volume but the *nature* of these services, some of which are once-off and limited in nature while others are intensive and ongoing. The following include some highlights.

- **Drop-in centres**, offered by five of the ten Projects, had 1,367 unique visitors and over 7,900 visits, meaning that each individual visited on average almost six times. This strongly suggests the service is seen as useful.

1 Monitoring and Evaluation Framework for the *European Refugee Fund* and *European Integration Fund*. Final Report March 1st 2011. NEXUS Research.

- **Outreach information and advice** visits were made exclusively to asylum seekers by three Projects, with 277 visits made to 321 people.
- **Training and education**, in the form of English language but also other accredited and non-accredited courses, was a key component, delivered by seven Projects. A total of 788 training programmes were run on specific topics, many of them in effect modules of larger courses². In all, 330 people received English language training, and about half that in a range of other subjects of whom 29 completed accredited courses during the period.
- **Legal advice and advocacy support** was also received by 208 people from the three Projects offering such support. Three quarters of beneficiaries were asylum seekers.
- **Mentoring activities**, which links up asylum seekers and refugees with Irish or other nationalities for intensive learning and engagement, was taken up by four Projects, with 17 people (all but two refugees) working with 19 mentors.
- **Trauma and other forms of counselling** was provided by two Projects to a total of 40 people, 32 of them women. This is one of the few categories in which women were in a majority.
- **Youth** were targeted by four Projects, with slightly more women/girls among the 92 young people involved in the diverse range of programmes run for them.
- Various actions to **encourage intercultural and interfaith dialogue** were organised by five Projects, attracting 1,174 participants, half of them from the Target group and the rest split between Irish and other non-Irish. One-off events included concerts, photo exhibitions, and celebrations of Africa Day, World Refugees Day and International Women's Day; and ongoing activities include film clubs, and Women's Groups.

Other Outputs work more widely with **service providers** among the statutory sector (six Projects) and community voluntary organisations (six Projects).

Capacity building in service coordination, in delivery and in interacting with the Target Groups, took the form for instance of:

- formal training courses for public employees of various kinds;
- workshops;
- the creation of fora to facilitate interaction and consultation; and
- seeking participation in Project Committee and structures.

The Target Group was often involved, as contributors and participants. Almost 300 Irish people took part, and a few dozen from the Target group and others.

In the 12 month period to 30th June 2011, a total of 109 volunteers worked the equivalent of 344 days supporting the implementation of ERF projects.

Outcomes

A couple of questions are pertinent. First, and most obviously, what kinds of results – concrete outcomes – are emerging in terms of improving the circumstances of asylum seeking and refugees and the quality and impact of the services available to them. Second, which outputs are leading to these outcomes, and why. All of these will be explored over the course of the evaluation of the ERF Programme as a whole.

2 It was not possible in the survey to determine the number of complete courses run. This number reflects the number of subjects covered in all the courses, and many courses covered more than one subject.

Because it is so early in the Programme and because they are by their nature more difficult to monitor and measure, the expectation is that specific Outcomes will become clearer as time goes on and as the evidence becomes available and accumulates.

At this early stage, a few indications can be given of emerging aggregate trends.

Based on the evidence to hand, Projects believe that the outcomes that they have influenced the most are, in descending but closely groups order:

- enhanced life-skills and personal development of refugees and asylum seekers;
- improved capacity to access services;
- improved skills/capacities of statutory and community and voluntary bodies in their interaction with the target groups; and
- Enhanced day to day interaction with the community.

This may be because such benefits arise directly from short-term training and capacity building exercises both of the Target Group, service providers and others.

Other desirable Outcomes were felt to have been influenced to a much lesser degree, including:

- improved redress in relation to racism and discrimination (regarding which few Projects were active);
- policy and practice changes among service organisations;
- enhanced capacity for the Target Group to engage in collective actions; and
- mainstreaming and replication of the activities undertaken.

Each of these involves influencing processes and/or organisations change, which takes longer both to build a case for and to implement.

In terms of the relative contribution that activities and outputs made to Outcomes as a whole, the following were felt to have been the most significant:

- Building the capacity of the community and voluntary sector;
- Building the capacity of the statutory sector;
- Promoting mainstreaming and developing policy;
- Delivering non-language education and training;
- Delivering English language training.

The anomaly here is that Projects felt that promoting mainstreaming and developing policy had a significant contribution. This merits further investigation as no immediate explanation is available for this finding, although it may be related to the fact that almost every Project is engaging in it. The others are all different forms of training and capacity building which tend to have an immediate impact and which have been delivered by the largest number of Projects.

The outputs and actions having contributed the least so far to Outcomes include:

- Delivering themed information and supports (only two projects engaged in this);
- Supporting actions to directly combat racisms and discrimination (again, only two projects engaged in this);
- Providing advocacy and legal support to individuals;
- Providing information and advice through outreach services.

Additional data is provided by Projects to further illuminate these results, and to provide concrete evidence for the beliefs held and claims made. Such outcome-related data will be

generated, in large part by the evaluators engaged by Projects themselves, in ever increasing volume in coming years to deepen understanding of these processes.

SECTION 1: BACKGROUND AND METHODOLOGY

1.1 Background

The European Refugee Fund (ERF) is one of four funds (along with the European Integration Fund) that form the general programme ‘*Solidarity and Management of Migration Flows*’ for the period 2007-2013. This general programme is administered by the Directorate General for Home Affairs within the European Commission.

The ERF supports Member States in receiving asylum seekers and refugees. Asylum seekers are eligible for reception supports. Persons whose stay in the State is of a lasting and stable nature i.e. refugees, persons with subsidiary protection and resettled persons, and members of their families, are eligible for reception and integration supports.

Reception supports are focused on activities that meet the basic social, medical and information needs of the target group, with an added focus on meeting the needs of specific ‘vulnerable groups’ from within the target group such as minors, unaccompanied minors, victims of rape or other forms of psychological, physical or sexual violence.

Integration supports are more focused on activities that promote durable and sustainable participation in the social, economic and cultural life of Member States.

In Ireland, the Responsible Authority (RA) for the ERF (and EIF) is the Office for the Promotion of Migrant Integration (OPMI). Responsibility for overseeing the implementation of both Funds has been delegated to Pobal since 2007.

In November 2010, Pobal contracted NEXUS Research Co-operative to design a monitoring and evaluation framework for the EIF and ERF in Ireland. The need for a new framework arose out of a review of existing monitoring and evaluation arrangements that identified a number of weaknesses that needed to be addressed. These included:

- The inadequacy of indicators set at the ERF/EIF programme level;
- The variety of approaches to monitoring and evaluation adopted at an individual project level;
- The lack of an agreed integrated monitoring and evaluation framework specific to Ireland that provided coherence between individual project evaluation and programme-wide evaluation, and which is aligned with EU monitoring and evaluation requirements.
- The potential for a disjuncture between current monitoring arrangements and future evaluation requirements at EU level

Following a consultation process with a range of stakeholders, including direct engagement with funded ERF/EIF groups, a framework was finalised in March 2011³.

The new monitoring and evaluation framework has three inter-related levels as follows:

- Final Programme evaluation reports which will be contracted by the Office for the Promotion of Migrant Integration (OPMI) to an independent evaluator(s).
- Programme-level evaluation which will include a focus on both thematic evaluation and programme level outputs and outcomes; and

3 Monitoring and Evaluation Framework for the *European Refugee Fund* and *European Integration Fund*. Final Report March 1st 2011. NEXUS Research.

- Project-level monitoring and evaluation with a focus on monitoring of progress, process evaluation, project-level thematic learning and project-level outputs and outcomes evaluation.

The new Framework addresses the weaknesses outlined above by providing the ERF with appropriate output and outcome indicators, ensuring coherence and consistency between Project level and Programme level evaluation, and ensuring complementarity with European Commission (EC) requirements.

The new framework is now being implemented by the 23 groups currently funded under the ERF and EIF.

A central component of the framework is the Programme-level evaluation which aggregates the results from individual Projects, and adds value specifically at the Programme level. The Programme-level evaluation is focused on two key elements, the Programme-level outputs and outcomes evaluation and the thematic evaluation.

The *Programme-level Output and Outcome Evaluation* will draw together results from the Project level. Groups complete an online evaluation survey by providing details of their Project's outputs and outcomes as of the 30th June each year, and at the Project end date. The online survey is completed by Project staff, with the support of their respective External Evaluators where necessary. The completion of the online evaluation survey by each Project will enable outputs and outcomes to be aggregated at the Programme level.

This report captures the results and analysis of the first ERF output and outcomes survey which was completed by groups during August 2011. It is the first in a series of three annual reports which will be prepared on foot of completion of the annual survey by funded groups. In addition, a final output and outcomes report will be completed at the end of the current round of ERF funded projects.

As surveys will be completed annually, a picture will gradually emerge covering the Programme outputs, its outcomes, and most importantly, the links between these outputs and the outcomes supported by all the evidence produced by Projects and the evaluators.

At the level of outputs, the picture built up is additive i.e. the survey captures the outputs each year, and in the end these will be added together to produce a final result. For outcomes, it is cumulative: each year will look back to the start of the Project and record the ripples of influence extending outwards over time.

The *Final Programme Evaluation Report* will present the results of the entire process.

1.2 Methodology

Groups funded under the ERF have a wide range of objectives and working methods. As work on the Framework began after the last round of approved ERF Projects had been designed, a key challenge for the Framework was to somehow render the disparate set of Project objectives, outputs and outcomes into a coherent and comparable set of Programme-level outputs and outcomes.

Key goals for the Framework were to:

- Ensure coherence between Project goals, national Programme goals and EU level goals;
- Maintain a focus on *actual outcomes* at Project and Programme level, while establishing a *causal link* between these, and the concrete actions and outputs undertaken by projects;
- Facilitate reporting to the European Commission by the OPMI.

At the same time, it was important to minimise any additional burden on funded groups in terms of their participation in Programme-level evaluation activities, and to take into account the limited staff time and budget that could be allocated for evaluation purposes.

The Framework proposed a solution with a number of characteristics.

1. The Programme evaluation would comprise two components:
 - a thematic component, grouping projects together to explore and extract policy and practice learning;
 - an aggregated component where the results of each Project would be combined in the context of a jointly-agreed, common and comparable set of programme outputs and outcomes.
2. The overall Framework would be based loosely on the Theory of Change⁴ and Logic Model, which explicitly trace the linkages between objectives, actions, outputs and outcomes. It also facilitates a link to be established between Project and Programme level activities, from the level of Project objectives through to EU reporting requirements.
3. The process should combine the experience and knowledge of staff and volunteers working in the Projects, with independent empirical research.
4. For ease of reporting and analysis, it was decided to use an online tool for the aggregated component into which Projects could input their individual data.
5. The Framework should cover both the ERF and the EIF Programme, but would be implemented separately in each, with separate reports following. There was some scope for greater collaboration between ERF and EIF Projects in the Thematic component of the Programme-level evaluation.

One of the first steps taken to support the implementation of the ERF Evaluation Framework was the preparation of a detailed set of Guidelines⁵ to enable Projects both to fully understand the principles and practice of the Programme-level evaluation and to participate effectively in the process. The Guidelines cover both the Thematic component and the outputs and outcomes component.

The following are the main features of the outputs and outcomes evaluation.

1. Each Project individually completes an annual online *Outputs and Outcomes Survey* covering the twelve months to June 30th, and again at the end of the funding period.⁶
2. Drawing on a list of outputs agreed in consultation with the Projects (as part of the process of designing the Framework), each Project selects those outputs that are relevant to itself, and reports in some detail on what they produced during the year.
3. Drawing similarly on a list of agreed outcomes, each Project reports for each relevant outcome: the focus it represented for the Project during the period in terms of effort and resources; the extent to which the Project believes it has influenced that outcome since the beginning of its work; the extent to which each output earlier identified contributed to this outcome; and the evidence available to sustain these conclusions.

4 See www.theoryofchange.org and <http://www.wkkf.org/knowledge-center/resources/2010/Logic-Model-Development-Guide.aspx> for more on these.

5 Programme Level Evaluation for the European Integration Fund and European Refugee Fund: Guidelines for Projects. June 2011.

6 See Annex X for the Survey.

4. Groups also complete a section that documents what they have learned, and how they might improve their effectiveness.

Each funded group has, or is in the process of, engaging its own evaluator, whose terms of reference include assisting with the completion of the Programme level evaluation, in particular around gathering evidence for the outcomes claimed.

1.3 Structure of the Report

This introductory section is intended to set the scene for the results of the Outputs and Outcomes evaluation so far. But the emphasis on this first Annual Report is primarily on the Outputs since, as noted elsewhere, it is still early days for the clear identification of Outcomes emerging from these outputs.

Section 1.4 below completes the introduction with an overview of the resources used by Projects in producing the outputs in terms of grant allocations, and the number of staff and volunteers active – noting also the different starting dates of Projects.

This is followed in **Section 2** by an analysis of outputs so far. After reviewing in Section 2.1 the number of projects active in each output area, Section 2.2 undertakes a detailed aggregate analysis of each output primarily in quantitative terms but, data permitting, including some qualitative analysis.

Section 3 covers Outcomes. This, though lengthy, is largely exploratory and is intended to present methodologies for demonstrating Outcomes more than the Outcomes themselves, such as they are to date.

It begins in Section 3.1 with an overview of which Outcomes Projects devoted most of their resources and efforts; and of the relative extent which they believe they influenced the Outcomes.

Section 3.2 then goes into each Outcome area in some detail, adopting a couple of approaches to assessing the relative influence of relevant outputs to it.

Section 3 concludes with a set of aggregate figures concerning the different contributions that Projects believe Outputs made to Outcomes, and well as an additional look at how much influence the Programme as a whole had on each Outcome.

1.4 Project Resources

Following a national call for applications in 2009/2010, 10 organisations were awarded funding under the ERF. A total of €1,661,396 was awarded in grant aid to these groups, with a further €997,617 in co-funding provided from a range of public and private sources. Grant allocations under the ERF range from €60,000 to €245,000. Projects are funded on a multiannual basis, initially from the 2009 ERF Annual Programme (AP) with funding also to be provided from the 2010, 2011 and 2012 APs in some instances.

Funded groups commenced their ERF projects on three different dates in 2010: 1st July, 1st September and 1st November. Projects vary in duration from 18 months to 3 years. Funded groups come from across the state and include a mix of national and locally based community sector and Non-Governmental Organisations (seven), Partnership Companies (two) and a statutory agency (one). The groups funded include as follows:

- BeLonG To Youth Services
- City of Dublin VEC
- Doras Luimni
- Dublin Rape Crisis Centre
- Galway Refugee Support Group
- KASI
- Longford Community Resources
- Mayo Intercultural Action
- St. Catherine's Community Services
- Westmeath Community Development

Projects funded under the ERF are varied in their focus, covering a range of themes and approaches including information provision, education programmes, community development initiatives, direct service provision, capacity building for service providers and local integration initiatives. Many projects combine a mix of approaches in their efforts to promote more effective reception and integration strategies for the target groups.

Funded groups employ project development staff who directly support the implementation of Project actions that produce the outputs and outcomes referred to in this report. A total of 12.5 Full-Time Equivalent (FTE) Project development posts are supported under the ERF. In addition, many projects are supported by volunteers. In the 12 month period to 30th June 2011, a total of 109 volunteers worked the equivalent of 344 days supporting the implementation of ERF projects.

SECTION 2: OUTPUTS

The 10 Projects, although all funded under the current round of ERF grants, are at different stages of development in several respects. This needs to be borne in mind when considering outputs and outcomes as the timeframe for project implementation up to 30th June 2010 varies.

- Four of the projects were building on work carried out under an earlier ERF (or EIF) grant (*Doras Luimní, Longford Community Resources, KASI and St. Catherine's*) and had an official project start date of 1st July 2010;
- All other Projects had later start dates, in September 2010 (*City of Dublin VEC and Mayo Intercultural Action*) or November 2010 (*BeLong To, Dublin Rape Crisis Centre, Galway Refugee Support Group and Westmeath Community Development*).

Adding delays that are associated with meeting pre-contract conditions and project start-up, (especially for projects new to the ERF), many groups had considerably less than 12 months in which to produce outputs.

There are 16 categories of outputs identified in the Evaluation Framework. The different categories of outputs, as defined in the Evaluation Framework, are presented below. This is followed by consideration of each output area in turn. Annex 1 contains a complete list of outputs.

2.1 Output Profile among Projects

Below the number of Projects engaged in producing of each type of output during the period is shown.

Table 1: Outputs by Projects

Outputs (Numbered as in Annex 1)	Number of Projects producing this Output
5. Delivering non-language related education & training	7
15. Promoting mainstreaming and developing policy	7
4. Building capacity in English language	6
12. Building capacity of the statutory sector	6
14. Building capacity of community/voluntary sector	6
16. Supporting other marginalised groups	6
1. Providing information & advice through a 'drop-in' service	5
10. Supporting intercultural/interfaith dialogue	5
6. Providing mentoring supports	4
7. Providing targeted support to young people from Target Group	4
2. Providing information & advice through outreach services	3
8. Providing advocacy & legal support for individuals	3
11. Supporting actions to directly combat racism	3
3. Delivering themed information supports	2
9. Providing trauma & other counselling supports (ERF only)	2
13. Building capacity of the business sector	0

The table represents Projects' activities so far. Several Projects pointed to outputs that they have not yet produced, but intend to in the future.

The 16 outputs can broadly be grouped into two categories: those that involve working directly with the Target Groups, and those that relate to service providers and the wider environment. It is possible in some instances to group some of the outputs that are similar in nature to yield the following:

Categories of Outputs that relate directly to Target Groups

- Providing information and advice to the target groups
- Building capacity of the target groups
- Providing advocacy and legal support
- Providing trauma and other counselling
- Targeting support at young people

Categories of Outputs that relate to service providers and the wider environment

- Supporting intercultural or interfaith dialogue
- Supporting actions that directly combat racism or xenophobia
- Building the capacity of statutory, business and community/voluntary sectors to address the needs of the Target Group
- Promoting mainstreaming of project activities and policy development
- Providing support to other marginalised groups, beyond the primary target

Data from the 2011 output/outcomes survey in relation to the 16 outputs are presented below.

2.2 Presentation of Output Data

2.2.1 INFORMATION AND ADVICE SERVICES

Information and advice is provided to refugees and asylum seekers in a number of contexts and forms, primarily in Drop-in Centres, but also as outreach services and in the context of workshops or seminars. (These correspond to Outputs 1 to 3 in Annex 1)

Drop-in centres as a means to provide information and advice (Output 1) have been the most active in terms of the volume of refugees and asylum seekers seen during the period. Half of the ten ERF Projects provide a drop-in service, making it among the most common of services provided. **Table 2** breaks down unique individual visitors by gender and Target Group type.

Table 2: Drop-in Centre unique visitors by gender and Target Group to end June 2011

	Asylum Seekers	Refugees	Total
Male	489	434	923
Female	242	202	444
Total	731	636	1,367

Males outnumber females by over two to one. The **total number of visits, at 7,915**, is much higher than that of *unique visitors*, at 1,367, indicating that each client visited on average just under six times. About one in 13 visits, on average, resulted in a referral to another service.

These averages hide significant differences in the nature of the service provided by projects. For instance, the *Carlow Rohingya Settlement Programme* focuses on a small, fixed number of people, and received 42 visitors during the period, but each visited an average of 29 times. *Doras Luimní*, on the other hand, saw a total of 822 different people, each visiting on average just over three times. Referrals also vary a lot, from over one per visit in the case of *BeLong To*, to about one in 40 visits for the *Carlow Rohingya Settlement Programme*.

The issues and needs raised by visitors were varied, with none dominating. Information provided most commonly related to *education* and *asylum application and/or appeals process*; followed closely by *social welfare, mental health, direct provision (living conditions/*

management), medical and accommodation (excluding direct provision). However, family reunification, workplace and work permits and domestic violence also featured.

Although precise figures on the nationalities of those visiting are not available⁷, West Africans, and in particular Nigerians, appear to be the largest group of nationals who visited drop-in services, followed by Somalis and Afghanis. Thirteen other nationalities featured among the top 5 nationalities named by groups visiting centres.

The delivery of information and advice through outreach services (Output 2) was less common, with three ERF Projects taking this approach. All dealt only with asylum seekers. A total of **277 Outreach visits** were undertaken, with the service being provided to **215 male** and **106 female** asylum seekers (indicating that some visits were to more than one person).

Information requests from the target group were varied and spanned access to welfare, educational, accommodation and health entitlements

Just **two workshops or clinics** (Output 3) were delivered by separate Projects. One was on the topic of *citizenship*, attended by 38 people; the other on *Current Immigration Issues* attended by 108 people from the target groups.

2.2.2 BUILDING CAPACITY AND EDUCATION/TRAINING OF INDIVIDUALS

A large number of ERF Projects engage in building the capacity of the Target Groups. Six projects provided various levels of English language training; seven provided non-language related capacity building and education/training; and five provided mentoring support. A number of projects were active across all 3 areas of activity.

The total number having begun or completed the various levels of **English language training** (Output 4) is large at 330, several of whom are taking or have taken one or more courses at different levels. Participants are mostly asylum seekers and are mostly male. Refugees are more evenly balanced gender wise, but much fewer in number.

Table 3: Target Groups completing or ongoing in one or more English language training courses

	Asylum Seekers	Refugees	Total
Male	208	31	239
Female	56	35	91
Total	264	66	330

Looking at *completed training courses* at different levels, the largest number were at *beginners level* (43%), followed by *intermediate level* (27%), conversational level (17%), and *one-to-one basic tutoring* (12%). While none completed advanced level English, two did receive FETAC accreditation. The **total number of completed courses came to 337**, indicating

(since the sum total of all those *completing or currently taking courses* is lower, at 330) that some participants completed more than one course, for instance beginners followed by intermediate level. At least 13 nationalities were given training, with Afghanis and Somalis being the most numerous as averaged out between Projects.⁸

The numbers varied enormously between those projects with a strong focus on English language training and dealing with a large catchment group, and others targeting a small group or providing English-language as a marginal activity. KASI dominated the figures, accounting for over 200 of the total; while at the other end of the scale Longford Community

7 Projects were asked to name the top five nationalities who visited drop-in centres.

8 Projects were asked to indicate the five most common nationalities, but not the precise number of each. Thus the average is not an average of total numbers, but those most commonly represented among the top five across Projects.

Resources provided training to just three individuals, bringing each of them through several levels.

A wide variety of other forms of **non-language related education and training** (Output 5) was provided to Target Groups. Table 4 shows the number of individuals completing courses, the number beginning but *not* completing (i.e. withdrawing from) courses, both accredited and non-accredited, and their gender.

Table 4: Number completing and withdrawing from accredited and non-accredited training

	Completed <i>non-accredited</i> course	Completed accredited course	Total Completing	Withdrew from <i>non-accredited</i> course	Withdrew from <i>accredited</i> course	Total Withdrawing
Male	63	13	76	17	1	18
Female	72	16	88	10	0	10
Total	135	29	164	27	1	28

Non-accredited training was delivered to the majority of participants. Most common areas of training were *IT training* (90 modules), *personal development/confidence building* (82) and *Independent living skills* (68). *Parenting skills, volunteering skills* and *peer information training* also featured.

Among the 29 who received accredited training, 20 received a fire safety certificate (in the *Carlow Rohingya Resettlement Programme*) and the others FETAC level 3 in computer literacy (from the *City of Dublin VEC Project*).

Mentoring support (Output 6) was the third form of individual capacity building provided. Numbers were relatively small here, with 17 in total being mentored.

Table 5: Number and gender mentored.

	Asylum Seekers	Refugees	Total
Male	1	6	7
Female	2	8	10
Total	3	14	17

The Carlow Rohingya Resettlement Programme accounted for 12 of these. **A total of 19 mentors**, Irish or other nationalities, were involved as volunteers in the provision of this service.

2.2.3 TARGETED SUPPORT FOR YOUTH

Four Projects **targeted some of its services on young refugees and asylum seekers** (Output 7), with the *City of Dublin VEC Project* being most active and accounting for 46 of the total young people supported.

Table 6: Number of Young People targeted with support

	Asylum Seekers	Refugees	Total
Male	25	20	45
Female	20	27	47
Total	45	47	92

The range of activities targeting young people was wide and included sports, after-school homework support, music and community arts, life-skills, English language, fashion design, summer/seasonal camps, ICT classes, emotional/psychological support and advocacy.

2.2.4 LEGAL AND ADVOCACY SUPPORTS

Three of the ten ERF groups provided **advocacy and legal support** (Output 8) to a total of 208 refugees and asylum seekers. *KASI* accounted for 124 of these, with *Carlow Rohingya Resettlement Programme* and *Longford Community Resources* providing the rest in approximately equal number.

Table 7: Number receiving Advocacy and Legal supports

	Asylum Seekers	Refugees	Total
Male	115	24	139
Female	35	34	69
Total	150	58	208

The supports provided assisted target group members in areas such as social welfare, medical, and education entitlements, advocacy on asylum applications, and support for citizen applications and family reunifications.

2.2.5 TRAUMA AND COUNSELLING

Two projects provided counselling, exclusively to refugees, to assist in dealing with **trauma and other issues**.

A total of 40 individuals benefited, 32 female and 8 male. Of the total, 21 were delivered in a single group counselling session by *Mayo Intercultural Action*; and *Carlow Rohingya Resettlement Programme* delivered 67 individual counselling sessions to 19 people.

2.2.6 INTERCULTURAL AND INTERFAITH DIALOGUE

This is the first of those output categories that does not focus exclusively on the Target Group, but rather casts its net wider to include other actors such as members of the local community and other service providers.

Four Projects include among their objectives **encouraging and supporting intercultural and interfaith dialogue** (Output 10). The main means comprise the organisation of one-off events (three Projects) and ongoing activities (three Projects), with Projects usually supporting more than one activity. All include the participation of the Target Groups alongside others.

The Table below gives an indication of the total numbers involved, from the Target Groups, Irish nationals and others.

Table 8: Number of One-off events and Ongoing actions and Participants

	One Off Events	Ongoing Actions	Total
Number of events/actions	12	4	16
Number of Target Group participants	515	73	588
Number of Irish participants	265	40	305
Number of other participants	236	45	281
Total Participants	1,016	158	1,174

The nature of the ongoing and one-off activities varied greatly, and this is reflected in the participation levels at any given event, ranging from several hundred to a couple of dozen or less.

Among the one-off events were:

- An Intercultural Winter Concert attended by 15 volunteers from the target group, with an audience of about 200; an Anti-Racism Photos Exhibition, including entertainment, by 3 Target Group members and eight other people, attracting an audience of 70 (Longford Community Resources).
- Events for Africa Day, World Refugee Day and International Women’s Day, attended by 573 people, including over 400 from the Target Group (KASI).
- A Social Barbeque attended by 20 people, including 12 refugees (Galway Refugee Support Group).

Ongoing activities included:

- “East Meets West” women’s groups, with 20 women participating, eight from the Target group; a Film Club of ten Target Group members and one non-target group member (Longford Community Resources).
- A Monthly Book Club, and Weekly Football match (Doras Luimní).

2.2.7 DIRECT ACTIONS TO COMBAT RACISM

Two Projects supported **direct actions to combat racism and discrimination** (Output 11), each with two activities. The total number of people involved is shown in Table 9 below.

Table 9: Participants in actions to directly combat racism

	Asylum Seekers	Refugees	Irish	Other	Total
Total	3	11	49	35	98

Activities organised by the *Carlow Rohingya Resettlement Programme* were:

- An integration project that created a Teenage Boys Group to develop good relationships with local Irish boys where problems had developed
- A Fashion Project for a Teenage Girls Group

Activities organised by *Longford Community Resources* comprised:

- An Anti-Racism Week event, during which a speaker from the Target Group described the experience of racism in her life in Ireland.
- Use of media to dispel myths and promote integration, in the *Longford Leader* their Website; and through notes on their own Website.

2.2.8 BUILDING CAPACITY OF SERVICE PROVIDERS

Two types of service providers were targeted in order to improve their understanding of the Target Group and the manner in which they interact with them and deliver the service: **Statutory Sector organisations** (Output 12); and **Community Voluntary Sector organisations** (Output 14).⁹ Both areas saw a lot of activities with six Projects supporting the Statutory Sector and seven projects supporting the Community Voluntary sector organisations.

⁹ The Survey also included the category of Capacity Building of Businesses (Outputs 13), but none of the ERF Projects have so far taken action in this area.

Table 10 indicates the types of activities taken in relation to each.

Table 10: Capacity Building Actions for Statutory and Community/Voluntary Orgs

	Courses	Seminars	Ongoing support	Other	Total
Statutory sector	1	2	4	6	13
Community voluntary sector	8	10	0	2	20
Total	9	12	4	8	33

Participant numbers totalled 363, and members of the Target Groups participated in three of the events as contributors.

Table 11: Number of Participants in Capacity Building Actions for Service Providers.

	Irish People	Other	Target Group	Total
Statutory sector	117	15	4	136
Community voluntary sector	178	18	31	227
Total	295	33	35	363

Examples of the activities, some of which addressed both statutory and voluntary sector organisations, give an indication of their variety include the following:

- An Intercultural Interagency Forum was established bringing a large number of state and voluntary agencies together to build alliances enabling integration to happen at all levels. Terms of reference were drawn up for the group with nine meetings taking place in a defined period. (Longford Community Resources)
- A series of six workshops, four taking place before 30 June, focused on programme development within the Refugee Access Programme (RAP). Youth workers and tutors participated in the workshops. Tutors and youth workers decided on a number of skills to focus on for the remaining six weeks of term. (City of Dublin VEC)
- Two representatives of HSE agencies sit on the *BeLong To* Project Steering Committee along with experts from both statutory and voluntary agencies, and as a result have a better understanding of the gaps in services for the project target group. (*BeLong To* Youth Services)
- A four day in-depth training programme was provided to staff in key support roles with refugees and asylum seekers who have experienced sexual violence and other trauma. The focus of this training was to optimise the skills of counsellors, support workers and key workers in one-to-one and in-depth support roles with refugees and asylum seekers who have been traumatised. In turn, it is hoped that the training will reduce the impact of trauma and contribute to healing and eventual adaptation/integration. (Dublin Rape Crisis Centre)
- A Mainstreaming Committee was formed for the *Different Together* project, made up of representatives of community/voluntary sector organisations and statutory bodies locally. Two meetings were held to date focusing on the formation of the committee, sharing project learning and gaining feedback. (Mayo Intercultural Action)
- Intercultural awareness training aimed at childcare providers using an Intercultural Pack. The objective was to increase cultural diversity understanding among child care providers in the Limerick city enabling them to relate better to children and parents from a diverse population. (Doras Luimní)

2.2.9 MAINSTREAMING AND POLICY DEVELOPMENT

Seven of the ten projects have instigated some form of **mainstreaming and policy development** (Output 15) activities.

Some groups do this as part of their normal activities, with many well advanced in terms of interacting with policy making and implementing organisations. A number of groups have procedures and policies in place for mainstreaming their actions internally and as appropriate externally.

Three Projects have met with policy makers and another has completed a research report, including needs assessment, intended later to feed into policy.

Given the early stage of development of most projects, it is expected that output in this area will grow in subsequent years.

2.2.10 SUPPORT FOR OTHER MARGINALISED GROUPS

Although all ERF groups specifically focus their resources on refugees and asylum seekers, **other marginalised groups** (Output 16) have availed of services within 4 projects.

The total number benefiting is estimated at 829, comprising EU Nationals (532, including mainly migrants) and third country nationals (282). Specific groups and nationalities that have availed of services include Travellers, Lithuanians and Latvians.

Services provided are as varied as the groups and needs involved. They include the Drop-in Centre information services, language and cultural orientation, and participation in sports, in women's groups and in some training. Some of the issues addressed through these supports and services include domestic violence, sexual violence (including children), and trauma, and issues relating to learning disabilities.

2.3 Key Points and Aggregate Figures

2.3.1 WHAT KINDS OF OUTPUTS ARE PRODUCED?

In terms of the diversity of ERF Project outputs, almost every project engaged in some form of education and capacity-building activity, many of them in several such activities. Among outputs delivered directly to the Target Groups, English language and other accredited and non-accredited training were the most common; while the majority of Projects also undertook some training of the statutory and community and voluntary sectors.

The next most common was the provision of a 'drop-in' service, and supporting a variety of different intercultural or interfaith dialogue activities. Mentoring supports also feature amongst nearly half of the projects, as do supports targeting young people. A few projects provide advocacy and legal support, outreach-based information and advice, and actions to directly combat racism.

Mainstreaming their activities and influencing policy is also a concern of Projects. Most also believe their actions offer benefits to other marginalised groups beyond the Target Groups.

2.3.2 HOW MANY OUTPUTS HAVE BEEN PRODUCED?

As noted earlier the number of outputs is influenced by the fact that this is the first year of the ERF Programme, and that many Projects had less than 12 months to June 2011 to begin project implementation. Many also would have spent considerable time in set-up activities. The table below gives an idea of the overall numbers involved in outputs that were delivered directly to the Target Group, mostly in one-to-one or individually tailored sessions.

Table 12: Summary of Target Groups numbers in Seven Outputs

	Asylum Seekers	Refugees	Total	Total	
Drop in Centre	Unique Visitors			Visits	
Male	489	434	923	7,915	
Female	242	202	444		
Total	731	636	1,367		
Outreach Service info.	Unique people met through outreach services			Visits	
Male	215	0	215	277	
Female	106	0	106		
Total	321	0	321		
English Language training courses	People taking courses			Total courses completed	
Male	208	31	239	337	
Female	56	35	91		
Total	264	66	330		
Non English-Language training	Completing non-accredited courses	Completing accredited Course	Unique people completing courses	Total courses completed	
Male	63	13	76	451	
Female	72	16	88		
Total	135	29	164		
Mentoring Supports	Number receiving mentoring support			Total mentors	
Male	1	6	7	19	
Female	2	8	10		
Total	3	14	17		
Targeted youth support	Number of young people receiving supports				
Male	25	20	45		
Female	20	27	47		
Total	45	47	92		
Advocacy/legal supports	Numbers receiving these supports				
Male	115	24	139		
Female	35	34	69		
Total	150	58	208		
Trauma and other Counselling	Numbers receiving counselling				Counselling sessions
Male	0	8	8		67
Female	0	32	32		
Total	0	40	40		
Anti-Racism actions	3	11	14		
GRAND TOTAL: Individuals	1,652	861	2,513		

The grand total above – over 2,500 refugees and asylum seekers receiving these services - must be treated with a degree of caution as there is probably some duplication involved i.e.

some individuals will have been in receipt of more than one service. The gender breakdown is about two to one in favour of males.

Table 13 also shows that further Target Group members were involved in group activities, numbering almost 600.

Table 13: Intercultural Dialogue

	One Off Events	Ongoing Actions	Total
Number of events/actions	12	4	16
Number of Target Group participants	515	73	588
Number Non Target group participants	501	95	596

Finally, there were also actions to build the capacity of service providers, both in the statutory sector and among community and voluntary organisations. This involved primarily Irish people and others, though with a few from the Target Groups acting in this case as resource persons.

Table 14: Capacity Building Actions for Statutory, Community and Voluntary sectors

	Courses	Seminars	Ongoing support	Other	Total
Statutory sector	1	2	4	6	13
Community voluntary sector	8	10	0	2	20
Total	9	12	4	8	33

Table 15: Number of Participants in Capacity Building Actions for Service Providers.

	Irish People	Other	Target Group	Total
Statutory sector	117	15	4	136
Community voluntary sector	178	18	31	227
Total	295	33	35	363

SECTION 3: OUTCOMES

The above enumerates and describes the outputs of the ERF Programme in the year to June 30th 2011. The key question, however, is what Outcomes have resulted from these that will bring benefits to the Target Groups, if not immediately, then in the medium term.

If it is true that outputs are only just beginning to emerge for Projects from this round of ERF funding, it is even more the case with regard to Outcomes. Outcomes in general follow some time after outputs, as the effects of actions taken ripple outwards, sometimes through intermediaries, towards the target community, and as that community begins to use some of the capacities, knowledge and opportunities developed. As a result, not a huge amount is expected with regard to Outcomes at this stage of the project implementation.

3.1 Overall Focus and Influence

Different Projects have different objectives. They aim for different Outcomes in relation to their Target Group, or in relation to the latter's service providers and the wider environment. Projects also attach very different priorities to achieving their various Outcomes, and these priorities can vary at different stages of a given Project.

Twelve possible Outcomes were presented to Projects for consideration, determined during the consultation process for the design of the Evaluation Framework. (The possibility of further unanticipated Outcomes will be considered later in the Programme evaluation.)

The title of each Outcome is outlined below, grouped (as were outputs) under those that directly impact on Target Groups and those that immediately impact on organisations that provide services to or interact with Target Groups and to the wider community. (See Annex 1 for the complete list of Outcomes).

Direct Outcomes for Target Groups

1. Enhanced life-skills and personal development
2. Enhanced day-to-day interaction/dialogue with local community
3. Greater participation in social, recreational and other activities
4. Enhanced capacity to engage in collective action and in NGOs
5. Enhanced capacity to seek/obtain training, education and employment
6. Enhanced access/capacity to access statutory, social, community services
7. Improved redress in relation to racism and discrimination

Outcomes related to Service Providers and the Wider Community

8. Improved interaction skills/capacities of statutory and community bodies
9. Better collaboration among statutory/community bodies to improve service
10. Inter-culturalism more deeply embedded among groups and the public
11. Mainstreaming /replication of programme good practice
12. Policy/practice changes among organisations to improve service

Projects can relate to each of these Outcomes in different ways.


The first issue is whether a **Project regards an Outcome as *relevant at all*** to them.

Least relevant, according to the data, is Outcome 7: *Improved redress in relation to racism*, featuring with only one Project. Three Projects consider Outcome 4 *Enhanced Capacity to engage in collective action and with NGOs*, Outcome 10 *Embedding interculturalism among groups and the public*, and Outcome 12 *Policy/practice changes among organisations to*

improve service as relevant. All other Outcomes are considered as relevant by six or more Projects.

Perhaps of more direct interest is the **relative focus, in terms of effort and resources, that Projects devoted to the different Outcomes** in the period under consideration. The columns in **Figure 1** illustrate which Outcomes, in aggregate, Projects indicated where their “greatest focus”, and which Outcomes Projects indicated were either their “greatest” or a “significant” focus.¹⁰

Figure 1: Comparative Focus of effort and resources among Projects on Outcomes



Outcome 1 *Enhanced life-skills and personal development* came in significantly higher than others, as the “greatest focus” of five Projects and a “significant focus” for three others during the period. Outcome 5 *Capacity to identify, Seek and obtain employment* is the “greatest focus” of three Projects, but is not a significant focus of any of the others

Outcome 4 *Enhanced capacity to engage in collective action and NGOs*; Outcome 12 on *Policy and practice changes among service organisations*; and Outcome 7: *Redress for racism and discrimination* were sought as a “significant” Outcome by at most, one project.

The extent to which Projects **believe that their activities and outputs influenced these Outcomes**, taking into account the *overall* level of needs of their Target Group in each Outcome area, can (depending on the nature of the Outcome) be a combined indicator of several factors:

- How effectively Projects feel they are implementing their activities;
- the size of a Project’s Target Group (the larger and more diffuse the Target group, the more difficult it is to influence any given Outcome area)


¹⁰ In the Outputs/Outcomes Survey, groups were asked to rate on a scale of 1 to 5, where 5 indicates that an Outcome was, in the period to end of June 2011, “the greatest focus of our efforts”; 4 “a significant focus of our efforts”; 3 “one focus, but other were more important”; 2 “a very minor focus of our project” and 1 “not a focus at all”. Figure 1 above is focused on 4 and 5 from this scale.

- How great the need a Project associates with an Outcome area (the greater the need, the harder it is to influence significantly).

The question here is whether a Project feels not only that their work is efficient in addressing the issue in question, but also whether it is adequate to tackle the scale of the challenge for a significant proportion of their Target Group.¹¹

Thus if a Project claims it had major influence on a given area of Outcome, it suggests that the effort they devoted to it was both *effective* and *commensurate* with the scale of the challenge in the outcome area being addressed.

Figure 2: Influence on Outcomes, All Projects




On the whole, projects feel they had most influence on Outcome 1 *Life-skills and personal development*; then on Outcome 8: *Interaction skills statutory/ community bodies*; followed by Outcome 2 *Interaction with the local community*. They felt they least influenced Outcome 7 *Redress for racism and discrimination*, Outcome 12 *Policy/practice changes among organisations to improve services* and Outcome 4 *Enhanced Capacity to engage in collective action/NGOs*.

Comparing the *relative focus of Projects* with what they believe they *achieved in terms of influencing their intended Outcome* yields the following result.

11 In the Outputs/Outcomes Survey, groups were asked to rate on a scale of 1 to 5, where, in the context of the overall level of Target Group needs in this Outcome area since the Project began, 5 indicates “a major influence”; 4 “some influence but not major”; 3 “a small but discernible influence”; 2 “a very small influence, not directly discernible” and 1 “no influence”.

Figure 3: Comparing Focus and Influence, across Projects



Across the programme as a whole, Projects in aggregate feel that their influence in relation to the scale of each challenge being addressed in the Outcome areas is broadly in proportion to the focus they devoted to each in terms of effort and resources

As noted, however, these are early results and anomalies do not as yet merit exhaustive examination. In the coming years of the Programme, the results are likely to evolve and change significantly as Projects can gauge more accurately the extent to which they influence Outcomes.

3.2 Overview of Outcomes

Each of the twelve potential Outcomes is given individual consideration in turn below.

The complete description as contained in the Evaluation Guidelines is presented first for each Outcome. A set of results regarding that Outcome is then given in the following format:

1. The number of Projects for which this Outcome was relevant (excluding those for whom it was a “very minor focus”); the extent to which Projects focused on it in terms of effort and resources; and the extent to which Projects believe they influenced it. (These have already been given in aggregate form above).
2. An examination of *which outputs*, according to Projects, *influenced this Outcome the most*. This is examined by way of two tables under each outcome:
 - The first table takes into consideration the views only of those Projects that actually produced the relevant output during the period – which gives an idea of how effective, in the eyes of Projects that produce them, each type of output is in relation to that Outcome;
 - The second table takes into consideration all Projects – which gives us an idea of how much the Programme as a whole, in the belief of Projects, has influenced this Outcome.
3. A selection of comments offered by Projects as evidence of their influence on that Outcome.

OUTCOME 1: ENHANCED LIFE-SKILLS AND PERSONAL DEVELOPMENT

The full text of this Outcome in the Evaluation Guidelines reads:

“Enhanced life-skills and personal development of Target Groups. This includes the Target Group gaining skills that help with day-to-day interactions and communications in the community (such as language skills), and contribute to personal development and feelings of well-being (such as trauma and other counselling).”

Eight of ten Projects in the ERF Programme consider this Outcome to be relevant to them. Figure 1 and Figure 2 above also show that overall this is the Outcome that Projects *focused most effort and resources on*, and felt they had *the greatest impact on*.

A further question, however, is: *Which outputs, according to Projects, influenced or brought about this Outcome the most?*

The table below answers this question by presenting Outputs that made a “very significant contribution”; a “significant contribution” or a “definite discernible contribution”. It takes into consideration *the opinion only of those Projects that actually implemented any given Output*. The table also shows *how many Projects produced each Output* (and therefore the number of views taken into account for this Output), and believed that it influenced this Outcome.

The scores in the middle column are averages. A score of 5 indicates that this Output made a “very significant contribution to this Outcome; a score of 4 a “significant” contribution, and 3 a “definite discernible” contribution – they are shaded accordingly. (Those indicating a “slight contribution” or “no contribution” are ignored.)

Table 16: Outputs and Projects Influencing Outcome 1: Enhanced life-skills /personal development

Outputs	Influence on this Outcome per Output	Number of Projects producing this Output
Output 1: Providing information & advice through a ‘drop-in’ service	5.0	4
Output 7: Providing targeted support to young people from Target Group	4.5	4
Output 5: Delivering Non-language related education & training	4.3	6
Output 4: Building capacity in English language	4.2	5
Output 9: Providing trauma & other counselling supports	4.0	3
Output 10: Supporting intercultural/interfaith dialogue	4.0	2
Output 2: Providing information & advice through outreach services	3.7	3
Output 8: Providing advocacy & legal support for individuals	3.7	3
Output 11: Supporting actions to directly combat racism	3.0	1

The Table reveals a number of things, for example:

- All Projects providing a ‘drop-in’ service considered that they made a very significant contribution to enhancing the life-skills and personal development of refugees and asylum seekers using the service.
- Targeted support for young people among the Target Group was also considered to have a very strong influence on this Outcome for those receiving it.

- At the other end, providing advocacy and legal support was considered by the three Projects providing the service as, on average, to have a definite discernible effect, at the higher end of that scale.
- The single Project that undertook actions to directly combat racism believes it had a definite discernible (though not significant) influence on those receiving it.

To get at the overall impact of the Programme on this Outcome, a different approach is taken. It must account for the higher level of influence that *a large number of Projects implementing a given output* would have, as compared to just a single or a few projects implementing that output.

Thus while Table 16 above relates to the influence of a given Output as an average of all Projects that produce that Output, Table 17 below refers to the overall level of influence that all Projects (i.e. the Programme as a whole), had on that Outcome. Outputs produced by only one or a few Projects are therefore likely to feature much lower in this scale.

Table 17: Outputs Influencing Outcome 1 Enhanced life-skills /personal development: Programme level average

Outputs	Average Influence on this Outcome
Output 5: Delivering Non-language related education & training	26
Output 4: Building capacity in English language	21
Output 1: Providing information & advice through a ‘drop-in’ service	20
Output 7: Providing targeted support to young people from Target Group	18
Output 9: Providing trauma & other counselling supports	12
Output 8: Providing advocacy & legal support for individuals	11
Output 2: Providing information & advice through outreach services	11
Output 16: Supporting other marginalised groups	10
Output 14: Building capacity of community/voluntary sector	10

Taking into account the number of Projects producing a given output, as well as the contribution that each believes it made to the Outcome, four Outputs stand out as the most important: Output 5 *delivering non-language related education and training* Output 4 *building capacity in the English language*, Output 1 *Providing information & advice through a ‘drop-in’ service* and Output 7 *Providing targeted support to young people from Target Group*.

Although it is very early for Projects to produce concrete evidence for their conclusions regarding the influence of their outputs on Outcomes, comments from Projects do offer some interesting considerations on how outcome was influenced:

You can see the development that has taken place among the community although there are different levels of progression depending on family and individuals. (Carlow Rohingya Resettlement Programme)

Through the clinics in particular, people who were lonely, had mental health problems or just needed someone to talk to had the opportunity to consistently meet with someone on a one to one and weekly basis. Asylum Seekers would share their frustrations and feel supported by the support worker. They were also referred onto other services and could return the following week and inform the worker of how it went. For many of the Asylum Seekers, the importance of knowing someone cared about them and would miss them if they were gone meant a huge amount especially

when they have no families and (some no friends) here in Ireland. This level of emotional support is hard to access elsewhere. (Longford Community Resources)

...The project youth worker has assisted some young LGBT asylum seekers and refugees to feel more positive about their situation and experiences, and the youth services provided by BeLonG To have assisted young LGBT asylum seekers and refugees to make friends and become involved in social and recreational activities. In the words of one LGBT asylum seeker/refugee youth who accesses BeLonG To's services "This is the truth: I don't think I'd be here right now if it wasn't for these services. I really wanted to kill myself, I just really wanted to die and get away from this. But then after talking to people from these services, encouraging me and constantly telling me that everything would be ok, and still giving me room to express myself all the time... They have helped me a lot, I have grown, and I have learned how to accept myself". (BeLonG To Youth Services)

OUTCOME 2: ENHANCED DAY-TO-DAY INTERACTION WITH THE COMMUNITY

The complete definition of Outcome 2 is:

Enhanced day-to-day interaction with the local community by the Target Group, and enhanced inter-cultural dialogue, understanding and respect.

This refers to the capacity of Target Groups to interact in their communities on a day-to-day and ongoing basis, including in the context of project related activities (both one-off events and ongoing activities) and in their ordinary interactions at school and work, and with neighbours and the wider community.

This Outcome was considered relevant by seven Projects and, in terms of being the focus of effort and resources, came third of the 12 Outcomes. Projects also felt it came third in terms of the extent of influence that they had had on it.

The next table addresses the question: *Which outputs, according to Projects, influenced or brought about this Outcome the most?*

Table 18: Outputs and Projects Influencing Outcome 2: Enhanced day-to-day interaction with the community

Outputs	Influence on this Outcome per Output	Number of Projects producing this Output
Output 1: Providing information & advice through a 'drop-in' service	5.0	2
Output 7: Providing targeted support to young people from Target Group	4.7	3
Output 2: Providing information & advice through outreach services	4.0	2
Output 8: Providing advocacy & legal support for individuals	4.0	1
Output 10: Supporting intercultural/interfaith dialogue	4.0	2
Output 5: Delivering Non-language related education & training	3.8	4
Output 4: Building capacity in English language	3.6	5
Output 9: Providing trauma & other counselling supports	3.5	2
Output 11: Supporting actions to directly combat racism	3.0	2
Output 16: Supporting other marginalised groups	3.0	4

Two of a total of five Projects (see Table 1) delivering a ‘drop-in’ service felt it made a very significant contribution to enhancing the day-to-day interaction of the Target Group with the community - though the other three felt it made no contribution in this area suggesting that the nature of the service differs between Projects. Targeted support to young people also came out strongly in three Projects.

While the above relates to the influence of a given Output as an average of all Projects that produce that Output, the table below refers to the overall level of influence that all Projects (i.e. the Programme as a whole), had on that Outcome.

Table 19: Outputs Influencing Outcome 2 Enhanced day-to-day interaction with the community: Programme level average

Outputs	Average Influence on this Outcome
Output 4: Building capacity in English language	18
Output 5: Delivering Non-language related education & training	15
Output 7: Providing targeted support to young people from Target Group	14
Output 10: Supporting intercultural/interfaith dialogue	12
Output 16: Supporting other marginalised groups	12
Output 14: Building capacity of community/voluntary sector	11
Output 1: Providing information & advice through a ‘drop-in’ service	10
Output 12: Building capacity of the statutory sector	10

Output 4, *to build capacity in English language*, emerged as the most influencing output in relation to this Outcome overall, with five projects believing that it contributed.

Relevant comments by Projects were as follows:

Very hard to quantify how much influence we have had as we noticed that it is almost, always the same local people who came to those events. We feel this will be on on-going work and we are trying to incorporate some aspect of our activities to include participation / involvement of local community. (KASI)

In terms of meeting the needs of the Target Group, the book club provided participant with an alternate to sporting activity and another opportunity to interact with persons outside the target group. In addition it provided a fora for increasing awareness of different cultures through literature. ... (Doras Luimni)

OUTCOME 3: PARTICIPATION IN SOCIAL /RECREATIONAL GROUPS & OTHER ACTIVITIES

The definition of Outcome 3 in the Evaluation Framework is:

Higher level of participation in social and recreational **groups and associated activities** by the Target Group

This refers to participation in social and recreational activities, including membership of social and recreational groups, as indicative of being more embedded in local and community life.

Six Projects considered this Outcome relevant to their activities. In terms of the focus of effort and resources during the period, it comes in seventh position, with three Projects considering it a significant, though not their greatest, focus. It is also seventh in terms of how much Projects feel they influenced this Outcome.

Table 20: Outputs and Projects Influencing Outcome 3: Participation in social /recreational groups and other activities

Outputs	Influence on this Outcome per Output	Number of Projects producing this Output
Output 8: Providing advocacy & legal support for individuals	5.0	1
Output 1: Providing information & advice through a 'drop-in' service	4.5	2
Output 7: Providing targeted support to young people from Target Group	4.0	3
Output 11: Supporting actions to directly combat racism	4.0	1
Output 10: Supporting intercultural/interfaith dialogue	3.8	4
Output 2: Providing information & advice through outreach services	3.3	3
Output 4: Building capacity in English language	3.0	5
Output 5: Delivering Non-language related education & training	3.0	4
Output 9: Providing trauma & other counselling supports	3.0	1

The one Project that included Output 8 *Advocacy and legal support* rated its influence on this Outcome at the highest level. Output 1 *Provide a drop-in service* is regarded by two Projects as an influence on this Outcome, and again scored high. Many more Projects, however, attributed an influence to each of several other Outputs, even if at a lower level.

The table below refers to the overall level of influence that all Projects (i.e. the Programme as a whole), had on that Outcome.

Table 21: Outputs Influencing Outcome 3: Participation in social /recreational groups and other activities: Programme level average

Outputs	Average Influence on this Outcome
Output 4: Building capacity in English language	15
Output 5: Delivering Non-language related education & training	15
Output 10: Supporting intercultural/interfaith dialogue	15
Output 7: Providing targeted support to young people from Target Group	12
Output 14: Building capacity of community/voluntary sector	11
Output 2: Providing information & advice through outreach services	10

The above table indicates that being able to speak English and other training and education are, overall, important influences of this Outcome, along with supporting intercultural and interfaith dialogue. This reflects the larger number of Projects that produced each of these outputs.

The following comments were offered as evidence that these outputs had an influence on the areas of Outcome.

The weekly physical training (boot camp) provided a great outlet for the men in the hostel. Nine sessions took place with an average of 10 people taking part. This was

taking off, but then the hostel closed. The weekly film club provided a space for asylum seekers to come together and collectively look at a film. There was no common area or place where people could sit together (besides the canteen) in the hostel so this filled the void. Voluntary work was also an excellent means for people to socialise and meet others... (Longford Community Resources)

...From oral feedback from Session 1 and through the facilitated discussion of participants' expectations of the project in Session 2 it is emerging that participants view their engagement with the project as an opportunity to improve their social skills, meet new people and improve their social engagement with local communities (record of feedback to be sent by email) (May Intercultural Action)

One young person on the RAP has become involved with a cricket team as a result of close links being built with a community organisation where our classes are based. All of the target group have been involved in extra-curricular activities such as museum and film trips, art workshops, etc. (City of Dublin VEC)

Over the twelve weeks between January and June 2011, an average of 80 participants attended weekly football training. This intercultural activity consisted of three teams from the target group, three teams from the indigenous population (residents of Limerick city), one team each from Brazil, Latvia and Romania. (Doras Luimní)

OUTCOME 4. ENGAGING IN COLLECTIVE ACTION AND NGOS

The definition of Outcome 4 in the Evaluation Framework is:

Enhanced capacity of target group to engage in collective action and to become actively engaged in civil society organisations

This refers to increased evidence of Target Groups organising collectively, and/or participating in community and voluntary organisations with a focus on addressing Target Group issues and advocating for change

No Project recorded this as its greatest focus, and just one as a significant focus of effort and resources.

Table 18 shows that despite the large number of outputs influencing this Outcome, at most two Projects believe that any given output has had an influence to date of any significance.

**Table 22: Outputs and Projects Influencing
Outcome 4. Engaging in collective action and NGOs**

Outputs	Influence on this Outcome per Output	Number of Projects producing this Output
Output 1: Providing information & advice through a 'drop-in' service	5.0	1
Output 5: Delivering Non-language related education & training	4.0	2
Output 7: Providing targeted support to young people from Target Group	4.0	1
Output 10: Supporting intercultural/interfaith dialogue	4.0	1
Output 3: Delivering themed information supports	3.5	2
Output 9: Providing trauma & other counselling	3.5	2
Output 2: Providing information & advice through outreach services	3.0	1
Output 8: Providing advocacy & legal support for individuals	3.0	2
Output 11: actions to directly combat racism	3.0	1
Output 14: Building capacity of community/voluntary	3.0	2

sector		
--------	--	--

The above relates to the influence of a given Output as an average of Projects that produce that Output. Notable is that no more than two Projects believed that any given output influenced this Outcome. A single Project offering a drop-in service considered that this had a very significant influence,

Because so few outputs are considered to influence this Outcome, the Programme level impact was low. The table below shows those with an average influence of 5 or more. (Other Outcomes have at least one Output scoring above 10, underlining how low this one scores.)

Table 23: Outputs Influencing Outcome 4. Engaging in collective action and NGOs. Programme level average

Outputs	Average Influence on this Outcome
Output 5: Delivering Non-language related education & training	8
Output 3: Delivering themed information supports	7
Output 9: Providing trauma & other counselling supports	7
Output 8: Providing advocacy & legal support for individuals	6
Output 14: Building capacity of community/voluntary sector	6
Output 1: Providing information & advice through a 'drop-in' service	5
Output 4: Building capacity in English language	5

Evidence offered that these outputs influenced the Outcomes include various collective activities underway.

- Group organising collectively to focus on the issue of a mosque and graveyard for the locality
- Collectively celebrate religious festivities and focus on issues pertaining to their culture and religious observances.
- Collectively have developed a website focusing on the Rohingya in Ireland and are very keen observers on and link in with Burma Action Ireland with regards the situation in Burma. (Carlow Rohingya Resettlement Programme)

OUTCOME 5. SEEK/OBTAIN TRAINING, EDUCATION, EMPLOYMENT

The definition of Outcome 5 in the Evaluation Framework is:

Enhanced capacity of Target Groups to **identify, seek and obtain** training, education and employment opportunities.

There are two aspects to this:

- (i) Improved skills and capacities needed to successfully identify, apply for and be recruited to employment and training or educational opportunities, such as producing a CV, applying for a job, filling out forms, attending interviews, seeking out and getting career-guidance support, work experience, job shadowing;
- (ii) Attending and completing direct vocational skills courses that will qualify individuals for specific jobs, or completing for instance foundation-level courses as prerequisites to proceeding to further education, that improve their chances of obtaining employment or further education.

Under the ERF, this Outcome relates more specifically to refugees as asylum seekers are ineligible to seek employment. Three Projects noted this Outcome as their greatest focus in terms of effort and resources.

The table below shows the influence each output on this Outcome as an average of Projects that produce that Output, the number of which is in the second column.

Table 24: Outputs and Projects Influencing Outcome 5. Seek/obtain training, education, employment

Outputs	Influence on this Outcome per Output	Number of Projects producing this Output
Output 3: Delivering themed information supports	5	1
Output 7: Providing targeted support to young people from Target Group	4.5	2
Output 8: Providing advocacy & legal support for individuals	4.5	2
Output 1: Providing information & advice through a 'drop-in' service	4.3	3
Output 2: Providing information & advice through outreach services	4.3	3
Output 4: Building capacity in English language	4.3	3
Output 5: Delivering Non-language related education & training	4.3	3
Output 6: Mentoring supports	4	1
Output 10: Supporting intercultural/interfaith dialogue	3.5	2

Output 3 *Delivering themed information supports* is regarded by one project as have a very significant influence on this Outcome, while a total of six other outputs are believed to be somewhat less significant, by either two or three Projects

This explains the result in the table below, which refers to the overall level of influence that all Projects (i.e. the Programme as a whole) had on that Outcome. This takes into account both the *level of influence* each Project believed its outputs had on this Outcome and the *number of Projects* believing that they have influenced this Outcome. Output 3, in top position above, does not feature here.

Table 25: Outputs Influencing Outcome 5 Seek/obtain training, education, employment. Programme level average

Outputs	Average Influence on this Outcome
Output 1: Providing information & advice through a 'drop-in' service	13
Output 2: Providing information & advice through outreach services	13
Output 4: Building capacity in English language	13
Output 5: Delivering Non-language related education & training	13
Output 14: Building capacity of community/voluntary sector	10

The following were among evidence provided by Projects regarding their influence on this Outcome.

Evidence from this is based on numbers attending mainstream secondary schooling. ...
(City of Dublin VEC)

We have secured 16 dedicated participants to participate in an NUI Level 8 Cert course, Feedback is very positive and there have been no drop outs. We have assisted some of these participants to engage in additional accredited courses and some part time employment. (Galway Refugee Support Group)

As a direct result of information disseminated at an {accessing education] Information Seminar, clients became aware of their rights, entitlements and obligations to avail of further and higher education. A number from the target group have applied for and been accepted on courses for further education and at third level education to commence in Sept. 2011. In addition an increased number of clients presented at the offices of Shannon Consortium to inquire about options for accessing third level education following the seminar. (Doras Luimni)

OUTCOME 6. ACCESS TO STATUTORY, SOCIAL AND COMMUNITY SERVICES

The definition of Outcome 6 in the Evaluation Framework is:

Enhanced **access to statutory, social and community services** for Target Groups, including enhanced capacity and empowerment of Target Groups to access such services

This specifically refers to an improved access to statutory and social services for the Target Group. It also includes enhanced capacity and empowerment of Target Groups including how to identify appropriate services, awareness concerning entitlements, and the ability to communicate with the service providers.

Two Projects noted this as their greatest focus of resource and efforts, and a further three as a significant focus. This Outcome ranked in fourth in terms of the extent of influence Project's believe they had on it.

Table 26: Outputs and Projects influencing Outcome 6. Access statutory, social, community services

Outputs	Influence on this Outcome per Output	Number of Projects producing this Output
Output 1: Providing information & advice through a 'drop-in' service	5	4
Output 8: Providing advocacy & legal support for individuals	5	2
Output 2: Providing information & advice through outreach services	4.5	4
Output 7: Providing targeted support to young people from Target Group	4	3
Output 10: Supporting intercultural/interfaith dialogue	4	2
Output 5: Delivering Non-language related education & training	3.2	5
Output 14: Building capacity of community/voluntary sector	3.2	5

A total of four Projects that offer a drop-in service, Output 1, believe it makes a significant contribution to this Outcome; and two that Output 8 *Advocacy and legal supports* has an equally strong influence.

The table below refers to the overall level of influence that all Projects (i.e. the Programme as a whole) had on that Outcome, which takes into account both the *level of influence* each

Project believed its outputs had on this Outcome, and the *number of Projects* believing that they have influenced this Outcome.

Table 27: Outputs influencing Outcome 6. Access to statutory, social, community services Programme level average

Outputs	Average Influence on this Outcome
Output 1: Providing information & advice through a ‘drop-in’ service	20
Output 2: Providing information & advice through outreach services	18
Output 5: Delivering Non-language related education & training	16
Output 14: Building capacity of community/voluntary sector	16
Output 15: Promoting mainstreaming and developing policy	14
Output 16: Supporting other marginalised groups	14
Output 12: Building capacity of the statutory sector	13
Output 7: Providing targeted support to young people from Target Group	12
Output 8: Providing advocacy & legal support for individuals	10

Output 1 *A drop-in service* emerges as the strongest influence here too, though Output 8 *Advocacy & legal support* drops to a low position since only two Projects offered this service in this context.

Evidence of this influence from Projects included:

1,218 drop in session focusing on day to day living with a large amount of support with regards the access of services.

179 cases of supported access to services such as: Social Welfare; Gardai; Education; Health/ Medical; Child Protection; Housing; Community Welfare (Carlow Rohingya Resettlement Programme)

Evidence from 1:1's show that participants feel that they now know where to access supports if needed and have the support to do so. (Galway Refugee Support Group)

Responses from participants on feedback questionnaires post training have been consistently positive in relation to the relevance and value of the training to their needs as service providers in terms of addressing the needs of asylum seekers and refugees who have experienced sexual violence and other trauma. (Dublin Rape Crisis Centre)

OUTCOME 7. REDRESS FOR RACISM AND DISCRIMINATION

The definition of Outcome 7 in the Evaluation Framework is:

Improved redress for Target Groups in relation to racism, xenophobia and other forms of discrimination.

Many factors combine to produce this outcome such as

- the presence of structures to identify and record incidence of racism and discrimination
- the implementation of explicit guidelines for to ensure an appropriate response
- the presence and evident operation redress mechanisms
- improved public and service-provider understanding of relevant issues.

Only one Project noted this Outcome as relevant to their activities that this was relevant, and even this it was only a minor focus and had a very small influence. The Outputs they felt had made that a discernible contribution were as follows.

Table 28: Outputs and Projects Influencing Outcome 7. Redress for racism and discrimination

Outputs	Influence on this Outcome per Output	Number of Projects producing this Output
Output 1: Providing information & advice through a 'drop-in' service	3	1
Output 7: Providing targeted support to young people from Target Group	3	1
Output 8: Providing advocacy & legal support	3	1
Output 10: Supporting intercultural/interfaith dialogue	3	1
Output 11: Actions to directly combat racism	3	1

Since only one Project was involved, the average influence is the same.

As evidence of a modest impact, the Project noted:

- We provided back up information and cultural information to the Gardaí where required.
- Arranged meetings with the Gardaí and the local community to speak about community wide issues as they arose. (Carlow Rohingya Resettlement Programme)

OUTCOME 8. IMPROVED SKILLS/CAPACITIES OF STATUTORY/ COMMUNITY BODIES

This Outcome and the others that follow focus not directly and exclusively on the Target Group but also include service providers and the wider community.

The complete definition of this Outcome is:

Improved skills and capacities of statutory bodies and community and voluntary organisations in their interaction with Target Groups.

This refers to positive outcomes derived from improved capacities and skills of organisations in direct and indirect interactions with the Target Groups.

One Project noted this as its greatest focus and a further three as a significant focus. In terms of having influenced this Outcome, Projects placed it somewhere in the middle.

Table 29: Outputs and Projects influencing Outcome 8. Interaction skills statutory/ community bodies

Outputs	Influence on this Outcome per Output	Number of Projects producing this Output
Output 2: Providing information & advice through outreach services	5	1
Output 11: Supporting actions to directly combat racism	5	1
Output 3: Delivering themed information supports	4	1
Output 8: Providing advocacy & legal support for individuals	4	2
Output 12: Building capacity of the statutory sector	3.7	6
Output 14: Building capacity of community/voluntary sector	3.7	7
Output 10: Supporting intercultural/interfaith dialogue	3.7	3
Output 1: Providing information & advice through a 'drop-in' service	3.5	2
Output 15: Promoting mainstreaming and developing policy	3	7

Notably, only a very few outputs are considered by Projects that produce them to have a very significant influence on the Outcome. Perhaps surprisingly, output 12 *building the capacity of the statutory sector* is felt to have a lesser influence on average, but it is pursued by a total of six Projects.

The table below refers to the overall level of influence that all Projects (i.e. the Programme as a whole) had on that Outcome, which takes into account both the *level of influence* each Project believed its outputs had on this Outcome, and the *number of Projects* believing that they influenced this Outcome.

Table 30: Outputs Influencing Outcome 8. Interaction skills statutory/ community bodies. Programme level average

Outputs	Average Influence on this Outcome
Output 12: Building capacity of the statutory sector	26
Output 14: Building capacity of community/voluntary sector	26
Output 15: Promoting mainstreaming and developing policy	21
Output 5: Delivering Non-language related education & training	11
Output 10: Supporting intercultural/interfaith dialogue	11
Output 16: Supporting other marginalised groups	11

It comes as no surprise that overall Outputs 12 *building capacity of the statutory sector* and Output 14 *building capacity of the community/voluntary sector* had the greatest influence.

Comments offered as evidence for this influence included the following:

- Improved relationships between St. Catherine's Community Services Centre and the local Gardaí, Social Services,

- Enhanced direct involvement between local GP's, public health nurses, schools, Gardaí and the community as a result of direct support from the resettlement programme. . (Carlow Rohingya Resettlement Programme)

The Mainstreaming Committee, made up of statutory and community organisations, has been established. Members have been informed of the rationale for the Different Together project and the objectives, they have been identified as potential contributors to the training programme and have had the opportunity to provide feedback on the project development...(Mayo Intercultural Action)

The findings of the BeLonG To Needs Analysis Report, including the feedback from LGBT asylum seeking and refugee youth who access BeLonG To's services, has led to a better understanding and awareness amongst Steering Committee members of the issues of LGBT asylum seeking and refugee youth, and the current lack of capacity within the statutory and voluntary sector to meet their needs. This will provide the basis for the next stage of BeLonG To's project which seeks to build the capacity and skills necessary amongst these organisations, and others, in order to address the needs of the target group. (BeLong To)

Responses from participants on feedback questionnaires post training have been consistently positive in relation to the relevance and value of the training to their needs as service providers in terms of addressing the needs of asylum seekers and refugees who have experienced sexual violence and other trauma. The trainings also address the need for staff care in order to avoid burnout/ vicarious trauma when working with traumatised individuals and much of the feedback received indicated that this was a valuable element. (Dublin Rape Crisis Centre)

As an outcome of the training delivered, childcare providers are more culturally competent and sensitive to the diversity of the children they care for. Links having been established with Limerick Childcare committee ... Following the training, participating institutes are currently developing their own intercultural strategy. The programme became a component of a FETAC level 5 programme in equality and diversity. (Doras Luimni)

OUTCOME 9. COLLABORATION AMONG STATUTORY/COMMUNITY BODIES

The definition of Outcome 9 in the Evaluation Framework is:

Improved **collaboration between statutory bodies and community/voluntary organisations** engaged in inter-cultural and integration activities, leading to better and more efficient service provision.

This refers to statutory agencies and the community and voluntary sector working together to co-ordinate services, and to bring about improvements of services that relate specifically to the Target Group.

This was the greatest focus of one Project, and a significant focus of three others. In terms of believing they have had an influence on this Outcome, Projects placed it somewhere in the middle.

**Table 31: Outputs and Projects influencing
Outcome 9. Collaboration among statutory/community bodies**

Outputs	Influence on this Outcome per Output	Number of Projects producing this Output
Output 1: Providing information & advice through a 'drop-in' service	5	1
Output 2: Providing information & advice through outreach services	5	1
Output 8: Providing advocacy & legal support for individuals	5	1
Output 3: Delivering themed information supports	4	1
Output 14: Building capacity of community/voluntary sector	4	4
Output 10: Supporting intercultural/interfaith dialogue	3.5	2
Output 15: Promoting mainstreaming and developing policy	3.5	4
Output 12: Building capacity of the statutory sector	3.2	5
Output 7: Providing targeted support to young people from Target Group	3	2

For a single Project in each case, Output 1 *drop-in services*, Output 2 *Outreach services*, and Output 8 *Advocacy and legal supports* were the most influential of outputs.

The table below refers to the overall level of influence that all Projects (i.e. the Programme as a whole) had on that Outcome, which takes into account both the *level of influence* each Project believed its outputs had on this Outcome, and the *number of Projects* believing that they influenced this Outcome.

Table 32: Outputs Influencing Outcome 9. Collaboration among statutory/community bodies. Programme level average

Outputs	Average Influence on this Outcome
Output 12: Building capacity of the statutory sector	16
Output 14: Building capacity of community/voluntary sector	16
Output 15: Promoting mainstreaming and developing policy	14
Output 16: Supporting other marginalised groups	10

When the number of Projects engaging in each output is taken into account the most influential are Output 12 *Building the capacity of the statutory sector*, and Output 14 *Building capacity of community/voluntary sector*.

The following are among the evidence offered of influencing this Outcome.

The Longford Integration Network (Intercultural inter-agency forum) provided the opportunity for agencies to meet monthly, share issues and information and support events/information seminars hence leading to a more collaborative approach to working with the target group. (Longford Community Resources)

The Mainstreaming Committee which is made up of both statutory and community/voluntary organisations was established. The Mainstreaming Committee has

agreed terms of reference to work together to achieve established objectives to progress the mainstreaming of the project (terms of reference for Mainstreaming Committee to be sent by email). The members of the Mainstreaming Committee have had the opportunity to share knowledge and to provide feedback on the development of the project through the Mainstreaming Committee meeting. (Mayo Intercultural Action)

We have had a major influence on the success of the ESOL partnership. Evidence of this collaboration is the joint application and assessment process for English language provision... (Doras Luimní)

OUTCOME 10. INTER-CULTURALISM WIDELY EMBEDDED

The definition of Outcome 10 in the Evaluation Framework is:

Greater **embedding of inter-culturalism** among social and other groups and the public more generally.

This refers to defined groups, not primarily involved with inter-cultural issues, such as youth clubs, sports clubs, faith-based groups, schools or businesses, and their awareness and understanding of inter-cultural issues and capacity to enhance interaction between them and Target Groups.

This was the greatest focus of one Project, and a significant focus of another. Overall, Projects claimed to have least influence on this Outcome.

Table 33: Outputs and Projects influencing Outcome 10. Inter-culturalism widely embedded

Outputs	Influence on this Outcome per Output	Number of Projects producing this Output
Output 1: Providing information & advice through a 'drop-in' service	5	1
Output 2: Providing information & advice through outreach services	5	1
Output 8: Providing advocacy & legal support for individuals	5	1
Output 5: Delivering Non-language related education & training	4	1
Output 7: Providing targeted support to young people from Target Group	4	2
Output 10: Supporting intercultural/interfaith dialogue	4	2
Output 12: Building capacity of the statutory sector	4	2
Output 14: Building capacity of community/voluntary sector	4	3
Output 4: Building capacity in English language	3.5	2
Output 11: Supporting actions to directly combat racism	3.5	2
Output 15: Promoting mainstreaming and developing policy	3.5	2
Output 16: Supporting other marginalised groups	3.3	3

Clearly, projects believe that this Outcome is achieved through the combined influence of a large number of Outputs. Information and direct support to Target Groups is considered the most influential, but all are considered to have a considerable degree of influence.

Table 34 below refers to the overall level of influence that all Projects (i.e. the Programme as a whole) had on that Outcome, which takes into account both the *level of influence* each Project believed its outputs had on this Outcome, and the *number of Projects* believing that they influenced this Outcome.

The top five Outputs in this regard are shown below. Building capacity of the community/voluntary sector and supporting other marginalised groups stand out above the others.

**Table 34: Outputs Influencing Outcome 10. Inter-culturalism widely embedded.
Programme level average**

Outputs	Average Influence on this Outcome
Output 14: Building capacity of community/voluntary sector	12
Output 16: Supporting other marginalised groups	10
Output 7: Providing targeted support to young people from Target Group	8
Output 10: Supporting intercultural/interfaith dialogue	8
Output 12: Building capacity of the statutory sector	8

Comments on what influenced with Outcome included the following:

- The development of an Intercultural forum which allows for the interaction and discussion on issues pertaining to different cultures in Carlow. A position on the intercultural forum has been extended to the Rohingya community...
- The development of the Carlow Cricket club with members from the Rohingya community, Ireland, England, Australia, India, Pakistan, Germany and Bangladesh.
- One member of the Rohingya community is on the committee of the cricket club which is a sub-committee of the local Rugby club.
- Three members of the community have completed their foundation coaching course and will hopefully complete level 1 coaching cert in year 2 of the programme.
- (Carlow Rohingya Resettlement Programme)
- The one off events/trips and East Meets West women's group satisfied this outcome. (Longford Community Resources)

OUTCOME 11. MAINSTREAMING AND REPLICATION

The definition of Outcome 11 in the Evaluation Framework is:

Mainstreaming or replication of programme good practice, within Project and partners or outside.

This refers to the current or future replication of the Project activities, within the Project sponsor or partners themselves or elsewhere for instance amongst other statutory agencies or community/voluntary bodies.

No Project regarded this as its greatest focus during the period, but for three it was significant.

Table 35: Outputs and Projects Influencing Outcome 11. Mainstreaming /replication

Outputs	Influence on this Outcome per Output	Number of Projects producing this Output
Output 14: Building capacity of community/voluntary sector	4	4
Output 12: Building capacity of the statutory sector	3.8	5
Output 15: Promoting mainstreaming and developing policy	3.8	5

There is a marginal difference between the three Outputs in terms of how Project regard their influence on mainstreaming and replication.

The Table below refers to the overall level of influence that all Projects (i.e. the Programme as a whole) had on that Outcome, which takes into account both the *level of influence* each Project believed its outputs had on this Outcome, and the *number of Projects* believing that they influenced this Outcome.

Here too the difference between the three Outputs is relatively small, all having had some influence.

**Table 36: Outputs Influencing Outcome 11. Mainstreaming /replication.
Programme level average**

Outputs	Average Influence on this Outcome
Output 12: Building capacity of the statutory sector	19
Output 15: Promoting mainstreaming and developing policy	19
Output 14: Building capacity of community/voluntary sector	16

Comments on mainstreaming and replication included the following:

Mainstreaming strategy developed in consultation with the partners and the steering committee. (Carlow Rohingya Resettlement Programme)

The Mainstreaming Committee was established and agreed terms of reference with the objective to progress the mainstreaming of the project at different levels including:

- Examining ways of mainstreaming the project through promoting the learning and good practice arising from the project.
- Examining the policy lessons from the project to ensure better service and support provision for refugees at a regional level.
- Devising an exit strategy for the participants and partners of the project.
- Examining funding streams within partner organisation to mainstream the project in full or relevant elements of it within their own organisations on completion of the project.

As the Mainstreaming Committee develops and learning from the project and committee members emerges this will influence the implementation of the mainstreaming strategy. (City of Dublin VEC)

Good practice developing from the ERF RAP is being implemented across the RAP... (City of Dublin VEC)

OUTCOME 12. POLICY/PRACTICE CHANGES

The definition of Outcome 12 in the Evaluation Framework is:

Changes in **policy or practices among organisations or companies** with which Target Groups relate, based on learning from the Project and from which the Target Group can gain benefits.

This includes changes in formal practices and policies of statutory agencies or community/ voluntary organisations, changes in policy or programmes of government or other public bodies, or changes in policy and practices of private or public enterprises, the effect of which is to generate benefits for the Target Group.

No Project gave this is greatest focus and just one a significant focus. Overall, Projects also felt that they had little influence on it so far.

Table 37: Outputs and Projects influencing Outcome 12. Policy/practice changes re. services

Outputs	Influence on this Outcome per Output	Number of Projects producing this Output
Output 12: Building capacity of the statutory sector	3.3	1
Output 14: Building capacity of community/voluntary sector	3	1
Output 16: Supporting other marginalised groups	3	1

Compared to most other Outcomes, the influence of any Output on policy and practice changes was low, and few Projects felt that they had any appreciable influence.

This is reflected in the table below which refers to the overall level of influence that all Projects (i.e. the Programme as a whole), had on that Outcome.

Table 38: Outputs Influencing Outcome 12. Policy/practice changes re. service. Programme level average

Outputs	Average Influence on this Outcome
Output 12: Building capacity of the statutory sector	10
Output 15: Promoting mainstreaming and developing policy	8
Output 14: Building capacity of community/voluntary sector	6
Output 16: Supporting other marginalised groups	6

One project noted an influence as follows:

The Resettlement Unit have offered to include a module designed by BeLonG To on LGBT issues for all programme refugees arriving in Ireland on an annual basis. (BeLonG To)

3.3 Aggregate Analysis of Output Influences and Outcomes

Aggregate figures are presented in two distinct areas.

First, is the varying extents to which Projects believe that that each of the outputs contributed to the Outcomes overall.


The overall contribution of each output is calculated by aggregating the contribution that all Projects believe they had on Outcomes. Thus the contributions that Projects believe that Output 1 made to each of the Outcomes are added together to arrive at an overall figure, and so on for the other Outputs. The result is a comparative table that combines both the level of contribution of each output has on Outcome, with the number of Outcomes that any given output has influenced.

Figure 4 shows the result. Specific scores are not given since the results are meaningful only as compared to each other.

Output 14 *Building capacity of the community voluntary sector* emerges as relatively the most influential output; followed by Output 12 *Building the capacity of the statutory sector*. The


least influential overall were Output 13 *Building the capacity of the business sector*, Output 3 *Delivering themed information supports*, and Output 6 *Mentoring supports*, all of which were delivered by few Projects.

Figure 4: The relative contribution of Outputs to Outcomes



The second aggregate figure concerns the Outcomes themselves, and specifically which ones that Projects believed overall they had most influence on. The influence that all Projects believe they had on each Outcomes are added together to arrive at this figure.

Figure 5: Outcomes Influenced the Most



Coming out on top here is Outcome 1: *Enhanced skills and personal development* followed by Outcome 6 *Enhanced capacity to access services* and Outcome 8 *Improved interaction skills of the statutory and community voluntary sectors*.

At the lower end are Outcome 7 *Improved redress in relation to racism and discrimination* and Outcome 12 *Policy and practice changes in service organisation*.

ANNEX 1: OUTPUTS AND OUTCOMES

The output and outcome categories listed below are taken from the Programme evaluation guidelines distributed to groups in June 2011.

Outputs relating to direct supports for Target Groups

1. Providing information & advice through a 'drop-in' service
2. Providing information & advice through outreach services
3. Delivering themed information supports
4. Building capacity in English language
5. Delivering non-language related education & training
6. Providing mentoring supports
7. Providing targeted support to young people from Target Group
8. Providing advocacy & legal support for individuals
9. Providing trauma & other counselling supports (ERF only)

Outputs related to service providers and the wider environment

10. Supporting intercultural/interfaith dialogue
11. Supporting actions to directly combat racism
12. Building capacity of the statutory sector
13. Building capacity of the business sector
14. Building capacity of community/voluntary sector
15. Promoting mainstreaming and developing policy
16. Supporting other marginalised groups

Direct Outcomes for Target Groups

1. Enhanced life-skills and personal development of Target Groups.
2. Enhanced day-to-day interaction with the local community by the Target Group, and enhanced inter-cultural dialogue, understanding and respect.
3. Higher level of participation in social and recreational groups and associated activities by the Target Group
4. Enhanced capacity of target group to engage in collective action and to become actively engaged in civil society organisations
5. Enhanced capacity of Target Groups to identify, seek and obtain training, education and employment opportunities.
6. Enhanced access to statutory, social and community services for Target Groups, including enhanced capacity and empowerment of Target Groups to access such services
7. Improved redress for Target Groups in relation to racism, xenophobia and other forms of discrimination.

Outcomes related to Service Providers and the Wider Community

8. Improved skills and capacities of statutory bodies and community and voluntary organisations in their interaction with Target Groups.
9. Improved collaboration between statutory bodies and community/voluntary organisations engaged in inter-cultural and integration activities, leading to better and more efficient service provision.
10. Greater embedding of inter-culturalism among social and other groups and the public more generally.
11. Mainstreaming or replication of programme good practice, within Project and partners or outside.
12. Changes in policy or practices among organisations or companies with which Target Groups relate, based on learning from the Project and from which the Target Group can gain benefits.