Report on Active Inclusion Learning Network: Disaffected Youth Transnational Event

Stockholm, 19 - 20 May 2014

Overview

- The event focused on the sub-themes of:
  - Youth not in education, employment or training (NEET)
  - Youth inclusion and empowerment
- 77 surveys on disaffected youth were reviewed - the NEET Group evaluated 45 surveys and the Inclusion and Empowerment Group evaluated 32 surveys.
- 25 Experts from 13 different nationalities, participated in the event
- 4 Project partners attended to facilitate and scribe the 2 sub theme groups (Kirsty Jacobs, Heather Law, Rhianon Williams and Giovanna Mangano). Dr. Ioan Durnescu attended the event in the capacity of the researcher and moved between the workshops to observe
- Presentations were made by representatives from the Swedish ESF-agency and the Swedish Public Employment Service (including the Director), as well as by partners in the project, and CESI, the organisation who are evaluating the network

What worked well

- The adjustments to the agenda following the lessons learned at the event in London worked very well. Delegates, for example has had enough time to mark the surveys at the event (3 hours, compared to 2 in London), without rushing, and having a lunch break in between to ensure they were not too fatigued.
- It was helpful and interesting when the delegates went around the room and introduced themselves in the plenary session. This worked because the number of experts was quite small. This would be too time-consuming to do at a larger event; however this concept should be used in the first workshop, when the delegates move ino their sub-theme groups.
- The group dinners provided the delegates with a good opportunity to network in a relaxed setting. The dinner on the first night worked particularly well because it enabled the del;egates to meet each other prior to the event. The majority of people's flights arrived in Stockholm by mid afternoon, so it was possible to organise a group dinner at 07.30pm - again it would be more difficult to facilitate this when delegates flights are very different in arrival time.
- The Inclusion and Empowerment workshop worked very well together. As such, the group wanted to be in contact post-Stockholm, to share, so they setup a "Google Group ", so that they can all network with each other in an online forum after the event.

Feedback

- Very positive feedback was received from the majority of the delegates who attended the event. Positive feedback focused on how positive they found the opportunity to network with other experts from across the EU, and how much they learnt from the event and were able to take back to their own organisations. One piece of feedback that particularly stood out was from an expert commenting that she has attended a lot of ESF funded events, yet this event was the only event she found truly valuable and a pleasure to attend. An example of the feedback received is below:

"It was really apleasure for me to take part in the event"
Italian delegate

"Thank you for sharing few days of hard work together! I am glad I had the chance to be a part of this event and to learn so much for just a few days."
Bulgarian delegate

"I was very glad to attend at the event. Again, the event was very interesting, as well as hard work."
Italian delegate

"Thank you for the excellent event. It was, for me, a great opportunity to exchange ways to work and to organise services and know each of you."
Italian delegate

"The events are so well organised."
Dutch delegate

"Thank you for the inviting me at this event, it was hard work but very interesting. Furthermore, I have not missed a word thanks to the clear English used to give instructions"
Polish delegate

"We really had a good meeting, and thats thanks to good preparation."
Project Partner

"We have contacted the Lithuanian expert who participated at the last event, she said it was interesting and inspiring"
Project Partner

Learning Points for next event

- Ensure that all presentations for the morning plenary session are available on a **laptop**, and are tested before the plenary session.
- Ensure that all documentation used at the event, including surveys, are available on a **laptop**, so that any extra copies of documents needed can be printed quickly.
- Be upfront in the pre-event guidance sent to the delegates, and in the morning plenary session, about the **varying quality of the surveys** . State that the project knows that some of them are of poor quality and explain why all the surveys are being assessed rather than the project pre-selecting the surveys (i.e. not all of the partners are experts in the field of social inclusion, we wanted to involve experts in our activities without filtering information as they are part of the network; to ensure, a transparent methodology, etc.).
  - Some complaints were received; complaints about the **contents of questionnaires** , so a previous check of them is ideal in order to better

manage the meeting. Thus, partners should receive the questionnaires ahead of time to be fully aware of contents.

- o Sometimes the questionnaire refer to **websites** for more information and it is a pity not considering this input. We could be clear with experts about the importance of looking at those websites before joining the meeting when they are sent the surveys. We could also make 1 or 2 laptops available at the event in case experts want to look again at some of them during the workshops.
- o One delegate raised a point about the potential **inconsistency in the initial scoring of the practices** . It was explained that this inconsistency is difficult to overcome as there will always be an element of subjectivity due to experts scoring just a selection of the total number of practices and not every single one, however, the detailed score sheet and instructions should help alleviate this. It was explained that we have taken this approach for practical reasons.
- o The inclusion workshop were concerned about **losing the good little practical ideas that were hidden within otherwise not so remarkable questionnaires.** It may be worth the facilitators asking people to read the questionnaires with this in mind – i.e. identify interesting nuggets of information, in what may otherwise appear to be not very good quality questionnaires. We can also reassure them that all points in the workshop reports will be included in the final report.

- Ensure that there is a **clear and agreed methodology among partners** about the process to be adopted on day 2 for the selection of the 8 best practices for the platform 2 meetings. During the pre-meeting before the event partners should share and agree the approach to select the 5 top practices and 3 reserves for peer reviews. In Stockholm, the facilitators had the opportunity to share some quick ideas the day before the event which was useful, but a shared and clear agreement on the process is fundamental the quality of the results.
- **Printing of surveys -** the Top-10 surveys were printed at the end of Day 1. This had the potential to make the process to identify the Top-10 surveys a bit of a rush as all the surveys needed to be marked and the top 10 identified by 4pm. There was also a delay in one of the workshops on day 2, where the Top 8 surveys were identified for the Top-10 surveys. This was because the Top-10 surveys for that workshop were not available on the laptop so couldn't be printed at the end of the day 1. Instead it meant at the start of day 2 photocopies had to be taken of the suirveys that delegates used during day 1. In London, the fact that all the surveys were printed out in advance meant that the identification of the Top-10 surveys and the distribution of these among the delegates, was a much smoother process.
- **Ensure the analysis of all top 10 practices by all of the experts in the sub-theme group on day 2.** Unfortunately, in Stockholm, because of an extended discussion at the beginning of the workshop we had to split the experts into just 2 main groups, in order to speed up the new scoring-process, to identify the top 8 surveys. This meant we had to share the top practices between them (5 different top practices for each group). This reduced the different point of views from experts on practices. One suggestion is to brief the group at the end of the day 1 on the methodology of how they will choose the top-8 surveys - this should mean they start the workshop on day 2 straight away.