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EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

BACKGROUND

Using evidence from both the U.S. and the European experience, the IRC launched the European Resettlement and Integration Technical Assistance (EURITA) project in October 2016 to provide technical support to European countries seeking to start or develop their resettlement programmes. Whilst EURITA was originally funded by the U.S. Department of State, the European Union, Asylum and Migration Fund (AMIF) contributed funding to the project from 2019 until March 31, 2021. The IRC Belgium led the project together with partners Accem in Spain, Conselho Português para os Refugiados in Portugal and the Schottener Foundation in Romania.

The objectives of the project were twofold: EU member states implement new or improved pre-departure and post-arrival cultural orientation activities for use with resettled third-country nationals and practitioners improve their capacity to provide resettlement integration services through the achievement of the outputs and outcomes outlined in the Table 1. The IRC defines Cultural Orientation as "an education program for refugees designed to help ease their adjustment to life in their receiving community. It is an ongoing, dynamic process that supports refugees in attaining the knowledge, skills, and attitudes to adapt and integrate into their new communities. CO can also be delivered to asylum seekers, third country nationals or those needing assistance to navigate key aspects of life in their new environment." CO can be delivered both pre-departure and post-arrival.

Information sharing practice for resettled refugees varies greatly across members states. Whilst pre-departure orientation is more routinely offered for resettled refugees (often in partnership between national government and international organisations such as IOM) the duration may vary, and post-arrival CO practices are less consistent. In 2019, the EURITA project met with an advisory committee comprising of EU FRANK, IOM and ICMC teams and carried out capacity assessment activities in Portugal (May), Romania and Spain (June) to inform the project activities.1

At the start of implementation, the challenges identified from the capacity assessment varied somewhat across countries but also included some common challenges. These challenges included: how to manage the expectations of refugees pre- and post-arrival; inconsistent or absence of monitoring and evaluation on the CO sessions in order to gauge refugee knowledge gain and attitude and behaviour change; how to increase attendance and engagement during sessions; and many of the staff who deliver the CO sessions are not dedicated trainers and do not have training or background in adult learning.

There were also challenges to the consistency and standardisation of information provision across different service providers within a country2 and in the case of Portugal and Spain there was a disconnect between the pre- and post-arrival orientation delivery.

---

1 These can be found here: Portugal; Romania; Spain.
2 For example, topics are not standard in Portugal and delivery modes varied between group sessions and one-to-one sessions, and sessions offered on a regular basis while others in a one-off standalone session.
TABLE 1. SUMMARY PLANNED VS. ACHIEVED

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROJECT OUTCOMES AND OUTPUTS</th>
<th>OUTCOMES</th>
<th>STATUS</th>
<th>OUTCOMES</th>
<th>STATUS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>477 practitioners received relevant capacity building support</td>
<td>90% of participants indicate that the training was useful</td>
<td>Exceeded by 130%</td>
<td>96%</td>
<td>96%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 practitioners trained in person on a thematic topic such as information sharing practices, Cultural Orientation and Case Management strategies</td>
<td>90% of participants indicate that the training was useful</td>
<td>Exceeded by 90.33%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>196 practitioners were trained via webinar on a thematic topic such as information sharing practices, Cultural Orientation and Case Management strategies</td>
<td>90% of participants indicate that the training was useful</td>
<td>Exceeded by 46%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 practitioners received one-on-one technical assistance on a thematic area such as information sharing practices, Cultural Orientation and Case Management strategies</td>
<td>90% of practitioners indicating that the technical assistance was useful</td>
<td>Exceeded by 250%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 pre- and post-arrival CO lesson plans were developed and distributed on the EURITA.org website</td>
<td>90% of practitioners taking part in the final survey who use the resource find it useful</td>
<td>Achieved 100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 resources were posted on the RefugeeLife.bg website for refugee use</td>
<td>83.33%</td>
<td>Not achieved</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One adaptable guidance document was developed for practitioners and distributed on the EURITA.org website</td>
<td>90% of practitioners taking part in the final survey who review the resource find it useful</td>
<td>Exceeded by 100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 refugee population information products developed and distributed on the EURITA.org website</td>
<td>Achieved 100%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One mentor handbook was developed for practitioners and distributed on the EURITA.org website</td>
<td>90% of practitioners taking part in the final survey who review the resource find it useful</td>
<td>Achieved 100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 mentors were trained to support resettled refugees in Spain</td>
<td>90% of volunteers were satisfied with the mentorship programme</td>
<td>Exceeded by 96%</td>
<td>98%</td>
<td>98%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80 resettled refugees were supported by mentors in Spain</td>
<td>85% of refugee participants were satisfied with their experience</td>
<td>Exceeded by 16%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>410 hours of mentoring delivered</td>
<td></td>
<td>Exceeded by 130%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

EVALUATION METHODOLOGY

The evaluation process examined the ways in which specific activities have been carried out in three areas of enquiry: effectiveness, impact and sustainability in order to identify best practices and opportunities for improvement. Data was collected and analysed from quantitative tools including post-training surveys, webinar surveys, Community of Practice surveys, website analytics and a midterm and final stakeholder feedback survey (which includes both qualitative and quantitative findings). In addition, purely qualitative findings have also been used to understand the context and factors that affected programme implementation, including stakeholder interviews and after-action review information. Some of the limitations to the findings included: the small sample size for the online surveys due to the voluntary completion by participants, response bias could be evident despite the anonymous nature of the surveys, self-reported feedback means that data could not be verified objectively and the inability to compare the same participants from mid term to final survey.

MAIN FINDINGS

EURITA exceeded nine outcome and eight output indicators targets, one outcome and three output indicators were not achieved, and two output indicators were not achieved. Overall, 607 stakeholders engaged in at least one EURITA activity from 19 EU countries, the top 5 countries of participation were: Portugal 33.72%, Spain 23.68%, Romania 18.42%, Bulgaria 10.26% and Lithuania 8.5%. The majority of participants were from civil society followed by international organisations and faith-based organisations. The majority of participants engaged in only one EURITA activity, however 26.68% participated in more activities with some participating in as many as 19 unique activities. The EURITA project played a convening role among participants, the vast majority of participants (94%) reported in post training surveys that they would collaborate more with peer organisations a result of the training. Based on feedback survey findings, 100% of participants responded that they found the EURITA trainings useful and 96% increased their knowledge of the training topic. In both midterm and final surveys, the most frequently selected option for how engaging with EURITA added value to the participant or organisation was, improving their integration strategies, followed by the strengthening of programming in the midterm survey and expanding the organisation scope of work in the final survey. Results from the final survey, practitioner responses indicated that the EURITA training activity/ies they had participated in (including in-person training, webinars, e-learning, technical assistance, delegation visits or remote support) had informed approaches to their work as follows:

- 86% of respondents agreed that EURITA training allowed them to gain knowledge which would help them improve the quality of the integration services they provide;
- 86% of respondents agreed that they knew more about best practice in refugee integration following EURITA training;
- 83% of respondents agreed that EURITA training gave them a better understanding of how to design responsive refugee integration programmes.

In addition, 58% of participants reported during the final survey that they used EURITA materials or replicated knowledge to train others in their organisation.
KEY RECOMMENDATIONS

Overall, the project was received very well by participants who were enthusiastic to participate and often noted the absence of integration experts and professional development opportunities in their country. Some specific best practices that were gathered during the evaluation process are as follows:

- Include global best practice with contextualised and individualised interventions based on a needs assessment
- Offer a combination of less intense activities (e.g., webinar with more intensive activities and community of practice)
- Make trainings and resources practical and easy to use
- Create opportunities to facilitate peer learning amongst diverse groups
- Regularly review and incorporate practitioner feedback into the design of the activities
- Create regular engagement opportunities through newsletters, etc.
- Set realistic project targets that measure both quantity and quality

The findings as outlined in the previous section demonstrate that participants improved their knowledge and strengthened their practice after participating in the EURITA activities. In conclusion, the continued support for transnational capacity building initiatives such as those provided by EURITA are essential to strengthening resettlement programmes and ensuring the exchange of best practices in the EU.

The IRC wanted to systematically document and learn from the implementation of this project. The evaluation process examines the ways in which specific activities have been carried out to identify best practices and opportunities for improvement. Data from tools including post-training surveys, webinar surveys, website analytics and a midterm and final stakeholder evaluation survey (which includes both qualitative and quantitative findings) has been analysed. In addition, purely qualitative findings have also been used to understand the context and factors that affected programme implementation, including stakeholder interviews and after-action review information.
METHODS

Midterm and final stakeholder survey
The EURITA project team developed a midterm stakeholder survey. This survey was completed by EURITA stakeholders, defined as those who had participated in a minimum of one EURITA activity (i.e., training or webinar). Data collection was carried out electronically (using Kobo) throughout March 2020 and again in April 2021. The survey asked a total of 10 questions (see Annex 1). Questions included open and closed questions and a rating scale. The survey covered three areas: 1) engagement with EURITA activities and resources; 2) perceived knowledge gained and value added to practitioners’ organisations; 3) ways EURITA could improve its activities. 61 stakeholders completed the survey in 2020 and 59 completed in 2021. They represented 15 and 17 countries, respectively.

Post-training surveys
These surveys were completed by participants in paper format immediately after the in-person trainings and data entered and analysed in Kobo. The surveys were created by the EURITA team. The surveys asked a total of 11 questions (see example in Annex 2). Questions included closed questions, a rating scales, and several open questions. The survey covered two main areas: 1) perceived knowledge gained and usefulness of the training; 2) most useful areas of the training; 3) ways in which the training could be improved. Of 300 post-training surveys administered in 16 trainings, 249 surveys were completed.3

Post-webinar survey
This survey was completed by participants after each webinar. The survey was created by the EURITA team and were completed by participants via Kobo. The surveys included 9 questions, with one additional question relating to additional training participants might be interested in added from October 2020 onwards (see Annex 3). The surveys covered two main areas: 1) overall learning; 2) areas for improvement in the training. Of 379 post-webinar surveys administered in 13 webinars, 268 surveys were completed.8

Website analytics
Google analytics reports were pulled on a monthly basis to identify the following: number of users, user location, most frequently accessed pages, referral source, and most frequently downloaded resources.

Partnership Survey and After-Action Review
A survey was shared with the consortium partners in January 2021 to complete via Kobo. The survey included 13 questions (Annex 5). In addition, IRC’s Regional Measurement Advisor led an online discussion via Teams with the consortium partners to reflect on lessons learned. Notes were taken of the partners discussion. Questions were asked on the project assumptions, best practices, scope of project activities, project effects, scaling up and hosting a multi-stakeholder project (Annex 6). A summary of the discussion is included in the section on Lessons Learned.

3 Note this is not unique stakeholders as individuals may have completed multiple trainings and therefore submitted multiple surveys.
LIMITATIONS

- Sample sizes: For all surveys carried out online via Kobo (the webinars, CoP and midterm and final survey), participants were able to choose whether or not they participated. This resulted in small sample sizes, with many participants choosing not to respond. This means the findings from some of the surveys are not generalisable, given the small sample size.

- Response bias: Because IRC conducted each of the surveys, there are potential concerns that respondents were providing responses they believe IRC wanted to hear. Both surveys were anonymous in order to encourage respondents to provide more honest feedback, but the anonymity restricts the possibility of follow-up.

- Self-reporting: For all methods of data, participants self-reported their feedback. As a result, data collected is subjective and based on reported perceptions, and could not be verified objectively.

- No control group: Due to the voluntary completion of the the midterm and final surveys, they were not administered to the same respondents. Therefore, the respondents demographics changed (countries and organisations where respondents work). In addition, the external environment of COVID-19 may have impacted responses. However, we found similarities and trends that show consistency throughout all respondents most preferred resources, project activities and materials, and their usefulness.

EVALUATION QUESTIONS

Areas of enquiry include the following:

01 Effectiveness
   - The execution of programme activities:
     - Which activities took place (vs. planned)?
     - How did project participants interact with these activities?
     - What went well? What went poorly? What was unexpected?
     - What external factors altered the way we expected to implement the activities?

   The engagement of stakeholders:
     - How do our stakeholders perceive our support?
     - What was missing?
     - What could we have done differently?
     - Were there barriers to participation that we noted?

02 Impact
   - Did the project ultimately contribute to the intended goal?

03 Sustainability
   - Is this model sustainable and/or scalable?

FINDINGS

EFFECTIVENESS

EURITA accomplishments are analysed in the Planned vs. Achieved matrix below in Table 2.

TABLE 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PLANNED</th>
<th>ACHIEVED</th>
<th>STATUS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 At least 477 practitioners receive relevant capacity building support and at least 90% of participants report increased knowledge of specialised topic</td>
<td>• 607 practitioners received capacity building support • 95% reported increased knowledge of the topic</td>
<td>Exceeded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 At least 300 practitioners trained in person on a thematic topic; at least 90% of participants indicate that the training was useful</td>
<td>• 271 participants were trained in person on a thematic topic; • 100% of survey respondents indicated the training was useful</td>
<td>Partially achieved Exceeded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 At least 196 practitioners are trained via webinar on a thematic topic; at least 90% of participants indicate that the training was useful</td>
<td>• 286 practitioners were trained online on a thematic topic; • 100% of participants indicated that the training was useful</td>
<td>Exceeded Exceeded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 At least 6 practitioners receive one-on-one technical assistance on a thematic area; at least 90% of participants indicate that the technical assistance was useful</td>
<td>• 18 practitioners received one-on-one technical assistance on a thematic area; • 100% of participants indicated that the technical assistance was useful</td>
<td>Exceeded Exceeded</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

9 OUTCOME AND 8 OUTPUT INDICATORS EXCEEDED
1 OUTCOME AND 3 OUTPUT INDICATORS ACHIEVED
2 OUTPUT INDICATORS NOT ACHIEVED
PLANNED | ACHIEVED | STATUS
--- | --- | ---
5 | At least 30 practitioners take part in the online Community of Practice (CoP); at least 90% of participants indicating that they would recommend participation in the CoP to peers | 42 practitioners took part in the online CoP; 97% of participants indicated that they would recommend participation to peers | Exceeded
6 | 8 pre- and post-arrival CO lesson plans are developed and published on the EURITA.org website, with a target of at least 30 downloads and 200 views of the page on which the resource is available; 90% of practitioners taking part in the final survey who use the resource find it useful | 8 lesson plans developed; 74 downloads; 904 page views; 100% of respondents in the final survey found the lesson plan useful | Exceeded
7 | 6 resources on COVID-19 are posted on the RefugeeLife.bg website for refugee use. | 5 COVID-19 resources posted in English, Bulgarian, Arabic, Farsi and Urdu; 332 page views | Partially Achieved
8 | 1 adaptable guidance document is developed for practitioners and distributed on the EURITA.org website, with a target of at least 30 downloads and at least 90% of practitioners taking part in the final survey who review the resource find it useful | 2 adaptable guidance documents developed: Cultural Orientation Insights guide developed in English and Spanish; and CO Program stages assessment; 100% of respondents in the final survey indicated that the resources was either useful or very useful; 148 downloads | Exceeded
9 | 5 refugee population information products developed and distributed on the EURITA.org website with a target of at least 100 downloads | 5 refugee backgrounder published; 63 downloads; 100% of respondents in the final survey found the refugee backgrounder useful | Achieved
10 | 1 mentor handbook is developed for practitioners and distributed on the EURITA.org website and a target of at least 30 downloads and at least 90% of practitioners finding the resource useful | 1 one-on-one CO Mentor Guidance developed; 106 downloads; 904 page views; 100% of respondents in the final survey found the resource useful | Achieved
11 | At least 20 mentors are trained to support 80 refugees in Spain, with 80% of refugees meeting their mentor at least 8 times, with 90% of volunteers being satisfied with the mentorship programme, at least 410 hours of mentoring delivered and at least 85% of refugee participants being satisfied with their experience | 39 mentors were trained to support 93 refugees in Spain, with 84% of refugees meeting their mentor at least 8 times, with 96.6% of volunteers being satisfied with the mentorship programme, 942 hours of mentoring delivered and 100% of refugee participants being satisfied with their experience | Exceeded

Overall, 607 stakeholders engaged in at least one EURITA activity from 19 EU countries as follows: Austria, Belgium, Bulgaria, Croatia, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, Germany, Greece, Ireland, Italy, Latvia, Lithuania, Netherlands, Portugal, Romania, Slovakia, Spain, Sweden. The top 5 countries of participation were: Portugal 33.72%, Spain 23.68%, Romania 18.42%, Bulgaria 5.26% and Lithuania 3.13%.

The vast majority of participants belong to civil society organisations, 282 out of 607 were from civil society followed by international organisations and faith-based organisations.
35 new resources developed by the project were made available through the online platform EURITA.org, which was re-launched in 2019 (including Spanish, Portuguese and Romanian translations which were developed, where applicable). The platform includes a wide range of resources produced by the project as well as external resources on five thematic topics: Interpretation and Language Access; Case Management; Information Sharing; Community Engagement; and Economic Empowerment. Two e-learning courses were developed; Information sharing practices in Portugal which had 82 participants between May and June 2020 and Case Management Strategies which was launched in May 2021.

**CASE MANAGEMENT**
- Resettlement Assessment (Spanish) (2020)
- Guidelines for Remote Case Management (Spanish) (2020)

**RESOURCES**
- Cultural Orientation Program Assessment Tool (Spanish) (2019)
- Cultural Orientation Insights (Spanish; Portuguese; Romanian) (2019)
- Information Sharing Practices in Resettlement and Integration presentation (Spanish) (2019)
- Strategies for Delivering Cultural Orientation presentation (Spanish) (2019)
- Lesson Plans for Cultural Orientation (Spanish; Portuguese; Romanian) (2020)
- Cultural Backgrounders: Refugees from Syria (Spanish; Portuguese; Romanian) (2020)
- Cultural Backgrounders: Refugees from Eritrea (Spanish; Portuguese; Romanian) (2020)
- Cultural Backgrounders: Refugees from Iraq (Spanish; Portuguese; Romanian) (2020)
- Cultural Backgrounders: Refugees from DRC (Spanish; Romanian) (2020)
- Cultural Backgrounders: Refugees from Somalia (Spanish; Portuguese; Romanian) (2021)
- Refugees from Eritrea webinar presentation (2020)
- Refugees from Iraq webinar presentation (2020)
- How to Deliver Remote Cultural Orientation (Spanish) (2020)
- Facilitating Virtual Meetings (Spanish) (2020)
- Creating Engaging Virtual Trainings and Meetings presentation (2020)

**INFORMATION SHARING**
- Mentoring Refugees: A Handbook for Volunteers (Spanish; Portuguese; Romanian) (2019)
- Managing Virtual Volunteers (Spanish) (2020)

**COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT**
How did project participants interact with these activities?

Overall the project had excellent engagement with the activities, based on the fact that the project reached more participants than planned. The feedback provided showed interest and need for more trainings. The majority of participants engaged in only one EURITA activity, however 26.68% participated in more activities with some participating in as many as 19 unique activities.

Participants ranked the usefulness of the activities they participated in. In the midterm survey, delegation visit to resettlement sites was reported as the most useful activity (83%), followed by in-person workshop or training (77%), and in-country technical assistance (one-on-one or small groups) and remote support (Skype or email) both with 75%. The changes brought by COVID-19 and EURITA project adaptations changed these preferences in the final survey, where the E-learning was reported as the most useful (72%) followed by in-person training or workshop (70%) and the Community of Practice (62.5%).

What went well?

Based on post-webinar and post-training survey findings, 100% responded that they found the trainings useful. The vast majority of participants would use in their daily work the resources presented in the webinars. Of 229 surveyed post webinar, 226 (99%) reported that they will use the resources from the webinar in their work with refugees/asylum seekers.

"The webinar was well structured, easy to follow and interactive."
— Webinar Participant, August 2020
The preferences about most useful resources in the midterm and final survey changed: while in the midterm survey respondents found Cultural Orientation (CO) Program Stages Assessment tool as the most useful (89%) followed by Cultural Orientation Insights (79%) and Mentoring Refugees: A Handbook for Volunteers (74%); in the final feedback survey, the handbook to mentor refugees and EURITA Cultural Backgrounder (for refugees from Iraq, Syria, Eritrea, Somalia or DRC) was found as the most useful (64%); followed by Cultural Orientation Insights and Cultural Orientation Program Stages Assessment tool (56%).

"We are inspired by your handbook while editing and upgrading our handbook. I really liked cultural orientation webinar about refugees from Iraq and chance to invite our volunteers to it as well."

— Final survey response from participant in Slovakia

The vast majority of participants found the trainings relevant to their context and engaging.

"We received many ideas of interactive activities, handouts, posters etc. that might be used in CO training."

— Participant, Bulgaria 2020 Training

The vast majority would recommend colleagues to participate in a Community of Practice (CoP).

The presentation of the webinar was engaging and interactive.
Resources were not downloaded at as high a rate as anticipated.
The Mentor Handbook was downloaded at the highest rate with 106 downloads. Based on website statistics, the newly-developed resources were not downloaded at as high a rate as anticipated, observing the download time trends it was noted that these resources were generally only downloaded after an event that promoted them. However, resources were also printed and distributed during in-person events which can also be attributed to the lower than anticipated download rate.

Unexpected Benefits
The EURITA project played a convening role among participants. The consortium anticipated that many of the national participants would know each other and regularly communicated however it was noted that in fact the EURITA project played a convening role.

Specific examples of feedback from the midterm survey included the following:

“Promoting opportunities for networking with similar organisations.”

The vast majority of participants (94%) reported in post-training surveys that they would collaborate more with peer organisations a result of the training.

Open responses from a survey delivered during the CoP revealed tangible collaboration within the CoP. One practitioner in Lithuania mentioned that they shared a donated computer for refugee families with another practitioner from Lithuania. In addition, the CoP brought about additional benefits. Practitioners mentioned that during the pandemic the feeling of support was important to them. They explained that they did not feel alone and that they realised many were facing the same challenges.

“I am learning different ways to approach a problem due to the experience of the CoP members.”

COVID-19 unexpectedly brought an increase in interest in participation on online activities.
The main change occurred as a result of COVID-19 when EURITA shifted all of the training activities to online for a period of time. Instead of reducing the number of participants, the project actually noted an increase in interest. This shift did, however, mean we did not achieve our target of 300 participants trained in person (271 were trained in person).

How do our stakeholders perceive our support?
Stakeholders relied on EURITA trainings and resources in their work. Participants reacted positively to our interventions as highlighted by select highlighted participant comments:

“EURITA was very useful for our organisation. We have disseminated their activities at the national level, through our stakeholder network. It also gave place to new opportunities of collaboration in-country and cross-EU countries, and new project proposals for funding.”

— Feedback from a respondent on the midterm survey

“... more trainings like this more regularly, with the participation of refugees.”

— Suggestion from a participant in the September 2019 Portugal training:
Before the CoP started, we asked EURITA participants where they currently get the resources they use for advice on dealing with challenges in their role.

Specific examples of feedback included the following:

“We deliver the project together with the durable solutions unit of the UNHCR office. We also rely on EURITA website for how-to resources.”

“We don’t have access to qualified experts whom we can consult; we are counting on training with experts like EURITA team and on receiving information about good practices in other countries.”

What was missing?
Participants during the midterm and final survey were asked for their feedback with respect to how EURITA could better support practitioners on refugee integration. Common participant responses related to:

- EURITA holding workshops and webinars more frequently (particularly for practitioners who cannot travel);
- EURITA providing more translations of resources in different languages;
- EURITA including more specific materials on the national realities and for specific professions;
- EURITA promoting collaboration and connections between different organisations.

Provide some country specific and local language trainings and resources
Some feedback that was received during the midterm and final survey highlighted the need to provide more specific examples and case studies during trainings and country specific webinars in different languages.

Based on this advice, three webinars were delivered to colleagues in Spain in May/July 2020, one in Romania in July 2020 and two in Portugal in September/October 2020 in the local language.

“It would be appreciated if we [could] [have] more information […] about success stories from different countries and some comparison between different types or models of integration in different countries.”

“Provide webinar country-based (for the participants) to further develop the discussion on each topic, based on the peculiarities (i.e., legislation, legal issues, procedural aspects and bureaucracy) that have a strong effect on the implementation of the tools and approaches proposed.”

Travel was the biggest barrier to attendance
Professional development opportunities are often only offered in larger cities which excludes many practitioners. However, EURITA provided travel assistance to cover the costs associated with participants who had to travel and hosted trainings in smaller municipalities. It was also noted that participant time to engage was limited especially during busy work periods, this was particularly evident during the small group and one-on-one TA follow up as actions that had been developed in the action plan were often delayed due to workloads of the responsible participants. EURITA team tried to offer flexibility in scheduling to ensure most practitioners could benefit from the activities.
The objectives of the project were twofold: EU member states implement new or improved pre-departure and post-arrival cultural orientation activities for use with resettled third-country nationals and practitioners improve their capacity to provide resettlement integration services.

Key findings can be identified as taking place at three levels: practitioner, organisational and community or country level. The majority of impact is evident at the individual practitioner level as outlined below.

Practitioner Level
Participants were asked if they had increased their understanding of the training topic after each activity, 96% participants agreed to have increased their understanding. A vast majority of participants reported that knowledge gained in training activities would help them improve the quality of the integration services they provide and how to design responsive refugee integration programmes.

Results from the final survey, practitioner responses indicated that the EURITA training activity/ies they had participated in (including in-person training, webinars, e-learning, technical assistance, delegation visits or CoP remote support) had informed approaches to their work as follows:

• 86% of respondents agreed that EURITA training allowed them to gain knowledge which would help them improve the quality of the integration services they provide;
• 83% of respondents agreed that EURITA training gave them a better understanding of how to design responsive refugee integration programmes;
• 86% of respondents agreed that they knew more about best practice in refugee integration following EURITA training.

In March 2021, feedback was gathered from members of the CoP during a short poll on what they have learnt from the CoP. Practitioners mentioned broadly four areas:

1. Learning about specific techniques to use in their programming (e.g., one practitioner mentioned how to engage volunteers in their programming and another how to successfully engage refugee women);
2. tools and resources they can use;
3. general ideas and inspiration from others;
4. getting a global picture of practices;
5. the possibility to experiment and innovate.

What is the most valuable part of participating in the CoP?
Participants were also asked to outline how EURITA had added value to their respective organisations:

- 69% of practitioners agreed that engagement with EURITA had improved their organisation’s integration activities;
- 44% of practitioners agreed that engagement with EURITA expanded the scope of their organisation’s work;
- 41% of practitioners agreed that engagement with EURITA had strengthened their organisation’s programming.

The majority of participants in the midterm survey (59%) and final survey (58%) reported using EURITA materials or knowledge gained to train others in their respective organisations.

As noted above in the results from the final survey, practitioner responses indicated that the EURITA project had added value to their respective organisations, as follows:

- 25% of practitioners agreed that engagement with EURITA had aided their organisation’s networking and creation of new partnerships.
- 20% of practitioners agreed that engagement with EURITA improved in-country collaboration for their organisation;
- 15% of practitioners agreed that engagement with EURITA improved their organisation’s collaboration with other organisations outside their country;

There was a consistent percentage increase in how respondents perceived the added value of engagement with EURITA activities from the midterm to the final survey.

In both mid-term and final surveys, the most frequently selected option for how engaging with EURITA added value to the participant organisation was, improving integration strategies with 24% in the mid-term, and a significant increase to 69% in the final survey. This was followed by expanding the scope of work, 44% in the final survey vs. 12.5% in the mid-term and the strengthening of programming, 40% in the final survey vs. 21% in the mid-term survey.

During followup it was noted that some key intra-national connections were made as a result of the convening of EURITA activities that have strengthened coordination, such as within Portugal IOM team now coordinates with CPR on the delivery of CO and CPR staff began delivering skype sessions as part of pre-departure orientation led by IOM.

An overall 3,989 resources were downloaded from the website and many practitioners indicated that they would use the resources in their daily work including in the delivery of pre-departure and post-arrival CO.

"EURITA is an extremely valuable and unique resource on refugee integration that should continue its work. In the future it could have an evaluation component where EURITA experts would analyse the work of participating organisations and provide recommendations on how to improve the work within the local context and available funds."
SUSTAINABILITY

Certain components of the project are sustainable with minimal resources, this includes 1) the website that will continue to be maintained with the resource library 2) the peer learning through the Community of Practice and 3) the relationships that were developed to strengthen in country and transnational collaboration.

The CoP is currently convened by the IRC and CPR, but efforts will be made to transition leadership amongst the group so that it can continue without EURITA support. Results from the final survey, practitioner responses indicated that the EURITA project had added value to their work at a community or country level and we can anticipate the impact continuing post project through improved in-country collaboration for their organisation and transnationally.

An illustration of how EURITA intervention will continue adding value to member states is evident in Ireland where EURITA provided technical assistance to the Irish Refugee Council to launch a resettlement Community of Practice to bring together practitioners across Ireland to share experience, the first meeting was held in March 2021. This peer learning exchange will now continue on a monthly basis without the support of the EURITA project.

RECOMMENDATIONS

LESSONS LEARNED

AND BEST PRACTICES

“EURITA is an extremely valuable and unique resource on refugee integration that should continue its work. In the future it could have an evaluation component where EURITA experts would analyse the work of participating organisations and provide recommendations on how to improve the work within the local context and available funds.”

— Feedback from a respondent on the final survey
LESSONS LEARNED
Based on the After-Action Review that was conducted with the consortium in February 2021, the following lessons were identified for consideration in future capacity-building project implementation.

CAPACITY-BUILDING DESIGN
✔ Design the project in collaboration with partners who know the local contexts. This reduces the need to change activities significantly during implementation.
✔ Conduct a needs assessment in each country and design resources that are adaptable for each.
✔ Offer a combination of activities and resources as part of the project.
✔ Engage organisations with different backgrounds to expand project reach. Involve organisations with different backgrounds, and not only the more traditional NGOs working with migrants e.g. schools, law enforcement, volunteers.

TRAINING DELIVERY
✔ Include costs for participant travel and consider scheduling to reduce barriers to attendance.
✔ Adapt to the limitations of in-person trainings by developing online training, including e-learning.
✔ Identify training topics based on audience needs; be flexible to changing the training topics.

BEST PRACTICES

Reach out to more cities to help improve relationships with local authorities.

The approach of including global best practice with contextualised and individualised interventions based on a needs assessment was highly valued by stakeholders.

Maintain a continued communication channel with participants that goes beyond just emailing each other, this can create better coordination and collaboration outside of the project scope.

Having an offer of less intense activities (such as a webinar) with more intensive activities (such as the CoP) allowed for practitioners’ individual learning needs to be met.

Set project realistic targets that not only look at quantity, but also at the quality of the work. For example, with regards to the number of CO sessions.

Regularly review and incorporate practitioner feedback into the design of the activities

Make trainings practical and resources easy to use. Practitioners appreciated the practical nature of the trainings and resources. Combining trainings with the instruction on how to use resources and referral to resources for further learning was effective.

Create opportunities to facilitate peer learning amongst diverse groups, in the case of EURITA many of whom would not normally have the opportunity to share experiences despite their shared work.
The EURITA project demonstrates the benefits of transnational cooperation and sharing of best practice. It follows that collaborative work across multiple stakeholders enhances the work of practitioners in a way that would not otherwise have been possible. Practitioners increased their knowledge of integration best practices allowing them to improve the quality of the integration services they provide in their country.

Key learnings included the need for continued professional development opportunities for the wide variety of actors who serve resettled refugees through the sharing of global best practice, contextualised support, and providing peer learning opportunities. The project revealed that continued, contextualised capacity building through a variety of modalities and to a diverse range of actors is still needed.

Overall, this model of providing technical assistance is effective and can be scaled to any resettlement context. Resources and training materials are easily adaptable and based on global best practice. The main resources required to implement the project are personnel with familiarity of the local contexts and expertise in the subject matter, however relatively few personnel are needed to reach a great number of practitioners across Europe.

The positive impact of EURITA in delivering much needed support to practitioners working with resettled refugees on their integration pathway demonstrates the need for continued capacity building efforts in the field.

Based on findings from the evaluation, IRC main conclusions are:

1. In which country do you work? [Armenia, Bulgaria, Croatia, Estonia, Greece, Italy, Latvia, Lithuania, Montenegro, Portugal, Romania, Serbia, Slovakia, Spain, Other – please specify]
3. What is your individual role in the organisation? [Case management / social worker, Health and/or psychosocial service provider, Education service provider, Legal aid service provider, Livelihoods / employment services, Monitoring and evaluation / research, Grants/funding coordination, HR and/or general administration]
4. I identify as… [Female, Male, Non-binary, None of the above, Prefer not to say]
5. Which of the following EURITA resources have you used? [CO Supplementary Lesson Plan – Employment, Cultural Orientation Insights, Mentoring Refugees: a handbook for volunteers, Cultural Orientation Program stages Assessment Tool, Other – Please specify, None]
6. How would you rate the overall usefulness of the resource you used? [Not useful, Fairly useful, Useful, Very useful]
7. What EURITA activity did you participate in? [In-person workshop or training, Webinar, E-learning, EURITA.org website, In-country Technical Assistance (one-on-one or small group), Delegation visit to resettlement sites, Remote support (Skype or email), Other – please specify]
8. How would you rate the overall usefulness of the activity you participated in? [Not useful, Fairly useful, Useful, Very useful]
9. Have you used the EURITA materials or knowledge gained to train others in your organisation? [Yes, No]
10. Following your participation in a EURITA activity, to what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements? [Strongly agree, Agree, Disagree, Strongly disagree]
   - I know more about best practices in refugee integration
   - I have a better understanding of how to design responsive refugee integration programmes
   - I gained knowledge that will help me to improve the quality of integration services I provide
9. In what ways did engaging with EURITA add value to your organisation? Please select all that apply. [Strengthening of programming, Improving integration strategies, Networking and creating new partnerships, Expanding the scope of our work, Improving in-country coordination, Improving cross-country collaboration, Other – please specify]
10. What could EURITA do differently to better support your work on refugee integration?
ANNEX 2

WORKSHOP/TRAINING SURVEY QUESTIONNAIRE

1. What type of organisation do you work for?

2. What is your individual role in the organisation?
   [Case management / social worker, Health and/or psychosocial service provider, Education service provider, Legal aid service provider, Livelihoods / employment services, Monitoring and evaluation / research, Grants/funding coordination, HR and/or general administration, Other - please specify]

3. I identify as...
   [Female, Male, Non-binary, Other, Prefer not to disclose]

4. I found the training to be relevant to my context

5. I have increased my understanding of [topic] because of the training

6. I will collaborate more with my peers as a result of this training

7. How would you rate the overall usefulness of the training?
   [Very useful, useful, Fairly useful, Not useful]

8. The best session or activity during the training was:

9. One topic I would like to learn more about is:

10. Do you have any suggestions for improving the in-person training delivery?

11. I would appreciate the following engagement and support from EURITA in the coming months (please select all that apply):
   [Resource materials on EURITA.org, Webinars, In-country one-on-one technical assistance, E-learning modules on EURITA.org, Emails, Community of Practice, Skype Q and A sessions]

ANNEX 3

WEBINAR SURVEYS

1. In which country do you work?
   [Armenia, Austria, Belgium, Bulgaria, Croatia, Estonia, Finland, Germany, Greece, Italy, Ireland, Latvia, Lithuania, Portugal, Romania, Serbia, Slovakia, Spain, Sweden, The Netherlands, Other – please specify]

2. What type of organisation do you work for?

3. What is your individual role in the organisation?
   [Case management / social worker, Health and/or psychosocial service provider, Education service provider, Legal aid service provider, Livelihoods / employment services, Monitoring and evaluation / research, Grants/funding coordination, HR and/or general administration]

4. I identify as...
   [Female, Male, Non-binary, None of the above, Prefer not to say]

5. To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements?
   [Strongly agree, Agree, Disagree, Strongly disagree]

6. How would you rate the overall usefulness of the webinar?
   [Very useful, Useful, Fairly useful, Not useful]

7. I will use resources from the webinar in my work with refugees / asylum seekers
   [Yes, No]

8. Do you have any other suggestions for improving the technical (online) delivery of the webinar?

9. What webinar topics would you be interested in learning about in future?
ANNEX 4

CoP SURVEYS QUESTIONNAIRES

1. In which country do you work?
   Armenia, Austria, Belgium, Bulgaria, Croatia, Estonia, Finland, Germany, Greece, Italy, Ireland, Latvia, Lithuania, Montenegro, Portugal, Romania, Serbia, Slovakia, Spain, Sweden, The Netherlands, Other – please specify

2. What type of organisation do you work for?

3. What is your individual role in the organisation?
   Case management / social worker, Health and/or psychosocial service provider, Education service provider, Legal aid service provider, Livelihoods / employment services, Monitoring and evaluation / research, Grants/funding coordination, HR and/or general administration

4. I identify as...
   Female, Male, Non-binary, None of the above, Prefer not to say

5. To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements?
   The EURITA Community of Practice has helped increase collaboration and/or coordination between practitioners inside my country
   The EURITA Community of Practice has helped increase collaboration and/or coordination between practitioners beyond my country
   I will continue to engage with other practitioners I met through the EURITA CoP
   I have increased my knowledge of information sharing practices as a result of participating in the CoP
   I would recommend participating in a CoP on refugee integration to my colleagues
   Strongly agree, Agree, Disagree, Strongly disagree

6. Please outline an example of how practice or collaboration/coordination in your context has been improved as a result of your participation in the Community of Practice.

7. Do you have any suggestions for improving the CoP?

8. Which topic/question/challenge would you like to discuss in the next CoP? Please include some information about it below.

9. Would you like to be a featured member in an upcoming meeting?
   Yes, No

10. Would you like to share a project or programme initiative that has been successful with the group in an upcoming meeting?
    Yes, No

11. Would you like to be a co-facilitator or take another role in the CoP?
    Yes, No

ANNEX 4 CONTINUED

WEBINAR SURVEYS

1. To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements?
   I have increased my knowledge of information sharing practices as a result of participating in the CoP
   I would recommend participating in a CoP on refugee integration to my colleagues
   Strongly agree, Agree, Disagree, Strongly disagree

2. Do you have any suggestions for improving the CoP?

3. Which topic/question/challenge would you like to discuss in the next CoP? Please include some information about it below.

4. Would you like to be a featured member in an upcoming meeting?

5. Would you like to share a project or programme initiative that has been successful with the group in an upcoming meeting?

6. Would you like to be a co-facilitator or take another role in the CoP?
ANNEX 5  
PARTNERSHIP SURVEY QUESTIONNAIRE

1. What are your main areas of responsibility in the organisation?

2. According to you, what is the value added to your organisation by partnering with IRC?

3. Can you think of any other ways partnering with the IRC has added value to your organisation?

4. On a scale of 5 – 1, with 5 being the most positive, how would you rate the provision of in-country and virtual technical assistance (programmatic support) by the IRC?

5. Can you provide an example of an aspect of the in-country technical assistance that was particularly helpful?

6. On a scale of 5 – 1, with 5 being the most positive, do you feel that the knowledge you exchanged throughout EURITA enabled your organisation to improve the quality of your activities?

7. Can you give an example of the positive impact that the knowledge you received/exchanged had?

8. Is there anything else you would like to tell us about the technical assistance you received from the IRC? What, specifically, could the IRC have done differently to improve the technical assistance provided to your organisation?

9. On a scale of 5 – 1, with 5 being the most positive, how would you rate the progress you and your organisation made in the capacity to collect data, evaluate, and report on the project(s)? Aspects to keep in mind include the logframe and indicator development, along with monitoring tools that were supported by IRC.

10. Can you give an example of the positive progress in your capacity to collect and report data on project(s)?

11. Do you agree with the following statements?
   - We understand the IRC’s plans and policies
   - IRC staff ask us for our advice and guidance
   - We feel comfortable questioning the IRC’s understanding or actions if we disagree with them
   - We understood the purpose and expectations of the project from the initial onboarding
   - We understand how the IRC uses the information we provide
   - The monitoring and reporting we do for/with the IRC assists us in improving what we do
   - IRC internal reporting demands are useful and reasonable for evaluation
   - The IRC treats our organisation with respect
   - We feel comfortable approaching the IRC to discuss any problems we are having
   - The IRC is responsive to requests for support
   - The IRC communicates deadlines and expectations of partners
   - I am satisfied overall with our relation with the IRC
   - The IRC treats all partners equally
   - Consortium products equally promote the visibility of all partners
   - The IRC clearly explains any conditions imposed by external donors

12. Do you have any other comments or suggestions you would like to share on the overall consortium relationship?

13. Do you have any suggestions for improving the consortium relationship or programmatic assistance provided?

ANNEX 6  
AFTER ACTION REVIEW DISCUSSION GUIDE

1. The proposal submitted to AMIF made a risk assessment, categorised its level, and made some assumptions. Did we face any of these risks? Did our mitigation measures hold or were valid during the life of the project?

2. What have you changed in the way you design and/or implement CO programs? What has changed in the way to do pre-departure CO and/or in post-arrival CO or one-to-one CO? Is there something that you are doing (or will do) differently?

3. Was this the right combination of activities, was it too wide? Was it enough?

4. What changes are needed at the IRC to “host” this type of multi-stakeholder project in the future?

5. Those who answered the survey, found that EURITA has contributed to expanding the scope of their work. Can you provide an example?

6. Lessons Learned. What would you do differently? What would you continue doing?