



Culture and Art for Restorative Justice (CA4RJ)

Project No.: 2020-1-UK01-KA227-ADU-094445

Overall Project/partnership Assessment

EVALUATION REPORT

June 2023

By:



Éδρα

social
cooperative
activities
for vulnerable
groups

This project has been funded with support from the European Commission. The author is solely responsible for this publication (communication) and the Commission accepts no responsibility for any use may be made of the information contained therein. In compliance of the new GDPR framework, please note that the Partnership will only process your personal data in the sole interest and purpose of the project and without any prejudice to your rights.

Table of Contents

A few words about the Project	3
About this Report	3
Results	4
1) <i>First Section: General Assessment about the project/partnership and its results</i>	4
2) <i>Second Section: Project Management, partnership and task allocation</i> ...	6
3) <i>Third Section: Communication and Dissemination</i>	9
4) <i>Fourth Section: Impact and Sustainability</i>	11
CONCLUSIONS	13
Appendix 1:	14

A few words about the Project

Culture and Art for Restorative Justice (CA4RJ) has been created in order to bring a strategic partnership of VET providers, cultural and art organisations so that the power of art and restorative justice can be used to increase cultural awareness and thus contribute to the successful integration of migrant communities at one of the most challenging times for Europe.

About this Report

The following represents an overall final report on the operation of the Project during months 1-24. A questionnaire was completed by a representative from each of the 7 partner organisations, to assess the overall effectiveness of the project management and partnership working, delivery outputs achieved till the final date, as well as establishing any issues arising and ways in which the project could become sustainable in the future.

A copy of the Project's Overall Assessment Questionnaire used is contained in Appendix 1.

All monitoring, quality and impact evaluation activities to be carried out by the CA4RJ Project have been designed and described in a **Quality & Evaluation Strategy**. The Strategy has been designed to observe, track progress, quality and achievement, and in doing so involves methodological review and objective analysis, through direct users / partners questionnaires.

The following Objectives have been established for quality assurance and evaluation:

- Evaluate & assess the workings of the consortium as a partnership over the duration of the project, making recommendations at key stages, in terms of:
 - Roles and tasks division within the Project;
 - Level of engagement, contribution and mutual support of each partner;
 - Effectiveness of communication & decision-making processes by consortium;
 - Working methods and conflict management within the consortium; and
 - Recommendations for modifications and improvements.
- Identify elements of good practice in the development and delivery of the project;
- Measure the outputs achieved against the project work-plan and quality indicators
 - Concrete results in relation to the aims of the project;
 - Local impact of practices experimented; and
 - Real commitment of the beneficiaries towards the project phases.
- Contribute to the Project's Reporting Requirements as set including the production of an interim formative evaluation report and a final summative evaluation report.

Results

The evaluation questionnaire distributed to all partner organisations, with the request to be filled out by key staff members directly involved in the implementation of the project. The questionnaire was divided into 4 different sections, each corresponding to an aspect of the project. Each section started with some CLOSE-END questions (so we can clearly measure and compare results) and OPEN-END questions for partners to express their opinion. Partners were asked to offer clear, complete answers to contributed to compiling this final report.

The 4 different sections of questions were:

1. General about the project/partnership and its results
2. Project Management, partnership and task allocation
3. Communication and dissemination
4. Impact and sustainability

1) *First Section: General Assessment about the project/partnership and its results*

Partners were asked to rate the **General characteristics of the Project** to date against a range of variables, with a rating of 5 being very effective and 1 ineffective.

The results are set out in **Table 1** below, including a comparison to the scores provided for the previous 24-month period:

Table 1: Rating results of Section 1

General about the project/partnership and its results	Rating
The overall work plan was clear and realistic.	4,7
Timetable and objectives of the project were reasonable (workload adequate to the time allocated).	4,5
We were aware of the common project goals and our contribution to the project plan throughout the partnership.	4,7
Relevant topics were discussed when needed to support the progress of the project.	4,5
Partners remained committed to the project objectives and intended impact.	4,4

Partners incorporated the project's goals and impact in their institution.	4,5
We are satisfied with the quality of the outputs/products of the partnership.	4,2
The tangible outputs of the partnership met the expectations of the project design in terms of quality, content and impact.	4,5
The tangible outputs were practical, useful, effective and efficient for their purpose in transferring good, innovative and interactive practices.	4,4

Table 1 shows that partners consider the project to have been very effective, with all scores provided between 4.2 and 4.7 on average.

Taking into consideration the above results, it seems that there was clear work plan and task allocation, and everyone was aware of the project goals and objectives. Everything was discussed on time and partners seemed satisfied with communication channels between partners.

Partners gave feedback to the following open questions for the First Section:

Q: "Strong points: What were the strong points of the developed outcomes?"

The partners highlighted the following points as the strongest assets of the developed outcomes:

- The strong point had to do with the exploration of art as a form of justice and art as a form of healing, and how this is already impacting people who have been displaced. Taking from this, there is a palpable strategy to amplify impact and support for those in need.
- Another strong point appears to be the fact that the **outcomes are based on real, current migrant needs** through relevant field research. They present the current state of the art from different states and cover a variety of topics.
- Partnership used **end-users feedback** in all training materials and outcomes.
- The creation of the **user scrutiny panel** for the feedback by professionals working with migrants to ensure validity, was proved a strong, crucial point for project evaluation.
- The outcomes produced contain **useful tools and educational visual materials and sources, on-the-point workshops and activities for migrants, practical ideas and case-studies**, while they are also offered in multiple languages.

Q: "Weak points: What were the weak points of the developed outcomes?"

Some partners sited the following points as the weakest points of the developed outcomes:

"I do not believe we went as in-depth as we could have in the developed topics,

"The European Commission support for the production of this publication does not constitute an endorsement of the contents which reflects the views only of the authors, and the Commission cannot be held responsible for any use which may be made of the information contained therein."

and it was difficult to find large groups of people to implement the report with."

"Instead of weaknesses, we believe that the project and its products have many challenges in terms of the integration of the adult migrants."

"I believe that the main weak point is the final long version of the e-book, which features chapters in different languages. It should have been all translated in all languages so everyone can read in detail the findings from other countries as well."

"Staff change of coordinator organisation was risky - we were happy to have Sofia to bring the project to a good end."

2) Second Section: Project Management, partnership and task allocation

Partners were asked to rate the operation of the project management & partnership to date against a range of variables, with a rating of 5 being very effective and 1 ineffective.

The results are set out in **Table 2** below, including a comparison to the scores provided for the previous 24 month period.

The results are set out in **Table 2** below:

Table 2: Project Management & Partnership Working

Project Management, partnership and task allocation	Rating
How would you rate the overall project management of the project?	4,2
How would you rate the coordination of the financial management in the project?	4,5
How would you rate the decision-making process of the partnership?	4,7
How would you rate the risk management and issues resolution process of the partnership?	4,7
The coordinator offered reliable guidance to the consortium (in-kind recourses like skills, expertise, information, connections, influence, space etc.).	4,4

"The European Commission support for the production of this publication does not constitute an endorsement of the contents which reflects the views only of the authors, and the Commission cannot be held responsible for any use which may be made of the information contained therein."

The coordinator promoted of teamwork.	4,5
The coordinator promoted partners' engagement.	4,5
Internal communication tools were adequate to support our work / communication process.	4,4
Partners were able to share their point of view and suggestions freely.	4,7
There was a clear design for cooperative production of project's results.	4,5
The partners were committed to efficient and effective performance (on time, on budget, with quality).	4,4
The partners made an effort to respect the deadlines, task allocation and assigned work plan.	4,4

Table 2 shows that partners consider the partnership working to have been very effective thus far, with all scores provided between 4,2 and 4,7 on average.

Partners gave feedback to the following open questions for the Second Section:

Q: "Elaborate a bit on the quality of the partnership."

Partners concluded the following:

Our project begun with a qualified partnership that brings a mixture of expertise and backgrounds. Our strategic partnership included: two UK organisations (Reframe House & Rj4All), two Greek NGOs (IASIS & EDRA) both active in the support of vulnerable groups, a Turkish education association for adult learners (CERA), a Spanish training centre (CIS) and a Cypriot research institute with expertise in migrants' integration (RESET). Based on the

distribution of the tasks and responsibilities, all the project partners were actively involved in the project activities. People in the partnership were keen to make the project work and all were collaborative and supportive. All made their effort to contribute to the fullest extent possible and to respect the deadlines, while all produced materials and activities were of high standard and quality because partners spent genuine time on this.

Q: "Please add details on the specific **activities** implemented by you/ your organization."

RJ4All

"RJ4All had the overall management and coordination of the project, while it also had the lead on the e-course accreditation and the e-books design, development and publication. We delivered all our tasks and guidelines on time, respecting partners' work and commitment. Also, we actively participated in all other IOs, apart from the ones leading. We took over Module 1 of our training programme, which was designed and planned based on Restorative Justice and Restorative Justice Art. We piloted both live and online IO2 with practitioners working with migrants, and we implemented 3 art workshops with migrants. Eventually, we came up with the UK national report (both short and long version) for the final E-book, capturing all the previous research and findings. On top of that we disseminated the project and its outputs widely throughout the project life-cycle and we implemented evaluations in each step. We appointed our USP member and also we have planned our Multiplier Event, doing all the necessary steps and preparing all the essential documentation."

Reframe House:

"We delivered all materials for the modules and materials on time and we made use of multi-media to enhance the material we supported with. We made sure we supported the project through a first person testimonial about the power of art for healing. Reframe was involved from the start, at the early brainstorming and strategy stages, to final deliverables. We worked predominantly in tandem with RJ4All as UK partners, and collaborated with various members of their team. Reframe was involved in two in-person TPMs and one remote one, as well as in conducting live and online workshops for the project. We collaborated with RJ4All to produce the final written report and will continue to support and disseminate the material. Reframe also continued to implement visual arts projects to support people who have been displaced, and can implement the material produced moving forward."

EDRA:

"We made focus groups researching the current situation of migrants. We created educational material and theory about them. We were responsible for IO2. We materialised various workshops. We materialised a multiplier event at the end of June'23. We wrote a chapter about the situation in Greece. We organised evaluation procedures for the project. We were the evaluation managers of the Project, creating questionnaires and reports about TPMs, each of the four outputs, USP panel contribution for each TPM, quarterly reports, multiplier events evaluation, e.t.c."

RESET

"RESET was the leader of IO1: Culture and Art for Restorative Justice Manual. RESET developed the methodology guidelines for partners to conduct their fieldwork. Fieldwork was conducted by RESET as well, where professionals working with migrants were gathered in focus group. Following, RESET overviewed the development of the reports while also creating its country report. After the reports were created RESET gathered them and provided feedback to the partners. Following RESET compiled the document and send it to the responsible partner. In regards to IO2: Culture and Art for restorative justice training courses with workers and cultural/creative professionals. RESET contributed to the decision of the final module topics. The allocated module was developed by RESET. Following when all modules were finalised they were compiled by RESET and send to the responsible partners. RESET also conducted the required piloting under IO2 where the material was presented to professionals working with migrants and developed the required documents. Furthermore, RESET contributed to the registrations of the e-course. In regards to IO3: Culture and Art for Restorative Justice pilots with migrants RESET organised 3 creative workshops with the total of 30 participants. One artistic workshop, one djembe (African drum) workshop and one theatrical expression workshop was organised. Following, 2 case studies were identified and shared their experience. Based on the aforementioned, RESET developed the required reports and materials. RESET's contribution for IO4: Culture and Art for Restorative Justice eBook, the findings and experience of RESET was developed in two documents. One document was developed in English and the other in the national language. Furthermore, RESET was responsible for the topic of the User-scrutiny panel to be discussed in TPMs based on instructions from the coordinator. Furthermore, RESET contributed to the evaluation and the dissemination of the project."

CERA

CERA implemented all project activities during the implementation of the project and delivered the project results including focus groups, educational material creation, workshops, writing a chapter, evaluation procedures, multiplier event.

"The European Commission support for the production of this publication does not constitute an endorsement of the contents which reflects the views only of the authors, and the Commission cannot be held responsible for any use which may be made of the information contained therein."

CIS

"We conducted focus groups researching the current situation of migrants. We contributed to the creation of educational material and theory about them. We organised dissemination of the project. We materialised workshops in Spain online and presential for different pilot groups. We wrote a chapter about the situation in Spain for result 4. As dissemination leaders we were responsible for the website."

3) Third Section: Communication and Dissemination

Partners were asked to rate Communication and Dissemination to date against a range of variables, with a rating of 5 being very effective and 1 ineffective.

The results are set out in Table 3 below:

Table 3: Communication and Dissemination

Communication and Dissemination	Rating
The dissemination strategy provided an efficient way to reach target audiences & stakeholders.	4,5
The dissemination plan was tailored easily to our specific needs and updated when needed.	4,5
The dissemination activities were effective to reach the targeted audiences relevant in each phase of the project.	4,4
The channels used for communication were able to bring the necessary visibility at the national, European and/or international level and contact our audiences.	4,5
The target group(s) were responding to our communication strategy.	4,5
The project reputation has been growing since the beginning of the project.	4,7

Table 3 shows that partners consider the delivery outputs produced to date have been very effective, with all scores provided between 4,4 and 4,7 on average.

The average scores reflect a high level of satisfaction from partners.

The dissemination and exploitation of the project seems to work well, and partners have discussed and formed clear plan and strategies to reach the intended impact. Throughout the project partners sought to disseminate the results and spread the word of the project, and this is something they will continue doing even after the funded period is over.

Partners gave feedback to the following open questions for the Third Section:

Q: "Which were the main dissemination activities you have conducted so far?"

Main dissemination activities materialised by all partners equally were:

Online, face-to-face dissemination of project, training sessions, piloting sessions, social media posts about the content, newsletters about the progress of the project. Promotion of the project in national events that especially invited stakeholders and networks interested. Presentation of the project in the context of other events.

Some examples of stakeholders approached and activities stated:

CERA had a constant cooperation with the Adult Training Centre and Directorate of National Education in Nevsehir Province, which will disseminate the project at local and regional level, while it will exploit the training materials of the project. CERA held meetings at local or regional level to illustrate the products, results and its benefit and to motivate them to be project supporters. CERA held local events and activities for the promotion and dissemination of the IOs, while shared 4 newsletters and a press release on our social media accounts and website.

CIS: "In Andalusia the major part of youth and social work is done by the municipalities. Thus, we aim to win them as multipliers as they have stable funding."

Reframe House has been involved in face-to-face dissemination strategies through presentations over zoom at the London Therapy Center, in person with L'Altre Festival in Barcelona, and through live workshops with RJ4All. Reframe have also shared the material through all social media channels, as well as targeted groups of people who have been displaced from home (WhatsApp, FB groups, etc).

RESET conducted various dissemination activities. Social media posts were created in the organisation's social media accounts. Relevant workshops were conducted in events where the project was disseminated, while also informing the population about the projects through attendance in festival days such as the Diversity Fair, FEMFest festival and Europe Day. Furthermore, RESET informed stakeholders about the project.

Q: "Please add any suggestions/comment for improvement on dissemination."

- Publication of piloting and workshops should take place earlier in the project to ensure larger audiences.
- Follow-up with the recipients of the dissemination materials.
- Ways to amplify the reach even further through a continued use of the material with targeted groups.
- Distribution of the e-books.

The dissemination and exploitation activities are essential for achieving multiple and EU-wide project impact. Therefore, it is important that our cultural and social policy partners as

"The European Commission support for the production of this publication does not constitute an endorsement of the contents which reflects the views only of the authors, and the Commission cannot be held responsible for any use which may be made of the information contained therein."

well as their and staff directly involved in the project exchange experiences and skills with each other throughout and after the development of the project, expand their network, improve their knowledge about the integration of migrants, and be equipped with an innovative training package to integrate into their activities.

4) *Fourth Section: Impact and Sustainability*

Partners were asked to rate the **Impact and Sustainability of the Project** to date against a range of variables, with a rating of 5 being very effective and 1 ineffective.

The results are set out in **Table 4** below, including a comparison to the scores provided for the previous 24-month period.

Table 4: Rating results of Section 4

Impact and Sustainability	Rating
The project results managed to contribute to the field of migrant integration through accredited training and other social actions using arts & restorative justice.	4,5
The project results managed to contribute to connecting cultural and art organisations with civil society, and strengthening cross-sectorial cooperation.	4,7
The project results managed to transfer good, innovative, interactive and effective practices for migrant integration, using arts & restorative justice.	4,8
Are the project's results and products useful and beneficial for your organisation?	4,7
Are the project's results and products useful and beneficial on a national and European level?	4,8
The strategy of the partnership to sustain and maintain the results and products of the project in the long period is effective and offers practical ideas and sustainability efforts.	4,7

The strategy to sustain and maintain the results and products of the project offers valuable suggestions for stakeholder engagement .	4,8
The strategy to sustain and maintain the results and products of the project offers valuable suggestions for financial sustainability .	4,2
The strategy to sustain and maintain the results and products of the project offers valuable suggestions for empowering partners and their staff to sustain and maintain the results.	4,5

Table 4 shows that partners consider the project to have been very effective, with all scores provided between 4,5 and 4.8 on average.

Partners gave feedback to the following open questions for the Fourth Section:

Q: "How will the results and products developed be useful and beneficial for the project's target group?"

Partners agreed that project's products are beneficial for its target groups in the following ways:

- Having a clearly documented and supported explanation as to how art can be used in tandem with restorative justice for migrant integration is pivotal to the successful intercultural exchange which is currently taking place in Europe and beyond. This material can provide solace and a road to healing and integration after suffering harrowing situations.
- Professionals working with migrants will be able to enhance their knowledge in regards to how arts can be used to bring the population together and how to address trauma. Furthermore, the material can also be used inside of the organisation enhancing the skills of the staff.
- The general public can also be enrolled and becoming aware of the challenges faced by migrants. They can benefited by the training programme, which will be offered both online and face-to-face and of course they can have unlimited access to our e-books, in order to be aware of the state-of-the-art and beneficial approaches.
- Through the project's various intellectual outputs, including its training, multiplier events, books, policy recommendations and best practices, it is expected that those

"The European Commission support for the production of this publication does not constitute an endorsement of the contents which reflects the views only of the authors, and the Commission cannot be held responsible for any use which may be made of the information contained therein."

working in the field of migrants integration will increase their knowledge. Better and more on the ground policies and practices are expected to be developed that reflect the real needs and wants of our marginalized target group. By extension and in the long term we expect our results to prevent the exclusion and marginalization of migrants and contribute to their social integration, taking also into account the new circumstances resulted from COVID-19.

CONCLUSIONS

The findings from the overall assessment questionnaires suggest that the CA4RJ Project operated very well in general with a high level of satisfaction from partners and success in achieving what has been planned to date. After collecting, analysing and discussing all responses from participants we are able to draw some final conclusions and recommendations. At first glance, it seems that the questionnaire collected rather positive feedback and overall, partners remained satisfied at the end of the project. Namely, all tables average scores reflect a high level of satisfaction from partners. With one or the other way and despite any arising problems and difficulties, partners found their way to produce results of high quality that can be an added value to migrant integration.

Final thoughts to conclude:

- The dissemination and promotion of the project results and outputs are really significant at local, regional, national and international levels not only in just the partner countries but also in Europe and all over the world.
- To have a continuous funding for the project, the decision makers should be convinced on the effectiveness and the impacts of the project on the migrant integration in the society. One recommendation for the exploitation of project results and outputs at national and international levels is to disseminate the training materials, e-learning platform, and evaluation reports widely among relevant stakeholders, including policymakers, NGOs, and community organizations working with migrants on issues related to restorative justice and art. This can help raise awareness about the potential benefits of using art and restorative justice practices for migrant integration and promote the adoption of similar programs in other countries or contexts.
- Additionally, organizing conferences or workshops to share project results and best practices with interested parties can further enhance the impact of the project.
- The engagement of end-users in the project proved to be challenging but crucial.

Appendix 1:

Overall Assessment Questionnaire

Country

**Organisation
Name**

Please rate the effectiveness of the following for the CA4RJ Project:

Rating out of 5:

1- strongly disagree;

2 – disagree;

3 – uncertain/not applicable;

4 – agree;

5 – strongly agree.

General about the project/partnership and its results	Rating
The overall work plan was clear and realistic.	
Timetable and objectives of the project were reasonable (workload adequate to the time allocated).	
We were aware of the common project goals and our contribution to the project plan throughout the partnership.	
Relevant topics were discussed when needed to support the progress of the project.	
Partners remained committed to the project objectives and intended impact.	
Partners incorporated the project's goals and impact in their institution.	
We are satisfied with the quality of the outputs/products of the partnership.	
The tangible outputs of the partnership met the expectations of the project design in terms of quality, content and impact.	

The tangible outputs were practical, useful, effective and efficient for their purpose in transferring good, innovative and interactive practices.	
Strong points: What were the strong points of the developed outcomes?	<i>Please elaborate.</i>
Weak points: What were the weak points of the developed outcomes?	<i>Please elaborate.</i>
Project Management, partnership and task allocation	Rating
How would you rate the overall project management of the project?	
How would you rate the coordination of the financial management in the project?	
How would you rate the decision-making process of the partnership?	
How would you rate the risk management and issues resolution process of the partnership?	
The coordinator offered reliable guidance to the consortium (in-kind recourses like skills, expertise, information, connections, influence, space etc.).	
The coordinator promoted of teamwork.	
The coordinator promoted partners' engagement.	
Internal communication tools were adequate to support our work / communication process.	

Partners were able to share their point of view and suggestions freely.	
There was a clear design for cooperative production of project's results.	
The partners were committed to efficient and effective performance (on time, on budget, with quality).	
The partners made an effort to respect the deadlines, task allocation and assigned work plan.	
Elaborate a bit on the quality of the partnership.	<i>Please elaborate.</i>
Please add details on the specific activities implemented by you/ your organization. Make specific reference if your team has been delivering results in a timely and cost-effective manner- in particular, in case of delay/inconsistency; let us know the reason and corrective actions you implemented to get back on track	<i>Please elaborate.</i>
Communication and Dissemination	Rating
The dissemination strategy provided an efficient way to reach target audiences & stakeholders.	
The dissemination plan was tailored easily to our specific needs and updated when needed.	
The dissemination activities were effective to reach the targeted audiences relevant in each phase of the project.	
The channels used for communication were able to bring the necessary visibility at the national, European and/or international level and contact our audiences.	
The target group(s) were responding to our communication strategy.	
The project reputation has been growing since the beginning of the project.	

Which were the main dissemination activities you have conducted so far?	<i>Please elaborate.</i>
Are you happy with your organisation's dissemination results?	<i>Please elaborate.</i>
Please add any suggestions/comment for improvement on dissemination. Suggest what can be done better/differently to increase project's visibility at any level.	<i>Please elaborate.</i>
Impact and Sustainability	Rating
The project results managed to contribute to the field of migrant integration through accredited training and other social actions using arts & restorative justice.	
The project results managed to contribute to connecting cultural and art organisations with civil society, and strengthening cross-sectorial cooperation.	
The project results managed to transfer good, innovative, interactive and effective practices for migrant integration, using arts & restorative justice.	
How will the results and products developed be useful and beneficial for the project's target group?	<i>Please elaborate.</i>
Are the project's results and products useful and beneficial for your organisation?	
Are the project's results and products useful and beneficial on a national and European level?	

<p>The strategy of the partnership to sustain and maintain the results and products of the project in the long period is effective and offers practical ideas and sustainability efforts.</p>	
<p>The strategy to sustain and maintain the results and products of the project offers valuable suggestions for stakeholder engagement.</p>	
<p>The strategy to sustain and maintain the results and products of the project offers valuable suggestions for financial sustainability.</p>	
<p>The strategy to sustain and maintain the results and products of the project offers valuable suggestions for empowering partners and their staff to sustain and maintain the results.</p>	