



Active Inclusion: Collected Practices Evaluation Grid

Instructions and Glossary

The evaluation grid should be used to assess the collected practices against pre-determined Standards that have been informed by research and debate.

Participants will work in small groups within their sub-theme to discuss and assess the collected practices against the evaluation grid. Each person in the group will then complete an individual evaluation grid for each collected practice.

The scores for all the collected practices for that sub-theme will then be collated. The 10 collected practices with the highest assessment marks will then be reviewed again by the participants and the 6 most innovative and effective collected practices selected. This selection will be made based on discussions and the total score of each collected practice.

How to use the Evaluation Grid

The evaluation grid is made up of 8 Standards. These are: General approach; Structural; Finance; Sustainability; Evaluation; Learning; Innovation; The User's Voice; and Transferability. Each Standard is then broken down into more detailed Criteria which provide a more explicit description of the Standard.

Assessing the Collected Practices

- **0** - the Criteria should be marked with 0 if there is no evidence that the collected practice does not comply with it.
- **1** - the Criteria should be marked with 1 if there is evidence that the criteria is covered but only partially.
- **2** - the Criteria should be marked with 2 if there is evidence that the collected practice fully complies it.

The total assessment mark for each collected practice is the sum of the assessment marks for each Criteria.

Significance Multipliers

- Some of the Criteria are more important than others. That is why some of the Criteria should also be assessed by using a significance multiplier. The assessment mark attributed to those criteria will then be multiplied by either 2, 3 or 6, depending on the criteria. For example, since the European Commission is very much interested in what is innovative, the significance multiplier for innovation is 6.

Glossary

I. General Approach

- I.1 Evidence based** - there is evidence from robust research that supports the approach taken in the intervention. For example, there is wider evidence (and not just research relating to the specific intervention) that provides a clear, plausible rationale for why the service should work.
- I.2 Clear definition of the problem** – there is clear description of what issue/problem the intervention is trying to overcome.
- I.3 Inter-agency co-operation** – the intervention is made up of, or involves, two or more agencies.
- I.6 Active Inclusion principles** – this means that the intervention combines, in a balanced way, adequate income support; inclusive labour markets; and access to quality services.

II. Structural

- II.1 Goals** – these are sometimes defined as a general objective. They are statements that describe what the project will accomplish.
- II.2 Outputs** – these are deliverables or tangible things. They are results that are achieved immediately after the implementation of an activity e.g. sessions provided / completed.
- II.3 Outcomes** – these are the long term results that related to the goals of the intervention. They usually appear after some time after the activity and suggest some change at the ground level e.g. numbers securing employment.

III. Evaluation

- III.1 Evaluation** – an evaluation is an objective process of understanding how a policy or other intervention was implemented, what effects it had, for whom, how and why. Evaluations can be divided into the following three main types:
- **Process evaluation:** looks at how the policy was delivered. It assesses whether a policy is being implemented as intended and what, in practice, is felt to be working more or less well, and why.
 - **Impact evaluation:** looks at what the impacts of the policy were. It attempts to provide an objective test of what changes have occurred, and the extent to which these can be attributed to the policy.
 - **Economic evaluation:** looks at did the benefits justify the costs. In simple terms, it compares the benefits of the policy with its costs.

Scoring

- **Score '0'** if the intervention has not been evaluated
- **Score '1'** if the intervention has been evaluated using a process evaluation
- **Score '1'** if the evaluation has been evaluated but it is not clear what evaluation type has been used
- **Score '2'** if the intervention has been evaluated using an impact, or economic evaluation.

III.3 Effectiveness – there is evidence that the goals of the intervention are being achieved and the targeted problem(s) are being solved. The effect of the intervention of 'soft skills' should also be taken into account – this includes those skills that prepare the beneficiaries for the job market (e.g. confidence, agency, literacy etc.)

III.4 Social and Environmental benefits – there is evidence that the intervention has wider beneficial or favourable impacts on people, communities, places, or the environment. Often these benefits cannot be 'traded' in markets, and have no 'associated costs' to them so no price is directly paid by the individual to receive them.

IV. Learning

IV.1 Learning points – the intervention shows new and interesting ways of tackling unemployment and enhancing social inclusion amongst disadvantaged groups, as well as providing key lessons learnt in terms of what to do and what not to do.

V. Innovation

V.1 Innovation – innovation can be defined as the successful exploitation of new ideas ('Innovation nation', DIUS, 2008). In the context of ESF this can include new approaches, tools, methods and service provision to extend employment and raise skills. It can also mean adapting and applying existing approaches, tools, methods and services to new regions, sectors or target groups.

VI. The User's Voice

V1.1 Users - the users of the intervention are those that directly use it, and benefit from it.

VII. Transferability

VII.1 Context-dependent – an intervention is considered context-dependent if its impact and functionality depends to a large extent on the labour market, on the existence of a particular institutional architecture or other structural factors specific to that particular country or region. The more context-dependent an intervention is the less likely it is for it to transfer well to other sites.