



Education and Culture DG

Lifelong Learning Programme



The CLARITY project

Impact Study

Qualitative and quantitative analysis



Education and Culture DG

Lifelong Learning Programme



Introduction

A key part of the Lifelong Learning Programme is to assess and measure the impact of project work on the target groups and communities that each individual project is aimed at. An emphasis on measuring impact ensures that projects stay close to the real needs of the sector involved.

This report provides an overview of the Clarity project's achievements as regards impact. It includes both hard numbers (quantitative results) and a summary of soft measurables.

Preparation tasks

To prepare the partnership for the Impact Study work, the partners were asked to read the UK NA's "Making A Difference" guide, which was published on the partner section of our website with NA permission. The UK promoter tried to incorporate the relevant ideas from that guide into the Impact Questionnaires that were completed by each partner (see below). Point Europa also added additional material for the partnership as a whole.

Impact Strategy - material from the Agreement

Hard measurables

Hard indicators for impact (numbers as targets) were relatively clear for this project. Each of the four core partners (FR, HU, IT, UK) had the following targets:

- 3 migrants supported to become own-language trainers. All of the partners achieved or exceeded this target - we found that it was necessary to involve more than three individuals from an early stage of the project, in order to cover for drop-outs. The UK partner had the most complicated experience, having worked with a total of 11 individuals over the course of the project. Seven of these actually started the training and five completed the course to become Clarity trainers.
- At least 50 migrants given Clarity B training in each core partner. None of the partners achieved this figure. We know from hindsight that the target was set too high for a relatively modest project, although the reasons for non-achievement did vary amongst the partners:
 - The French partner chose Cambodian restaurant workers as their target group. They effectively worked with every available (legal) migrant in that sector in their city, so in this case no further realistic achievement was possible
 - The Hungarian and Italian partners worked with very small numbers of people from any given source: small construction businesses in the Hungarian case, and individual referrals/contacts in the Italian case. This meant that it was simply not possible to work with the very large number of sources that would have been necessary to achieve the target of 50



Education and Culture DG



Lifelong Learning Programme

participants; as it was, the Hungarian partner found some delays in completing their pilot training because of the need to work with many microbusinesses.

- The UK partner had the opposite problem. We worked with a small number of large enterprises, with up to 800 migrant workers in each. We put in a great deal of effort to provide exactly the training package that the employers wanted - at the factories, during or straight after work, using site-specific material. Our strenuous efforts to meet the employers' preferences, together with the significant complications arising from staggered shift patterns and wide fluctuations in workloads, meant that we found it very difficult indeed to pin down the businesses to definite dates and times. Three pilot training sessions were cancelled at short notice and two employers were in the end unable to take advantage of the Clarity offer within the available time period (though they are both still interested and willing to pay for the training). We encountered significant delays on completing the pilot testing and had to limit the delay, at the recommendation of the National Agency. All of this meant that we were finally only able to provide the training to 23 individuals.

Additional numbers were available for recording:

- Number of professionals contacted through dissemination, including Clarity Forums and the Local Network Directories
- Number and type of organisations contacted
- Number of dissemination contacts achieved, through wide-scale publicity work



Education and Culture DG

Lifelong Learning Programme



Soft measurables

These are targets with no specific target numbers attached as part of the project Agreement itself. However, we were able to set specific targets in the following areas:

Engagement with VET policy-makers

Statutory training is carefully regulated in each country: the goal was to have the Clarity courses accepted as equivalent qualifications, or at least a routeway established on achieving this. Each pilot training partner was asked to engage with the national VET structures in their countries, to try and develop a working relationship and seek the best possible level of official interest / accreditation of our new material. The results of this work are to be found in the separate report on national VET structures.

Impact on the sector - Network Directories and Clarity Forums

A principal impact / dissemination tool for the project were the Local Network Directories, listing the key contacts in our partner areas, and the Clarity Forums, which gave us specific dialogue with direct contact and involvement by relevant organisations in our countries. Each pilot training partner has prepared a summary on their Forum work, including the attendees and their interests and priorities; these are available as Attachment 7 of the Final Report attachment set.



Education and Culture DG

Lifelong Learning Programme



Impact on the sector - wider contacts

The sector-specific focus of our Dissemination Plan meant that we were in regular contact with the potential users of the project's results, using the Clarity Local Network Directories.

Previous experience across the consortium confirms that a genuinely useful project will be widely disseminated by users and well-wishers, above and beyond the specific tasks carried out by the partners themselves. This works through personal/professional networks, each starting from a particular point of contact with the project (eg, receipt of a relevant document, attendance at a presentation).

We measured the project's impact on the wider sector by asking the partners to record the total number of contacts that they achieved, as follows:

- Number of professionals in work related to the project (eg training centres, employers of migrant workers, support organisations)

- Number of organisations contacted

Impact on the migrant community

Statistics on the number of migrants in a given geographical area are notoriously unreliable, because there are no central records and a varying percentage of illegal and/or unregistered migrants to confound attempts at counting. This makes analysis of the impact percentages very difficult to achieve with any rigour. Nonetheless, the partners worked with migrant support groups and others to try and assess the project's impact as a proportion of the total need. We were of course able to assess and measure the direct impact on the project participants themselves, as described in the Hard Measurables sector above. So the questions asked were:

- How many migrants were directly involved in the project in some way. This figure is higher than the trainee + participant number, because of including from others who attended information sessions or made enquiries.
- Estimated number of migrants who will have become aware of the project - through shared use of space, visible posters and other publicity material, feedback from participants about numbers of people they are in contact with.
- Estimated number of migrants from the target language group, in the immediate area
- Percentage of project contact with the target group of migrants



Education and Culture DG

Lifelong Learning Programme



Clarity Impact Study - Results

<i>Indicator</i>	<i>Results Achieved</i>					<i>Comments</i>
	<i>FR</i>	<i>HU</i>	<i>IT</i>	<i>UK</i>	<i>Total</i>	
3 Migrant trainers	3	5	5	5	18	
50 Pilot testing participants	23	14	17	13	67	Underachieved in all countries
Professionals involved	22	37	21	56	136	Direct involvement - networked contact figure will be higher (x5?)
Organisations / businesses	16	14	11	32	74	
Dissemination contacts	Dissemination activities reached at least 5,000 separate contacts					Please see separate dissemination report
Migrants with direct contact	48	32	29	45	86	Good awareness via personal contact, discussions etc
Migrants aware of project	60	75	100	400	725	High in UK from factory publicity
Total contact with migrants	108	87	129	445	811	
Target migrants in partner area	150	2000	5000	9000	16,150	Estimated - include illegals
% of migrants reached	72%	4.3%	2.6%	4.9%	5%	FR - Total of Cambodian migrants is small, hence high %