

# The Gilfillan Partnership

RESEARCH AND EVALUATION SERVICES

**Language Interpreter Training as a Stepping Stone to Work**  
(UK/12/LLP-LdV/TOI-56)

## FINAL EVALUATION REPORT



Report title:	<i>Language Interpreter Training as a Stepping Stone to Work</i>
Report type:	Final evaluation report
Report commissioned by:	Mark Mitchell, Community Action Dacorum
Report author:	Liz Mackie, The Gilfillan Partnership
Contact telephone:	The Gilfillan Partnership: 020 8974 8909
Contact e-mail:	<a href="mailto:liz@sharedenterprise.org.uk">liz@sharedenterprise.org.uk</a>
Date:	8 October 2014

*This project has been funded with support from the European Commission. This publication reflects the views only of the author, and the Commission cannot be held responsible for any use which may be made of the information contained therein.*

## CONTENTS

		<b>Page</b>
<b>ONE</b>	<b>INTRODUCTION</b>	<b>5</b>
1.1	Language Interpreter Training as a Stepping Stone to Work	5
1.2	The transfer of innovation	5
1.3	The LITSSW delivery model	6
1.4	Intended results and impacts	6
1.5	Evaluation	7
<b>TWO</b>	<b>EVALUATION FINDINGS</b>	<b>9</b>
2.1	Achievement of intended results	9
2.2	Achievement of intended impacts	12
2.3	Working in partnership	21
2.4	Sustainability	22
2.5	Dissemination	24
2.6	Project management	24
2.7	Lessons learned	25
<b>THREE</b>	<b>CONCLUSIONS</b>	<b>26</b>
3.1	Overall conclusion	26
3.2	Results	26
3.3	Impacts	26
3.4	Working in partnership	27
3.5	Project management	27
3.6	Dissemination	27
3.7	Areas for improvement	28
3.8	Sustainability	28
3.9	Future development	28
 <b>ANNEXES</b>		
ONE	Public service agency interviewees	31
TWO	Evaluation results: tables	33
THREE	Evaluation results: final conference	35

		<b>Page</b>
<b>TABLES</b>		
I	Achievement of intended results	10
II	Public service agencies engaged with the pilot training courses	12
III	Pilot training course participants	14
IV	Learner ratings	15
V	Learner ratings	16
VI	What was valuable about this course?	17
VII	Knowledge of how to provide high quality interpreting	32
VIII	Confidence to act as an interpreter	32
IX	What was valuable about this course?	33
X	Understanding of how public services are organised	33
XI	Working as a paid interpreter for public service agencies	34

## **ONE: INTRODUCTION**

### **1.1 Language Interpreter Training as a Stepping Stone to Work**

This is the final report of the external evaluation of the Language Interpreter Training as a Stepping Stone to Work (LITSSW) project. The external evaluation was carried out by The Gilfillan Partnership.

The LITSSW project was a Transfer of Innovation project funded through the Leonardo Da Vinci strand of the European Commission's Lifelong Learning Programme. The project was led by Dacorum Council for Voluntary Service (DCVS) and took place over a 24 month period from October 2012 to September 2014.

Dacorum CVS (working name Community Action Dacorum) is a voluntary organisation based in Hemel Hempstead in the UK providing a range of support services for local voluntary and community groups. In the LITSSW project DCVS Community Action Dacorum worked in partnership with:

- RUNI Centre, a not for profit educational centre in Sofia, Bulgaria;
- Iberika, a private language school for adult learners in Berlin, Germany;
- Il Centro per lo Sviluppo Creativo Danilo Dolci (CSC), a centre for community action in Sicily, Italy;
- Active Citizens Partnership (ACP), a not for profit organisation supporting vulnerable individuals and communities in Greece.

### **1.2 The transfer of innovation**

The aim of the LITSSW project was to transfer an innovative model of language interpreter training from DCVS Community Action Dacorum to the four partner organisations.

DCVS Community Action Dacorum began delivering interpreter training following research in 2001 which showed that local public service providers needed better access to quality interpreters. The same research identified that there were local people with the necessary language skills but who lacked any training or certification to act as public service interpreters. To fill this gap, DCVS Community Action Dacorum established the Herts Interpreting and Translation Service (HITS) which provides interpreting services to a range of public and private agencies across the southern English counties, and which also delivers interpreter training courses to enable local people to learn the skills and achieve the qualifications required to become professional interpreters.

HITS delivers the nationally recognised Diploma in Public Service Interpreting (DPSI) which comprises 120 hours of tutored learning and is accredited by the Chartered Institute of Linguists. HITS has a growing reputation as an excellent provider of

interpreter training. HITS students have won numerous awards and the service itself won national awards for best DPSI examination results in 2007, 2010 and 2014.

HITS also deliver an Introduction to Public Service Interpreting. This is a shorter, 36 hour course which was developed by HITS to provide introductory training for people who are not yet ready take on the commitment of the full DPSI training. The short course constitutes the first quarter of the DPSI course and can be counted towards the Diploma for learners who decide to progress on to this.

The LITSSW project aimed to transfer the 36 hour Introduction to Public Service Interpreting course to RUNI Centre, Iberika, CSC and ACP.

### **1.3 The LITSSW delivery model**

The 36 hour interpreter training course was transferred to the partner organisations through the following process:

- An initial needs analysis was carried out by each partner to identify the context for interpreter training in each country including: the main migrant communities and language needs; the organisation and accreditation of interpreter training; the use of interpreters for public services.
- Two trainers from each partner organisation received two days training at DCVS Community Action Dacorum in May 2013 to prepare them for running the pilot training courses.<sup>1</sup>
- DCVS Community Action Dacorum provided the course outline and training materials for the 36 hour training course. The partner organisations adapted these materials to suit their local circumstances.
- The interpreter training course was piloted twice by each partner. Each partner recruited groups of at least 10 learners to take part in the pilot training courses. The first pilots took place in summer 2013. Partners exchanged their experiences of the first pilot courses during the third project meeting, which took place in Athens in January 2014. Ideas for adaptations to the interpreter training course were agreed in Athens and implemented by the partners in the second pilots which took place in spring 2014.

### **1.4 Intended results and impacts**

The LITSSW partners identified 50 results that they intended to achieve during the project period. These are the tangible outputs of the project and include reports, newsletters and leaflets. The results are listed in Section 2.1 of this report, where their achievement is considered.

---

<sup>1</sup> Unfortunately, due to restrictions imposed by the UK Border Agency, one trainer from CSC was unable to travel to Hemel Hempstead to take part in this training.

The project application identified a number of impacts which the project was intended to achieve. The intended impacts were:

- Impact 1: Public service agencies engaged with the project will increase their understanding of and interest in interpreting as a means of breaking down communication barriers;
- Impact 2: Individuals from migrant communities will have a pathway towards improving engagement with wider society;
- Impact 3: An improvement in community cohesion resulting from learners and public sector guest speakers interacting in the classroom and through visits by learners to public sector delivery settings;
- Impact 4: An improvement in cohesion between learners resulting from studying alongside people from different linguistic and cultural backgrounds;
- Impact 5: Progression of learners into further studies and/or employment;
- Impact 6: Academic institutions are engaged with the project and involved in discussions towards accreditation of the course;
- Impact 7: An improvement in understanding by learners of how public services are delivered and confidence in engaging with these services;
- Impact 8: Local social enterprises are developed to offer interpreting services to public sector agencies, NGOs and individuals.

The progress made in achieving each of these impacts is considered in Section 2.2 of this report.

## **1.5 Evaluation**

The LITSSW partners commissioned The Gilfillan Partnership to carry out an external evaluation of the project. The partners required an external evaluation to review the effectiveness of their activities and to support any improvements that could be made. The external evaluation ran alongside the internal evaluation activities carried out by the partners which included reviews of project progress and collecting and analysing partners' feedback from each project meeting.

The external evaluation addresses the following questions:

1. Have the project's intended results been delivered?
2. Have the intended impacts of the project been achieved?
3. What value has been achieved by working within a European partnership?
4. How sustainable are the results and impacts of the project?

5. Has dissemination of the project been effective?
6. What lessons have the partners learned from this project?
7. Are there any elements of project organisation and delivery that could be improved for this or for future projects?

The external evaluation used a range of methods, as detailed in the project evaluation framework which is available from DCVS Community Action Dacorum. The main methods were:

- Participation in three project meetings (the second, third and final project meetings which took place in Hemel Hempstead, Athens and Berlin);
- Interviews with each project partner;
- Design and analysis of evaluation feedback questionnaires and interview templates. These were used by RUNI Centre, Iberika, CSC and ACP to collect feedback from participants of the pilot interpreter training courses and from public service agencies engaged with the pilot courses;
- Review of information collected through internal evaluation processes, including feedback from partners after each project meeting;
- Design and analysis of evaluation feedback from participants at the final conference which took place in Berlin in September 2014.

## **TWO: EVALUATION FINDINGS**

### **2.1 Achievement of intended results**

The LITSSW project has delivered almost all of its intended results. The remaining results are the final project report and final financial report. These are due within two months of project completion (i.e. by end of November 2014) and will undoubtedly be completed by that deadline. The completed results are shown in Table I.

All the results have been delivered to a good standard. Taken together, the project results form an excellent documentary record of project progress and achievements. Some of the project results are very good indeed and offer a best practice approach which should be adopted in future projects. These include:

- The Quality Interpretation Analysis Report from each partner country (results 1 to 5) and the summary of the five partner reports (result 6). These reports presented analysis and conclusions from research carried out by each partner into the context for interpreting services in each country, with particular reference to migrant communities. The research reports provide the context for the transfer of innovation to each partner country. They identify key stakeholders to be engaged through the project and issues for interpreter training and for migrant communities.
- The project newsletters (results 10 to 12). The project intended to produce three newsletters over two years but actually produced six. The newsletters are interesting and informative and have been widely circulated.
- The minutes of project meetings (results 29 to 32) were clearly written and included all relevant information, points of discussion, agreements and decisions. The minutes are an excellent record of project progress and decision making.
- The reports of the pilot training courses (results 15 to 22) were a particularly useful means of documenting and sharing the partners' experiences of piloting the interpreter training. While verbal feedback in project meetings is a useful means of sharing information about delivery experiences, the written report format used in the LITSSW project provided additional information, in a comparable format, and is an exemplary approach to collecting and sharing information about project activities within partnership projects.

Table I: Achievement of intended results

<b>Results</b>		<b>Achieved Yes/No</b>
1	Quality interpretation analysis report - Bulgaria	Yes
2	Quality interpretation analysis report - Germany	Yes
3	Quality interpretation analysis report - Greece	Yes
4	Quality interpretation analysis report - Italy	Yes
5	Quality interpretation analysis report - UK	Yes
6	Quality interpretation analysis: executive summary of partner reports	Yes
7	Dissemination strategy	Yes
8	External evaluation – mid-term report	Yes
9	External evaluation – final report	Yes
10	Project newsletter Issue 1	Yes
11	Project newsletter Issue 2	Yes
12	Project newsletter Issue 3	Yes
13	Project website	Yes
14	Sustainability strategy	Yes
15	Report on pilot version 1 training - Bulgaria	Yes
16	Report on pilot version 1 training - Germany	Yes
17	Report on pilot version 1 training - Greece	Yes
18	Report on pilot version 1 training - Italy	Yes
19	Report on pilot version 2 training - Bulgaria	Yes
20	Report on pilot version 2 training - Germany	Yes
21	Report on pilot version 2 training - Greece	Yes
22	Report on pilot version 2 training - Italy	Yes
23	Final training package (classroom)	Yes
24	Development of e-learning modules for pilot in second version training	Yes
25	Final version e-learning modules (2)	Yes
26	Report on course accreditation	Yes
27	Project dissemination event	Yes
28	Dissemination report	Yes
29	Partner meeting 1 minutes	Yes
30	Partner meeting 2 minutes	Yes
31	Partner meeting 3 minutes	Yes
32	Partner meeting 4 minutes	Yes
33	Mid-term project report	Yes
34	Final project report	Due Nov 2014
35	Project leaflet (introduction)	Yes
36	Project leaflet – Bulgaria learner recruitment for pilot course version 1	Yes
37	Project leaflet – Germany learner recruitment for pilot course version 1	Yes
38	Project leaflet – Greece learner recruitment for pilot course version 1	Yes
39	Project leaflet – Italy learner recruitment for pilot course version 1	Yes
40	Project leaflet – Bulgaria learner recruitment for pilot course version 2	Yes
41	Project leaflet – Germany learner recruitment for pilot course version 2	Yes
42	Project leaflet – Greece learner recruitment for pilot course version 2	Yes
43	Project leaflet – Italy learner recruitment for pilot course version 2	Yes
44	Summary delivery report – 6 months	Yes
45	Summary delivery report – 18 months	Yes
46	Version 1 course material	Yes
47	Report on the train the trainer the event	Yes
48	Training manual for teachers	Yes

<b>Results</b>		<b>Achieved Yes/No</b>
49	Mid-term final report (end Year 1)	Yes
50	Final financial report	Due Nov 2014
<b>Additional results</b>		
	Project newsletter Issue 4	
	Project newsletter Issue 5	
	Project newsletter Issue 6	

One area that was explored but not well developed within the LITSSW project was e-learning (results 24 and 25). The intention was that the project would develop e-learning resources for use in the second pilot training courses. This was achieved to some degree. Most partners used e-learning elements in the second pilot courses, such as Moodle. The e-learning idea was also explored through using a Wiki. The Wiki as created by ACP to provide a place where trainees could create shared glossaries of specialist terms used in public services. This original and creative idea would have been an exciting development for the project but was unfortunately hindered by lack of ICT knowledge within the partner organisations. Trainees were unable to contribute to the Wiki and trainers did not have the ICT skills to help them do this. The idea of shared glossaries proved popular, however, and although not implemented through the Wiki, these were developed by participants on the second pilot course at CSC.

Although lack of time and resources prevented any greater focus on this element within the project period, the discussions and explorations by the partners suggest that there is considerable potential for future development of e-learning. Areas to further explore include the use of e-learning to support effective delivery of interpreter training, with further development of Learning Management Systems, Wikis and social media, and use of e-learning as the main delivery mechanism for short interpreter training courses, or for training trainers to deliver short interpreter training courses.

## 2.2 Achievement of intended impacts

Impact 1: *Public service agencies engaged with the project will increase their understanding of and interest in interpreting as a means of breaking down communication barriers.*

The LITSSW partners in Bulgaria, Greece, Germany and Italy all engaged with public service agencies in the course of adapting and delivering the short interpreter course. These agencies were involved as advisers, to help ensure that the course materials were accurate and used the specialist language required for their area of public service, and as guest speakers during the pilot training courses. The public service agencies engaged with the pilot training courses are shown in Table II.

Table II: Public service agencies engaged with the pilot training courses

Country	Name of agency	Sector	Role in pilot training
Germany	JobCenter	Employment	Guest speaker
Germany	AOK	Health insurance	Advisory
Germany	AWO Migrationsberatung	Migrant integration	Guest speaker
Germany	Arbeiterwohlfahrt Friedrichshain-Kreuzberg	Migrant integration	Advisory
Germany	Caritas Berlin Lichtenberg	Migrant integration	Advisory
Germany	Bundesamt für Migration und Flüchtlinge	Migrant integration	Advisory
Germany	Diaakonisches Werk/ Jugendmigrationsdienst	Migrant integration	Advisory
Germany	Kontakt und Beratungsstelle für Flüchtlinge und MigrantInnen e.V.(KuB)	Migrant integration	Advisory
Italy	Tribunale di Palermo	Legal	Guest speaker
Italy	APA	Mental health	Guest speaker
Italy	Commune di Palermo	Municipality	Arranged visit for trainees
Italy	Angelo Raneli (individual expert)	Legal	Guest speaker
Italy	APA web	Mental health	Guest speaker
Italy	SIMM (Società Italiana di Medicina delle Migrazioni)	Health	Guest speaker
Bulgaria	Regional Inspectorate of education	Education	Guest speaker
Bulgaria	Ministry of Interior	Government	Guest speaker
Bulgaria	Nikolay Dimitrov (individual expert)	Social security	Guest speaker
Bulgaria	The State Agency for Refugees with the Council of Ministers	Government	Adviser
Bulgaria	Chiezi Bulgaria	Health	Guest speaker
Greece	Labour Office	Employment	Guest speaker
Greece	Police	Police	Guest speaker
Greece	Agiz Olga Hospital	Health	Guest speaker

The partners interviewed representatives from public service agencies to collect their views about the use of interpreting services. Each partner interviewed one or more public agency representatives at each pilot stage. A total of 12 interviews were conducted with 10 representatives from eight public service agencies. The interviewees are shown in Annex One.

All the agencies interviewed believed that interpreters are essential for effective delivery of public services to migrants with limited skills in the national language. The interviewees all had a good understanding of the need for trained interpreters and of the difficulties that can arise from using friends and family rather than professional interpreters. They regarded it as highly desirable for interpreters to have knowledge of the terminology that is specific to their particular sphere of public service and several interviewees pointed out that this is currently lacking. Several interviewees, particularly at the final evaluation stage, stressed that their agencies face severe budget constraints which affect their ability to hire professional interpreters.

Most of the interviewees were involved in the LITSSW pilot training as guest speakers. They found this experience valuable in several ways, including:

- Helping them to understand the qualities of a good interpreter;
- Understanding why it is essential for interpreters to be impartial;
- Identifying weaknesses in their agency's process for hiring public service interpreters and improvements which could be made;
- Developing a better understanding of the difficulties which migrants can face when using public services.

The main issues for interpreter training arising from the interviews with public service agencies are as follows:

- Most agencies have an ad hoc approach to finding new interpreters. Some rely on word of mouth or use 'whoever has left a business card';
- Public agencies would like to use professionally trained interpreters but in practice, mainly due to budget constraints, most agencies rely on informal interpreters, including their own bi-lingual staff, volunteers and friends or family of service users;
- Public agencies strongly agree that interpreters should operate to high quality and ethical standards. However, until they took part in the LITSSW pilot sessions, most of the public service representatives were not fully aware of what these standards should be.

Impact 2: *Individuals from migrant communities will have a pathway towards improving engagement with wider society.*

This impact can be considered to have two dimensions. Firstly, the pathway created for participants of the interpreter training course. This pathway can help individuals from migrant communities to increase their engagement with wider society both through increased understanding of how public services work, and through increased employability as interpreters. Secondly, the pathways developed by creating more and better trained interpreters who will help to improve access to public services for individuals from migrant communities.

Firstly, we consider the impact of the project for individuals who participated in the interpreter training courses. The four 'receiving' partners delivered eight pilot courses over the project period; four courses in pilot one and four in pilot two. Fifty four trainees took part in the first pilot training courses and 61 took part in the second pilot training courses; a total of 115 participants across the eight pilot training courses. Of the 115 interpreter training participants, 102 (89%) completed evaluation questionnaires at the end of the training course, as shown in Table III.

Table III: Pilot training course participants

Partner	Number of participants			Interpreting languages covered		Evaluation forms completed
	Pilot 1	Pilot 2	Total			
Iberika	11	14	25	German	Spanish, Portuguese, Arabic, Russian, English, French	21
CSC	19	20	39	Italian	English, Romanian, Bangla, French, Urdu, Persian, Arabic	34
RUNI	12	13	25	Bulgarian	English, French, Russian, Turkish, Persian, Italian, German	25
ACP	12	14	26	Greek	Albanian, Arabic, Pashto, Farsi, English	22
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>54</b>	<b>61</b>	<b>115</b>			<b>102</b>

The evaluation results show very positive views from the participants of all eight pilot courses. The participant ratings, as shown in Table IV, indicate that satisfaction was highest for the trainers, with all 102 respondents rating the trainers as 'good' or 'very good'. Satisfaction was lowest for the number of sessions, in both pilot one and pilot two. Participants in both pilots commented that they would have liked the course to have been longer; that is, to include more sessions. There were no significant differences in the satisfaction scores for the pilot one courses and the pilot two courses; participants in both sets of pilot courses were equally satisfied with the pre-course information, course materials, trainers, number and length of sessions and the amount of homework given. Nor were there any significant differences in the satisfaction scores given by participants of pilots in the four partner countries;

participants were equally satisfied with the pilot courses delivered in Germany, Italy, Bulgaria and Greece.

Overall, participants considered the interpreter training to be very high quality and expertly delivered. The following comments are typical of those made by participants of all the courses:

*'I think that the programme of the course was very well structured and all the activities and sessions were carefully chosen. The main objective of the course was achieved thanks to the professionalism and the devotion of the trainers and the competent guest speakers.'* [pilot course participant, RUNI Centre]

*The training course was organised and delivered really professional. The materials the trainers gave us made the process of education easier. The methods of teaching were very modern and dynamic....The training exceeded my expectations!* [pilot course participant, RUNI Centre]

Table IV: Learner ratings (% rating 'good' or 'very good')

	Pre course information	Course materials	Trainers	Number of sessions	Length of each session	Amount of homework given
<b>PILOT ONE</b>						
Iberika	82	100	100	73	84	91
CSC	94	94	100	81	100	88
RUNI	92	100	100	83	83	92
ACP	75	100	100	83	83	92
<b>Average for all partners</b>	<b>86</b>	<b>98</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>80</b>	<b>84</b>	<b>90</b>
<b>PILOT TWO</b>						
Iberika	100	90	100	100	100	100
CSC	100	100	100	61	83	94
RUNI	92	92	100	62	85	92
ACP	100	100	100	100	100	100
<b>Average for all partners</b>	<b>98</b>	<b>96</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>77</b>	<b>90</b>	<b>96</b>

Learners considered that participation in the pilot course will help them to become high quality and possibly professional interpreters. Participants were asked to evaluate their knowledge and confidence to act as high quality interpreters before and after taking part in the training. The results are shown in Table V (detailed results by pilot and partner agency are in Annex Two).

Participants in all eight pilot courses showed a substantial increase in their knowledge of how to provide high quality interpreting as a result of the training. The average ratings for all pilot courses, which were given on a scale of 1 to 10, increased by 73 per cent across all learners, from an average rating of 4.8 before taking part in the training to an average of 8.3 after the training.

There are large variations between the partner countries, with participants at RUNI Centre showing by far the largest increase (115%) and those at CSC showing the smallest (43%). These variances are due to the tendencies towards higher or lower 'before' scores in the different pilots. However, the variations between partner countries are not consistent between pilot one and pilot two. In pilot one, for example, participants at RUNI Centre tended to give their 'before' knowledge of how to provide high quality interpreting a very low score (the average score was 2.9), while in pilot two, the RUNI participants scores themselves far higher on this indicator (average score was 5.1). As the number of participants within each pilot course was fairly low (ranging from 11 to 20) the variations in scores between partner countries cannot be treated as significant.

In terms of the confidence of learners to act as interpreters, this also increased substantially as a result of the training, with an overall increase across the eight pilot courses of 62 per cent from an average before score of 5.0 to an average after score of 8.1.

The follow up of learners by partner organisations shows that the interpreting course does create a pathway for individual participants to improve their engagement with wider society. The partner agencies reported on outcomes for 20 of the 115 pilot course participants, of whom at least 12 had found work as public service interpreters as a direct result of their participation in the pilot training.

Table V: Learner ratings (on a scale of 1 to 10 where 1 means no knowledge or confidence and 10 means very high knowledge or confidence)

	Average rating <b>BEFORE</b> training	Average rating <b>AFTER</b> training	Improvement rate (% increase from before to after)
<b>Knowledge</b> of how to provide high quality interpreting	<b>4.8</b>	<b>8.3</b>	<b>73</b>
<b>Confidence</b> to act as an interpreter	<b>5.0</b>	<b>8.1</b>	<b>62</b>
<b>Understanding</b> of how public services are organised	<b>5.0</b>	<b>8.1</b>	<b>62</b>

In terms of the second dimension of this impact (the pathway created for individuals from migrant communities as a result of having more and better trained public service interpreters) it is beyond the scope of this evaluation to collect evidence of this impact. However, the evidence from pilot course feedback shows that around 80 per cent of participants are likely to work as public service interpreters in the future. This, together with the fact that 30 per cent of participants had previously worked as public service interpreters despite having no interpreter training, suggests that LITSSW will have an important impact in creating better trained public service interpreters. It is highly likely that the availability of better trained interpreters will result in better engagement between public service agencies and migrant communities.

Impact 3: *An improvement in community cohesion resulting from learners and public sector guest speakers interacting in the classroom and through visits by learners to public sector delivery settings.*

Impact 4: *An improvement in cohesion between learners resulting from studying alongside people from different linguistic and cultural backgrounds.*

The two impacts on cohesion are considered together in this section. It is difficult to demonstrate impacts on community cohesion from initiatives such as the pilot training courses, as they are on a very small scale and because learners are unlikely to view their participation in terms of community cohesion. As proxy indicators for community cohesion, the evaluation feedback forms asked learners to say whether the course had been valuable in terms of (1) meeting people from different cultural backgrounds and (2) meeting people from public service agencies.

A majority (69%) of learners valued meeting people from different cultural backgrounds and a similar majority (67%) valued meeting people from public service agencies. These ratings are reasonably high, but are not the highest ratings given by participants when they were asked to indicate what they valued about the course. The highest rating was for 'learning to be a good quality interpreter', which was valued by 84 per cent of participants across the eight courses. These results are shown in Table VI.

There is a good deal of variance between learners in different countries. The participants of the Iberika courses were least likely to value the opportunity to meet people from different cultural backgrounds (43% rated this) and to meet people from public service agencies (48% rated this). The CSC participants were most likely to value meeting people from different cultural backgrounds (82% rated this) while the ACP participants were most likely to value meeting people from public service agencies (86% rated this). These detailed results are shown in Table IX in Annex Two.

Table VI: What was valuable about the course?

	Learners agreeing	
	Number	%
Learning to be a good quality interpreter	86	84
Learning how public services work	76	75
Learning about employment opportunities for trained interpreters	72	71
<b>Meeting people from different cultural backgrounds</b>	<b>70</b>	<b>69</b>
<b>Meeting people from public service agencies</b>	<b>68</b>	<b>67</b>
Developing bi-lingual skills	65	64

### *Impact 5: Progression of learners into further studies and /or employment*

As discussed under Impact 2, learners showed significant increases in their knowledge and confidence to provide high quality interpreting services as a result of their participation in the pilot courses. The percentage of all participants who considered it likely that they would provide professional interpreting services to public sector agencies in the future increased to 79 per cent after taking the course, from 31 per cent who had done this before coming on the course.

There has been insufficient time and resource for the partner agencies to follow up the outcomes for all 115 participants of the eight pilot courses. The follow up which the partners have been able to conduct shows that most participants have progressed onto further studies or into employment and that their participation in the pilot courses has been an important factor in supporting this progression. The four partner agencies tracked and reported on the progression of 20 people who participated in the pilot courses. Of these, at least 12 people who were not previously doing this are now working as public service interpreters. In addition, several participants are now studying, or applying to study, at undergraduate or postgraduate level to become professional interpreters.

Examples which illustrate the progression of learners from the pilot courses include Valentina who took part in the pilot training course at Iberika. Valentina works as a volunteer interpreter for a charity in Berlin, helping Russian-speaking migrants to access medical services, but had never trained as an interpreter. She is now planning to enrol on a Masters programme in translation to improve her skills. Another notable example comes from ACP where seven participants of the first pilot course are establishing a social enterprise to provide interpreting and cultural mediation services to NGOs and public agencies in Greece. The social enterprise will create employment for the seven participants, all of whom are migrants to Greece from Afghanistan or Africa and were previously unemployed. A similar initiative is underway in Palermo with participants from the CSC courses.

### *Impact 6: Academic institutions are engaged with the project and involved in discussions towards accreditation of the course.*

All partners engaged with academic institutions through the research and needs analysis which took place in the early stages of the project; 14 universities and 11 educational centres contributed to this phase of the project. This research showed that interpreting courses are offered by many universities and other education institutions in the partner countries, although none specialise in training migrants to become interpreters, or in training interpreters to work with migrants. The research indicates that there are different routes for certifying interpreters in each country, and in some cases these are very restrictive. In Bulgaria, for example, only the Ministry of Foreign Affairs has the legal right to certify interpreters. In contrast, in Italy there is no regulation of interpreter qualifications and universities and education centres are able to offer their own certification, although may be unlikely to accredit training offered by organisations viewed as 'competitors' to their own courses.

Following the research and needs analysis, all partners explored the potential for accreditation of the interpreter training course, including through discussions with academic institutions. For various reasons, it is unlikely that the short interpreter training course will receive accreditation in its current format in any of the partner countries. The main reason is that, at 36 hours, the course is considered too short to be accredited by any of the bodies which have been approached. In several of the partner countries there are additional factors which make it unlikely that the interpreter training course, even in a longer format, would achieve accreditation. These factors are to do with the complexity of the accreditation systems, particularly in Greece and Italy.

There is potential for accreditation of the short interpreter training course in Germany and Bulgaria. Iberika is engaged in constructive discussions with the Job Centre about developing the course to train interpreters for Job Centre clients, which would be accredited by the Job Centre. RUNI Centre has had positive discussions with Sofia University which will endorse the course in its current 36 hour format. However, whether Sofia University will include the interpreter training in its programme of new courses is not yet clear, as new developments throughout Bulgaria are on hold while the country remains in political limbo.

DCVS Community Action Dacorum has explored accreditation options in the UK with the aim of finding an accrediting body which will endorse the 36 hour course for delivery in other EU countries. The 36 hour course is not separately accredited within the UK where it is only delivered by HITS as an introduction to the full, accredited DPSI. DCVS Community Action Dacorum is in discussion with the College of Teachers about possible accreditation of the short course as a Level 2 qualification.

The issue of accreditation for the 36 hour course remains unresolved at the end of the project period. There is potential for enhancing the status of the training provided through endorsement of the course in Bulgaria (through Sofia University) and Germany (through the Job Centre). DCVS Community Action Dacorum will continue to explore options for accreditation of the course by a UK body for delivery outside the UK.

*Impact 7: An improvement in understanding by learners of how public services are delivered and confidence in engaging with these services.*

The evaluation feedback from course participants shows a clear improvement in their understanding of how public services are organised and delivered in the country where training took place. When asked to rate their understanding of how public services are organised before and after completing the training, the average before rating from all participants was 5.0 rising to 8.1 for after the training was completed. This is an increase of 62 per cent from the average before rating to the average after rating; in other words, a 62 per cent improvement rate.

Within the average 62 per cent improvement rate for understanding of how public services work, there are variations between the partner countries, although because the numbers of participants are small, any comparisons between partners should be treated cautiously. The detailed results are shown in Table X in Annex Two. The

greatest improvement rate by far was shown by course participants at the RUNI centre, with an enormous 142 per cent, while learners on the ACP courses in Greece increased their understanding of how public services work by a more modest 31 per cent. As all the pilot courses included information about how public services work, along with presentations from public officials and visits to public service agencies, it is difficult to explain why the increases in understanding were so much greater in Bulgaria than in Greece. The difference is due to the marked tendency from participants of the first pilot course in Greece to score themselves very highly on their level of understanding before taking part in the course, but it is not clear why this was the case.

*Impact 8: Local social enterprises are developed to offer interpreting services to public sector agencies, NGOs and individuals*

As a direct outcome of the LITSSW transfer of innovation, two local social enterprises are being established to offer interpreting services to public sector agencies, NGOs and individuals. Seven participants in the pilot training delivered by ACP in Greece are already in the process of setting up a social enterprise which will provide interpreting and cultural mediation services to public agencies and NGOs working with the growing numbers of people who are seeking to migrate into the EU through the Greek-Turkish border. ACP sees a strong demand for interpreting and cultural mediation services from public agencies, particularly from those providing policing and immigration services, and from some private sector companies. When established, the social enterprise will provide employment for its seven founder members, who are all currently unemployed. A similar move is being undertaken by CSC, where there is also strong demand for interpreting and cultural mediation services to support the influx of migrants crossing into the EU from Africa via southern Italy.

In addition to the two social enterprises being established, many of the pilot course participants will be working as public service interpreters on a freelance basis. Across the eight pilot courses, 31 per cent of participants had previously worked as paid interpreters for public service agencies. After taking the course, 79 per cent of participants believed that they were likely to do this in the future. It is worth noting that none of the course participants had previously received any training in interpreting. Therefore, the impact here is not only a considerable increase in the number of people from migrant communities who will be working as public service interpreters in the future, but in the number of public service interpreters who have been trained to understand and deliver high quality public service interpreting.

## 2.3 Working in partnership

The European partnership approach is fundamental to this project. The transfer of innovation concept rests on the idea of sharing what works in one part of the EU with agencies in other parts of the EU which can learn from this approach to tackle similar issues, while also enabling the 'transferring' partner to learn from the experience of the 'receiving' partners. The LITSSW partnership has made this approach work in a highly effective way.

The key factors for the success of this partnership have been:

- A very clear innovation to address a commonly experienced difficulty. The interpreter training developed by DCVS Community Action Dacorum is an innovative and demonstrably successful approach which tackles two problems which are common, and increasing, throughout the EU. Firstly, a deficit in the quality of interpreting services in the public sector. This problem is growing with reductions in public funding, as public service providers are increasingly using cheaper or unpaid interpreters who are unlikely to have been trained to recognise and deliver good quality services. Secondly, the barriers facing migrants who are seeking employment within the EU, including migrants who are bi- or even tri-lingual but who still find it difficult to gain employment.
- Committed, appropriate and experienced partners. The partner agencies all work in the fields of language training or supporting migrant communities, and some partners cover both. They were eager to learn from DCVS Community Action Dacorum's experience. The partners had good experience of European cooperation projects and knew how to work well together to produce good results. Some partners brought additional expertise which added value to the project, such as ACP's skills in ICT and Iberika's practical experience of using on-line Learning Management Systems.
- Good project management. The project was very well managed. It was delivered to a very clearly written work plan which set out all the necessary actions and scheduled these in a logical order.
- Good relations between partners. All the partners had worked together in previous EU projects and had already established good working relationships. The LITSSW project meetings operated in a friendly, co-operative and productive manner, with all partners contributing and listening to the contributions of others with respect.

The interim evaluation report recommended that all partners should re-visit what they wanted to gain from the LITSSW transfer of innovation, particularly in terms of impacts for migrant communities, and consider whether and how this was being achieved through the project. The recommendation was that each partner should write up these reflections in a short article to appear in one of the project newsletters. DCVS Community Action Dacorum responded to this recommendation with an interesting and thoughtful article on what they wanted and what they achieved from the transfer of innovation. It would have been valuable if all partners had produced similar newsletter articles. These would have given the newsletter readers some

useful insights into the motivations of the partner agencies to participate in the project, and a better understanding of the impact of the project for migrant communities.

## **2.4 Sustainability**

Many of the project's results and impacts will be sustained beyond the project period. These include:

- The capacity of the partner organisations to deliver short courses on interpreting. Two trainers from each partner organisation now have the skills, experience and confidence to deliver short interpreter training courses. The organisations also have the training materials which DCVS Community Action Dacorum shared with them, and which the partners have adapted to fit their local circumstances. There remain some issues regarding Intellectual Property Rights which need to be resolved in order that the partner organisations can deliver the short interpreting course in the future.
- A cohort of 115 people has been trained to understand, recognise and implement good practice in public service interpreting. Almost 80 per cent of the pilot course participants say that they are likely to work as public service interpreters in the future. By training these individuals to understand the principles and practices of good quality interpreting, the project has increased the number of people who can provide high quality interpreting services in public agencies serving migrant communities in Greece, Italy, Germany and Bulgaria.
- Two migrant-led social enterprises providing interpreting and cultural mediation services in Greece and Italy. Once established, these social enterprises will provide much-needed interpreting and cultural mediation services for public agencies which currently lack the skills to communicate with growing numbers of new migrants, as well as providing employment for migrants who are unable to secure other forms of work.
- For the public service agencies which participated in the pilot courses, increased awareness of good quality and ethical standards in interpreting, and of the importance of these in providing effective services for migrant communities.
- For the LITSSW partners, increased understanding of the uses and potential for ICT in lifelong learning. There was very good exchange of information and experience between partners on this topic. All partners learned from ACP's creative and innovative idea to develop a wiki for trainee interpreters to produce shared glossaries of public sector terminology. Dacorum CVS learned from Iberika's use of Moodle as a communication and resource management tool in learning programmes, and is likely to adopt Moodle or something similar for its own interpreter training courses.
- For DCVS Dacorum, increased capability and confidence to successfully manage larger scale, innovative and creative EU projects.

It is highly likely that all four partners will deliver the short interpreter training course in the future, either independently (as ACP and CSC are likely to do) or in partnership with other agencies (e.g. Iberika with the Job Centre). The key issue for future delivery is cost. None of the partner organisations is able to cover the cost of the short course delivery from existing resources, so all will need to either levy a charge from future participants or find alternative funding sources in order that training can be delivered without charge, or at very low cost to participants. In all four partner countries it is unlikely that participants will pay for the training provided. In Bulgaria, where all the pilot course participants were in employment and could potentially afford to pay for training, the lack of accreditation for the course means it does not have the status of a recognised professional qualification that individuals would be prepared to pay for. RUNI is hopeful that Sofia University will cover the cost of future training. In contrast, the pilot course participants in Greece and Italy were unemployed migrants with few opportunities to gain work and without the resources to pay for training. Given the demonstrated success of the project in helping unemployed migrants to find jobs, the European Social Fund may be a potential source of funding support for future delivery in Greece and Italy. In Germany, Iberika is in discussion with the Job Centre which may cover the costs of a future training course.

The partners consider that sustainability of the interpreter training will be greatly increased if the course receives accreditation. In light of feedback from accrediting bodies that the 36 hour course is too short to be accredited, partners are keen to deliver the 120 hour interpreting course offered by DCVS Community Action Dacorum and accredited by the Chartered Institute of Linguists. To pursue this, the LITSSW partners have developed a proposal for a follow up project focused on transferring the 120 hour course from DCVS Community Action Dacorum to partner agencies. The proposal was submitted in the 2014 round of the Erasmus + programme but was unsuccessful. The LITSSW partners are likely to further develop and resubmit this proposal in future funding rounds.

A sustainability strategy was produced for the project. This was a potentially helpful document which set out the context for sustaining the short interpreter course in each partner country and presents a marketing plan for developing this beyond the project period. However, the timing of the sustainability strategy, which was completed in April 2014, meant that there was no opportunity for the partners to jointly consider their individual strategies for sustaining the short interpreter training course, nor to discuss whether any actions within the remaining project period could be tailored to facilitate this.

It might be useful, for future projects, to timetable the development of the sustainability strategy for an earlier stage in the project, to enable discussions of sustainability to take place from, say, the mid-point of the project. It would also be useful in future projects to consider the sustainability strategy not as a one-off product, but as a 'live' document to be revised and updated throughout the project period.

## 2.5 Dissemination

A dissemination strategy was produced at an early stage in the project. This identified the key areas for dissemination, the intended audiences, target groups and stakeholders and, in broad terms, the media to be used.

The project used a range of dissemination channels including:

- A project website <http://interpretertraining.eu/>
- Information about the project on the websites of the partner organisations.
- Creating and distributing six newsletters. This is three more than originally planned.
- A Facebook page for the project, which received over 200 'likes'.
- Leaflets promoting the pilot courses. These were distributed by the partner agencies through their networks and via agencies working with migrant communities. The leaflets were effective in attracting people to apply for the training courses. There were more applicants than places available on all eight training courses, and several partner agencies are keeping waiting lists of applicants who will be offered places if the courses can be run again.
- An excellent final dissemination event which was attended by more than 30 people, including representatives from Caritas and the Job Centre in Berlin. Feedback from participants indicate that the event itself helped to increase knowledge about interpreter training and that participants will be sharing this knowledge within their own organisations in a variety of ways. The participant feedback from this event is shown in Annex Three.

The final dissemination report shows that through the collective dissemination activities of the partners, information about the LITSSW project was communicated to approximately 5,300 people through face to face activities, 2,500 people through local and EU media, and around 23,000 people through on-line activities.

## 2.6 Project management

The project was very well managed. This is evidenced by the following:

- The project ran to its planned timetable.
- All the project results were completed to a good standard and some were outstandingly good.
- The minutes of project meetings provide an excellent record of key discussions and decisions.

- The project meetings were productive. The evaluation feedback from partners shows that partners are very positive about the achievements and efficiency of the meetings, and about the way the project meetings were organised and managed.
- Partners were clear about their responsibilities and the actions they had to carry out.

## **2.7 Lessons learned**

All partners learned a great deal from piloting the interpreter training. Some of the most valuable lessons learned include:

- There is strong demand from migrant communities for interpreter training courses which are free, or affordable for those on minimal incomes.
- The course in its current format provides sufficient training to provide a stepping stone into higher level interpreter training, or, in areas of the EU where there is an urgent need for interpreters to communicate with newly arriving migrants, into employment.
- Asking learners to jointly produce glossaries, rather than doing this individually, is a very effective way of building relationships between participants and of creating useful shared glossaries.
- Participants highly value input to the training from people who are already working as public service interpreters.
- A specific focus on how to find employment as a public service interpreter, with input from someone who can advise on this, is particularly helpful for participants.
- Moodle, or other Learning Management Systems, is a good way of sharing resources and communicating with learners, and is especially useful when learners have missed sessions.

The key lessons learned from managing and delivering the LITSSW project are:

- The e-learning element of the LITSSW could have been developed further, but there was a lack of understanding and ICT skills within some partner organisations to support this.
- The ICT skills which ACP brought to the project were invaluable for helping to develop and deliver good quality materials and resources, including the project website and templates for project leaflets.
- The final conference, organised by Iberika in Berlin, was a good lesson in how to organise an effective dissemination event.

## **THREE: CONCLUSIONS**

### **3.1 Overall conclusion**

The LITSSW project worked very well indeed. The project has achieved a strong and sustainable impact through creating capacity within the four 'receiving' organisations to provide interpreter training focused on improving engagement between migrant communities and public services. The project has also had impacts within the 'transferring' organisation, notably in terms of building organisational capacity and confidence to manage larger scale transnational projects.

The success of the LITSSW project is due to a number of factors, chief of which are:

- An excellent transfer of innovation concept and product. The innovating partner, DCVS Community Action Dacorum, transferred an exceptionally good and highly successful model for providing community language interpreting services and creating employment opportunities within migrant communities;
- A strong case for the transfer of innovation. The case for this transfer of innovation was made by all four partner countries, with a particularly strong need identified in Italy and Greece which are experiencing an unprecedented inflow of migrants from war zones in Africa, Afghanistan and the Middle East;
- Very good project management;
- A very good partnership, with experienced partners working in relevant fields.

### **3.2 Results**

The project achieved all of its planned results and some extra ones too. The results are good quality and some are very good indeed. The written reports produced by each partner after the pilot training courses were an excellent way of ensuring that the information and lessons learned from the pilots were systematically captured and shared within the partnership. This approach should be adopted for any future projects.

### **3.3 Impacts**

The project has achieved three main impacts. Firstly, 115 people from migrant communities have been trained to understand, recognise and deliver good quality interpreting services. All the people in this cohort had already worked as interpreters, either paid or unpaid, but without any training in the ethics and principles of good quality interpreting. As a result of their training, they will now be delivering better quality interpreting, thereby enabling service providers to deliver, and service users to receive, better quality public services. Secondly, the interpreter training has increased the employability of participants, many of whom are now working as interpreters. This is a particularly important impact for migrant

communities which experience great difficulties securing employment within the EU. There is strong potential to develop the interpreter training as a route into employment for bi-lingual migrants through the European Social Fund programmes. Thirdly, the project has built the capacity of four organisations to deliver a model which addresses the communication difficulties faced by public service agencies and newly arrived migrant communities.

### **3.4 Working in partnership**

The LITSSW project is an excellent example of the benefits of European partnership working. The partnership has been co-operative and productive and has achieved results and impacts that would not have been possible if partners had worked alone on the same tasks.

### **3.5 Project management**

This was a very well managed project. The project was delivered to a clear work plan. Each partner was clear about their own roles and responsibilities within the project and delivered what was expected. The project manager communicated clearly and regularly with all partners and fostered co-operative and productive working environment within and between project meetings.

Project meetings had clear agendas and were well chaired. Key decisions were made in project meetings with all partners, ensuring that they were transparent and consultative. Clearly written minutes of each meeting were produced promptly and provided an excellent record of discussions and decisions made at the meetings.

### **3.6 Dissemination**

Through a range of channels, including a website, newsletters and social media, information about the LITSSW project was communicated to around 30,000 people. This is a great achievement. The dissemination activities were very good at communicating what happened in the project and particularly good at illustrating the enthusiasm of the learners on the pilot courses, including through case studies featured in the newsletters, photographs and video testimony.

However, more attention could have been focused on using the evidence from the LITSSW project to develop specific dissemination messages for key audiences, including potential funders and future customers of public service interpreting services (e.g. local public service agencies). There was scope to use the dissemination activities to help ensure the sustainability of the project outcomes by developing targeted dissemination activities which would support this. It would have been useful for partners to regularly and jointly consider what the key dissemination messages should be for specific audiences. For example, it may have been useful to disseminate information about the potential for interpreter training to create employment opportunities within migrant communities, and to communicate this to funders of employment support programmes including European Social Fund

managing agencies. It would also have been useful for the 'receiving' partners to disseminate information about what they wanted to achieve from this transfer of innovation, and what impacts this had for their organisations and for migrant communities, as recommended in the interim evaluation report.

### **3.7 Areas for improvement**

There is scope for improvement in any project, although in this case the areas in which improvements could have been made are very minor. That said, we saw potential for improvements in the following areas:

- The Sustainability Strategy could have been produced at an earlier stage in the project and then revised and updated at regular intervals. It would be useful in future projects to view the Sustainability Strategy as a live document to guide strategic discussion, rather than as a product.
- It may have been useful to revisit the Dissemination Strategy at each project meeting and to focus in particular on agreeing dissemination messages to be communicated to specific audiences.
- The recommendation for each partner organisation to write a newsletter article about what they wanted to achieve from the project and whether this was being met, should have been implemented by Iberika, CSC, ACP and RUNI Centre.
- There was scope to articulate and disseminate stronger messages about the role of the interpreter training course as a means of improving public service engagement with migrant communities.
- The e-learning element of the project could have been better developed. It may have been more effective to give the lead responsibility for this to the partner with the highest level of ICT skills.

### **3.8 Sustainability**

There is strong potential for sustainability of the innovation transferred through the LITSSW project. It seems probable that the four 'receiving' organisations will deliver the 36 hour interpreter training course in the future. DCVS Community Action Dacorum is continuing to seek some form of EU-recognised accreditation for the 36 hour course, with the expectation that this will increase the value and therefore the sustainability of the short interpreter training course.

### **3.9 Future development**

The LITSSW partners are keen to work together to further develop public service interpreter training for migrant communities. They consider that the next stage would be to transfer the 120 hour interpreter training course from DCVS Community Action Dacorum to the four partner agencies and to additional agencies in other EU

member states. The rationale is that feedback from accrediting bodies and from learners on the LITSSW pilot courses indicated that 36 hours of training is insufficient for interpreter training. Therefore, a longer training course should be developed as this will secure the necessary accreditation to give learners a qualification in public sector interpreting. An accredited course will also be more likely to have longer term sustainability as there is greater potential to receive funding for its delivery, from public agencies (such as Job Centres), funding programmes (such as the European Social Fund) or through charging some or all learners to participate. An application submitted by the LITSSW partners for Erasmus + funding was unsuccessful in the first application round and is likely to be revised and resubmitted in future rounds.

While the value of transferring the longer course is clear, there are limitations in the transfer model, which is a relatively expensive way of transferring expertise from one organisation to a small number (four in this case) of organisations. There may also be issues regarding the Intellectual Property Rights of the longer interpreter training course, which are still being resolved for the 36 hour training course.

There is potential for the LITSSW partners to build on the needs identified and the successes of the current project to reach a wider audience and so to have a considerably greater impact. The key areas of need identified by the project are for:

- Improved quality in interpreting within public services working with migrant communities, particularly for agencies dealing with increasing numbers of newly arrived migrants.
- Employment opportunities for individuals from migrant communities experiencing difficulties securing jobs within EU countries.

The LITSSW project has demonstrated that:

- The 36 hour training course can be very successfully transferred to other agencies.
- There is a high level of interest from migrant communities in taking up free interpreter training; most pilot courses were over-subscribed but partners felt that few of their target learners would pay for the training.
- The 36 hours of training is sufficient for learners to identify whether they wish to progress onto longer training or, in many cases, to find work as an interpreter. This has been the case even without accreditation for the course.
- Many public service agencies have ad hoc processes for finding interpreters and little understanding of the importance of using quality interpreters.

Taken together, these factors suggest that future development of the LITSSW project should be focused in some, or all of the following areas:

- Developing a mechanism to deliver the 36 hour interpreter training course to greater numbers of people from migrant communities. The mechanism could be

for direct delivery to individuals (perhaps through e-learning modules for individual learners) or by developing a methodology for training trainers to deliver the 36 hour interpreter course (again, this could be through an e-learning approach). The aim should be to scale up the transfer of innovation in order that far greater numbers of individuals within migrant communities can benefit from the interpreter training.

- Sharing the interpreter training resources with agencies that are working with newly arrived migrant communities which are struggling to access public services and to find employment. This is most likely to be with NGOs in the southern EU member states (Spain, Greece, Italy). The aim should be to build capacity of NGOs to improve public service engagement for migrant communities through quality interpreter training.
- Developing resources to raise awareness within public sector agencies about the importance of quality interpreting, and what to look for when recruiting an interpreter. This could be done through creating videos or on-line learning materials. The aim should be to develop understanding and awareness of the value of quality interpreter training in order to push up the overall quality (resulting in better engagement between public services and migrant communities) and grow the market for trained interpreters (resulting in more job opportunities for unemployed migrants).
- Securing accreditation for the 36 hour course, or endorsement from a body with EU-wide credibility. This may necessitate lengthening the course, or it may be possible to link the 36 hour course as a pathway step to a longer, accredited interpreter training course, as is already the case in HITS. Accreditation will necessitate developing an assessment process. Options for delivering on-line assessment could be explored, as could the potential for training on-line assessors, or for on-line training of face to face assessors.

## ANNEX ONE: PUBLIC SERVICE AGENCY INTERVIEWEES

<b>Interviewee</b>	<b>Agency</b>	<b>Interviewed by</b>
Ina Gorozolka	Job Centre	Iberika
Trin Tran	Vivantes Hospital	Iberika
Alessia Gordienko	Job Centre	Iberika
Magdalene Mausolff	Vivantes Hospital	Iberika
Eva Maria Wischnewski	AWO Migrationsberatung	Iberika
Nicolay Catania	Accademia Psicologia Applicata	CSC
Vitalba Sanfilippo	Tribunal of Palermo	CSC
Vasya Arsenova	Regional Inspectorate of Education	RUNI Centre
Ivalina Popova	Sofia Directorate of Internal Affairs	RUNI Centre
Katerina Flake	Manpower Organisation	ACP

## ANNEX TWO: EVALUATION RESULTS: TABLES

Table VII: Knowledge of how to provide high quality interpreting: average ratings on a scale of 1 to 10

	Average rating BEFORE training	Average rating AFTER training	Improvement rate (% increase from before to after)
<b>PILOT ONE</b>			
Iberika	3.3	8.6	161
CSC	4.8	7.9	65
RUNI	2.9	8.3	186
ACP	5.3	7.8	47
Average for all partners	4.1	8.2	100
<b>PILOT TWO</b>			
Iberika	6.5	9.2	42
CSC	6.3	8.0	27
RUNI	5.1	8.8	73
ACP	3.6	7.8	117
Average for all partners	5.4	8.5	57
<b>PILOTS ONE &amp; TWO COMBINED</b>			
Iberika	4.9	8.9	82
CSC	5.6	8.0	43
RUNI	4.0	8.6	115
ACP	4.5	7.8	73
<b>Average for all courses</b>	<b>4.8</b>	<b>8.3</b>	<b>73</b>

Table VIII: Confidence to act as an interpreter: average ratings on a scale of 1 to 10

	Average rating BEFORE training	Average rating AFTER training	Improvement rate (% increase from before to after)
<b>PILOT ONE</b>			
Iberika	4.6	8.1	76
CSC	5.5	7.7	40
RUNI	4.2	7.4	76
ACP	5.8	7.8	34
Pilot One average	5.0	7.8	54
<b>PILOT TWO</b>			
Iberika	6.1	9.2	51
CSC	4.8	8.0	67
RUNI	5.0	8.3	66
ACP	3.9	7.9	102
Pilot Two average	5.0	8.4	68
<b>ALL COURSES</b>			
Iberika	5.4	8.7	61
CSC	5.2	7.9	52
RUNI	4.6	7.9	72
ACP	4.9	7.8	59
<b>Average for all courses</b>	<b>5.0</b>	<b>8.1</b>	<b>62</b>

Table IX: What was valuable about the course?

	Meeting people from different cultural backgrounds		Meeting people from public service agencies	
	Number	%	Number	%
<b>PILOT ONE COURSES</b>				
Iberika	5	46	6	55
CSC	12	75	12	75
RUNI	11	92	8	67
ACP	3	25	10	83
Total for all partners	31	61	36	71
<b>PILOT TWO COURSES</b>				
Iberika	4	40	4	40
CSC	16	89	9	50
RUNI	9	69	10	77
ACP	10	100	9	90
Total for all partners	39	76	32	63
<b>ALL COURSES</b>				
Iberika	9	43	10	48
CSC	28	82	21	62
RUNI	20	80	18	72
ACP	13	59	19	86
<b>Total for all courses</b>	<b>70</b>	<b>69</b>	<b>68</b>	<b>67</b>

Table X : Understanding of how public services are organised: average ratings on a scale of 1 to 10

	Average rating BEFORE training	Average rating AFTER training	Improvement rate (% increase from before to after)
<b>PILOT ONE COURSES</b>			
Iberika	4.6	8.5	85
CSC	4.7	6.8	45
RUNI	2.9	7.7	166
ACP	7.8	8.5	9
Pilot One average	5.0	7.9	58
<b>PILOT TWO COURSES</b>			
Iberika	6	8.3	38
CSC	5.3	7.8	47
RUNI	3.7	8.3	124
ACP	5.1	8.2	61
Pilot Two average	5.0	8.2	64
<b>ALL COURSES</b>			
Iberika	5.3	8.4	59
CSC	5.0	7.3	46
RUNI	3.3	8.0	142
ACP	6.5	8.5	31
<b>Average for all courses</b>	<b>5.0</b>	<b>8.1</b>	<b>62</b>

Table XI: Working as a paid interpreter for public service agencies

	Before this training		Likely to do this in the future	
	Number	%	Number	%
<b>PILOT ONE COURSES</b>				
Iberika	5	46	5	46
CSC	6	38	13	81
RUNI	3	25	12	100
ACP	6	50	11	92
Pilot one average		39		80
<b>PILOT TWO COURSES</b>				
Iberika	3	30	5	50
CSC	2	15	15	83
RUNI	2	15	12	92
ACP	5	50	8	80
Pilot two average	12	35	40	78
<b>ALL COURSES</b>				
Iberika	8	38	10	48
CSC	8	24	28	82
RUNI	5	20	24	96
ACP	11	50	19	86
<b>Average for all courses</b>	32	<b>31</b>	81	<b>79</b>

## ANNEX THREE: EVALUATION RESULTS: FINAL CONFERENCE

The final conference took place in Berlin on 10 September 2014. The event was attended by 34 people, of whom 18 completed evaluation feedback forms.

<b>General feedback</b>	<b>Average score</b>
How much did you know about interpreter training before this event?	4.1 out of 5
How much do you know about interpreter training after this event?	4.8 out of 5
How enjoyable was this event?	4.6 out of 5

<b>What was the most useful thing about this event?</b>	<b>Number of times mentioned</b>
All the presentations	4
The presentation from the professional interpreter	3
The presentation about e-learning and use of IT platforms	2
The role play	2
Sharing knowledge and experiences	2

<b>Was there anything about this event which could have been improved?</b>	<b>Number of times mentioned</b>
Having a wider audience	3
Having more guest speakers	2
Sorting out technical problems on audio/visual presentations	1

<b>Is there anything from today's event which you will share within your organisation?</b>	<b>Number of times mentioned</b>
How successful this project was	3
The role of an interpreter	2
Approaches to e-learning	2
How to organise a good dissemination event	2
Interpreter training	1
Information about the project partners	1