

Evaluation of:
“Networking with youth to combat violence against separated children”

Financed by DAPHNE II



Photo: Lise Bruun

Bistandsbureauet

Annemette Danielsen – phone: +45 2711 8005

www.bistandsbureauet.dk

I. Acknowledgement

Save the Children Denmark (SCDK) contracted the Danish consultancy, Bistandsbureauet, to undertake an evaluation of the project "Networking with youth to combat violence¹ against separated children".² The evaluation took place in the period 9th December 2008 to 21st January 2009.

The evaluation team, comprising Mrs. Annemette Danielsen and Mr. Mikael Bjerrum, wishes to thank all persons involved in this evaluation: representatives from the SCEP organizations, members of the Advisory Board and the project coordinator, Ms. Lise Bruun, who have all been committed and providing valuable and liable information. We would like to express a special appreciation as Mrs. Lise Bruun in her role as project coordinator has been extraordinarily supportive, timely and responsive in providing us with all necessary background information and documentation.

A particular gratitude applies for the inputs from the separated children, provided by Hadi, Kia, Rafid, Abdi, Jean, Kai, Ajmal, Asmat, Serge, Adam, Osman, Adem, Nasim, Hamid, Sudi, Didier, Jimmy and Mansour. We are very pleased that the majority of the young participants engaged in interviews - without their strong voices as ultimate beneficiaries the findings and conclusions in this evaluation would have been less viable.

¹ Please note that in the following the word 'violence' is understood as 'violation of rights'.

² See appendices p. 27 for Terms of Reference for this evaluation.

II. Abbreviations

DAPHNE II – European programme to combat violence against, children, young people and women

MEP - Member of European Parliament

NGO – Non-governmental Organization

SCY – Separated Children and Youth

SCDK – Save the Children Alliance Denmark

SCEP - Separated Children in Europe Programme

UNHCR – UN High Commissioner for Refugees

III. Content of evaluation report

I. Acknowledgement	2
II. Abbreviations	3
III. Content	4
IV. Executive summary	5
1. Introduction	7
2. Methodology	8
3. Context: The involved actors	9
3.1. SCEP organizations	9
3.2. The participating SCY	9
4. Efficiency: achievement of results	11
4.1. The Budapest seminar, the Aalsmeer workshop and the Brussels exhibition	11
4.2. Additional outputs	15
4.3. Screening of outputs as stated in the application	15
5. Effects related to objectivities	17
5.1. Participation of youth	18
5.2. Public awareness and advocacy	20
6. Organization and management	21
6.1. Involvement of SCEP organizations	21
6.2. Advisory Board	21
6.3. Management	22
6.4. Financial management	23
7. European dimension	24
8. Future perspectives and recommendations	24
9. Appendices	27
9.1. Terms of references for evaluation	27
9.2. Responses to questionnaire	29
9.3. Summary of interviews with the SCY	30
9.4. Summary of interviews with NGO representatives	34
9.5. NGO Matrix	40
9.6. Summary of interviews with Advisory Boards	41
9.7. List of documents	43

III. Executive Summary

In February 2007, DAPHNE II informed that the application on the project named “Networking with youth to combat violence against separated children” had been approved. 144.054 Euros were allocated to the Separated Children in Europe Programme (SCEP), an existing network comprising some 30 European organisations with Save the Children, Denmark, being the formal contract holder to DAPHNE II. The project is a two year project terminating in February 2009.

The goals of the project “Networking with youth to combat violence against separated children” are to strengthen youth participation and support the foundation of a European forum of separated children and youth (SCY) and further more raise awareness about the importance and value of youth participation by exchanging good practice.

The objectives of the project are to support separated children and youth to make their voices heard so that the SCEP NGO network, the general public, policymakers and decision makers are better informed and aware of children and young people’s perspectives. Likewise, the project aims to create a context where youth have more opportunities to exchange information and to support each other through a European forum of separated children and youth.

According to the evaluation the project has been extremely successful in providing viable and noteworthy results within a limited time of two years and a small budget too. The two immediate target groups, NGOs and SCY have been interviewed by the evaluation team – these interviews substantiate the impression from internal evaluations, namely that both groups are very pleased with the project and find it highly relevant.

Management wise the projects has been very efficient in setting up a small and well functioning Advisory Board to pursue daily management and support SCEP member organizations. The Board comprises a complementary pattern of expertise areas and SCY representatives ensured during interviews that their interests, perspectives and competences were reflected in all matters.

SCEP has with this project brought about a true innovation in establishing the Separated Children’s Network – it is the first network of separated children to transcend the borders and hence the first European network. In order for this to be achieved a number of prerequisites needed to be put in place. Hence as a start, the SCEP organizations were supported to either build or advance their capacity in regards to working with participation and integrate youth participation into their programmes. Along with training and capacity building, a survey was conducted on existing initiatives among the European countries regarding participation and involvement of separated children.

It has been the intention as stated in the application that youth should be left with the opportunity to have a real say – it was for the SCY to decide the activities they wanted to engage in. However, often such statements are pure rhetoric but in this case the aim was fulfilled – the youth coming together in a meeting in June 2008 agreed on creating a public exhibition in Brussels which subsequently was accepted by the management. The exhibition was realised half a year later and was in many aspects a remarkable success. For the young people who could take most of the credit due to the fact that they had themselves done most of the work – supported efficiently by the management - preparing the exhibition, it became a major source to enhanced self esteem and it nourished their endeavours to further engage in a role as change agents for fellow SCY throughout Europe. For the SCEP organisations, it became an eye opener regarding

the strength and potentials of these young people and an inspiration to arrange for more awareness raising activities at national level.

The critical point in the project at this point is how to keep the network alive as funding and support from the DAPHNE II terminates. Modern media has already been drawn upon – and SCY will within short communicate via Facebook. Due to the fact that the project was delayed, the young people had no more than half a year to establish themselves which is definitely too little for relations to become stable and profound. The evaluation team, supported by the SCY and the majority of the NGOs, recommends that SCEP explores options for new funds and other means to support the network for a period in order to help sustain it.

1. Introduction

For some time a debate had been running on how to consult and integrate separated children actively in advocacy and information work undertaken in the SCEPT network. SCEPT was established in 1997 as a joint initiative among members of the International Save the Children Alliance forming a network together with non-Save the Children organisations, NGOs from across 30 countries throughout Europe.³

Save the Children, Denmark (SCDK) is currently hosting SCEPT and undertakes the management of the network. SCDK is a member of the Save the Children Alliance and has since 1945 worked to protect and promote the right of children in societies.

Eventually in 2006 it was decided to apply for DAPHNE funds for a project addressing the issue of integration of separated children and youth. Three SCEPT organizations - Save the Children, Denmark (SCDK), Save the Children, Sweden and Save the Children, Norway - agreed to allocate the resources needed to meet the requirements for 20 percent of co-financing, in this case a total of 47.850 Euros divided into three. In the process of drafting the application to DAPHNE, 15 SCEPT organizations (12 EU and 3 non-EU) signed the partner declaration supporting the application. It was agreed that SCDK should act as administrator of the project. In February 2007 DAPHNE informed that the application had been approved and 144.054 Euros was allocated and subsequently the work of the Youth Network began – SCEPT Youth Network is the term for the SCY linked to the SCEPT organisations involved in the project titled “Networking with youth to combat violence against separated children” project.

Although the project period is set to be two years, the timing was from the beginning affected by the fact that the assigned coordinator left SCDK just as the projects was due to start. Moreover the person intended to be the ‘main consultant’ had limited time availability, forcing the project to contract an alternative person. Such changes required approval by the DAPHNE administration before any activities could be launched. Finally setting up the Advisory Board, in particular identifying SCY representatives for the Board, took some time. These challenges caused a delay which affected activities throughout the whole period, implying that the group of SCY would not get together until June 2008, leaving them with around 6 months to develop a network and for the plan and launch the final activity – an event of a kind but which was allotted to the SCY to resolve.

The goals of the project are:

- to strengthen youth participation in preventing violence against young immigrants and asylum seekers by supporting an European forum of separated children and youth and as well
- to raise awareness about the importance and value of youth participation by exchanging good practice.

The objectives of the project are to support separated children and youth to *make their voices heard* so that the SCEPT NGO network, the general public, policymakers and decision makers are better informed and aware of their perspective on preventing and addressing violence. The project intends to create *a context*

³ See list of participating NGOs in appendices: “NGO Matrix”, p. 40.

where youth have more opportunities to exchange information and to support each other through a European forum of separated children and youth.

The purpose of this external evaluation is to analyze output, performance and impact of the project and critically review whether results stated in the application have been achieved.

2. Methodology

The structure and methodology of the evaluation assures that DAPHNE guidelines for monitoring and evaluation are properly adhered to.⁴ A core statement in these guidelines is the following: *“Ultimately, the question that must be asked about every project is: “Has it made a difference for the beneficiaries?” or at least: “has it engendered change that will be for their benefit?”*

The evaluation draws upon a variety of methodologies and inputs.⁵ Initially a briefing meeting with the coordinator and a desk study reviewing all available documents linked to the project were pursued which together established a frame and outset. It has been important to the team of consultants to design the evaluation in a way that would fully reflect the perceptions of those involved, implying that initially the view of NGOs and young people on the preferred foci of the evaluation was established through a minor questionnaire inquiry at the Brussels meeting.⁶ It became clear that the main focus for all involved was the participation of the SCY in the project.

In order to frame the interviews with the SCY, so these would have the highest degree of relevance, a face to face ‘test’ interview with one of the young people was set up beforehand in order to accommodate questions and entry points.

As the evaluating aims at being based on the conceptions and assessments of those involved the main information source is a comprehensive interview scheme pursued with all involved, added up to a total of 39 interviews providing liable information from the project beneficiaries.

Four categories of actors were interviewed:

- the group of SCY, young people, where the evaluation team has interviewed 18 out of a total of 22 persons,
- the group of NGO representatives - 14 out of 20 relevant organizations was interviewed, giving priority to the very active NGOs with 10 out of 11 interviewed,
- the Advisory Board, where all six members were interviewed and
- the project coordinator.

⁴ http://ec.europa.eu/justice_home/daphnetoolkit/html/launching_project/dpt_launching_project_11_en.html and http://ec.europa.eu/justice_home/daphnetoolkit/html/evaluation_risk/dpt_evaluation_risk_05_en.html

⁵ See appendices for “List of documents”, p. 43.

⁶ See appendices: “Responses to questionnaire from Brussels”, p. 29.

The evaluation team has followed the regulations set in “Guidelines for interviewing (separated) minors” elaborated by the Directorate for Migration, Finland, in cooperation with UNHCR.⁷

In sum, the evaluation team finds they have had a solid ground for conducting this evaluation, as it is based on sufficient documentation material such as seminar reports and comprehensive minutes from internal meetings together with evaluations among participants on single activities. Combined with a significant number of interviews, this altogether forms a credible platform for analysis, findings and recommendations presented in the evaluation.

3. The involved actors

There are two principal actors in the project, namely the SCEP organizations and the young people, the separated children. Concerning the SCEP which comprises 30 European organizations, only a group of 15 NGOs signed a partnership declaration, however, basically the project is meant to relate to and involve all 30 NGOs. Regarding the SCY it is assumed in the application that 15 will take active part – this number ended up being 24⁸. Supported by the project, SCY, the young people have later formed a network which is in the following referred to as the Youth Network.

3.1. SCEP organizations

As seen from the “NGO Matrix”⁹ there has been quite some differences regarding the involvement of the 30 SCEP organizations in the project and due to this, they can be categorized as follows:

- The very active 11 organizations which have links to young SCY in the network. These organizations had representatives both at the Budapest and Brussels events.
- The active 9 organizations with no SCY linked with the network, participating in the Budapest meeting only.
- The not active 10 organizations which did not participate in any of the events, but received information about the network through e.g. SCEP Newsletter and from the coordinator.

3.2. The participating SCY

It soon became evident that identifying and selecting the young people to be invited to take part in the project appeared to be a problem and it became one of the main issues at the Budapest seminar in November 2007.¹⁰ A principal viewpoint was that the participating SCY should be ‘representatives’, meaning they should represent a national organization. However, as such national organizations or networks of separated children could not be found in all countries, alternative criteria were obviously needed. It was eventually agreed that the SCY to take part would be nominated on the ground of their

⁷ http://www.unhcr.se/SE/protect_refugees/pdf/children_world/interviefin.pdf

⁸ Out of the total 24 SCY connected to the network, two have not been able to participate physically.

⁹ See appendices: “NGO Matrix”, p. 40

¹⁰ See about the Budapest seminar on p. 11-

interests and abilities – such as being relatively strong, confident and possessing necessary language skills, e.g. being good at English.

A number of countries did not succeed in attracting SCY for the network. There are mainly two reasons for this, one being the travel restrictions as in some countries SCY are not allowed to leave the country of residence, hence they would not be able to go abroad for meetings in the network¹¹. As well poor language skills among SCY were argued to form an insuperable barrier. Another factor is that several of the participating NGOs seem to be convinced that the living conditions and everyday life of SCY in their particular countries were too demanding to make this sort of extroversion and outgoing activities attractive for SCY.

Obviously, the main precondition for the project to succeed was that the SCEP organizations managed to pinpoint SCY and engage these in project activities. Eventually, in 11 countries SCEP organizations succeeded in identifying a total of 24 young people interested in participating in the network, 2 of these SCY participating only via virtual means as they were not allowed temporary travel permissions.

Out of the 22 young people actively connected to the network 18 are male and 4 are female. This reflects more or less the actual situation of SCY in Europe. A UNHCR report covering 2001-2003 concludes that 28% of SCY in Europe are female.¹² One can say that to a certain extent the gender balance of the youth group in SCEP mirrors the general picture. When interviewing the young people it was obvious that neither the males nor the females considered the gender balance to be a problem.

Regarding the decision of incorporating SCY in the network within the age range of 15 to 25 years, it must be noted that this decision was made in order to identify resourceful and experienced young SCY. Through the interviews with the SCEP organizations, with the Advisory Board and with the SCY it became clear that the age range has proved to be appropriate. Moreover, the SCY express that for them the gap between very young (15 years old) and adults (up to 25 years) has not been a problem within the group of SCY. As one of the youngest members of the network puts it:

“When we are together in the group, age does not matter – then we all become children again. I can talk with a 24 year old and we have mutual respect.”

Finding: The team acknowledges that the selection process pinpointing certain SCY must be considered legitimate as representativity could not work as criteria as there were no (or very few) existing national networks. Moreover it must be concluded that the unequal gender balance in the youth network is a mirror of the actual SCY situation in Europe; and that the age range from 15 to 25 years within the group of SCY is considered appropriate.

¹¹ In the UK within an established group of SCY, “Brighter Future”, some would be allowed travel permits, others not; making it difficult to allow some to participate in the network and others not, as it would favor those most fortunate.

¹² <http://www.unhcr.org/statistics/STATISTICS/40f646444.pdf>

4. Efficiency: Achievement of results

The report will in this section focus on the output – on the activities and what was “produced” throughout the two years the project has been running. Apart from a short introduction to the involvement from the SCEP member organisations, the section is divided into three – initially the three major events in the project - the Budapest seminar, the Aalsmeer workshop and the Brussels exhibition - will be analyzed separately. After this additional outputs will be looked into and the expected results such as these appear in the application will be screened.

Interviewing the six member of the Advisory Board,¹³ these were questioned about the involvement of the SCEP organizations in the project. All Advisory Board members found that the Budapest seminar had revealed big differences in approach to the project and moreover, the Advisory Board members explained that there was some skepticism¹⁴ in the beginning of the project among the SCEP organizations, but this was later replaced by a genuine interest from a number of the NGOs. Members of the Advisory Board, Jean Gatsinzi puts it like this:

“At the Budapest seminar it became clear that some of the NGOs found the project relevant but others did not. So there has all the time been this difference in between the NGOs and how much they got involved in the project.”

Finding: Giving the obstacles for quite some of the organizations as SCY from their countries would not be allowed to travel and hence not being able to take active part, it must be considered positive that 11 SCEP organizations actually succeeded in getting profoundly involved. Moreover, the project should be acknowledged for critically raising awareness internally on the issue of participation – taken into account that actually 20 member NGOs took part in the training on the issue of participation that was pursued at the Budapest seminar.

4.1. The Budapest seminar, the Aalsmeer workshop and the Brussels exhibition

There is a logic structure in the steps and phases these three events takes. As involving SCY was new to many of the SCEP organizations the first meeting in Budapest was focused on two issues that the network would initially have to come to terms with, both related to the fundamental question – how can aims of participation and involvement of separated children in fact be dealt with in praxis? Next meeting is a workshop with the now appointed young people for themselves to plan and arrange for their involvement. In the application the last event was set up as a seminar but that was just to budget for an event as it was impossible beforehand to know what the young people would prioritize, the seminar could obviously be turned into other kinds of activities addressing rights issues – in this case to an exhibition as it appeared, this was what they wanted.

The Budapest seminar

¹³ See appendices: “Summary of interviews with the Advisory Board”, p.41.

¹⁴ The skepticism from some SCEP representatives was mainly related to the fact that many of the European SCY are living a difficult life with social insecurity and psychological trauma making it difficult for them to become engaged in a broader social context.

The first meeting in the SCEPT Youth Network was a seminar held in November 2007 in Budapest, Hungary, with the participation of 21 representatives from SCEPT-organizations and the members of the Advisory Board. This was the first meeting in the SCEPT Youth Network with a broad participation.¹⁵

The agenda of the seminar shows that the main elements were capacity building, to secure a common understanding of the concept of SCY participation, to establish a 'shared foundation' to approach the issue of participation and to exchange experiences and to discuss challenges. Further, the meeting aimed at discussing participation of SCY and settling the process of how to select young persons to participate in the network. A discussion related to 'representativity' of the SCY took place, but the decision was that each of the SCEPT organizations would have to hand-pick SCY based on their resources and language skills, albeit in a few countries existing national networks of SCY could be used as a platform for the selection process.

The Budapest seminar was praised by the participants. In the evaluation schemes 19 respondents answered either "very good" (12) or "reasonable" (7) to the question on whether the seminar met their expectations. Related to other more specific questions the number of positive reactions was high.¹⁶

During interviews with the evaluation team, representatives from the SCEPT organizations again were very positive regarding the Budapest meeting. All 14 respondents declared that it was a constructive and positive meeting.¹⁷ Christoph Braunsweig from SSI Switzerland¹⁸ stated:

"Budapest was really interesting. Beforehand we received a lot of good and relevant material about the project and then it was days of intensive learning about participation. It was excellent."

At the meeting a draft report on the mapping of a range of issues related to SCY in European countries elaborated by Terry Smith was discussed.¹⁹

Finding: The Budapest seminar was well-attended, well organized and provided participants with valuable inputs regarding participation.

The Aalsmeer workshop

In June 2008 a workshop took place in Aalsmeer, The Netherlands with the participation of 17 SCY, the coordinator and two project consultants plus the resource person from the Advisory Board. It was the first time that the group of SCY met. Evaluation schemes were filled out by the participants showing that out of 16 respondents, 13 responded "very much" and 3 "reasonable" to the question on whether the event met their expectations. Moreover 15 out of 16 responded "very much" to the question on whether they enjoyed meeting other SCY.²⁰

¹⁵ See Appendices for documents from the Budapest meeting, p. 43.

¹⁶ See appendices: "Summary of interview with NGO representatives", p. 34.

¹⁷ See appendices: "Summary from interview with NGO representatives", p. 34.

¹⁸ SSI Switzerland participation in Budapest was at their own cost.

¹⁹ For a discussion of the report elaborated by Terri Smith see: Production and dissemination of report, p. 16

²⁰ See appendices: "Summary of interviews with NGO representative", p"34.

The evaluation team has interviewed 14 of the SCY that participated in Aalsmeer. All 14 have a very positive view of the event and they all stated that the major achievements from the Aalsmeer workshop were the opportunity to meet with other SCY and the fact that they learned a lot, respectively.²¹

Concerning the opportunity of meeting the others the following quote cover the overall assessment from the SCEP-Youth group:

“It was great to meet people from a lot of different countries and we shared the same back ground so it created a common ground”.

The meeting in Aalsmeer was organized around a number of themes, issues and workshops. From the interviews with the young people it is evident that the topics were all relevant to them. All respondents stressed the importance of learning about Child Right and one young person states:

“It was very exciting. We learned a lot about Children’s Rights and the Convention of the Child – things I did not know of before.”

Planning for a coming event was as well part of the agenda in Aalsmeer - what activity to prioritize at their next meeting. In the original DAPHNE application a “seminar” was proposed as part of the process but as stated elsewhere, it could be turned into any other event addressing children’s rights. Eventually the SCY Youth Group agreed to arrange for an exhibition in order to raise public awareness of the situation for SCY in Europe. The proposal from the young was adopted and a preparation phase started in order to be able to arrange an exhibition in Brussels in December 2008.²²

Finding: The Aalsmeer meeting was a very important milestone in the project being the first time the selected SCY met each other. Moreover, they all felt they gained a lot as they learned about subjects they considered very important. Finally, the Aalsmeer meeting presents a proof of a genuine form of participation as the decision of arranging an exhibition in Brussels came from the SCY and it was immediately accepted by the management.

The Brussels exhibition

During the autumn 2008 the SCY, the consultants, the coordinator and a number of the SCEP-organizations made preparations for the Brussels event. From the 30th of November to the 3rd of December 16 SCY and 13 representatives from SCEP-organizations met in Brussels. An inter-active exhibition was presented at the Goethe Institute and a number of meetings took place.²³

Evaluation schemes were filled out from the Brussels event, showing that out of the 15 respondents 13 answered “very much” and 2 “reasonable” to the question on whether the exhibition met their expectations.²⁴

²¹ See appendices: “Summary of interview with the SCY, p. 30.

²² See Appendices: “Summary of interviews with NGO representatives”, p. 34.

²³ See Appendices: “Summary of interviews with NGO representatives”, p. 34.

²⁴ See appendices: “Summary of interviews with NGO representatives”, p. 34.”

The evaluation has interviewed 13 of the SCY who participated in Brussels and 10 of the NGO representatives. Out of the 13 young people two thirds of them expressed that the preparations for the exhibition had required a lot of hard work and half of them responded that they had been quite nervous before the presentations. The majority of the SCY praised the support received from the management. All the young participants claimed that the Brussels meetings and exhibition had been a very positive experience, with particular emphasis in the following two matters – they all appreciated meeting with the other SCY and they were all very pleased that the exhibition turned out to be a success.

Regarding the exhibition most of the young people felt that it was a very good event raising public awareness and being able to meet with influential people. All respondents emphasized the meeting with Renate Weber, Member of European Parliament, MEP, but a few felt that there could have been more visitors and more than just one MEP present. A relevant quote from one of the SCY:²⁵

“It was a success, we raised a lot of awareness, a lot of people were contacted. It was cool.”

The evaluation team has interviewed 10 persons from the 11 SCEP organizations present in Brussels. All respondents expressed very positive views about the exhibition. The majority (8) of the respondents were somewhat disappointed with the number of visitors. The conclusion is that the SCY found the attention of the exhibition very good, while the SCEP organizations in general could have wished for more visitors and more MEPs to be present. Heinz Fronck from Asylkoordination, Austria expressed it in the following way:

“It was a fantastic event. It was really well prepared. There is really a difference when SCY do this – telling their own stories – compared to when professionals or our organizations are doing lobby. The SCY presented really strong messages. It was a really good exhibition, but it was a pity that so few people came.”

And Thale Skybak from Save the Children Norway stated:

“The exhibition in Brussels was very impressive, really well planned. There was a clear focus on children’s rights. All the young people were – despite they came from different countries – focused on the same things. It was a very strong message because it was their own personal stories. It was a pity that not more people visited the exhibition. It would be great if it could travel around the European countries.”

In the interviews with the Advisory Board ²⁶it is clear that all members found that the exhibition was a great success because of the active participation of the SCY, but that there is a somewhat disappointment with the actual number of visitors to the exhibition. As stated by Asmatullah Fikrat:

“The goal was not completely fulfilled. It was only the exhibition in Brussels that contributed to public awareness and advocacy. All the other activities were internally. We could have done more.”

Besides the exhibition the gathering in Brussels was used to let the SCY discuss the future of the network.²⁷

²⁵ See appendices “”Summary of interviews with SCY, p. 30.

²⁶ See appendices: “”Summary of interviews with the Advisory Board”, p. 41.”

²⁷ See page 24: “Future perspectives and recommendations.

Finding: The expectations to the Brussels exhibition concerning number of visitors was not quite met. However the Brussels exhibition was a successful event, both in terms of giving the SCY a possibility of making their voices heard and providing them with a certain self esteem and awareness of own potential strength.

4.2. Additional outputs

Related to the Brussels exhibition a number of information materials - besides the specific exhibition materials - were produced and distributed both as pamphlets and as information presented on a number of websites of institutions within the EU. Besides the public outreach with regards to the Brussels exhibition the project has produced several forms of information materials, worth mentioning are:

- A website designated the Youth Network: http://www.scepyouth.eu/forum/portal_scepyouth.php
The intention of the website was to encourage the SCY to communicate internally through this platform. It showed out to be not the most efficient way for the SCY as it was considered troublesome (because of log in procedures) and somewhat boring (because not many people placed information on the website). It became clear that a better way of securing internal communication was to use existing tools such as Facebook and Messenger – already used by the vast majority of the SCY.
- A pamphlet presenting the network and distributed through the SCEP organizations. A number of News Flashes about the network were distributed.
- At the Cork University Conference on “Children in Migration” in April 2008 in Ireland, the SCEP Youth network took part and conducted a couple of presentations.
- A number of national materials, both web based and in hard copy. The majority of the respondents of the SCEP organizations²⁸ stressed that they were inspired by the project, thus initiating initiatives related to participation on a national level.

Finding: The project has on one hand itself disseminated information about the project to relevant external actors and on the other hand it has inspired a number of SCEP organizations to initiate activities related to the participation of SCY on a national level.

4.3. Screening of outputs as stated in the application

The application operates with expected results/outputs and the evaluation will in the following assess to what extend such expected outputs have been achieved. In the DAPHNE application the following are stated as the expected results:

- A) Creation of a new European forum of separated children and youth
- B) Production and targeted dissemination of a report to SCEP partners, including:
 - a mapping of organizations
 - a compilation of awareness raising materials
 - documentation of good practices

²⁸ See appendices: “Summary of interviews with NGO representatives”, p. 34.

- overview of possible approaches
- C) A seminar and a seminar report addressing a specific form of violence against separated children selected by the European forum of separated children and youth including recommendations to decision makers

- **Creation of a new European Forum of separated children and youth**

In the project application the objective stated is to attract 15 young people from various European countries to participate in the network. At the moment 24 young people are connected to the network implying that the quantified goal has been more than fulfilled.

From the descriptions of the young people's involvement in the network obviously one can conclude that the planned result as the formation of a forum for SCY fully has been achieved or even overachieved. This is substantiated by the fact that all 14 respondents from the SCEP organizations agree that a living network consisting of 24 young people living in 14 different European countries is now a reality.²⁹

Finding: There is no doubt that such an existing and vibrant group of SCY can be recognized as a "European forum of SCY" and the expected result has been achieved.

- **Production and dissemination of a report to SCEP partners**

Another expected result of the project is to publish a report about SCY in the European countries which maps and identifies existing national initiatives regarding participation within the group of SCEP organizations. The report has been elaborated by Terry Smith under the title: *"Children's participation within the SCEP – mapping and identifying of initiatives to date."*³⁰ It was presented in draft form at the Budapest meeting and has since been finalized.

The report is based on a questionnaire sent to all 30 SCEP organizations. 19 responded though five with the answer that they would not have anything to report back, hence 14 contributed with information to the report. Terry Smith comments in the report in this way:

"The relatively low rate of return may be an indicator that youth participation is not practiced widely throughout parts of Europe; it may on the other hand merely reflect that partners are extremely busy or that some partners had little or nothing to contribute to this research. Indeed a small number of returned questionnaires merely outlined that there were no participatory projects taking place in the respondent country."

The outset for the report must be regarded quite ambitious with a very wide range of questions to the SCEP organizations related to the term 'participation' both with regard to professional assessments and descriptions of concrete national activities.

²⁹ See appendices: "Summary of interviews with NGO representatives", p. 34.

³⁰ See appendices: List of document", p. 43.

The main conclusions in mapping the report suggest that there is still a lot to do regarding participation of SCY in the European countries. Nevertheless the report presents a number of ongoing or planned initiatives within the SCEP organizations.

Related to one of the expected outputs of the report – a compilation of awareness materials – it became clear that very few materials exist. In this sense the report documents the lack of relevant materials targeting SCY.

A number of SCEP organizations see the project as a first step related to real involvement in participatory activities. In this light – and in the light of the fact that a number of SCEP organizations now has started activities within the field of participation - it might be worth while investigating the possibility of producing a mapping of activities, either through a new report or through a mechanism encouraging the SCEP organizations to report back within the frame of the already existing structures and procedures like the European Mapping Reports.

Finding: It must be concluded that expected result – a report mapping and identifying initiatives related to SCY participation – has been fulfilled.

- **A seminar and report addressing a specific form of violence against SCs**

In the DAPHNE application a finalizing ‘seminar’ was outlined which however were transformed into the mentioned exhibition in Brussels. This event is considered a valid substitute due to the fact that the exhibition was an idea that arose from the young people themselves, it was prepared and carried out in a highly professional manner and it attracted both decision makers and a general public in Brussels. Further more the project has inspired a number of SCEP organizations to plan national activities as mentioned in 4.2. “Additional outputs” on p.15.

Finding: The Brussels event was a truly break-through for the involved SCY as the event was entirely reliant upon inputs from the young people and hence the success can to a high degree be fully ascribed to the efforts made by the young people themselves. The exhibition further proved how efficient personal stories can be in information and advocacy work. In this sense the last event pursued as part of the project had an even greater impact than anticipated.

5. Effects related to goals and objectives

In the DAPHNE application the **goals** of the project are described as:

- strengthen youth participation in preventing violence against young immigrants and asylum seekers by supporting an European forum of separated children and youth and as well
- to raise awareness about the importance and value of youth participation by exchanging good practice

According to application the **objectives** of the project are to support separated children and youth to *make their voices heard* so that the SCEP NGO network, the general public, policymakers and decision makers are better informed and aware of their perspective on preventing and addressing violence. The project will

create a *context* where youth have more opportunities to exchange information and to support each other through a European forum of separated children and youth.

In the following the evaluation will assess the achievements of these two major goals/objectives, being the participation of youth and advocacy and public outreach, respectively.

5.1. Participation of youth

Primarily based on the interviews with SCY, the outcome from the perspective of the young people can be divided into three different categories: personal development, acquisition of knowledge and the involvement of roles as social agent.

- Personal development

All 18 respondents say that it was a very positive experience to meet the other SCY, to learn that young people in other European countries have similar personal backgrounds. Several of the respondents, all of them young of age (15 to 18 years) said that the network had contributed to their personal development regarding becoming more serious and focused. Three said that the network has influenced the daily performance, e.g. school performances were improved which could be attributed to their involvement in the network. Some of the respondents further emphasize that they have improved their English skills due to involvement in the network. One quote:

“Personally SCEP Youth has meant that I in general take things more seriously, e.g. in school where my teacher says that I am much more focused now.”

- Knowledge

All respondents say that they have learned a lot from being engaged in the network, and two things apply for all respondents, namely the knowledge of Children Rights and the knowledge of the actual situation for SCY in other European countries. One representative puts it this way:

“I learned a lot of things that I did not know about before. It will help raise awareness. It has been very, very positive. I hope to learn a lot more about equity and who has problems all over Europe.”

- Social agent

One significant finding is that all the respondents time after time stress that the main objective for them being active in the network is that it creates the grounds for helping others. The respondents acknowledge that the network has had a positive impact on their personal development and that they had gained a lot of knowledge, but they all see these achievements as tools in order to reach what is really important, namely to help other SCY around Europe. Three quotes documents this attitude:

“You start out talking about what you feel, listen to the others and it will end up being contributions to political changes.”

“We will use the network to be able to help others. It is important to bring together the NGOs and the youngsters, as the NGOs do have influence. One young person can do very little alone, but together with other young people and with NGOs we can make a difference.”

“The network has given us hope! Together we can make people listen and do something.”

The evaluation team has as well examined whether the young participants feel they have been able to influence on the process and the choice of activities in the network.

- Influence

All respondents reply positively to the question on whether they feel that they had influence on the process and activities within the network. All the 14 SCY who participated in the Aalsmeer workshop emphasizes that the idea of arranging an exhibition came from the SCY themselves. This can further be substantiated by the following quotes:

“We had a very good influence. It was the youngsters who decided the exhibition in Brussels and this decision motivated all of us.”

“Listen, we the youngster decided everything and we had the opportunity to tell our opinion”.

The SCEP organizations have been impressed by the commitment of the SCY. In the interviews with representatives from the organizations all 14 respondents expressed that the goal of strengthening youth participation has been 100% fulfilled.³¹ Blanka Stevenson from UK (Refugee Council) labeled the project by saying: *“this is really an empowerment project”*, and the following quote from Marina Uzelac, Slovenia, covers the general impression of all SCEP organizations:

“This is a very good project. Money very well spent! This is a chance for the SCY to raise their voices and talk about their rights.

All six members of the Advisory Board have been interviewed by the evaluation team.³² They all express that the goal of engaging young people in a European network of SCY has fully been achieved. A quote from Simone Bommeljé:

“What can I say? Great! Wow!”

Finding: The objective of strengthening the youth participation has been fully achieved. Quite a number of young people have been engaged and they have been given all the space needed to organize their own way of taking part. Further the SCY fully attribute personal growth and knowledge acquisition to their participation in the project. Moreover and very interestingly, they apply a political perspective and assume a role as agents of change – at the same time acknowledging the affiliation with NGOs as important to attain results in their endeavor to promote positive changes for SCY in Europe.

³¹ See appendices: “Summary of interviews with the NGO representatives”, p.34.

³² See appendices: “Summary of interviews with the Advisory Board”, p. 41.

5.2. Advocacy and public outreach

It says in the DAPHNE application that the project supports separated children and youth to *make their voices heard* so that the SCEP NGO network, the general public, policymakers and decision makers are better informed and aware of their perspective on preventing and addressing violence. However, initially there was no description of activities aiming public awareness on the situation of SCY in Europe; all planned activities had primarily an internal character³³. The decision to arrange a public exhibition to be held in Brussels in December 2008 made up for this and provided an extraordinary viable platform for the network to raise public awareness and make the voices of the SCY heard. The exhibition took place in Brussels on the 2nd of December and apart from the general public, representatives from organizations, members of the European parliament and people from DAPHNE were invited, thus making the event both public information and an advocacy event addressing decision makers.

Despite some of the young people and in particular some of the NGO representatives and the Advisory Board members being somewhat disappointed with the number of people visiting the exhibition, the exhibition must be considered a fairly successful event combining public information and advocacy. One should note that information about the exhibition was distributed to a number of EU institutions and was published on various EU websites. Moreover, one should not underestimate the fact that related to the exhibition a number of information materials were produced, also by the SCY themselves and there is a potential for utilizing these materials in the future.

In order to analyze side effects of the project within the field of public outreach and advocacy the evaluation team has explored whether the project has inspired national activities. The responses were positive from the vast majority of the responding SCEP organizations.³⁴ The exhibition and the idea of having the SCY using their personal stories in a broader public and political context has been inspirational for all involved SCEP organizations – they have all distributed some information about the Youth Network. Moreover, a number of SCEP organizations of those being categorized as very active are now planning activities of a similar kind at national level as for instance an exhibition in Norway, distribution of a pamphlet about SCY in Portugal, publishing of stories on the website of Swedish Save the Children, the arrangement for a workshop in Austria and setting up a national network of SCY in Denmark.

Finding: The project has achieved a greater impact regarding raising public awareness and enhancing advocacy than anticipated in the original planning of the project – mainly due to the idea of arranging the exhibition in Brussels presented by the SCEP Youth Network. Achievements have had effect internally – SCEP member organisations have improved their national efforts potentially leading to future new European activities if the network obtains further support. All in all, the objectives of ‘making the voices of the SCY heard’ have been fully accomplished.

³³ Looking at the original budget for the project it is remarkable that no funds were originally allocated for ‘information activities’, in spite that one of the two goals was to ‘raise public awareness’.

³⁴ See appendices: “Summary of interviews with the NGO representatives”, p.34.

6. Organization and management

6.1. Involvement of the SCEP organizations

From the NGO Matrix³⁵ it is obvious that the level of involvement in the SCEP Youth Network from the 30 SCEP organizations shows quite some variation. Three organizations invested own funds in the network. 15 of the SCEP organizations co-signed the partnership declaration; however six of these co-signing partners did not participate in any of the activities that have taken place during the past year and a half³⁶. The project coordinator explains this is due to the fact that at the time of handing in the application, time got scarce implying that only the quick ones got on board and signed the application. In principle whether SCEP member organization were part of the signing group has not been considered an issue, basically all SCEP organizations have been inclined to engage in the project about developing a concept and praxis for participation of the SCY.

6.2. Advisory Board

The Advisory Board was approved by the SCEP Steering Committee and consisted of six persons. It was established in June 2007, consisting of the coordinator (Mrs. Lise Bruun), the three consultants (Mr. Terry Smith, Ms. Yvonne van 't Oever and Ms. Simone Bommeljé), the two SCY residing in Sweden and Austria respectively and finally the resource person, Zaïna Karekezi from the Netherlands, in her professional capacity but with a personal background as SCY.³⁷

Taking into consideration that three SCEP organizations (Save the Children from Denmark, Sweden and Norway respectively) contributed with own funds to the project, it is somewhat remarkable that there was no official representation in the Advisory Board from any of these organizations. The explanation appeared to be that the SCEP Steering Committee were fully informed during the process and in that sense functions as a "Directorate Board". As stated by Eva Larsson Bellander from Save the Children, Sweden:

*"If I had not been a member of the Steering Committee I might have wanted to be in the Advisory Board. I need to follow up what is happening with the money and engagement of Save the Children Sweden."*³⁸

The evaluation examined the satisfaction among the SCEP NGOs with the work of the Advisory Board. This work was highly praised by most of the respondents. Giving the close relationship between the SCEP Steering Committee and the Advisory Board, it seems that the establishment of a manageable and efficient Advisory Board (rather than a broader entity with participation of a number of SCEP organizations) was the right decision.

The evaluation team has studied the minutes from the Advisory Board meetings and interviewed all six members of the Advisory Board.³⁹ All members of the Advisory Board underlines that the cooperation

³⁵ See appendices: "NGO Matrix", p. 40.

³⁶ There are various explanations to the lack of involvement, the main ones being lack of resources and shift of staff.

³⁷ See Appendices for Terms of Reference for the Advisory Board, "List of documents", p. 43.

³⁸ See appendices: "Summary of the interviews with NGO representatives", p.34.

³⁹ See appendices: "Summary of interviews with the Advisory Board", p. 41.

within the Board has been very good and constructive. The importance of having the SCY and the resource person in the Board from the beginning was stressed, securing that the project would at all times be in line with the interest of the SCY. A quote from one of the members of the Advisory Board, Yvonne van 't Oever:

“The SCY in the Board became more and more powerful. It was very good to have them on board from the beginning. We are so used to do things ‘for’ people – this was doing things ‘with’ people. The Board functioned as a bridge between staff and the SCY.”

Particularly due to the objectives of enhancing participation, it is excellent that the involvement of the SCY has been secured from the very beginning of the project by including some of them in the Advisory Board.

Finding: The Advisory Board has functioned as an efficient entity in the structure. Moreover, it must be concluded that securing the active involvement of the SCY and the resource person within the Advisory Board from the beginning of the project has contributed significantly to the success of the project.

6.3. Management

The project operates with a project coordinator and three consultants – these together forms what is here termed ‘the management’. They all undertake various responsibilities and all of them had been employed part-time by the project. From the interviews with the SCEP organizations⁴⁰ and with the consultants⁴¹ it is clear that the main responsibility for the project has been with the management group. The roles of the SCEP organizations have most prominently been to define the overall frame of the project, which was basically what was done during the Budapest seminar and the other task has been to identify and select relevant young people to participate in the network. The planning, organizing and executing of all activities within the project has been in the hands of the management with support from participating SCEP organizations. Member of the Advisory Board, Simone Bommelje explains it like this:

“In the process the organizations were more like spectators. One must understand that the people in the organizations are very busy doing a lot of other things. The process was very much in the hands of the consultants and the coordinator – and with good support from the Advisory Board.”

Regarding the management of the project the evaluation team has interviewed 14 SCEP representatives.⁴² The vast majority of the respondents (11 out of 14) replied very positively to questions related to the management and structure of the project. In particular what was emphasized about management was:

- Timely distribution of relevant material
- Positive and assisting attitudes related to the SCY
- Professional planning of all meetings and events

⁴⁰ See appendices: “Summary of interviews with the NGO representatives”. P. 34.

⁴¹ See appendices: “Summary of interviews with the Advisory Board”, p. 41.

⁴² See appendices: “Summary of interviews with NGO representatives”, p. 34.

Three critical comments occurred. One representative found that there had been too much material distributed by the coordinator and the Advisory Board. Another representative highly appreciated the quality of the information sent out but complained that materials several times arrived very late, making it difficult to plan. The third critical remark related to the fact that the decision of arranging an exhibition in Brussels implicated that the SCY came back with expectations that the national organization would finance various expenses related to materials and presentations – costs that the organization had not been informed about and had not budgeted for.⁴³ However, the following quote from Heinz Fronck, Austria, covers what was expressed by the majority:

“The management was successful because the SCY felt supported and that we in SCEP received good information. The management did a good job”.

The management group comprises of a number of complementary diversified qualifications within the fields of pedagogic, professional knowledge of participation, children’s rights and organizational experiences. It is the assessment of the evaluation team that the diversity in qualifications has shown to be a major strength in the project, as the management concretely has been able to provide the necessary support to the SCY, to ensure a very efficient and constructive planning of the project activities and provide profound inspiration to the SCEP organizations within the field of participatory approaches.

From the interviews with the coordinator and the consultants it is clear that the cooperation within this group has been very good, although it has apparently at times been somewhat difficult to pursue tasks in a timely manner due to the obligations to other activities outside the project as they are all part time employed. From the interviews with the SCY and the SCEP organizations it is clear that there has been a high degree of satisfaction with the work of the coordinator and the consultants.

The project has in all allocated 265 working days for the management (110 days for the project coordinator and 155 days for all three consultants). Looking at what has actually been achieved within the project period and at the same time looking at the time allocated for the consultants and for the coordinator, one can only be impressed with a high degree of efficiency.

Finding: The effort and performance of management – the coordinator and the consultants - has been impressively good and efficient. It is the assessment that the diversified qualifications within the group of management have been a major strength for the project. From the interviews with the SCEP organizations and with the SCY it is clear that there has been a high degree of satisfaction with the work of the coordinator and the consultants.

6.4. Financial management

The evaluation team has looked into the preliminary accounts of the project. The figures show a very close correlation between the budget, divided into various budget lines and the actual spending. This indicates that the financial management of the project has been efficient.

Finding: The assessment of the preliminary accounts indicates that the financial management of the project has been adequate and efficient.

⁴³ See note 32 on p. 20 regarding the lack of budgeting for ‘information activities’.

7. European dimension

The number of SCY coming in to Europe has increased during the years and it is likely, the tendency will continue. The handling of SCY is primarily a question of national legislations, there is, however, a tendency that the EU institutions play an increasingly important role in the formation of overall policies, member states need to adhere to.

This DAPHNE II funded project has in its nature a European dimension. All the young people interviewed stressed the importance of obtaining knowledge of the situation for SCY in other European countries. And the respondents from the SCEPT organizations all pointed out that an important part of the project is the European dimension, not only, as stressed by the SCY, in order to learn more about the actual condition in various European countries but as a recognition that questions about refugees and asylum are being dealt with at a political European level, not only national. The representative from Slovenia, Ms. Marina Uzelac states:

“The European dimension is important because through this project the youngsters found out what is going on in other European countries and demonstrate a willingness and motivation to do something not only for themselves but for other SCY now and in the future.”

And the representative from Norway, Ms. Thale Skybak, states:

“It is very good with a European perspective. Children and youth continue to seek asylum in Europe and it is important to inform the EU – I think it was a strong signal to have the exhibition in Brussels in order to direct the message to the EU.”

The dual objective of the project – creating a SCY European network which to our knowledge is the first of the kind and actively use the network to enhance public awareness and advocacy - truly connects to a European dimension.

Finding: The European dimension of the project has been significant. The SCY and the SCEPT organizations have learned very much about the situation in other European countries; moreover the public awareness and advocacy elements in the project are crossing borders and addressing issues at a European level.

8. Future perspectives and recommendations

All 14 respondents representing the SCEPT organizations express that they would find it very sad if the Youth network would not be able to continue in some form or the other.⁴⁴

The evaluation is taking note of the fact that the project was delayed in relation to active involvement of the SCY and the creation of a network. The SCY met for the first time in Aalsmeer in June 2008, just 7 months before the actual closing of the project in February 2009. All the SCY responding in the interviews expressed the wish to continue the network and several of the SCY referred to the discussions at the Brussels meeting presenting concrete ideas of activities to be arranged by the SCY.⁴⁵ At the same time both

⁴⁴ See appendices: “Summary of the interviews with the NGO representatives,” p. 34.

⁴⁵ See appendices: Summary of interviews with the SCY, p. 30.

the SCY and the interviewed representatives of the SCEP organizations⁴⁶ expressed a need to secure an overall coordination of the network. As Simon Hoff from the Save the Children Sweden puts it: *“This is too good an idea to be buried”*, a statement that this evaluation team fully supports.

All members of the Advisory Board expressed concern about the future of the project.⁴⁷ The general opinion is that if new goals are not set and new funds are not allocated within soon, there is a great risk that the network will fall apart. As stated by Simone Bommeljé:

“You cannot create a whole new European network of SCY and then just drop it. I really hope that the network will continue and that new funds can be allocated. Keep it simple. Use the strength that already exists.”

It is the viewpoint of the evaluation team that the SCEP Youth Network has huge potentials going far beyond the possibilities of having SCY throughout Europe meet and communicate. It is the assessment that the existence of an active SCY network provides good opportunities in enhancing public awareness regarding the situation of the thousands of SCY living in European countries, and has the possibilities of functioning as a platform for advocacy and political initiatives. The fact that this project is grounded within SCEP – a strong and established network of influential organizations - strengthens the findings that using the existing SCEP project as a point of entry for new initiatives seems very appropriate.

In the following the evaluation will line up a number of challenges related to the future of the SCEP Youth Network:

- Virtual network

It is clear that a number of SCY in various European countries has been incapable of participating physically in the network due to travel restrictions. Moreover it is clear that communicating through the internet (Facebook and Messenger) among the SCY in the network is essential. It is recommended to secure a designated portal on Facebook for the network providing both the possibility of the existing SCY Network to communicate internally and providing options for interested SCY in other European countries to participate virtually in the network. **It is recommended that resources are allocated for the management of such a portal.**

- Financing

Virtual contact between the SCY is not sufficient if genuine network activities are to be seen in the future. The SCY need to define common activities and to meet occasionally in order to withhold the energy and use the experiences already gained. A number of actors (both SCY and SCEP representatives) have launched the idea of replicating the Brussels exhibition in other European cities, and other types of activities might be relevant. It is recommended to secure activities among the SCY beyond a virtual network. In the conversations with the SCEP representatives, the consultants and the coordinator a number of ideas related to financing of future activities within the SCEP Youth Network has been presented:

- Applying for a Phase II from DAPHNE III

⁴⁶ See appendices: “Summary of interviews with NGO representatives”, p. 34.

⁴⁷ See appendices: “Summary of interviews with Advisory Board”, p. 41.

- Applying from other European sources (e.g. European Fund for Youth)
- Encouraging SCEP organizations to operate with a special “European dimension” budget line when applying for funds for national activities; and possibly pooling these incomes into a European project.
- Investigate the possibilities of obtaining funds related to the Swedish presidency of the EU in autumn 2009.

It is the assessment of this evaluation that new funding is needed within short in order to be able to build on the very positive experiences from this project. **It is recommended to on one hand investigate a number of different funding possibilities and on the other hand to secure a coordination of such initiatives.**

- Coordination

Although the co-operation in between the SCY has been very impressive it is the assessment that there is a need for overall coordination of the network in the future. **It is recommended to secure that one person functions as a coordinator for the network at least until summer 2009 and preferably until new funds can be allocated to the network.**

- National SCY networks

In several European countries initiatives are on their way of creating national networks of SCY. **It is recommended to secure a link between such national networks and the SCEP Youth Network; moreover it is recommended that SCEP organizations with national initiatives share good practices with other SCEP organizations.**

- Cooperation outside SCEP

There exist a number of both national and European initiatives related to the thought of participation of SCY. The evaluation mentions “Brighter Future” in the UK and “Terre des Hommes” in Switzerland as national activities and VYRE – Voices of Young Refugees in Europe – as a European initiative. **It is recommended to further explore the possibilities of connection between SCEP and such initiatives.**

- Within SCEP

For several of the SCEP organizations this project has been a first step related involvement in participation of SCY. **It is recommended to use this project as a point of entry for new initiatives within SCEP related to strengthening of SCY participation. Moreover it is recommended to investigate the possibilities of having SCY participate in various working groups within the SCEP network. It should be investigated whether it is possible to incorporate SCY participation in already existing activities of SCEP, like the European mapping report, in the revision of the “Statement of Good Practices” and the TORs for the Thematic Groups. Finally it should be explored whether a person within SCEP should be nominated as ‘focal point’ for SCY participation.**

9. Appendices

9.1. TOR for evaluation of project:

“Networking with youth to combat violence against separated children”

1. Introduction and background

At the request of Red Barnet/Save the Children Denmark (SCD) a team of external consultants has been commissioned to undertake an evaluation of the project “Networking with youth to combat violence against separated children”.

The project has been in effect from beginning of 2007 through 2008 to finish by February 2009. It has been partly financed by DAPHNE II.

SCDK (Red Barnet Denmark) is the formal applicant to DAPHNE II on behalf of the Separated Children in Europe Programme (SCEP) and its NGO network. SCD is a member of the Save the Children Alliance and has since 1945 worked to protect and promote the right of children in societies.

SCEP is a joint initiative of some members of the International Save the Children Alliance working closely together with UNHCR. An integral part of the Programme is its network of partners from non-governmental organizations across 30 countries throughout Europe. SCD currently hosts and manages SCEP.

The **goals** of the project are to:

- strengthen youth participation in preventing violence against young immigrants and asylum seekers by supporting an European forum of separated children and youth and as well
- to raise awareness about the importance and value of youth participation by exchanging good practice

The **objectives** of the project are to support separated children and youth to *make their voices heard* so that the SCEP NGO network, the general public, policymakers and decision makers are better informed and aware of their perspective on preventing and addressing violence. The project will create *a context* where youth have more opportunities to exchange information and to support each other through a European forum of separated children and youth.

2. Objectives of the evaluation

The objectives of the external evaluation are to analyze output, performance and impact of project activities as well as to critically review the project management structure and how successfully youth participation was supported. The evaluation will end up making recommendations for how to improve future efforts.

The evaluation will focus on the expected **results** of the project

- A. Creation of a new European forum of separated children and youth
- B. Production and targeted dissemination of a report to SCEP partners, including:
 - o a mapping of organizations
 - o a compilation of awareness raising materials
 - o documentation of good practices
 - o overview of possible approaches
- C. A seminar and a seminar report addressing a specific form of violence against separated children selected by the European forum of separated children and youth including recommendations to decision makers

The evaluation team will specifically:

- Assess whether the expected results have been achieved.
- Assess the activities that have taken place within the frame of the project.
- Assess whether the project has contributed to exchange of good practices among the partners.
- Assess whether and how the project has contributed to the establishment of a new European forum for separated children and youth.
- Assess the involvement of partners in the project.
- Assess the impact of project regarding whether the project has enhanced the possibility of giving a voice to the involved youth (separated children).
- Assess the impact of the project on advocacy and public awareness.
- Assess information materials produced in relation to the project.
- Review the management structure of the project.
- Assess the use of funds related to the original budget.
- Present recommendations for future efforts within the field.

3. Outputs

The outputs of the evaluation should include, but not necessarily be limited to:

- Inception report
- Draft report to be sent for comments to involved stakeholders
- Final evaluation report (15-20 pages)

4. Method of work

The evaluation will follow the DAPHNE toolkit regarding monitoring and evaluation:

http://ec.europa.eu/justice_home/daphnetoolkit/html/launching_project/dpt_launching_project_11_en.html and
http://ec.europa.eu/justice_home/daphnetoolkit/html/evaluation_risk/dpt_evaluation_risk_05_en.html

The interviews with the young persons will follow the guidelines recommended by UNHCR:

http://www.unhcr.se/se/Protect_refugees/pdf/children_world/interviefin.pdf

The evaluation will use the following tools:

- A. Assess existing materials produced within the context of the project (seminar report, final report, minutes from advisory board, questionnaire report elaborated by Terry Smith, information materials, website etc.)
- B. Conducting a questionnaire survey
- C. Interviewing NGO partners.
- D. Interviewing youngsters involved in the project.
- E. Interviewing SCDK and the advisory board regarding the management of the project, including assessment of financial statements.
- F. Compile the above into a draft report to be sent for comments by involving partners.
- G. Final report including recommendations.

5. Time frame

The evaluation is scheduled to take place in the period from the 5th of December 2008 to the 22nd of January 2009.

9.2. Responses to questionnaires distributed in Brussels in December 2008

Responses from 8 NGO representative and 15 SC

The evaluation distributed a questionnaire to participants at the Brussels event in order to receive initial input from some of the involved actors in the project. The input has been used to design the interviews with the SCY and the representatives from the SCEP organizations.

SCEP-representatives:

All 8 respondents found that the projects had succeeded in achieving the overall goals of securing an active participation by the SC. Moreover all respondents found that the exhibition had contributed to raise public awareness and as an advocacy tool, due to the meeting with MEP, Ms. Renate Weber. Most of the respondents expressed that the preparations had been good, while one respondent questioned the unclear division of responsibility between the consultants and the organizations.

SCY

All 15 responding SCY agreed that the exhibition had been a success and they all expressed the importance of coming together as a network. The majority of the SCY found that the preparations had required quite some work but stated that they had received relevant support.

The balance between impacts (1 being the most important, 3 being the least important)

NGO representatives	1	2	3
Impact concerning youth participation	5	2	1
Impact concerning benefits for participating NGOs	1	1	6
Impact regarding advocacy and public awareness	2	4	2

Among the 8 NGO representatives 6 found that the least impact was the benefit for the NGO's, while the participation of youth was most important.

SC	1	2	3
Impact concerning youth participation	8		
Impact concerning benefits for participating NGOs	1		
Impact regarding advocacy and public awareness	3		

Among the 15 SCY 8 found that youth participation was the most important one, 3 that advocacy and public awareness was most important and 1 the benefit for the NGOs.

9.3. Summary of interviews with the SCY

Facts

The contact list consists of 22 persons from 14 different European countries. Out of the 22 potential persons to contact the evaluation has talked to 18, which is considered to be a very satisfactory number. Out of the 22 persons 18 are male and 4 are female. The ages range from 15 to 24 years.

As some of the SCY had negative experiences with authorities it was decided to secure anonymity for all respondents⁴⁸. This means that the quotes used from the youngsters can not be identified as belonging to one in particular. It is the general impression that most of the respondents found it quite comforting that the interviews secured anonymity. The interviews have been based on the guidelines for interviewing (separated) minors developed by the Finnish Directorate of Migration in co-operation with UNHCR.⁴⁹

In the following extract it should be noted that regarding the general attitudes there will be no distinction on whether people participated in both Brussels and Aalsmeer or only one of the events, as there were no significant differences in the responses from the two groups.

Participations of the group and of the interviewees are:

	In Aalsmeer	In Brussels	In both events	In none events
Total: 22	17	16	13	4
Interviewees: 18	14	13	10	1

Findings

Initial involvement

Out of the 18 respondents, 11 say that they were contacted by a national NGO, 4 that a social worker or counselor was the contact and 3 that it was either a personal contact or unknown.

Aalsmeer

Out of the 16 interviewees 14 participated in the Aalsmeer workshop. All 14 had a very positive view of the event. All 14 pointed out two major achievements from the Aalsmeer workshop: one was the opportunity to meet the other SCs and the other that they learned a lot.

Concerning meeting the others central quotes from the youngsters is:

"It was very interesting to meet with the other SCs. You met people that although they came from different countries and lived all over Europe they had some of the same history as yourself."

⁴⁸ Excluding the two SCY participating in the Advisory Board.

⁴⁹ http://www.unhcr.se/se/Protect_refugees/pdf/children_world/interviefin.pdf

“It was great to meet people from a lot of different countries and we shared the same back ground so it created a common ground”.

“It was a surprise to see that this network existed and find out that we had same background and opinions as SCY.”

Concerning the learning process from the Aalsmeer workshop all 13 persons expressed that they learned a lot, especially the Rights of the Child was emphasized by most of the respondents. A quote from one the participants:

“It was very exciting. We learned a lot, e.g. Child Convention and Rights – things I did not know of before.”

Brussels

Out of the 17 respondents 13 participated in the Brussels meetings and exhibition. 2/3 of the respondents expressed that the preparations for the exhibition had required some hard work and ½ of them responded that they had been quite nervous before the presentations.

All respondents claimed that the Brussels meetings and exhibition had been a very positive experience.

They all emphasized two major achievements: one was to be able to meet with the other SCs and the other that the exhibition took place.

Regarding the exhibition most of the respondents felt that it was a very good event raising public awareness and being able to meet with influential people. All respondents emphasized the meeting with Ms. Renata Weber, MEP. A few of the respondents felt that there could have been more visitors and more than just one MEP meeting them. Relevant quotes for the exhibition are:

“It was a success, we raised a lot of awareness, a lot of people were contacted. It was cool.”

“It could have been better. I had hoped for more people and more MEPs to come, but it was OK. And the youngsters were very happy about it. We had a really strong message.”

“At first I was a bit worried on whether people would come and whether people would find our message interesting, but it was really great. People came and were surprised to learn about SCs; and MEP Renate came as well. It was very useful.”

“The MEP met with the youngsters and planned to talk to them for 10 minutes, but stayed for an hour. All us youngsters felt that someone listened and took us seriously.”

“The exhibition is a first step of raising awareness. We need to fight to get more people to support us.”

Overall

The outcome for the youngsters from the network can be divided into three different categories: personal development, knowledge and the role as social agent. The evaluation has as well investigated whether the youngsters feel that they had influence on the process and the activities in the network.

- Personal development

All 18 respondents say that it was a very positive experience to meet the other SCY, to learn that young people in other European countries have similar personal backgrounds. Several of the interviewees, all of them young of age (15 to 18 years) said that the network had contributed to their personal development

regarding becoming more serious and focused. Three said that the network has influenced the daily performance e.g. at school where they had enhanced their performances because of the involvement in the network. Some of the respondents emphasize that they have improved their English skills due to the involvement in the network. One quote:

"Personally SCEP Youth has meant that I in general take things more seriously, e.g. in school where my teacher says that I am much more focused now."

- Knowledge

All respondents say that they have learned a lot from being in the network. Two things go through all respondents, namely the knowledge of Children Rights and the knowledge of the actual situation for SCY in other European countries. Some quotes:

"I learned a lot of things that I did not know about before. It will help raise awareness. It has been very very positive. I hope to learn a lot more about equity and who has problems all over Europe."

"Some SCY are really having a hard time. Some have difficulties; it depends on the country you live in. We need to help each other."

"Although that we share same background (with a lot of differences in our personal stories) I found out that the situation for SCY are very different from country to country in Europe."

"Learning about Children Rights has been really important. I have learned a lot about the situation in other countries. It is very different from watching TV to hear from a friend how the situation really looks like."

- Social agent: use skills and network 'to help others'

One significant finding is that all the respondents stress time after time that the main objective for them being active in the network is that it creates the grounds for helping others. The respondents recognizes that the network has been positive for their personal development and that they had gained a lot of knowledge, but they all see these achievements as tools in order to reach what is really important, namely to help other SCs around Europe. Quotes:

"You start out saying what you feel, listen to the others and it will end up being contributions to political changes."

"We will use the network to be able to help others. It is important to bring together the NGOs and the youngsters, as the NGOs do have influence. One young person can do very little alone, but together with other young people and with NGOs we can make a difference."

"The network has given us hope! Together we can make people listen and do something."

"I can feel with myself that I am stronger and am now able to help other people."

- Influence

All respondents reply positively to the question on whether they feel that they had influence on the process and activities within the network. All the 14 persons that participated in the Aalsmeer workshop emphasizes that the idea of arranging an exhibition came from the youngsters themselves. Quotes:

"Definitely we, the youngsters, decided to make the exhibition in Brussels. "

"We had a very good influence. It was the youngsters who decided the exhibition in Brussels and this decision motivated all of us."

"Listen, we the youngster decided everything, and we had the opportunity to tell our opinion".

More than half of the respondents stated that they had received valuable assistance from the consultants and from the coordinator.

Communication

The evaluation has investigated how the youngsters communicate with each other. 16 out of 17 respondents say that the existing website (www.scepyouth.eu) is not working optimal for the purpose of communicating with each other. In general it is found 'troublesome' and 'boring', because you need to log in and not very much is happening. In stead 15 out of the 17 respondents inform that they use Facebook and/or Messenger to communicate internally. Most of the respondents express hope that a special portal can be established on Facebook for the SCEP Youth network.

Future

All respondents expect the network to continue in some form or the other. All expressed a willingness to continue communicating with each other. A number of the respondents mentioned that the youngsters had discussed several ideas of future activities, e.g. to replicate the exhibition from Brussels in Greece. Most of the youngsters emphasize the high motivation within the group. Some of the respondents say that they would still need some assistance if they are to set up future activities. Quotes:

"The network must be alive and develop. It is a new idea and we have found out that SCY can do things themselves. It is important to use the experience within the group. These must be transformed into activities and raise public awareness about the situation for SCY all over Europe. There is a strong potential, strong motivation, so the network will never stop. It is a brilliant idea. Although most of us are very busy with work and studies we still spend a lot of voluntary work with the network, this shows how important it is to us."

"I hope the network will expand. I have talked to some children and youth and proposed them to join. I hope it will grow bigger."

"This is a first step, a very big and important step, but we still need to do more and we will."

"We will certainly continue as a network in spite of the fact that the project closes down in February 2009. We have found out that we can do things ourselves – we do not need someone else to help us. We have a lot of ideas from the Brussels exhibition and will try to pursue them."

"The youngsters have the motivation and are willing to work to create new activities but they would still need help from the NGO's some form of coordination."

9.4. Summary of the interviews with NGO representatives

As seen from the “NGO Matrix”⁵⁰ there has been quite some differences regarding the involvement of the 30 SCEP organizations in the Youth Network. One can talk about three categories:

- The very active 11 organizations which have connections with young SCYs in the network. These organizations had representatives both at the Budapest and Brussels events.
- The active 9 organizations which participated in the Budapest seminar.
- The not very active 10 organizations which did not participate in any of the events, but received information about the network through e.g. SCEP Newsletter.

There are mainly two reasons why a number of countries did not succeed in attracting SCY for the network, namely travel restrictions for SCY in the country, meaning that the SCY would not be able to physically meet other European SCY and the insufficient language skills (English). Moreover several of the respondents explained that the living conditions and everyday life of SCY in their particular country were quite hard, making it difficult to interest SCY in extrovert activities.

No. of Organizations	Brussels and Budapest	Budapest only	None of the events
Participating in	10	10	10
Interviewed	10	4	0

The table shows that the evaluation has prioritized interviewing representatives from the most active organizations – in all 16 persons coming from 14 different organizations (the evaluation has interviewed two persons from Sweden and Austria respectively due to shift of staff). It should be noted that the evaluation has interviewed 10 of the 11 most active organizations in the network. The sample is considered to be satisfactory.

Budapest seminar

From the evaluations schemes it is clear that the participants in the Budapest seminar found it very relevant and constructive. This is sustained by the interviews, where all respondents articulated great satisfaction with the meeting. Especially the introductions regarding children’s participation and the workshops were highlighted. Christoph Braunsweig from Switzerland:

“Budapest was really interesting. Beforehand we received a lot of good and relevant material about the project and then it was days of intensive learning about participation. It was excellent.”

Inger Neufeld, Denmark:

There were long discussions regarding how to pick out the young people as there exists no national network so we could have representatives. It was agreed to hand pick the young people. This means that the picked young people would be the strong persons with English knowledge. Besides this it was a very good meeting with focus on participation.

Brussels exhibition

⁵⁰ See p. 40.

The evaluation has interviewed 10 persons from the 10 SCEP organizations present in Brussels. All respondents expressed very positive views about the exhibition. The majority (8) of the respondents expressed that they were a bit disappointed with the number of visitors.

Heinz Fronck from Asylkoordination Austria expressed stated it in this way: *“It was a fantastic event. It was really well prepared. There is really a difference when SCY do this – telling their own stories – compared to when professionals or our organizations are doing lobby. The SCY presented really strong messages. It was a really good exhibition, but it was a pity that so few people came.”*

Thale Skybak from Save the Children Norway expressed: *“The exhibition in Brussels was very impressive, really well planned. There was a clear focus on children’s rights. All the young people were – despite they came from different countries – focused on the same things. It is a very strong message because it is their own personal stories. It was a pity that not more people visited the exhibition. It would be great if it could travel around the European countries.”*

Stefanie Studnitz from Germany: *“Very positive. The idea of the exhibition came from the youngsters themselves so there was a high degree of motivation.”*

Blanka Stevenson, UK: *“It was really good, Strong voices to be heard. There was a lot of energy. It was a great opportunity in Brussels to present the messages both in front of the public and decision makers.”*

Assessment of goals to engage SCY and to raise public awareness and advocacy

All 14 respondents declared that the first goal of engaging SCY in the project had full been fulfilled. Regarding the second goal of raising public awareness and advocacy the majority of the respondents present in Brussels expressed a slight disappointment with the number of visitors to the exhibition. There is however a consensus that the objective of raising public awareness and enhancing advocacy had been achieved.

Blanka Stevenson, UK Refugee Council: *“This project is really an empowerment project. Both goals have fully been achieved. With the advocacy we can work more, continuing to raise awareness.”*

Christoph Braunsweig, Switzerland: *“The project is really good because we have had a lack in dealing with participation before. This is more than a good idea, it is a necessity. We appreciate a lot that SCEP decided to take the lead in this and received funds from DAPHNE”.*

Justin Watson, UK (SC): *“Looking from outside it seems that the whole idea has been really exciting and a fantastic idea to gather young people from various European countries in one network.”*

Inger Neufeld, Denmark: *“The goals of the project have been achieved, both engaging the young people and raising awareness. Somewhat disappointed about the number of visitors, but the young people were really glad that they had a chance to talk to the MEP.”*

Julia Andrasi, Hungary: *It has been absolutely positive. Everybody loved it. The goal of engaging the SCY was achieved 100%. They made their voices heard. The goal about public awareness was also to some extent achieved. The exhibition was very successful although we could have hope for more people to come and see it. It was good with the meeting with MEP.”*

Marina Uzelac, Slovenia: *“This is a very good project. Money very well spent! This is a chance for the SCY to raise their voices and talk about their rights. It was a success regarding both engaging the youngsters and regarding public*

awareness and advocacy. The latter through the Brussels exhibition where people came and they met MEP Ms Renata Webber. Very good achievement.”

Eva Larsson Bellander, Sweden: *“Very successful project. I have been with SCY more than 10 years and I think we should have done a thing like this years before.”*

Laurent Aldenhoff, Ireland: *“Overall the project has been a success. The SCY have been engaged and they were able to have their voices heard. And they learned a lot. It was a success in a way regarding public awareness and advocacy due to the Brussels exhibition. Although not too many people visited the exhibition it was important for the SCY to be able to express themselves and for the visitor to have the opportunity to hear their strong personal stories. Moreover they met with MEP Ms. Renate Weber. Such an exhibition is very different from reading a report about SC.”*

Margit Polheimer, Austria: *“The network is a very good idea and I hope that it will continue.”*

Senja Kemppainen, Finland :*“ In general I strongly got the impression that the project has succeeded. Youngsters seemed very keen and satisfied with the opportunity to be involved in network, the representatives, including me, were very impressed by the work of youngsters, and the coordinators were satisfied for the outcomes. I believe that the goal to enhance public awareness and advocacy related to SCY was reached, at least in some extent. Exhibition was a good and definitely efficient mean to enhance public awareness, but it is naturally depending on the number of visitors. Furthermore, it is a quite expensive way.”*

Heinz Fronck, Austria: *“The goal of raising public awareness could have been better. All SCEP organizations have a responsibility to help with this. Advocacy: succeed with the MEP and the DAPHNE people visiting the exhibition.*

Stefanie Studnitz, Germany: *“If we only look at the exhibition not very many people visited it. And I understand that the other activities within the network have had an internal character so in all it might not has been enhancing very much public awareness. If the SCEP Youth network inspires national NGOs we might see a result through that.”*

Simon Hoff, Sweden: *“I think that the main strength in the SCY group is the potential to have political influence. Politicians tend to listen more to children. They have their personal histories and use them to influence. There is a very strong potential here.”*

European dimension:

Slovenia: The European dimension is important because through this project the youngsters found out what is going on in other European countries and demonstrate a willingness and motivation to do something not only for themselves for other SCs now and in the future.

Sweden: Many different countries. There is a political dimension as the EU is a good political forum to discuss the situation for SCs.

Germany: It is very important that it is a European network because if we need changes regarding the situation for SCs we need to do it on a European, not a national level.

Norway: Very good with a European perspective. Children and youth continue to seek asylum in Europe and it is important to inform the EU – I think it was a strong signal to have the exhibition in Brussels in order to direct the message to the EU.

Inspiration to national activities

All 14 respondents expressed that the SCEP Youth Network had inspired them in making national activities. Below is a list of such inspired activities:

Switzerland has seen this as very good inspiration. We have profited from the network and are using the information within our professional network here in the country.

Austria will use the messages and will write article, both for public awareness and advocacy.

Denmark has been inspired by the network to initiate an analysis of the needs of the SCY with respect to participation. The goal is to create some kind of national network of SCY.

Hungary has the ambition is to bring the exhibition to Hungary. They have distributed information about the network and placed stories and photos on our website.

UK (Save the Children) has seen a mutual inspiration between the SCEP Youth Network and their initiative "Brighter Future."

Ireland has distributed material about the network directly to SCY as well as to the Health Service Executive (social service working with SCY), Dun Laoghaire Refugee Project (www.drp.ie) and CDVEC Education Service for Separated Children. As the Irish Government plans to implement new legislation (Immigration, Residence and Protection Act) in 2009, the Irish Refugee Council plans to work with UNICEF and key stakeholders including SCY in order to make the new protection application procedure more child-friendly.

Austria is now planning a workshop on SCY in Austria with inspiration from the SCEP Youth Network.

Slovenia would like in the future to do similar things as the network so it is an inspiration for us.

Portugal was inspired by the network to produce a pamphlet in Portuguese about SCY sponsored by the European Refugee Fund.

Finland is going to spread the information about this youth network and their experiences and this exhibition in different work groups and by doing so try to look for some organizations which could be able to organize something similar in national scale.

Sweden published articles and a blog on their websites targeted young people in Sweden and got some reactions from this."

Germany is doing a very similar thing on a national basis.

Norway: The two Norwegian SCY participants came straight home from the Aalsmeer meeting and went to a Norwegian asylum centre to tell about the network and did this on their own. The SCY has been meeting all staff at Save the Children Norway to tell about the network. They have been inspired to do a national Norwegian exhibition with asylum and refugee children.

UK Refugee Council is thinking of developing national activities targeted both the general public and decision makers.

Belgium is already involved in participatory activities, e.g. “What do you think?” project run by UNICEF-Belgium and a “Opinion Court” where a jury of 12 to 18 years old children put the Belgium government on trial because of the use of detention of SC.

Management

The vast majority of the respondents (11 out of 14) replied very positively to questions related to the management and structure of the project. The structure of having an Advisory Board was praised by most of the respondents. Especially emphasized about management was:

- Timely distribution of relevant material
- Positive and assisting attitudes related to the SC
- Professional planning of all meetings and events

Three critical comments occurred. One was that a representative found that there had been too much material distributed by the coordinator and the Advisory Board and the other recognized the quality of the information sent out but complained that materials several times came out very late, making it difficult to plan. The third critical remark related to the fact that the decision of arranging an exhibition in Brussels implicated that the SCY had expectations that the national organization would finance various expenses related to the preparations of presentations – costs that the organization had not been informed about and had not allocated within their own budget.

A few quotes:

Eva Larsson Bellander, Sweden: “We are satisfied with the internal cooperation. I am in the Steering Committee of the SCEP network and here we got a lot of information from the project coordinator. If I had not been a member of the Steering Committee I might have wanted to be in the AB. I need to follow up what is happening with the Save the Children Sweden money and engagement.

Marina Uzelac, Slovenia: “Regarding management there has been a good flow of information and I am very satisfied with the management, the coordinator and the Advisory Board.”

Heinz Fronck, Austria: “The management was successful because the SCY felt supported and that we in SCEP received good information. The management did a good job”.

Stefanie Studnitz, Germany: “We have had possibilities to participate and to get influence. It is my belief that the management of the project very much would like the involvement of the NGOs”.

Future

Regarding future all 14 respondents from the SCEP organizations express the wish that the network will continue in some form or the other. In the following is a catalogue of ideas from the organizations related to the future of the youth network:

Switzerland has now contact to Terre des Hommes in Switzerland who is about to start a participation project and a link between them and the SCEP Youth Network will be secured.

Denmark has the viewpoint that the network needs to be sustained. Finally SCEP has got a counterpart with the participating young people. The young people would need the help of a professional coordinator.

An idea is to use existing national activities and in national applications operate with a European dimension. Another idea is to use the Swedish chairmanship of the EU in doing activities. A third idea is to integrate the aspect of participation in the Working Groups of SCEP. Regarding advocacy an idea is to use the upcoming elections to the European parliament to promote the SCEP Youth Network.

Hungary thinks that ambitions of having it continue on an EU level are too high. They will try to raise funds in Hungary and perhaps in neighboring countries to continue.

UK (Save the Children) will create a link to the children within “Brighter Future”.

Ireland has the idea of linking to VYRE – Voices of young refugees in Europe, and support the idea of showing the exhibition in other European countries.

Czech Republic is a bit worried that the SCY involved will be disappointed as they would still need some support. A discussion within SCEP on what to do is needed.

Portugal finds that it is very necessary to continue the network in some way or the other. It is very important as the future will bring even more SCY to Europe as SC.

Sweden finds that it is too good a project to be buried. The kids get a kick out of it and there is so much momentum right now. The SCY can do a lot of things on their own but they would need assistance and coordination.

Finland hopes that the ideas and views from youngsters themselves are heard and taken into account within the work of the SCEP network and within the work of our organizations. Furthermore they hope that on the basis of these experiences it is possible to create some kind of continuation for the project.

Germany thinks that it is a pity that it is over already. The young people have just started meeting each other. They have started discussions internally about how it will be possible to continue the youth network and state they it is really important to prioritize the participation of the young people.

Norway has not yet discussed on whether to engage in a new project. Overall they think it would be very nice if the network could continue but it will be a discussion to be taken within SCEP

UK (Refugee Council) really hopes that the network can continue - it would be a pity if it stopped.

Belgium hopes as well that the network will continue and that perhaps SCY from Belgium can participate.

9.5. NGO Matrix: European organizations with relation to the SCEP Youth network

Country	Organisation	Status	Budapest	Brussels	Interviewed
Denmark	Save the Children	Co-financing	Inger Neufeld	Inger Neufeld	Inger Neufeld
Norway	Save the Children	Co-financing	Karoline Bakke Hjerto	Thale Skybak	Thale Skybak
Sweden	Save the Children	Co-financing	Monica Jacobson	Simon Hoff	Simon Hoff Eva L. Bellander
Austria	Asylkoordination Don Bosco	DAPHNE partner	Margit Polheimer	Heinz Fronek	Heinz Fronek Margit Polheimer
Finland	Central Union for Child Welfare	DAPHNE partner	Anna Mikkonen	Senja Kemppainen	Senja Kemppainen
Germany	B-UMF	DAPHNE partner	Thomas Gittrich	Stefanie Studnitz	Stefanie Studnitz
Ireland	Irish Refugee Council	DAPHNE partner	Jyothi Kanics	Laurent Aldenhoff	Laurent Aldenhoff
Netherlands	DCI	DAPHNE partner	Carla van Os		
Slovenia	Philantropia	DAPHNE partner	Marina Uzelac	Marina Uzelac	Marina Uzelac
Latvia	Red Cross	DAPHNE partner			
Spain	Save the Children	DAPHNE partner			
Italy	Save the Children	DAPHNE partner			
Slovak Republic	Hum. Council	DAPHNE partner	Katarin Ianovska		
Estonia	Union for Child Welfare	DAPHNE partner			
Albania	Save the Children	DAPHNE partner			
Croatia	CSPI	DAPHNE partner			
Hungary	Menedek		Julia Andrasi	Julia Andrasi	Julia Andrasi
Malta	OIWAS		Sarah Borda Bondin		
UK	Refugee Council		Helen Johnson	Blanka Stevenson	Blanka Stevenson
UK	Save the Children		Jess Nott Justin Watson		Justin Watson
Switzerland	Service Social Int.		Christoph Braunschweig		Christoph Braunschweig
Greece	ISS Greece		Chris Kondoyanni		
Luxembourg	Caritas		Cristina Lopes		
Portugal	Refugee Council		Monica Frechaut		Monica Frechaut
Lithuania	Red Cross				
Romania	Save the Children		Stefania Ionita		
Belgium	DCI		Benoit vKeirsblick		BenoitvKeirsblick
Bulgaria	Helsinki Committee				
France	Defense d Enfants				
Poland	Nobody's Children				

9.6. Summary of interviews with the Advisory Board

The Advisory Board consisted of the project coordinator, Ms. Lise Bruun, the three consultants of the project, Ms. Yvonne van 't oever, Ms. Simone Bommeljé and Mr. Terry Smith, a resource person, Ms. Zāina Karekezi (having a background as SCY herself), and two SCY, Mr. Jean Gatsinzi and Mr. Asmatullah Fikrat.

The evaluation has interviewed all seven members of the Advisory Board individually.

Assessment of the project

All members of the Advisory Board found that the project had been a success. They all stress that a key factor has been the genuine participation of the SCY, including that there were two SCY and a resource person within the Advisory Board from the beginning of the project. Quotes:

Simone Bommeljé: *“What can I say? Great! Wow!”*

Zāina Karekezi: *“It was an even greater success than I expected. When it started I thought, OK, let us do it, but was a bit skeptical on whether we would succeed in attracting the SCY.”*

Goal to engage the SCY

All members of the Advisory Board agree that the goal of engaging young people in the network has been fully achieved.

Zāina Karekezi: *“It was a great success. Fully achieved. The exhibition in Brussels was great because it was decided by the SCY themselves. They really grew in the process, because they thought: This is our own thing.”*

Goal to raise public awareness and advocacy

All members of the Board express that they have wished for more people to visit the exhibition in Brussels. But they all find that the goal has been – at least – partly achieved. Quotes:

Asmatullah Fikrat: *“The goal was not completely fulfilled. It was only the exhibition in Brussels that contributed to public awareness and advocacy. All the other activities were internally. We could have done more.”*

Simone Bommeljé: *“We had hoped for more people to come to the exhibition. But we shall not forget that there was good publicity around the exhibition – many EU institutions had information about it on their own websites.”*

Zāina Karekezi: *“There is still a long way to go. The people visiting the exhibition were professionals. We need more genuine publicity. It was very fine to see the SCY arrange the exhibition themselves.”*

Terry Smith: *“We probably did not really achieve this goal. We have made a start and have got a good basis to move on.”*

Cooperation with the SCEP organizations

All Board members expressed that the Budapest meeting showed that there were big differences in between the organization concerning the involvement in the project (as shown also in the “NGO Matrix” p. 40). Moreover the Board members explained that there was some skepticism in the beginning of the project among the SCEP organizations, but that this has been followed by genuine interest by a number of the organizations. In the process it soon became clear that the responsibility of making the project a success was in the hands of the coordinator and the consultants. Quotes:

Jean Gatsinzi: *“At the Budapest meeting it became clear that some of the NGOs found the project relevant but others did not. So there has all the time been this difference in between the NGOs and how much they got involved in the project.”*

Simone Bommeljé: *“In the process the organizations were more like spectators. One must understand that the people in the organizations are very busy doing a lot of other things. The process was very much in the hands of the consultants and the coordinator – and with good support from the Advisory Board.”*

Yvonne van 't Oever: *"The feeling from the organizations was a bit skeptical to start with (Budapest meeting), but things were clarified. Almost everything was put in the hands of the consultants. Some of the NGOs have been very valuable because they contributed time and were genuinely interested in assisting the SCY from their country."*

Terry Smith: *"I have been working with SCEP for ten years and can tell that there is three different groups of organizations, namely the core group always responding, another group sometimes being active and a third group that I would consider as 'sleeping partners'. In this project I find that the level of engagement has been pretty good – in fact better than in some of the other SCEP initiatives."*

The work of the Advisory Board and the role of the SCY in the Board:

All Board members praised the cooperation within the Board. The importance of having the SCY and the resource person in the Board from the beginning was stressed, because it secured that the project would all the time in the process be in line with the goals of the SCY. The Advisory Board functioned as a bridge between the SCY and the consultants. Quotes:

Yvonne van 't Oever: *"The SCY in the Board became more and more powerful. It was very good to have them on board from the beginning. We are so used to do things 'for' people – this was doing things 'with' people. The Board functioned as a bridge between staff and the SCY."*

Asmatullah Fikrat: *"We had the same influence as the other Board members but it is obvious that we as young people lack organizational experience."*

Simone Bommeljé: *"It was very good to have the SCY and Zaïna represented in the Board from the very beginning. This contributed very much to the success because they secured that we were on the right track. The work in the AB was a learning process for me as well, because the participation of the SCY and Zaïna in the Board was genuine participation and we – the professionals – learned a lot from that."*

Zaïna Karekezi: *"They were listening to me as the voice of the SCY – although I did not take part in the SCY group, but with my background I could express opinions on behalf of them. When professionals address the SCY they are often concerned whether they hurt their feelings (because they have gone through many terrible things), but I could tell them not to worry about that, to put demands to the SCY."*

Terry Smith: *"I am not really sure on whether we listened enough to the young people. But it was great having them on board and they did a kind of reality check for us – saying what could and what could not work with the SCY."*

Future

All Board members expressed concern about the future of the project. The general opinion is that if new goals are not set and new funds are not allocated within soon there is a great risk that the network will fall apart. Quotes:

Jean Gatsinzi: *"I do not think that SCEP should let the youngsters down now – they need some help to do e.g. further activities."*

Simone Bommeljé: *"You cannot create a whole new European network of SCY and then just drop it. I really hope that it will continue and that new funds can be allocated. We should do the exhibition again somewhere else. Keep it simple. Use the strength that already exists."*

Yvonne van 't Oever: *"I am concerned about what will now happen with the network. It should be continued. It is important to have clear goals and new funds. The SCY need to set a goal and agree to meet in the future. They would still need support and some form of coordination."*

Zaïna Karekezi: *"The SCY still needs support, funds and coordination. And they need to set up a goal, e.g. the set up the exhibition in a new place, as soon as possible. Or else I fear that the network will fall apart."*

Terry Smith: *"I share the concerns over what will happen now to the network. It would be a real shame to close it. If we could find some funds the ideal would be to have 2-3 young people engaged in coordinating, keeping the contacts and so on. And the network would need to meet at least once a year. When we talk about future funding we should not put all our eggs in one basket, but look for different options."*

9.7. List of documents

Application to DAPHNE

Terms of Reference for the evaluation

Advisory Board and management

- Terms of Reference for Advisory Board
- List of members
- Minutes from meeting Amsterdam on the 30th and 31 of August 2007
- Minutes from meeting in Vienna on the 22nd and 23rd of March 2008
- Preliminary accounts for the DAPHNE II project

Budapest meeting

- Final agenda, Budapest on the 15th and 16th of November 2007
- Report SCEPT NGO network seminar
- Evaluation schemes

Aalsmeer meeting

- Programme Aalsmeer, on the 13th to 15th of June 2008
- List of participants
- Programme
- Workshop report
- Evaluation schemes

Brussels meeting

- Programme on the 30th of November to 3rd of December 2008
- List of participants
- Leaflets for exhibition, including invitation
- Evaluation schemes

Report: Children's participation within the SCEPT – mapping and identifying of initiatives to date

- First draft of above report
- Second draft of above report

Guidelines

- DAPHNE guidelines on final report
http://ec.europa.eu/justice_home/daphnetoolkit/html/launching_project/dpt_launching_project_11_en.html
- DAPHNE toolkit on monitoring and evaluation
http://ec.europa.eu/justice_home/daphnetoolkit/html/evaluation_risk/dpt_evaluation_risk_05_en.html

- Guidelines for interviewing (separated) minors, Directorate of Immigration, Finland, March 2002: http://www.unhcr.se/se/Protect_refugees/pdf/children_world/interviefin.pdf

Methodology input

- Responses to questionnaire distributed in Brussels December 2008
- List of questions to the SCY
- List of questions to NGO representatives
- List of questions to Advisory Board

Background documents

- SCEP statement on Good Practices: <http://www.separated-children-europe-programme.org/index.html>
- SCEP newsletter and reports – <http://www.separated-children-europe-programme.org/index.html>
- SCEP: Annual Report 2007
- SCEP Strategic Plan 2009-2013
- SCEP Strategic Development Framework Paper
- SCEP Terms of Reference Thematic Groups
- Information from <http://www.scepyouth.eu>
- Pamphlet and News Flash with information about SCEP Youth Network
- UNHCR: trends in SCY numbers 2001-2003: <http://www.unhcr.org/statistics/STATISTICS/40f646444.pdf>