**Reshaping Attention and Inclusion Strategies for Distinctively vulnerable people among the forcibly displaced**

www.raisd-h2020.eu

# Evaluation Criteria: Actor–oriented and integrated evaluation

## (Evaluation Framework in RAISD)

### Deliverable D7.4

Antti Kivijärvi[1]

[1] *University of Helsinki, Unioninkatu 37 (PL 54), 00014, Helsinki, Finland*

# Document Information

| Grant Agreement #: | 822688 |
|---|---|
| Project Title: | Reshaping Attention and Inclusion Strategies for Distinctively vulnerable people among the forcibly displaced |
| Project Acronym: | RAISD |
| Project Start Date: | 1st February, 2019 |
| Related work package: | WP7: Cross analysis |
| Related task(s): | Task 7.3 Definition of evaluation criteria |
| Lead Organisation: | University of Helsinki |
| Submission date: | 17/02/2022 |
| Dissemination Level: | Public |

# History

| Date | Submitted by | Reviewed by | Version (Notes) |
|---|---|---|---|
| 14/02/2022 | Antti Kivijärvi (UH) | Liisa Hänninen (UCM) | V1 First version (draft) |
| 17/02/2022 | Antti Kivijärvi (UH) | All Partners | V1 Final version |

*Del. 7.4 Evaluation criteria [February, 2022]*

# Table of content

## List of Tables

## RAISD Glossary

| | |
|---|---|
| ARU | Action Research Unit |
| EC | European Commission |
| FDP | Forcibly Displaced People / Person |
| HVG | Highly Vulnerable Group |
| RAISD | Reshaping Attention and Inclusion Strategies for Distinctively vulnerable people among the forcibly displaced |
| RRI | Responsible Research and Innovation |
| TAIS | Tailored Attention and Inclusion Strategy |
| VC | Vulnerability Context |
| VG | Vulnerable Group |

| About RAISD | |
| --- | --- |
| *Call (part) identifier* | *H2020-SC6-MIGRATION-2018* |
| *Topic* | *MIGRATION-08-2018*<br>*Addressing the challenge of forced displacement* |
| *Fixed EC Keywords* | *Globalisation, migration, interethnic relations* |

*Forced displacement crises overcome societies and institutions all over the world. Pushed by the urgencies rather than events, solutions are frequently reactive, partial, and disregard some groups. The project 'Reshaping Attention and Inclusion Strategies for Distinctively vulnerable people among the forcibly displaced' (RAISD) aims at identifying highly Vulnerable Groups (VG) among these forcibly displaced people, analysing their specific needs, and finding suitable practices to address them. The concept of 'vulnerability context' considers the interplay between the features of these persons and their hosting communities, their interactions and experiences, and how different solutions for attention and inclusion affect them. As a result of this work, a methodology to carry out these studies will be developed. These goals are aligned with the call. They pursue characterizing these migrations and developing suitable aid strategies for them. The Responsible Research and Innovation (RRI) frames the project. It proposes that all actors (including civil society) co-design actions, transversely integrates the gender perspective, and supports sustainability. Our research strategy will be based on methodological triangulation (i.e. the combined application of several methodologies). We will implement it through a specific participatory action research approach to fulfil the aim of undertaking advocacy-focused research, grounded in human rights and socio-ecological models. The team will work as a network of units in countries along migration routes. The units will promote the VG people' involvement, so they can speak with their own voices, gather information, and test practices. Work will rely on a tight integration of Social and Computer Sciences research. Automated learning and data mining will help to provide evidence-based recommendations, reducing a priori biases. A software tool will support collaboration, continuing previous H2020- funded RRI work.*

Coordinator contact:

Dr. Rubén Fuentes-Fernández | Universidad Complutense de Madrid | Calle Profesor José García Santesmases, 9. Ciudad Universitaria 28040 MADRID, Spain.

t: +34/91 394 7548 | email: rfuentes@ucm.es | web site: www.ucm.es  grasia.fdi.ucm.es

www.raisd-h2020.eu

Del. 7.4 Evaluation criteria [February, 2022]

Coordinator contact: Dr. Rubén Fuentes-Fernández | Universidad Complutense de Madrid | Calle del Profesor José García Santesmases, 9. Ciudad Universitaria 28040 MADRID, Spain.
t: +34/ 91 394 7548 | e: rfuentes@ucm.es | w: www.ucm.es , grasia.fdi.ucm.es

This project has received funding from the European Union's Horizon 2020 research and innovation programme under grant agreement No 822688.

*Page 4 of 18*

# Executive Summary

In the RAISD-project, Tailored Attention and Inclusion Strategies (TAIS) are developed in order to alleviate the vulnerabilities of forcibly displaced people (FDP) living in different environments. To determine the feasibility of TAIS and to formulate evidence-based policy recommendations, an evaluation scheme is needed.

In this deliverable, an evaluation framework for the RAISD-project is set. The framework is designed for evaluating small-scale and multi-stakeholder interventions in contexts of forced displacement. The framework has been developed together with all project partners and their stakeholders. Key stakeholders in each project country were asked to define the most relevant evaluation criteria from their perspective. Based on these 'actor-oriented criteria', integrated evaluation criteria were determined.

In addition to actor-oriented and integrated evaluation criteria, the evaluation framework draws from a realistic tradition of evaluation science. In practice, and following the RRI principles, this means respecting the variety of stakeholder and beneficiary perspectives while acknowledging the different contexts in which TAIS have been implemented – studying 'what works for whom in which contexts'.

This is the final deliverable related to task 7.3 providing summarised answers and reporting key contributions. More thorough account on realist evaluation, actor-oriented and integrated evaluation criteria, and evaluation studies in the context of forced displacement have been reported in deliverable 7.3.

Del. 7.4 Evaluation criteria [February, 2022]

www.raisd-h2020.eu

Coordinator contact: Dr. Rubén Fuentes-Fernández | Universidad Complutense de Madrid | Calle del Profesor José García Santesmases, 9. Ciudad Universitaria 28040 MADRID, Spain.
t: +34/ 91 394 7548 | e: rfuentes@ucm.es | w: www.ucm.es , grasia.fdi.ucm.es

This project has received funding from the European Union's Horizon 2020 research and innovation programme under grant agreement No 822688.

Page 5 of 18

# 1 Introduction

In addition to producing knowledge on forced displacement and vulnerability contexts along the routes from the Middle East to Southern, Central and Northern Europe, the essential aim of the RAISD project was to develop attention and inclusion practices tailored for refugee populations in vulnerable positions. Further, to assess the feasibility of these practices, methodological work was conducted to establish common principles and tools of evaluation. In this deliverable, the focus is on the latter: evaluation of the Tailored Attention and Inclusion Strategies (TAIS) in different Vulnerability Contexts (VCs).

The aim of this deliverable is to present the evaluation framework of RAISD-project in a concise manner. Like all RAISD activities, also the evaluation methodology has been developed from a participatory perspective, aligned with the RRI principle. Consequently, the foundation of the methodology has been the evaluation criteria defined by various stakeholders in different contexts. These criteria are called *actor-oriented evaluation criteria*. Out of a diverse set of actor-oriented criteria, the task has been to determine *integrated evaluation criteria* while providing a common evaluation tool for RAISD project together with consortium partners.

In the following chapters three themes will be summarised in designated chapters. First, a rough outline of the theoretical principles of RAISD evaluation will be set. Second, a brief presentation of actor-oriented criteria of local stakeholders is conducted. Third, based on the theoretical foundation and local perspectives defined in the previous chapters, an 'integrated' evaluation criteria and an evaluation framework for the whole consortium is set.

Finally, the evaluation framework of RAISD is set to be congruent with the overall principles of the project: respecting diversity and principles of Responsible Research and Innovation (RRI) (Owen et al., 2012). Therefore, as with planning the TAIS and implementing them, it has been of essential importance to include the perspectives of different stakeholders and potential beneficiaries while designing the evaluation criteria. Moreover, as in all phases and work packages in the project, it has been focal to ensure the diversity among involved stakeholders both in terms of gender and also in respects of several social categories such as ethnicity, sexuality and religion. Most importantly, including the FDP perspectives and co-designing various project activities with them has been stressed throughout the project trajectory.

## 1.1 What is evaluation?

According to a renowned scholar in evaluation studies, Evert Vedung, evaluation refers to 'careful retrospective assessment of interventions, their organization, content, implementation, outputs, or outcomes, which is intended to play a role in future decision situations.' (Vedung, 2010). In short, evaluation means defining 'the value of certain project, program, intervention or service' (Robson, 2000, pp. 24). Thus, evaluation inevitably includes political aspects and include at least some level of researcher engagement (ibid, pp. 25); the core idea is to evaluate interventions designed to make desired changes to happen.

Consequently, to deploy an old academic dichotomy, evaluation studies fall into a category of 'applied research' instead of a sometimes more distinguished 'basic research'. Conducting applied research requires abilities in doing field work, interacting with various stakeholders, an in-depth understanding of an empirical phenomenon

under scrutiny and the contexts it is embedded in, and a capacity to compose policy relevant research settings. The evaluator is thus deeply bound up with the complexities, ambiguities and messiness of everyday life (e.g. Pawson, 2013, pp. 33-46).

In real life contexts outside laboratory conditions, conducting a reliable evaluation is never simple. First, changes are hard to accomplish (e.g. Stange & Phillips, 2007). A countless number of factors and institutional or structural conditions might mitigate the effects of even the most impressive program. A good evaluator can, at the very least, present informed predictions in which types of conditions certain interventions either succeed or fail. After that, if changes do happen, it might be even more difficult to indicate what it is in the program that have caused the changes. In other words, an evaluator is often expected to reveal causal relations between two or more variables or change provoking mechanisms (e.g. Webster & Sell, 2007).

In the RAISD-project and in this deliverable, evaluation means defining the value of piloted activities, TAIS, in their particular contexts. RAISD evaluation do not claim to reveal universal causalities but to explore some of the context-specific mechanisms promoting or preventing changes when trying to alleviate the vulnerabilities of specific refugee populations. This is done by having a look into each TAIS with mixed datasets and in close co-operation with a diverse set of stakeholders who are familiar with each context.

## 1.2   TAIS and their contexts in RAISD

The number and backgrounds of FDP and their living environments and vulnerability contexts differ greatly between the countries in the RAISD consortium. The neighbouring countries of crises-ridden areas such as Jordan, Lebanon and Turkey host millions of FDP while the number of refugees and asylum seekers in the 'fortress Europe' is significantly lower, particularly in some of its Eastern and Northern regions. In addition to differences in numbers, there are probably differences in characteristics as well. For decades, making the highly expensive, burdensome and dangerous journey to Europe have required resources that only few possess (e.g. Juntunen, 2016). Consequently, the poorest and physically weakest are often those who are not able to make the journey while the bulk of asylum seekers in Europe are young men from families with at least some financial resources.

The most important differences within the RAISD consortium partner countries, however, might be contextual. Societal and cultural structures are quite different in prosperous Nordic states with strong public sectors and regulation compared to, for instance, Mediterranean countries and Middle East (Esping-Andersen, 1990; Fangen et al., 2012). With all these huge differences in mind, it should not come as a surprise that the implemented TAIS differed as well. The TAIS probably need to be different, for instance, for asylum seekers in Finland than for undocumented Syrians in Turkey (for a detailed account on contextual differences, see deliverable 4.3).

As a result, the planned TAIS were quite different from each other. In Spain, the aim was to promote the inclusion of female refugees from sub-Saharan origins by enhancing their entrepreneurial skills. In Italy, the educational trajectories of women from refugee backgrounds were supported with a help of a digital tool. In Hungary, the pilot targeted professional audiences while aiming to create a monitoring toolkit for social workers in recognising refugee vulnerabilities. Finnish TAIS were focused on alleviating the vulnerabilities of two asylum seeking groups: young single men and parents of small children. Multilingual online forum aimed to foster language acquisition

www.raisd-h2020.eu

Del. 7.4 Evaluation criteria [February, 2022]

Coordinator contact: Dr. Rubén Fuentes-Fernández | Universidad Complutense de Madrid | Calle del Profesor José García Santesmases, 9. Ciudad Universitaria 28040 MADRID, Spain.
t: +34/ 91 394 7548 | e: rfuentes@ucm.es | w: www.ucm.es , grasia.fdi.ucm.es

This project has received funding from the European Union's Horizon 2020 research and innovation programme under grant agreement No 822688.

Page 7 of 18

and social inclusion of asylum-seeking men while the goal of developing childcare activities in reception centres was to improve the living conditions of both parents and their children.

Outside European Union, in Turkey, Lebanon and Jordan, the planned TAIS took their unique and context sensitive forms as well. In Turkey, a series of trainings were designed for municipal service providers to promote the rights of mainly Syrian female refugees in their local areas. In Lebanon, an online health awareness campaign was delivered and targeted mostly to Syrian refugees. The participatory campaign was geared to engage in awareness, prevention and treatment of COVID-19 and other health issues as well. Finally, in Jordan, methods of delivering psycho-social support for refugee populations were developed.

# 2    Theoretical foundations: Realist evaluation

One can find a countless number of evaluation cookbooks, a huge number of distinct evaluation methods and even a few paradigms of evaluation studies. Therefore, while figuring out the best possible evaluation strategies, one needs to recognise the possibilities and needs of the current project. The inescapable starting point in RAISD was that all TAIS were implemented in differing contexts, with various aims and among different populations and stakeholders. Common for most of the TAIS was that they were relatively small-scale and local exercises (in contrast to state-level programs), and they were implemented in complex real-world settings with actual people (in contrast to controlled laboratory conditions).

Consequently, the evaluation framework of RAISD-project is based on a *realist tradition*. For a realist evaluator, the key slogan is 'what works for whom in which contexts'. Thus, in realist evaluation studies, interventions are set in their discursive and material contexts and scrutinized among different stakeholders with mixed methods with an aim to explain changes in the everyday lives of people.

For a realist, the reality, even though not beyond dispute, is 'out there', largely independent of the human mind (e.g., Sayer, 2000, pp. 2). However, the reality is rarely directly observable. The aim of a realist is thus to theorise and explain observable regularities and their exceptions in certain contexts during certain time, without claiming universal truths. This means that instead of trying to reveal directly observable 'successionist causality' (A causes B), the aim is to explore 'generative causation' (B follows A because of operation of certain mechanisms). The key word in realistic evaluation is thus mechanisms (see e.g., Pawson & Tilley, 2004, pp. 6). Mechanisms describe what in programs bring effects. While mechanisms are often hidden (not directly observable), they are often responses of various stakeholders to a program. Programs thus might activate some people to change their perceptions, opinions, behaviour, or routines. (E.g., Pawson & Tilley, 1997, pp. 65; Robson, 2000, pp. 115-116; Astbury and Leeuw, 2010). Realist slogan says that 'interventions do not work, it is the interpretations of their subjects that produce results' (Pawson, 2013, pp. 34). People are seen as agents in their lives, not passive recipients of some exterior interventions.

All this means that an evaluator needs to have a substantial knowledge on the context and the phenomenon under investigation and possible mechanisms that might play a role (either promoting of blocking certain effects). In real-world surroundings, mechanisms and their contexts are messy and complex. Moreover, since evaluation often takes 'place in someone else's territory' (Robson & McCartan, 2016, pp. 1), such as refugee camps, an

evaluator has little control over the implementation of the program. (E.g., Shadish, Cook & Campbell, 2002, pp. xix).

Finally, a popular slogan for realist evaluators is 'what works for whom in which contexts' (Pawson, 2013, pp. xiii). A realist evaluator thus admits the limits of scientific enquiries – they are always fallible. Evaluation offers only best possible explanations based on limited empirical evidence. For a realist evaluator, a messy context 'is not unwelcome noise, not a confounding variable to be controlled for – but an integral part of a programme' (Pawson, 2013, pp. 36). Thus, the aim is not to exclude the effect of contexts or unknown factors, but rather to take them as objects of investigation (see e.g., Patton, 2014). An evaluator needs to resort, in addition to contextual knowledge, to multifaceted datasets and mixed methods (e.g., Robson & McCartan, 2016, pp. 5-6; Lipscomb, 2008).

## 3  Actor-oriented evaluation criteria

In the following, a brief summary on the actor-oriented criteria of different stakeholders is provided. A more detailed list of RAISD partner country-specific criteria can be found in the deliverable 7.3. As was expected, local actor-oriented criteria were manifold. The stakeholders, mostly ARU members and interviewed FDP in different contexts, rarely provided explicit and detailed directions on how to do the evaluation. Instead, many of their accounts included ideas on what types of issues should be considered while implementing the TAIS and what should be achieved with them. Consequently, actor-oriented criteria are divided into two categories: process and outcome criteria.

After initial processing and analysis, all actor-oriented criteria were listed and ranked based on their frequency (please see more detailed description in the deliverable 7.3). As a result, a set of both process and outcome criteria were established (table 1). The division between process and outcome evaluation is in line with the basic principles of realist evaluation. Processes might equal to mechanisms as they are triggered by the program or intervention. Processes can include things such as provoked co-operation, enabling new relationships, awareness raising or improved access to services. In addition to processes, it is important to observe or measure outcomes as well. An evaluator is interested in the results of processes.

Table 1.    Actor-oriented criteria

| Process criterion | Frequency | Outcome criterion | Frequency |
|---|---|---|---|
| Respecting FDP diversity | 16 | Increased autonomy | 12 |
| Listening to FDP | 5 | Increased professional skills/employment rate | 9 |
| Listening to service providers | 5 | Increased access to support/education | 8 |
| Fostering cross-professionalism | 3 | Improved living conditions | 5 |
| Sensitivity to local context | 3 | Promoted intergroup cohesion | 5 |
| Wide reach | 2 | Improved language skills | 3 |
| | | Increased knowledge on rights/available services | 2 |

This project has received funding from the
European Union's Horizon 2020 research and innovation
programme under grant agreement No 822688.

| | | Increased cross-professional co-operation | 1 |
|---|---|---|---|

The most frequently mentioned process criteria were respecting FDP diversity, listening to FDP and listening to service providers. Therefore, when it comes to evaluating processes, there was a strong emphasis of engaging with local people and implementing the TAIS together with them. As for outcome criteria, particularly wellbeing and inclusion of FDP were frequently mentioned. In more detail, these included criteria such as increasing the autonomy and empowerment of FDPs and promoting their access to various institutions. Consequently, according to project stakeholders, outcome criteria open up a diverse set of potential goals for TAIS in different contexts.

Despite differing contexts and interests of various local stakeholders, actor-oriented criteria included few, if any, conflictual contents or extreme positions. This is rather surprising when considering also the diverging aims of designed TAIS in all partner countries. Quite consistently, most stakeholders emphasised participatory stances and viability of TAIS while planning and implementing them. Almost as unanimously, stakeholders wished to put effort on evaluating the success of TAISs by looking at the wellbeing of FDP.

## 4    Evaluation framework in RAISD

In the following sub-chapters, a framework for evaluation in RAISD project is set. The framework is built out of several components. In addition to tradition of realist evaluation and actor-oriented and integrated criteria, evaluation framework was designed to fit the work of local Action Research Units (ARUs). The process of outlining, planning and implementing the TAIS was organised around ARUs iterative work. This work had a cyclic character, gradually refining the strategies in each context to enhance their adaptation and feasibility. In practice, TAIS were implemented in three cycles. During the cycles, they were further developed according to stakeholder and end-user feedback. Consequently, successful definition of integrated evaluation criteria did not mean that evaluation framework for RAISD-project would be finished. There was also a need to design the framework to fit the developmental trajectories of each TAIS.

### 4.1    Integrated evaluation criteria

In the following, an elaborated definition for integrated evaluation criteria is presented. In the integrated criteria, the actor-oriented criteria are not repeated in their 'raw' form. To fit the partners' interests and the ideas of realist evaluation, actor-oriented criteria have been on one hand generalised into a more abstract set of categories, and on the other hand, elaborated further to determine the methods and datasets to be used both in process and outcome evaluation. The distinction between process and outcome criteria were maintained. A more detailed description on the formulation of the integrated criteria can be found from the deliverable 7.3.

As for the **integrated process evaluation**, when looking at actor-oriented criteria, both FDP and service provider perspectives were strongly emphasised. Criteria on respecting FDP diversity, listening to them and wide reach are directly related to potential end-users of the pilots. In evaluation practice, this set of criteria were translated into categories of accessibility, acceptability and empowerment. In addition to FDP perspective, the standpoints of service providers were covered in the actor-oriented criteria on listening to them, fostering cross-professionalism

and pilots' malleability and sensitivity to local contexts. In the integrated evaluation criteria, the notion of viability summarises the service provider perspective.

Below, all four process criteria are deciphered.

- *Accessibility* means that pilots can be reached and used by people with diverse abilities and resources. Accessibility can be evaluated by compiling statistics on the profiles or social statuses of FDP who are reached and interviewing them on the ease of access, ease of use and non-discriminatory nature of the TAIS implementation. Moreover, if possible, also potential FDP who are not reached can be interviewed. They might be the key informants in providing the most critical information on accessibility.

- *Acceptability* refers to perceptions of the FDP and whether and to what extent the pilot is adopted by them. In the evaluation literature, acceptability most often means determining how certain piloted activity is received by the beneficiaries (e.g. Sekhon et al. 2017). Even though the starting point in assessing the acceptability is qualitative and subjective, it can be studied with quantitative and objective methods as well. Therefore, in addition to qualitative interviews in which the reception of the TAIS is probed among FDP, an evaluator can use behavioural indicators on withdrawal and adherence rates (see e.g. Knowles et al. 2017).

- *Empowerment* takes the process evaluation one step further and comes close to exploring mechanisms. Evaluating the empowering potential of pilots means to explore the resources or recognition they might provide for beneficiaries in accomplishing the changes they aspire. Provided resources might help people, for instance, to change their behaviour or use accessible support in novel ways. Moreover, being recognised might turn into changed patterns of thinking or relating to one's surroundings. In any case, assessing the empowering aspects of pilots requires subjective and qualitative data, most often in the form of interviews. An evaluator needs to know how TAIS are used and for what purposes.

- *Viability* refers to a service provider perspective. TAIS need to be seen as useful and appealing by service providers. If this is the case, it increases the likelihood that they are promoted in a way that FDP can benefit from them. TAIS should not be too burdensome for the practitioners and be compatible with their professional orientations (see Kivijärvi et al. 2019). A further aspect in assessing viability is malleability; whether practitioners can deliver TAIS in ways that seems reasonable for them in each situation. Successful and relatively effortless cross-professional co-operation might be seen as a process toward more comprehensive and effective service provision. Viability of the TAIS can be assessed with several types of datasets. It might be done by observing the frequency or intensity with which it is used or provided. Moreover, qualitative interviews of service providers can be used as well to understand their perspectives.

A quite detailed set of different actor-oriented outcome criteria (table 1) also need be abstracted into a more comprehensive categories of **integrated outcome evaluation**. As with process criteria, in the actor-oriented outcome criteria both FDP and service provider perspectives were highlighted. The former set of criteria included increasing FDP autonomy, improving their labour market position, securing their access to various institutions,

improving their living conditions, promoting intergroup solidarity, improving their language skills and knowledge on their rights in the host society. Below, these are merged into three overarching categories: capability, inclusion and capacity. Service-providers were given a more marginal status in actor-oriented outcome criteria while only promoting cross-professionalism was included. However, cross-professionalism is more a means than an end. It is thus essential to determine what types of (positive) outcomes might follow from cross-professional co-operation. These outcomes might be related to, for instance, increased skills in working with FDPs and promoting a more comprehensive understanding on forced migration and vulnerabilities. Consequently, competence function as the overarching outcome category for service providers or practitioners.

- *Capability* refers to actual possibilities people have when trying to achieve the goals they aspire. This includes both the available resources and the circumstances in which these resources can be used. Thus, capability is not only about individual assets but also abilities to use and benefit from them in certain contexts. This might refer to the kind of social life, level of health and lifestyle people wish to pursue. (E.g. Sen 1992; 1993). In this sense, the notion of capability relates to the notion of autonomy – the ability of individuals to pursue the goals that are the most desirable for them. Changes in capabilities can be traced with both qualitative interviews and by using established survey scales.

- *Inclusion* denotes to a broad idea on position of FDP in relation to host communities and society: social connectedness, labour market participation, educational degrees, community engagement and access to services. Inclusion can be assessed as a subjective and an objective outcome. Subjective inclusion relates to feelings of belonging to local communities and host society while objective inclusion can be measured as ties with majority representatives, service use and as an access to educational institutes and labour market. Due to the all-encompassing nature of the notion, each partner has determined the most relevant aspects to be evaluated. Some TAIS might explicitly aim to increase intergroup cohesion while others focus mainly on promoting educational opportunities.

- *Capacity* refers to FDP and their abilities to steer their everyday lives. In the actor-oriented criteria, knowledge and skills of FDP denoted to capacities. Concretely, capacities might be professional and language skills or knowledge on individual rights and local opportunities. Moreover, capacity could also refer to a more in-depth understanding of the cultures and institutions of the host societies. Change in the capacities can be assessed with various methods. In more objective terms, the language skills and various know-hows of FDP can be tested. However, since tests are designed to produce top-down information, they might be disempowering for some FDP. Therefore, also subjective information should be composed by focusing on the perceptions of people. This would mean surveying and interviewing TAIS beneficiaries on the development of their skills and awareness.

- *Competence* is related to institutions and service providers. The actor-oriented-criteria included a quite narrow view of competences since only cross-professional co-operation was mentioned. Cross-professionalism is more a means to achieve results (process) by fostering learning, not an outcome per se. TAIS might promote learning and knowledge accumulation also by introducing new ways of reflecting the service provision, encountering FDP, and providing first-hand knowledge on their living conditions. Transformations related to learning and possible changes in professional orientations are complex and

quite unpredictable phenomena and thus not easily operationalised as survey items. Additionally, the number of service providers included in each TAIS might be relatively modest. Therefore, while evaluating changes in competence, resorting to qualitative and retrospective interviews is probably a must.

## 4.2   Evaluation framework

Realist evaluation starts early. Evaluation work is running throughout the trajectory of the program, from the planning phases to the retrospectives after the implementation. Therefore, evaluation of all TAIS started in the very beginning of the RAISD-project by studying the contexts, vulnerabilities and needs of various FDP sub-populations. The key to planning successful programs is that they fit the contexts in which they are implemented in. Understanding the contexts and needs ensure that the right questions are asked, promising interventions are set up, relevant vulnerabilities are targeted and that FDP needs are met. In other words, contextual knowledge has provided a rationale for each TAIS that was implemented during the project. The focus of this deliverable, however, is more on the evaluation during and after the implementation of TAIS.

During the implementation, a key issue is to study the potential mechanisms of each TAIS (how they might provoke changes). TAIS are evaluated as processes. To do this, an evaluator needs to be engaged with the people involved in implementing the TAIS. Very often this requires compiling qualitative data in the form of observations and interviews. Concrete questions need to be posed: How is pilot perceived among different stakeholders? What happens during the pilots? How could they be improved? How much time and effort it requires from stakeholders? Process evaluation have been given the priority during the early phases of TAIS implementation to ensure that they are provided in feasible and ethically sustainable ways and that they provide useful resources for different stakeholders.

In the final stages and after the TAIS implementation, the outcomes were scrutinised to determine the possible harms/benefits for various stakeholders. At this stage, longitudinal datasets are preferred in order to estimate the change the TAIS might have provoked. In practice, this often means follow-up surveys or retrospective interviews among potential beneficiaries. Further, outcome evaluation can include a cost estimation as well. This would include information on working hours and materials used.

As with process evaluation, also in outcome evaluation it is of essential importance to deploy the RRI principles. Outcomes might not be the same for all. Differences might be observed in outcomes between service providers and end-users and between different sub-groups among them. Again, these differences might stem from varying societal statuses or positions within an institution that the TAIS is targeting. In realist evaluations, the aim is to study for whom the program works and for whom it does not.

www.raisd-h2020.eu

Del. 7.4 Evaluation criteria [February, 2022]

Coordinator contact: Dr. Rubén Fuentes-Fernández | Universidad Complutense de Madrid | Calle del Profesor José García Santesmases, 9. Ciudad Universitaria 28040 MADRID, Spain. t: +34/ 91 394 7548 | e: rfuentes@ucm.es | w: www.ucm.es , grasia.fdi.ucm.es

This project has received funding from the European Union's Horizon 2020 research and innovation programme under grant agreement No 822688.

Page 13 of 18

Table 2. General evaluation framework

| General criteria | Tasks | Methods | Timing |
|---|---|---|---|
| Defining needs | Conceptualising vulnerabilities and vulnerability contexts | Literature, statistics and stakeholder and FDP interviews | Before |
| Defining mechanisms | Determining what happens during the TAIS and how they are implemented and perceived | Stress on qualitative data: interviews, participatory observation, action research | During |
| Defining outcomes | Determining the level of change TAIS provoke and estimating their costs | Stress on quantitative data: mostly follow-up surveys but also retrospective interviews | After |

Finally, in the table 3, a framework for integrated evaluation criteria is set including the four target categories for both process and outcome evaluation. Integrated evaluation criteria are congruent with the general evaluation framework presented in the table 2. After a careful analysis of vulnerability contexts (defining needs), chosen TAIS were implemented in each partner country. While implementing the TAIS, particularly during the beginning phases, the focus was on process evaluation and determining the mechanisms potentially generating the sought-after outcomes. Consequently, accessibility, acceptability, empowering aspects and viability of the TAIS were assessed. This required resorting mainly to qualitative methods in the forms of interviews and requested feedback, but also statistics on the number and profiles of end-users, the frequency of using the pilot and on the adherence and withdrawal rates. Process evaluation provided data on how to refine and develop TAIS further, and how to explain the possible outcomes.

In the last phases of TIAS implementation, a plenty of evidence-based developmental work had already taken place. At this stage, the main task was to evaluate the outcomes in the forms of changes in capabilities, inclusion, capacities and competences. Since observing the changes is crucial when evaluating the outcomes, there was a need of longitudinal assessments. For some, this meant conducting baseline and follow-up surveys while others carried out retrospective interviews. Overall, the focus of outcome evaluation was on beneficiaries.

www.raisd-h2020.eu

Del. 7.4 Evaluation criteria [February, 2022]

Coordinator contact: Dr. Rubén Fuentes-Fernández | Universidad Complutense de Madrid | Calle del Profesor José García Santesmases, 9. Ciudad Universitaria 28040 MADRID, Spain.
t: +34/ 91 394 7548 | e: rfuentes@ucm.es | w: www.ucm.es , grasia.fdi.ucm.es

This project has received funding from the European Union's Horizon 2020 research and innovation programme under grant agreement No 822688.

Page 14 of 18

Table 3.    Integrated evaluation criteria

| PROCESS EVALUATION | POSSIBLE DATA & METHODS |
|---|---|
| **Accessibility**<br>The level of ease TAIS is reached by beneficiaries | • Statistics: Number of beneficiaries & distributions of them (according to gender, ethnicity, ability etc.)<br>• Qualitative feedback (beneficiaries): Ease of access/use & non-discrimination<br>• Qualitative feedback (stakeholders/potential beneficiaries): Who were not reached? |
| **Acceptability**<br>How TAIS is perceived by the beneficiaries? | • Statistics: Adherence and withdrawal rates (according to gender, ethnicity, etc.)<br>• Qualitative feedback from beneficiaries/stakeholders: How TAIS match needs?<br>• Qualitative feedback from beneficiaries/stakeholders & observations: How TAIS is received? |
| **Empowerment**<br>What types of resources TAIS provides or what types of changes it provokes for the beneficiaries? | • Qualitative feedback/observations: How pilots are used and for what purposes?<br>• Qualitative feedback/observations: What kind of resources and/or recognition TAIS provides for the beneficiaries |
| **Viability**<br>Feasibility of the TAIS from the service provider perspective | • Statistics: Frequency of using/providing TAIS<br>• Statistics: Increased cross-professional contacts as a result of TAIS<br>• Qualitative feedback: Ease of providing TAIS<br>• Qualitative feedback: How TAIS match with professional/institutional culture? |
| OUTCOME EVALUATION | POSSIBLE DATA & METHODS |
| **Capabilities**<br>To what extent TAIS promotes beneficiaries' perceived autonomy and coping in the context of host communities? | • Follow-up surveys/retrospective interviews: Change in the level of perceived autonomy<br>• Follow-up surveys/retrospective interviews: Change in the level of perceived coping skills |
| **Inclusion**<br>To what extent TAIS promotes societal participation of beneficiaries? | • Follow-up surveys/retrospective interviews: Change in social networks/community engagement<br>• Follow-up surveys/retrospective interviews: Change in employment or educational status and change in the level of access to support |
| **Capacity**<br>To what extent TAIS promotes competences/skills of beneficiaries? | • Follow-up surveys/retrospective interviews: Knowledge on work and educational opportunities, and on the rights and available support<br>• Follow-up surveys/retrospective interviews/tests: Change in language skills and societal/cultural knowledge |
| **Competence**<br>To what extent TAIS promotes competences/skills of service providers? | • Retrospective interviews/feedback: Learning instigated by new methods of service provision or cross-professional co-operation<br>• Retrospective interviews/feedback: Professional/institutional transformations as a result of providing the TAIS |

The integrated evaluation criteria provide a framework for assessing each TAIS implemented in the context of the RAISD-project. Even though the foundation of the integrated evaluation is criteria defined in highly diverging surroundings, actor-oriented criteria were surprisingly similar in highlighting similar aspects such as respecting the diversity and promoting the autonomy of FDPs. Despite the similarities in evaluation criteria, the concrete TAIS piloted in each partner country differed in many respects. For individual evaluators, it was thus not necessary or even reasonable to follow the integrated criteria and its methods to a full extent. Moreover, individual partners

www.raisd-h2020.eu

Del. 7.4 Evaluation criteria [February, 2022]

Coordinator contact: Dr. Rubén Fuentes-Fernández | Universidad Complutense de Madrid | Calle del Profesor José García Santesmases, 9. Ciudad Universitaria 28040 MADRID, Spain.
t: +34/ 91 394 7548 | e: rfuentes@ucm.es | w: www.ucm.es , grasia.fdi.ucm.es

This project has received funding from the European Union's Horizon 2020 research and innovation programme under grant agreement No 822688.

Page *15* of *18*

added their own evaluation criteria outside the integrated evaluation framework when necessary. In the end, the notion of framework describes the integrated evaluation criteria aptly: It provided a foundation for all partners which were adjusted to local needs.

# 5 Conclusions: Evaluating small-scale programs in contexts of forced displacement

In this deliverable, an evaluation framework for RAISD-project was set. The aim of the framework is both to promote the development of each TAIS and help in assessing their feasibility. The framework is built out of three main components: realist tradition of evaluation science, actor-oriented criteria defined by various stakeholders in all partner countries and the developmental trajectory of the project. All components were compatible while highlighting similar issues. Much stress was put to participation of different stakeholders, usage of manifold datasets and multi-method analysis and studying TAIS from the perspective of both processes and outcomes.

The evaluation framework provides several tools for evaluating different TAIS. However, since all TAIS differ from each other and they have been implemented in diverging contexts with different stakeholders, they need to be evaluated in different ways as well. Consequently, RAISD evaluation framework can be considered as a cookbook from which each project partner has been able to pick the most fitting ingredients to their final evaluation recipe. The framework is not meant to be followed meticulously.

The loose nature of the framework means that it can be used for wider purposes as well and is well aligned with the RRI dimensions of anticipation, responsiveness, and flexibility. The framework is designed in evaluating small-scale and real-life interventions or programs in the contexts of forced displacement. It should be particularly beneficial in projects in which there is enough time to plan and pilot the program before its final implementation. In these cases, one can fully benefit from the combination of process and outcome evaluation. Considering the above conditions, and after adjusting the framework to fit local needs, the framework can be used in evaluating a great variety of developmental endeavours.

Del. 7.4 Evaluation criteria [February, 2022]

www.raisd-h2020.eu

Coordinator contact: Dr. Rubén Fuentes-Fernández | Universidad Complutense de Madrid | Calle del Profesor José García Santesmases, 9. Ciudad Universitaria 28040 MADRID, Spain. t: +34/ 91 394 7548 | e: rfuentes@ucm.es | w: www.ucm.es , grasia.fdi.ucm.es

This project has received funding from the European Union's Horizon 2020 research and innovation programme under grant agreement No 822688.

Page 16 of 18

Astbury, B., & Leeuw, F. (2010). Unpacking Black Boxes: Mechanisms and Theory Building in Evaluation. *American Journal of Evaluation*, 31(3), 363-381.

Kivijärvi, A., & Aaltonen, S., & Välimäki, V. (2019). Feasibility of an online discussion group as a component of targeted youth work in Finland. Children and Youth Services Review. Published online 4 July 2019.

Knowles, L.M. & Stelzer, E.-M. & Jovel, K.S. & O'Connor, M.-F. (2017) A pilot study of virtual support for grief: Feasibility, acceptability and preliminary outcomes. Computers in Human Behavior, 73, 650-658, 10.1016/j.chb.2017.04.005

Lipscomb, M. (2008) Mixed method nursing studies: A critical realist critique. Nursing Philosophy, 9, 32-45.

Owen, R., & Macnaghten, P., & Stilgoe, J. (2012). Responsible research and innovation – From science in society to science for society, with society. Science and Public Policy, 39(6), 751-760.

Patton, M. Q. (2014). Qualitative inquiry in utilization-focused evaluation. In L. Goodyear, E. Barela, J. Jewiss & J. Usinger (eds.) Qualitative inquiry in evaluation: From theory to practice (pp. 25–54). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Pawson, R. (2013). *The Science of Evaluation. A Realist Manifesto*. London: Sage.

Pawson, R. & Tilley (1997). *Realistic Evaluation*. London: Sage.

Robson, Colin (2000). *Small-Scale Evaluation*. London: Sage.

Robson, Colin & McCartan, Kieran (2016). *Real World Research. Fourth Edition*. London: Wiley.

Sayer, Andrew (2000). *Realism and Social Science*. London: Sage.

Sen, A. (1992). *Inequality re-examined*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Sen, A. (1993). Capability and Well-being. In: M. Nussbaum and A. Sen, eds., *The Quality of Life*. Oxford: Clarendon Press. pp. 30–53.

Sekhon, M. & Cartwright, M. & Francis, J.J (2017) Acceptability of healthcare interventions: An overview of reviews and development of a theoretical framework. *BMC Health Services Research*, 17(88), 10.1186/s12913-017-2031-8

Shadish, W. R., & Cook, T. D., & Campbell, D. T. (2002). Experimental and quasi-experimental designs for generalized causal inference. Houghton: Mifflin and Company.

Stange, K. C., & Phillips, W. R. (2007). In This Issue: Real Change Is Real Hard in the Real World. *Annals of Family Medicine*, *5*(2), 98–100. doi:10.1370/afm.684

Vedung, E. (2010). Four waves of evaluation diffusion. *Evaluation*, (16), 263–277.

Webster, M. & Sell, J. (eds.) (2017). *Laboratory Experiments in the Social Sciences*. London: Elsevier.

# www.raisd-h2020.eu

Del. 7.4 Evaluation criteria [February, 2022]

**www.raisd-h2020.eu**

Coordinator contact: Dr. Rubén Fuentes-Fernández | Universidad Complutense de Madrid | Calle del Profesor José García Santesmases, 9. Ciudad Universitaria 28040 MADRID, Spain.
t: +34/ 91 394 7548 | e: rfuentes@ucm.es | w: www.ucm.es , grasia.fdi.ucm.es

This project has received funding from the European Union's Horizon 2020 research and innovation programme under grant agreement No 822688.

*Page 18 of 18*