External Evaluation of 'Youth for Human Rights' KA3 Project of seven National Agencies during 2016-2019

Author: Yael Ohana with Marija Bulat
Frankly Speaking

Introduction

Background

The Austrian and the Estonian National Agencies of Erasmus+/Youth in Action are coordinating the projects "Aware and Active" (AT NA in partnership with 6 other NAs) and "Youth for Human Rights" (EE NA in partnership with 7 other NAs) which will be implemented between beginning December 2016 and end December 2019. These projects were granted in the framework of the Call for Proposals in Erasmus+ KA3: Initiatives for policy innovation – Social Inclusion through education, training and youth.

The "Aware and Active" (AAA) project aims to
- promote intercultural understanding and positive benefits of a diverse society among general public in Europe
- enhance critical thinking and media literacy among young people
- foster active youth participation
- improve access to the ERASMUS+ programme and societal inclusion through civic participation of young refugees, migrants and asylum seekers.

This project is coordinated by Interkulturelles Zentrum, the Austrian National Agency of Erasmus+/Youth in Action.

The project "Youth for Human Rights" (YfHR) is a networking of Erasmus+ National Agencies on Human Rights Education in the Field of Youth that aims to
- improve understanding of Human Rights Education in the field of Youth – and thereby to support young people's acquisition of social, civic and intercultural competence;
- support youth workers, trainers and other practitioners in the youth field in using Human Rights Education to address issues that directly affect social cohesion, such as inclusion and diversity;
- improve the quality of youth work practice, and of activities undertaken as part of young people's non-formal learning (such as, volunteering), through networking and capacity-building.

This project is coordinated by Archimedes Foundation Youth Agency, the Estonian National Agency for Erasmus+.

As partners in each others' projects, these two national agencies are responsible for the evaluation work packages. The evaluations of these projects were for this reason be conducted together in one 'evaluation project' by one evaluation team.

The Evaluation

Evaluation remit

Objectives of the evaluation

The objective of the evaluation is to investigate, assess and evaluate the implementation of the AAA and YfHR projects with specific reference to
- the relevance and quality of project design;
- the efficiency of project implementation;
- the effectiveness of project implementation; and
- the expected impact of the two projects, in consideration of the overall objective of the KA3 call for projects under which the projects were granted.

Framing considerations for the evaluation

Linked projects

While for practical reasons it was decided to conduct the evaluations of these two projects together, the actual links between the projects are relatively limited. What they do share are the common overarching objectives of the KA3 call for proposals - 'Support for policy reform - social inclusion through education, training and youth', under which they have been granted.

This refers to upscaling and disseminating innovative good practices falling under the scope of the Paris Declaration with one of the following two general objectives:
- Preventing violent radicalisation and promoting democratic values, fundamental rights, intercultural understanding and active citizenship;
- Fostering the inclusion of disadvantaged learners, including persons with a migrant background, while preventing and combating discriminatory practices.

These overarching thematic priorities are important guidelines for the evaluation enquiry framework that has been developed for this evaluation, which takes into account generic issues as outlined in the call for expressions of interest (stated above under objectives of the evaluation) but also the more substantial desired impacts of the projects in the long-run.

Short and long-term impact indicators included in the KA3 project applications

Each project application also identified a series of quantitative and qualitative indicators specific to the nature of each project. In addition to the general framework for the evaluation, which addresses relatively general considerations, these provide criteria for evaluation of the impact of the two projects in the short and long terms. The overview of indicators for each project can be found in the appendices to the evaluation report.

Formative evaluation

It was the wish of the National Agencies coordinating the projects that the evaluation process should also provide advice about how to improve the quality of project implementation and outcomes on an ongoing basis. As such, the evaluation has had both formative and summative dimensions. The formative evaluation required a more granular and detailed understanding of the progression of each project. To this end the evaluators accessed information from stakeholders with intimate knowledge of how managerial decisions taken at one level impacted on the capacity of the projects to deliver their desired results to beneficiaries further down the value chain, and this in real time. The evaluators provided project staff with tools and templates to facilitate the reflection by and with various participating stakeholders. Formative evaluation input was provided on an ongoing basis to both project coordinators and steering groups and was used in different ways to adapt project implementation, and is therefore not included in this report, which focuses on the summative evaluation of each of the projects.

A three-year time frame

The three-year time frame of both projects, and essentially two year time frame of the evaluation was both an advantage and a disadvantage at one and the same time. With two years ahead of it, the evaluation can collect and interpret a substantial amount of information. However, the limited time and financial resources available for travel and face-to-face meetings also mean that there will be long periods of time where evaluation information can only be gathered digitally or through intermediaries. Hence, the evaluation process has been developed to consider how punctual face to face activities can be supplemented effectively with remote communication to ensure the evaluators can maintain a comprehensive overview of what is happening in the projects and how, on an ongoing basis through the entire evaluation.

Outputs

The final output of the evaluation will be a narrative report accompanied by relevant annexes. In the course of the evaluation suggestions and recommendations were made to support the ongoing development of the projects (formative evaluation dimension). Other specific outputs of the evaluation were the templates and methods prepared by the evaluators for the decentralised collection and for the centralised collation of qualitative and quantitative data.

Methodology

Framing considerations for the choice of methodology

De-centralised information collection approach

As mentioned above, the resources available for face-to-face meetings and information gathering from key stakeholders, including and especially beneficiaries, are relatively limited. While the projects are linked at the level of their overarching objectives, they have no activities in common, which means that the evaluation team cannot conduct common information gathering activities. Rather face-to-face activities such as interviews and focus groups will have to be done for each project separately. For this reason it is foreseen that the evaluation team will have to rely on intermediaries more directly in touch with project beneficiaries (especially) to access information about the results and impacts of the projects. These intermediaries will

most likely be teams implementing project outputs such as training courses, networking activities, awareness raising activities, or the production of publications, etc. Centralised information gathering activities by the evaluators are also foreseen, but these will likely focus on the functioning of the projects and on providing advice to the project coordinators on how to improve the quality of project implementation. Furthermore, a number of other activities of an evaluative nature are under way with regard aspects of these projects. In the first place, there exists a common monitoring framework for the functioning of these and and several other KA3 and KA2 projects being conducted by the consortium. The information collected within this monitoring framework will be published every 3 months from early 2018 and should be used in the evaluation. In the second place, a special learning survey is being conducted by the RAY research group concerning the learning impact of the YfHR project, and should the results of this survey be available in time, these would be of immense use to the evaluation.

Common enquiry framework

Although the links between the projects in terms of activities are limited, there are enough overlaps in their ultimate goals to justify the development of one common enquiry framework for the evaluation. This means that the same main (categories of) evaluation criteria (and by extension the same questions) will be applied to both projects. However, each of the KA3 applications includes specific matrices of indicators for benchmarking of impact targets for each project, the common evaluation framework can be easily supplemented to ensure a more granular and project specific evaluation.

Sources of data

The evaluation relied primarily on qualitative sources of data including the following:

- A variety of documentation produced by the different project coordination and implementation teams about and as a result of planning, implementation and coordination activities of both the projects (application materials, meeting reports, outputs of the different work packages, etc)

- Face to face meetings, focus groups and interviews with a variety of stakeholders involved in the management and implementation of the projects, and with end beneficiaries during activities

- Activities to collect information assigned to project stakeholders with more direct access to the end beneficiaries of the projects using templates and methods prepared by the evaluation team

- Outputs of other monitoring and evaluation projects addressing specific aspects of these two projects (RAY special learning survey, Common monitoring framework for consortium projects)

This said, each project application has committed to also benchmark specific quantitative targets, and indicators have been established for those. The evaluation is, therefore, also putting

in place a framework for those data to be collected centrally for each project. A diversity of project stakeholders and the project coordinators will have to be directly in such data collation.

The enquiry framework

The evaluation enquiry framework is based on the OECD/DAC framework and was pre-determined by the project partners, and adapted with sub-criteria to the realities of the two projects, including the above framing considerations, as follows:

Table 1: Enquiry framework

Theme/s	Question/s	Issues to be researched	Sources
Project design - relevance and quality	Relevance and quality of project design is defined as the alignment of the project objectives, activities and outputs with what the project stakeholders and beneficiaries understand as necessary to effect the targeted change - Which assumptions underpin the 'theory of change' of each project? - How appropriate are the projects' objectives and activities to the needs and priorities of their target groups, beneficiaries and other stakeholders? - How well does each project's design meet the demands of its objectives? - To which extent have the choices made in the course of the project contributed to the	- Project needs analyses and assessments - Explicit or implicit social analyses - Theories of change implied by the project descriptions - Ideas about cause and effect in the projects - Appropriateness of the project activities in relation to the perspectives of the end beneficiaries and other stakeholders	Various project documents - grant applications - project descriptions - activity descriptions/meeting reports Recent independent research on the themes/issues of the individual project objectives and the overall project objective

Co-funded by the
Erasmus+ Programme
of the European Union

FRANKLY SPEAKING
training.development

Youth for
Human Rights

	project outputs, results and impacts?		

Project implementation - efficiency and effectiveness	Efficiency and effectiveness of project implementation are defined as the degree to which the desired effect has been achieved within the planned resource framework (e.g. time, money, human resources, etc)
	- How well were the resources/activities invested converted into project outputs?
	- In each of the projects, what is the quality of
	  - inter-partner communication
	  - information sharing between teams
	  - general coordination
	  - management processes and procedures
	  - decision-making processes
	  - task division and different levels of involvement
		- Extent of participation on the part of project stakeholders and their experience of their participation
		- Satisfaction of stakeholders in different roles with the overall process, procedures and mechanisms of cooperation/partnership and results of the projects
		- Quantity of resources invested compared to perceived results (perceived 'good value')
		- Success of outreach to target groups
			Project reporting
			Common monitoring framework reporting
			Information collected from different stakeholders during
			- face to face meetings
			- focus group activities with key stakeholders

| Project impact for the overall objective - apparent and projected | Impact is defined as the marked effect or influence of the project in view of its objectives and implicit theory of change
- What are the outputs of each project?
- What are the results of the projects?
- To which extent has each project met the impact targets set in the KA3 applications?
- To which extent have the project's results/outcomes contributed to achieving the purposes of each project?
- What are the projects' likely contributions to the overall objective of the KA3 call for proposals under which the projects were granted? | - Added value of the project process, outputs and results for the overall objective, for the participating stakeholders and for the project beneficiary communities
- Apparent / projected multiplication of results of the projects
- Apparent and / or projected policy effects
- Achievement of quantitative targets for each project in line with KA3 applications submitted
- Extent of coherence between the perspective of different stakeholder groups on the achievement of the qualitative impact targets for each project | Information collected from different stakeholders through
- face to face meetings
- focus group activities
- end of AAA national training surveys
- Ongoing evaluation activities (possibly survey based) during YfHR ToT
- RAY special learning survey for YfHR

Concrete outputs of each project

Quantitative data collected in each projects' centralised monitoring database |

Methods of data collection

The following table summarises the different methods used to collect the information used for the preparation of the evaluation and this report.

Table 2: Methods of information collection used in the evaluation process:

Information gathering activity		Specifics	Who was involved?
Document review	Collation of key literature	Documentation about the projects (KA3 call for applications application	Project coordinators

	Analysis of literature for key information in compliance with the general evaluation framework and specific qualitative target indicators for each project	forms submitted, partner agreements, etc)	
		Documentation produced by the projects (outputs)	
		Documentation produced during coordination and planning meetings (meeting reports, etc)	
		Documentation produced by other monitoring and evaluation activities conducted on aspects of each or both of the projects (Common monitoring and evaluation framework for projects implemented by the consortium, Special YfHR learning survey)	Project coordinators with - Miguel Angel da Silva Lopez - Andreas Karsten
Centralised activities for information gathering	Information gathering activities conducted by the evaluators themselves	Face to face meetings, direct communication with project partners / participants during meetings attended by the evaluators, written communication with key stakeholders, select remote interviews if necessary	Evaluation team with support from project coordinators
Decentralised activities for information gathering	Information gathering activities conducted by project teams on the basis of guidelines produced by the evaluators during the implementation of specific project activities, the results of which are communicated to Yael & Marija for analysis	Short and long term quantitative indicator monitoring databases for each project End of training evaluation template for AAA decentralised training activities Training evaluation template for the YfHR Training for Trainers (TBC) Reporting from key	As appropriate: project partners, project implementation team members, supporting organisations; with the from the project coordinators

Consultation of key stakeholders	Collection of feedback from relevant stakeholders regarding the draft narrative report	Possibly digital consultation survey to gather feedback from key stakeholders Inclusion of relevant feedback and finalisation of the report on that basis	Evaluation team for preparation of the consultation methods and the integration of feedback Project coordinators for dissemination of the report and collation of the feedback received

Chapter 2: Youth for Human Rights

The Youth for Human Rights Project

Purpose and objectives of the Youth for Human Rights Project

The starting-point for this project is a specific need expressed in the Paris Declaration and relates to the primary purpose of education. Education should not only 'develop [young people's] knowledge, skills, competences and attitudes and to embed fundamental values, but also to help young people - in close cooperation with parents and families - to become active, responsible, open-minded members of society.'[1]

In the meantime, Human Rights Education has become a tried and test basis for developing social, civic and intercultural competence, at the very least at the level of individual projects and initiatives.

However, and while the number and quality of resources for Human Rights Education has grown consistently over the last years, mainstreaming in national and local youth work programmes and formal education remains limited. Compass, A manual on Human rights education with young people (Council of Europe, 2002) is among the most prominent, together with the resources in research and analysis now emerging from the European Commission's Radicalisation Awareness Network (RAN). Youth for Human Rights aimed to such resources are fully exploited, and that mainstreaming of Human Rights Education is strengthened through the collaboration between youth workers/practitioners and their counterparts in the fields of education and training.

The network of Erasmus+ National Agencies recognises the scale and urgency of the challenges facing youth workers and other educators in this context. There is increased demand for professional development and capacity-building in regard of these aims. Human Rights Education[2] could play a pivotal role. Reference to international human rights can provide young

---

[1] Quoted in the Youth for Human Rights project application, from the Paris Declaration.
https://ec.europa.eu/assets/eac/education/news/2015/documents/citizenship-education-declaration_en.pdf

[2] The YfHR project is conceptualised based on the definition of Human Rights Education set out in the Charter on Education for Democratic Citizenship and Human Rights Education (Council of Europe, 2010): *Education, training, awareness raising, information, practices and activities which aim, by equipping learners with knowledge, skills and understanding and developing their attitudes and behaviour, to empower learners to contribute to the building and defence of a universal culture of human rights in society, with a view to the promotion and protection of human rights and fundamental freedoms.*

people with a framework for their understanding of complex societal issues. Human Rights Education in youth work and non-formal learning can help in clarifying rights and responsibilities, enabling young people to feel confident in applying principles of fairness and mutual respect.

With this background in mind, the project consortium of National Agencies proposing the Youth for Human Rights project, elaborated its purpose as follows:

> *'... The purpose of the project is to improve young people's resilience to extremism and radicalisation. To this end, the network of Erasmus+ National Agencies will exploit the unique potential of the Erasmus+ programme to provide international experience (to youth workers and young people), to promote critical dialogue and to encourage intercultural competence. In line with the Paris Declaration and informed by similar statements from the European Commission[3], the project will intensify the contribution of youth work and non-formal learning to young people's resilience and their active support for values of freedom, tolerance and non-discrimination.*
>
> *In particular, the project will address the following priority concerns:*
> - *ensuring that children and young people acquire social, civic and intercultural competences, by promoting democratic values and fundamental rights, social inclusion and non-discrimination, as well as active citizenship;*
> - *promoting intercultural dialogue through all forms of learning in cooperation with other relevant policies and stakeholders.'[4]*

This purpose was further distilled into the specific objectives of the Youth for Human Rights Project:
- To improve understanding of Human Rights Education in the youth field, and thereby to support young people's acquisition of social, civic and intercultural competence;
- To support youth workers, trainers and other practitioners in the youth field in using Human rights education to address issues that directly affect social cohesion, such as inclusion and diversity;
- To improve the quality of youth work practice, and of activities undertaken as part of young people's non-formal learning (such as, volunteering), through networking and capacity-building.

Furthermore, the application for funding to the European Commission indicates that the project responds to the following KA3 Call aims and objectives:

Main objective of the KA3 Call	Associated specific objectives of the Youth for Human Rights Project

---

[3] Preventing radicalisation to terrorism and violent extremism: Strengthening the EU's response (2014) and the Council of Ministers, Draft conclusions on the Role of young people, youth policy and youth work in an integrated and cross-sectoral approach to preventing and combating violent radicalisation of young people (2016).

[4] Youth for Human Rights Application to the KA3 Call for Applications from National Agencies.

Preventing violent radicalisation and promoting democratic values, fundamental rights, intercultural understanding, and active citizenship	Improving the acquisition of social and civic competencies and fostering knowledge, understanding and ownership of democratic values and fundamental rights.
	Supporting teachers and educators in handling conflicts and dealing with diversity
	Enhancing the quality of non-formal learning activities, youth work practices and volunteering.

Activities

The Youth for Human Rights project aimed worked in five activity categories, with attendant outputs.

Accessible online resources in Human rights education

Results from mapping and analysis (existing resources, including: main actors, concepts and training approaches) are collated on a digital platform.

Training curriculum development for project target groups

New curricula are developed and delivered for learning in the area of Human rights among youth workers and other practitioners in the field of Youth (emphasis on trainer-training and preparation of multipliers – including integration of new curricula in the context of National Agencies' TCA projects).

Recommendations for Human rights education in the field of Youth

Further monitoring and evaluation of new resources, and their implementation, leads to take-up by youth organisations – as well as by colleges, universities and accrediting bodies providing pre- and in-service training in youth work/non-formal learning.

European conference: Mainstreaming Human Rights Education in the field of youth

The accrued knowledge and understanding from the phases of activity referred to above – and specific insights regarding the needs and opportunities for Human rights education in the field of Youth – are shared among new and existing stakeholders in this area (including representatives from Education and Training). The conference is designed to influence both implementation of Erasmus+ to 2020 and preparation for a successor programme.

Human Rights Education and youth policy impact

Priority findings and recommendations are communicated at selected policy fora – in local, regional and national government, as well as in European and other multilateral bodies. The pivotal role of Human rights education in providing young people with a framework for their understanding of complex societal issues – thereby increasing their resilience to extremism and radicalisation and, in turn, supporting their acquisition of social, civic and intercultural competences – is fully acknowledged in relevant policy documents. Preparation for the successor programme to Erasmus+ gives appropriate emphasis to the role of Human rights education.

The following grid provides a chronological overview of all activities including the profile of the different categories of participating stakeholders, and references the key outputs of the activity or project action.

Table 3: Chronological overview of activities in the Youth for Human Rights Project with participant profile and numbers

Time period	Activities	Participant profile and number
2017		
February	Project kick-off (steering) meeting, Tallinn	YfHR project steering group, 12 pax
September	Project steering meeting, Zagreb	YfHR project steering group, 10 pax
October	EACEA meeting, Brussels Planning meeting with external evaluation team, Brussels Expert Group Meeting #1, Riga YfHR project promotion in RAN event, Vienna	Planning meeting with external evaluation team, Brussels: 4 pax Expert group meeting, Riga: 21 pax
December	KA3 projects Consortium meeting in the framework of NA Business Meeting, Brussels	NA Heads and three E+ KA3 Consortium project coordinators, 26 pax
February	Project kick-off (steering) meeting, Tallinn	YfHR project steering group, 12 pax
2018		
January	Project steering meeting, Brussels Expert Group Meeting #2, Riga	Project steering meeting: 8 pax Expert group meeting: 19 pax
April	Meeting with Council of Europe about synergies between YfHR and Council of Europe programmes, Strasbourg Expert Group Meeting #3, Tallinn Preparatory Meeting for Training of Trainers, Tallinn	Meeting with CoE: 11 pax (with Partnership and youth department officers) Expert group meeting: 12 pax Prep meeting for ToT: 3 pax
June	Phase 1: Training for Trainers, Slovakia	Phase 1 Training for Trainers: 28 pax

September	National Agency staff training Preparatory meeting, Destelheide National HRE Training in Austria, Innsbruck National HRE training EE, Pärnu YfHR project promotion during AAA event, Ljubljana	National HRE trainings: 40 pax
October	National HRE training EE, Rakvere National HRE training HR, Orahovica National HRE training LV, Bauska National HRE training LV, Valmiera National HRE training HR, Petrcane KA3 projects consortium meeting in the framework of NA Business Meeting, Vienna	National HRE trainings: 90 pax KA3 projects consortium: 15 pax
November	National transfer seminar HR, Zagreb National HRE training SK, Košice National HRE training BE/FL, Lommel National HRE training DE, Würzburg National HRE training AT, Vienna National HRE training DE, Berlin National transfer pre-meeting EE, Tallinn	National HRE trainings: 83 pax National transfer seminars: 24 pax (target group profile: mostly universities offering youth work studies/pedagogical studies/social work studies, but also some youth workers and some educational organisations providing (certified) non-formal trainings for future youth workers)
December	NA staff training, Destelheide Project steering meeting, Destelheide	NA staff training: 22 pax Project steering meeting: 9 pax
2019		
January	National HRE training SK, Žilina	National HRE trainings: 16 pax
February	National networking activities HR, Zagreb Phase 2: Training for Trainers (evaluation seminar), Zagreb Prep meeting for European Conference, Tallinn	National networking activities: 17 pax Training for trainers: 29 pax Prep meeting for European conference: 6 pax (steering group members)
March	National transfer seminar AT, Vienna National transfer seminar DE, Bonn	45 pax (target group profile mostly consisting of higher education institutions (these are lecturers at universities / universities for applied sciences providing professional

Co-funded by the
Erasmus+ Programme
of the European Union

FRANKLY SPEAKING
training.development

Youth for
Human Rights

		preparation of future youth workers as well as trainers at other educational institutions providing certified trainings for youth workers), youth field trainers, youth workers and educational organisations providing (certified) non-formal trainings for future youth workers. Also a few policy makers.)
April	National networking activities BE/FL, Brussels Project steering meeting, Vienna	National networking activities: 5 pax Project steering meeting: 9 pax
May	National networking activities AT, Vienna National transfer seminar EE, Narva National transfer seminar LV, Riga	National networking activities: 44 pax National transfer seminar: 98 pax (target group profile consisting of mostly youth work studies university students of undergraduate and graduate level, but also of policy makers and other non-formal educational organisations)
June	YfHR project promotion occasions during other transnational events in TCA/NET meeting in Königswinter and in EGL strategic partnership conference in Brussels National transfer seminar/inspiration day BE/FL, Brussels	National transfer seminars/inspiration day: 37 pax (target group profile were predominatly youth workers but also some educational organisations providing (certified) non-formal trainings for future youth workers and other non-formal educational organisations)

July	Conference facilitators' Prep meeting, Tallinn	6 pax (2 conference facilitators, 2 EE NA pax, 2 partners from booking agency Reisiekspert)
September	YfHR project promotion for NA Heads and Researchers, at the "Offenburg Talks 2", Offenburg National networking activities EE, Tallinn National networking activities DE, Bonn National networking activities LV, Ikšķile National transfer seminar SK, Bratislava	National networking activities: 45 pax National transfer seminar: 30 pax (target group profile consisting mostly of youth workers but also some youth leaders, youth field trainers, policy makers: 5 and higher education institutions)
October	National networking activities SK, Zvolen National transfer seminar EE, Tallinn EACEA (funder) Cluster meeting participation, Brussels	National networking activities: 18 pax National transfer seminar: 31 pax (target group of youth workers)
November	European HRE Conference 'Youth for Human Rights' and steering group meeting, Tallinn YfHR promotion, Becoming Part of Europe event, Rome	National networking activities: 115 pax
December	Project finalisation and closure of accounts	Project coordinating NA and partners

Approach

Youth for Human Rights was a policy project and process, rather than a 'young person'-centred project. While it did not have an explicit theory of change, it used expertise-pooling, capacity development, networking and dissemination activities with youth work and youth worker education stakeholders at national level to kick off a policy development process and to create momentum for mainstreaming Human Rights Education in the youth work sectors of several countries.

The following could be considered a 'reconstruction' of the activity cascade and approach of the Youth for Human Rights project.
- Generating evidence for the actual state of development and dissemination of Human Rights Education in Europe

Co-funded by the
Erasmus+ Programme
of the European Union

FRANKLY SPEAKING
training.development

Youth for
Human Rights

- and an intense exchange of HRE actors and networks
- will develop meaningful and efficient educational modules
- this will then allow the field of youth work and education to achieve better exploitation of the already existing abundance of HRE resources and educational concepts/modules
- and to generate added value and greater quality of impact, including and especially through the Erasmus+ programme
- the active dissemination of the products of such efforts across the network of National Agencies and the wider community of practice concerned with youth work and education in Europe practice
- will enable a snowball effect mainstreaming HRE through the programmes and a wider circle of youth and education actors

The project took its starting point from an existing range of practices and resources developed through various European processes and by different institutions, notably the Council of Europe's Human Rights Education programme, rather than starting from scratch with the development of new resources. Nevertheless, complementary materials were developed. In some cases, these products were not initially planned. It further relied on the following strengths of the national agencies involved and of the overall network of National Agencies.

Geographical reach: National Agencies responsible for implementing the Erasmus+ Youth Chapter cover 33 EU and non-EU Programme Countries. Their established operational links to counterpart bodies responsible for delivering Erasmus+ Education and Training allowed them to identify and exploit cross-sectoral synergies.

Professional reach: In support of their functions in programme implementation, National Agencies have broad-based contacts with youth workers and other practitioners in the field of Youth at local, regional and national levels. They were well placed to identify project participants who can act as multipliers. This supported policy relevance.

Strategic capacity: National Agencies have shown their ability to respond to specific interests and needs within the programme and in the youth sector. Their collaborative relations with a range of government and civil society partners across Europe, as well as with the European Commission and other multi-lateral organisations, further supported policy relevance.

https://noored.ee/wp-content/uploads/2019/11/YfHR-project_short-project-overview-joonmeedia.jpg
Graphic 1. Visualisation of the project.

Steering and staffing

Project steering was ensured by a working group made up of staff of each of the National Agencies involved in the project application and implementation.

The EE National Agency for Erasmus+:YiA, Foundation Archimedes, coordinated the project. Seven NAs from AT, FI, FR, IT, SI, and North Macedonia initiated the project. The FR partner

decided to withdraw from the project at approximately mid-way, and an amendment was granted by the European Commission to redistribute the funds allocated to the FR partner to other NAs. The tasks of the French NA were redistributed amongst remaining project partners, mostly taken over by EE NA. No tasks were cancelled.
The project partners include: EE, LV, SK, HR, DE, BE FL, AT.

The steering group met at regular intervals, at so-called partner meetings, usually docked on to one or other of the project activities in one of the participating countries (with the intention of reducing on travel and keeping overheads down). 5 such meetings took place over the course of the project. In addition, the steering group met on a regular basis remotely using teleconferencing and Basecamp the project management platform. Bilateral meetings between different members of the Steering Group and additional staff of participating NAs also took place on a needs basis, in some cases face to face at other activities of the NA network.

Staffing of the project included 1 overall project coordinator, seconded to the project from the staff of the EE NA (lead) full time. No other staff working on the project worked on it full time. The project accounts show that it involved staff costs of 110,713 euros for a total of 1072.5 working days, which covered the work of a total of 17 members of NA staff across the 7 partners, although with differing numbers of staff and staff working days being allocated to the project by each NA, over the 3 year life cycle of the project.

The following table provides an overview of the project management activities conducted in addition to the overall and day-to-day coordination provided by the EE NA project coordinator.

Table 4: Youth for Human Rights Project Management Activities through the project life cycle

Management activity	Timeframe	Description
Project kick off meeting		1st meeting of all partners involved in the project, including those NA Directors that participated in the drafting of the project application to prepare the launch of the project
6 Partner group meetings		Regular meetings of the members of the NA delegated to decision-making and implementation of the project in Tallinn, Zagreb, Brussels, Destelheide, Vienna, and again in Tallinn.
Meetings with the EECEA		Compulsory meeting with the funder in Brussels

Meetings with the Evaluation Team		1 face to face kick off meeting of the 2 coordinators and the evaluation team at the beginning of the project 2 check in meetings between the project coordinator and members of the evaluation team during Steering Group meetings and other activities in the project calendar Regular check-in and formative evaluation calls between the coordinator and the evaluation team members over the project life cycle (approx. 1 per 6 – 8 weeks)
Exchanges with other institutions		Meeting with the Council of Europe in Strasbourg to exchange on connections and possible synergies between the YfHR project and the Council of Europe Human Rights Education Programme of the Youth Department
Other meetings		There were several meeting held during the lifespan of the project dedicated for promotion of the project for various target groups. Mostly these events aimed for input gathering from these target groups and were further connected to some transnational events already taking place in the NA year calendar. Such events took place in Vienna, Ljubljana, Brussels, Königswinter, Offenburg and in Rome.

Budgetary considerations

Below, a breakdown of the overall budget into different cost-categories.

Table 5: Budget dedicated to different categories of activities in the Youth for Human Rights Project
(final figures, 20 January 2020):

Category of activities	Spent	Description
Steering/management activities	153972.68	Partner meetings hosted by 5 countries Meeting with the EACEA in Brussels x 3 NA Staff training in Destelheide Staff costs Staff travel and subsistence costs in the framework of the project
Expert group meetings	22270.26	14 experts and 1 facilitator participated. The experts contributed to the following activities: • Training of Trainers • Training of Youth Workers • Training of Erasmus+ NA staff • Educational resources and tools
Training of trainers	56760.63	In 2 phases, hosted in 2 countries; includes trainers fees, trainers and participants travel costs
Networking and tranfer activities	145193.49	Includes organizational and local travel expenses
Final conference	92390.87	Includes conference organizational costs, facilitators and speakers fees (2 conference facilitators, 5 facilitators of workshops, 5 speakers), travel costs of participants
NAHRE dissemination events - The RAN YF&C "The role of youth work in the prevention of radicalisation and violent extremism", 6-7 December 2017, Vienna; - TCA Meeting – Learning Islands, 12-14 June 2018, Budapest - TCA/NET Meeting, 12-13 June 2019, Köningswinter - The 3rd European event of EGL, 4-6 June 2019, Brussels - K3 Project BpE Dissemination, 12-13 November 2019, Rome - "Offenburg Talks 2", 2-3 September 2019, Offenburg	4075.09	Includes participation costs
Development of resources and documentation Mapping (including RAY survery) Formal education paper	39009.96	
Publication	18952.84	
Audit, external evaluator	9095.75	
TOTAL	**541721.57**	

The financial dimension of the project will be further discussed in the section on project efficiency and effectiveness.

Evaluation

Evaluation of the project design - relevance and quality

General considerations

For the purposes of this evaluation, relevance and quality of project design was defined as:
> *'the alignment of the project objectives, activities and outputs with what the project stakeholders and beneficiaries understand as necessary to effect the targeted change'.*

According to the project application and stakeholders, the relevance of the project lies in a need observed by National Agencies in their interactions with the youth sectors in the countries where they are implementing the programme.

Assumptions underlying the project design

Two main assumptions underlie the design of the project, as described above in the section on regarding   approach.

A first assumption is that European level cooperation projects could lead to the mainstreaming of Human Rights Education in key national educational frameworks and programmes. A second is that such a project can effect policy change in the national context.

While neither of these assumptions are wrong per se, and the project has made strides towards these kinds of outcomes, they do indicate a certain 'idealism' in regard of European cooperation projects and their capacity to influence the national level. While partners are satisfied with the outcomes and immediate impacts of the project, many pointed out that their ambitions regarding policy change, notably within the life cycle of the project, were too high. Furthermore, all were surprised at the level of effort, time and resources it took to come as far as they did, which based on the summarised feedback from the steering group is evaluated as 'kicking off the process', especially when looking to the sector of formal education of youth workers. Furthermore, it was repeated in steering group evaluations that mainstreaming efforts will depend so much on the political will of National Agencies. The sustainability of mainstreaming is far from guaranteed at this point. This said, commitment is visible, the National Agencies involved have developed stronger ties and working relationships and effective team work, and there are already concrete plans on the table. So the potential longer term of the project is tangible, especially as its major challenge was to get policy makers with some decision making powers in the to acknowledge this issue is important. This has definitely been the case. The project's final conference welcomed prominent members of the European and national communities of practice in youth work and youth policy, and the recommendations developed on the basis of the project action have been validated as actionable.

An important further factor in relation to assumptions and project design is scale of action, a challenge for any model project, which is not initiated by governmental institutions with direct responsibility for the policy area concerned nationally. On the one hand, YfHR could directly involve an impressive number of stakeholders interested in HRE in its activities (almost 900 discrete individuals), and through its national dissemination activities, transfer seminars, and

online activities, the multiplication of the resources has been even larger. On the other hand, and despite the fact that so many activities were organised, approx. two activities per country limits the potential of multiplication, and national language websites and materials were not foreseen. Hence, an effective taking of the excellent outputs of this project to scale remains work to be done in the future.

Appropriateness of project design to the priorities and perceived needs of different stakeholder groups

In spite of the idealism revealed by the assumptions underpinning the YfHR project, the evaluation also reveals general and widespread satisfaction among the project partners regarding project design. Generally speaking, the steps taken were considered logical and the outputs developed fed into each next step of the project, with each step building from the previous one. One exception to this generally positive evaluation was the 'concept paper'. Some partners felt that it was not used to its best potential during the project, and that there is no clear plan for its use, beyond general dissemination, in the future. A second exception, and indeed critical point in this regard, was the omission in the project design of more extensive resources for dissemination of the outputs of the project (transfer seminar and national dissemination events; translation of outputs produced in English).

Project implementation - efficiency and effectiveness

For the purposes of this evaluation, we defined efficiency and effectiveness of project implementation as the degree to which the desired effect has been achieved within the planned resource framework (e.g. time, money, human resources, etc).

Resourcing

According to the final accounts, approx. 542,000 Euros were spent on the project as a whole. The financial breakdown of the YfHR Project above. In this section, we discuss the adequacy of the resources available for the ambitions of the project, and the extent to which it these were appropriately and to best effect deployed.

Steering group members critically evaluated the resourcing of the project, in fact project stakeholders evaluated that the project was under-resourced in all respects – time, finances and human resources. In relation to human resources, most partners evaluated that the workload involved in the project was significantly more than they had initially expected, and although actively engaged, several struggled to keep up. It is noteworthy that this kind of project comes in addition to the regular work load of NA staff members participating. In most cases, their regular NA responsibilities were not reduced to accommodate the workload in this project.

Some partners were critical of the fact that the European project coordinator was at one and the same time a country coordinator, because the workload involved in these two roles is too significant for one full time staff, and it was obvious that the coordinator had to juggle too many tasks. Nevertheless, the steering committee congratulated the coordinator for a job well done under challenging circumstances.

The project was 'activity heavy', with a total of 50 discrete programme activities (i.e. non-management activities). All of the partners mentioned that the time available for the preparation and implementation of so many discrete activities in each of their countries was insufficient, making the pace too fast and the spacing of activities unrealistic. This was notably a challenge for reaching the communities of practice targeted through particular activities and for motivating them to join the project. Furthermore, some partners felt that there could have been

more time at the end of the project to ensure collection of results and effective dissemination of learning, given this was a pilot project.

In some countries, there were issues with the level of interest among youth workers in the offered activities, notably the national training courses, and one planned course had to be cancelled. In the country concerned, it was felt the level of investment required to conduct the project was high and the potential return was rather low. Partners were surprised that the European and international dimension brought to bear by the process was not more interesting for local youth work stakeholders, but this 'reality' is an important confirmation of the need related in the application and further evidence that the project's needs analysis is relevant.

Furthermore, the 'dedicated' financial resources available for running the number of activities planned was considered insufficient, notably to ensure adequate staffing of the activities. A total of 50 discrete programmatic activities took place involving approx. 900 direct participants. This is equivalent to 2700 participant days (on average 3 working days per activity). The total amount of financial resources invested in these activities was approx. 360,000 euros. In total, 130 euros per participant day have been invested in the activities. If one then factors in the cost of the approx. 3 support staff to these activities, i.e. trainers, facilitators, other staff involving in organising the activities, we come to a figure of approx. 60 euros per day per participant invested in the actual programmatic activities. All partners felt that this level of financial investment in the programmatic part of the project was simply not adequate to the nature of the task. Policy development projects are time intensive and require extensive facilitation over the medium term. And, this project's experience just underscores that knowledge.

Of course, the project could not have taken place if it was not for the managerial activities as well, and these cost a not-insignificant amount of financial resources, according to the final accounts: approx. 154,000 euros overall. As compared to the programmatic investment, this is very large, approx. 30%, even if this is at the lower end of what can be usual for managerial costs for such large scale EU funded projects.

Several important considerations are not visible when looking solely at this figure, however:
- the extent of 'undeclared' staff costs involved in the project, i.e. the NAs involved put a lot more staff time in than they expected and were compensated for with additional EU funding
- the extent of other 'undeclared' resources that the NAs put into the project without being compensated with additional project funding
- The pilot and experimental nature of the project, and the international dimension of the management of the project – this takes additional time and facilitation than in a standard activity run again and again by one National Agency using internally established processes
- The multiplication effect of the activities with this large number (approx. 900) policy and education responsible direct participants, and of the HRE materials disseminated.

Taking these considerations into account along with the overall direct costs of the project, the partners evaluated and this evaluation finds that the project was cost-effective. Overall, more could not have been done with the same or less human, financial and time resources. There is a sense that without the significant commitment, dedication and persistence of the partners, and

their investment of additional and unpaid time, it would not have been possible to complete this project.

We cannot close out the chapter on resourcing without discussing whether the resources invested were used for appropriate activities, and whether the outputs of the project were best suited to fulfilling the needs underpinning the project. The partners generally evaluated the activities as appropriate, with two small doubts. The first relates to the expert group. At least one partner questioned whether the composition and size of the expert group was the most effective way of generating the knowledge foundations needed for the rest of the project action. Their idea was that smaller, more diverse and agile groups of experts working in tandem or relay, might have worked better than the process involving the large and more formal group that was formed. This is, however, just a speculation and really cannot be substantiated, because there is no basis for comparison. The second relates to specific products of the project, the mapping report, 'concept paper' on Human Rights Education & Youth Work, and the transnational synthesis report on HRE, which are felt to have been important products, although possibly under-utilised, or at least the extent to which they are in use remains unclear. Furthermore, and as mentioned in relation to project design, no resources were budgeted for translations into national languages, possibly limiting to some extent the multiplication effect and the usability of resources on HRE. While there were dedicated resources allocated to website development, some partners felt that the web-presence of the project was not effective enough, because there were no 'separate' national websites, and questioned the extent to which this might have negatively impacted on the level multiplication of resources and results. This cannot be substantiated, however. Each national project created a dedicated section on each of the national agency websites, and there were also dedicated funds for the establishment of the final conference website.

Cooperation in the partner group (communication, team-work, trust and decision-making)

All partners demonstrated satisfaction with the level and quality of communication and the project management approach, involving a combination of face-to-face and remote meetings, and a Basecamp project community. The face-to-face meetings were most productive, but partners also developed new ways of working and interacting using the online tools, and also took time to evaluate this and to learn from the experience. At the same time, at least one partner was concerned with the fact that it was not possible to work with 'established' NA processes of management and administration, and that new processes had to be established for decision-making. This points to the fact that cooperation between NA's which have very different profiles (some are embedded in or closely associated to Minisitries of national governments, some are non-governmental organisations with delegated authority to implement of the objectives of the programmes, some are youth specific, some are responsible for multiple programmes and youth is only one portfolio).

At the end of the project, partners have similar evaluations of what worked well, and what could have been done better, so a degree of consensus and common perspective has been established through the work together. For example, partners agree that there is a dissonance between the high-level KA3 objectives, notably the prevention of radicalisation, the project activities and outputs.

Co-funded by the
Erasmus+ Programme
of the European Union

FRANKLY SPEAKING
training.development

Youth for
Human Rights

General coordination, management processes and procedures, division of labour

Again, in general, the partners were very complimentary regarding the general coordination delivered by the project coordinator, even with the constraints of time and workload mentioned above. The coordinator was able to put in place management process and procedures which effectively supported implementation (for example, workflow handbook, etc.) and the work-package approach (standard for all EC funded projects in the meantime) allowed for a clear, straight-forward, fair and strict division of labour. Even the withdrawal of the French partner could be absorbed with relative ease, although one partner felt that this resulted in some tasks not being adequately covered.

On the more critical side, one partner felt that although the coordinator grew into her role during the project, she did not have a lot of experience of managing large-scale international projects at the outset, and that guidance and leadership through the project could have been stronger. One partner was critical of the fact that it was not possible to use well-established NA processes of cooperation, communication and implementation for the project and that new ones were established. One partner felt it was confusing to work with Basecamp, for example. Furthermore, and although decision making processes worked well for managerial issues, the evaluation observed that time for face to face discussions of conceptual issues was missing. This was notably the case for the partner meetings, which invariably heavy practical and managerial agendas and is exemplified by the complaint of one member that the external evaluation took up too much time at a partner meeting, time that was needed for other discussions. Related to this, is the perspective of one partner who mentioned that not all partners were at the same level of knowledge and comfort with the theme of the project – HRE. In that relation, there was a suggestion to hold a short training for all the steering group members at the beginning of the project. It was noted that not all members of the steering group participated in the NA staff training organized by the project. It was mentioned by one partner that differences in national context meant there were situations in which, although willing, it was not possible for partners to actually help each other. Also, one partner related that communication on some occasions was difficult and there were misunderstandings, which the group was not able to handle with 'maturity'. Differences in NA structure, understanding of the role of an NA and national context were certainly contributing factors in any communication difficulties experienced (however minimal), and it appears that not as much attention as might have been necessary was paid to this 'intercultural' dimension of the project.

Overall, however, coordination and cooperation in the steering group is positively evaluated as supportive and committed, with the caveat that the workload was too large and quite invisible, demanding more effort and resources than anyone expected, so while fruitful, not sustainable.

Project impact for the overall objective - apparent and projected

In the context of this evaluation, impact is defined as 'the marked effect or influence of the project in view of its objectives and implicit theory of change'.

Outputs

The major outputs of the project were

Three expert reports on Human Rights Education

Detail	Description
Transnational mapping on Human Rights Education	The transnational mapping https://noored.ee/wp-content/uploads/2018/07/Transnational-mapping-NAHRE..pdf highlighted the current situation of HRE in Erasmus+ and offered insights into the HRE resources available and commonly in use. It fed into the work of the Expert Group on building up the training modules as well as into the communication campaign of European HRE materials. The mapping also fed into project policy recommendations. This resource has been uploaded on the project website and was part of the social media campaign, which highlighted HRE resources collected and developed during the project. According to Google Analytics, the campaign had 835 individual views overall, and the Mapping page has had 245 discrete views.
HRE Synthesis report	The national mappings fed into the synthesis report and were used in the national HRE training courses by trainers as input to build up the programme, share materials with participants, give references, decide which materials to make available for the training, etc. The synthesis report was mostly used as input material (working document) for the project but we also distributed it in the social media campaign, using NA social media resources. In fact, the Mapping page https://noored.ee/meist/tegevused/noored-inimoiguste-eest/human-rights-education/mapping/ received altogether 245 separate views, especially during the conference on October 2019 and during the Human Rights Day on Dec 10th, 2019 https://noored.ee/human-rights-day/ The synthesis of the main conclusions from the mappings (incl. national HRE mappings) was put together by the project coordinator to feed into Consortium meeting findings. The individual national mappings demonstrate follow-up potential for 2020-2021 for further distribution.
HRE in youth work concept paper	The HRE in youth work concept paper https://noored.ee/wp-content/uploads/2018/12/HUMAN-RIGHTS-EDUCATION-YOUTH-WORK_PAPER.pdf fed into the transfer seminars involving universities, NGOs, youth work students/lecturers, and other

	stakeholders to discuss how to bridge formal and non-formal education in regard of mainstreaming HRE in youth work in national youth work sectors
	The paper has been or is being translated into national languages from resources outside of the project budget. It is already being used by some universities who have youth workers' curricula and youth work students.
	This resource has been uploaded on the project website and was part of social media campaign.

Other key outputs are the training curriculum for the Training of Trainers, a tested training format adapted to national context and conducted in national languages, a tested 'transfer seminar' format adapted to national context and conducted in national languages and tested networking format adapted to national context and conducted in national languages. Furthermore, the project developed and published international policy recommendations about mainstreaming HRE in youth work and youth worker education.

Achievements of the YfHR Project

From the evaluation, and at the end of the project life cycle, it is possible to conclude that the YfHR project achieved:

1/ The pooling and synthesis of different strands of expertise reg. HRE around Europe: Brought together diverse and disparate communities of practice.

2/ The wide sensitisation of a variety of communities of practice to HRE in at least seven countries and possibly more as a result of national training activities, European level dissemination efforts through the national agency network and the final European conference:
- A significant number of training activities were held in parallel across Europe involving participants that were not necessarily typical beneficiaries or users of the Erasmus+ Youth in Action programme. Beneficiaries tend to be more experienced in HRE, so this effort spread the word about HRE to a wider public of youth workers and youth organisations. The process was important because it helped people working in the field of youth work see that their youth work is directly connected to Human Rights Education and the potential that it could have for their work;
- This sensitisation has been complemented by the learning of the NA network itself in relation to HRE. The 7 NA's directly involved in the project have formed what one partner described as a 'task force' on HRE within the NA network;
- Furthermore, the training of trainers and the national training courses have extended pool of youth workers with HRE competence working in the national context in 7 countries.

3/ The creation and dissemination of existing and new materials about HRE of relevance to the youth work community of practice at the European level:

- Through the training and dissemination activities Compass and Compassito have become more widely available, as have other HRE online tools and print materials in national languages and English;
- Furthermore, these activities brought the attention of youth workers to concrete, 'hands-on' tools for understanding how human rights relate to their daily personal lives and profession as a youth worker.

4/ The initiation of contact and exploration of the potential of cross sectoral engagement with stakeholders of the (formal) youth worker education community of practice in some countries in regard of mainstreaming HRE.

5/ The development of policy commitment to HRE by some institutional actors at European and National levels, including synergies with other institutions promoting HRE (for example, the Council of Europe).

Furthermore, the project had some specific results for each of the stakeholder and target groups involved.

For the youth work communities of practice in the participating countries, the project made visible that youth work is a human rights profession, by building networks and connecting youth workers and youth work providers with each other, and showing them the potential of the Erasmus+ programme. Furthermore, national networking helped some NAs to reach new target groups, including social workers and professionals working in foster care. These professionals working with young people in other sectors had the opportunity to familiarize with HRE methods for the first time.

The project was also an important and deep moment of learning for the participating National Agencies. NAs developed their profile as HRE supporters / educational providers and not only as funders, and understood in more depth the challenges that youth workers experience in their daily work, something that has traditionally been challenging for NAs because their usual contact with beneficiaries takes place through project applications and beneficiary reports. For the partners, HRE has become a new 'priority' alongside more traditional ones like inclusion. Through the project NAs have had the opportunity to develop contacts and partnerships with new categories of partner orgnaisation, that previously would not have been on the radar. Their participation in the project has developed their capacity not only in the direct subject matter, but also in the practice of large scale European Commission project implementation. As beneficiaries of such projects, they have also gained insight into the challenges their own beneficiaries experience when they are working with EU funding. Finally, this project has been an important experience of development connection and complicity between local experiences and a European narrative.

YfHR was also an 'experimental pilot', and has had some results relevant for the Erasmus+ Programme as a whole. One partner stated that Youth for Human Rights has opened up new horizons in terms of priority setting for Human Rights and democracy. In this regard, partners believe the project has had some success in demonstrating that Erasmus+ and the European

Solidarity Corps are programmes for more than 'just' transnational mobility, helped them clarify why and how they want to be involved in HRE, and to develop a shared vision about their involvement. Some partners expressed a sense that the project helped them to address highly pertinent political and societal developments. The outreach that the project achieved towards actors of both the formal and non-formal education sectors is seen as something new for the NA network. The project showed these usually separate sectors that there is added-value in cooperation and that the programme could be a good instrument for them to reach their aims. The project is seen as having increased awareness about the necessity of mainstreaming Human Rights Education in Erasmus+/European Solidarity Corps projects, and the wider youth field. This experience of collaboration among NAs in a KA3 project has been useful for understanding what it takes to conduct such projects in terms not understood previously – finances, time, workload and work organisation, communication strategies, etc. It has also become clear that there is broader interest in the theme of HRE beyond the 7 NA partners. This is seen as potential for the further and more systematic mainstreaming of HRE in the youth sector. An important further dimension has been the connections made through the theme to other stakeholders of the youth sector that have been working on and promoting HRE in a more systematic manner and for some time – notably the Council of Europe. The NA network now has better access to more experienced HRE experts and trainers. Finally, NAs valued the fact that the project was an integral effort to bring together different perspectives on the topic, not just a series of once off events.

The YfHR project also made its specific contribution to the achievement of the objectives of the KA3 Call for Applications of the European Commission.

Main objective of the KA3 Call	Associated specific objectives of the Youth for Human Rights Project
Preventing violent radicalisation and promoting democratic values, fundamental rights, intercultural understanding, and active citizenship	Improving the acquisition of social and civic competencies and fostering knowledge, understanding and ownership of democratic values and fundamental rights.
	Supporting teachers and educators in handling conflicts and dealing with diversity
	Enhancing the quality of non-formal learning activities, youth work practices and volunteering.

The participating National Agencies are positive in regard of the contribution of the project to the objectives of the KA3 call. They observed that to the extent that this project sought to improve the regularity and quality of HRE projects, and the mainstreaming of HRE in the European Commission youth work programmes and in curricula for youth work training, it has been a relevant contribution to addressing the general themes of the KA3 Call, notably by creating practice and policy discussions around how to promote democratic values and fundamental rights in youth work and about how to create ownership for that agenda in the youth sector. This said, all partners recognise that a direct relationship between the HRE in youth work and the prevention of radicalisation was possibly an unrealistic expectation, even

with the extensive policy drive and momentum that is apparent at the end of the project life cycle and that is expressed in the drafted recommendations. Regarding the specific objective of supporting teachers and educators in handling conflicts and dealing with diversity, it is clear that this is a long term goal, and can be easier addressed in the non-formal education sector than in the formal education sector. It will take a lot more and in depth work and investment in each national context to keep that momentum going. Regarding the enhancement of the quality of non-formal learning activities, youth work practices and volunteering, there are positive signs that there is better understanding among direct participants of the project of the concepts and practices of HRE and that the efforts to promote high quality materials on HRE more widely could create more awareness in at least the youth work sector. Finally, on mainstreaming, the national event reports demonstrate that there are plans for more in depth processes in the making. Some of the partner institutions involved through the transfer seminars, including academic institutions responsible for youth worker education, are working towards developing modules on human rights to include in their youth worker training curricula.

Finally, in terms of the added value of the partnership among the NAs, the evaluation observes that all stakeholders are positive about the project and the fact that it was conducted as a partnership effort as having had added value for each NA and for the programme as a whole. It is clear, that the peer learning effect has been important, and that would not have been possible without the dedication of specific resources by the European Commission to enhance cooperation between NAs. Notwithstanding challenges and some disappointments (developed upon in the next section), no single partner or NA stated that the project was not worth it or represented a disproportionate investment in comparison to the value it had for them as individual professionals and as structures.

Challenges and disappointments

While satisfaction is generally high with the way the project progressed, its outcomes and potential impact, YfHR was not without its challenges and disappointments. Just like any other experimental or pilot process, there were many hurdles to be overcome in the course of the three years the project was ongoing.

One obvious challenge was the fact that one of the partner NAs (FR) dropped out of the project mid-way, but the results of the evaluation indicate that was dealt with effectively by all concerned and did not especially adversely affect the project. One partner felt that some of the tasks of the FR partner could not be taken up appropriately, but this was not underlined by any other partner, and so appears to be an individual impression. Nevertheless, this development increased the workload in an already tight human resource situation which was undoubtedly challenging.

The following challenge categories are observable through participating stakeholders' evaluations:

Resourcing
This question was discussed at length above, but stakeholders further discussed that it was challenging to engage the wider team of the NA in YfHR, due to other priorities, tasks and a lack of financial support for staff involvement. Notably, the partners suggested that more

attention should be payed to the capacity of NAs for running such work intensive projects, and to ensuring financial support for translations into national languages, which is now understood as essential for reaching local youth work communities who do not necessarily understanding English.

Project conceptualisation:
Some partners see challenges in what they understand as an 'over-focus' on experts and the work of the expert groups, and therefore on the utility and added-value of some of the project outputs. One of the main concern of stakeholders in regard of project conceptualisation has been about the capacity of this kind of project to respond to KA3 objectives such as prevention of radicalisation. In regard of mainstreaming HRE, it is noted that mainstreaming truly relies on governments and national partners in other sectors, but that the youth work sector does not necessarily have significant influence. Hence, there is a jo of work to be taken seriously by stakeholders around the project partners if this objective is to be reached long term. Finally, on the approach of working towards both the higher education sector and the youth work sector, some partners questioned whether the project might have benefitted from more in depth focus on a smaller number of activities and orgnaisaitons / partners in each sector.

Unrealistic expectations and ambitions: While for the most part, stakeholders involved in the evaluation feel that their expectations towards the project have been met, some referred to ambitions they feel were not realistic. As discussed extensively under the section on resourcing, the project was really ambitious in terms of number and complexity of activities in a time frame that has generally been evaluated as too tight for the usual speed at which NAs work. The expectation that the project could be run with existing NA human resources without liberating them from existing tasks is evaluated as unrealistic, even if this is what actually happened. One partner, who experienced difficulties in recruiting participants for the training course, evaluated the goal to train 40 youth workers was unrealistic, because the NA is not regularly in contact with youth workers on the local level, had to collaborate with other partners to promote the training, and this did not go as well as they had hoped. One partner stated that they had expected the number of HRE project applications to the NA would increase during the project life cycle. This did not happen, and the partner concerned realises now that even such an intensive project as YfHR takes time to filter down into the community of practice. At the end of the project lifecycle and after a series of networking activities, project applications specifically on HRE are slowly starting to come in. One partner stated that they had hoped that the project would have an impact on the national youth strategy development process in favour of the inclusion of HRE. This did not happen, and the partner evaluates the expectation as unrealistic. Although not mentioned in answer to the same question and possibly not stated by the same partner, the political context at national level and the favour or lack thereof with which government officials concerned view HRE was mentioned by at least one partner as a possible reason for this expectation not being fulfilled. Possibly related to this reflection, two partners stated that they did not consider the objective to reach out to the formal education sector and governmental bodies in their countries as realistic, and therefore did not invest significantly in it. Also, with so much to do in so little time, it was important to prioritise where time could be best put to use. In that relation, on the regional level were people were already motivated for the topic or some processes about HR were already ongoing there we just offered what the people needed and wanted at that time and there was impact afterwards.

Level of interest / motivations of the community of practice: Some partners were concerned about the apparent lack of interest on the part of the community of practice in their countries. Some noted a lack of interest in the international dimension and some noted a lack of interest in the level of HRE specialisation presented by the training. The motivations of the different youth workers involved in the project were very diverse and this made it difficult for some NAs to address what they express as needs, and to develop actions that would attract what they call "non-believers", the ones who are critical towards human rights. For the NAs, it has been a challenge to create dialogue on the value of HRE without prosletysing.

Communicating the project and dissemination: Some partners felt challenged by the communication and dissemination aspects of the project, which they felt were not always up to collective ambitions. One key issue for these partners was that there was no independent project website to disseminate all project outputs, even if there were local websites associated with the National Agencies. Some national agencies felt the project did not strike the right chord with the youth work community of practice, i.e. that it did not use the "right" language/tone to attract the interest of youth workers and that this was because of the explicit use of the term Human Rights Education, which may have scared people off. Some partners felt that the kind of promotional activities chosen were not effective in reaching out to the targeted youth work communities of practice. One partner thought it would have bene more effective to make a promotional video involving youth workers speaking to other youth workers about how use the programme for their purposes. Another aspect of this concern relates to the use of 'digital' means during the project and after. This was not a priority in the context of the project life cycle and if it is going to happen then it will require political and financial support from the a wide range of partners, including but not exclusively the project partner NAs.

Conclusion

The YfHR has been a valuable experience for everyone involved. That is undisputed. Furthermore, there are strong indications that the policy work initiated and the momentum achieved will lead to more extensive mainstreaming of HRE through the work of the partner NAs at least – each of these has some specific plans for what they want to do in their own context and with each other on the European level already mapped out. Furthermore, all the partners involved and many of the discrete participants have been quite clear in positioning the project as a strategic intervention for Human Rights Education but also for the National Agencies and for the youth work and non-formal education sectors in participating countries and at the European level.

Notably, there is a sense that the policy recommendations developed on the basis of the other actions of the project are a valuable basis to build upon, also for the future Erasmus+ programme generation. In the end the full strategic value of this project will depend on how the NAs and other decision making bodies in regard of policy in the programmes will integrate these policy recommendations into their longer term planning for the implementation of the programme in each country and in their inter-national agency cooperation plans. Some are clearly moving in this direction, with how to include and mainstream the results of the project in NA directors' decisions, national policy planning and TCA budgets being under discussion in quality of youth work programming, and the development of more concerted efforts inside national agencies to follow-up mainstreaming efforts on a transversal basis. At the same time,

there are partners that do not see this kind of commitment in their NAs and that are understandably concerned about future prospects.

Part of the strategic value of this project does lie in the fact that there is a developing awareness of the Erasmus+ programme's civic mission, and that mainstreaming this requires a wider understanding of the youth field, one that considers how youth work is constructed in curricula that train the profession, as well as in programmes for volunteers. Hence, the strategic value in this project is also the fact that it has made connections across the formal and non-formal education divide that is common in most if not all national contexts. In addition, and certainly most relevant, is the fact that youth work on the local level is crucial to this kind of effort. The closer contact established with local youth work sectors by the National Agencies will be essential to the long term prospects for policy impact of this project. Therefore, the understanding on the part of the National Agencies that a European level project can develop concepts of relevance to the local context in cooperation with that local context is a very concrete and relevant strategic value of this project.

Finally, this project shows that irrespective of the theme and issue, KA3 projects are clearly a valuable opportunity for NAs to develop a more strategic way of working together and on issues of concern to some, if not all NAs. With more realistic resourcing to address local specificities and needs, and the actual workload involved for NA staff, and more critical mass in terms of the number and scale of such projects in the future, they could be a very valuable policy instrument for the development of the European and national youth sectors in years to come.

Appendices
- *Mainstreaming human rights education in the field of youth: Policy recommendations.* https://noored.ee/wp-content/uploads/2019/12/Policy-recommendations.pdf
- *"Youth for Human Rights": The perspective of participating trainers and youth workers: final survey report.* https://noored.ee/wp-content/uploads/2019/09/Y4HR_Research-Report_20190912.pdf