



DDP-YD/ETD (2019) 163

Strasbourg, 16 December 2019



REVIEW OF THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE *ENTER!* RECOMMENDATION

Meeting of the Monitoring Group

European Youth Centre Budapest
15 November 2019

REPORT

1. Mandate of the group and purpose of the meeting

The mandate and composition of the group were established by the Joint Council (CMJ) to follow up the review process of the *Enter!* Recommendation. The group was not able to meet physically before – inputs and feedback were provided by writing.

The meeting is organised to:

- Discuss the findings and provide feedback to the authors of the review
- Prepare input to the documents and proposed decisions for the meetings of the Joint Council on Youth.

Apologies were received from Miguel Angel García López, one the consultants, Thierry Dufour (CDEJ, Belgium) and Larissa Nanning (CCJ, OBESSU).

Michael Piccinino, bureau member of the European Youth Forum, participated in the meeting through online visio facilities.

2. State of affairs of the review process

The review process of the implementation of the Enter! Recommendation has been decided by the CMJ in 2016 - document CMJ (2016)2 rev on the Process for the implementation and reviewing of the recommendation. The process and scope of the review were also decided by the CMJ in October 2018 – document CMJ(2018)19. The review includes:

- A desk review
- Surveys
- Focus groups and feedback from participants in the Enter! Youth Week (July 2019)

The aim of the review is to identify if and how the Recommendation influenced youth work and youth policy and, in particular, how it may have influenced the access to social rights for young people from disadvantaged neighbourhoods.

The findings were presented in the form of a draft report and discussed through a presentation with many charts, figures and bullet points.

3. Presentation of the draft study on the review

Rūta Brazienė, consultant, presented the main findings and conclusions of the study so far. Overall there is concordance of the findings of the desk research, surveys and focus groups. Education/training and employment are the areas most noted to have been impacted/improved by measures proposed in the recommendation. Housing, and sport, leisure and culture are, on the opposite, the areas with less visible impact or attention. It can be safely stated that the recommendation has had an impact on youth policy and youth work at various levels, even if it can not always be measured or traced exactly.

About the process

There were some difficulties when it came to gathering and processing the data: The survey malfunctioned (did not show some country names), a link that was sent out was not the right one, some of the forms people received were unreadable, the data does not add up in some areas, the formulation of some of the questions could have been better and the survey only had a limited number of responses. There was also no de-segregation of data according to language (English and French).

We also need to take into account the bias of the people who fill in such a survey, i.e. they are more likely to be concerned about the situation in the first place. It is very hard to counter this tendency, but we do need to make note of it in the conclusions. Many replies are probably from a self-selective group in a "circular process": replies are received from people who know the recommendation.

Not only this, but some of the other difficulties faced are inherent limitations of social studies and can thus not be avoided. This should be made clear and contextualised. In order to avoid some of these problems, the survey needs to be monitored better in the future.

In the final data, only responses by people who filled in most of the survey (>76 %) were taken into account. The data is reliable enough to draw certain conclusions about the impact and people targeted by the survey. It should be made clearer who gave which answers, as well as how many answered in French and in English. Making a map of the results only makes sense when the information is verifiable and reliable. Sometimes the CDEJ responses seem mixed with the local and regional authorities; some responses attributed to NGOs are in fact from Member States. The final figures about how many member states contributed to the survey are thus not totally reliable, but it is fair to deduct that they are between 20 and 25, hence approximately 50% of the member states.

It is important to state what the surveys are reliable for and, similarly, what they are not reliable for (or even pretend to be).

The involvement of the European Youth Forum in disseminating the surveys was disappointing for many; it would be nice if they are more proactive in the future particularly about involving national youth councils.

We would get more concrete results if we had limited our review to specific areas, but that would also mean that we had to focus our projects on more specific areas. Maybe it would be worth reflecting on housing, education and training and see what difference we can make in that field. How the Council of Europe can provide the best support when it comes to implementation of the recommendation in specific areas. We can have a more focused review on this in the future

Lastly, the process of research also had some shortcomings. There were technical issues that slowed down the whole process, and the team of researchers could have been larger. In general there was not enough time. Maybe if there was, open questions could have been used, which would have resulted in a different range of information.

The summer period should be avoided as a time for people to contribute to surveys. More time is also needed to re-launch and possibly target countries not yet covered or reached.

Regarding form

There are a number of issues with wording: some needs to change ("*provide*" must be changed to "*invite*"); there needs to be consistent use of terminology, e.g. use either 'municipalities' or 'local authorities', not both. The language in general needs to be looked over for spelling, grammar and clarity. Some graphs show counter intuitive results, such as the impact being strong and limited at the same time, some of the tables need to be placed in the appendices.

Although it is more useful to have percentages, graphs and charts can be handy when the former cannot be used. There should be no contact data of the participants of the focus groups, only countries.

Finally, all conclusions should be summarised in the executive summary. This should be presented as the main findings.

About contents/findings

Some of the findings show a disparity between the main area of competence of youth work and policy, and the perceived or lived experience with it. An example of this is housing, which is rarely a remit of youth policy authorities. Obvious disagreement between discourse at European level and local level should be highlighted.

On the other hand, categories such as "improving living conditions" are very generic, and should be differentiated from the more specific questions. Additionally, the category "preventing violence" is a high impact one and should be made explicit.

The research does not feature a lot about transportation, a very important subject that has sparked riots in recent times. It should be looked into more. Other than that, there a number of non-argumentative links that need to be worked out: there should be a glossary explaining definitions of terms and abbreviations, conclusions from review should be grouped and be clearly identified, challenges should be linked to Recommendations

It is unclear how the Recommendations impacted on advocacy by youth workers. Also, it would aid the analysis if it is specified which neighbourhoods are discussed. This has an impact on which tools or actions plans, national or local, are to be used.

It is good that there is a review and it was certainly important to get young people to participate in this process. In general, the focus groups were useful, but we could have done more if we had more people. The question is how much young people from disadvantaged neighbourhoods could have contributed to the review. And it wasn't just young people, it is good to associate youth workers and public authorities as well, even though we do not have access to these stakeholders in the same way.

In the future we need to look into how to involve authorities that are not our direct partners in order to widen our reach. At the same time we must ask ourselves, how far do we need to reach out? Furthermore, National Youth Councils require a specific approach. How to make them interested in a way that they feel concerned? One potential approach is to have more in-depth interviews with CDEJ and the Youth Councils to discover what the barriers in their participation are. Through this process they can also become associated and learn about the Recommendation.

It could have been useful to research in depth two to three municipalities to see what has changed and how. These case studies could teach us what made a difference and how. We have to be clear what do we want to learn as institution: this will define the method, especially with the different stakeholders.

4. Conclusions

- i. It is very important that the review was conducted. This is a premiere for the youth sector and we should be able to learn from it for other recommendations.
- ii. It was very important to associate young people to it – even if improvements are possible.
- iii. The text of the Recommendations is not very friendly – we should make it more accessible, understandable and shorter. This accessible version is then to be translated and distributed widely in the member states. This can happen in tandem with a promotion and information campaign to make it more visible for the public.
- iv. To provide more resources to youth organisations – it can be interesting to have recommendations presented a bit differently. For example, if there is advisory mission to some country - there could be an activity accompanying it: a workshop or info meeting. Youth workers need a toolkit but not necessary the official policy documents.
- v. The Enter! Recommendation should be articulated with the Youth Work Recommendation and Youth Work Convention in order to see connections between activities of youth work that also contribute to the implementation of the Enter Recommendations.
- vi. Collect, disseminate and exchange good practices between member states on implementation and some specific programmes/projects connected to the Recommendation. This should be done in the consultation with young people and youth organisations. There should also be bilateral and multilateral activities in cooperation with member states (workshops, study visits, support measures) *in the specific areas* – this is also part of the responsibility of the CMJ.
- vii. We probably need to go for more evidence-based interventions addressing specific measures in the recommendation. This can be aided by the creation of tools helping to visualise which projects contribute to the ENTER Recommendations in the first place, as well as making some of the tools for social rights available. The Quality Label youth centres network could play a strong role in this dissemination process.
- viii. Periodic policy reviews of youth policies or assistance measures should reflect the implementation of the Enter Recommendation. A Check if list or some other easy assessment tool is needed for that.
- ix. Member states should be encouraged to translate the recommendation into their national languages and into specific policy measures in cooperation with local authorities and in consultation with youth workers and youth organisations.
- x. EYF-supported projects should give more visibility to the recommendation and have other resources than just Dignityland.
- xi. Education and training of youth workers should remain a priority.

5. Next steps

At the beginning of December, Ruta will finalise the document and will propose Miguel the format for good practice. There need to be reports of this meeting and proposals to prepare

for the CMJ meeting. Rutha needs to be invited to present the review at the meeting of the CDEJ or CMJ. The meeting will be held from 23 to 25 of March 2020 in Budapest.

6. Closing of the meeting

All participants agreed that it was important to meet and discuss together the main findings.



PARTICIPANTS

Ivan Hromada, European Steering Committee on Youth

Nato Antia, Advisory Council on Youth

Dan Moxon, Pool of European Youth Researchers

Michael Piccinino, European Youth Forum

Rūta Brazienė, Consultant

Natalia Chardymova, Educational advisor, Youth Department of the Council of Europe

Rui Gomes, Head of Division Education and Training, Youth Department of the Council of Europe

Apologised

Miguel Angel García López consultant

Thierry Dufour (CDEJ, Belgium)

Larissa Nenning (CCJ, OBESSU).