

CONCORDIA  
Evaluation  
Of  
*“Partnership For Progress”*  
Project

	<u>Contents</u>	<b>Page</b>
1.0	<b><u>Introduction</u></b>	1
2.0	Executive Summary	3
3.0	<b><u>Terms of Reference</u></b>	7
4.0	Methodology	8
5.0	Background to the project	10
6.0	The Transnational Programme	12
7.0	Research and Policy work	32
8.0	Support to social partner representatives	37
9.0	Horizontal Principles & Peace Distinctiveness	40
10.0	Financial Performance	46
11.0	Conclusions and Future Needs	48
	<b><u>Appendix 1: Questionnaire Survey</u></b>	

# **INTRODUCTION**

## **1.0 INTRODUCTION**

1.1 Concordia is a social partnership that brings together the local business, agricultural, trade union and voluntary and community sectors in Northern Ireland. These sectors are represented on the Concordia Board by the following organisations respectively – Confederation of British Industry (CBI); Ulster Farmers Union (UFU); Irish Congress of Trade Unions (ICTU); and Northern Ireland Council for Voluntary Action (NICVA). Concordia's aim is to drive forward social and economic development for the benefit of the whole community. Collaborating, in an unfunded capacity, since 1995, on issues of common concern, Concordia was successful in its bid for Peace II monies to deliver the **Partnership for Progress** Project. It was awarded just over £1m under Measure 4.1 of the Peace II Programme – *Networking in Europe and Beyond*, which is administered through the Office of the First and Deputy First Minister (OFMDFM). The Project commenced in July 2003 and it is due to end in December 2006.

1.2 The three main aims of the Partnership for Progress Project are:

- To support social partnership representatives (i.e. representatives nominated by one of the Concordia member organisations) on bodies associated with structural funds, primarily LSPs, to improve their skills and their ability to work in partnership with each other.
- To advance a common agenda through policy development and research and to advise Government and Concordia members on the development of social partnerships.
- To develop a transnational programme to explore learning and disseminate best practice across the sector.

1.3 In order to achieve the above aims, a number of projected outcomes were established for the Project. According to the Economic Appraisal undertaken on the Project, the following objectives were set.

### **Training / Capacity Building**

1.4 Offer training to all of 240 LSP Concordia representatives in areas such as committee skills, negotiation skills and alliance building. [However, this aspect was subject to a Training Needs Analysis being completed to ascertain the number of LSP social partner representatives that would be involved in the training and how many workshops / seminars would be delivered within this theme.]

### **Policy Development**

1.5 Produce 2/3 joint policy papers per year on cross-sectoral issues and hold 8 seminars per year covering sectoral and cross-sectoral issues. That equates to a total of 7 – 10 joint policy papers and 28 seminars in all, over the duration of the 3.5-year project.

**Transnational Programmes**

- 1.6 Facilitate a number of transnational study tours as follows:
- 48 individual study tours (3-5 days) covering each sectoral area;
  - 6 group study tours (2-4 days) involving 120 people; and
  - 16 long-term (6-month) international placements.
- 1.7 However these programmes were subsequently revised in June 2005 (in agreement with the founder) to the following:
- 59 individual study tours;
  - 15 group study tours; and
  - 19 long-term (now redefined as 6-weeks to 6-months) international placements.
- 1.8 Given that the Project is nearing its completion date, Concordia commissioned Peter Quinn Consultancy Services to undertake an Evaluation of the Project. The Evaluation was carried out during November and December 2006. This report represents the findings of the review.

## **Executive Summary**

## **2.0 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

2.1 The 'Partnership for Progress' Project was awarded £1,056,931 under Measure 4.1 of the Peace II Programme – *Outward and Forward Looking Region*. The Project aimed to (a) deliver a transnational programme involving overseas study tours; (b) undertake research and policy development; and (c) support social partner representatives on LSPs. The Project commenced in July 2003 and was due for completion at the end of December 2006.

### **2.2 Project Promoters**

2.2.1 The Project Promoter is Concordia, a Northern Ireland social partnership that brings together the local business, agricultural, trade union and voluntary and community sectors. It's members are made up of four partner organisations as follows:

- Business – Confederation of British Industry (CBI);
- Agriculture – Ulster Farmers' Union (UFU);
- Trade Union – Irish Congress of Trade Unions (ICTU); and
- Voluntary and Community Sector – Northern Ireland Council for Voluntary Action (NICVA).

### **2.3 Evaluation Methodology**

2.3.1 The evaluation, which was conducted during November and December 2006, included the following:

- Desk research and review of documentation relating to the Project;
- Face to face consultations and telephone interviews with Concordia Board members, staff and other key stakeholders; and
- Questionnaire surveys of Project participants.

### **2.4 Achievement of Project Targets**

2.4.1 The Project was successful in achieving the targets in relation to two of the three main aims – the transnational programme and the research and policy work. The targets relating to the third aim, provision of training to social partner representatives on the LSPs, were subject to a Training Needs Analysis (TNA). Whilst training needs were identified from the TNA, many barriers to the potential implementation of the training were highlighted and consequently it was agreed that support for LSPs would be through the other two strands of the Project.

2.4.2 The following table summarises the targets, which were set for the Project and the extent to which these were achieved.

<b>TABLE 2.1</b>		
<b>Achievement of Project Targets</b>		
<b>Output Area</b>	<b>Target</b>	<b>Actual Achieved</b>
Study Tours	378 participants	379
Seminars	28 seminars	28
Joint Policy Papers	7-10 papers	10
Training for LSPs	Training offered to 240 (Subject to TNA)	Training Needs Analysis completed and Support offered through the other two strands of the Project

**2.4.3** The success of a Project has to be measured by more than achievement of targets; therefore the impacts of the Project activities were assessed.

## **2.5 Impact of the Project**

**2.5.1** By far the most positive outcomes, discernible to date, arise from the Study Tours. These include the following:

- New and improved cross-sectoral working as reported by more than half of the participants;
- Establishment of new networks and contacts, both domestic and overseas;
- The initiation of new joint projects and collaborative working arrangements, both here and abroad; and
- The acquisition of new learning and the widespread dissemination of same was a dominant feature of the Study Tours.

**2.5.2** Given that the policy work was undertaken during the latter part of the Project, it is too early to assess its impact. However, the following outcomes were noted:

- The policy documents will be useful to the social partners and other key stakeholders in lobbying government for change.
- The documents effectively form another strand, of a range of interventions, in each of the policy areas, adding to an accumulated effect on each of the issues.
- The media attention that the work was able to capture helped to raise awareness of the various policy issues.
- The strength of the policy work is the united voice of the four social partners, which is more difficult for government to ignore.
- The discussion and debate generated during the process has led to a better understanding of the other partners' perspectives.
- There is evidence of a shift in thinking among some of the social partners in certain strategic and policy areas, which was seen as positive.
- From a senior civil servant's perspective, the policy work undertaken by the Project, can effectively act as a filter, with more realistic, practical and workable proposals coming forward, than propositions and requests from individual groups and organisations.

## Evaluation of 'Partnership For Progress' Project

---

**2.5.3** Although it was not possible to deliver training to the LSPs as planned, it was reported that a number of social partner representatives attended seminars delivered through the Project and participated on the Study Tours. Furthermore, research was undertaken during the Project, which examined the impact and experience of the social partners in relation to the Peace II Programme. It was found that social partner representatives contributed the following:

- Their understanding and knowledge of the sector and local area, bringing a greater economic and social focus to the processes;
- A challenge function and additional transparency to the process;
- Greater access to, and buy-in from difficult to reach groups;
- Improved relationships with central and local government, statutory agencies, and elected representatives and better partnership working; and
- Fuller engagement from political representatives from opposing sides of the spectrum.

## **2.6 Peace Distinctiveness and Horizontal Principles**

**2.6.1** The Project grew out of the need for participative democracy in a society polarised by decades of conflict, to advance economic and social progress, which was hampered as a result of the Troubles. Therefore, it concurs with the two main aims of the Peace II Programme: *Addressing the Legacy of the Conflict* and *Taking Opportunities Arising from Peace*. Furthermore, given the transnational element to the Project, it is congruent with Measure 4.1 -*Outward and Forward Looking Region*, under which it was funded.

**2.6.2** The Project provided opportunities for individuals to come together on a cross-community and cross-sectoral basis to engage in dialogue. It is felt that this has had a positive impact, although, it is acknowledged that the full impact is more likely to emerge in the longer term, following the outcomes of the linkages made among participants and the advancement of the policy papers produced during the Project.

**2.6.3** In relation to the Horizontal Principles, the Project has promoted Environmental Sustainability and Rural Development. The policy areas explored during the Project, when advanced, should ultimately contribute to Economic and Social development in the region.

## **2.7 Challenges**

**27.1** The Project was implemented without any major problems, but it did encounter a few relatively minor challenges, which were largely overcome as follows:

- The over optimistic targets in relation to long term exchanges was overcome by revising the criteria for long term exchanges and re-profiling the other targets and corresponding budgets.
- Barriers to engaging with LSPs were met, therefore, support to the social partner representatives was offered through the other two strands of the Project.

**Evaluation of 'Partnership For Progress' Project**

---

- The staffing structure did not allow for engagement with the individual sectors, as initially envisaged, however, external expertise was bought in, to help fill the gap.

**2.8 Limiting Factors**

**2.8.1** It was more difficult for Trade Union members and individuals from the Business sector to participate on the study tours, consequently, less benefits were gained by these sectors.

**2.8.2** It is felt that the policy work may have had more impact had a devolved government been in place during the course of the Project, with whom to engage in dialogue and to drive the agendas forward.

**2.8.3** Although there was a delay in the Project start date, it is felt that the Project could have benefited from some time being spent at the outset to plan the implementation, in order to bring a more strategic approach to the thematic areas, to target specific areas and to provide greater cohesion and integration between the strands.

**2.9 Financial Performance**

**2.9.1** Of the £1,056,931 awarded to the Project, £70,000 was decommitted during 2005, due to the difficulty securing sufficient participants to undertake long term study exchanges. The remaining £987k was either spent or committed at the time of the evaluation.

**2.9.2** The ratio of 'programme costs' to 'administration costs' of the Project budget was 54% / 46%. However, given the high cost of the study tours, a budget skewed more in favour of 'programme costs' would have been expected. It was reported that the organisation of the study tours was quite labour intensive and that savings were made on Project expenditure where possible.

**2.10 Future Needs**

**2.10.1** Future needs were identified during the evaluation that are relevant to Concordia, including the advancement of the policy documents produced during the Project and the need to pursue other policy areas. A need to progress the implementation of international learning in an organised and systematic manner was also identified. Further development of Concordia itself, as a social partner, was highlighted and it is felt that there is an important role for social partners to work with the new super councils in relation to community planning and community relation.

**2.10.2** Overall, Concordia successfully delivered the 'Partnership for Progress' Project with many positive benefits resulting. Each of the partners was highly committed to the Project and they are motivated to continue to develop and promote participative democracy as a means of helping to progress social and economic development in Northern Ireland.

## **TERMS OF REFERENCE**

### 3.0 TERMS OF REFERENCE

3.1 The Terms of Reference for this assignment were based upon the Consultants' Brief circulated by Concordia on 11<sup>th</sup> September 2006 that define the effective parameters within which the Consultants were expected to operate. The main objective of the assignment was construed by the Consultants as being:

*'To undertake a final evaluation of the 'Partnership for Progress' Project, assessing achievement of objectives, overall impact and value for money of the Project.'*

3.2 Within this overall aim, the following sub-objectives have been identified:

- To describe the 'Partnership for Progress' initiative in terms of its purpose and context within the Peace II programme;
- To examine the way in which the project has been developed, implemented, supported and managed to date;
- To evaluate the processes involved and how they have evolved from the onset of the project;
- To identify the major achievements and outputs of the project in relation to the following, and relate these to the original stated targets:
  - Transnational study tours (i.e. individual, group and long-term study tours);
  - Policy & research work;
  - Work with the 26 NI Local Strategy Partnerships;
- To comment on the impact of the above activities in terms of how they have/are contributing to:
  - Change/progress within the four social partner sectors;
  - Informing government policy;
  - Partnership working and decision-making within local areas.
- To examine to what extent the Project has met each of the Horizontal Principles of the Peace II programme and the Peace II Distinctiveness criteria;
- To assess the overall financial performance of the project.



# **METHODOLOGY**

## **4.0 METHODOLOGY**

- 4.1 The Project had three main components (Study Tours, Research and Policy Work, and Support to Social Partners on LSPs), and the approach to the evaluation was designed to seek both quantitative and qualitative information relating to the three aims, along with both internal and external perspectives.
- 4.2 One challenge to the evaluation was the fact that there were a large number of participants on the Project who each only engaged with a small part of the project (e.g.) attendance at one seminar, or participated on one study tour). Consequently, they each could only comment upon a minor aspect of the Project. Therefore, getting an overall picture required quite an extensive scoping exercise involving a significant number of surveys and consultations.
- 4.3 The methodology undertaken is outlined below.

### **Desk Research**

- 4.4 A review was undertaken of the following:
- Quantitative data relating to the Project, including monitoring data, participant numbers, and activities which took place;
  - Financial budget for the Project, showing project budget and actual spend;
  - Policy documents produced during the course of the Project;
  - Application and selection procedures for the study tours;
  - A sample of study tour reports produced by participants; and
  - Other related documentation e.g. Application Form, Economic Appraisal, Letter of Offer, etc.

### **Consultations**

- 4.5 Face-to-face consultations were undertaken with 9 Concordia Board members, and telephone interviews were held with 2 Board members. A face-to-face interview was held with 1 consultant who was commissioned to undertake policy and PR work for the Project. There was ongoing liaison with the Project Manager and other staff throughout the duration of the evaluation.
- 4.6 In order to get an external perspective on the impact of the Project, particularly the policy work, six senior civil servants, who were suggested by Board members, were contacted. Feedback was received from two of these government officials.
- 4.7 Six social partner representatives on LSPs, proposed by Concordia Board members were contacted for feedback on the Project. Feedback was received from two of the representatives.

**Study Tours**

- 4.8 A questionnaire survey was distributed by e-mail to 181 study tour participants. Completed questionnaires were received from 84 participants, giving a response rate of 46% and a sample size of 19% of the total number of study tour participants.
- 4.9 In addition, a questionnaire survey was distributed to 10 co-ordinators of sectoral study tours. Three completed questionnaires were received.

**Seminars, Research and Policy Work**

- 4.10 A questionnaire was sent to attendees of four seminars, which led to the production of policy papers. Of 38 questionnaires distributed, 10 completed surveys were returned, giving a response rate of 26%.

## **BACKGROUND TO THE PROJECT**

## 5.0 **BACKGROUND TO THE PROJECT**

- 5.1 In order to examine how the Project was conceived and its context within the Peace II Programme, it is necessary, firstly, to provide some background information on Concordia.
- 5.2 The social partners making up Concordia, which was established in 1995, had been working together informally since the early 1990s to help deal with the problems of Northern Ireland. The requirement for social partnership involvement in the planning and implementation of European Programmes consolidated the need for Concordia, which represented the four pillars of the EU model of social partnership. Therefore, during the late 1990s, Concordia as an informal body met with European Community officials and parliamentarians and advised on developments such as the Peace I and Peace II Programmes.
- 5.3 From 1998-1999 Concordia, supported by the NI Centre in Europe, produced a specific piece of work 'Creating Collaborative Advantage', on long-term unemployment. This acted as a further catalyst for continued collaborative working between the partners. During this period the CBI, NICVA and ICTU issued several joint statements stressing the importance of peace and political stability to the public, businesses and politicians in Northern Ireland. This culminated in the 'Time's Running Out', a joint campaign to raise the profile of issues relating to peace and to highlight the need for a speedy political settlement, following the establishment of the new Assembly. With the advent of Peace II, Concordia was asked to nominate the social partner representatives for the 26 Local Strategy Partnerships.
- 5.4 Concordia identified the need to provide support to the various social partner representatives active in partnerships across Northern Ireland, along with the need for a more cohesive approach to problem solving and liaison with Government, but it required resources to fulfil these aims. In pursuit of funding for this purpose, Concordia was invited to apply to Measure 4.1 '*Outward and Forward Looking Region*' of the Peace II Programme. Its application to OFMDFM was successful and it was awarded just over £1m to deliver the '**Partnership for Progress**' Project.
- 5.5 The Project commenced in July 2003 and it is due to end in December 2006. Section 1.0 sets out the three main aims of the Project and the projected targets to be achieved within the timescale.
- 5.6 The funding allowed for the recruitment of the following staff:
- 1 Project Manager;
  - 2 Field Officers; and
  - 1 Administrator.

- 5.7 The Management Board of Concordia had overall responsibility for the Project, and it played an active role in guiding and facilitating the Project activities. This included identifying areas for research and policy development, assessing applications for study tours, and promoting participation in the Project among their constituent members and groups. The Board met on a bi-monthly basis. At the time of the Evaluation, the Board was made up of 14 members drawn from the following sectors:
- Agriculture – 3 members;
  - Business – 3 members;
  - Community and Voluntary – 4 members;
  - Trade Union – 4 members.
- 5.8 As Concordia is not a constituted body or legal entity, Countryside Services, a subsidiary of the Ulster Farmers Union, undertook the financial management of the Project, along with the employment and line management of the staff.
- 5.9 The secretariat for the Project was based in the offices of Countryside Services on the outskirts of Dungannon.

# **THE TRANSNATIONAL PROGRAMME**

## 6.0 THE TRANSNATIONAL PROGRAMME

6.1 The aim of the Transnational Programme was to explore learning and disseminate best practice across the sector. This aspect formed a major part of the Project in terms of expenditure (accounting for 42% of overall Project costs at the time of the Evaluation), staff time and numbers of participants.

### 6.2 Achievement of Projected Targets

6.2.1 The targets set for the study tours are summarised in the following table and the final column shows the results achieved in terms of participation.

	<b>Original Targets in Letter of Offer</b>	<b>Revised Targets agreed with funder (June 2005)</b>	<b>Achieved</b>
Individual Study Tours	48 Participants	59	75
Group Tours	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 6 tours</li> <li>• 120 participants</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 15 tours</li> <li>• 300 participants</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 24 tours</li> <li>• 278 participants</li> </ul>
Long-term Exchanges	16	19	26
<b>Total Number of Participants</b>	<b>184</b>	<b>378</b>	<b>379</b>

6.2.2 There was some revision of targets during the course of the Project as it was difficult to attract participants to undertake long-term exchanges of six months. Long-term exchanges were redefined as tours of 6 weeks to 6 months duration, as opposed to 6 months duration. Furthermore, the targeted numbers of group tours and individual tours were increased.

6.2.3 It can be seen from the table above that the targets for overall numbers of participants have been achieved in relation to the transnational programme. Participant numbers on the individual tours and long-term exchanges exceeded the projected targets. It was found that it was not always possible to attract twenty participants for each group study tour; therefore, a greater number of group tours than that proposed took place, with smaller numbers in each group.

### 6.3 Marketing and Selection

6.3.1 Opportunities available under the transnational programme were advertised in the press and, in addition, each of the four partners disseminated information on the study tours to their constituent members. Those interested completed application forms, which were assessed by members of the Concordia Board. Applications for individual study tours had to demonstrate the potential of the tour to contribute to any of the following objectives:

- Examination of best practice models and extract learning points relevant to N.I.;
- Opportunity to examine diverse groups working in partnership;
- Identification of opportunities which have potential application within the four sectors;
- Provision of information to assist with policy formulation on behalf of the social partners.

6.3.2 In addition, applications were assessed against the following selection criteria:

- Experience relevant to the study tour;
- Perceived benefits to be gained;
- Potential long term impact;
- Opportunity to address the legacy of conflict;
- Opportunity for dissemination of information through established networks / links or other channels of communication.

#### 6.4 Monitoring

6.4.1 Although all applicants were requested to complete a monitoring form, not everyone did so. Monitoring data for a total of 326 applicants is available. This data are summarised in the following tables. It should be noted that this relates to applicants and not participants.

<b>TABLE 6.2</b>		
<b>Religious Affiliation of Applicants to Study Tours</b>		
	<b>Number</b>	<b>% of Total</b>
Protestant Community	179	54.9
Catholic Community	105	32.2
Other	38	11.6
Not Stated	4	1.2
<b>Total</b>	<b>326</b>	<b>100</b>

<b>TABLE 6.3</b>		
<b>Gender of Applicants to Study Tours</b>		
	<b>Number</b>	<b>% of Total</b>
Male	188	57.7
Female	138	42.3
<b>Total</b>	<b>326</b>	<b>100</b>

6.4.2 Assessment panels were cognisant of ensuring that there was cross-community participation and male and female participants on each of the group study tours. This was achieved almost without exception.

## 6.5 Sectoral Participation

6.5.1 The participation rates from each of the sectors is summarised in the following table.

<b>Participation on Study Tours by Sector</b>										
	<b>Agriculture</b>		<b>Business</b>		<b>Community &amp; Voluntary</b>		<b>Trade Union</b>		<b>Total</b>	
	<b>No.</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>No.</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>No.</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>No.</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>No.</b>	<b>% of total</b>
Individual	19	<b>25</b>	16	<b>21</b>	34	<b>45</b>	6	<b>8</b>	75	<b>20</b>
Group	119	<b>43</b>	46	<b>16</b>	78	<b>28</b>	35	<b>13</b>	278	<b>73</b>
Long Term	22	<b>85</b>	1	<b>4</b>	3	<b>11</b>	0	<b>0</b>	26	<b>7</b>
<b>Total</b>	<b>160</b>	<b>42</b>	<b>63</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>115</b>	<b>30</b>	<b>41</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>379</b>	<b>100</b>

6.5.2 It can be seen that the Agricultural sector had the highest participation rate, representing 42% of the participants. This was followed by the Community and Voluntary sector, representing 30% of participants. The Trade Union and Business sectors had lower participation rates at 11% and 17% respectively. Almost all of the long-term exchanges were from the Agriculture sector, while the Community and Voluntary sector made up almost half of the individual study tour numbers.

6.5.3 Board members reported that it was difficult for trade union members and individuals from the Business sector to take time off work to participate in the tours, explaining the lower participation rates.

## 6.6 Individual Study Tours

6.6.1 A total of 75 individual study tours took place, ranging in duration from 1 day to 31 days, with the average length of stay being 7 days. Over 20 different destinations were visited, including the following (participant numbers are in brackets): USA (17), South Africa (11), UK and RoI (12), China (3), Australia (2), New Zealand (1), with the majority of the remaining participants visiting European destinations.

## 6.7 Group Study Tours

6.7.1 A total of 24 group study tours took place, with Concordia organising 10 of these, involving 141 participants. The remaining 14 group study tours, involving 137 participants, were organised by sectoral groups. Details of the Group Study tours are provided in the following table.

<b>Group Study Tours Organised By Concordia</b>						
<b>Purpose / theme</b>	<b>Destination</b>	<b>Agri</b>	<b>Bus</b>	<b>C&amp;V</b>	<b>TU</b>	<b>Total</b>
Waste Mgt	Sweden	3	2	2	1	8
Renewable Energy	Germany	3	3	3	4	13
Community Planning	Scotland	1	1	10	1	13
EU Institutions	Brussels	3	2	3	3	11
EU Funding	Brussels	3	3	5	3	14
Rural Development	Spain	7	3	7	2	19
Innovation	Australia	5	4	4	4	17
Childcare	Devon	0	3	13	2	18
Reconciliation	USA	4	2	7	3	16
Sustainable Dev't	Germany	4	2	4	2	12
<b>Sub-Total</b>		<b>33</b>	<b>25</b>	<b>58</b>	<b>25</b>	<b>141</b>
<b>Group Study Tours Organised by Sectors</b>						
<b>No. of Tours</b>	<b>Destination</b>	<b>Agri</b>	<b>Bus</b>	<b>C&amp;V</b>	<b>TU</b>	<b>Total</b>
9 Tours	Various	86	-	-	-	86
2 Tours	Various	-	21	-	-	21
2 Tours	Various	-	-	20	-	20
1 Tour	Denmark	-	-	-	10	10
<b>Sub-Total</b>		<b>86</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>137</b>
<b>Overall Total</b>		<b>119</b>	<b>46</b>	<b>78</b>	<b>35</b>	<b>278</b>

**6.7.2** The Community and Voluntary sector had a high representation on the Concordia organised tours and the Agricultural sector availed most of the opportunity to organise their own sectoral tours, visiting Denmark, Italy and Holland. The Business sector visited USA (9) and South Africa (12), while the Community and Voluntary sector tours were to Scotland (10) and Bulgaria (10) and the Trade Union members travelled to Denmark (10).

## **6.8 Long Term Exchanges**

**6.8.1** Of the 26 individuals that undertook a long-term exchange, 22 were from the Agriculture sector, of which all, with the exception of one, were representing a Young Farmer's Club. The remaining four participants were from the Community and Voluntary sector (3) and the Business sector (1). Again there was a wide range of destinations visited, including Australia (4), Canada (4), Switzerland (2) and USA (2).

**6.9 SURVEY OF STUDY TOUR PARTICIPANTS**

6.9.1 A survey of study tour participants (for whom e-mail addresses were available) was undertaken to assess the impact of the tour in relation to the aims and objectives of the Programme. A copy of the survey is enclosed in Appendix 1. A total of 181 surveys were issued and the response rates per sector are summarised in the following table.

<b>Respondents by Sector</b>					
<b>Sector</b>	<b>No. sent</b>	<b>No. Returned</b>	<b>Response Rate</b>	<b>Total No. of Study Tour Participants</b>	<b>% of Total</b>
Agriculture	26	16	62%	160	10
Business	25	11	44%	63	17.5
Com & Vol	59	41	69%	115	35.6
Trade Union	19	5	26%	41	12
Statutory	14	9	64%	0	-
Other	2	2	100%	0	-
Unknown	36	0	0%	0	-
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>181</b>	<b>84</b>	<b>46%</b>	<b>379</b>	<b>19.3%</b>

6.9.2 The survey generated a 46% response rate, which in turn represented over 19% of the total number of participants from the sectors. Overall, this is an ample sample size from which to draw valid conclusions. While the sample is not equally representative of all of the sectors, they are nonetheless adequately represented as follows – Agriculture (10%); Business (17.5%), Community and Voluntary (35.6%); and Trade Union (12%).

6.9.3 There was good representation among the survey respondents from both the Group and Individual Study Tours, with 14 having participated on an Individual Study Tour (that is, 19% of the total Individual Study Tour participants) and 64 of the respondents having participated on Group Study Tours (21% of Group and Long Term Exchange participants). A further 6 respondents had participated on both a Group and Individual Study Tour.

**6.10 Social Partnership**

6.10.1 Of the respondents, 39% reported being a member of a social partnership or a social partner on a board / management committee.

**6.11 Objectives of the Study Tour**

6.11.1 The main objectives of the study tour for participants were to:

- Increase knowledge and gain new ideas;
- Learn about more advanced / best practice;
- Learn about how others addressed certain challenges / issues;

**Evaluation of 'Partnership For Progress' Project**

- Learn about initiatives which have not worked elsewhere;
- Make international linkages;
- To lobby;
- Raise awareness and effect change on return;
- Learn from other sectors involved in the tour;
- Identify opportunities for business development overseas;
- Gain information for business development on return;
- Identify funding opportunities;
- To export learning and good practice from NI;
- To promote NI;
- To benchmark with the same sector internationally.

**6.12 Achievement of Objectives**

**6.12.1** Overall, more than half of the respondents (55%) felt that their expectations were fully met and that their objectives were fully achieved. More than a quarter of the respondents (26%) reported that their expectations were almost met, and the remainder (19%) felt that their objectives were partly achieved.

**6.12.2** There were some sectoral differences, with a higher proportion of the Agricultural sector participants fully achieving their objectives (69%) compared to 53% of the Community and Voluntary sector participants. The sectoral analysis is summarised in the following table.

<b>Achievement of Objectives – By Sector</b>						
<b>(% of Respondents by Sector)</b>						
	<b>Agric</b>	<b>Business</b>	<b>Com &amp; Vol</b>	<b>TU</b>	<b>Other</b>	<b>Total</b>
Fully	69	55	53	60	62	55
Almost	25	36	21	20	15	26
Partly	6	9	26	20	23	19
Little/not at all	0	0	0	0	0	0
No Response	0	0	0	0	0	0
<i>Base No.</i>	<i>15</i>	<i>10</i>	<i>41</i>	<i>5</i>	<i>13</i>	<i>84</i>

**6.12.3** There were little differences between the Individual Study tours and Group Study Tours, with 58% and 52% respectively fully achieving their objectives, as shown in the following table.

TABLE 6.8				
Achievement of Objectives – By Tour (% of respondents by Tour)				
	Individual Tours	Group Tours	Both	Total
Fully	58	52	83	55
Almost	21	28	17	26
Partly	21	20	0	19
Little/not at all	0	0	0	0
No Response	0	0	0	0
Base No.	14	64	6	84

**6.12.4** As reported, more than half of the respondents stated that their expectations for the tour were fully realised. Many of the remaining respondents gave reasons why this was not achieved for them. The reasons included specific individual requirements not being met, logistics, lack of time and need for more group interaction. A sample of these is provided below.

**6.12.5** It was found (which is a practical reality of group events) that it was not always possible for group tours to meet **specific individual / sectoral needs** of each participant, or indeed to provide a **comprehensive coverage** of a topic / theme. This was evidenced from the following comments:

- *Enjoyed the exchange of ideas but discovered virtually nothing about how Freiburg tackles the problem of litter and Local Environmental Quality.*
- *The area of waste management, particularly for the municipal and commercial / industrial sectors was not really covered during the tour. It is used for energy generation in the region, and it would have been useful to see how this is approached given the role of waste management in contributing to sustainable development.*
- *Was 'sold' as a childcare study but a lot of the discussion / visits centred on extended schools.*
- *Expected the tour to be solely about childcare in extended schools but instead a lot of it was irrelevant to our organisation's needs and what we specifically wanted to find out.*
- *Was disappointed that there was no provision made to visit private nurseries, which provide wrap-around care to schools. This would have proved insightful as to the feasibility of it all.*
- *The Voluntary / Community sector should have done much more research to organise and target our meeting more effectively, to mirror the approach by the Agriculture sector.*
- *Would have liked to have had more details of how they get through all the red tape that seems to stifle projects in Northern Ireland.*
- *...The tour was interesting but not particularly relevant to my work.*
- *I was interested in finding out more about direct local / central government interventions – there was not any evidence of any such practice.*
- *Not all presentations were relevant to my sector.*

**6.12.6** Tour **logistics** meant that the expectations of some participants were not met:

- *Visit to university inopportune as academic term was just commencing.*
- *The guide on a couple of days did not have good enough English, and perhaps knowledge, to give us a really good insight into the issues.*
- *..this study tour took place wholly in an urban setting. (That is it did not include rural context).*
- *Itinerary didn't afford an opportunity to liaise with folk relevant to carers' interests.*
- *I was not able to visit all sites as planned because of site problems on mainland and their inability to facilitate external visits.*

**6.12.7** For some, the **timescale** appeared to be an issue:

- *Too much to see and hear in a limited time frame.*
- *Excellent study tour but a bit rushed at times with a very full schedule.*

**6.12.8** However, one participant felt that the tour was too long and could have been achieved in 3 days without the 'time fillers' to pad the tour out to 5 days.

**6.12.9** Other participants reported **barriers to implementation** upon return, which have hindered progress:

- *Limited funding to implement plans upon return.*
- *...But ways now have to be explored to adopt and use these in our particular context.*
- *Without similar investment, however, in such programmes (extended schools) in NI as across the water any impact here will be small scale.*

**6.12.10** Some participants would have enjoyed **more group discussions** to help realise their goals:

- *More opportunity for discussions with other study visit participants would have been useful.*
- *I felt that visits were too many in too short a period of time with no time for discussion between the group on our findings.*
- *Not all members of the group were willing to exchange perceptions of Sustainable Development.*

## **6.13 Benefit of the Study Tour to area of work / sector**

**6.13.1** The majority of respondents (60%) found the study tours to be 'Extremely Beneficial', to their area of work or sector, with more than a quarter (26%) reporting that the tour was 'Quite Beneficial'. Just 14% found it of 'Some Benefit' and no one reported 'Little or No Benefit'. This is summarised in the following table.

## Evaluation of 'Partnership For Progress' Project

<b>TABLE 6.9</b>						
<b>Benefit to Work / Sector – By Sector</b>						
<b>(% of Respondents by Sector)</b>						
	<b>Agric</b>	<b>Business</b>	<b>Com &amp; Vol</b>	<b>TU</b>	<b>Other</b>	<b>Total</b>
Extremely Beneficial	63	64	61	60	62	60
Quite Beneficial	25	27	26	0	23	26
Of Some Benefit	12	9	13	40	15	14
Little or No Benefit	0	0	0	0	0	0
<i>Base No.</i>	<i>15</i>	<i>10</i>	<i>41</i>	<i>5</i>	<i>13</i>	<i>84</i>

**6.13.2** There was little variation between the sectors on this factor, but interestingly a significantly higher proportion (85%) of those who participated on the Individual tours found the tour to be 'Extremely Beneficial' compared to 53% of Group tour participants. This is summarised in the table below.

<b>TABLE 6.10</b>				
<b>Benefit to Work / Sector – By Tour</b>				
<b>(% of Respondents by Tour)</b>				
	<b>Individual Tours</b>	<b>Group Tour</b>	<b>Both</b>	<b>Total</b>
Extremely Beneficial	85	53	83	60
Quite Beneficial	8	28	17	26
Of Some Benefit	8	19	0	14
Little or No Benefit	0	0	0	0
<i>Base No.</i>	<i>14</i>	<i>64</i>	<i>6</i>	<i>84</i>

**6.13.3** The reason for the higher level of reported benefits among the Individual study tour participants may be due to them having identified and tailored the tour to meet their own needs in relation to their work / sector. Whereas by their nature, group tours have to accommodate the needs of a number of participants.

**6.13.4** The **benefits** of the tour reported by respondents included:

- Establishing valuable contacts;
- New learning;
- Able to incorporate new ideas into strategic planning;
- Explored potential business opportunities;
- Able to profile own work / business;
- Opportunity for local women to work at international level and see how global issues can have a local impact.

**6.13.5** A few respondents felt that more benefits could have been gained. Their comments included the following:

- *With previous background knowledge I would have been better informed. I felt the first few visits were lost to me as I didn't know where I was going or what I would see.* [Concordia reported that it held a seminar in advance of

**Evaluation of 'Partnership For Progress' Project**

each tour that it organised, to provide participants with detailed information on the tour, including a full itinerary.]

- *No specific agricultural visit apart from one arranged by ourselves on the way to the airport.*
- *Brilliant opportunity, which could have been, maximised better if we had done more groundwork into our specific area.*
- *We did not know enough people to make the tour more useful.*

**6.14 Dissemination of Learning**

**6.14.1** The purpose of the study tours was not only for individual benefit, but it was intended that participants would disseminate the information gained to others upon return. The extent to which this dissemination process took place is summarised in the following table.

	<b>Agric</b>	<b>Business</b>	<b>Com &amp; Vol</b>	<b>TU</b>	<b>Other</b>	<b>Total</b>
Extensive	31	45	31	40	31	31
Some / Moderate	63	45	63	60	38	60
Little / No	6	9	3	0	31	8
No Response	0	0	3	0	0	1
<i>Base No.</i>	15	10	41	5	13	84

**6.14.2** It can be seen that almost all of the participants have been involved in disseminating the learning gained from the tour, with 31% having undertaken 'Extensive' dissemination and 60% involved in 'Some / Moderate' dissemination. Just 8% have undertaken 'Little / No' dissemination.

**6.14.3** There is a difference in the level of dissemination of learning upon return, with double the proportion of participants on Individual tours reporting 'Extensive' dissemination compared to those on Group tours. This can be seen from the following table.

	<b>Individual Tours</b>	<b>Group Tour</b>	<b>Both</b>	<b>Total</b>
Extensive	50	25	50	31
Some / Moderate	43	66	33	60
Little / No	0	9	17	8
No Response	7	0	0	1
<i>Base No.</i>	14	64	6	84

**Evaluation of 'Partnership For Progress' Project**

**6.14.4** The main means of dissemination reported were as follows:

- Written reports;
- Presentations;
- Features in press and broadcast media;
- Briefing meetings;
- Articles in newsletters, trade journals and magazines;
- Input to conferences and inclusion in conference papers;
- Development of position papers;
- Inclusion in training programmes and educational courses;
- Reports posted on websites;
- Experiences quoted in research publications; and
- Ongoing dissemination during the course of the participants' work.

**6.14.5** The full spectrum of targeted audiences has been recipients of the information. This includes policy makers (government departments and politicians), to consumers (end beneficiaries). Management boards, staff, clients, customers, colleagues, interest groups and committees were all also recipients of the information on the study tours. UTV provided a camera to one participant and coverage of the study tour is due to be broadcast shortly.

**6.14.6** Thirty-six respondents who had not disseminated the learning as extensively as they might have liked, gave reasons for not disseminating information upon return. 'No opportunity to'; 'Not in a position to'; and 'Lack of resources' were the main reasons reported. The data are summarised in the following table.

<b>TABLE 6.13</b>						
<b>Reasons for Lack of Dissemination By Sector</b>						
<b>(No. of Respondents)</b>						
	<b>Agric</b>	<b>Business</b>	<b>Com &amp; Vol</b>	<b>TU</b>	<b>Other</b>	<b>Total</b>
No opportunity to	0	2	0	1	3	6
Not in a position to	0	1	2	0	1	4
Lack of resources	1	0	4	0	0	5
Nothing to disseminate	1	0	0	1	1	3
Other Reasons	0	2	5	1	1	9
No Response	1	0	7	1	0	9
<i>Base No.</i>	<i>3</i>	<i>5</i>	<i>18</i>	<i>4</i>	<i>6</i>	<i>36</i>

**6.14.6** Other reasons were given for lack of dissemination of information. These included the following:

- Some respondents had only recently returned from a study tour and they have not yet had time to disseminate information.
- Two respondents have subsequently changed their jobs and they are no longer in a position to disseminate the information.
- Lack of time due to current workloads (x3).
- Awaiting opportunities in the future to present findings from the tour (x4).

**6.15 Action taken to effect change**

**6.15.1** In addition to disseminating information, participants were asked if they had taken any action to effect change as a result of the tour. The responses are summarised in the following table.

<b>Taken Action to Effect Change -By Sector</b>						
<b>(% of Respondents)</b>						
	<b>Agric</b>	<b>Business</b>	<b>Com &amp; Vol</b>	<b>TU</b>	<b>Other</b>	<b>Total</b>
Yes	88	91	66	100	77	76
No	12	9	24	0	8	17
N/A No learning to apply	0	0	8	0	15	6
No response	0	0	2	0	0	1
<i>Base No.</i>	<i>15</i>	<i>10</i>	<i>41</i>	<i>5</i>	<i>13</i>	<i>84</i>

**6.15.2** It can be seen that more than three quarters of participants have already taken specific action/s to bring about change as a result of learning from the study tour.

**6.15.3** The type of actions varied among the participants. Their responses are summarised below.

**Ongoing Discussions and Informing:** The most frequently reported actions (by 23 respondents) included ongoing discussions, networking and informing about learning gained on the study tour, with a view to effecting change in the future.

**Influencing Future Plans:** A total of 17 respondents reported that learning and information gained on the study tour has influenced their input into consultations, action plans and the development of strategic plans. Sixteen participants reported that they have lobbied government and policy-makers for change as a result of information gained from the study tour.

**New Practices:** Thirteen respondents reported having changed current practices and / or implemented new systems based upon observations and learning from the study tour. A further 13 respondents have made proposals for change and are promoting new ideas, in an effort to effect change.

**Further Research:** Thirteen respondents have undertaken further research relating to the study tour, with 5 reporting that they have undertaken follow-up visits to the tour or have planned further tours (for themselves and others) to gain more information.

**Business expansion:** One participant reported having started a new business as a result of learning gained from the tour and 2 further participants reported business expansion due to opportunities and contacts gained from the tour. At least three other participants are investigating new business opportunities.

**6.15.4** Other participants who have not taken any action subsequent to the tour gave the following reasons:

**Lack of time:** Three participants reported not having the time to take action, especially after taking time off work to participate in the tour and having to catch up on the backlog.

**Not in a position:** Two participants reported that it was not within their area of responsibility to implement change and that any real change would have to be instigated by Government / policy makers.

**Learning not transferable:** Two participants reported that as the structures and systems in the other country are very different from here it would not be possible to replicate the models examined, here.

**No practical learning to apply:** Two participants reported that practices here are superior to that visited, therefore there was no new / better learning to apply. A third participant stated that the information gained was more academic than practical, so it was used to inform rather than to change.

**Resources already committed:** One participant reported that to effect change, government resources would be required, but these are already committed for the foreseeable future, therefore, there is little opportunity to effect change at the present.

**6.15.5** In terms of taking action, participants on Individual tours appear to be more responsive, with 86% reporting having taken action, compared to 74% of participants on Group tours.

## **6.16 International Contacts**

**6.16.1** Participants were asked about what contact they have maintained with representatives of organisations and individuals from abroad that they met on the study tour. It was found that more than three-quarters of respondents are in contact with key personnel from overseas, with more than a quarter of these in regular / frequent contact. Almost one fifth have not had any contact subsequent to the tour. However, it should be noted that these figures are probably slightly inflated, as the comments from many of the respondents demonstrated that they were referring to contact with other tour participants rather than individuals that they met abroad.

## Evaluation of 'Partnership For Progress' Project

6.16.2 The responses are summarised in the following table.

<b>TABLE 6.15</b>						
<b>Contact with Individuals from Abroad By Sector</b>						
<b>(% of Respondents)</b>						
	<b>Agric</b>	<b>Business</b>	<b>Com &amp; Vol</b>	<b>TU</b>	<b>Other</b>	<b>Total</b>
Frequent / Regular	31	36	31	20	15	26
Occasional	38	45	53	60	54	51
No contact	31	0	13	20	15	19
No response	0	0	3	0	15	4
<i>Base No.</i>	<i>15</i>	<i>10</i>	<i>41</i>	<i>5</i>	<i>13</i>	<i>84</i>

6.16.3 An analysis by type of tour highlights that participants on the individual tours have maintained more 'Frequent / regular' contact than participants on group study tours. This can be seen from the table below.

<b>TABLE 6.16</b>				
<b>Contact with Individuals from Abroad – By Tour</b>				
<b>(% of Respondents by Tour)</b>				
	<b>Individual Tours</b>	<b>Group Tour</b>	<b>Both</b>	<b>Total</b>
Frequent / Regular	57	22	17	26
Occasional	22	53	83	52
No contact	14	25	0	21
No response	7	0	0	1
<i>Base No.</i>	<i>14</i>	<i>64</i>	<i>6</i>	<i>84</i>

6.16.4 A least six of the respondents, who are in regular contact with representatives from abroad, are in the process of developing joint projects / plans. For example:

- One participant has started a business with the support of a company visited;
- Another participant is developing joint projects with two of the US companies met abroad;
- Another participant is establishing a Memorandum of Understanding between his organisation here and its counterpart in Australia;
- Contact has been maintained with the New South Wales Farmers Association and there are plans to commence video conferencing to share ideas and discuss policy issues;
- Arrangements have been made by another participant to meet with a representative from Hong Kong with a view to further developing an idea;
- One business owner is developing new products based upon produce from the region visited, so is maintaining ongoing contact with suppliers.

6.16.5 A number of other participants are in contact with representatives from abroad, primarily for the purpose of exchanging information, although plans may develop in the future.

6.16.6 Other participants who have not maintained contact explained why continued communication was not appropriate / applicable for them. Their comments included the following:

- *It was more of a learning tour as opposed to a networking opportunity;*
- *It is up to my organisation to decide whether it wishes to spend the resources on further in-depth study of the overseas model;*
- *I was not able to make contact with people working directly on the same issues;*
- *I have no need to maintain contact;*
- *I am on longer in the job.*

### 6.17 Contact with Tour Participants

6.17.1 Of the Group Tour participants, more than a quarter (26%) have been in 'Frequent / regular' contact with other participants, while 60% have been in 'Occasional' contact. 13% reported 'No' contact at all with other participants. The Business sector had the highest proportion in 'Frequent' contact at 46%.

6.17.2 The purpose of the contact between participants varies.

**Joint working:** A number of the participants explained that they are liaising with other participants for the purpose of developing specific projects, investigating potential business opportunities and accessing a wider range of expertise to pursue their business goals.

**Networks:** Arising from the tour, some of the participants have joined existing networks, or have developed new networks. For example, participants on the study tour to Australia have set up an Innovation Australia committee, which meets approximately every two months. In addition to its report on the tour, it has developed an Action Plan to further disseminate the learning with a view to influencing government policy.

**Ad hoc contact:** Many of the participants reported that they meet up with other participants on an ad hoc basis; for example, at seminars, conferences and other meetings, through the course of their work.

**Writing of Report:** The obligation to produce a joint report of the study tour was the main purpose for contact with other participants subsequent to the tour, for many of the respondents.

**Future contact:** A few of the respondents reported that while they have not made much contact with other participants to date, they intend to in the future.

Evaluation of 'Partnership For Progress' Project

**6.17.3** Some **barriers** to establishing and maintaining contact with other participants were identified. They include the following:

- The **geographical dispersal** of participants makes it difficult to develop meaningful and purposeful working relations.
- **Lack of opportunity** during the tour **to explore fully the roles** of other participants and **learn about their respective sectors**; therefore, without this knowledge, it is difficult to see potential opportunities for working together.

**6.17.4** A couple of suggestions were made that would enable cross-sectoral working among participants, whilst progressing specific thematic aims and objectives:

- The organisation of **follow-up meetings** among study tour participants to identify what learning from the tour could be progressed and how this might be done.
- Providing **contact details** of each of the participants on the study tour, was suggested, so that participants could keep in touch. [Concordia reported that participant contact details were issued to each participant prior to each tour that it organised.]

## **6.18 Understanding of Social Partnerships**

**6.18.1** An aim of the overall Partnership for Progress project was to increase the understanding of social partnerships and their value to society. Therefore, participants were asked about their understanding of Social Partnerships as a result of their involvement in the tour. The responses are summarised in the following table.

<b>Contribution to Understanding of Social Partnerships - By Sector</b>						
<b>(% of Respondents)</b>						
<b>Contribution</b>	<b>Agric</b>	<b>Business</b>	<b>Com &amp; Vol</b>	<b>TU</b>	<b>Other</b>	<b>Total</b>
Very little	0	9	11	0	0	6
Better understanding	50	18	37	20	54	38
Much better understanding	25	46	34	40	38	29
N/A already had good understanding	25	27	18	40	5	26
No Response	0	0	0	0	8	1
<i>Base No.</i>	<i>15</i>	<i>10</i>	<i>41</i>	<i>5</i>	<i>13</i>	<i>84</i>

**6.18.2** Excepting those who already had a good understanding of Social Partnerships (26% of the respondents), 91% of the remaining respondents gained a 'Better' (52%) or 'Much Better' (39%) understanding of Social Partnerships, with the exception of just 5 individuals who felt that they had gained 'Very Little' understanding. Therefore, the study tours were effective in informing and educating participants on the value of Social Partnerships. There were no major differences between sectors or type of tour in relation to this factor.

## 6.19 Contribution to Cross-Sectoral Working

The impact of the Study Tour on cross-sectoral working was assessed. Overall, almost one third felt that the Study Tour had contributed 'Significantly' to cross-sectoral working, with more than a quarter reporting 'Some examples of new / improved cross-sectoral working'. However, more than a quarter of respondents also reported 'Limited' or 'No impact' in this area.

- 6.19.1** A sectoral analysis shows that participants from the Community and Voluntary and Trade Union sectors reported less of an impact in this area than the other sectors. This can be seen from the following table.

<b>Contribution</b>	<b>Agric</b>	<b>Business</b>	<b>Com &amp; Vol</b>	<b>TU</b>	<b>Other</b>	<b>Total</b>
Significant	50	46	16	20	38	30
Some examples	25	36	31	20	23	29
Limited	19	9	24	0	23	20
No impact	6	9	3	20	8	6
N/A	0	0	18	40	8	12
N/R	0	0	8	0	0	3
<i>Base No.</i>	<i>15</i>	<i>10</i>	<i>41</i>	<i>5</i>	<i>13</i>	<i>84</i>

- 6.19.2** Interestingly, participants on the Individual Tours were as positive about the impact on cross-sectoral working as Group Tour participants, with 54% of Individual Tour participants and 58% Group participants reporting 'Significant' and 'Some examples' of cross-sectoral working as a result of the tour.
- 6.19.3** The type of cross-sectoral working ranged from having a better understanding of the other sectors, to joint working initiatives. These are described in more detail below.
- 6.19.4 Better understanding of other sectors:** The most frequently reported outcome, in response to impact on cross-sectoral working, was how the study tour contributed to a better understanding of the other sectors. The following comments help to illustrate this:

- *I got an insight into the TU and voluntary sectors, which was new to me.*
- *The people on the tour raised issues from within their sectors that I was not aware of and which I now understand to be there. I have been in contact with some people from the group to discuss issues further.*
- *As participants were from a variety of sectors, we did learn about each other so it has contributed, as we have a better understanding of each other.*
- *As someone working in the agricultural field and in a broader business context the intermixing was valuable. The TU and Voluntary input was very useful giving a different perspective on issues from their position.*

**Evaluation of 'Partnership For Progress' Project**

---

- *Improved understanding of the challenges across all sectors, appreciate the needs of other sectors.*

**6.19.5 Relationship Building:** From the comments, it is evident that the study tour, for some, resulted in the development of trusting relationships between participants from different sectors:

- *Pre misconceptions of certain groups have changed. I have made valuable links with fantastic people that will try their best to help me and vice versa.*
- *More open to exploring working relationships with educational bodies and other organisations (from business sector respondent)*
- *The diversity of the group was great. Putting such a group together for 2+ weeks working and travelling together is a great experience. Everybody got on well and became good friends; we had no animosity or issues. Some very strong friendships were forged or appeared to be forged and in most cases these were across sectors.*
- *The tour provided ample opportunities for business, trade union, community and voluntary sector workers to share experiences and to see things from other perspectives. From a voluntary sector perspective it was very useful too in finding out how varied the work in NI is and meeting so many motivated people who are working towards improving life in NI. I would feel confident about contacting any of those involved if I had any queries relating to their area of expertise in the future.*
- *This was one of the most valuable aspects of the tour. The time together discussing relevant but non-threatening topics created a positive learning environment and fostered mutual respect. Each sector learned about the others and how their business priorities differed. Personally, I could see many ways in which I would like to work with my colleagues from the other sectors whereby we could achieve real synergies in serving our own and each others' constituencies, or business objectives.*

**6.19.6 Identification of Common Interests:** In addition to getting a better understanding of the other sectors, and developing relations across the sectors, participants discovered areas of common interest between the sectors that were not apparent to all previously and on which joint working would be mutually beneficial.

- *There was a good mix of people from all of the sectors and during discussions I began to appreciate their points of view, which were different from mine, but we had one common theme and that was the need for society to have a smaller impact on the environment as far as waste is concerned.*
- *We worked with people from different sectors on similar work e.g. migrant workers, which relates to agriculture, business, T.U. and voluntary sectors.*
- *Each sector has problems and by working together we can try and solve some of them, which affect all of us.*
- *Real friendships were established and in many cases common interests identified that were not immediately apparent.*

**6.19.8 Joint working:** A few respondent gave examples of how they have now initiated new / improved cross-sectoral working, subsequent to the tour.

- *We now operate with sponsorship from local businesses and council and have recruited a strong volunteer base. We have strengthened links with statutory agencies ... The study tour showed ways of using all available means through a variety of sectors to achieve sustainability.*
- *As a result of the tour, linkages have already been established between the business, agricultural and education sector, the results of which should in the short to medium term prove to be mutually beneficial, and also contribute to the implementation of sustainable initiatives here in Northern Ireland.*
- *A new network has been established across the sectors.*
- *Followed up with Farmers Union to consider opportunities around charitable giving.*
- *In this instance, I feel cross sectoral work is important and as such have advocated this to head teachers. This would not traditionally have occurred between schools and others previously.*
- *Brought sectors and individuals from different backgrounds together – has encouraged sectors to work together - have developed joined up approach to problems solving and way forward. Now have contacts within various sectors.*
- *Contributed to academic and NGOS working together.*

**6.19.8 Outward looking:** One participant felt that getting out of Northern Ireland was useful in getting participants to become more outward looking in their perspective:

- *The study tour provided a really useful opportunity for a wide range of sectors (organisations and individuals) to get together to learn and think outside the 'NI Box'*

**6.19.10** For the remaining respondents, the study tour did not contribute to new or improved cross-sectoral work for a number of reasons. These are listed below.

- Some participants were already involved in cross-sectoral work;
- The sectoral tours (involving only one sector) did not provide opportunities to meet other sectors;
- The learning from the tour is not readily applicable in the Northern Ireland context; therefore, few opportunities for cross sectoral working have arisen;
- On some tours, participants remained in their sectoral groups, which was not conducive to the establishment of cross-sectoral relations, nor joint working for the future.
- Getting engrossed in own job roles and lack of time were also given as reasons for not initiating cross-sectoral developments.

## **6.20 Co-ordination of the Tours**

**6.20.1** The vast majority of participants (87%) rated the help provided by Concordia in relation to the study tour as being either 'Excellent' or 'Good', demonstrating a high level of satisfaction with the preparatory work and co-ordination. In particular, the pre-tour meetings, information, administration, claims and monitoring process were all, in the main, praised. Aspects which attracted less satisfied responses related to components of the tour itself, for example, the itinerary; overload / underload in the programme at times; travel arrangements; duration of the tour (too long / too short); need for more specific information during the tour; and the need for facilitated sessions during the tour. The majority of the criticisms reflect a desire on the part of the participants to see and learn as much as possible, that is of most value to them, in the limited time available. It has been mentioned earlier in this report that accommodating the needs of all individuals in a group is a difficult task and there inevitably will be those less satisfied than others with the outcomes. A few respondents reported delays in the reimbursement of expenses.

## **6.21 Suggestions**

**6.21.1** A few of the respondents gave unsolicited suggestions that might enhance the impact of the study tours. These included the following, with the number of participants who raised the point given in brackets:

- A structured follow-up programme for the groups would help to maximise the benefits (3);
- More work could be done at a local level on developing cross-sectoral linkages (2);
- An opportunity for follow up visits to see other specific examples / re-visit particular areas of interest; establish more contacts / cement relations; and to collect more information (2).

## **6.22 Peace and Reconciliation**

**6.22.1** Feedback in relation to peace and reconciliation is provided in Section 9.0 of this report.

## **RESEARCH AND POLICY WORK**

## 7.0 RESEARCH AND POLICY WORK

7.1 An aim of the Partnership for Progress Project was to advance a common agenda through policy development and research and to advise Government and Concordia members on the development of social partnerships.

### 7.2 Achievement of Projected Targets

7.2.1 The projected targets in relation to this aim are set out in the following table, along with attainment of the targets during the Project term.

<b>TABLE 7.1</b>		
<b>Achievement of Research and Policy Development Targets</b>		
<b>Targets (over 3.5 years)</b>	<b>Actual Achieved</b>	<b>Comment</b>
28 seminars	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 14 Briefing Seminars (Prior to Study Tours)</li> <li>• Other Seminars:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ County Development Boards 1</li> <li>○ County Development Boards 2</li> <li>○ Value of Partnerships</li> <li>○ Community Planning 1</li> <li>○ Community Planning 2</li> <li>○ NIWEP Seminar</li> <li>○ RPA Seminar</li> <li>○ Migrant Workers</li> <li>○ Agri-Food</li> <li>○ Strategic Framework 1</li> <li>○ Strategic Framework 2</li> <li>○ Shared Future 1</li> <li>○ Sustainable Development</li> <li>○ Shared Future 2</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	28 seminars – Target Achieved
7 – 10 joint policy papers	<p><b>Briefing Papers</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Review of Public Admin.</li> <li>• EU Enlargement</li> </ul> <p><b>Policy / Joint Papers</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Documenting SP Experiences of Peace II</li> <li>• The Path to Partnership (Research document and Briefing Paper)</li> <li>• RPA (Joint Position Paper)</li> <li>• Migrant Workers (Joint Response to Consultation &amp; Joint Position Paper)</li> <li>• Peace III (Position Paper)</li> <li>• Sustainable Dev't (Response to SD strategy)</li> <li>• Childcare (Policy Document)</li> <li>• Shared Future (Response to Triennial Action Plan)</li> </ul>	Target Achieved

### 7.3 Feedback from Stakeholders

7.3.1 In order to assess the effectiveness of the process, the quality of outputs and the impact of the programme of seminars, research and policy development; an e-mail survey was conducted of seminar attendees along with a consultation process with Concordia Board members and key stakeholders.

### 7.4 E-mail Survey of Attendees

7.4.1 An e-mail survey was distributed to participants who attended seminars which led to the production of joint policy / response papers (in order to gain feedback on both seminars and policy development). Therefore attendees at the following four seminars were surveyed Migrant Workers, Sustainable Development, Childcare and Shared Future. Board members of Concordia were not included in the survey. The following table summarises the number of surveys distributed and the number of completed surveys returned.

<b>Response rate to Survey Re: Seminars / Policy Development</b>		
<b>Seminar / Policy Area</b>	<b>No. Distributed</b>	<b>No. of Responses Returned</b>
Sustainable Development	11	4
Migrant Workers	10	2
Shared Future	8	2
Childcare	9	2
<b>Total</b>	<b>38</b>	<b>10 (26%)</b>

7.4.2 This is a reasonably high response rate considering that the attendees had minimal involvement, which in the majority of cases was attendance at just one meeting.

### 7.5 Consultations

7.5.1 Consultations were undertaken with Concordia Board members, Project Manager and a Consultant who was commissioned to undertake research, facilitate seminars and write up a number of policy documents. In addition, Concordia suggested senior personnel from the Office of First Minister and Deputy First Minister (OFMDFM), Special European Union Programmes Body (SEUPB), Department of Finance and Personnel (DFP) and the Department of Health, Social Services and Public Safety (DHSSPS), who could comment upon the impact of the work of the Concordia Project. Feedback was received from just two of these representatives.

### 7.6 Need for Policy / Response Documents

7.6.1 There was a consensus of opinion that there was a need to undertake work in various policy areas. The work was seen to be timely in responding to government policies and in filling gaps in the policy arena. Concordia being the main driver was seen as an additional bonus, as it was representing a wide constituency and it was not pursuing a singular agenda.

**7.6.2** In terms of approach to this component of the Project, it was recognised that a more structured and strategic method could have been adopted to identify and prioritise policy areas for more detailed research and development, rather than the ad hoc method employed.

**7.7 Process Employed in Producing the Policy Papers**

**7.7.1** Overall, the majority of opinion demonstrated that the process of producing the policy papers was seen to have been appropriate and effective. Consultees made the following positive points in relation to the process employed:

- Tasking an external consultant with this appeal worked well;
- It provided sufficient opportunity to provide input;
- It brought a variety of individuals together with diverse perspectives which was good;
- The fact that representation and input went beyond just the four social partner organisations, to include actual practitioners, was a particular strength;
- The process was considered inclusive, by the majority of those consulted;
- Although there were differences of opinion and the debate at times was frustrating, it is positive that meaningful exchange is taking place concerning issues that are often ignored or not discussed, especially in the Northern Ireland context.
- A comprehensive review of already published material was undertaken.

**7.7.2** Just a few shortcomings, which were in the minority, were noted as follows:

- More sessions would have been useful to allow more detailed debate and discussion (Sustainable Development).
- More time would have been needed to produce a more thorough document (Sustainable Development).
- Smaller group work may have enabled specialist expertise to be drawn upon (Sustainable Development).
- Although an attempt was made to include a number of organisations, there were some gaps, e.g. representatives from the statutory sector (e.g. Childcare Partnerships) were not included, which could impact upon eventual buy-in (Childcare).

**7.8 The Final Policy Papers Produced**

**7.8.1** There was widespread satisfaction with the final outcomes in relation to the production of the policies and policy response documents. The following points reflect the comments from the consultees.

### **Evaluation of 'Partnership For Progress' Project**

---

- The final paper is very good / good, considering that it is a compromise position between different sectors, which often hold different views.
- The balance of views and perspectives from the different sectors was well achieved.
- The document has a particular strength in that it has the support of four major sectors, and not just one sector / organisation.
- The very fact that Concordia has produced the document is lending kudos to this policy area. It focuses the spotlight on the current problems and gaps.
- Another major strength is the fact that the production of one report (in relation to the respective policy areas) gives a common denominator position that highlights how these are issues that affect all four sectors and indeed all of society.

**7.8.2** However, achieving a satisfactory end out put was not always easy.

- One consultee expressed concern that the Childcare strategy focused primarily upon the early years and did not cater as well for older age groups (e.g. 4 – 12 years old) and that one identified agency was recommended for funding, which has the potential to disadvantage other agencies working in the sector.
- It was reported that Concordia's response to the government's consultation on The Review of Public Administration is a collation of four viewpoints. The process lacked productive dialogue and consequently the resulting document does not represent an integrated Concordia stance.
- It proved very challenging to produce a joint response to A Shared Future Triennial Action Plan 2006-2009, due to different viewpoints. In the end a two-page document was agreed.

### **7.9 Impact of the Policy Work**

**7.9.1** Given that the policy documents have just been produced in the latter part of the Project, it is quite early to assess impact. The main view among those consulted, was that impact will be determined by how the documents are used to lobby government and other decision-makers. The following points summarise the main comments:

- The reports will be extremely valuable in informing and lobbying government departments, local MLAs and their political parties and direct rule ministers.
- Impact will depend upon a number of factors such as:
  - Who has 'bought-in' to the process of producing the paper and final document produced;
  - The distribution of copies of the papers / policies;
  - Resources available to lobby for change;
  - Resources available to action the proposals; and
  - The extent to which Concordia and other bodies push the agenda.

**Evaluation of 'Partnership For Progress' Project**

---

- Each of the policy documents produced is only one strand of a broad band of interventions in each of the policy areas and as such it's impact will be part of an accumulated effect with the other initiatives. The policy documents will play their part in this.
- Concordia has generated a lot of publicity around the policy documents, which is very positive.

**7.10 Other Comments**

**7.10.1** This component of the Partnership for Progress Project was seen to be valuable with the following points being made:

- There was a high level of appreciation that Concordia had recognised the importance of the various policy areas and that it had lent its support to addressing the pertinent issues.
- The process was seen to be an important aspect in the development of the policy papers, as it allowed individuals to express their views and hear opposing arguments, leading to greater openness and a level of agreement on common issues.
- The opportunity to examine best practice in other countries and input that learning to research and policy documents for Northern Ireland was welcomed.
- Consultees reported that they would like to see this role continued, with Concordia exploring other policy areas.
- Finally, there was a request for the policy groups / key stakeholders to be kept up to date and informed on progress in relation to the policy documents.

**7.11 Limitations**

**7.11.1** While much was achieved in the area of research and policy work, it was reported that the uncertainty of the political situation in Northern Ireland limited the full potential impact of the work. Because of direct rule, engagement was primarily with civil servants rather than a devolved government, rendering the process to be somewhat mechanistic, and lacking in meaningful dialogue with government. Effectively, the work was undertaken in a vacuum, without the key local players to drive the agendas forward.

**SUPPORT TO SOCIAL PARTNER  
REPRESENTATIVES**

## **8.0 SUPPORT TO SOCIAL PARTNER REPRESENTATIVES**

**8.1** The third aim of the 'Partnership for Progress' Project was to support social partnership representatives on bodies associated with structural funds, primarily Local Strategy Partnerships (LSPs), to improve effectiveness of partnership working. It was intended that training would be offered to all social partner representatives on the LSPs, in areas such as committee skills, negotiation skills and alliance building, although a more definite training plan was to have been developed following the completion of a training needs analysis.

### **8.2 Time lapse**

**8.2.1** There is a strong view among Board members of Concordia that the need for training identified when the Project was planned, became less of a priority by the time the Project was being implemented, when the LSPs were already up and running. Consequently, the offer of training support at this stage was seen as 'too little, too late'. The application for funding was submitted in April 2002, and the Project underwent an economic appraisal with the final costing and outputs being determined in February 2003, and staff were not in post until July 2003, more than a year later.

### **8.3 Training Needs Analysis**

**8.3.1** The training needs analysis of social partner representatives on LSPs, commissioned by Concordia, was completed in November 2003. The report states that this was a difficult task. Getting an accurate up to date database of LSP members was problematic, making it difficult to administer the survey. LSP members were under pressure of 'N+2' at the time and were unable to give sufficient time to the exercise. Response rates to the survey were variable and did not permit generalisations to be made from one area to another. There appears to be a high level of turnover among sector representatives, therefore, some representatives may have received training whilst others from the same LSP may not, making it difficult to develop a clear picture of the main training needs.

**8.3.2** Not only was the Training Needs Analysis a complex task, but the report highlighted that addressing the training needs, which were identified, is fraught with difficulties as follows:

- The timing of the proposed training by Concordia was seen by many as being too late and irrelevant at this stage;
- Many members would not have the time to attend training, given their own work commitments and time devoted to their LSP, for which they do not receive remuneration or expenses;
- Training for social partner representatives only, suggests that these representatives are weaker than other LSP members;
- Separate training for social partner representatives would be divisive;

**Evaluation of 'Partnership For Progress' Project**

---

- The LSPs had the majority of their funding allocated by this stage and their future role was uncertain; therefore, training was not seen as a priority issue at the time.

**8.3.3** As a result of the report, Concordia decided that training was not the best way to support the social partner representatives on the LSPs at this stage. Attending the seminars and study tours being provided by Concordia could support the social partner representatives, along with the development of joint policy / briefing papers.

**8.4 Impact and Experience of Social Partners re: the Peace II Programme**

**8.4.1** Despite the difficulties in supporting the social partners as planned, research commissioned by Concordia (*NI Social Partner Research Project, Deloitte MCS Ltd, October 2005*) as part of the 'Partnership for Progress' Project, examined the impact and experience of the Social Partners in relation to the Peace II Programme. The report states that the positive impact of social partners has been:

- Participation and commitment, often in a voluntary capacity, not just on the main body but also in working groups and sub-committees.
- The provision of realism. In particular, their understanding of their sector or local area provides the body with an insight as to what is achievable and what is not.
- The provision of a challenge function, asking questions ensuring there is clarity and justification at an early stage in the decision making process.
- Additional transparency and credibility of the process and the programme, facilitating access to, and buy-in from difficult to reach groups.

**8.4.2** In terms of further developing relationships and partnership working, the research found evidence that the social partners had contributed to improved relations with central government, local government, statutory agencies elected representatives and between social partners themselves, although there were exceptions, where relations can be strained. Overall the need to invest in relationship building was highlighted, especially to counter the problems of large membership at meetings, relative infrequency of meetings of some bodies (Monitoring Committee and Regional Partnership Board) and member turnover (e.g. LSPs).

**8.4.3** The report concludes that:

- Northern Ireland has suffered from a polarised society and a number of decades of inter-community and intra-community violence. The inclusion of social partners within the implementing structures of the Peace II Programme has helped to bring economic and social focus to processes, which in turn has allowed fuller engagement from political representatives from opposing sides of the political spectrum.
- The 'democratic deficit' in Northern Ireland created space and need for participative democracy provided through partnership bodies such as LSPs, Monitoring Committees, Regional Partnership Board, etc.

**Evaluation of 'Partnership For Progress' Project**

---

- The inclusion of social partners in the processes can provide access and relationships with target communities and sectors that government departments and agencies struggle to engage with, including those communities that have suffered significantly from the conflict.

**8.4.4** It recommends the following:

- Currently, the majority of social partner engagement is linked into EU programmes, the future of which are uncertain. Therefore the value of social partners in a wider arena needs to be articulated. For example, social partners can contribute to community planning and community relations in a post-RPA local government environment.
- There is a desire to normalise local politics and to involve local representatives more fully in decision-making. Therefore, Concordia and its social partners need to be prepared to articulate how participative democracy complements representative democracy offered through fully elected bodies.

**8.4.5** Effectively, therefore, although Concordia did not offer the training to social partners on LSPs as planned, it undertook research to demonstrate the impact of the social partners and identify lessons of social partner engagement that can be disseminated more widely.

**HORIZONTAL PRINCIPLES & PEACE**  
**DISTINCTIVENESS**

## **9.0 HORIZONTAL PRINCIPLES & PEACE DISTINCTIVENESS**

9.1 The extent to which the Project has met each of the Horizontal Principles of the Peace II Programme and the Peace II Distinctiveness criteria was examined.

### **9.2 HORIZONTAL PRINCIPLES**

9.2.1 Of the ten Horizontal Principles embedded in the Peace II Programme, five are applicable to the implementation of Projects. The congruency and contribution of the Project to each of these five Principles is examined in the following paragraphs.

### **9.3 Economic and Social Sustainability**

9.3.1 The Operational Programme for Peace II states that all projects should have an appropriate exit strategy whereby they will either have completed the task for which they were funded, have become self-sustaining or have identified alternative sources of funding. In relation to the 'Partnership for Progress' Project, it was a time bound Project, and the tasks for which it was funded have been completed. It was the opinion of all of those consulted that Concordia plays an important role in promoting, developing and supporting social partnerships, which should continue. To this end, Concordia has applied for funding from DFP, for secretariat assistance to help it continue this role.

9.3.2 On a wider scale, it is felt that the Project has played a role in creating opportunities for more dialogue in Northern Ireland between the different sectors. A better understanding of different perspectives has resulted and the way forward on some issues of common concern has been agreed. It is felt that this approach, although difficult to measure quantitatively, will contribute to a more stable society, with an enhanced economic outlook.

9.3.3 The learning gained by the numerous participants during the course of the Project will be acted upon in their work role and other civic roles (especially as many are leaders / drivers in their sector / communities), thereby contributing to increased capacity and social sustainability.

### **9.4 New Targeting Social Need**

9.4.1 Although the Project did not have a strategy for targeting geographic areas of greatest social need, alleviating poverty and social disadvantage is a key aim of two of the main partners (the Trade Union and the Community and Voluntary sectors) of the Project and engagement of their members helped to provide access to and hopefully benefits, to the ultimate target areas.

9.4.2 Furthermore, there is evidence that knowledge and contacts obtained by the industry and agriculture sectors, have benefited enterprises, which it is hoped will create greater employment opportunities in these sectors.

**9.5 Environmental Sustainability**

**9.5.1** The Project contributed to the body of knowledge in Northern Ireland on environmental sustainability, through seminars and study visits abroad. Not only is there now an increased awareness of environmental issues, but a number of the participants are currently pursuing environmental projects as a result.

**9.5.2** Furthermore, the fact that the four sectors, with very different perspectives, were able to agree a response to the Sustainable Development Strategy was a major achievement. The common ground identified, is a sound basis on which to move forward, with government.

**9.6 Balanced Intervention**

**9.6.1** Applicants for the study tours were monitored but the breakdown of actual participants is not known. The data shows that 56% of the applications were from the Protestant community and 33% were from the Catholic community. 58% of the applications were from males and 42% from females. Four per cent of the applicants had a disability and 2% were from other ethnic groups.

**9.6.2** Although the data was not reviewed during the course of the Project to ensure balanced intervention, each of the group tours had, almost without exception, cross community make up and male and female participants.

**9.7 Rural Development**

**9.7.1** Given the involvement of the agricultural sector, the Project clearly contributed to this principle. There were more participants on the study tours from the agriculture sector than from any of the other sectors, representing 42% of the total and 82% of the long-term exchanges. The resultant learning of these visits is likely to impact upon rural development.

**9.8 Partnership**

**9.8.1** The Project, also contributed to a sixth Horizontal Principle, Partnership, which is primarily aimed at managing authorities and implementing bodies, rather than individual projects. The Project espoused the role of social partners on the bodies associated with the Peace II Programme, which is wholly congruent with the Partnership Principle.

**9.10 PEACE DISTINCTIVENESS**

**9.10.1** The promoters' application for funding was assessed under the more general criteria of Peace Distinctiveness, prior to the introduction of detailed criteria relating to 'areas', 'sectors' and 'groups'.

**9.11 Addressing the Legacy of the Conflict & Taking Opportunities Arising from Peace**

**9.11.1** Due to the conflict in Northern Ireland, the various sectors were not as active as desired, in working together, to develop common agendas to advance economic and social progress, resulting in lack of input and ownership of policy to effect change. Furthermore, given the preoccupation with the 'Troubles' an inward looking perspective prevailed. The 'Partnership for Progress' Project was designed to address this legacy, by encouraging greater cross-sectoral working and learning from international experience, while, exporting our lessons on peace building abroad.

**9.11.2** It was felt that the political climate was appropriate to be able to open up dialogue and debate issues of common concern with the aim of progressing a more integrated and strategic approach to policy making.

**9.11.3** The Project has provided the opportunity for interaction among the sectors and development of joint actions and policy papers, aiming for economic and social renewal.

**9.12 Reconciliation**

**9.12.1** Given the large constituencies represented by the four social partners, and the diversity of the groups and individuals involved, the Project was able to bring a large cross-section of Northern Ireland into forums to discuss policy issues of concern and to learn from overseas. This helped build bridges between the sectors and between the two traditional communities in Northern Ireland.

**9.13 CONTRIBUTION TO PEACE AND RECONCILIATION**

**9.13.1** The participants on the study tours were asked in the survey about the impact of the tour on Peace and Reconciliation. Their responses are summarised in the following paragraphs.

**9.13.2** All of the participants, with the exception of one, were aware that the EU Peace II Programme funded the study tour. Fifty six percent of the respondents felt that the study tour had contributed to peace and reconciliation in Northern Ireland 'Significantly' or 'Moderately', with 29% reporting that it had 'Little' or 'No' impact to date. These proportions changed to 79% and 12% respectively, when asked about likely impact in the future. This demonstrates that the full potential in relation to this factor has not yet been achieved, as it is a longer-term process.

**Evaluation of 'Partnership For Progress' Project**

**9.13.3** An analysis by sector showed considerable differentiation, with a higher proportion of participants from the Agricultural sector (31%) reporting 'Significant' impact to date, compared to just 9% and 8% from the Business and Community and Voluntary sectors respectively and none from the Trade Union sector.

**9.13.4** The following tables summarise the responses.

<b>TABLE 9.1</b>						
<b>Contribution to Peace and Reconciliation to Date By Sector</b>						
<b>(% Of Respondents)</b>						
<b>Contribution</b>	<b>Agric</b>	<b>Business</b>	<b>Com &amp; Vol</b>	<b>TU</b>	<b>Other</b>	<b>Total</b>
Significant Impact	31	9	8	0	8	12
Moderate Impact	38	36	55	2	31	44
Little Impact	25	46	21	0	38	26
No Impact	0	9	0	1	0	3
No Response	6	0	16	2	15	14
Not Applicable	0	0	0	0	8	1
<i>Base No.</i>	<i>15</i>	<i>10</i>	<i>41</i>	<i>5</i>	<i>13</i>	<i>84</i>

<b>TABLE 9.2</b>						
<b>Likely Contribution to Peace and Reconciliation in the Future By Sector</b>						
<b>(% Of Respondents)</b>						
<b>Contribution</b>	<b>Agric</b>	<b>Business</b>	<b>Com &amp; Vol</b>	<b>TU</b>	<b>Other</b>	<b>Total</b>
Significant Impact	47	46	26	60	15	35
Moderate Impact	40	36	44	0	77	44
Little Impact	13	18	13	20	0	12
No Impact	0	0	0	0	0	0
No Response	0	0	15	20	0	8
Not Applicable	0	0	0	0	8	1
<i>Base No.</i>	<i>15</i>	<i>10</i>	<i>41</i>	<i>5</i>	<i>13</i>	<i>84</i>

**9.13.5** Comments from those who reported 'Significant' or 'Moderate' impact include the following:

- *Thirty years of troubles followed by 11 years of peace has left many Northern Ireland people with an inward looking view. By providing tangible help and encouragement for many people to go and visit other countries to see how people live and work, and see how the world has moved on, is a very helpful and worthwhile thing. It is bound to have an impact now and in the years to come.*
- *Any activity, which brings together people from different sectors, background and traditions, makes an incremental contribution to P&R - in that regard, this study tour contributed its tuppence worth.*
- *The cross community and cross-sectoral basis of the group was interesting and provided an opportunity to discuss NI issues. The inclusion of a representative from PSNI also contributed a lot to this.*

**Evaluation of 'Partnership For Progress' Project**

---

- *We had an opportunity to see the sector operate in a different jurisdiction, which opened up a significant discussion about the sector's role here in creating a shared future. We are now in discussions with the Community Relations Council about a strategic Shared Future event.*
- *The learning has been incorporated into practice in peace building, body of research and peace building training.*
- *The individual I met and am now working with is from the Protestant community and due to our tour I have a good relationship with her and plan to interact with her project. This is important, as we will be trying to develop cross community activities for mums, and children up to the age of 4 years.*
- *All sections of the community have a better understanding of the others' views and background.*
- *I think the tour contributed to a number of the group revising their attitudes to others from different beliefs, cultural backgrounds, occupations and classes. It is a good way to encourage constructive debate, challenge assumptions and prejudices and generate new solutions. A programme that provided incentives and facilitation to continue the process should be considered.*

**9.13.6** It was widely acknowledged that Peace and Reconciliation impacts are more likely to emerge in the longer term, rather than immediately:

- *.... If each sector takes the positives learned from the study tours and are willing to put these ideas to use in their prospective areas of concern, then benefits to society in Northern Ireland and the peace process will be invaluable. It will take time for compromise and cooperation to become as commonplace in NI as the 'not an inch' approach we are currently experiencing and battling against.*
- *Benefit will accrue in the longer term as a result of better working relationships between sectors and resulting from coherence in policies and actions.*
- *Projects and ways of moving forward are currently being explored and established but it will take time for these to roll out and resulting impacts on opinions / attitudes / behaviour to be seen clearly.*
- *One of the key messages was the need for an inclusive approach to build a shared vision and consensus on the future shape of the city and the community, and implement it through politicians who have a mandate for effecting change. I believe therefore, that this is a message that will take time to work its way through as participants have the opportunity to reflect on the experience, and use it, and their influence, to assist in building a fair and sustainable society in Northern Ireland. It therefore, will have a future, rather than an immediate impact.*
- *It may do so in future as it may result in an improvement of the economy, which would have the knock on effect of improving Peace and Reconciliation.*
- *The one thing pointed out to us in Richmond was not to be fixated on instant results – it took the Hope in the Cities project a good few years to get to*

**Evaluation of 'Partnership For Progress' Project**

---

*where they are today. By building on what the group has started, significant impact will occur in the future as sectors build links and develop working relations.*

**9.13.7** Comments from those who reported 'Little' or 'No' impact in this area include the following:

- *There was no discernible antipathy between delegates on religious or nationalistic grounds during the tour; therefore, it was impossible to detect an impact.*
- *I went on the tour for purely commercial reasons and even though the group was made up of different religions and political backgrounds, we all got on very well... I found that the other members of the group were like myself, broadminded and we were able to discuss our differences quite openly.*
- *This question is not as relevant to our study tour as peace and reconciliation issues were not at the forefront of our reasons for going.*
- *The four sectors are not the problem so much as the two communities. We four sectors can work together magnificently but community reconciliation would not necessarily be progressed by our joint work.*
- *.... But reconciliation in Northern Ireland will never be solved immediately and at best we live in a society that tolerates each other not one that is reconciled to each other.*

# **FINANCIAL PERFORMANCE**

## 10.0 FINANCIAL PERFORMANCE

10.1 The total cost of the 'Partnership for Progress' Project and funding sources, (according to the Economic Appraisal), is detailed below.

<b>Source</b>	<b>Amount (£)</b>
Peace II (Measure 4.1)	1,056,931
Match Funding (In Kind Contributions from Concordia Management Board)	107,520
<b>Total Funding</b>	<b>1,164,451</b>
Revenue Generated	-
<b>Total Cost of Project</b>	<b>1,164,451</b>
Proportion of Peace II Funding to Total Cost	90%

10.2 OFMDFM awarded £1,056,931 grant assistance towards the Project.

10.3 By June of 2005, it was evident that there was difficulty in securing sufficient participants to undertake study visits, in particular the long-term exchanges. Therefore, in agreement with OFMDFM, the transnational element was re-scoped, and the budget was re-profiled, with £70,000 decommitted from the Project. Grant aid was accordingly capped at £986,931.

### 10.4 Breakdown of Expenditure

10.4.1 A summary of the Project expenditure is provided in the following table, showing actual spend compared to that budgeted.

<b>Item</b>	<b>Budget</b>	<b>% of Total</b>	<b>Actual £</b>	<b>% of Total</b>	<b>Variance</b>
Capital	14,420	1	15,247	2	+827
Staff Costs	300,857	30	273,775	30	-27,610
Running Costs	40,036	4	38,114	4	-1,922
Professional Fees	25,344	3	5,335	1	-20,009
Financial Mgt	3,743	0	5,806	1	+2,063
Management Costs	73,816	7	69,024	8	-4,792
<b>Sub-Total</b>	<b>458,216</b>	<b>46</b>	<b>406,773</b>	<b>45</b>	<b>-50,915</b>
Promotion & Publicity	49,172	5	65,982	7	+16,810
Trans-National	426,000	43	378,795	42	-47,205
Policy	31,518	3	27,487	3	-4,031
Support for LSPs	22,025	2	23,179	3	+1,154
<b>Sub-Total</b>	<b>528,715</b>	<b>54</b>	<b>495,443</b>	<b>55</b>	<b>-33,272</b>
<b>Total</b>	<b>986,931</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>902,744</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>-84,187</b>

**Evaluation of 'Partnership For Progress' Project**

---

**10.4.2** It should be noted that the under spend of £84k was at the time of the evaluation. The Project Manager reported that this was already committed and that the entire budget of almost £987k would be spent before the Project was completed, resulting in little or no variance.

**10.4.3** Some observations on the Project expenditure are listed below:

- Overall, the Project expenditure has adhered, in the main, to the budget profile projected at the outset of the Project.
- The main variances occurred in relation to Staff Costs, Professional Fees, and the Transnational Programme, with underspends of £27k, £20k, and £47k respectively, at the time of the evaluation. Although, as noted in paragraph 10.4.1 above, these variances may be reduced by the end of the Project.
- The underspend in staff costs was due to just one Field Officer being in post for most of the Project duration rather than the projected two Field Officers. It was felt that the wide range of knowledge and skills required for the different policy areas and the facilitation of specialist study tours would be more easy to acquire by buying in the appropriate expertise, than through the employment of a Field Officer. Therefore, Concordia advertised and commissioned consultants and facilitators to undertake specific aspects of the Project around policy development and a number of the study tours.
- The only significant over expenditure occurred in relation to Promotion and Communications, with almost £17k more being spent on this activity than the projected budget. This was largely attributed to gaining a media profile for the work of Concordia, for which a PR consultant was hired.

**10.5 Value for Money**

**10.5.1** In terms of value for money, it is noted that just 54% of the budget was allocated towards 'programme' costs – that is, directly related to the three main aims and outputs of the Project (Transnational visits, Policy work and support for social partners on LSPs). The remainder of the budget (46%) related to the 'administration' of the project, including running costs and staff costs. Obviously the ratio between 'programme' costs and 'administration' costs can vary, depending upon the nature of the Project. In this Project, given the cost of the travel and accommodation for the study tours, which was the major component of this Project, a ratio skewed more in favour of the 'programme' costs (that is, more than 54%) would have been expected. A representative of OFMDFM reported that it does not use any benchmark in determining the ratio between 'programme' and 'administration' costs of projects. Concordia reported that the organisation of the study tours was quite labour intensive and that savings were made on Project expenditure where possible.

## **CONCLUSIONS AND FUTURE NEEDS**

## **11.0 CONCLUSIONS AND FUTURE NEEDS**

**11.1** Having reviewed the quantitative data relating to the Project and analysed the findings from the study tour survey, along with feedback from Concordia board members and other consultees, the following conclusions can be drawn.

### **11.2 Achievement of Project Outputs**

**11.2.1** The Project was successful in achieving the targets in relation to two of the three aims – the transnational programme of activities and the research and policy work. Due to a time lapse from when the Project application was submitted for funding, to implementation stage, circumstances surrounding the need and timeliness of the third aim had changed. Therefore, the targets in relation to supporting social partners on LSPs, were not achieved in the manner that was planned.

### **11.3 Impact of Study Tours**

**11.3.1** The study tours formed the major part of the project in terms of expenditure, staff time and participant numbers. Not surprisingly, the greatest impacts of the project are seen in this area. These include the following:

**Benefits Gained:** The tours proved beneficial in establishing valuable contacts; acquiring new knowledge; exploring potential business opportunities; and promoting the work / sectors of the participants.

**Dissemination of Information:** Almost all of the participants have disseminated information gained from the study tour, with nearly one third having undertaken extensive dissemination.

**Action Taken:** More than three quarters of the participants have undertaken action subsequent to the tour. This includes ongoing discussions; influencing input to strategic plans; development of new practices and implementation of new systems as a result of the learning; undertaking further research; and business expansion.

**Overseas Contacts:** More than a quarter of the participants are in frequent contact with individuals that they met on the tour from abroad. The purpose of the ongoing contact includes the development of joint projects; sharing information and ideas; and pursuing business interests.

**Domestic Contacts:** More than a quarter of the participants are in regular contact with other participants on the study tour. Developing joint projects, investigating potential business opportunities and accessing a range of expertise to pursue business goals are the main reasons for continued contact.

**Networks:** Participants on some of the study tours have established their own networks or joined existing networks, with the aim of progressing learning from the

## Evaluation of 'Partnership For Progress' Project

---

tour. Participants on other tours reported the need for organised group meetings to follow up on ideas from their respective tours.

**Social Partnerships:** Almost all of the participants on the study tours now have a better understanding of social partnerships and their value to society.

**Cross Sectoral Co-operation:** More than half of the participants feel that the study tour contributed to new and improved cross-sectoral working. They reported better understanding of other sectors and their respective perspectives; the development of trusting relationships with participants from other sectors; the identification of areas of common interest between sectors that were not apparent previously and on which joint working would be mutually beneficial; the commencement of new / improved cross-sectoral working and generally a more outward looking perspective.

**11.3.2** The study tours were well planned and organised. While many positive outcomes have been achieved to date, the full impact of the tours has yet to be realised, as participants continue to develop linkages and partnerships. The study tours constituted a major aspect of the Project and were conducted successfully.

### **11.4 Impacts of the Policy Work**

**11.4.1** Considering that the policy work was undertaken during the latter part of the Project, it is too early to assess its impact. However, the following outcomes were noted:

- The policy documents will be useful to the social partners and other key stakeholders in lobbying government for change.
- The documents effectively form another strand, of a range of interventions, in each of the policy areas, adding to an accumulated effect on each of the issues.
- The media attention that the work was able to capture helped to raise awareness of the various policy issues.
- The strength of the policy work is the united voice of the four social partners, which is more difficult for government to ignore.
- The discussion and debate generated during the process has led to a better understanding of the other partners' perspectives.
- There is evidence of a shift in thinking among some of the social partners in certain strategic and policy areas, which was seen as positive.
- From a senior civil servant's perspective, the policy work undertaken by the Project, effectively acted as a filter, with more realistic, practical and workable proposals coming forward, than propositions and requests from individual groups and organisations.

**11.4.2** Although getting a consensus and producing an agreed document was challenging in a number of cases, the process opened up dialogue and provided an opportunity for a constructive exchange of views between the partners. While there is an increased appreciation of the other sectors, there is scope for further developmental work among the partners around the role and operation of the social partnership.

11.4.3 Overall, the research and policy work undertaken by the Project was valuable and there is a strong desire to see this work continued.

### 11.5 Contribution to Peace & Reconciliation

11.5.1 Concordia grew out of the need for participative democracy in a society divided and polarised by decades of conflict. The Project was designed to enable Concordia to continue to pursue the aim of economic and social progress, to help redress the lack of development as a result of the Troubles. Therefore, the Project was congruent with the two main aims of the Peace II Programme, addressing the legacy of the conflict and taking opportunities arising from peace.

11.5.2 The Project has enabled individuals become more outward looking, gaining a wider perspective from the overseas visits, in relation to their work and their sector. The Project has also enabled the development of cross-sectoral and international linkages, many of which are likely to continue and help in progressing more forward looking plans. Therefore, the Project was highly congruent with Measure 4.1 *Outward and Forward Looking Region*, of the Peace II Programme.

11.5.3 The Project, and the study tours in particular, brought individuals from diverse backgrounds; sectors and communities together, providing opportunities for exchange that would not otherwise take place. This was seen to have had a positive impact. Furthermore, the outcomes from the linkages and connections that have been made are likely to lead to greater inclusion, coherence, and social and economic prosperity in Northern Ireland in the future, which, in turn, will have an impact on stabilising that society.

11.5.4 Therefore, the Project adopted a strategic approach to addressing Peace and Reconciliation with indirect (as opposed to direct) targeting of 'areas', 'groups' and 'sectors' affected by the conflict.

### 11.6 Horizontal Principles

11.6.1 Specific activities of the Project showed clear congruency with Environmental Sustainability and given the high level of involvement of participants from the Agriculture sector, there should be a contribution to Rural Development in Northern Ireland. It is also expected that the Project will contribute to Economic and Social development. Although not specifically targeted, new TSN areas and under-represented groups had the opportunity, through open selection processes, to participate in the Project activities. It is anticipated that some of the policy areas explored through the Project and new initiatives arising from the study tours, will bring benefits to Northern Ireland as a whole, including these areas and groups.

### 11.7 Limiting Factors

11.7.1 In terms of impact, there were a few factors, which may have limited the full potential of the Project being achieved.

**Time Lapse:** Unfortunately, due to the time delay in the commencement of the Project, it was not opportune to provide support to the social partners on the LSPs as planned. Although, a number of social partner representatives on the LSPs participated on the project in an individual capacity, a significant opportunity was lost to the Project, to engage and develop capacity at local level.

**Unable to Participate on Study Tours:** Members from the Trade Union and Business sectors were less able to get released from work to participate in the study tours. Consequently, less benefits were gained by these sectors.

**Lack of Targeting:** Opportunities presented by the Project were open to all, and selection for the study tours was based upon the individual's potential to gain from the experience and make positive use of the learning. However, this approach meant that specific direct targeting did not take place, which could potentially have added value to the project in terms of direct impact, for example, by targeting those from or working with new TSN areas, under represented groups, and the Peace II 'areas', 'groups' and sectors'. However, counter to this, it is accepted that (a) the Project attracted those who are in positions where they are more able to influence / effect change and (b) the Project dealt with issues which should benefit these groups and areas.

**Political Context:** It was reported that the policy work could have had more impact had there been a devolved government. Local politicians could have been engaged in dialogue and tasked with driving forward the various issues.

**Cohesive strategic approach:** The Project could have benefited from time being spent at the outset to plan a strategic approach to the Project, whereby priority policy areas could have been identified in a structured and systematic manner. Corresponding study tours could then have been planned which would contribute and link into these areas in a more integrated manner. It is felt that some additional synergies could have been gained through greater cohesiveness and integration. However, it is accepted that by the time Project commenced, there was urgency to progress implementation as expediently as possible.

## 11.8 Challenges

11.8.1 The Project implementation presented some challenges along the way.

**Optimistic Targets:** The targets for the long-term exchanges were over- ambitious and this created some pressure to recruit the projected participant numbers. The Project had to achieve a balance between becoming target driven without losing sight of the overall purpose and aims of the Project.

**Staffing Structure:** Concordia's application for funding included four Field Officers, (one for each sector) but this was reduced to two following an Economic Appraisal. It was reported that dedicated sectoral Field Workers, with knowledge of the individual sectors, were needed to meaningfully engage with the respective sectors, to encourage participation, undertake research and policy work, liaise with

## Evaluation of 'Partnership For Progress' Project

sectoral representatives on the LSPs and to bring a planned, structured and integrative approach to the study tours and policy issues. While Concordia board members and their organisations contributed to this, they did not have the time or resources to undertake this fully. The allocation of just two Field Officers (who were drawn into an administrative function given the level of organisation and co-ordination associated with the tours) meant that they were not able to fulfil the developmental role and, when one left, much of this work was outsourced to various consultants and facilitators. It is debatable what impact this had on the outcomes of the Project. On the one hand there possibly could have been more considered and informed input and ownership from the sectors, but on the other hand, the use of external expertise brought objectivity, impartiality and possibility expediency to the process.

**Role of the Concordia Board:** Much success of the Project is due to the commitment and effort of the members of Concordia Board, who gave of their time voluntarily to the Project. However, there were a few minor issues pertaining to the role of the Board members relating to the implementation of the Project. Firstly, there were some changes in membership of the Board, which affected the continuity of the work. Secondly, there was some confusion around whether Board members were / should be giving their personal opinions or representing the views of their organisation. Thirdly, it was queried whether Board members are representing their organisation or sector and if the latter, how the views of their constituency are heard and fed into the process. These were issues that the Board had to work through and perhaps there is still more work to be done in this area.

### **11.9 Future Needs**

**11.9.1** Although the Project was time bound and it has achieved the targets that were possible, futures needs were identified during the evaluation, that are relevant to Concordia.

**11.9.2** There is a strong desire to see aspects of the Project continued in some way.

- There is a need to advance the policy documents already produced and to pursue other new policy areas.
- Although participants on some study tours are progressing the learning individually and in groups, there was a demand from some participants for facilitated support to help progress what was learned, in an organised and systematic manner here.

**11.9.3** It is felt that there is an important role for social partners in the new super councils, in relation to community planning and community relations.

**11.9.4** It was reported that while Concordia is made up of four social partners, each of the partners is a separate pillar, which also, individually, has an important role to play in liaising with government and policy / decision makers.

**11.9.5** Despite having delivered a major Project (Partnership for Progress), Concordia would benefit from further development itself, as a social partnership, to explore

**Evaluation of 'Partnership For Progress' Project**

---

and re-affirm its role; examine how the partners can work most effectively together; and reach agreement on issues such as membership, representation, mandates and processes.

**11.10 Concluding Note**

**11.10.1** Concordia successfully delivered the 'Partnership for Progress' Project with many positive benefits resulting. The Project is highly congruent with Measure 4.1 of the Peace II Programme. International learning has been acquired, much of which is being acted upon. Local and international networks have been established. Joint policy papers have been produced, presenting a formidable voice to government.

**11.10.2** The Project has embedded the concept of social partnership within the four partner organisations and it has developed a greater understanding and promoted the value of social partnerships to their respective constituencies.

**11.10.3** Each of the partners was highly committed to the Project and they are all motivated to continue to develop and promote participative democracy as a means of helping to progress social and economic development in Northern Ireland. The Project has created a demand for the work of the Project and Concordia to continue.

## **APPENDIX 1 : QUESTIONNAIRE SURVEY**

**EVALUATION OF 'PARTNERSHIP FOR PROGRESS'**

**(A Project Delivered By Concordia)**

***As a participant on a Study Trip funded by Concordia through the Peace II Programme you are requested to complete this questionnaire as part of the evaluation process.***

Name \_\_\_\_\_

Email Address \_\_\_\_\_

Daytime Telephone Number \_\_\_\_\_

Duration of Study Trip (In days) \_\_\_\_\_

**1. To which Sector do you belong?**

- Agriculture
- Business
- Community / Voluntary
- Trade Union
- Statutory
- Other  Please state:

**2. Are you a member of a Social Partnership or a Social Partner representative on the Board / Management Committee of any organisation / body?**

- Yes  If 'Yes', on how many bodies / partnerships? \_\_\_\_\_
- No
- Don't Know

**3. Please list your three primary reasons for taking part on the Study Trip?**

(i)

(ii)

(iii)

**4. To what extent were your expectations met / objectives achieved?**

- Fully
- Almost
- Partly
- Little or Not at All

Please explain:

**5. Please rate the benefit of the study trip to your area of work / sector:**

- Extremely Beneficial
- Quite Beneficial
- Of Some Benefit
- Little or No Benefit

Please explain reasons for your rating:

**6. To what extent have you disseminated the knowledge / information that you gained from the study tour to others since your return:**

- Extensive Dissemination
- Some / Moderate Dissemination
- Little or No Dissemination

**7. Please explain briefly how you disseminated the information (e.g. presentations, reports, media articles, etc) and to whom:**

**8. What is / are the main reason/s for lack of dissemination of information?**

- No opportunity to
- Not in a position to
- Lack of resources
- Nothing of value to disseminate
- Other Reason/s
- N/a – Have disseminated info

9. **Other than the dissemination of information, have you taken any specific actions to effect change as a result of learning from your trip?**

- Yes
- No
- N/a, as no learning to apply

10. **If 'Yes', please explain what actions were taken and the impact?**

11. **If no action has been taken, can you please explain why not?**

12. **What contact have you maintained with organisations / individuals from abroad that you met on tour?**

- Frequent / Regular contact
- Occasional contact
- No contact

Please explain further:

13. **To what extent has the study trip contributed to your understanding of Social Partnerships (SPs)?**

- Very little
- I now have a better understanding
- I now have a much better understanding
- N/A - As I had a very good understanding of SPs prior to the trip

14. *Were you aware that the study trip was funded by the EU Peace II Programme?*

Yes

No

15. **To what extent do you feel that the study trip has contributed to Peace and Reconciliation in Northern Ireland, or is likely to in the future?**

	To date	In the future
Significant impact	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Moderate impact	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Little impact	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
No impact	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Please explain:

16. **Did you participate on an individual trip, a group study tour, or both?**

Individual trip / exchange

Group study tour

Both individual trip and group tour/s

17. **Do you feel that the study trip has contributed to cross-sectoral working (i.e. with agriculture, business, trade unions and community and voluntary sectors)?**

Yes, significantly

Some examples of new / improved cross-sectoral working

Limited cross-sectoral working resulted

No impact in this area

Not applicable

Please explain your response above, and include reasons if 'Not applicable'.

**18. Please rate the help provided by Concordia in relation to the Study Trip:**

- Excellent
- Good
- Satisfactory
- Poor

Please explain:

**FOR PARTICIPANTS ON GROUP STUDY TOURS ONLY**

**19. What contact have you maintained with tour participants from any of the other sectors since your return?**

- Frequent / Regular contact
- Occasional contact
- No contact

Please explain further:

Please add any further comments. If you wish to discuss any issues relating to the evaluation of the Partnership For Progress project please contact me (Catherine Ward 028 66327150 / catherineward@peterquinn.com).

**PLEASE RETURN YOUR COMPLETED QUESTIONNAIRE BY ONE OF THE FOLLOWING METHODS BEFORE FRIDAY 24<sup>TH</sup> NOVEMBER 2006:**

- (a) **Post** Bronagh Donnelly, Peter Quinn Consultancy Services, 26 Darling Street, Enniskillen, BT74 7EW
- (b) **E-mail** [bronaghdonnelly@peterquinn.com](mailto:bronaghdonnelly@peterquinn.com)
- (c) **Fax** 028 66325689: Marked - For the Attention of Bronagh Donnelly
- (d) **Phone** Ring Bronagh on 028 66327150, and give responses over the telephone

**THANK YOU FOR YOUR CO-OPERATION  
IT IS MUCH APPRECIATED**