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1. INTRODUCTION: OBJECTIVES AND RATIONALE


The proposed Guidelines are developed in accordance with two of the INTEGRACE project objectives and are a key step towards their fulfilment:

- to enhance the effectiveness of policies and programmes for the integration of refugee and asylum-seeking children in the EU;
- to develop analytical tools for the evaluation and impact assessment of programmes and policies for the integration of refugee children at schools.

The methodological guidelines aim to develop a common approach to the evaluation of good practices in the integration of refugee children in educational systems of the Old Member States (Austria, Italy and Sweden) and to the social impact assessment (SIA) of potential initiatives in the New Member States (Bulgaria and Slovenia).

The guidelines have several main goals:

- to define the objectives and the rationale of the evaluations and SIA of the best practices in the field of educational integration of refugee and asylum-seeking children (RASC);
- to outline the general design of the evaluation and SIA of best practices in the educational integration of RASC;
- to propose the content of the national reports on the evaluation and SIA research.

An important objective of the INTEGRACE project is to promote the integration of RASC in the educational systems of EU Member States by developing common standards and designing a common methodology and analytical tools for the evaluation and social impact assessment of best practices. First, the project will identify and describe best/good practices in the educational integration of refugee and asylum-seeking children, which will be presented in written country reviews of best practices in the integration of refugee and asylum-seeking children. Situation reports where best practices are scarce and examples of the design of preparedness initiatives (“stress tests”) where the target group is small will be also prepared. While Old MSs have experience with various integration programmes in the field of education, New MSs have to develop effective policy responses to the rising number of refugees and asylum seekers.

The rationale of the evaluation and social impact assessment exercises lies in the need to explore the possibility of transferring good practices in the educational integration of RASC from one specific national/local environment to another. The main purpose of the evaluation of existing best practices in the three Old Member States (Austria, Italy and Sweden) will be to analyse to what extent and under what conditions they could be replicated in a different context. The principle aim of the SIA will be to assess the possibility of replication and the social impacts of the eventual implementation of a practice which has already been identified and evaluated as a good one in some of the Old MSs.

Based on the identified best practices and areas in need of improvement, evaluations of selected
initiatives in three Western European EU Member States (Austria, Italy and Sweden) and social impact assessments for their implementation in two Eastern European countries (Bulgaria and Slovenia) will be conducted. The evaluations and social impact assessments carried out will facilitate the transfer of knowledge from Old to New Member States, thereby allowing the latter to deal more effectively with the new migration realities. Evaluations and SIAs will also provide the grounds for developing a common EU approach to addressing the educational needs of refugees via conducting methodologically thorough and standardised evaluations and impact assessments.

The Guidelines aim to advise on the steps and methodologies to be employed in the three programme evaluation exercises (to be conducted in Austria, Italy and Sweden) and in the two social impact assessment exercises (to be conducted in Bulgaria and Slovenia). Further, the social impact assessment methodology described by this document aims to contribute to a process of adaptive management in countries with modest experience in refugee integration, and to inform the design and operation of needed interventions.

Based on these general guidelines, specific analytical tools, questionnaires and indicators should be developed by the CENSIS Foundation, the Ludwig Boltzmann Institute of Human Rights (BIM) and the University of Halmstad (UH), relevant to the concrete interventions to be evaluated. Specific analytical tools, questionnaires and indicators should also be developed by the Center for the Study of Democracy (CSD) and the Peace Institute (PI) for the social impact assessment of potential good practices.

For the purposes of these particular evaluation and SIA exercises and their aims, the following principles/criteria should be integrated to guide its methods and processes:

- **Comprehensiveness**: the evaluation and social impact assessment should identify and involve all affected groups (to be full participants in the evaluation and SIA exercise). This involvement must reach out to groups that do not routinely participate in government decision making because of cultural, linguistic or economic barriers.

- **Impact equity**: identification of all groups likely to have been affected by the introduction of the respective best practice. The varying benefits as well as the possible adverse impacts should be considered for all involved parties.

- **Focus**: the evaluation and SIA need to be focused on the most significant outcomes and/or impacts by order of priority. They need to identify all significant positive and negative outcomes and expected impacts for all affected groups.

2. GENERAL DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY FOR BEST PRACTICES EVALUATION AND SIA

The methodological guidelines are developed to help examine whether best practices in countries with vast experience in the field of refugee integration (such as Austria, Italy and Sweden) can be transferred and utilised in countries with relatively recent refugee regimes and instruments (such as Bulgaria and Slovenia). The proposed approach for evaluation and SIA stems from a proactive stance towards the educational integration of RASC across the EU. The present guidelines constitute an approach which aims to integrate and analyse key experience in the field of educational integration of RASC and test its transferability and applicability across the EU. For this purpose, the present document provides the framework of what actions need to be taken and how to proceed in order to analyse whether, to what extent or following what modification/s a practice in the field of educational integration of RASC, proven to be successful in a country with a long-established refugee assistance regime, can be implemented in an environment with little experience in this area.

In this context the methodological guidelines for evaluation and SIA of best practices should be very well synchronised – keeping their distinctive characteristics yet complementing each other.

The evaluations and SIAs should be based on a common methodological design, which will include several basic steps:

1. Selection of best/good practices to be evaluated/assessed;
2. Description of the practice to be evaluated/assessed;
3. Stakeholder identification and analysis;
4. Data collection;
5. Assessing outcomes, impacts and risks of the practice being evaluated/assessed;
6. Conclusions regarding the transferability of the best practice.

The main questions the evaluation and SIA research should answer will be: could the practice under consideration be transferred to different national/local environments? What should be the preconditions for the practice to be replicated successfully in different national and/or local contexts?

National reports on the results of completed evaluations and SIAs in each of the three Old MS (Austria, Italy and Sweden) and in the two New MS (Bulgaria and Slovenia) will be prepared. The main deliverable will be the summary report on the evaluation/SIA of select initiatives for the integration of refugee children at school in the three old EU MS and the two new MS.

2.1. Selection of best/good practices to be evaluated/assessed

In order to coordinate the evaluation and SIA activities the Center for the Study of Democracy (CSD) and the Peace Institute (PI) will propose areas in need of improvement so that the selection of best practices for evaluation takes place in these fields. CENSIS Foundation, Ludwig Boltzmann Institute of Human Rights (BIM) and University of Halmstad (UH) will propose up to three best/good practices to be evaluated based on their potential to be replicated.

The good practices to be proposed for evaluation and SIA in the field of educational integration of RASC could be of different types. There will be no restrictions with respect to specific educational areas and levels, institutional set-ups and organisational forms, educational methods and techniques, etc. Some of the generally defined educational practices to be explored, as agreed at the Capacity building seminar in Sofia, could be:

1. Educational policies targeting the integration of RASC at European, national and local level;
2. Educational programmes for refugee and asylum-seeking children;
3. Curricula, methods and techniques relevant to RASC;
4. National and local educational projects targeting RASC;
5. Administrative measures to solve specific problems of RASC related to their educational needs;
6. Extracurricular activities and opportunities for out-of-school-hours learning;

Operational definitions: programme/policy evaluation and social impact assessment

“Evaluation is the systematic assessment of the operation and/or the outcomes of a programme or policy, compared to a set of explicit or implicit standards, as a means of contributing to the improvement of the programme or policy.” (Weiss, 1998: 4)

“Social Impact Assessment includes the processes of analysing, monitoring and managing the intended and unintended social consequences, both positive and negative, of planned interventions (policies, programmes, plans, projects) and any social change processes invoked by those interventions.” (Vanclay, 2003: 5)

“By “social impacts” we mean the consequences to human populations of any public or private actions that alter the ways in which people live, work, play, relate to one another, organise to meet their needs and generally cope as members of society. The term also includes cultural impacts involving changes to the norms, values, and beliefs that guide and rationalise their cognition of themselves and their society.” (Guidelines and Principles for Social Impact Assessment, 1994).
7. Services provided to refugee children and families to help with their immediate needs;
8. Measures to ensure a safe and secure school environment for refugee and asylum-seeking children;
9. Involvement of key stakeholders (families, refugee and migrant groups, local receiving communities, non-governmental organisations, and others);
10. Relevant funding schemes;
11. Monitoring and evaluation methods.

Based on an intensive consultative process project partners will agree on the good practices to be selected for evaluation and social impact assessment. The main criteria for the selection of already identified good practices in educational integration of RASC to be evaluated will be their potential for replication in the identified areas in need in the New MS (Bulgaria and Slovenia).

2.2. Description of the best practices to be evaluated/assessed

Each practice should be described in details with attention being paid to the respective national and local context. The description and evaluation of the selected good practice could be organised along the following lines:

• What was the problem the practice addressed and who identified the problem?
• Who initiated the practice, who were the main stakeholders and how were they involved in the initiative?
• How did the practice develop and what were its stages?
• What were the positive and/or negative consequences?
• What are the impacts of the practice (effectiveness)?
• What are the externalities, i.e. any unintended positive and/or negative impacts of the practice on other than immediate beneficiaries?
• How viable and sustainable is the practice in the long term?
• What is the significance of the practice for the target group of RASC (relevance)?

The first step in the description of the intervention being evaluated/assessed is to define the problem, the objectives and the context of the intervention.

Problem identification should be precise and clear. This is a key prerequisite in the programme evaluation and SIA process. The precise and informed problem definition will serve a critical precondition for the recognition of the success of concrete actions, the identification of the type of the intervention and the formulation of adequate objectives and appropriate instruments for its achievement. SIA research should explore if the problem to be solved in a new context differs from the problem addressed in the original context of the intervention.

Objectives should be identified in accordance with the so-called SMART principle. They should be Specific, Measurable, Accepted, Realistic and Time-dependent. Objectives should be clearly defined to be understood in the same way by all involved parties (specific). They should name desired improvements, with possibly quantifiable indicators, to make possible verification of future achievement (measurable). Objectives should be realistic and reasonable, as well as accepted and motivating for all parties to be responsible for their achievement (realistic and accepted). Finally, objectives should be tied to specific deadlines (time-dependent).

Objectives should be identified based on the following distinction:

• General goals to involve the principal impacts and the future social condition to be achieved through the intervention (e.g. widening the scope of social inclusion of refugees, decrease in illiteracy rates, enhancement of child protection among vulnerable categories of refugees, etc.).
• Specific outcomes define the direct impacts and results of the intervention (policy, programme, project) over its target groups (e.g. diversified social services provided to RASC with special needs, improved local language proficiency of RASC, improved protection of unaccompanied RASC, etc.).
• Specific outputs involve the specific products and services that have been provided by the particular intervention (e.g. number of established social service contact points, number of local language training courses and number of

---

1 See for similar guidelines: Handbook on Integration for Policy Makers and Practitioners, European Communities, November 2004.
trainees, number of refugee consultation centres, number of information brochures distributed among beneficiaries, etc.).

**Context analysis** should aim to identify the impact and restrictions that the local conditions, institutional settings and legislative frameworks, have had or will have upon the realisation of the intervention and its objectives. This analysis should be based on the description of the **historical and political specificities** related to the problem that has been addressed or will be addressed by the intervention. It should also consider the respective **institutional set-up and legislative frameworks** playing a role in the process of intervention implementation. In particular, this analysis needs to shed light on the nature of inter-institutional cooperation, conflict zones among different stakeholders, the identification of their institutional interests and the implications for the roles played in the intervention implementation process. Similarly, a review of the respective legislative framework will clarify whether the implemented intervention has been hindered by legislative gaps or has been eased by well designed regulations. Finally, it is important to pay attention to the social and cultural characteristics of the social groups related to the intervention to predict and take into account the potential attitudes to the intervention.

The evaluation and SIA process should involve a clear **description of the implemented/planned intervention** and its key parameters (financial resources, institutional capacities and experience, stakeholder cooperation, time-period, etc.). The description should involve an analysis of the **limitations to the implementation** of the intervention (e.g. financial constraints, legal regulations, institutional capacities, etc.) that may render its objectives or the proposed means for their achievement unrealistic. The evaluation and SIA will thus make possible the identification of pitfalls to be avoided and of ways of improving the future implementation of the relevant best practice in new environments.

In the context of the planned SIA **one to three intervention alternatives (scenarios)** should be defined and described together with the model intervention. Both the model intervention and the identified alternative scenarios should be subject to SIA. The social impact assessment will thus make possible the identification of the best intervention approach, balancing between social benefits, the potential to mitigate adverse effects (costs) and the level of achievement of intervention objectives.

As part of the intervention description, a logic model\(^2\) of the implemented or proposed intervention (as well as separate logic models of the SIA alternatives, as applicable) could be constructed. Logic models help focus attention to the most critical elements of the proposed action and also help illustrate the action as it unfolds through time in a concise and vivid manner. In the case of SIA (as opposed to programme evaluation exercises in Western Europe), the already constructed logic models for the analogous best practice to be borrowed from WE should inform the construction of the logic models for Bulgaria and Slovenia. Expert/academic interviews would need to be conducted at the beginning of the SIA process in order to judge to what extent the proposed intervention would be practicable in the local context, as well as to modify the logic models as needed and adapt them to the new environments. The logic models would also help identify key stakeholders – and in turn the identification and analysis of stakeholders should inform the logic models, which could then be modified accordingly.

### 2.3. Stakeholder identification and analysis

This analysis should include all groups and institutions that have been influenced by, or influence the intervention and its results in a positive or a negative way. Clearly identified and defined problems and respectively context analysis would facilitate precise identification of the involved parties, their interests and behaviours and possible strategies for their involvement in the evaluation and social impact assessment.

This process should involve:

1. Identification of the key stakeholders;
2. Analysis of their interests, their importance with respect to the intervention and the level of their influence over the intervention implementation;

\(^2\) See Annex I on practical steps/tips in constructing logic models.
3. Analysis of the impacts of the intervention on them;
4. Identification of successful strategies for the meaningful involvement of interested parties, and pitfalls to avoid.

The stakeholder analysis should include those directly involved (intervention implementing parties and beneficiaries) as well as groups that have been indirectly influenced either positively or negatively. Depending on the intervention context, such indirectly involved or influenced parties in initiatives relating to the educational integration of RASC might include: RASC parents, or relatives in the respective home countries, public school teachers, pupils who are nationals of the host country, etc. If needed, these groups might be further subdivided according to demographic (age, gender), educational (level of education, literacy), national or other relevant indicators.

2.4. Data collection: sources and methods of the evaluations and SIAs

The evaluations and SIAs to be conducted should pay keen attention to the specifics of the local contexts. They should build on local knowledge (refugee communities, expert community, etc.) and therefore utilise participatory methods to analyse the concerns of interested and affected parties. They should involve stakeholders in the evaluation and assessment of social impacts and the analysis of alternatives of the planned interventions.

The proposed evaluation and SIA process should be based on thorough research to include desk research and qualitative methods of analysis. Different types of data should be collected at the different stages of the process according to the respective analytical needs.

Desk research should involve the collection of available statistical data, related surveys, institutional reports as well as academic literature. Data collected by way of desk research is particularly important in the preparatory stages of the evaluation and SIA aimed at thorough analysis of the intervention context and its objectives.

Qualitative methods rather than quantitative ones appear more relevant in view of the small and dispersed target groups of the interventions. They will allow for the accumulation of understanding regarding beneficiaries’ and other stakeholders’ perceptions, motivations and concerns to be integrated into the integration formulation. The proposed qualitative methods should include rapid assessments by means of:

- Semi-standardised interviews with individuals representing different stakeholders. Semi-structured interviews could be conducted with representatives of involved institutions or local community members (up to 6 interviews) to help define stakeholders’ interests, expectations, potential as well as limitations. Semi-standardised questionnaires should be developed by each project partner in accordance with the local and intervention contexts.
- Focus group discussions to guide the process of stakeholder analysis and social impacts identification and analysis. Focus group discussions might appear especially beneficial in the process of social impacts identification and analysis as well as in the process of scenarios development. They will allow for the collection of comparative data from a variety of stakeholders. Depending on the local and intervention context relevant focus groups might involve: RASC parents, RASC pupils, RASC public school teachers, social service practitioners, and Ministry of Education officials. Focus group agendas and questionnaires should be developed on the part of the project partners in accordance with the local and intervention contexts.

Depending on the specific country interventions and local contexts, other methods (qualitative or quantitative) could be also considered appropriate. They may include: participant observation, on-site study visits, workshops, surveys, content-analysis, social experiments.

2.5. Assessing outcomes and impacts of the practices being evaluated/assessed

Identification of outcomes and social impacts

The most important social outcomes/impacts of the implemented/planned intervention and their scope (local, regional, national, international) should be
identified. Consideration should be given to both impacts perceived by the implementing agencies and to those perceived by affected groups and/or beneficiaries.

The variables along which social outcomes/impacts could be measured and analysed could follow a model, modified after Vancley (Vancley, 2003: 8) in accordance with the purposes of the present program evaluation and SIA exercise:

- way of life – daily interactions and routines of people or group of people involved in or influenced by the intervention;
- culture – how values, customs, beliefs and language have been or are influenced by the intervention;
- community stability and cohesion;
- political system and/or empowerment – levels of participation in decision making, levels of control over resources;
- human rights – hindrances to or enhancement of the respective human rights;
- fears and aspirations – perceptions about the levels of security with respect to personal plans and aspirations for the future.

The proposed model could be modified further to fit most closely the local and intervention contexts respectively in project partners’ countries.

**Selection of social outcomes/impacts to be analysed as part of evaluation and SIA.**

Out of the identified social outcomes and impacts, those that are most important should be selected to be scrutinised under comprehensive evaluation/social impact assessment. Selection criteria should include but not be limited to: higher probability of the impact occurring in the new environment; larger scope of influence (more people are impacted) of both positive and negative (pitfalls to avoid) influence; long-term over short-term duration of the influence; sustainability; overall relationship between benefits and costs over impacted groups (although detailed cost-benefit analysis of the initiatives selected is not to be conducted as part of programme evaluations or SIA). Additional criteria to be considered might include: higher potential for adverse influence, likelihood of causing subsequent impacts, relevance to present or future policy decisions and developments.

Comprehensive social impact assessment should be carried out based on thorough context analysis and intervention objectives, the identification of all stakeholders and their interests, and the selection of key potential social impacts. A successful approach in the area of educational integration of RASC in countries with relatively new refugee instruments and institutions might include:

- **comparative methods**: analysis of differences in future social conditions in the case of implemented or unimplemented intervention;
- **expert evaluations**: of the qualitative and quantitative characteristics of the expected social impacts;
- **scenario analysis**: logical hypotheses based on the construction of possible futures through a process of mentally modelling the assumptions about the variables in question; and (2) fitted empirical-similar past cases used to analyse the present case with experts adjusting the scenario by taking into account the unique characteristics of the present case (Guidelines and Principles for Social Impact Assessment, 1994).

While SIA should focus on direct social impacts, planned by the intervention objectives, it should also pay attention to indirect social impacts, which might be prompted at a later stage by the social processes triggered by the intervention.

### 3. CONTENTS OF THE EVALUATION/SOCIAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT NATIONAL REPORTS

#### 3.1. Methodological introduction

(2-3 pages)

This section of the report should include a summary of the specific methodological tools used for the respective evaluation/SIA. It should explain the country-specific evaluation/SIA methodology designed in accordance with the Guidelines and the local and intervention context. The section should list the sources of data, the data gaps encountered and the research and analytical methods employed to make the evaluation/SIA possible.
3.2. Background and local context  
(3-4 pages)

This section should provide description to the historical, institutional and legislative characteristics of the problem to be addressed by the intervention, as well as the profile and the history of the related target group/s. The analysis to be provided could be summarised using Tables 56 and 57.

3.3. Stakeholders identification and analysis  
(4-5 pages)

The section should summarise the key findings with regard to the stakeholders’ context of the intervention with detailed description of their interests and responsibilities over the interventions, and the likely developments and changes (impacts) they are to encounter as a result of its implementation. The analysis to be provided could be summarised using Table 58.

3.4. Evaluation/social impact analysis  
(8-10 pages)

The section should provide an extensive list of all identified actual outcomes and/or potential impacts, along with a detailed analysis of the key ones. Correspondingly, conclusions should be drawn regarding the model intervention and the proposed alternative scenario/s. The logic model(s) (including all variations for all assessed alternatives, as applicable), completed at the beginning of the

---

**Table 56. Problem analysis**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Problem identification and description</th>
<th>General goals</th>
<th>Specific Outcomes</th>
<th>Specific Outputs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 57. Context analysis**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Context analysis</th>
<th>Potentials/ Positives</th>
<th>Limitations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Institutional Settings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legislative Frameworks</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Community</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 58. Stakeholders**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stakeholders</th>
<th>Interests</th>
<th>Potential intervention impacts over them</th>
<th>Significance and level of influence of stakeholder over the intervention</th>
<th>Inclusion strategies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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process of conducting SIA, will need to be included in this section in order to illustrate and support the analysis and conclusions.

3.5. Recommendations and concluding remarks
(2-3 pages)

The section should include a list of key findings to justify recommendations with regard to the most appropriate intervention design. Conclusions should be drawn on the main questions of the evaluation and SIA: could the practice under consideration be transferred to different national environments and what are the preconditions for the practice to be replicated successfully in different national and/or local contexts.

ANNEX I. BUILDING A LOGIC MODEL

The logic model serves as a useful advance organiser when evaluators and others are designing evaluation studies and performance measurement systems. It helps them to focus on the important elements of the programme and identify what evaluation questions should be asked and why and what measures of performance are key. The logic model also helps evaluators frame evaluation reports so that findings from the evaluation and measurement can tell a performance “story” and results can be linked to programme elements and assumptions about them.

A programme can also be thought of as a hypothesis: if a programme is implemented as planned, then certain results are expected to follow. Logic modelling is a tool that can be used as an aid in understanding the underlying assumptions and creates strategies to test the hypothesis. The model presents a description of how the programme staff members or other stakeholders believe the programme works. If the evaluation finds that the programme is successful in achieving its aims but works differently in practice, the logic model may be revised.

A logic model is a plausible and sensible model of how a programme is expected to perform, and what sorts of problems it is expected to resolve. The typical elements of a logic model are resources, activities, outputs, short-term outcomes, intermediate outcomes, and long-term outcomes. Sometimes the programme beneficiaries are added as well as the relevant external contextual (antecedent and mediating) influences.

Simplified logic model

Resources: human and financial resources supporting the programme.

Activities: the action whereby programme outputs are produced.

Outputs: the products, goods, and services provided to the programme’s direct beneficiaries or programme participants (RASC).

Outcomes/Impacts: changes or benefits to RASC, refugee organisations, or other programme targets

3 This is based on Handbook of Practical Program Evaluation by Wholey et al., as well as on Developing a logic model: Teaching and training guide by Ellen Taylor-Powell and Ellen Henert (http://www.uwex.edu/ces/pdande/evaluation/pdf/lmguidemcomplete.pdf), with modifications for the purposes of the INTEGRACE project.
that are expected to result from RASC’s being exposed to activities and outputs. It is necessary to distinguish short-term outcomes/impacts, the benefits most closely associated with the action and outputs related to the best practice evaluated. Second are the intermediate outcomes (e.g. learning new skills), which are expected to result from the short-term outcomes (e.g participating in some form of training). Long-term outcomes could not have been manifested even until the RASC have become adults (e.g. this could be increased rates of enrolment at schools and universities, or employment in a region where a best practice has been implemented).

The best practice under consideration may have been influenced by external contextual factors, also affecting the success of the programme and logic model. These have to be taken into consideration and integrated into the logic model. Such external factors could be classified as antecedent (those the programme starts out with, such as socio-economic environment in the area concerned). Mediating factors are the influences that emerge as the programme unfolds, such as new policy developments or complementary programmes.

Although tools such as flowcharts, risk analysis, and systems analysis can be used to plan and describe programmes, logic models more comprehensively address the increasing requirements for both outcomes measurement and measurement of how the programme is being implemented to allow for improvement.

One of the benefits of the logic model is that unlike other more static methodologies, such as flow charts and risk/system analysis, they are more dynamic as they show the unfolding of the best practice through time. They facilitate improvement via outcomes measurement and measurement of how the programme is being implemented to allow for improvement.

The stages of building a logic model are:

1. Collecting relevant information
   - Interview people associated with the programme, starting with those closely associated with its design and implementation (Ministry/School officials) and then moving to others either affected by the programme (RASC, RASC parents) or having a stake in its results (Refugee Associations, NGOs, immigration experts and academics, etc);
   - For the purposes of SIA in Slovenia/Bulgaria, it may be best to start with the logic model developed for the WE best practice chosen; academics/experts may need to be approached first in order to verify the practicality of transferring the best practice in question in local conditions, and the best ways of modifying the logic model to fit local conditions.

2. Defining the problem the best practice has to/will solve and its context
   - Define the specific aspect of educational integration that the best practice addresses;
   - Determine whether the programme can be modified to address the contextual factors identified, as well as different contextual factors in CEE countries;
   - Identify possible synergies/partnerships with other programmes or organisations whose results affect the best practice outcomes.

3. Defining the elements of the model in a table
   - As you are categorising elements of the logic model, define the target audiences and expected effects of the programme for each;
   - Put the outcomes into a sequence;
   - Map both forward and backward to develop and check logic and assumptions;
   - Ask questions such as: How do [did] we make this happen? Why do [did] we do this? What follows from this? What is the causal relationship?
   - Check up, down, and across for associations with other programmes and partners.

4. Drawing the model
   - Start with simple forms of the diagram (as above, or see Fig. 1 here: http://www.uiweb.uidaho.
edu/extension/LogicModel.pdf), and then move
to more complex diagrams (See for instance the
multi-component logic model for a parent support
initiative on p. 77 here: http://www.uwex.edu/
ces/pdande/evaluation/pdf/lmguidecomplete.pdf).
However, avoid overly complicated diagrams
like the multi-dimensional planning model on
Fig. 2, p. 2 here: http://www.uiweb.uidaho.edu/
extension/LogicModel.pdf;
• Persevere – several drafts may be necessary
before a version is arrived at, which successfully
describes the key features of a programme;
• Limit the words in the diagram. Provide more
detail in separate tables, charts or the core
text;
• Show only the most critical relationships/arrow;
• Do not treat the logic model as an organisation
chart: make separate organisation charts if
needed.

5. Verifying the model with stakeholders
• Engage the appropriate stakeholders in the logic
model review process where possible. Use the
logic model diagram and the supporting table(s)
and text for the purpose;
• These logic model design questions can be
addressed in the final verification process:
• Is the model detailed enough to clarify the
elements and their interrelationships?
• Is the model complete: are all key elements
included?
• Do all elements fit logically?
• Have all key external contextual factors been
identified and described?
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