



EUROPEAN COMMISSION
JOINT RESEARCH CENTRE

Institute for Prospective Technological Studies
Information Society

Testing of the MIREIA eInclusion Intermediary Actors - Impact Assessment Framework (eI2-IAF)

E-skills and your future profession Poland

Final Report of Case Study Analysis

CONTRACT NUMBER: 153219-2012-A08-PL

This document has been prepared by ŁUKASZ OSTROWSKI from THE UNIT FOR SOCIAL INNOVATION AND RESEARCH “SHIPYARD” as part of Task 6 of the MIREIA project - Measuring the impact of eInclusion Actors (AA INFSO/H3/2011/2 - SMART 2011/007 conducted by the Information Society Unit of the Institute for Prospective Technological Studies (IPTS) of the European Commission's Joint Research Centre in collaboration with DG CONNECT. For more information about the MIREIA Project visit: <http://is.jrc.ec.europa.eu/pages/EAP/eInclusion/MIREIA.html>

Disclaimer: *The views expressed in this document are purely those of the author and may not in any circumstances be regarded as stating an official position of the European Commission.*

© European Union, JRC-IPTS, 2013

Table of Contents

0. Executive Summary	3
1. Introduction	5
1.1. IPTS research on ICT for Inclusion and the MIREIA Project.....	5
1.2. Objectives of the Study	6
1.3. Objectives of the Report	6
1.4. Structure of the Report	6
2. Overview of the context of the case study intervention	8
2.1. Socio-economic context of reference for the intervention.....	8
2.2. Policy context of reference for the intervention	8
2.3. Context of the intervention within the organizational settings	9
3. Description of the case study intervention	11
3.1. Justification	11
3.2. Objectives	11
3.3. Target population and beneficiaries	12
3.4. Activities	12
3.5. Expected results/impacts	14
4. Management and Evaluation of the intervention.....	15
4.1. Stakeholders and Governance.....	15
4.2. Modalities of management.....	16
4.3. Monitoring and evaluation	17
5. Methodological application of MIREIA eI2-IAF (Task 2).....	21
6. Gathering of relevant data and indicators (Task 3).....	24
7. Conclusion.....	30
7.1. Relevance and feasibility of the approach for data gathering.....	31
7.2. Availability of data and indicators.....	32
7.3. Lessons learned	33
7.4. Applicability in a full-large-scale case study experiment	33
8. ANNEX. Completed instruments for the first two levels of the model	34

0. Executive Summary

The “E-skills and your future profession” is a project by The Information Society Development Foundation (FRSI). The overall goal of the project is to increase opportunities of young people from rural areas on the job market. The project is supporting that goal by increasing young people awareness of various professions in modern economy and the role of ICT in modern professional life.

The Information Society Development Foundation (FRSI) is a non-governmental organization established by the Polish-American Freedom Foundation (PAFF) in 2008. The statutory goal of the FRSI is to support and promote the development of information society in Poland and abroad. The key activity implemented by FRSI Foundation is the Library Development Program to help Poland's public libraries provide access to computers, the Internet, and training. FRSI is based in Warsaw, Poland. The foundation's team consists of 17 persons. Its operating costs amounted to approximately 3,5 million EUR in 2012.

“E-skills and your future profession” was a short one year-long project not a long-term program. It started in May 2012 and was finished in April 2013. In the last month of the project (April 2013) the decision was made to start another edition of “E-skills ...” in 2013.

The intervention was funded with grant from Microsoft YouthSpark initiative (60%) and from Polish-American Freedom Foundation (40%). Total budget of the project amounted to 166.700\$. The project's team consisted of two persons: project manager and project assistant – both working part-time.

During the project FRSI recruited a number of young, active and charismatic professionals (e.g. architects, software specialists, graphic designers) coming from small towns, whose examples and success stories might inspire the youth, underlining the role of ICT. FRSI encouraged libraries, schools and other institutions from rural areas to organize a meeting with a professional for a local youth. FRSI supported the organizers by providing contact to professional and all the instructions and materials necessary to organize the event. FRSI provided educational materials for the participants too and organized a competition for the organizers and the youth at the end of the project. During the course of project 280 institutional organizers held 308 meetings attended by more than 10 000 participants.

Original monitoring and evaluation system applied to the intervention consisted of four tools:

- 1) Self-administered pen and paper questionnaire for youth participating in the meetings
- 2) Self-administered computer-assisted web interview for organizer (library, school, community center etc.) (quantitative)
- 3) Self-administered computer-assisted web interview for young professional (quantitative)
- 4) Sticky notes with participants' opinions and impressions (collected after the meeting).

All the outcome indicators were defined on a basis of the surveys mentioned above. All the collected data have been analyzed and the evaluation report have been prepared by the “Shipyard” Foundation in June 2013.

For adjustment of MIREIA eI2-IAF to the intervention a workshop was held to discuss the MIREIA approach and options for the methodology implementation with FRSI, IPTS, Tech4i2 and Shipyard. The workshop was held 28th February in the FRSI office in Warsaw. After the workshop the additional methodology for testing MIREIA eI2-IAF was discussed and agreed upon.

The additional tools designed for testing MIREIA eI2-IAF included:

1. (Q1) Follow-up survey for the meeting participants that took part in the meetings before the April 5th (Previous Cohorts).
2. (Q3) Three measurement points survey for the remaining meetings participants (Current Cohorts - three separate surveys).
 - a. Pre-survey with youth participating in the remaining meetings.
 - b. Post-survey with youth participating in the remaining meetings.
 - c. Follow-up survey for youth participating in the remaining meetings.
3. (Q2) Survey for the control group of non-participants in locations of the remaining meetings (Counterfactual Cohorts).

The data was being collected using the original evaluation design till April 5th. After that date the research design and tools were switched to the scheme proposed by Tech4i2 for testing MIREIA eI2-IAF. The data was successfully collected in Q2 and Q3 surveys with the response rate at 31-40%. The response rate in Q1 survey was very low.

The activities of the MIREIA project in the Polish case were focused on conducting the survey to receive participants' feedback and test the randomised control trial (RCT) or Matching (Counterfactual) approach. However other MIREIA instruments were discussed too.

The testing procedure revealed that from the intermediary perspective it is not clear which instruments are designed to be self-administered and should be useful for the intermediary and which are part of the MIREIA research project and are aimed at collecting the information about the intermediaries for JRC-IPTS. These two perspectives are sometimes contradictory (e.g. instrument designed for providing the information about the project and intermediary is crucial for the JRC-IPTS but not for the intermediary).

Regarding the further development of the MIREIA Impact Assessment model the authors could focus more on "user experience" of the model and instruments. If MIREIA eI2-IAF is to become self-usable tool for intermediaries then more user-friendly, accessible and easy to follow approach is recommended.

1. Introduction

1.1. IPTS research on ICT for Inclusion and the MIREIA Project

The 'Socio-economic Analysis of ICT for Learning and Inclusion Action' (ICTLI) of the Information Society Unit at the European Commission's JRC-IPTS is conducting research in the area of ICT for socioeconomic inclusion with the main goal of providing evidence based analysis to support EU policy design, implementation and evaluation, focusing on the interplay between ICT, social inclusion and empowerment of groups at risks of exclusion.

As part of its research strategy and among its key activities the ICTLI Action is conducting research with the specific objective of **Measuring the impacts of ICT for socio-economic inclusion**, including the structuring of the policy landscape and the characterization of the various actors active on it, as well as the development of a conceptual and methodological framework and implementation strategy to gather data and assess impacts of specific ICT-enabled services in support of groups at risk of exclusion and to promote social inclusion, integration and employability. A particular interest in this regard concerns the role of e-Inclusion Intermediaries (due to their multiplier effects) in promoting socio-economic inclusion at various levels (e.g. regional, local, community, thematic, etc.).

Therefore, as part of the Administrative Arrangement (AA) for 2012-2013 with DG CONNECT a **study on Measuring the impact of e-Inclusion Actors on Digital Literacy, Skills and Inclusion goals of the Digital Agenda for Europe (hereinafter referred to as MIREIA)** has been agreed.

According to the research design of the MIREIA project, the JRC-IPTS is developing a **conceptual and methodological framework to assess the socio-economic impacts of eInclusion Intermediary actors in Europe (in short MIREIA eI2-IAF)**. This framework will include both a theoretical model and operational guidelines for evaluation of practices, as well as attempting to link these to policy goals and the way these are measured in terms of socio-economic impact at European level.

To achieve this objective, and following discussion with experts and practitioners in order to reach consensus on a pragmatic yet scientifically sound methodological framework and a concrete set of indicators to monitor and assess real case interventions (MIREIA Experts' Workshop, Seville, 6th September 2012), the MIREIA eI2-IAF will be further applied to a set of specific interventions in order to refine the methodology and test its validity, as part of *Task 6 – Test of the Impact Assessment Framework* of the MIREIA project which will run in the period January – July 2013.

In this perspective, within the framework of MIREIA, *testing* the impact assessment framework means *conducting analysis to test the conceptual and methodological framework underpinning the MIREIA eI2-IAF while supporting the implementation of case studies, allowing to make corrective changes with regard to the procedures for data gathering, suggesting adjustments to the overall MIREIA eI2-IAF and developing more specific and appropriate tools, instruments and guidelines that could help generalise the application of the MIREIA eI2-IAF in other contexts and thus support eInclusion intermediary actors across Europe to set up and conduct their own impacts assessment*.

For this purpose, a limited number (4) of interventions have been identified as suitable cases for testing the methodology. This report presents the analysis of the case of “E-skills and your future profession” as part of the contract between JRC-IPTS and THE UNIT FOR SOCIAL INOVATION AND RESEARCH “SHIPYARD”.

1.2. Objectives of the Study

The general objective of the contract consists of providing specialist services in gathering and analyse data in support to the "testing" of the MIREIA eInclusion Intermediary Actors - Impact Assessment Framework (eI2-IAF) in a selected 'case study intervention'.

The specific objectives of the contract are the following:

- To collect contextual information and gather relevant data and indicators according to the existing monitoring systems and evaluation procedures available at the level of the organisation(s) involved in the case study intervention and put them at disposal of the organisation that will be awarded the complementary contract for testing the MIREIA eI2-IAF for conducting the evaluation of the case study;
- To facilitate the activities conducted as part of the methodological support to test the MIREIA eI2-IAF in order to assess the case study intervention, while at the same time contributing to "contextualizing" the instruments for data gathering and monitoring defined, adapting as much as possible to the local context of the case study intervention so to be possibly compliant with the MIREIA eI2-IAF;
- To provide an analysis of the case study experience addressing methodological considerations (including limitations encountered and possible way to overcome them) with specific regard to the approach followed, the data collection and the appropriateness of the methodological framework of the MIREIA-eI2-IAF.

1.3. Objectives of the Report

The objective of this report is to present an analysis of the case study experience. This report provide a summary of the activities conducted and address, in particular, methodological considerations (including limitations encountered and possible way to overcome them) with specific regard to the approach followed, the data collection and the appropriateness of the methodological framework of the MIREIA-eI2-IAF. It also includes indications on the feasibility and relevance of the proposed methodology and how to revise and improve the MIREIA eI2-IAF and some suggestions on how to possibly improve upon the small-scale case study results in order to design a full-large-scale case study experiment in similar intervention contexts.

The drafting of this report have taken into consideration inputs from stakeholders' consultation organised alongside the case study.

This report will serve as an input for the Final Report of the testing phase of the MIREIA-eI2-IAF conducted in parallel by the contractor of the complementary study and under the direct supervision and active participation of the JRC-IPTS.

1.4. Structure of the Report

Chapter 2 describes the overall context of the intervention: the situation of young people in Poland regarding unemployment and finding a first job, the national policy for the employment support, the FRSI (organization leading the project), the donors and other projects led by FRSI. Chapter 3 gives a description of a goal and objectives of "E-skills..." project, defines target population and beneficiaries, describes undertaken activities and expected results and impacts. Chapter 4 describes the stakeholders involved, the management and tools planned and implemented for monitoring and evaluation.

Chapter 5 gives the general description of the actions undertaken while testing MIREIA eI2-IAF in polish case.

Chapter 6 describes the research activities in more detail, report on the structure of indicators and discuss the experience with Impact Assessment model, randomized control trial (RCT) and Matching (Counterfactual) approach and Performance Assessment Model.

Chapter 7 offers discussion of the relevance and feasibility of the approach, availability of the required data and assess the process and the results from the intermediary perspective.

2. Overview of the context of the case study intervention

2.1. Socio-economic context of reference for the intervention

As of December 2011 the unemployment rate in Poland amounted to 9,9%. However, among people at the youngest age group (up to 24 years old) it amounted to 27,7% (not counting those who are studying). High unemployment among youth is due to entering the labor market for the first time by young people after completing their education. School leavers is the group with very high risk of unemployment.

The reasons are manifold. In some cases it might be lack of proper education. Public statistics data show that tertiary and vocational education guarantees better situation of the youth on the labour market, especially completion of tertiary education significantly reduces the risk of unemployment (“Entry of young people into the labour market in Poland in 2009”, Central Statistical Office 2010). In other cases problem comes as a result of lack of professional experience. Two thirds of young people complete education with no professional experience at all while data show that occupational experience gained during education facilitates finding the first job in much extent. Another reason is a structural inadequacy between supply and demand for labor. Young people often choose schools or faculties which are not in demand from the employers’ perspective. In particular it is the case of technical, engineering and natural science faculties. The result is that almost 40% of young people did not work in their acquired profession while in a first job. Most of them because they couldn’t find a job related to their profession.

The problem of selecting the right track of the future professional development is especially critical in rural areas, where young people have limited concepts and possibilities of available career tracks compared to those living in large cities. Therefore it is necessary to broaden the scope of ideas that young people from rural areas have facing the job market in order to increase their future opportunities. In this context the role of ICT is particularly important. This aspect of professional life is not visible enough in school curricula, both in terms of searching for a job as well as an important tool in any profession.

2.2. Policy context of reference for the intervention

Regarding the goals of the intervention the most relevant national policy is the “National Plan for the Employment Support 2012-2014” (KPDZ/2012-2014 Krajowy Plan Działań na rzecz Zatrudnienia) accepted in August 2012 .

The policy includes three tasks which are to some extent related to project implemented by FRIS. Although it should be noticed that FRIS acts as an independent organization and national policy have little effect over the course of project.

Task 1.4 KPDZ. Preparing an online system for educational and occupational information

Goal: to provide pupils, parents, teachers and job advisors with easy access to valid educational and occupational information

Activities: the online platform is still under construction. According to assumptions it will aggregate information about demand for labor, labor demand forecasts, opportunities for education and training, tools for self-assessment, work materials for job advisors etc.

Task 2.5. KPDZ. Counteracting social exclusion of youth and supporting young people on a job market.

Goal: To increase opportunities of the youth threatened by social exclusion and unemployment for starting independent life as an adult and employee.

Activities: The task is performed by the Voluntary Labour Corps (Ochotnicze Hufce Pracy) - a state organization established to create adequate conditions for proper social and vocational development of young people, including special actions that are addressed to disfavoured groups. VLC activities include: organizing vocational competitions, trainings, camps, serving as employment agency and job counselling agency.

Task 4.8 KPDZ. Developing a new model of service for young unemployed.

Goal: research for standard of service for unemployed under 30 years old and testing innovative solutions for improving youth activity, independence and mobility.

Activities: The pilot project have not been started yet.

Moreover supporting educational and vocational choices of young people is an obligatory task for lower and upper secondary schools. Schools are supposed to offer job counselling to the youth. Each school should have a dedicated job counsellor or a chosen teacher should be entrusted with this responsibility.

In practice the educational and vocational counselling in schools is very underdeveloped. The support for youth is accidental, not coordinated and depend on the local school's willingness and capability. Most of schools do not have internal plans for job counselling, do not hire a professional job counsellor, do not have any educational or informational publications or reports on labour market. Very few students benefit from such a service.

2.3. Context of the intervention within the organizational settings

The Information Society Development Foundation (FRSI) was established by the Polish-American Freedom Foundation (PAFF) on March 13, 2008. The statutory goal of the FRSI is to support and promote the development of information society in Poland and abroad, in particular:

- i. to improve citizens, institutions and organizations access to the Internet, as well as to Internet-based information and communication technologies;
- ii. to popularize knowledge of the benefits information and communication technologies bring to citizens life - to their personal and professional development, and to their business activities, as well as to the functioning of institutions, organizations and other entities;
- iii. to initiate, stimulate and support cooperation between entities from different sectors in order to create conditions conducive to information society development and popularizing the knowledge of the benefits brought about by the use of modern information and communication tools and technologies.

FRSI is based in Warsaw, Poland. Total expenditure of FRSI in 2012 amounted to 14.788.018 PLN. (approximately 3,5 million EUR, annual report for 2012). The foundation employs 17 persons.

They key activity implemented by FRSI Foundation is the Library Development Program to help Poland's public libraries provide access to computers, the Internet, and training. The Library Development Program in Poland is a result of the partnership between the Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation and the Polish-American Freedom Foundation. The Program's goal is to equalize opportunities of the underserved living in rural areas enabling them to participate fully in the economy, education, culture, social relationships and community life by revitalizing local libraries; this will improve peoples' lives, increase quality of human/social capital, local development and modernization of Poland. Since 2009 the Program has been providing support for more than 3,300 local public libraries from more than 1,100 small towns and villages, transforming the libraries to modern, multi-functional information, cultural and education centres stimulating civic involvement. The Program includes: library staff training and educational activities (more than 3,000 participants so far), hardware and software delivery for libraries (more

than 2,700 PCs, more than 6,500 pieces of other hardware, e.g. laptops, multifunctional devices, projectors, cameras), small grants (for more than 150 libraries so far), capacity building of the library system (training, grants etc. for the National Library, provincial public libraries, Polish Librarians' Association) as well as various advocacy and outreach activities (including the portal www.biblioteki.org run by the FRSI or the annual convening for more than 500 librarians). The libraries participating in the Program were visited by 2,670,000 library users, and almost 700,000 used the computers in these libraries. Major Program partners are: Microsoft Corp. donating software (via TechSoup), Telekomunikacja Polska S.A. (largest telecom operator in Poland) providing free Internet connection to all public libraries for three years, the Ministry of Culture and National Heritage that initiated the "Library+" venture, implemented by the Book Institute, providing e.g. grants for the renovation of libraries as well as training for librarians. The Library Development Program implementation period is since April 2009 until March 2015. The total grant amount is 33 million dollars.

In June 2012, the Library Development Program and the FRSI received the e-Inclusion Award "Be Part of IT" under the competition organized by the European Commission.

The FRSI is a member of the "M@turity in the Net" coalition for seniors' e-inclusion, the platform for cooperation gathering NGOs, public institutions and business companies (e.g. Microsoft, UPC Poland, IBM). The FRSI was the main organizer of a contest "M@turity in the Net. Good Practice", aimed at promoting the best examples of activities for the digital education of people at the age of 50+. 115 applications from all over Poland were sent. The best practices examples are being promoted, showing how to effectively use new technologies for the development of one's own passions, better communication and active participation in social life.

Examples of activities that are particularly relevant for "E-skills and your future profession" project:

- a) In a "Work it out in library" project librarians receive professional training and tools to help members of local community who are unemployed or look for a better work opportunities. They learn how to assess abilities, where to find an employee profile, how to use online tool for employability self-assessment. Afterwards they plan library activities in area of work support, attract respective partners among local labour institutions, and with a small grant and hardware donation try to put new skills and knowledge into practice.
- b) As one of the components of Library Development Program FRSI in cooperation with Foundation for Socio-Economic Initiatives implement a project "New job. Enter". In a project 30 libraries are prepared to serve as local work support centres for unemployed or for people planning their professional life. Librarians receive 4 days of training in job counselling, learn how to use practical online guide to professions, skills and institutions offering work support. Next step is participating in two-day workshop dedicated to working out local strategies for libraries. Some of the strategies are supported with a small donation and help from advisor.
- c) Europe-wide "Get Online Week" 2011, which was coordinated in Poland by the FRSI, following an invitation from the Telecenter-Europe. The goal of the campaign was to reach as many e-excluded people as possible and bring them online via various telecentres, including libraries. The action's main activities were held from Feb 28th until March 5th, 2011, when libraries organized meetings for digitally excluded seniors according to three scenarios prepared by FRSI: „Virtual wish concert", "Health Clinic" and "Talk - priceless". Events throughout Poland were attended by over 6,000 people. Also, a competition for the best stories describing events in libraries was organized with

over 100 prizes, founded by Microsoft, UPC Poland and FRIS. More than 350 libraries sent their applications for the competition.

- d) "The Library-the Place of a Safe Internet" is the six-month campaign initiated in Nov 2011 by the Nobody's Children Foundation, the FRIS and Microsoft. The campaign is aimed at involving public libraries across Poland in educational activities for safe Internet use by young library users. Within the campaign all the public libraries have been given access to an e-learning platform with e-learning courses on the safe Internet use. About 350 libraries took part in the campaign.

At the time of the MIREIA project, apart from „Library Development Program”, FRIS leads 6 other projects:

- a) "E-skills and your future profession"
- b) Europe-wide "Get Online Week" 2011
- c) "About personal finance... in library" – training courses for seniors.
- d) "Work it out in library" - professional training for librarians
- e) "America in your library" – books in English and online access to journals and articles for 8 local libraries
- f) "New technologies locally" – program for grassroot NGOs offering training and small grants.

All these projects are independent in terms of management and budget. What is common for all of these interventions (with exception of "New technologies locally" program) are the libraries whether as a direct beneficiaries ("library development program", "work it out in library", "America in your library") or as a partners for cooperation ("E-skills...", "Get Online Week", "About personal finance... in library").

"E-skills and your future profession" is the name of the project used in grant application and internal documentation. For wider public the name "Link to the Future. Youth. Internet. Career" is used.

3. Description of the case study intervention

3.1. Justification

The direct justification for the project came out of research conducted by FRIS on libraries and library users in 2010 and 2011. The research revealed that more and more often unemployed search for a job through public internet access points located in libraries. It is estimated that around 80 thousand people have been searching for a job in libraries participating in Library Development Program and that 26 thousand people already found the job that way. Library users take advantage of free access point to browse job advertisements, prepare CV, send application etc.

However the research also revealed that libraries have no job-related offer at all. Among 460 libraries investigated during the first edition of the program only 2 performed some activities addressing problems of unemployment or professional development.

Moreover it was found that over 35% of library users are youth under 24 years old.

The idea of the project was to take advantage of the opportunity created by Microsoft YouthSpark initiative to close a gap between a demand for job-related support and an offer proposed by libraries.

3.2. Objectives

The overall goal of the project was to increase opportunities of young people from rural areas on the job market. More specific and short-term objectives, presumably leading to overall goal, were:

- increasing young people's awareness of various professions
- increasing young people's awareness of the role of ICT in modern professional life
- bringing attention of young people to the role of ICT in professional development (in terms of searching for a job as well as an important tool in any profession)
- broadening the scope of ideas that young people from rural areas have facing the job market
- supporting young people from rural areas in planning their professional career in developing information society and knowledge-based economy
- inspiring youth from villages and small cities to think creatively about their professional future - to reach out beyond the pattern set by their environment

Depending on context project objectives were stated using different wording. The list above is composed of objectives described in grant application, press release, progress reports and website.

3.3. Target population and beneficiaries

End-users were defined as young people from villages and small cities (up to 20 000 inhabitants) considering their career path. In particular pupils attending upper secondary school (liceum) or last grades of lower secondary school (gimnazjum) were preferred. It means that end-users were children and young adults aged 15-19. It was assumed that up to 14 000 young people would benefit from the project in various ways: 6000 participants of meetings with professionals provided by FRIS, 2000 participants of meetings with local professionals (suggested by local youth), 6000 youth participating in events, advisory services, courses etc. based on reusing project's educational resources but organized by other parties (in 3-years time).

During the course of project the target population was broadened and cities up to 200 000 were allowed. The change was made after finding out that large number of pupils coming from villages attend secondary school in cities above 20 000 inhabitants.

The stakeholders involved in organizing events for young people may be considered the intermediate beneficiaries. For local libraries it is a part of wider support provided by FRIS and an opportunity for broadening their offer.

3.4. Activities

The following eight activities were planned to be implemented by FRIS and its partners:

(1) preparing a set of **promotional and educational materials** of importance to ICT in professional life targeted at young people (e.g. multimedia presentations, movies, games, online interviews) and addressing it to the youth mainly via the Internet (social portals) and the network of public libraries from rural areas (approx. 6,600 units all over Poland).

(2) **identifying a number of young, active and charismatic professionals** (e.g. architects, lawyers, doctors, software specialists, graphic designers) from small towns, whose examples and success stories may inspire the youth, underlining the role of ICT.

(3) organizing **webinars and chats with the young professionals** and transmitting them on-line, available also in the libraries.

(4) the **meetings with young professionals** for youth in local libraries were to be organized based on ready-to-use scenarios of meetings prepared by FRIS. The scenarios were to be promoted among public libraries in rural areas.

(5) organizing **competitions for young people** by local libraries. The task was to identify a person in their local community whose profession could be inspiring for young people.

(6) organizing another **local meetings** in libraries **following the contests for youth**.

(7) organizing a **national competition** for libraries and their young users **for the best multimedia report from local meetings**.

(8) organizing **the summing-up event in Warsaw** for the most active librarians and young people participating in the project (preferably in collaboration with the Microsoft Poland).

The project is promoted through the Internet – websites and social portals (www.linkdoprzyszlosci.pl; <http://www.youtube.com/user/linkdoprzyszlosci?feature=watch>; <http://www.facebook.com/pages/Link-do-przyszlosci/145270555613946?fref=ts>) including library portal and communication tools used by FRIS within the Library Development Program (www.biblioteki.org; newsletter subscribed by more than 4 500 subscribers), through libraries' network, through the FRIS's institutional partners' (e.g. provincial libraries as well as NGOs, especially those collaborating with schools) communication tools; through local media (newspapers, local news Internet portals etc.), through youth educational magazines. FRIS developed a polish version of Skillage – a tool for assessing the ICT for employability skills of young people. Skillage was originally designed and implemented by Telecentre Europe and funded by Microsoft Corporation.

Over the course of preparatory work near 30 young professionals coming from villages and small towns were found and signed up for cooperation. Invited professionals included for instance: music journalist, telecommunication specialist, online magazine editor, teacher, mobile application developer, e-learning platform manager, online marketing specialist, project manager and many others.

The idea of webinars with professionals was suspended due to technical problems. It was found that technical requirements to organize webinar are too stringent for most libraries to fulfil. The bandwidth capacity in most of libraries usually is too low.

The most important part of project were the meetings with young professionals. The meetings most often were being organized by local libraries but other institutions were also allowed such as schools, Voluntary Labour Corps, community centres and other cultural and educational organizations. Very often that local library initiated and coordinated the event but it was school who provided the venue and facilitated recruitment.

Institutions interested in organizing the event applied through online form. The organizer had to provide a contact details and choose a preferred professional. The invited professional should have contact organizer within 5 workdays to make an appointment for a meeting.

The organizer was provided with a set of resources including: detailed workshop outline, materials for workshop participants (list of 'future professions', list of proposed questions to professional, leaflet about resources available online), promotional items (posters and invitations), self-administered survey questionnaire for participants, information about competition for the organizers and contest for participants, regulations and forms for the competitions. All the resources were downloadable from the project website. FRIS covered all the costs of inviting a professional.

The organizer were supposed to choose a professional, send an application for a project using online form, set a date and place for a meeting, engage volunteers, promote a meeting and invite

participants, prepare and lead a meeting according to the workshop outline, fulfil the online evaluation questionnaire and send some pictures and short description of the event.

The young professional invited to the meeting was supposed to tell a story about himself/herself and his/her work highlighting the role of ICT in his daily routine.

The meetings were organized according to the detailed nine-page workshop outline describing 7 tasks:

1. Invitation and information about the meeting
2. Energizer (participants pick one of 'future professions' at random, explain it and justify why they are able to become one)
3. Young professional – his/her day at work
4. Young professional – questions and answers
5. Quiz about current state and trends on a labour market
6. Exercise – “What inspired me most?” (participants answer the questions on sticky notes)
7. Competition announcement, self-administered questionnaire and leaflet for participants

Moreover the workshop outline gave instructions how to arrange the space for the meeting, what kind of hardware is required, how to engage partners and volunteers, how to promote the event and its results. The meeting was designed to last for 1,5 hour. 15 to 30 participants was recommended.

The meeting was followed up by the competition for organizers and participants. Organizers might send a narrative description of the meeting. The best descriptions were awarded an xBox, TV set or e-readers. Participants were encouraged to organize similar meeting on their own – to find a local professional, prepare a meeting in cooperation with library, school or community centre and send a narrative description to FRSI. The best descriptions sent by youth were awarded with an excursion to Copernicus Science Center in Warsaw for all the participants and some small IT-related gift for the youth organizer.

The project started in May 2012 and was finished in April 2013. In September 2012 two test meetings were held in order to develop the workshop outline. The promotion started in October 2013. The meeting organizers might apply for the project from 15th October 2012 to 15th March 2013. The meetings organized by youth could be held up to 15th April 2013. The competition for institutions was open up to 29th March 2013. The competition for youth was open till 15th April 2013.

During the course of project 280 institutional organizers held 308 meetings attended by more than 10 000 participants. Only a couple meetings were organized by youth.

3.5. Expected results/impacts

The project's outputs were:

- Set of educational materials
- Tools for promotion (website, facebook page)
- Group of young professionals contracted for meetings in local communities
- Meeting offer for libraries, schools, community centres etc.
- Resources for organizers of meetings
- Competition for institutional organizers
- Competition for youth organizers

The short-term outcomes of the project were:

- Meetings with young professionals organized by libraries, schools etc. (FRSI provided all the necessary components but actual result depended on libraries willingness to

cooperate). The indicator for that outcome are the number of meetings and the number of individuals trained. Targets were set on 300 meetings and 6000 participants. Final numbers were 308 meetings and around 10 000 participants. The satisfaction of trainees is important to achieve longer-term impact so it was considered a key additional dimension of the outcome. Satisfaction indicators were based on self-administered survey of participants.

- Meetings with local young professionals organized by youth (FRSI provided all the necessary components but actual result depended on young people willingness to organize such events). The outcome indicator was a number of meetings and participants. The target was set on 100 meetings and 2000 participants. Finally just a couple of meetings have been organized by the youth.
- Young people make use of educational and informational materials prepared, collected and available on project website. The indicators and targets for that outcome were not determined.
- Institutional organizers inspired by the project adapt and reuse its tools and resources to organize more events, provide advisory services, promote educational materials. Indicator for that outcomes was defined as number of people benefiting from project's resources in 3-years time. Target was set on 6000 people benefiting in 3-years time.

Expected long-term outcomes (or intermediate impacts, depending on definition) of the project were:

- Participants' awareness of the various professions and the role of ICT in modern professional life increases
- Participants' awareness on the job market increases and the scope of their possible professional career paths broadens
- Participants' awareness about the role of ICT in various professions increases.
- Participants learn how they can take advantage of the IT skills they have already acquired
- Participants discover new e-skills that are needed in various professions and learn where to gain new e-skills
- Participants learn how to choose a proper path of education to achieve their professional goals or fulfil their aspirations

All indicators for these outcomes were based on the self-administered survey for young people participating in meetings. The questionnaire consisted of small set of mostly close-ended questions. Questionnaires were being collected by librarians and then included in the short on-line report submitted by librarians to FRSI.

Expected impact of the project was stated in very general terms. In a long run the project was designed to increase opportunities of young people from rural area on the labour market. There was no written theory of change explaining how outcomes of the project contribute to that impact and no impact studies have been planned during the course of the project.

4. Management and Evaluation of the intervention

4.1. Stakeholders and Governance

Key stakeholders of the project were:

- FRSI
- Microsoft Poland
- Polish-American Freedom Foundation

- Organizers of the meetings - local libraries / local schools / other cultural and educational organizations
- Young professionals

The role of local libraries and young professionals have been already briefly described in previous sections. They did not participate in taking strategic decisions. However their remarks and opinions are taken into account while designing the second edition of the project. Online surveys described earlier were the primary tools for organizers and professionals to express their views. Project manager had a bit more direct relations with young professionals for logistic reasons (contracts, payments etc.).

“E-skills and your future profession” was designed as a short, one year-long project not a long-term program planned and lasting for years. Keeping that in mind it comes with no surprise that most of the major strategic decisions about the form of intervention was taken while preparing the grant application. FRSI had already been implementing other projects aimed at convincing libraries to support professional development and getting people out of unemployment by the means of ICT. The Microsoft Poland offer to start cooperation within the YouthSpark initiative came as good opportunity for another project in that area. It was easy to find common ground in particular because the YouthSpark assumptions are rather general. The main idea of the project was discussed and agreed at the meeting including Microsoft and FRSI. The details was described in a grant application prepared by FRSI and accepted by Microsoft. Some of the issues regarding implementation of the program have been consulted with Microsoft but as a general rule project manager was independent in his decisions and only held responsible for the results. In major decisions project manager had to consult with president of FRSI too.

At the stage of preparing grant application the main assumptions of the project and general idea for its implementation had to be consulted and approved by Polish-American Freedom Foundation. PAFF is a founder of FRSI and supports its mission financially on a regular basis. The rules for YouthSpark grants require that Microsoft donation amounts to at most 60% of total project’s worth. PAFF has been providing the financial contribution as well as a general supervision of the project (not participating in the management of the venture).

In the last month of the project (April 2013) the decision was made to start another edition of “E-skills ...” in 2013. The project will be funded again by Microsoft Foundation and Polish-American Freedom Foundation. The second edition will end in August 2014.

4.2. Modalities of management

The intervention (first edition of the project) was funded with grant from Microsoft YouthSpark initiative (60%) and from Polish-American Freedom Foundation (40%). Total budget of the project amounted to 166.700\$. The donation was transferred in one payment.

YouthSpark program is an initiative designed to create opportunities for youth (16-24) around the world. Through partnerships with governments, non-profits and businesses Microsoft aim to empower youth to realize their potential by connecting them with greater education, employment, and entrepreneurship opportunities.

Microsoft partners for YouthSpark initiative are chosen among trusted organizations with successful track record of cooperation. Since its founding FRSI partnered Microsoft. One of components of Library Development Program are Microsoft software donations for libraries administered by TechSoup. Moreover FRSI organized a few small ventures in collaboration with Microsoft Poland CSR department such as “Get Online Week” or “Safe Internet in Library”.

The project’s team consisted of two persons: project manager and project assistant – both working part-time. However they were often supported by members of FRSI team. For example preparing press releases, promotional materials, workshop outlines and recruitment of young professionals were strongly supported by other FRSI employees.

All kinds of cultural and educational institutions from villages and towns up to 200 000 inhabitants might apply for the project. No other selection criteria were implemented. All applicants were accepted.

The meeting organizers did not get any financial gratification or donation. They were offered with online resources for preparing a meeting and an access to young professionals. FRSI covered a cost of professionals’ salaries, travel costs and other costs related to their visits – the total cost of one meeting was equal for all the meetings, amounted to 500 PLN (approx. 110 EUR) and covered all the costs.

4.3. Monitoring and evaluation

Monitoring and evaluation system originally applied to the intervention consisted of four tools:

- 1) Self-administered pen and paper questionnaire for youth participating in the meetings
- 2) Self-administered computer-assisted web interview for institutional organizer (library, school, community centre etc.) (quantitative)
- 3) Self-administered computer-assisted web interview for young professional (quantitative)
- 4) Sticky notes with participants’ opinions and impressions.

Tool 1. Self-administered pen and paper questionnaire for youth participating in the meetings

The questionnaire was distributed to youth at the end of the meeting. It was one-page form and consisted of 7 questions – 5 close-ended and 2 open ended. The questions related to participants satisfaction after the meeting and the perceived impact of the meeting on knowledge and skills useful for planning their career path.

Respondents were also asked to leave their e-mail address for sending more information and educational materials. However their answers remained anonymous.

The questions regarding knowledge and skills were designed to track project impact as far as possible. A need for measuring impact is recognized by FRSI. It was also an expectation of Microsoft to track impact in terms of realizing the opportunity and achieving goals such as “continuing education”, “obtaining a job”, “starting a social venture”, “starting an entrepreneurial venture”. These are main YouthSpark impact indicator which FRSI would like to estimate. Nonetheless it seems that indicators included in the questionnaire were able to grasp only a first step towards these long-term goals.

Number	Question	Answers
Q1	How do you evaluate the meeting, in general?	Good / Bad
Q2	What was the biggest advantage? What was the biggest drawback?	Open-ended
Q3	How do you evaluate these components of the meeting?	Good / Bad

	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Energizer 2. Quiz about current state and trends on a labor market 3. Young professional – presentation 4. Young professional – questions and discussion 5. Items for participants 6. Competition for participants 	
Q4	<p>After the meeting, do you know more about...?</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. various professions, one can practice 2. what one can learn and study in order to find interesting job 3. how one can choose a job, find a job or start up own business 4. what is the role of ICT in a professional job 	Yes / No
Q5	Would you like to meet other professional in the future? What profession?	Open-ended
Q6	How old are you?	<16 / 16-19 / 20-24 / >24
Q7	What kind of school do you attend?	Primary / lower secondary / vocational / technical / upper secondary / upper vocational / upper education / I am working / I am looking for a work

After the meeting the organizer collected questionnaires, counted answers and sent them back to FRIS using online form which was a part of self-administered web interview for institutional organizer (tool 2). It is important to notice that answers sent back were in aggregated form, not in a form of a database.

Finally 220 (out of 308) groups sent back their answers.

Tool 2. Self-administered computer-assisted web interview for institutional organizer (library, school, community centre etc.)

The survey was hosted on FRIS’s online survey platform. The organizer was asked to answer the survey shortly after the meeting. Link to the survey could be found in a workshop outline and sent by an e-mail.

The questionnaire was divided into three sections: “meeting details” (7 questions), “aggregated answers collected from youth” (9 questions) and “assessment of the meeting and its results” (7 questions). The survey was not anonymous.

Number	Question	Answers
--------	----------	---------

Meeting details		
Q1	Organizer	Open-ended
Q2	Locality	Open-ended
Q3	Date	Open-ended
Q4	Name and surname of professional	Open-ended
Q5	How many persons participated in the meeting?	Open-ended
Q6	How many persons were interested but did not come?	Open-ended
Q7	What other institutions helped to organize the meeting?	Open-ended
Aggregated answers collected from youth		
Assessment of the meeting and its results		
Q17	How do you evaluate the project, in general?	Very Good / Good / Bad / Very bad
Q18	Does the project answer to important needs in your local community?	Yes / rather yes / Rather not / Not at all
Q19	What was the advantages of the project? What was the drawbacks?	Open-ended
Q20	How do you evaluate these components of the project ...? 1. Workshop outline 2. Young professional 3. Quiz about current state and trends on a labour market 4. Website 5. Support from FRSI	Very Good / Good / Bad / Very bad
Q21	Do you plan to organize events like this one in the future?	Yes / rather yes / Rather not / Not at all
Q22	What was the main problems in organizing the event? What could have been done to avoid them?	Open-ended
Q23	Other remarks	Open-ended

Questions about “meeting details” were answered by 220 organizers and about “Assessment of the meeting and its results” by 142 organizers.

Tool 3. Self-administered computer-assisted web interview for young professionals

The survey was hosted on FRSI’s online survey platform as well. The professionals were asked to answer the survey shortly after the meeting. It was an obligatory task necessary to receive payment. The questionnaire consisted of 12 questions. The survey was not anonymous.

Number	Question	Answers
Q1	Name and surname	Open-ended
Q2	Date	Open-ended
Q3	Name of the organizer	Open-ended
Q4	Place	Open-ended
Q5	How many meetings have you already attended?	Number
Q6	How many people did participate in the meeting?	Number
Q7	What are your impressions after the meeting? In terms of participants, purposefulness, the future perspectives of youth, social role of your profession etc.	Open-ended
Q8	Remarks about meeting organizer and FRSI. What can be improved while organizing another events?	Open-ended
Q9	Was it your last meeting during the project?	Yes / No
Q10	How do you evaluate the project, in general?	Very Good / Good / Bad / Very bad
Q11	General evaluation of the project: 1) Do you think that this project helps young people preparing for their professional life? 2) Was the project interesting for you? 3) Would you like to participate in such a project in a future?	Yes / rather yes / Rather not / Not at all
Q12	Other remarks	Open-ended

Tool 4. Sticky notes with participants’ opinions and impressions.

After the meeting participants were given coloured sticky notes and asked to finish the sentence: “What inspired me most was ...?”.

Organizer collected the notes, scanned them or took a picture of them and sent the picture files back to FRSI. Sticky notes were analysed and provided important insight into participants impressions and opinions. Quotations were also used for promotion.

Data analysis

All the collected data have been analysed and the evaluation report have been prepared by the “Shipyard” Foundation in June 2013.

5. Methodological application of MIREIA eI2-IAF (Task 2)

For adjustment of MIREIA eI2-IAF to the intervention a workshop was held to discuss the MIREIA approach and options for the methodology implementation with FRSI, IPTS, Tech4i2 and Shipyard.

The workshop was held 28th February in the FRSI office in Warsaw. Participants at the workshop were: Katarzyna Szkuta (T4i2), Cristina Torrecillas (IPTS), Rafał Kramza (President of FRSI), Mariusz Boguszewski (FRSI, project coordinator for E-skills and your future profession), Maciej Kochanowicz (FRSI evaluation specialist), Elżbieta Dydak (FRSI), Łukasz Ostrowski (Unit For Social Inovation And Research “Shipyard”).

During the workshop the IPTS presented the overall goals of the MIREIA study, FRSI presented the goals, justification, progress and applied evaluation scheme for the “E-skills and Your Future Profession” project and Tech4i2 presented an approach to the study and led a discussion about possible indicators for testing MIREIA eI2-IAF.

We discussed a general classification of program objectives proposed by Tech4i2 and tried to apply that framework to “E-skills...” objectives. FRSI chose the classes that were most relevant to the project.

Enhanced Wellbeing	Objective class relevant to “E-skills...” project
Improved Self-Confidence	X
Increased Social and Support Network	
Improved Quality of Life	
Increased Independence	X

Equality, Inclusion & Empowerment	Objective class relevant to “E-skills...” project
Improved participation in community decisions	
Reduced Isolation	
Increased feeling of being part of community	
Improved Accessibility of Services	
Improved opportunities and life chances	X
Enhanced access to Information	X

Education and skills	Objective class relevant to “E-skills...” project
Improved numeracy skills	
Improved literacy skills	
Improved ICT skills	
Participation in education activity	X (understood as supporting)

	the choice of job-related education
Use of eLearning	
Qualification(s) gained	

Employment and Economy	Objective class relevant to "E-skills..." project
Enhanced Information Advice and Guidance	X
Enhanced capability to search and apply for work	X
Obtain Work / get a job	

Moreover we agreed on conducting an additional survey with project beneficiaries and discussed briefly some of the survey questions operationalizing the project objectives.

After the workshop the additional methodology for testing MIREIA eI2-IAF was discussed and agreed upon.

The original "E-skills..." evaluation research design consisted of four tools:

1. Self-administered pen and paper questionnaire for youth participating in the meetings (on the spot, all the participants were asked to answer the survey)
2. Self-administered computer-assisted web interview for institutional organizer (library, school, community centre etc.) (quantitative, soon after the meeting, all the organizers were asked to answer the survey after every meeting)
3. Self-administered computer-assisted web interview for young professional (quantitative, soon after the meeting, all the professionals were asked to answer the survey after every meeting)
4. Sticky notes with participants' opinions and impressions (during the meeting, writing sticky notes were a part of the meeting scenario, all the organizers were asked to send the notes after the meeting).

The additional tools designed for testing MIREIA eI2-IAF included:

4. (Q1) Follow-up survey for the meeting participants that took part in the meetings before the April 5th (Previous Cohorts). Online questionnaire administered to the respondents by the FRSI two months after the meeting using e-mail addresses collected during the event.
5. (Q3) Three measurement points survey for the remaining meetings participants (Current Cohorts - three separate surveys). In the first week of April 2013 there were 58 remaining meetings planned in the period of 5-15th April. The survey was designed only for the youth participating in these meetings.
 - a. Short pre-survey with youth participating in the remaining meetings. Paper questionnaire administered to the respondents by the meeting organizer just before the event.
 - b. Post-survey with youth participating in the remaining meetings. Paper questionnaire administered to the respondents by the meeting organizer on the end of the event.

- c. Follow-up survey for youth participating in the remaining meetings. Online questionnaire administered to the respondents by the FRSI two months after the meeting using e-mail addresses collected during the event. The same questionnaire as in Q1 is used but for other group of participants.
6. (Q2) Survey for the control group of non-participants in locations of the remaining meetings (Counterfactual Cohorts). Paper questionnaire administered by the meeting organizer to the youth that did not participate in the meeting. The sample of youth is taken by means of convenience/opportunity sampling without randomising the sample.

6. Gathering of relevant data and indicators (Task 3)

Description of the activities

Relevant data and indicators was collected according to research designs introduced in a previous chapter. It is important to notice that data for evaluation of “E-skills..” project was collected using two separate research designs:

1. original evaluation research design prepared in the beginning of the project
2. new research design and tools proposed by Tech4i2 in consultation with IPTS for testing MIREIA eI2-IAF and consulted with FRSI

Regarding the original evaluation research design the following data have been collected.

Research tool	Data collected
Self-administered pen and paper questionnaire for youth participating in the meetings (on the spot)	5200 responses
Self-administered computer-assisted web interview for institutional organizer (library, school, community centre etc.) (quantitative, soon after the meeting)	220 responses
Self-administered computer-assisted web interview for young professional (quantitative, soon after the meeting)	307 responses submitted by 22 professionals
Sticky notes with participants’ opinions and impressions (during the meeting).	1117 sticky notes from 46 locations

Regarding the new research design and tools applied for testing MIREIA framework the following data have been collected.

Research tool	Data collected
Follow-up survey for the <u>meeting participants that took part in the meetings before the April 5th (Q1 Previous Cohorts).</u>	The data was being collected from May 10 th till May 17 th . The invitation was sent to all participants in the meetings (that took place before April 5 th) who gave their e-mail addresses. 856 invitations was sent. The survey have been administered by Tech4i2.
Short pre-survey with youth participating in the remaining meetings (Q3 Current Cohorts)	The data was being collected from April 5 th till April 15 th All 58 organizers of the remaining meeting planned for that period were asked to administer the survey to participants.

	790 responses from 23 meetings were collected.
Post-survey with youth participating in the remaining meetings (Q3 Current Cohorts)	The data was being collected from April 5 th till April 15 th All 58 organizers of the remaining meeting planned for that period were asked to administer the survey to participants. 709 responses from 22 meetings were collected.
Survey for the <u>control group of non-participants in locations of the remaining meetings (Q2 Counterfactual Cohorts).</u>	The data was being collected from April 5 th till April 15 th All 58 organizers of the remaining meeting planned for that period were asked to administer the survey to non-participants. 519 responses from 18 meetings were collected.

Application of the Impact Assessment model to Polish case

The MIREIA Impact Assessment model consists of theoretical framework and 6 instruments operationalizing the framework for use with intermediaries (described elsewhere).

It is designed to:

- 1) allow the systematic collection of end-users' longitudinal microdata through intermediaries
- 2) provide a robust set of instruments that would enable comparison between the characteristics and impacts of intermediaries
- 3) to support the intermediary organisations in learning from the eInclusion actions implementation processes

Therefore it is important to design MIREIA IAF as an approach that is both self-usable by intermediaries and provides comparable results to policy makers.

Level 0 and 1 instruments:

1. General information about intermediary,
2. Information required about the eInclusion initiatives undertaken by intermediaries
3. Information required about the relative intensity of activity in pursuing eInclusion initiatives

The application of the instrument 1 was not necessary because all the requested information was provided in the "Inception Report of Case Study Analysis". In a way the instrument 1 was a part of template for "Inception Report of Case Study Analysis". Therefore the relevant data was collected. Completed instrument 1 could be found in the Annex. However the instrument was not tested as a template that could be completed by intermediary alone.

Instrument 2 was applied as a checklist before the study to select the case studies. To some extent the relevant information was provided in the "Inception Report of Case Study Analysis" too.

Some questions included in the instrument was used during the workshop facilitated by Tech4i2. The required information was synthesized in the Inception Report.

The instrument 3 as described in the “Inception Report D1 T4i2” was not applied. During the workshop facilitated by Tech4i2 participants performed a similar exercise in classifying the objectives of the “E-skills...” project (exercise described in the previous chapter of this report). Completed instrument 3 could be found in the Annex. Classifying the objectives turned out to be an easy task for participants. However the result did not provide the clear link between the project under study and EU policy level. Perhaps the specific elements of level 0 and level 1 of the Impact Assessment model (policy strategies and policy actions) was not defined yet. Therefore the instrument 3 as described in the “Inception Report D1 T4i2” was not tested as a template that could be completed by intermediary alone but all the necessary information was collected. This experience suggests that classifying projects’ objectives or activities into predefined classes does not provide new information or ideas to intermediary. However comparison with other projects and linking to EU policies could produce some new and useful knowledge.

For the intermediary there is no clear reason for applying instruments 1-3 regarding that they do not provide any new information. From the intermediary perspective these instruments are part of MIREIA research project designed to collect information about “case study” (where the intermediary is an object not the subject of the study). Therefore the intermediary has no interest in using those instruments.

Level 2 and 3 instruments:

4. Identification of current assessment criteria
5. Identification of the relative importance of broad assessment criteria
6. Identification of the importance of specific assessment criteria and variables

The instruments 4-6 (as described in the MIREIA project documentation) were not tested at the stage of adjusting the MIREIA framework to the “E-skills...” project.

The instrument 6 have been discussed and tested near the completion of the MIREIA project. For that reason the application of this instrument did not affect the process of evaluation nor the design of the questionnaire.

Completed instrument 6 could be found in the Annex. The test revealed that it is difficult to use the instrument without facilitator. Some parts of instrument are not clear to the user. It would be difficult to use it without some clarification. But probably, if amended and clarified, the instrument could be completed alone.

Using the instrument was a bit difficult because some ‘assessment variables’ were not relevant to the project. Moreover some “perspectives for evaluation” were not clear. It is not clear what “performance” means in the first perspective. Does it mean “providing outputs” or “getting the results”? In the third perspective it is not clear if it is related to the indicators that intermediary collect or to indicators that the intermediary perceives useful in evaluation.

Perhaps the instrument would be more useful if it was applied at the very beginning of the project and the answers were analysed by an external expert and led to some kind of recommendations.

The “assessment variables” that were not relevant to the “E-skills...” project are:

- Average # of participants a year assisted on self-employment-entrepreneurship
- Average # of job offer yearly made available
- Average # of job offer yearly generated by the target users

- Average # of users yearly progressing to take up ICT advanced eInclusion for employability initiatives
- Average # of users that have been yearly placed on the job market
- Average # of users that have yearly found a job
- Average # of users that have yearly improved their job position
- Average # of users that have yearly increase their earns
- Average # of participants successfully assisted on self-employment-entrepreneurship yearly based
- Average # of successful job-matching activities yearly based
- Average # of SMEs (or other organizations) yearly increasing their “digital enterprise degree” that have increased their competitive advantages

Summarizing the analysis above: only some of the indicators proposed are relevant to the project objectives. Either “E-skills...” project does not align with the EU policy actions or the proposed set of indicators does not cover the variety of types of intermediary interventions.

All these instruments are self-administrative questionnaires. They do not provide instructions how to interpret answers and what is the next step after the completion of a questionnaire. From the intermediary perspective it is not clear how to use them for self-evaluation or for designing research methods. They provide some support for self-reflection (e.g. “what are our assessment criteria?”) but do not provide means for working out some useful recommendations for action.

Application of the The Impact Assessment methodology based upon randomised control trial (RCT) and Matching (Counterfactual) to Polish case

The key component in the application of the Impact Assessment methodology based upon randomized control trial (RCT) and Matching (Counterfactual) was development of questionnaires for participants to assess their reaction to the project.

In line with the instructions described in the MIREIA documentation the project’s evaluation research design was changed to include surveys with three categories of participants: current cohort, previous cohorts and counterfactual cohorts.

As described in the previous chapter four tool have been implemented:

PREVIOUS COHORT: Follow-up survey for the meeting participants that took part in the meetings before the April 5th (Previous Cohorts). Online questionnaire administered to the respondents by the FRSI two months after the meeting using e-mail addresses collected during the event.

CURRENT COHORT: Two surveys for the participants in the meetings that took place in the period of 5-15th April.

Pre-survey with youth participating in the remaining meetings. Paper questionnaire administered to the respondents by the meeting organizer just before the event.

Post-survey with youth participating in the remaining meetings. Paper questionnaire administered to the respondents by the meeting organizer on the end of the event.

COUNTERFACTUAL COHORT: Survey for the control group of non-participants in locations of the remaining meetings. The survey is expected to allow for comparison with the participants’ current cohort. Paper questionnaire administered by the meeting organizer to the youth that did not participate in the meeting. The sample of youth is taken by means of convenience/opportunity sampling without randomising. One should note that the lack of control over sampling procedure and lack of randomisation raises serious concerns about the validity of the results. At the level of

the analysis it will be difficult to clearly attribute the difference between counterfactual and current cohorts to the effect of the project. Perhaps some matching procedure will be applied to reduce the non-random error. However it may be difficult to avoid the autoselection bias.

The starting point for the questionnaire development was the basic questionnaire proposed by Tech4i1 (to be found in the MIREIA documentation). However the questionnaire was adjusted to the context of “E-skills...” project during the workshops and the following communication. **The set of questionnaires could be found in the Annex.**

The paper questionnaires were sent back to FRSI by meeting organizers. FRSI processed the questionnaires into a database and share it with Tech4i2 for analysis.

While interpreting the data one should note that the MIREIA surveys were introduced just before the end of the project and it is likely that it might have influence on the results:

Some of the professionals that were invited the most frequently (those most interesting for) didn't participate in this phase of the project because of exceeding the maximum number of meetings FRSI agreed with them

Increase of the number of meetings organized in each month was faster and faster and there was a peak of the meetings at the end of the project, that's why in this phase of the project very often professionals were assigned according to their availability not the preferences of the organizers of the meetings

The quality of the meeting depends on chairing the meeting by the organizer – it's likely that the most active institutions joined to the project at the beginning

Tech4i2 provided FRSI with basic statistical analysis of the data collected in surveys with “current cohort” and “counterfactual cohort”. The Tech4i2 report is a part of “Assessment of case studies interventions” (pp. 29-32).

According to the report most of participants declared they are satisfied with the meeting. 93 per cent felt that the meeting was good or very good. Attitudes to study and developing ICT skills were enhanced by the meeting, 80 per cent suggested that their attitude had increased or increased significantly. 53 per cent stated that the meeting had been useful in planning for their professional future. 61 per cent thought that the meeting had been useful in improving their employment prospects.

Moreover Tech4i2 tested the “impact of rurality” – the difference in skills, attitudes and behaviour of rural and non-rural respondents. They found out that most of participants (69 per cent) come from rural areas and live in towns with a population of less than 5,000 people. Rural and non-rural participants turned out to be quite similar with exception that rural participants spend less time each week using computers than their non-rural counterparts.

Tech4i2 compared “current cohort” and “counterfactual cohort” too. However the number of comparable questions asked of the counterfactual group and the treated group were relatively limited and according to the report there was little difference between the two groups. Report suggests that it is due to relatively limited extent of treatment (90 minute meeting) and the areas that are being investigated (changing individuals perceptions).

For the FRSI the most important result is the “impact of rurality” which seems to support the foundation's focus on rural areas that are in many ways excluded from the information society. However the analysis is very brief and does not provide much useful information. In the future surveys, following the methodology being tested, it is recommended to provide more question

allowing for comparison between “current cohort” and “counterfactual cohort” and to focus more on measuring the important dimensions of the intervention.

Application of the Performance Assessment Model to Polish case

The Performance Assessment Model as operationalized in the MIREIA documentation have been tested near completion of the MIREIA project. For that reason the application of PAM did not influence the performance of neither the foundation nor the project team. Completed instrument could be found in the Annex.

The test revealed that some parts of instrument are not clear. They should be amended or used with a help from facilitator or external expert.

- It is not clear what is the level of analysis. Does intermediary should give answers on the level of organization (intermediary) or on the level of project?
- Meaning of “importance” in “degree of indicator importance” is not clear. What does intermediary should assess? Is it important to have the ‘involvement of public institutions’ or is it important to assess it?
- In case of FRSI the indicator “FTE of volunteers in the last five years” is ambiguous. All the libraries were organizing the meetings voluntary. However from the perspective of FRSI they are institutional partners and “intermediaries”. On the other hand some volunteers were involved in organizing some meetings too.
- In case of FRSI the indicator “Average value of previous participants to activities being analysed still continuing to maintain active contacts with the Intermediary” was ambiguous. The “participant” may be interpreted as a “student” or an “organizer” (e.g. library).
- The indicator “Average % of new services introduced every year” is ambiguous. What does “new services” mean in context of “E-skills...” project? In the next year FRSI will organize more meetings but otherwise. Are they a “new service”?

Some indicators were not relevant. It could be improved to include all variety of intermediaries and their projects. Not relevant indicators were:

- # users progressing to regular Internet use beyond working activities (e.g. internet surfing; access to ePurchasing/booking; eBanking; eServices etc.)
- # of participants to activities being analysed achieving an increase of their level of confidence of use of ICT for social innovation purposes
- % of additional people benefitting from the ICT training project above the number of final beneficiaries (e.g. their family members or members of the social group to whom they belong)

The instrument, as it is now, may increase awareness of some issues and focus intermediaries attention (eg. performance indicator “degree of involvement of stakeholders in the strategic decision” encourages to think more about stakeholders involvement). But it would be more useful if the responses were analysed by an external expert and some feedback and recommendation were offered.

7. Conclusion

What did the intermediary gain from involvement? Would they do it again?

FRSI gained some important benefit from involvement in the MIREIA project. First one is the visibility and recognition of the FRSI and the “Link to the future. Youth. Internet. Career” project (formerly “E-skills and your profession”) in the EU. FRSI believes in promoting libraries as a telecentres and think about MIREIA as a part of their advocacy efforts. FRSI’s interest in the field of youth employability is quite recent so being a part of MIREIA is important in terms of increasing FRSI’s credibility. MIREIA is a prestigious project bringing together experienced organizations working in that field from all over the Europe. Being chosen as one of four outstanding initiatives is an important message for donors, libraries, polish government agencies etc. FRSI is very satisfied with the cooperation with IPTS. MIREIA project helps FRSI to tighten relationships with EU institutions and opened some new opportunities. MIREIA offered important benefits for “Link to the future” project’s evaluation too. It brought some new experience and perspective, some elements of the conducted survey may be useful in the future evaluation of the project. The survey results supported the foundation’s focus on rural areas that are in many ways excluded from the information society. Moreover MIREIA provided some financial support that opened the possibility for getting an evaluation support from the “Shipyard” Foundation. Participating in the MIREIA was very promising because it offered an external perspective on the “Link to the future” project and it’s evaluation approach.

What was most arduous about involvement?

It was a challenge for FRSI to change the evaluation methodology while the “Link to the future” project was already running. FRSI had developed and implemented its own evaluation plan before entering MIREIA. Probably it would have been easier to implement the MIREIA survey, if all the tools were available at the earlier stage of the project. Despite of this difficulty FRSI would definitely recommend participation in MIREIA project and is looking forward to future cooperation.

What would the intermediary change in relation to the 'process and their involvement?

FRSI would expect more feedback from IPTS and Tech4i2 about the survey results and some recommendations and advice for their evaluation methodology. FRSI was a bit disappointed with the Polish case study not fully presented during the workshop at the Spark 2013 conference in Granada, but it fully understands, that there might have been various reasons behind this.

Which instruments were useful?

The surveys with participants was most useful instrument. It was an opportunity to test the feasibility of “counterfactual” and “pre-test/post-test” approach. Both turned out to be achievable. However the analysis of the survey data was very brief and did not provide information useful for working out recommendations. According to the report there was little difference between “current” and “counterfactual” groups – the survey did not proved the impact of the project. It raises the questions – either the project had no impact on beneficiaries or the survey did not measure some important dimensions of the intervention. The survey could be more useful if there were more questions allowing for comparison between “current” and “counterfactual” cohorts and were more focused on expected results of the intervention.

Which instruments were not useful?

The main obstacle for using the instruments for intermediary’s own evaluation was the schedule for testing of the instruments. The participants surveys (counterfactual and 2-months-after –

instrument 7) and workshop in Warsaw (based on instrument 2) were the only instruments that were fully tested with the FRSI in the first stage of project (before the workshop in Granada at the Spark 2013 conference). General information about the intermediary (instrument 1) were collected by the Polish contractor (“Shipyard” Foundation) in cooperation with the FRSI. All other instruments were tested after the surveys and close to project’s completion.

Another obstacle was that instruments were generally perceived as tools for providing an information about “Link to the future” to IPTS and Tech4i2 rather than as a tools for self-evaluation.

What would the intermediary change about the instruments? How would they change participant involvement in the future?

As for the workshop it could have been designed more as an opportunity for intermediaries to self-reflect and reconsider basic assumptions of their projects. Now the workshop is closer to group interview than to a working meeting. As for the proposed research tools it seems that there could have been more qualitative and in-depth methods. The proposed surveys are designed to prove an impact of a project but there is not enough space for extra information that can be useful in improving a project. In case of “Link to the future” useful information could be obtained using focus group interviews with participants, professionals and meeting organizers, analysing content created by participants during the meetings or as a homework, analysing recorded meetings etc. Moreover the survey questionnaire could be tested with some participants face-to-face.

7.1. Relevance and feasibility of the approach for data gathering

The activities of the MIREIA project in the polish case were focused on conducting the survey to receive participants’ feedback and test the randomised control trial (RCT) or Matching (Counterfactual) approach. The main practical challenge was the lack of time for developing and adjusting the methodology and questionnaires caused by the upcoming project ending. In result there was very little time for “contextualization” of the methodology.

The Tech4i2 proposed a new, more complex research design much different to the design originally implemented:

1. The new design is focused solely on meeting participants while the original design gathered the information from organizers and professionals too
2. Regarding the participants the original design was based on a one simple survey after the meeting. The new design introduced the pre-survey before the meeting, survey 2-months after and survey with control group.
3. The new design changed the scope of questions asked to make them fit to MIREIA IAF assumptions.

Despite the initial concerns regarding a short time of preparation and fieldwork the approach turned out to be feasible (thanks to the commitment of FRSI team). However the response rate differs depending on a tool used (more on the subject in 4.2).

The survey research of meeting participants seems a relevant methodology to study the project outcomes and impact of the case study. The original research design also adopted a survey approach. The three-point measurement with counterfactual cohort is more time-consuming for participants, meeting organizers and project team therefore that approach was not originally adopted. However in the testing it turned out to be technically feasible,

The set of questions proposed by Tech4i2 is broader than originally used. Some of indicators are relevant to “E-skills...” project objectives but most of questions are relevant to MIREIA IAF assumption but do not measure directly the intended outcomes and impact of the project.

Following questions are directly relevant to project objectives:

PREVIOUS COHORT, ONLINE SURVEY, TWO MONTHS AFTER

- Q14 How important was this meeting for increasing your chances of getting a job?

CURRENT COHORT, PAPER QUESTIONNAIRES, AFTER THE MEETING

- Q8 Did your knowledge about the job and occupations that uses the ICT skills changed after the meeting?
- Q9 Will this meeting help you to plan your career path?
- Q10 In your opinion what are your chances for getting a job after completing your education? (IN COMPARISON with COUNTERFACTUAL COHORT Q10).
- Q11 How important was this meeting for increasing your chances of getting a job?

7.2. Availability of data and indicators

The methodology under testing is based on surveys with participants and parallel non-participant group. The availability of the data depend on the tool used:

1. PREVIOUS COHORT, ONLINE SURVEY, TWO MONTHS AFTER

Remarks: The invitation have been sent on May 10th to 856 participants that gave their e-mail addresses. After a week 33 interviews have been completed. At that moment the response rate was very low (4%). One can name a few possible reasons for low response rate. The participants are not much involved in a project (from their perspective it's a 1,5 hours meeting) so they do not feel committed to answer the survey. Field work time has been very short. FRISI offered no additional incentives to answer the survey. Apart from e-mail invitation there was no other attempts to contact the respondents. Perhaps phone contact would substantially increase the response rate but it's not feasible because of budget constraints. The survey is administered by Tech4i2 – we do not know the current response rate of the survey.

2. CURRENT COHORT, PAPER QUESTIONNAIRES, BEFORE AND AFTER THE MEETING

Remarks: The data on current cohort collected on the spot with a paper questionnaire was easily available. The survey was administered by the meeting organizers. They were responsible for conducting the survey during the meeting, gathering the questionnaires and sending them back to FRISI. The response rate for the surveys was over 40%. It is a good result considering the unexpected change in the methodology. The important factor was an information from FRISI - all the organizers were informed about the change by e-mail and the phone call from project's team. The organizers often are long-term collaborators of FRISI. The relationship with FRISI helps to keep the response rate at high level. The response rate for the meetings before the change in the methodology was close to 90%.

3. COUNTERFACTUAL COHORT FOR COMPARISON WITH CURRENT COHORT, PAPER QUESTIONNAIRES

Remarks: Over 30% (18 out of 58) of the organizers provided the data about non-participants. Perhaps with enough time for preparation the response rate could be much higher. However it should be noted that we have no control over the sampling procedure. The organizers were choosing the non-participants at their convenience. The random sample would be very hard to obtain. Apart from sampling issues data seems available.

7.3. Lessons learned

The main improvement of the new research design was introducing the three-point measurement for current cohort and counterfactual cohort as a benchmark. Unfortunately the analysis revealed little difference between “current” and “counterfactual” groups. Perhaps the survey would bring more reassuring results if there were more questions allowing for comparison between “current” and “counterfactual” cohorts and the questions were more focused on expected results of the intervention.

There is no clear link between the Impact Assessment model (levels 0 – 3) and the question bank proposed for participants’ feedback. The list of indicators for Impact Assessment (level 4) does not match the question bank. The survey for participants seems separate from Impact Assessment model.

Regarding the further development of the MIREIA Impact Assessment model the authors should focus more on “user experience” of the model and instruments. If MIREIA eI2-IAF is to become self-usable tool for intermediaries then more user-friendly, accessible and easy to follow approach is recommended.

7.4. Applicability in a full-large-scale case study experiment

Regarding scaling up the framework JRC-IPTS and Tech4i2 may consider following recommendations:

- Provide a short and simple description of the framework for the practitioners.
- Improve the instruments to make them more self-explicable and more self-usable.
- Provide a short, step-by-step instruction explaining how to use the instruments and how to interpret and analyse the results. The instruction should explain how the instruments are related (e.g. how a choice of assessment criteria determine the choice of indicators and questions list)
- Broaden the indicators list to include all variety of intermediaries goals and activities
- Develop further the “theory of change” of the employability to include all variety of intermediaries’ activities.
- Open the question bank and indicators list for contribution from intermediaries. The framework could be developed using bottom-up approach.
- Develop the list of research methods linked with the framework to include other stakeholders and qualitative methods.

8. ANNEX. Completed instruments for the first two levels of the model

Instrument 1: General information about intermediaries

The first instrument collects basic information about the intermediary. This information was accompanied in this study by access to information provided in an Inception Report developed by each case study.

- Brief description of the intermediary in terms of mission and objectives.
- Date of establishment.
- Organisational structure (Private for profit; Private Non Profit Organisation; Public, Public-Private, Other)
- Brief description of the type of activities.
- Organisation chart with roles and responsibilities.
- The last three years balance sheets

	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012
Total financial resources received by the case study for activities. Of which:	x	x	x	x	166.700\$
Total financial resources received from the public sector for activities being analysed	x	x	x	x	0
Total financial resources received from the private sector for activities being analysed	x	x	x	x	166.700\$
Total financial resources allocated for activities being analysed on eInclusion for employability	x	x	x	x	166.700\$
Number of full time staff	x	x	x	x	0
Number of part-time staff	x	x	x	x	2
Operating surplus or deficit (x1000€)	x	x	x	x	166.700\$

Number of participants enrolled	x	x	x	x	10 000
Number of participants completing the activities being analysed of eInclusion for employability of which:	x	x	x	x	10 000
% of participants of working age completing the activities being analysed	x	x	x	x	3%
% of completing participants entering paid work	x	x	x	x	0-2%
% of completing participants entering unpaid work	x	x	x	x	NA
% of completing participants becoming self-employed or starting a business	x	x	x	x	0-2%
% of completing participants entering training or education	x	x	x	x	98%
% of completing participants becoming unemployed	x	x	x	x	0,3%
% of completing participants undertaking other activities	x	x	x	x	NA
% of completing participants whose activity on leaving the activities being analysed is unknown	x	x	x	x	0%

Instrument 3: Information required about the relative intensity of activity in pursuing eInclusion initiatives

This instrument identifies the intensity of eInclusion initiatives in key areas undertaken by the intermediary during the last three years.

Listed below are three key areas of high level activity being addressed in this study. In the table below can you indicate the proportion of activity you have undertaken in each of the three areas. A similar table, with nine activities, is then provided that disaggregates these three higher level policies. Can you complete this table in the same way describing the proportion of activity you have undertaken in each area. For both tables the percentage you insert should total 100.

- **Digital access and skills policies.** These policies aim at promoting digitally inclusive initiatives stimulating the initial level of understanding of ICT usage. Possible examples could be: support actions in favour of “basic digital literacy training” or support actions aimed at “providing ICT access” (e.g. Public Internet Access Point, Telecentres) and “eAccessibility policy measures”. They are preliminary to more digital inclusive policy actions addressing employability and community building.
- **Skills improvement and employment creation policies.** These policies aim at supporting young generations and persons of working age to improve their employability either in terms of increased opportunities to find/maintain job or enhancing their job position, or in terms of enhancing their skills, particularly through undertaking ICT training. Examples these activities, affecting intermediaries’ eInclusion activities are: digital literacy and training (i.e. learning through ICT learning development; advanced ICT skills development; specific ICT skills development for employability; outreach ICT capability development); job seeking and matching policy measures.
- **Community building, equality and cohesion policies.** These policies aim to develop digital inclusiveness. They include supporting workers and entrepreneurs to increase their digital inclusiveness for better management of their activities as well as for contributing to societal cohesion and empowerment and moving towards a more sustainable society. Examples of these policies are: ICT supported community building (i.e. assistance to SMEs in accessing digital services and/or moving towards digital business processes); ICT networking actions to increase self-employability and entrepreneurship).

Please indicate the percentage of your organisation’s activities that have been undertaken in each area in the last three years in the tables below. The top table requires a high level overview of only three activity areas. The bottom table provides a more disaggregated and granular list of nine activities.

High level activities	% of intermediary activity undertaken on the activity
Digital access and skills policies.	
Skills improvement and employment creation policies.	
Community building, equality and cohesion policies.	
Other	
<i>The total should sum to 100%</i>	Total

Activities	% of intermediary activity undertaken on the activity
ICT access and use	
Basic digital skills development	
Skills for employability	
Numeracy, literacy and eLearning	
Advanced digital skills development	
Self employment and business start-up skills	
Community building	
Equality and inclusion	
Access to information and services	
Other	
<i>The total should sum to 100%</i>	Total

The instrument 3 as described above was not applied in Polish case. During the workshop facilitated by Tech4i2 participants performed a similar exercise in classifying the objectives of the “E-skills...” project.

Enhanced Wellbeing	Objective class relevant to “E-skills...” project
Improved Self-Confidence	X
Increased Social and Support Network	
Improved Quality of Life	
Increased Independence	X

Equality, Inclusion & Empowerment	Objective class relevant to “E-skills...” project
Improved participation in community decisions	
Reduced Isolation	
Increased feeling of being part of community	
Improved Accessibility of Services	
Improved opportunities and life chances	X
Enhanced access to Information	X

Education and skills	Objective class relevant to “E-skills...” project
Improved numeracy skills	
Improved literacy skills	

Improved ICT skills	
Participation in education activity	X (understood as supporting the choice of job-related education)
Use of eLearning	
Qualification(s) gained	

Employment and Economy	Objective class relevant to "E-skills..." project
Enhanced Information Advice and Guidance	X
Enhanced capability to search and apply for work	X
Obtain Work / get a job	

Instrument 6: Identification of the importance of specific assessment criteria and variables

The final table below records the views of intermediaries about the importance of assessment variables that will be sought from participants that they are 'treating'. Workshop attendees are asked to provide their views about the assessment criteria from three different perspectives, using a Lickert Scale (from 1 to 5, where '1' indicates 'very low importance' and '5' indicates 'very high importance').

The three perspectives for evaluation are:-

1. The degree of importance in measuring the variable
2. The measurability (in terms of costs and benefits) of the variable
3. The likely usage level of the variable

Assessment criteria	Assessment variables (to be assessed in a defined timeframe, i.e. 2010-2011-2012)	Degree of importance in measuring eInclusion for employability performances of the intermediary's services					Degree of measurability in terms of cost-benefits in data collection and their usage in assessing intermediary's performances					Degree of usage by the intermediary in assessing its eInclusion for employability services				
		1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
Efficiency	Average # of participants a year to the eInclusion for employability initiatives		X								X			X		
	Average # of participants a year completing the eInclusion for employability initiatives		X								X			X		
	Average # of participants a year counselled and mediated		X								X			X		
	Average # of participants a year assisted on self-employment-entrepreneurship	not applicable														
	total target users			X							X			X		
	Average # of job offer yearly made available	not applicable														
	Average # of job offer yearly generated by the target users	not applicable														
	Average cost of the action per participant				X						X				X	
	Average time to deploy the activities being analysed			X					X				X			
	Average # of SMEs or other organizations (e.g. NGOs, social innovation association) yearly assisted			X						X			X			
	potential SMEs target in the area of influence of the intermediary															

Effectiveness	Average # of users yearly progressing to take up ICT advanced eInclusion for employability initiatives	not applicable																		
	Average # of users that have been yearly placed on the job market	not applicable																		
	Average # of users that have yearly found a job	not applicable																		
	Average # of users that have yearly improved their job position	not applicable																		
	Average # of users that have yearly increase their earns	not applicable																		
	Average # of users with clear evidences of skills progressing yearly based				X							X							X	
	Average # of participants successful counselled and mediated yearly based				X							X							X	
	Average # of participants successfully assisted on self-employment-entrepreneurship yearly based	not applicable																		
	Average # of successful job-matching activities yearly based	not applicable																		
	Average # of SMEs (or other organizations) increasing their “digital enterprise degree” yearly based		X									X							X	
	Average # of SMEs (or other organizations) yearly increasing their “digital enterprise degree” that have increased their competitive advantages	not applicable																		
	Other																			
	Other																			
	Other																			
Other																				

Sustainability	Yearly average found raising value for the initiative (whole amount – partial amount – marginal amount – none)			X						X				X			
	Degree of stakeholders “ownership” of the assessed action (full – partial – marginal – null)		X							X				X			
	Average # of users/beneficiaries who become regular users of eLearning services in a year		X						X				X				
	Average % of SMEs (or other organizations) yearly assisted that become supporters-donors-sponsors of future eInclusion initiatives	not applicable															
	Degree of stability of the yearly fund raising flow for the assessed action		X									X					X
	Other																
	Other																
Strategic alignment	Average numbers of basic eInclusion for employability initiatives yearly performed by the intermediary	X									X			X			
	Average # of activities being analysed performed in a year	X									X		X				
	Average # of intermediaries yearly involved in the joint actions		X								X		X				
	average # of intermediaries yearly performing in the reference areas of influence	X									X		X				
	Average numbers of advanced eInclusion for employability initiatives yearly performed	What does ‘advanced’ mean?															
	Other																
Operational	Average number of Full Time Equivalent yearly dedicated by the intermediary’s work force to joint eInclusion for employability	X									X	X					

alignment	initiatives															
	Average number of Full Time Equivalent yearly allocated by the intermediary to eInclusion for employability initiatives	X								X	X					
	Average number of Full Time Equivalent yearly dedicated to design the joint eInclusion for employability initiatives	X								X		X				
	Average number of Full Time Equivalent yearly dedicated to design eInclusion for employability initiatives	X								X	X					
	Other															
	Other															
Technological alignment	Presence of ICT platforms (e.g. eLearning platform, job matching platform) for delivery shared basic eInclusion initiatives for employment	X								X					X	
	Presence of shared performances monitoring systems and their degree of usage for basic eInclusion initiatives for employment	X								X					X	
	Other															
	Other															
Social Value Generated	Average # users yearly progressing to regular Internet use beyond working activities (e.g. internet surfing; access to ePurchasing/booking; eBanking; eServices etc.)		X							X			X			
	Average number of participants to activities being analysed in a year			X						X	X					
	Average # of participants to activities being analysed achieving an increase of their level of confidence of use of ICT for social innovation purposes in a year	X								X	X					
	Average % of additional people yearly benefitting from the ICT training project above		X						X					X		

	the number of final beneficiaries (e.g. their family members or members of the social group to whom they belong)																	
	Other																	
	Other																	
Compliance of the inclusive action	Average # of participants who completed ICT basic eInclusion for employability initiatives in a year	Not applicable																
	Average number of participants to the eInclusion for employability initiatives in a year		X										X			X		
	Average degree of user satisfaction for the observed for the eInclusion for employability initiatives in a year			X							X					X		
	Average # of participants who completed advanced eInclusion for employability initiatives in a year	What does “advanced” mean?																
	Other																	
	Other																	

Instrument 7: The participant questionnaires

The survey for the PREVIOUS COHORT consists of following questions:

Follow-up survey for the <u>meeting participants that took part in the meetings before the April 5th</u>		
Number	Question	Answers
Q2	Gender	F / M
Q3	How old are you?	
Q4	Where do you live?	
Q5	When did you participate in the meeting?	Data DD/MM/YYYY
Q6	How would you rate your ICT skills?	Very good/good/medium/poor/very poor
Q7	How many hours a week (on average) do you spend using a computer?	Number
Q8	How much money do you think you save each year from using the Internet to search information, obtain services and purchase goods?	None / A little / Some / Quite a lot / A lot
Q9	How much time do you think you save each year from using the Internet to search information, obtain services and purchase goods?	None / A little / Some / Quite a lot / A lot
Q10	If you plan to continue your education what kind of education you would like to continue?	Social science, business, law/ Engineering, production, architecture / Health, social services / Humanities, art / Mathematics, informatics, science / Agriculture, veterinary / I don't plan to study at the university
Q11	In your opinion, how much impact will ICT skills have on your future education?	None / small / big / very big
Q12	Why?	I will get (better) job / I will earn more / I will make a career / I will be able to keep a job
Q13	In your opinion what are your chances of getting a job after completing your education?	Very good / good / average / poor / very poor
Q14	How important was this meeting for increasing your chances of getting a job?	Very important / rather important / average / poor / not important
Q15	What do you think you will be doing in five years	Entrepreneur / employee / volunteer / self-employed /

	after graduating from high school?	continue education / parent, legal guardian / unemployed / other
--	------------------------------------	--

The pre-survey for the CURRENT COHORT consists of following questions::

Pre-survey with youth participating in the meetings that took place in the period of 5-15 th April.		
Number	Question	Answers
Q1	Your e-mail adress	Open-ended
Q2	Gender	Female / male
Q3	How old are you?	Under 15 / 15/ 16 / 17 / 18 / 19 / over 19
Q4	Where do you live?	countyside / town up to 5000 inhabitants / city 5000-20000 inhabitants / city 20000-100000 inhabitants / city over 100000 inhabitants
Q5	How would you rate your ICT skills?	Very good/good/medium/poor/very poor
Q6	How many hours a week (on average) do you spend using a computer?	Number
Q7	How much money do you think you save each year from using the Internet to search information, obtain services and purchase goods?	None / A little / Some / Quite a lot / A lot
Q8	How much time do you think you save each year from using the Internet to search for information, obtain services and purchase goods?	None / A little / Some / Quite a lot / A lot
Q9	If you plan to continue your education what kind of education you would like to continue?	Social science, business, law/ Engineering, production, architecture / Health, social services / Humanities, art / Mathematics, informatics, science / Agriculture, veterinary / I don't plan to study at the university
Q10	In your opinion, how much impact will ICT skills have on your future education?	None / small / big / very big
Q11	In your opinion how much will your career path will depend on acquiring or deepening your ICT skills?	None / in a small degree / in a large degree / in a very large degree
Q12	Why?	I will get (better) job / I will

		earn more / I will make a career / I will be able to keep a job
--	--	---

The post-survey for the CURRENT COHORT consists of following questions:

Post-survey with youth participating in the meetings that took place in the period of 5-15 th April.		
Number	Question	Answers
Q1	Your e-mail address	Open-ended
Q2	Gender	Female / male
Q3	How old are you?	Under 15 / 15/ 16 / 17 / 18 / 19 / over 19
Q4	Where do you live?	countyside / town up to 5000 inhabitants / city 5000-20000 inhabitants / city 20000-100000 inhabitants / city over 100000 inhabitants
Q5	What do you think about the quality of the meeting?	Very good / good / medium / bad / very bad
Q6	What was best about the meeting?	Open-ended
Q7	What would you do to improve the meeting?	Open-ended
Q8	Did your knowledge about the job and occupations that uses the ICT skills changed after the meeting?	It increased a lot / it increased a little / it did not change / it decreased a little / it decreased a lot
Q9	Will this meeting help you to plan your career path?	Very likely / likely / neither likely nor unlikely / not likely / very unlikely
Q10	In your opinion what are your chances for getting a job after completing your education?	Very good / good / average / poor / very poor
Q11	How important was this meeting for increasing your chances of getting a job?	Very important / rather important / average / poor / not important
Q12	What do you think you will be doing in five years after graduating from high school?	Entrepreneur / employee / volunteer / self-employed / continue education / parent, legal guardian / unemployed / other

The survey for the COUNTERFACTUAL COHORT (for comparison with the Current Cohort) consists of following questions:

Pre-survey with youth participating in the meetings that took place in the period of 5-15 th April.		
Number	Question	Answers

Q1	Your e-mail adress	Open-ended
Q2	Gender	Female / male
Q3	How old are you?	Under 15 / 15/ 16 / 17 / 18 / 19 / over 19
Q4	Where do you live?	countyside / town up to 5000 inhabitants / city 5000-20000 inhabitants / city 20000-100000 inhabitants / city over 100000 inhabitants
Q5	How would you rate your ICT skills?	Very good/good/medium/poor/very poor
Q6	How many hours a week (on average) do you spend using a computer?	Number
Q7	How much money do you think you save each year from using the Internet to search information, obtain services and purchase goods?	None / A little / Some / Quite a lot / A lot
Q8	How much time do you think you save each year from using the Internet to search information, obtain services and purchase goods?	None / A little / Some / Quite a lot / A lot
Q9	If you plan to continue your education what kind of education you would like to continue?	Social science, business, law/ Engineering, production, architecture / Health, social services / Humanities, art / Mathematics, informatics, science / Agriculture, veterinary / I don't plan to study at the university
Q10	In your opinion what are your chances for getting a job after completing your education?	Very good / good / average / poor / very poor

Instrument 8: The experimental Performance Assessment Model

The Performance Assessment Model (PAM) will examine the organisational impacts of eInclusion intermediaries.

DRAFT – WORK IN PROGRESS

Criteria	Sub Criteria	Performance Indicators The level of analysis is not clear. Do we analyse the indicators on the level of organization (intermediary) or on the level of project.	Metrics	Degree of Importance				
				Meaning of “Importance” is not clear. Importance to whom? Importance of what? What do we assess? Is it important to have the ‘involvement of public institutions’ or is it important to assess it?				
				Low	-	Med	-	High
Community building and management capability	Absolute value of public participation	Level of active Involvement of public institutions in the strategic management processes	(none – few – high – full)		X			
		Level of active Involvement of public institutions in the operational management processes	(none – few – high – full)	X				
	Absolute value of private participation	Level of active Involvement of private organizations in the strategic management processes	(none – few – high – full)				X	
		Level of active Involvement of private organizations in the operational management processes	(none – few – high – full)			X		
	Time made available by the participants	FTE of volunteers in the last five years	(none – low – medium – high) All the meetings were held by librarians voluntary. However the library is an institution, some kind of ‘intermediary’. What should we mark?				X	
		Average value of previous participants to activities being analysed still continuing to maintain active contacts with the Intermediary (e.g. to request information; to reply to an Intermediary	(none – < 20% – >=20%; <50% – >= 50%) What does “Participants” mean in our project? Students					

		communication; to provide suggestions)	or libraries?						
Vision and strategic capability		Degree of usage of strategic planning techniques	(none – low – medium – high)						X
		Degree of usage of <i>ex ante</i> user needs analysis methodology e.g. sample interviews; focus groups; previous training participants periodically recalls; on line questionnaire)	(none – low – medium – high)						X
		Degree of involvement of <i>stakeholders</i> in the strategic decision	(none – low – medium – high)					X	
		Average % of new services introduced every year What does “new services” mean in context of our project? In the next year we will organize more meetings but otherwise. Are they a “new service”?	(based on last five years of observation) on total service yearly provided The project started this year. We cannot calculate the average.						
		Average % of services revised/improved every year	(based on last five years of observation) on total service yearly provided The project started this year. We cannot calculate the average.					X	
Social Value Creation capability		# users progressing to regular Internet use beyond working activities (e.g. internet surfing; access to ePurchasing/booking; eBanking; eServices etc.)	Value Not relevant.						
		# of participants to activities being analysed achieving an increase of their level of confidence of use of ICT for social innovation purposes	Value Not relevant.						

		% of additional people benefitting from the ICT training project above the number of final beneficiaries (e.g. their family members or members of the social group to whom they belong)	% Not relevant. The project is not the ICT training project.					
Assets management capability		Average target beneficiaries in the last five years	Average Value of the last 5 years The project started this year.			X		
		Average number of participants enrolled in the last five years	Average Value of the last 5 years The project started this year.			X		
		Average numbers of participants completing the activities being analysed in the last five years	Average Value of the last 5 years The project started this year.			X		
		Average number of completing participants entering paid work/unpaid work/self employed or starting business	Average Value of the last 5 years The project started this year.			X		
		Average degree of user satisfaction for the observed action	Average % of the last 5 years The project started this year.				X	
		Average time to deploy the training activities being analysed	Value 3 months				X	
		Average cost of the action per participant	€ 12,70				X	
		Usage of performance measurement systems	never – very few - sometimes – often - always					X
		Usage of knowledge management systems/procedures	never – very few - sometimes – often – always			X		
		Usage of user satisfaction measurement systems	never – very few - sometimes – often - always				X	
	Usage of quality systems based on	Yes – no		X				

		certified standards							
Economic and financial capability		Average operating surplus or deficit in the last five years	€ c. 46 200						
		Ratio of current assets to current liabilities (from the organization' periodic balance-sheet)	Value 1.0						
		Ratio of total assets to total liabilities	Value 1.0						
		Average and trend of % of yearly economic turnover generated by the services provisioning and by the fund raising process on total yearly economical resources availability (sum of: economic turnover generated by the services provisioning, economic resources generated by the fund raising process, resources yearly provided by private and organizations) in the last five years	Value; % What is the difference between fund raising and resources obtained from private organizations?						
		Ratio of average yearly economic public resources to total average yearly economic resources in the last five years	Value						
		Cash flow project or organization	€ c. 3 480 878						

DRAFT - WORK IN PROGRESS