



IMPART Policy Forum 22nd March 2012 in Berlin

Statements of Mr Norbert Kreuzkamp

(Draft version)

You have been acting as a peer in IMPART, but you have also a longstanding experience of working with projects that demonstrate how transnational cooperation can be harnessed to organise effective transfer of innovative approaches to valuing the intercultural diversity of migrants and thereby increasing their employability.

Mr Welbers, thank you very much for your kind introduction. Please allow me, first of all, to thank the hosting Public Authorities and Partners of the IMPART Learning Network for the friendly invitation to give my modest contribution to this final round table. I feel honoured by this invitation, which is a real pleasure to me. I do say this as an individual, and I also do say this as a representative of a non-profit organisation: ACLI is a large Christians Workers' Movement spreading out from Italy by migration; so in fact ACLI Self Help Organisation of Cross-Cultural, Intercultural Work is a small migrants' organisation, a part of – let me say – *our* and – let me say – *common* civil society.

Giving the high standards of professionalism for granted, I would like, secondly, to stress out, to high lighten my highest opinion about of seriousness and fairness, I had opportunity to learn in this IMPART as well as the ambitious and wise desire to implement its results into the further development of the European Social Fund for the end of the decade.

Let me at the beginning of my short statement, speak on the IMPART methodology from a grassroots' angle of view: We have invited Richard Stanton to come to our INPUT project's place at Tübingen. For the 23rd of May we asked him to give us some advice on the question how the IMPART project's results and methodology might be helpful for us to strengthen our reflection and practice. We also raised the question whether, and if so, how an IMPART methodology "en miniature" (in miniature) might improve in terms of sustainability our future planning, implementation and mainstreaming of our (labour market and social integration of migrants) projects.

Why do we think that we are looking forward to a fruitful debate on project partners' level? I see 4 "good reasons":

(a) Firstly, the peer review methodology is a wise balancing complement to self-evaluation, external evaluation, programme learning networks as well as qualitative counterweight to a well on pending formalization of monitoring which might risk to abandon a fair intervention within the process in favour of a "knowing better" ex post;

(b) Secondly, it might be instinct and swarm intelligence to entitle the bona fide peer-review teams, within a rather small time commitment and quite low information depth (just three days!), using a simplified meta-plan red light tool, to distil "truths"; and it might happen that, based on the collegial autonomy of the peer review team, these "truths" or let us simply say "findings" may even find hearing.

(c) A third "good reason" for the IMPART methodology: The differentiated indicators, the "critical factors", how they are called, understood also filters of perception might cause in some circumstances a reduction of complexity. But they also contain a structural knowledge, and therefore might represent quite useful tools for the planning and control of performance on individual project level. On the programme management or structural fund's level these indicators might become interesting, if we include a reflection on the allocation of responsibility on the different implementations' level: 'For some of the critical factors it might be helpful to envisage performance responsibility not only on project's level but – maybe sometimes in a joint form – also on programme's or on Regional Authority's level.

(d) Finally it must be mentioned the modest, friendly, diplomatic, incorruptible, supportive, synthesis-oriented, authentic and responsibility generating, very pragmatic view of "peers" like – let as say – Richard Stanton (just to mention one name for all). This has, in my view really "great quality".

In your view, what aspects of the IMPART approach are particularly appropriate to identify opportunities for, or barriers to, transnational learning in a project?

Within an agreed framework the European Social Fund – if I understand well – supports where national, regional and local public Authorities do support. This is the systemic logic with its advantages and disadvantages. Transnational co-operation and learning as transversal commitment is highly reasonable. But it is – let us be honest – quite complex, needs quite some continuity, is somehow an individual and structural learning of – let me say – second degree or second order because on a first level of plausibility it is obvious that the solutions do not fit, if the frameworks are different. And in many cases social, economic, legal contexts and institutional frameworks are different.

Let me first say that I would like to propose you a reflection on how a transnational peer review instrument itself, as implemented in the IMPART project, would have an intrinsic logic of improving transnational learning. I assume, most of the hosts partners felt that the preparation, implementation and evaluation of the peer review visits themselves have been an important stimulus in strengthening and improving transnational learning. And I guess this is valid also for the outgoing peers. What I want to say: The implementation of a methodology that envisages for all transnational projects combined forms of local and transnational peer review methods might strengthen intensity and quality of transnational learning.

Looking at the critical factors I would like to high lighten in a specific way *two* of them.

The second core factor is entitled “migrant voice”. I admit, a professional life in minority and migrants’ communities’ frameworks has similar temptations of blind eye’s views, of solidifying self-attribution and habituation of acting strategies as outside in the “real world”. But nevertheless, I am still very much convinced that the diversity of self-expression of individuals and groups, including challenges and decisions, is nearer to the truth than interpretations made by mainstream institutions or good-willing voices of majorities. So I want to invite us to be critical: we still have to face in many cases the convictions of public and private entities – and I would not exclude in this case nor companies, nor unions – that non difference is to be made for younger, elderlies, workers or unemployed people if they do have or not a migration history. It becomes quite difficult to handle quite mainstreaming arguments like “there is no problem at all with migration, maybe only with education levels and Muslims”.

In many occasions we observe a quite high mission of public institutions and good-willing actors to get in touch with migrant communities to make them understand better the local rules, institutions and rules of success. I am quite happy that IMPART has no critical factor like “migrants ears”. The indicator of success, in fact, is the opposite: a structural, continuous, real implementation of “migrant voice” into projects and programmes, on local, regional and transnational level.

Coming to your question of transnational learning I think that the IMPART instruments give us quite some indications on opportunities and barriers of transnational learning.

If we assume, that transnational learning has to overcome specific obstacles and needs as specific awareness in the mainstreaming process, I think we can point out as quite significant and relevant all the “critical factors” that take into consideration the needs of continuity, structural implementation and involvement of stakeholder for their success. That means that we could emphasise as most relevant in the IMPART benchmarks:

— Core factor 6: Commitment to mainstreaming

And certainly somehow linked, if we speak about transnational learning in work promotion of migrant also

— Core factor 3 and 4: the engagement of employers and the involvement of other stakeholders

And certainly the critical factors chosen for an integrated territorial approach might also be quite relevant for complex transnational network’s learning experiences:

— The factors 5, 1, 4 – Project strategy, political leadership, governance – might be quite relevant.

If I reflect my own experience I think that best results could be achieved where young migrants, enterprises, vocational schools, families and the migrant community could do together a sustainable experience of how international and intercultural competences can be discovered, developed and tailored according to the real needs of the different actors. I think that this exemplary result gives evidence of the reasonable selection of tools within the IMPART project.

I assume we all do agree that transnational learning is not just a short-term-adventure but an approach that needs a strong political and institutional desire and commitment, a long-term perspective and some extra resources of time and money for larger understanding, extra deviations and creative putting together of what never had been thought to fit together.

What lessons from IMPART should be drawn at the ESF programme level in order to provide a sustainable framework to stimulate such learning?

Let me be quite short on this and try to give just “keywords”: ESF infrastructure, National and Regional Authorities, ESF programmes and Programme agencies as well as the administrative implementation rules should...

- **Promote** and **support** transnational activities and learning.
- **Allow** a *continuity* of building-up, implementing, testing, maintaining and – let me say – “harvesting” processes of transnational learning.
- **Link** more and more *networks* instead of *projects*.
- **Promote** and **encourage** *qualitative evaluation methods* like peer review instruments and *thematic* or *sectorial networking* instruments.
- **Develop** and **implement** instruments and methods of *step-by-step transition* from project innovation into regular structural funding measures (Programme Agency assisted mainstreaming).
- **Develop and implement** programme strategies involving political deciders more deeply into the transfer of results on local, regional and transregional level.
- **Promote** and **encourage** migrant (self) organisations as responsible actors.
- **Offer** and **assist** networks and projects by so called “mainstreaming pathways” (not just events).
- **Distribute** best budgets for the poorest citizens.
- **Envisage** future-oriented programme activities to face and improve in a proactive way neighbourhood migration with the neighbour continent Africa.