



## The Utrecht Refugee Launchpad Research and Evaluation Framework

Concept paper and advisory board record, please do not quote.

Dr Caroline Oliver, October 2017, updated 2018

### Summary

This paper presents the research and evaluation strategy that has been developed within the first year of the Utrecht Refugee Launchpad and records of the advisory board meetings throughout the project which is funded as part of the Urban Innovative Action initiative. It explains the background to the project, the purposes of the evaluation and explains the evaluation strategy chosen to meet these needs. It provides an explanation of how the research will be conducted, the results of which will provide the subject matter of an interim report to be published on this website in June 2018, and a final evaluation report towards the end of the project in 2019.



*This project is co-financed by the European Regional and Development Fund through the Urban Innovative Actions Initiative*

## Contents:

<b>1. Background to the research</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>2. Goals of the evaluation</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>3. The research team</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>4. The U-RLP research advisory group</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>5. The U-RLP Evaluation design</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>6. Theory of Change development:</b>	<b>10</b>
<b>7. Monitoring and research plan</b>	<b>10</b>
<b>8. References</b>	<b>12</b>
<b><i>Appendix 1: U-RLP research team</i></b>	<b>13</b>
<b><i>Appendix 2: U-RLP research Advisory Group</i></b>	<b>14</b>
<b><i>Appendix 3: Summary of meetings of Advisory Board</i></b>	<b>16</b>
<b><i>Appendix 4: U-RLP project plan</i></b>	<b>17</b>

## 1. BACKGROUND TO THE RESEARCH

Utrecht City Council received €2.87m funding for the Utrecht Refugee Launchpad from the EU (ERDF) *Urban Innovative Actions* (UIA) programme, a scheme designed to provide urban areas throughout Europe with resources to test new and unproven solutions to solve urban challenges. The Utrecht Refugee Launchpad (U-RLP, see [www.uia-initiative.eu/en/uia-cities/utrecht](http://www.uia-initiative.eu/en/uia-cities/utrecht)) is an initiative that aims to build an inclusive approach in the city to facilitate the integration of asylum seekers from day one. The intervention involves a range of partners: Socius Living; Utrecht University's School of Economics and Centre for Entrepreneurship (UtrechtCE); People's University of Utrecht; Social Impact Factory and the Dutch Council for Refugees. With Utrecht city council, they are bringing to life a new concept for a reception centre, based on shared living and learning of local people and asylum seekers in Overvecht, on the fringes of the city.

The new reception centre, named *Plan Einstein*, seeks to be a hub from where social networks between newcomers and locals are established. In addition to having 38 local young people living in the centre, various activities are offered to inhabitants and locals, aimed at encouraging asylum seekers to participate and build relationships with people from the neighbourhood. These include training courses in English language, entrepreneurship and international business. Another dimension is the provision of expert coaching and opportunities to incubate new business ideas and connect people to the local business environment. Finally, specialist individual support and counselling are provided for those going through the asylum process.

Through participating in the U-RLP, participants are expected to both build local connections, as well as develop 'future-proof' skills that will be of benefit to them whether that is in the Netherlands or elsewhere. The project is also anticipated to improve wellbeing, specifically helping asylum seekers repair 'broken narratives' and/or halt the negative spiral created by the usual approach to reception based on enforced passivity and uncertainty in a period of limbo. Existing reception centres in the Netherlands might provide some educational programmes, but most of these are to help people learn Dutch language or gain knowledge about Dutch society, while work opportunities offered are low-key maintenance of centres

and their grounds. This project differs in aims, networking people socially and in business environments, creating a better reception experience and yet changing how reception is experienced also by locals, who themselves face problems of unemployment and potentially feel a sense of competition for scarce resources in the areas where centres are placed. Deputy Mayor of Utrecht, Kees Diepeveen explains the project aims, as developing:

An inclusive approach to facilitate integration from day one by introducing a shared living concept in which local youth and asylum seekers live together. It aims to create an innovative reception facility which is built upon social networks within the neighbourhood developing future proof skills together with asylum seekers. After the determination of an asylum status participants will have developed skills in self efficacy and resilience which can be used both in the Netherlands and elsewhere ([www.uia-initiative.eu/en/uia-cities/utrecht](http://www.uia-initiative.eu/en/uia-cities/utrecht))

## 2. GOALS OF THE EVALUATION

The UIA sets out the expectation for the evaluation framework as follows, referring to the need for evidence on effectiveness and yet understanding of how the project works, to aid transferability:

*As the aim is to experiment, as in a scientific experiment, one should know what worked and what did not, and why so, what should be done differently etc.'* (ec.europa.eu/regional\_policy/sources/activity/urban/urban\_innovative.actions.pdf).

The concern for policy understanding ('why it works', or doesn't...) is paramount, especially given the innovative and untested nature of the U-RLP experiment. In order to advance the second goal, it is therefore important to build recognition of 'context' into the evaluation, to explain what mechanisms are working here and why, so that the approach might be adapted for use elsewhere. In light of this, the evaluation goals of the U-RLP research and evaluation strand have been identified as follows:

- To provide evidence on *effectiveness, benefits and early outcomes* of the U-RLP experiment for participants and neighbourhood inhabitants in the city;
  - To offer *evidence-based recommendations* for use by other cities across Europe.
- (Parsons 2017:29)

The integration of the research team as connected to the project team from the outset also means that while as independent observers of the project, we recognise the intervention is not yet a finished product at this stage, and aim to provide formative feedback from evaluation results as the project develops.

### **3. THE RESEARCH TEAM:**

Evaluation of the U-RLP is through a distinct work-package of the project, concerned with research, monitoring and evaluation and involving two UK based universities, the University of Roehampton, London and the University of Oxford. The central research activities are managed by Dr Caroline Oliver, Roehampton University as Principal Investigator, working with two Utrecht-based researchers also employed part time on the project, Dr Karin Geuijen and Dr Rianne Dekker. Dr Geuijen and Dr Dekker are both employed at Utrecht University School of Governance yet are working for this project in the capacity of researchers affiliated to both Roehampton and the Centre on Migration, Policy and Society, University of Oxford, UK. Dr Sarah Spencer, Deputy Director of COMPAS and Director of COMPAS' Global Exchange in Migration and Diversity takes responsibility for governance, web dissemination and facilitating of learning exchange around the project. More information on the research team can be found in Appendix 1.

### **4. THE U-RLP RESEARCH ADVISORY GROUP**

The research team presents periodically their strategies and activities to an advisory board of highly respected scholars, who have both extensive knowledge of the theories that explain the complex social processes in play throughout the U-RLP project, and significant experience of empirical research and evaluation. The advisory board meet three times throughout the project, advising on research strategy and proving a testing board for the project theory, given

their extensive knowledge of the subject matter. The advisory board, managed by COMPAS, include:

- **Professor Alice Bloch**, Professor of Sociology, University of Manchester, with expertise on the lived experiences of forced migrants focussing on refugees, asylum seekers and undocumented migrants, as well as innovative methodologies in relation to sensitive research with vulnerable groups
- **Professor Ash Amin CBE FBA**, Professor and Head of Geography, University of Cambridge, with expertise on race, belonging, cities and political renewal.
- **Professor David Parsons**, Visiting Professor, Leeds Beckett University (Carnegie Faculty) a specialist in public programme evaluation, combining roles as an independent policy researcher and evaluator at LBU, and consultant and advisor to public and voluntary sector bodies, directing and co-directing a number of high profile studies for public bodies including, in the UK, BIS, DfE, Defra, DFID, DWP, ESRC, QIA/LSIS, HEFCE and HEFCW, LSC/SFA, HEA, Home Office, NAW, TDA and devolved administrations, and in Europe for the European Commission, CEDFOP, the UNs International Labour Office and others.
- **Dr Peter Scholten**, Associate Professor Public Policy & Politics at Erasmus University, Rotterdam; Director of IMISCOE (Europe's largest network of academic research institutes on migration, integration and social cohesion in Europe); Coordinator of Master Governance of Migration & Diversity; Editor-in-chief of Comparative Migration Studies, Erasmus University Rotterdam, with expertise on issues of governance in multicultural societies.

## 5. THE U-RLP EVALUATION DESIGN

Adopting the appropriate evaluation design for a project such as U-RLP has involved consideration of both what is achievable as well as desirable to produce the type of answers needed from the evaluation. While, proponents of experimental methods advocate the use of Randomised Control Trials as the gold standard, and quasi-experimental approaches as a preferred option, there is also debate in the evaluation community on their relevance in some cases. In particular, while these prove impacts or outcomes that can be attributed to the project, they are less helpful in understanding why the changes have come about. In many

circumstances, such approaches are not even possible, especially in cases of experimentation where a project design might be evolving and outcomes are emergent, or data limited because of small sample sizes or ethical sensitivities.

In practice, the evaluation design for U-RLP is constrained by both the project's pilot nature, where outcomes are to some degree emergent, as well as characterised by high complexity. The target population is difficult to predict, with the number and nature of entrants to the programme unpredictable and unstable, depending on asylum seeker mobility and selectivity that is outside the influence of the project team. There are also multiple constituents, since the target population encompasses asylum seekers, members of the local neighbourhood, as well as local young people recruited to live in the centre. The intervention itself involves multiple partners and involves a range of different interventions and activities, generating multiple possible degrees of engagement and variable pathways within the overarching concept. It also seeks to achieve multiple outcomes, of which some of these are for complex social processes such as 'inclusion' and 'integration', which remain highly contested in academic literatures and hard to measure. There are also contestations over the meaning of the programme, which cannot easily be simplified (Kushner 2016). In these circumstances, the evaluation design is what Parsons (2017) might recognise as 'constrained', lending itself much less to evaluation through conventional experimental methods (building clear counterfactuals and evidence on causation).

However, given that the evaluation design is also informed by the goal that many cities across Europe will be interested to see how the initiative works, and should learn from the city's experiment, alternatives to experimental methods are arguably more suited to the U-RLP evaluation strategy in any case. Developing an evidence-based resource for other cities needs to show how this programme has worked in this setting, enabling others to understand the mechanisms and processes that might be needed if it were to be replicated elsewhere. As a result, the evaluation centrally uses *Theory of Change*, which is one of a number of non-experimental evaluation approaches that have 'emerged to fill a deficit in policy and programme evaluation' because of some of the inconclusive results of other (methods-driven) evaluation attempts in these types of programmes (Blamey and McKenzie 2007: 440; Pawson and Tilley 1997). Context here is not eliminated by reducing it to confounding

variables to be controlled (ibid.) but rather theory based approaches, developed especially by Weiss (1997) recognise that 'context is key to understand the interplay between programme and effects' (Blamey and Mackenzie 2007:441). Theory-based approaches make context a key aspect of evaluation, recognising that the social makeup of interventions areas, organizational differences, response of local stakeholders etc. are key elements in understanding the success or otherwise of programmes (ibid.)

Theory of Change approaches provide a full understanding of the steps needed to reach a long term change that addresses a complex social problem, and seeks to articulate the reasoning that are behind the steps leading to that change. The steps taken to develop a theory of change are identified by Blamey and McKenzie (2007) using Anderson (2005) as follows:

- 1. Identify a long-term goal or vision.** This likely extends beyond the timescale of the project and addresses a local or national problem
- 2. Conduct 'backwards mapping' to identify the preconditions [outcomes] to achieve the goal.** What are the necessary outcomes that you need to see by the end of your programme? What are the shorter term outcomes and outputs that will help you achieve those targets?
- 3. Identify the interventions that your initiative will perform to create these preconditions:** What activities will bring about the background change and what resources can be brought to do so?
- 4. Develop indicators for each precondition [outcome] that will be used to assess the performance of the interventions.**
- 5. Write a narrative that can be used to summarise the various moving parts in your theory.** This programme theory should be plausible, doable and testable. This means that in addition to doing the programme work, the programme can be open to evaluation through having a high degree of specificity around outcomes.

A Theory of Change was generated in the early stages of a programme; but this is not yet presented, since it should be considered a work in progress, or 'living document' that will change as the programme develops.



While pursuing this approach, in discussion with our advisory board, the research team explored the possibility of supplementing this with some construction of the counterfactual, enabling comparison of what actually happened to *what would have happened* if the intervention was not in place. Especially since transferability is an important goal for the evaluation (aim 2) for city policymakers, it is important to know the added value of the project, by knowing what would have happened had the interventions of the project not been put in place). Some proponents of theory-based approaches do not see it necessary to construct counterfactual evidence, but nevertheless the research team explored the possibilities of demonstrating the difference made by the intervention using comparative data (e.g. from another asylum seeker centre or national settings). Given that the use of RCTs was not proportionate or viable for the U-RLP, the evaluation still explored other options for the counterfactual, including a quasi-experimental passive control (a geographical comparison group) through comparing outcomes at other reception centres not running the evaluation. This was theoretically possible comparing outcomes on the NOA assessment, repeated, which was a 3-hour assessment gaining important information on background, connections, skills and wellbeing, used in both the U-RLP and other neighbouring centre. However, in practice, due to concerns of selectivity in the groups assigned to the U-RLP, turbulence in populations (especially mobility between centres) and difficulties securing permissions to use the data, this is increasingly looking like an impossible and less than pragmatic option, which also raises ethical challenges.

As a result, the evaluation instead aims to build a strong case, built on strong 'before and after' empirical evidence, supported by ex-post Contribution Analysis (Mayne 1999) to demonstrate the contribution the intervention has made to outcomes. Contribution Analysis involves the compilation of a 'performance story', reinforced by an 'ecology of evidence' (Sridharan and Nakaima 2012:378) which will be assessed by experts in light of other likely alternative explanations. This will help to generate an understanding of the contribution of the intervention to observed outcomes, reducing uncertainty and strengthening the case for its impact.

## 6. THEORY OF CHANGE DEVELOPMENT

The theory of change has been developed in two formats including:

- 1) A full Theory of Change including complex detail and multiple pathways; and
- 2) A Logical Framework that presents a simplified, neater and linear version of how the project works. This will provide a more accessible tool for understanding the ToC for stakeholders and interested parties who do not have a research or evaluation background, and will be accompanied by a narrative.

Both will be available to view in the final evaluation report.

The process has involved collaborative working involving the research team and project team to make the theory and goals of the project explicit, and to articulate a series of intermediary outcomes that will lead to the outcome (results chain). The Theory of Change documents in detail the contexts, intermediary outcomes and activities of the project, based around two interdependent pathways:

**Pathway 1:** Neighbourhood pathway to social cohesion

**Pathway 2:** Skills training pathway and individualised support

These build a sequence from initial to intermediary to longer-term changes. While it was relatively straightforward to clarify the basic theory, it has been harder to articulate the assumptions behind the project. As the project progresses, the project team and evaluation team will need to provide further evidence to support the theory and its assumptions, to demonstrate that impact and outcomes are achievable. This evidence can be presented from knowledge and/or learning from previous experience or similar types of intervention, as well as academic research.

## 7. MONITORING AND RESEARCH PLAN

The **project team** are tasked with providing data to the **research team** related to activities, which are captured through monitoring of 21 process indicators linking to the Theory of Change. These provide information on intermediary outcomes for specific activities (e.g. attendance numbers, composition of classes, range of classes, events and activities held etc.) The project management will be responsible for ensuring monitoring outcomes at

various levels of the theory of change on a (suggested) five-monthly basis; this provides useful context for the evaluation as well as information to support project management.

The **evaluation team** will generate data on the overall outcomes, which are independent of any specific project related activity. These outcomes are:

1. Good relations
2. Professional Development and
3. Personal wellbeing.

New empirical evidence will be generated on these outcomes, through a number of results indicators operationalising the outcomes, which will be used to assess whether the theory can be supported, using a variety of measures. Research on the results indicators is conducted through a mixed methods approach, with the timeline attached in Appendix 4, including:

- A neighbourhood survey conducted through face to face individuals to a random sample of 1500 households living within the vicinity of the centre;
- A survey of all the local young people from the neighbourhood now living in the Centre;
- Interviews with target groups and stakeholders (with attention to 'high' and 'low' success);
- Post-course evaluations;
- Field visits, observations in the site and collection of impact stories;
- (Potential) use of existing NOA assessments of asylum seekers' skills and wellbeing, if prove reliable and valid.

The research team will also concentrate on researching secondary data to support the theory. All data - on intermediary outcomes and final outcomes – as well as the supporting evidence and consideration of alternative explanations will form the basis of the evaluation assessment.

## References:

- Anderson, A. 2005. 'An Introduction to Theory of Change.' *The Evaluation Exchange* XI 2: 18. Accessed online Jan 2017 at: [www.theoryofchange.org](http://www.theoryofchange.org)
- Blamey, A. and McKenzie, M. 2007. 'Theories of Change and Realistic Evaluation. Peas in a Pod or Apples and Oranges?' *Evaluation*. 13 (4): 439-455.
- Kushner, S. 2016. *Evaluative Research Methods: Managing the Complexities of Judgment in the Field*. Charlotte, NC: IAP.
- Mayne, 2001. 'Addressing attribution through contribution analysis: using performance measures sensibly.' *Canadian Journal of Program Evaluation* 16 (1):1-24.
- Mayne, J. 2012. 'Contribution Analysis: Coming of Age?' *Evaluation*. 18 (3): 270-280.
- Parsons, D. 2017. *Demystifying Evaluation. Practical Approaches for Researchers and Users*.
- Pawson, R. and Tilley, N. 1997. *Realistic Evaluation*. London: Sage.
- Sridharan, S and Nakaima, A. 2012. 'Towards an evidence base of theory-driven evaluations: Some questions for proponents of theory-driven evaluation'. *Evaluation* 18 (3): 378-395.
- Weiss, CH. 1997. 'Theory-based evaluation: past, present and future. *New Directions for Evaluation*. 76:41-55.

## Appendix 1:

### U-RLP Researchers

**Dr Caroline Oliver**, Reader, Department of Social Sciences, University of Roehampton

Caroline has interests in migration, education and life course, as well as the role of the State in integration processes. She has a PhD in Sociology and Social Anthropology and has worked previously as a Senior Researcher at the Centre on Migration, Policy & Society (COMPAS) at the University of Oxford (2012-2016) where she remains a Research Associate. She also worked as a researcher in the Faculty of Education at the University of Cambridge (2006-2012) and as a Lecturer in Social Anthropology at Newcastle University (2002-2005).

**Dr Sarah Spencer**, Director, Global Exchange on Migration and Diversity, and Senior Fellow, COMPAS, University of Oxford.

Sarah's particular interests are in irregular migrants, integration, human rights and equality issues, and in the policy making process. She was an Open Society Fellow (2012-2014), exploring issues relating to irregular migrants in Europe and is a Visiting Professor at the Human Rights Centre, University of Essex. Sarah was awarded her doctorate at Erasmus University Rotterdam, has an MPhil from University College London and took her first degree at the University of Nottingham.

**Dr Karin Geuijen**, Assistant professor, Utrecht University School of Governance

Karin's main research interest is on the role hybrid (multilevel and multisector) networks have in creating public value, especially in the domains of justice and security. She carries out monitoring and evaluation research in order to establish whether public value is actually created. Recently she developed a framework for evaluating international police co-operation and also co-leads a monitoring project on innovative financial arrangements for social enterprises (social impact bonds).

**Dr Rianne Dekker**, Assistant professor, Utrecht University School of Governance

Rianne Dekker has a background in sociology (MSc, 2011) and public administration (PhD, 2016), with research interests focussing on the role of (social) media in public issues, including international migration, migrant integration and public security. More information on Rianne's past and current activities can be found at <https://www.uu.nl/staff/RDekker3/0> and [www.riannedekker.nl](http://www.riannedekker.nl)

## Appendix 2:

### U-RLP Research Advisory Group

**Professor Alice Bloch**, Professor of Sociology, University of Manchester

Alice Bloch's research focuses on understanding the lived experiences of forced migrants focussing on refugees, asylum seekers and undocumented migrants. Key themes include: marginalisation and exclusion, rights and agency, engagement in transnational relations, social and community networks, economic strategies and labour market experiences and the ways in which experiences intersect with class, gender, ethnicity and power. She is also interested in methodology, especially innovative methodologies in relation to sensitive research with vulnerable groups and in developing capacity building strategies for longer term non-academic impact and engagement. She has carried out a number of research projects for different funders including government departments and the ESRC.

**Professor Ash Amin**, Professor and Head of Geography, University of Cambridge Ash Amin CBE FBA is Professor and Head of Geography at the University of Cambridge. He is also Foreign Secretary and Vice President at the British Academy. He writes about race, belonging, cities and political renewal. His latest books are *Land of Strangers* (Polity, 2012), *Arts of the Political* (Duke, 2013, with Nigel Thrift) *Seeing like a City* (Polity, 2017, with Nigel Thrift), and *European Union and Disunion: Reflections on European Identity* (British Academy, 2017, co-edited with Philip Lewis). He is currently working on a project on mental health and the metropolis, led by Nick Manning at King's College London).

**Professor David Parsons**, Visiting Professor, Leeds Beckett University (Carnegie Faculty)

An economic geographer, David is a specialist in public programme evaluation and an established Visiting Professor at Leeds Beckett University (Carnegie Faculty) since 1999. Following an early academic career (University of Nottingham; Sussex; Cranfield Management School), David was an Economic Advisor to the UK's National Economic Development Council, and later Director of Research at CIPD and Advisor to the European Commission (Employment and Social Affairs). He combines roles as an independent policy researcher and evaluator at LBU, and consultant and advisor to public and voluntary sector bodies, directing and co-directing a number of high profile studies for public bodies including, in the UK, BIS, DfE, Defra, DFID, DWP, ESRC, QIA/LSIS, HEFCE and HEFCW, LSC/SFA, HEA, Home Office, NAW, TDA and devolved administrations, and in Europe for the European Commission, CEDFOP, the UNs International Labour Office and others. His appointments include Specialist Associate to the

UK Commission for Employment and Skills, and Lead Assessor to the Career and Enterprise Company. David is a widely recognised authority on proportionate evaluation methods, principally for public bodies, leading or contributing to 38 national / home-country or cross-national programme evaluations in the last decade on social policy and other issues. He is course leader on the UK's Social Research Association's 'Evaluation' programme, and has advised a number of government departments and other agencies on strategies and methods for proportionate impact evaluation. His most recent publication is *Demystifying Evaluation* (Policy Press, 2017).

**Dr Peter Scholten**, Associate Professor Public Policy & Politics; Director of IMISCOE; Coordinator of Master Governance of Migration & Diversity; Editor-in-chief of *Comparative Migration Studies*, Erasmus University Rotterdam.

Peter Scholten is associate professor public policy & politics at Erasmus University Rotterdam and director of IMISCOE, Europe's largest network of academic research institutes on migration, integration and social cohesion in Europe. Also, he is editor in chief of *Comparative Migration Studies* and member of the editorial board of the journal of *Comparative Policy Analysis*. Peter has published in various international journals and recently published, together with Andrew Geddes, a book on the Politics of Migration and Immigration in Europe.

### **Appendix 3: Advisory Board Meeting Notes**

#### **Note on the First Meeting of the Advisory Committee to the EU Urban Innovation Project, Utrecht.**

A meeting of the Advisory Committee was held in London on 22 May 2017 involving Professor Ash Amin, Professor Alice Bloch, Professor Peter Scholten, Dr Sarah Spencer and Dr Caroline Oliver. A subsequent meeting was held with Professor David Parsons. Key topics covered at both meetings are noted here.

The committee discussed its advisory, non-management role in relation to the evaluation research. The division of responsibilities for the evaluation between Roehampton and Oxford universities was clarified. Caroline Oliver presented on the aims and content of the Refugee Launchpad project, its context, objectives and early stages of implementation; and on the importance attached to its evaluation. The committee responded with a range of comments and questions on the project, the ideas and assumptions built into it, and its intended outcomes, drawing out the relevance of its design for evaluation purposes.

Caroline Oliver then presented on the theory and methodology of the proposed evaluation, leading to a discussion on the methodological options for assessing outcomes and for identifying the contributory factors. The committee discussed the indicators that could be used to measure progress and outcomes; the research tools that could be used; and the feedback that the research exercise could contribute to the project operation. It also discussed the relevance of earlier research literature to consideration of the aims and operation of the project. The complexity of the issues being measured, the volume of indicators monitored, and the changes that would take place during the course of the project, were among the challenges raised.

The committee considered the range of research issues in different academic disciplines to which the project could provide valuable evidence beyond the evaluation itself. It also considered the relationship between the evaluation and external applications to carry out research on Plan Einstein, on which Caroline Oliver had been asked to advise.

It was agreed that if feasible the next meeting of the Advisory Committee would be held in Utrecht.



The meeting with Professor Parsons focused on the methodological issues relating to the research including transferability and demonstration of the counter-factual; how to operationalise the theory of change; the relationship between the evaluation and the process monitoring undertaking by the project team; and the research tools.

A full minute of the meetings was prepared for the committee members.

**Sarah Spencer**

**Project Advisory Group**

**Note of the Second Meeting of the Advisory Committee to the EU Urban Innovation Project, Refugee Launch Pad, Utrecht, held at Plan Einstein, Utrecht, on 26 July 2018**

Attending: Professor Ash Amin, Professor Alice Bloch, Professor David Parsons, Dr Sarah Spencer (chair); Dr Caroline Oliver, Dr Karin Geuijen, Dr Rianne Dekker.

Apologies: Professor Peter Scholten

Sarah Spencer thanked the members of the Advisory Committee for travelling to Utrecht to see the project and to hear the lunch time presentations that preceded the meeting. It was agreed that that earlier session, and seeing the facilities at Plan Einstein, had been invaluable in the committee gaining a fuller understanding of the project.

Caroline Oliver, Karin Geuijen and Rianne Dekker each presented sections of the draft Interim Report, which had been circulated in advance. The presentation focused on the neighbourhood findings and skills and well-being findings.

Discussion with the Advisory Group focused first on the anticipated audience for the Interim report and areas of the literature relevant to considering the research findings. It then focused on details of the neighbourhood findings; on the findings relative to expectations; on the role of the Socius youth; and on the significance of the physical layout of the building. In relation to skills and well-being the discussion focussed on the significance of having those with refugee status among the COA residents; on the degree of flexibility in the

programme to reflect changing circumstances; on the ‘future-proof’ concept; on the relevance of differing language and skill levels among the learners; on the NOA well-being data; and on the mode of managing a programme involving municipal and non-governmental agencies.

The meeting then discussed the aim and design of the second wave data collection, and the possibility of using Qualitative Comparative Analysis, before a final discussion on editing of the draft interim report to finalise it for circulation. The Advisory Group was informed about the possibility of a Plan Einstein 2.0 at another Utrecht reception centre.

The format of the Seminar and Symposium to be held the next day were discussed, and the potential timing of the final meeting of the group in 2019.

## Appendix 4: U-RLP Evaluation Project plan

### Year 1 2017

<b>Q1</b> <i>Jan-Mar</i> <b>2017</b>	<b>Q2</b> <i>Apr-Jun</i> <b>2017</b>	<b>Q3</b> <i>Jul-Sep</i> <b>2017</b>	<b>Q4</b> <i>Oct-Dec</i> <b>2017</b>
Approval and finalization of U-RLP Project plan; Partnership agreements. 1 <sup>st</sup> partnership meeting; constitute advisory board	Set up project website and publicity; researcher recruitment; Progress report and first advisory board meeting	Researcher orientation	
	Stakeholder engagement, facilitation and co-design of Theory of Change	Design research and monitoring plan following TOC, prepare evaluation framework; flyer for IMISCOE 2017  Ethics approval and pilot research	Explore potential to build counterfactual with other centres;
		Monitoring of intermediate outcomes using TOC indicators	Monitoring continuing; Neighbourhood survey and survey with young people living in centre  Interviews with neighbourhood members (including some youth starters); interviews with asylum seekers and stakeholders; observations; participant observation

### Year 2 - 2018

<b>Q5</b> <i>Jan-Mar</i> <b>2018</b>	<b>Q6</b> <i>Apr-Jun</i> <b>2018</b>	<b>Q7</b> <i>Jul-Sep</i> <b>2018</b>	<b>Q8</b> <i>Oct-Dec</i> <b>2018</b>
		Progress report and Advisory Group meeting July 2018	
	Publish interim findings on website on neighbourhood perspectives	Publish interim findings on website of centre users and asylum seekers	Write academic article on phase 1
Continued data monitoring of centre entrants and outcomes monitoring using TOC indicators			<b>Centre closes Nov 2018</b>
Interviews, impact stories			Repeat neighbourhood survey at centre close  Interviews with neighbourhood, centre inhabitants, asylum seekers, stakeholders; analysis

**Year 3 - 2019**

<b>Q9 Jan-Mar 2019</b>	<b>Q10 Apr-Jun 2019</b>		<b>Q11 Jul-Sep- 2019</b>	<b>Q12 - Oct 2019</b>	
			Progress report and final advisory board meeting (July); peer review of final outputs (Sep)		
Publish interim findings from follow up survey on neighbourhood attitudes		Publish interim findings on website on wave 2 centre users and asylum seeker perspectives	Write 2 academic articles on overall project findings		Publish evaluation report
Phase out period of continued data monitoring of centre			Analysis and report writing comparing the two waves of data; assembling evidence on outcomes for the Theory of Change; verification through ex-post Contribution Analysis  Identifying options for knowledge exchange		
Analysis and write-up project report of -neighbourhood perspectives					