



Migration Policy Group

# Evaluating MIPEX III

Results of the MIPEX III Quantitative & Qualitative Evaluations

# Evaluating MIPEX III

## Introduction

The Migrant Integration Policy Index (MIPEX) is a unique long-term initiative which evaluates and compares what governments are doing to promote the integration of migrants in society. It is a fully interactive tool and reference guide measuring the policies of **33 countries**. The first edition of MIPEX was published in 2004, the second edition was released in 2007 and the third in 2011.

The two managing partners of the project were the British Council and Migration Policy Group.

The third project period of the MIPEX has been externally and internally evaluated from both qualitative and quantitative perspectives. This document draws on those findings to present the strengths of this project and address areas of weakness moving forward. Part I presents the key findings of the quantitative evaluation, Part II outlines the results of the external qualitative evaluation conducted by Weisblatt & Associés.

## Part I: Key findings of the quantitative evaluation

MIPEX has achieved significant reach to local and international policy makers, civil society organisations, academics and the public via a communications campaign which resulted in:

- Distribution of **6,000 hardcopies** of the full MIPEX report in English, and **500 full German translations** as well as **12,800 hardcopies of translations** of the country results of France, Germany, Italy, Poland, Spain, Finland, Netherlands, Romania, Portugal.
- **68,000** views of the MIPEX reports via the online reader.
- Partners produced **independent translations** using their own resources for the country results of: Belgium, Canada, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Greece, Hungary, Latvia – Estonia – Lithuania, Switzerland.
- **800 press mentions** reaching an approximate audience of over **100 million readers** across **41 countries and in 27 languages** (Deutsche Welle, Die Welt, El Pais, la Repubblica, Guardian, Daily Telegraph, Le Monde, Liberation, etc.)
- **72,000 visitors** to the MIPEX website at [www.mipex.eu](http://www.mipex.eu) since the launch and **600 people subscribed** to the newsletter for updates and latest blog posts on MIPEX-related policy developments.
- **2,800 integration stakeholders total participated in 30 national-level events** in **29 countries** across Europe and North America. Invitations were targeted at local policy actors, migrant and civil society organisations and researchers in the field of migrant integration. Attendance ranged from 30 to 300 participants per event.

- **11** government ministers responsible for integration attended the events and heard the MIPEX results and recommendations in person.
- **Three** EU-level events debating policy areas on the basis of the MIPEX findings with Members of the European Parliament, political advisors and European Commission representatives.
- Support from **72 national level signatories** across 26 MIPEX countries. These individuals serve as contacts for media, moderators and speakers at public debates, and representatives of the immigrant community (for your country, see [www.mipex.eu/signatories](http://www.mipex.eu/signatories))

### Monitoring use of the MIPEX by policy actors

Uses of the MIPEX by type of user (government, global actors, advocacy, research or press) are actively monitored and publicized on the MIPEX website. **115 uses** of MIPEX data have been collected and posted just since February 2011 ([www.mipex.eu/use](http://www.mipex.eu/use)).

### MIPEX-inspired policy debates

Demand for information and trainings on the findings continues. Indeed, MPG's MIPEX Project Director and Research Coordinator were invited to present MIPEX at **17 additional events** since March. MIPEX experts have also been called up to share their knowledge at external events. Requests come from global actors including the EU institutions and agencies, OSCE, research networks, cities and regions, universities, and so on. These events are listed on the updates section of the website.

Partners continue to organise workshops and research projects on specific strands of the MIPEX and, comparisons with different countries or regions and targeted to specific user groups.

### High-level endorsement

The MIPEX III received written statements of support from:

- Juan Fernando López Aguilar, Chair of the Committee on Civil Liberties, Justice and Home Affairs at the **European Parliament**
- Cecilia Malmström, **European Commissioner for Home Affairs**
- Ilze Brands Kehris, Chairperson of the **EU Fundamental Rights Agency** Management Board
- Howard Duncan, Executive Head of the **Metropolis Project**
- Amin Maalouf, **Author**

## Part II: Qualitative evaluation

The qualitative evaluation was conducted by an external evaluator, and can be found below:

## Migrant Integration Policy Index (MIPEX III) Final Evaluation: Results of Interviews with Key Actors and Analysis<sup>1</sup>

Assessment undertaken for the British Council and the Migration Policy Group (MPG) according to the terms of reference dated May 2, 2011.

Submitted by: Karen Weisblatt, External consultant, October 1 2011.

### 1. Evaluation Objectives: Setting the stage & terms of reference

The main purpose of this external evaluation is to examine the long-term sustainability of the MIPEX project. In addition, it is to document lessons learned from this endeavor and to provide constructive recommendations for follow-up actions. Our objective was to gauge the degree of “ownership” of the MIPEX tool by national network and managing partners in order to assess whether the project can be successfully maintained and developed over time. Our ultimate goal was to test the hypothesis that users are deeply engaged with the instrument and would like to carry on using it even if its current supporters are no longer engaged with the same intensity. To these aims we looked at the following core issues:

- Will advocacy continue apace if core outreach and networking activities are reduced?
- What is the on-going role of the national partners in the network that organized national debates during MIPEX?
- Will the users exploit the tool successfully? Is there a political buy-in?
- Will policy makers, governments and others persist in aiming to improve and monitor policy with this aid, or will they be less engaged with these issues if the central team is no longer actively encouraging people to engage?
- Do national partners need the “legitimacy” of the MIPEX Brussels team to help them advocate for policy changes?

MIPEX is a research project with direct advocacy and policy benefits. It is a double-track independent international instrument with both research and advocacy strands woven together seamlessly. It is best understood as a top flight comparative study on migration issues that achieves its full impact due to a dissemination policy encouraging debate and advocacy. This is the third iteration of an undertaking that from the outset has been a collaborative effort between the “think and do tank” MPG and the British Council, with co-funding from the European Commission. At present the British Council has undertaken a strategic shift away from engaging in society and human rights in favor of arts, education and English language;

---

<sup>1</sup> For the purposes of this report we will use the abbreviation “MIPEX” for the MIPEX III project

the decision to gradually discontinue a robust contribution to MIPEX was taken in this context. In sharp contrast however the MPG team indicates a keen interest in continuing this undertaking. Therefore this evaluation, undertaken to fulfill a commitment to the European Commission as part of the initial grant proposal nevertheless aims to identify the sustainability of this mission in this new environment.

## 2. Methodology

This was primarily an interview-based assessment intended to provide a sound understanding of stakeholder interests and intentions. An external consultant undertook 37 confidential interviews with individuals selected by MPG and the British Council in the spring of 2011. The evaluation methodology included:

- Familiarization with project background and project documentation;
- Discussion of the methodology and objectives with project team;
- Review data/information collection tools including a British Council internal assessment by its participating managers entitled *MIPEX partner Evaluation Survey Results*;<sup>2</sup>
- Participation as an observer at the MIPEX Closing Evaluation Meeting in Brussels, June 2011; and
- Undertaking and analyzing stakeholder interviews including national partners, British Council national managers, European and national policy makers, and representatives of civil society.

Interviews were undertaken in 12 countries and represent a reasonable geographic spread within the EU plus one non-European nation for benchmarking purposes: Canada, France, Germany, Hungary, Italy, Latvia, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Spain, Sweden, and the United Kingdom. Details of the research design and methodology follow in the annexes of this report (page 11) followed by a list of interviewees (pages 12-13) and copies of the questionnaires employed (pages 14-17.) Conversations focused on three areas: the relevance of MIPEX, engagement to sustain the tool, and possibilities for its positioning moving forward.

## 3. Establishing a baseline for outputs

This report is the final result of the work of an independent external evaluator. In addition the above mentioned internal British Council assessment was undertaken and shared with the assessor. Budgets were also reviewed, but this is not an assessment of the validity of the current budget cycle.

## 4. Results of our interviews: Analysis and report

---

<sup>2</sup> The survey was conducted via online survey monkey tool. It was sent to 68 respondents (project partners and British Council project managers.) The project team received 52 responses. The survey was conducted for the project team to understand how project network viewed and assessed various aspects of project implementation and coordination. Detailed responses are available on request but due to the size of the document are not attached to this evaluation.

The dichotomy between the usefulness of this endeavor, which has been confirmed by this study, and the difficulties in finding resources to sustain this work at national level is significant. It cannot be underscored sufficiently the degree to which the current economic climate is negatively impacting on the efforts of even the largest and strongest NGOs and independent research institutes in Europe. There is less funding available from their traditional local funders, often government. And competition for private philanthropic funding continues to intensify. In addition, and perhaps most significantly, this field is not one that is seen to be attractive to donors. A Central European partner summed up the situation in a nutshell: “Spending money on migration is seen as a poor choice. And private companies don’t want to damage their images by giving in this area. There are very few options for funding at present.” This report will demonstrate that the challenge facing this project is maintaining excellence in an environment of shrinking resources.

*Will advocacy continue apace if core outreach and networking activities are reduced?*

There is every reason to believe that this tool will continue to generate advocacy *in the short term*, while the data remains current and as long as some on-going resources are available to maintain activities. Today a number of activities are emerging which indicate a high level of interest in continuing this project. Many, if not all such initiatives, rely on the continued presence and guidance from the MPG core team in Brussels; some involve the on-going input of British Council staff in at least a limited capacity.

A few examples from our conversations demonstrate plans for advocacy moving forward:

- In Switzerland the Swiss Commission against Racism used the occasion of the MIPEX national meeting to launch recommendations for country to create an Anti-Discrimination Law that met with wide interest.<sup>3</sup>
- In Romania MIPEX brought together the British Council and the Open Society Institute whose Migration and Development Program will draw on these results in on-going efforts to create a new NGO platform for advocacy.
  - *This demonstrates how this project brought together “natural allies” (OSI and the British Council) for the first time in a constructive manner.*
- In France an initiative bringing together one of the partner organizations and UNESCO based on MIPEX is being studied (France Terre D’Asile); and another partner, Terra Nova, has integrated materials in briefs to political figures.

---

<sup>3</sup> Protection contre la discrimination: il faut que la Suisse agisse Berne, 05.04.2011 - Dans la troisième évaluation de l’index des politiques d’intégration des migrants (« Migrant Integration Policy Index », MIPEX III), la Suisse occupe l’avant-dernière place du classement des 31 pays analysés en ce qui concerne la protection contre la discrimination. La Commission fédérale contre le racisme (CFR) propose des solutions pour combler les lacunes de la législation suisse en la matière. (avis de la CFR sur [www.ekr.admin.ch/shop/00007/00073/index.html?lang=fr](http://www.ekr.admin.ch/shop/00007/00073/index.html?lang=fr))

- *This highlights an NGO-International Institutional connection which augurs well for the long term sustainability of the project, because the more organizations like UNESCO use these results the better the chances are of having them contribute to the project over time.*
- In Portugal the High Commission for Immigration and Intercultural Dialogue uses MIPEX in its research and publications. It is also being used in the development of the 2nd national integration plan.<sup>4</sup> In Poland in the spring of 2011 the government published a draft migration strategy followed by public consultations; examples of best practices were drawn from MIPEX and this material is now being used in two comparative studies to raise the integration agenda in their country.
  - Both of these examples underscore the on-going interplay between the MIPEX tool and national government.
- In Poland local NGOs and ODIR are cooperating so as to expand MIPEX so as to include other European Countries out of EU.

In addition, national partners themselves are keen to continue to engage in this process and to integrate the initiative into their regular work plans in a whole host of ways ranging from quoting the reports in internal documents, to citing the research in public, to launching additional activities based on the most recent project. The key networking and advocacy period however is linked to the national launches and there was a unanimous impression that that without this activity locally there would be a serious loss of momentum in the undertaking. Virtually every partner and observer was keenly aware of the positive impact of the launch events: the force and influence of the “comparative photo” is critical to advocacy efforts. Further, few were convinced that on-line launches would be sufficient to promote advocacy at the same level.<sup>5</sup> Indeed a European Policy Maker stated “it is important to make a lot of noise – the launch is a policy tool”. Public exposure is important and without these activities MIPEX undoubtedly would not be taken as seriously by politicians.

Therefore the current model which requires members of the Brussels-based research team to participate in launches across the continent continues to have great appeal for both non-governmental partners and policy makers. It came up in all of our interviews as a key element for partners developing outreach and advocacy plans. A significant reduction in this aspect of the work will undoubtedly have negative repercussions on advocacy. As the British Council provided the space and significant resources for most of these launches and networking at present, this is a fraught issue.

*What is the on-going role of the national partners in the network that organized national debates during MIPEX?*

---

<sup>4</sup> <http://www.mipex.eu/tsf-rosario-farmhouse-elogia-portugal-como-bom-mercado-de-trabalho-para-imigrantes>

<sup>5</sup> There was a successful webinar launch in Canada which could serve as a model

National partners continue to include MIPEX-related activities in their plans wherever possible and seek out ways of keeping the project vigorous and useful.<sup>6</sup> They are interested in seeing that the tool continues to be updated and look to the MPG staff to maintain this tool and centralize information. Some suggested that they would like to intensify their engagement with the project, either through possibly playing a role in research or organizing public meetings to replace those undertaken by the British Council.

There was unanimous agreement that MIPEX had served to help national partners improve their organizations understanding of integration policies and their role as leaders in this field. Dissemination, the running of training workshops, and direct advocacy with governmental officials came across as the most pertinent activities as the project moves forward. This augurs in favor for a continuation of engagement by national partners if resources can be found to help off- set costs.

Some examples of on-going activities for national partners include:

- In Germany the *Citizens of Europe* network is using the findings to develop a project on political participation of migrants and a new research project studying related matters in 80 cities was launched as a result of this work and the British Council will continue with ongoing policy making seminars in order to inform decision making on migration issues. Likewise in Latvia a partner organization is engaged in follow up research to focus on the political participation of migrants.
- Selected British Council offices will integrate the MIPEX educational strand in *Connecting Classrooms* project on inclusion and diversity in schools. In addition, two British Council projects, *Belief in dialogue*, an international project looking at how to counter misunderstanding and misconceptions of different communities, widening participation and encouraging engagement towards global citizenship and *Language Rich Europe*, looking at multilingualism in Europe, including a focus on migrant languages, will provide some outlets for integrating MIPEX materials. MIPEX and its methodology are also used by the British Council in its Open Cities project.
- In Italy the European Institute in Florence has invited national partners and the research coordinator of MIPEX to give a conference about the tool in October.
- In the UK Runnymede Trust is planning to organize a series of follow up activities from November 2011 through March 2012:
  - a parliamentary event – in conjunction with a relevant All Party Parliamentary Group, to brief legislators and key civil society organisations about the relevance of MIPEX III for policy decision-making
  - an academic event – in conjunction with Runnymede’s Academic Forum of the 75 leading academics in race relations, migration and social justice
  - an online event – in conjunction with Runnymede 360 network of leaders and emerging leaders on race equality, an interactive online event that draws attention to the relevance of MIPEX III as a resource for activism

---

<sup>6</sup> This despite the fact that the British Council has informed local managers of a strategic shift in their activities which does not include their maintaining a significant engagement in this project



Some individuals discussed integrating MIPEX directly into their work plans. The vast majority of partners said that they would be able or wanted to continue to devote time to this activity, and especially valued the international networking, but that they need to obtain validation from their supervisors and/or boards before committing time to the project moving forward. Many spoke of hoping to get approval to continue but as being unable to provide a definite response at present. *It is important to recall that these national partners, NGOs themselves, were not paid for their contribution to the project, and therefore this level of commitment is quite extraordinary.* In some cases it was clear that resources could be raised internally within an organization and the project could continue at a similar level, while others have severe financial constraints hampering their ability to devote even limited time to activities without corresponding budgets. In addition, some national partners were fairly confident that they could, for example, organize a launch comparable to those primarily held at the British Council, while others have little experience or resources available for this sort of public action.

*Will the users exploit the tool successfully? Is there a political buy-in?*

Users include partners, journalists, advocacy specialists, and in the broadest possible sense, the policy making community, where this project is particularly appreciated. A British policy maker notes:

“It is a hugely valuable resource for me. But more importantly it has changed the way policy makers think about the topic. Here in the UK we don’t have an integration strategy. But MIPEX has helped put the spot light on what are indeed British policies. This has made our country much more self conscious and has provoked a lot of debate in the policy community.”<sup>7</sup>

This project is also firmly ensconced as an independent actor contributing to the European Institutional agenda, indicating a strong interest in on-going use of the materials and indeed overall political buy in.<sup>8</sup> The research itself is being used in a wide range of prestigious institutional settings including the Eurostat report<sup>9</sup>. It has been being cited by the European Commission as a successful monitoring tool<sup>10</sup> and ECRI, the Council of Europe’s primary outreach institution in this area, uses MIPEX as a source frequently in its country reports and is often referred to by its Secretariat at meetings, both public and private. ODHIR also utilizes this tool. In addition, as will certainly be assessed elsewhere in this report, a whole host of prominent figures ranging from Cecilia Malmström, European Commissioner for

---

<sup>7</sup> There was only one discordant note on this, a French governmental policy maker who was not convinced by the independence of the material.

<sup>8</sup> Even if some of our possible interviews with officials did not bear fruit. This was notably the case with the Council of Europe whose representatives feared a conflict of interest and declined to be interviewed.

<sup>9</sup> [www.mipex.eu/eurostat-compares-mipex-naturalisation-rates](http://www.mipex.eu/eurostat-compares-mipex-naturalisation-rates)

<sup>10</sup> See MIPEX website

Home Affairs to Ilze Brands Kehris, Chairperson of the EU Fundamental Rights Management Board, have publicly endorsed the project.<sup>11</sup>

Overall it is relatively easy to make good use of the tool in policy making circles or in educating the general public through press coverage, while it is harder to find the resources to continue in-depth advocacy.

*Will policy makers, governments and others continue to improve and monitor policy with this aid, or will they be less engaged with these issues if the central team is no longer actively encouraging people to engage?*

This is a very complex issue and one which is quite difficult to assess. Given the way in which the project has been designed, where the research is really not an end in itself but rather part and parcel of a larger scheme, it would seem that there is little room for continuing to monitor policy long term unless both parts of the mission continue. The interviews with National Policy Makers and European Policy Makers indicate that both groups feel the need for such an activity to maintain pressure on governments. The psychological weight of knowing that this comparative tool is going to appear serves as a successful burden to many in government and policy making circles close to power. As was noted by a national civil society representative, MIPEX is “as powerful a tool as any *external lever* can be in helping governments set policies in a more progressive manner”. It is difficult to imagine how momentum could be maintained should there be a vacuum at this level.

*Do national partners need the “legitimacy” of the MIPEX Brussels team to help them advocate for policy changes?*

There were some regional differences with regards to this issue. The “Southern” Europeans were conscious of their successes, especially in Portugal, and anxious to see this maintained and serve as a model, while being far from self-congratulatory: they understand that policies are one thing, long term success in practice another. For them the international comparison and the networks provided by this project were hugely important. In Eastern and Central Europe the global comparisons were critical and kick started advocacy; it served to provide “cover” in efforts to push for legislative change. In Northern Europe the rankings and work with the central Brussels team were most often used to maintain pressure on national governments and to encourage new research.

Canada was the absolute exception to this trend. Canadians felt that the indicators are more European than “universal” and therefore that this is in many ways a normative instrument. They nevertheless felt that their inclusion as a benchmark is interesting. Their core criticism is that subjective elements of immigrant experiences are needed to enhance the meaning of indicators, in other words linking between the rankings and outcomes is key. In short, MIPEX assesses policy and not outcomes, and is of little pertinence in advocating for change at the national level in Canada.

---

<sup>11</sup> See MIPEX website, signatories page

Most partners want to work with MPG to achieve sustainability of the tool because they understand that it is the international comparisons that makes this tool so valuable. There was near- unanimous support for the present research data collection system in which national correspondents update, score, and check the data with MPG serving a centralizing and management function. The presence of the Brussels team in national launches and follow up activities as appropriate was widely lauded.

### Lessons Learned: Suggestions for improving MIPEx

Overall a wide variety of stake holders ranging from civil servants, NGOs, politicians, researchers, and the press were engaged with this project and responded to our investigation and enthusiasm.

The most interesting strategic suggestion to emerge from these conversations was the notion that the MIPEx team should invert the public relations pyramid and focus in the next round on how best to apply the research. This would mean putting the emphasis on the dissemination plan and on how to develop advocacy strategies with this material. The rankings themselves will always be picked up by journalists as the “new worthy” information. Several policy makers and national partners felt that an even more powerful advocacy tool can be crafted so as to make even more of the vast quantities of intelligently gathered independently validated information.

A second important lesson is a warning about the complexity of the tool. A wide variety of people mentioned the need to keep it simple. As one interviewee said, “there is always a strong temptation to add more strands and additional information, but it should be resisted. The more complex it gets the harder it will be to sell the tool. MIPEx needs consolidation, not innovation at present.”

This argues against adding new strands at present. Our feeling is that the complexity issue is itself multifaceted: while it is true that too much breadth could dilute the tool, it is more the global “comparisons” that concern this reviewer, although they can be very useful from a benchmarking perspective. It may prove difficult to maintain legitimacy and relevance for the tool in a more complex global environment. This is a strategic decision which will need to be ironed out once a new partnership is developed to support the activity.

Another suggestion to improve the project would be to give greater visibility to the very significant number of world class researchers connected to the project. A number of people mentioned the role of the signatories and the possibility that a more visible scientific board or advisory board could be given a higher profile.

In an unrelated area, salient comments were made by two National partners from Central Europe concerning the larger political context in which this project is evolving. In particular, much European attention has been focused on the plight of the Roma while “general” broader migration issues have less political saliency. No suggestions were provided to “offset this disadvantage” but it was noted as challenge.

One final lesson does not come from the interviews themselves, but rather from the interviews we did not conduct: migrant organizations were by and large absent from our conversations. A number of national partners mentioned the dearth of their participation in the MIPEX project with regret. One civil society researcher noted that this could be due to an inherent contradiction: most migrant associations focus on national issues rather than European challenges and therefore they are not necessarily drawn to MIPEX spontaneously. Nevertheless despite this lacuna the project links research and advocacy communities to government, independent policy advisors, civil society and the press in a remarkable manner.

### Conclusion

Overall, MIPEX is very well regarded internationally for three reasons:

- it is a scientifically robust peer reviewed tool with a consistent track record established over a number of years;
- the quality of its outreach and communications have led to effective advocacy and training; and
- the excellence of staff engaged in this project at the British Council and at MPG have enabled a relatively seamless interface between the two disparate strands of work.

Significant resources have been invested in this activity over a sustained period of time. The success of the project is not in doubt and is measured by numerous outputs, and it is a well developed “brand” in the field. It is a complex project requiring an ability to make and sustain excellent contacts both in the academic, governmental and non-governmental worlds in many countries, and the sheer number of organizations and individuals that MIPEX has *successfully* partnered with over the years as well as the very broad geographic spread of its engagement was very impressive indeed. And these partnerships are very solid, even if we remove the British Council from the equation. Likewise, the level of professionalism and the considerable abilities of the MPG and British Council staff were commented on regularly.

These interviews are overwhelmingly positive and give the evaluator every reason to be optimistic about the ability of the MPG-MIPEX team to continue to successfully develop and manage this project. This is an “international reference tool” which has been used as a catalyst for policy change and has widespread support amongst users. It was lauded both as a source of data and as an advocacy tool. Most commented that it is written in a way that policy makers and non – experts can easily understand; it is user friendly and not too theoretical.

While there was one substantive challenge to the model by the Canadian partners who essentially felt that it was too “Eurocentric”, there was surprisingly little on-going discussion amongst other policy makers and partners regarding the issue of whether this is a normative tool: it is widely accepted as adequately reflecting the needs of the European research and advocacy community. A few national policy makers did suggest that it would be interesting to cross reference economic data with MIPEX inputs in order to be able to gauge the level in which policies must be *implemented*. While this would certainly be extremely interesting, it

would increase the size of the project substantially and pose numerous methodological challenges.

There is a strong demand “from below” at national level for the continued presence of the central MIPeX team to remain engaged in this process. There is a need that the Brussels team continues to participate in launches or other national activities as they provide legitimacy as representatives of the all important international references.

This overwhelmingly positive picture is nevertheless contrasted by a very difficult funding environment. Non-governmental organizations are seeing their budgets stretched to the breaking point, hampering their ability to “carry” this project in the absence of external funding. There is a will to continue this undertaking, or what one civil society interviewee described as the “best fact gathering project possible”. MIPeX provides tools for policy makers and advocates so that they are capable of developing concepts which can ultimately bring about positive change. With so much positive feedback, willing partners, and verifiable impact, we feel confident that an appropriate funding mechanism will be put into place to keep this critical project moving forward.

## Annex 1. Research design and methodology

For the purposes of this evaluation we took “stakeholders” to mean the following groups: national “civil society” MIPEX representatives from the 27 member states, Switzerland, Norway, USA and Canada; a sample of “institutional” organizations including the European Commission, Council of Europe, the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe (OSCE), or others; and a sample of academics and/or researchers. While the methodology for selecting countries was not noted in the Terms of Reference, it was refined through conversations with the client.<sup>12</sup> The data itself concerning the MIPEX indicators did not enable us to easily generalize on a regional basis and after some debate a decision was made to assess impact in a number of countries rather than undertaking interviewing *all* of the states included in the MIPEX.

Three customized interview questionnaires produced to meet the needs of the categories of interviewees identified by the client: Partners, Policy Makers and British Council Managers. Researchers who undertook the data collection were not interviewed.

An independent and external consultant undertook confidential interviews with individuals selected by MPG and the British Council in the spring of 2011. Three separate interview questionnaires were established in order to tailor our questions to the diverse populations: British Council managers, partners, and policy makers. Most of these interviews took about 30 minutes; a few were significantly longer. The interview questionnaires were approved by the client. This report should successfully conclude our mission.

There were a total of 37 interviews successfully undertaken in the period from July through mid-September 2011. With the exception of senior staffers from the Council of Europe who expressed the opinion that it would be a conflict of interest to speak with us, we had a nearly 100% response rate.<sup>13</sup>

These interviews were conducted over the phone or on skype using the formatted questionnaires but allowing for open ended comments at the end.<sup>14</sup> A full list of interviewees is in Annex 2. The three questionnaires are in Annex 3.

---

<sup>12</sup> For the purposes of this report “the client” means both the British Council as represented by its Senior Project Manager Ketitishvili and MPG, as represented by its Director Jan Niessen

<sup>13</sup> In some instances we substituted names from the original list with the agreement of the client when we were unable to speak with interviewees in France and Germany. In one case, for example, in Sweden, the British Council staffer felt that we did not need to speak with them because we had already spoken with the local partner.

<sup>14</sup> In two cases we were sent written responses to our questionnaire (both in France)

Annex 2 : List of individuals interviewed

|                      |                   |   |                       |
|----------------------|-------------------|---|-----------------------|
| Canada               | Howard Duncan     | Director Metropolis project                               | National Policy Maker |
| Canada               | Jack Jedwab       | Association for Canadian Studies                          | National Partner      |
| Canada               | Sandra Lopes      | Maytree Foundation  | National Partner      |
| European Stakeholder | Eva Schultz       | European Commission                                       | European Policy Maker |
| European Stakeholder | Marta Kindler     | Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe      | European Policy Maker |
| European Stakeholder | Peter Bosch       | Member, Cabinet for Commissioner Cecilia Malmström        | European Policy Maker |
| European Stakeholder | Nils Muiznieks    | Chair, European Commission Against Racism and Intolerance | European Policy Maker |
| France               | Mathieu Tardis    | France Terre D'Asile                                      | National Partner      |
| France               | Michel Aubouin    | French Ministry   | National Policy Maker |
| France               | Alice Bonnet      | Terra Nova  | National Partner      |
| France               | Patrick Lozes     | French NGO leader, political figure                       | Civil Society         |
| France               | Sandrine Mahieu   | British Council   | British Council       |
| Germany              | Guido Jansen      | British Council   | British Council       |
| Germany              | Gunilla Fincke    | German Expert Council on Migration and Integration        | Civil Society         |
| Germany              | Barbara John      | Professor Humbolt U/Chair of NGO                          | Civil Society         |
| Germany              | Mekonnen Mesghena | Böll Foundation   | National Partner      |
| Hungary              | Adras Kovats      | Menedek   | National Partner      |
| Hungary              | Agota Biro        | British Council   | British Council       |
| Italy                | Laura Davi        | ISMU  | National Partner      |
| Italy                | Susan Costantini  | British Council   | British Council       |

|                |                         |                            |                       |
|----------------|-------------------------|----------------------------|-----------------------|
| Italy          | Udo Enwereuzor          | COSPE                      | Civil Society         |
| Latvia         | Dace Akule              | Providus                   | National Partner      |
| Poland         | Justyna Frelak          | IPA                        | National Partner      |
| Poland         | Mirosław Bieniecki      | Caritas                    | Civil Society         |
| Portugal       | Hugo Seabra             | Gulbenkian Foundation      | National Partner      |
| Portugal       | Paulo Mendes            | President, AIPA            | Civil Society         |
| Portugal       | Rosário Farmhouse       | High Commissioner          | National Policy Maker |
| Romania        | Alina Constantinescu    | British Council            | British Council       |
| Romania        | Iris Alexe Aurica       | Soros Foundation           | National Partner      |
| Spain          | Elena Sanchez           | Project Manager, CIDOB     | National Partner      |
| Spain          | Nicolás Marugán         | Ministry of Social Affairs | National Policy Maker |
| Spain          | Raquel Fernandez Montes | British Council            | British Council       |
| Sweden         | Elin Svensson           | British Council            | British Council       |
| Sweden         | Henrik Nilsson          | Swedish Red Cross          | National Partner      |
| Sweden         | Henry Martenson         | Ministry of Employment     | Policy Maker          |
| United Kingdom | Chris Hedges            | Home Office                | Policy Maker          |
| United Kingdom | Sarah Spencer           | Compass                    | Civil Society         |



## Annex 3: Interview Questionnaires

### Questionnaire on the sustainability of MIPEX for policy-makers

#### Section One : Relevance of MIPEX

- Has MIPEX improved your (Y/N):
  - Knowledge and understanding of integration policies
  - Public image as knowledgeable on integration
- If yes, with whom? Select all that apply (Y/N):
  - NGOs
  - Politicians
  - Researchers
  - Migrant organisations
  - Press
- Are you using MIPEX in the following ways, and if so, on what specific topic?
  - Better understand your countries policies?
  - Compare them with international standards?
  - Learn from other countries?
  - Assess/debate a newly proposed law?

#### Section Two: Engagement sustaining the tool

- Would you like to be involved in producing MIPEX? (Y/N) If so, in what way:
  - You/ your organization inform MIPEX on legal and policy changes and MIPEX fact checks with independent correspondents
  - MPG updates MIPEX scores & web-text and checks with you/your organization
- Do you think that changes in the MIPEX data should be presented on the website?
  - Whenever they are reported and scored
  - At the end of every month via newsletter alert
  - At the end of every quarter via newsletter alert
  - At the end of every year via print or online publication

#### Section Three: Positioning moving forward

- How can you or your organization contribute to the on-going success of this project?
- Would you be able to provide or to help seek out funding you or do you have any suggestions on how MIPEX can be funded moving forward?

## Questionnaire on the sustainability of MIPEX for its partners

### Section One : Relevance of the MIPEX tool

- Has being a MIPEX national partner improved your organisation's (Y/N)
  - Understanding of integration policies?
  - Public image as a leading organisation?
- If yes, with whom? Select all that apply (Y/N)
  - Civil servants
  - NGOs
  - Politicians
  - Researchers
  - Migrant organisations
  - Press
- Are you using MIPEX in the following ways, and if so, on what specific topic?
  - Start new research/report?
  - Network with other organisations?
  - Undertake advocacy?
  - Provide information for other non-MIPEX events ?
  - Add information to and other press releases or publications?
  - Assess/debate a newly proposed law?

### Section Two: Engagement sustaining the tool

We are seeking to understand who can best keep an eye out for legal/policy changes, update scores and the MIPEX web site.

- Which of the following alternatives would be best for you?
  - MIPEX national correspondent(s) looks out for changes
  - MPG updates MIPEX scores & web-text and checks with partners
  - MIPEX national correspondent(s) update scores/text and checks
- How do you feel it is best to indicate changes in the MIPEX data?
  - Whenever they are reported and scored
  - At the end of every month via newsletter alert
  - At the end of every quarter via newsletter alert
  - At the end of every year via print or online publication
- Would it be easier for you and/or national correspondents to update data:
  - Whenever government/media report a legal/policy change
  - At the end of every month to check for any legal change
  - End of every year to check for any legal changes

- Can your organization continue to devote some time to this project? Whose time?
  - Yours
  - A colleague
  - An associated or partner researcher
  - An intern
  
- If yes, how much time can you continue to devote to this project?
  - Approximate hours and or days per month
  - Maximum per month
  
- How would you like to use MIPEX for events? Select all that are appropriate.
  - Use MIPEX as part of your organisation's on-going events
  - Undertake dedicated 'launches' annually or bi-annually (MIPEX III model)
  - Organize dedicated policy events at key moments in political calendar (e.g. when a new law is passed)
  - Organize regional events on key theme(s)
  - Organize international-level events on key theme(s)

### Section Three: Positioning moving forward

The following are open ended questions.

- How can your organization contribute to the on-going success of this project?
  
- Would you be able to help seek out local funding partners and / have any suggestions on how MIPEX can be funded moving forward?

## Questionnaire for British Council Managers – Sustainability of MIPEX

### Open ended questions

- Given the overall context of diminishing BC involvement in the implementation of MIPEX, in what ways do you think you will continue to use or help to disseminate MIPEX?
- Are you planning to integrate MIPEX in other ongoing BC projects, activities and events? Please specify.
- Do you have any ideas about other partner organizations that might be interested in supporting MIPEX?
- Do you have other colleagues in your country you can recommend as useful resources in this transition?
- Do you have any suggestions for fund raising locally?
- Do you have any other suggestions?