

PROJECT: "A MODEL TO EVALUATE
ACTIONS AND POLICIES ON SOCIAL INCLUSION"

**OUR EXPERIENCE IN FOUR STEPS:
SOME CONCLUSIVE REFLECTIONS**

**PAPER PRESENTED AT THE SEMINAR
'INCLUSIVE POLICIES ON SOCIAL INCLUSION IN AN INCLUSIVE
SOCIETY?'**

ANTWERP 1999/11/29

Liliana LEONE

VIDES Internazionale NGO

Via Gregorio VII, 133 Rome ITALY

December 1999

European Commission DG V
PREPARATORY MEASURES TO COMBAT SOCIAL EXCLUSION
Coordinator: Jan Vranken Department CASUM - University of Anversa

Liliana Leone - Via Fontana della Girandola 24- 00040 Monte Porzio
Catone (Roma) ITALY
Tel. Fax. ++39 06 9422505 E mail: leone.l@microelettra.it

INDEX

1° STEP: THE BEGINNING OF THE RESEARCH

OBJECTIVES OF THE RESEARCH

METHOD AND SAMPLE

SOME CONCLUSIVE REFLECTIONS

2° STEP: TO DEVELOP A REVIEW OF EVALUATION EXPERIENCES REALISED AT NATIONAL LEVEL

CRITERIA OF THE CHOICE OF CASES

3° STEP: MEETING IN ROME ON NOVEMBER 11TH AND DIFFUSION OF RESULTS

4 STEP: CONCLUSIONS AND FINAL DISCUSSION WITH THE PARTNERS AND THE EUROPEAN COMMISSION DGV

A. THE EVALUATION SITUATION OF SOCIAL POLICIES IN ITALY

SOCIAL EVALUATION IN THE EIGHTIES

EVALUATION OF SOCIAL POLICIES IN THE NINETIES

THE CONTRIBUTION OF THE ITALIAN ASSOCIATION OF EVALUATION (AIV)

STRONG POINTS/WEAK POINTS

B. THE EXPERIENCE OF GOVERNMENTAL AND NON GOVERNMENTAL ORGANIZATIONS ON PARTICIPATORY APPROACHES OF MONITORING AND EVALUATION AT INTERNATIONAL LEVEL: WHICH SUGGESTIONS?

C. THE EMPLOYMENT OF SOCIAL INDICATORS

D. SUGGESTIONS AND PROPOSALS

ANNEXES

ITALIAN EVALUATION CASES: SUMMARY TABLE

NOTES ON THE PARTECIPATORY EVALUATION APPROACHES

BIBLIOGRAPHY

A. Bibliographical documentation about “Evaluation Cases”

B. Short bibliographical documentation about Italian policies on social

C. inclusion

D. Bibliography on social policies evaluation

E. Social inclusion and evaluation in the WEB

As stated in the proposal of the project co-financed by DGV, one of the aims of the study was: *"to identify and to analyse experiences in Italy in evaluating actions and policies to promote inclusion."*

The work, executed in Italy by Vides (an International NGO), can be summarized into 4 steps.

1° STEP: THE BEGINNING OF THE RESEARCH

The research starts operatively from April 99 and its first aim is to understand how "social inclusion policies" are declined at national level.

We have developed a study based on the collection and analysis of direct evidences of national referents (institutional and private welfare) of the policies against social exclusion and a review of evaluation cases on policies, programmes and projects whose final scope is the promotion of social inclusion.

Considering the vastness and, at the same time, the ambiguity with which certain concepts could be used and translated, it appears to us as being necessary that, before speaking about evaluation, we should try to comprehend the "object". We need to understand how these policies are operatively translated in Italy. *Therefore, besides developing an analysis of documentary kind, based on the literature in use (see first report bibliography), we asked some "witnesses" to make clear which are the actions and measures, the programmes, the laws expressing promotion policies for social inclusion and policies against social exclusion at national level.*

OBJECTIVES OF THE RESEARCH

A) To compare the expressed opinions of about 10-20 preferential witnesses from the Third sector and of the institutional referents of the policies against social exclusion.

The subjects contacted were some referents from: Department of Social Affairs, Poverty Commission, *ISFOL*, some metropolitan town councils (ex.: Town council of Bologna and Rome, Township Forum of the fight against social exclusion in Naples...), National Research Institute and University, Italian Association of Evaluation (*AIV*), organizations of the Third Sector (ex. Permanent Forum of the Third Sector, *CNCA*, *Cilap*, *CGM*, *National League Co-operative Confcooperative*, ...).

During the interviews, the above authorities were asked to express their opinion with regards to the following topic areas:

- the operative definitions of the programmes and projects to fight social exclusion and to promote social inclusion;
- the collection of opinions regarding possible "evaluation questions and evaluation objects" (What purpose should it serve? To whom? Responding to which needs? On which aspects, levels..?);
- the collection of opinions regarding elements which could distort (see adverse effects of the programmes) programmes and projects whose final result is aimed at social inclusion;

- singling out of cases, experiences, good evaluation practices of the programme and the project.

METHOD AND SAMPLE

We carried out 11 semi-structured interviews during the period of July – October.

We also contacted as witnesses about twenty other persons who indicated some of the evaluation cases set out in the following paragraph. The results and reflections arisen during the in-depth interviews enabled us to focus much better on some of the questions dealt with in the fourth paragraph where some evaluation cases of the programmes and projects were set out.

SOME CONCLUSIVE REFLECTIONS

Our research confirm what has been stated in the previous studies.

As declared by Chiara Saraceno, "in Italy there isn't a real policy aimed at fighting against any form of exclusion and poverty, especially when a policy is meant to be an integrated system of tools, which specifically focused on this target. There aren't policies tackling social exclusion and poverty as multidimensional and process phenomena. However, the different sectors of our social protection national system (welfare, social security, health, etc.) can count on multiple devices that, as a whole, outline an *implicit policy* against social exclusion and poverty."

The expression 'social exclusion' is a wide-ranging concept that may refer to different sectors; as a matter of fact, a distinction among different forms of exclusion can be made (according to C. Saraceno, Negri 1997) :

1. Exclusion from economic life
 2. Exclusion from an appropriate residential context
 3. Exclusion from the health system
 4. Exclusion from education
 5. Exclusion from social life
1. More specifically, the expression 'exclusion from economic life' (one form of exclusion) means the exclusion from consumer and labour markets.

AREA 1: Definition

The different witnesses interviewed are in agreement with the belief that, in Italy, a specific reflection on the fight policies against social exclusion is rather recent and seems to be matured in consequence of the EC debate.

This is one of the reasons that explains the lacking definition of such Policies: such concepts are used as "omnibus" definitions behind which statements and advances, even being different, are hidden.

The notion of social inclusion risks to be translated in services of "social assistance" or in measures for the working inclusion and the employment insertion rather than a more complex *policy* that concerns transversely a vast series of interventions, precautions, projects that act at a macro level and locally: refer to the enjoyment of the cultural assets of a community, to the

Liliana Leone - Via Fontana della Girandola 24- 00040 Monte Porzio
Catone (Roma) ITALY

Tel. Fax. ++39 06 9422505 E mail: leone.l@microelettra.it

defence of the right to study, to the formative policies in addition to the work and welfare policies.

It would be useful to have a bigger elaboration and co-division of the notions of the “fight against social exclusion” and promotion “of social inclusion” that come to be defined by a “lacking” (that isn’t available in Italy...) or that are translated immediately and are identified with individual legislative precautions or individual instruments: law 285/97, the PIC Employment, law 237/98 that establishes experimentally the minimal income of insertion etc. An element of concurrence is given by a strong emphasis put on the matter of unemployment: among the processes that produce social exclusion, a predominant role is recognized by that processes connected to the exclusion of the employment market. Priority comes today to the subject of work insertion and of the creation of employment for the “weakest segments”.

AREA 2: Examples at National level

The opinion of the witnesses about the operative translation of the notions of the fight against social exclusion and the promotion of social inclusion, seems particularly interesting and partly explains and closely examines what was discussed in the first Area of the interview.

As first element, we have to underline the fact that only in the 90’s people have begun to speak in Italy about social inclusion while previously we referred to the precautions and interventions of the insertion in the MKT of work of the “weakest segments”.

This cultural passage has left the sign in the conception of the fight against social exclusion that now emerges. Not by chance in Italy, and in other countries in a more decisive way (referred to *Germany in EAPN, Social Inclusion a priority task for the new Structural Funds*, pp. 38. 1998), this notion is going to be declined from the point of view of its operative translation in promotion of the employment insertion of the *target group* that basically does not diverge from the segments of the receivers defined previously as “weakest”.

Of course, the search wasn’t proposed to realize an exhaustive outline of the policies that in Italy could re-enter inside of the notion of the fight against social exclusion but rather to gather the first associations and reactions to the question presented by us. Still the “absence and the lacking” already indicate to us something about the visibility and recognizability of some interventions rather than others, of some targets of use or typology of need with respect to others.

The law 285/97 Infancy and Adolescence Plan and the *Minimal income insertion*- Legislative Decree 237/98, are surely recognized as instruments, even if being partial, of fight against social exclusion. The agreement between the Ministry of Labour and the Social Affairs Department, for a common administration of the European Social Fund directed to projects against social exclusion and the PIC Employment are mentioned.

As already stated, the conception of the employment policies of the weakest segments was a conception extremely limited to the activation of instruments for the vocational training and the support to employment insertion. These

Liliana Leone - Via Fontana della Girandola 24- 00040 Monte Porzio
Catone (Roma) ITALY

Tel. Fax. ++39 06 9422505 E mail: leone.l@microelettra.it

interviews don't mention actions that regard other fields, such as the re-qualifications of the urban district (refer to district contracts), interventions for the residential housing, the measure of defence of the right to study (refer to observatories of scholastic dispersal) for every citizen even immigrant or the relative precautions of the access to health and cultural services, or to tax relieves to favour the weakest segments.

AREA 3: Effectiveness an impact

With respect to the impact and effectiveness of the different instruments for social inclusion, we put in evidence the following points:

- *The role of the community programmes in the cultural innovation of the Italian Public Administration and the role played by the local administration.*
- *The need of integration between the different programmes and funding and the co-divisions of common strategies;*
- *The scarce effectiveness and the low rate of "survival" of many services of vocational guidance and their limits at the level of planning , inadequacy of the service (too centred on information), of the methodologies and of the offered contents;*
- *The need to overcome the employment viewpoint for target of classic use;*
- *The need to develop quick monitoring systems, not centred on individual categories of need (ex. house, work...), sensitive to fast change and rooted at a local level_*
- *The need to integrate, put into the net and coordinate several instruments of intervention (assistance and advice of the neo firms, vocational guidance, vocational training, individual support).*
- *The need to unite the Assessorships of Labour and of Vocational Training.*

We mention three requirements of a correct and efficient use of directly or indirectly resources aimed at the fight against social exclusion.

1. A first requirement is given by the continuity of the financial supports and of the interventions that should be extended, in the case of community programmes or of national financial projects, for a time no less than three years.
2. The integration of the policies and of the interventions at local level represents the second requirement.
3. The third requirement is the role of the local governments always more directed to the governmental functions and to the administration of planning processes.

AREA 4: The evaluation

As already stated, lacking a translation of the notions of "fight against social exclusion" in the integrated *policies*, as a matter of fact almost no evaluative

research is commissioned to evaluate the results at multidimensional level. One of the risks that we run is to obtain only evaluations connected to the accomplishment of a particular law, of a particular programme (the Urban rather than the Employment) and so the evaluations are in function of the activated financial source.

We have such results in spite of an increasing attention to the subject of territorial integrated policies and of the emphasis put at EU level on the mainstreaming strategies and on the necessary synergy among the different funds (FSE, FEAOGA, FESR).

With respect to the matter of the “evaluation indicators”, the common opinion is that social inclusion indicators are not proper. A key element is the integration among: *policies* (of employment, welfare, of the house...etc.), institutional competencies (too shattered), programmes and services.

In some last legislative precautions we find clauses that regard the evaluation of results; a cultural growth of the operators working at different levels, either public or of the social private (to which the realization of projects and services are always more committed) is to be developed.

Some experiences of the “Observatories” (Caritas observatories of poverty, FIOPSD observatories of the homeless, observatories of the scholastic dispersion of Provincial Education Super-intendencies, of the employment market trend of the Regional and Provincial Employment Agency, of the Infancy and Adolescent as given by L.451/97 at the regional level...) activated at local, regional or national level on the matters of poverty, homeless, employment,... seem to respond also to the inquiry needs connected to the implementation of the different *policies*.

In some cases, they realize evaluative researches.

Even if there has been a general growth of the culture and of the evaluation practice, we can find some declarations: “evaluation is needed”, although followed by practices of control and monitoring attentive only to the formal dimension and to the administrative needs. This last annotation also regards monitoring and evaluation of the structural funds.

Altogether, the witnesses contacted and interviewed have mentioned only few cases of evaluation generally connected to the personal professional activity and to the role held; the general current opinion is that there is not enough evaluation.

2° STEP: TO DEVELOP A REVIEW OF EVALUATION EXPERIENCES REALISED AT NATIONAL LEVEL

The second phase of the research deals with a collection and analysis in evaluation cases which are strictly linked (even if not explicitly) to the field of social exclusion, fight against poverty and promotion of social inclusion. Such concepts will be defined afterwards.

We have done a first mailing list of organizations that handle “social inclusion” (coming from previous mailing lists of institutional organizations , referents of social exclusion Commission etc.). These organizations are asked to point out “evaluation cases”.

It deals with a collection of cases that doesn't pretend to be complete or exhaustive. We were more interested in selecting few cases, correct experiences from a methodological point of view whose useful results could guide decision making and to develop new learnings (see the degree of usefulness of evaluation) and vice versa, evaluative researches which would bring to our attention possible failures (see the evaluation report left in the drawer...).

We must analyze evaluation cases; the question is: evaluation of “what”? Of working policies for the disabled persons and those at low income level, of health policies, (Ex. accessibility to services or protection for the elderly at risk..), of educational policies (see study on rate of early desertion of school), of housing policies etc.

It seems to us to be somewhat limited and misleading to refer only to EC programmes, and in particular to the *PIC Employment or to Poverty 3*, which obviously makes explicit reference to the question of social inclusion and we prefer to include also national policies (see Law 285/97 Infancy and Adolescent Plan, Legislative Decree 237/98 on minimal income insertion), ministerial programmes and projects at local level.

The official literature which is available in form of an evaluation of such policies is relatively scarce, fragmentary and it often refers only to a single dimension or aspect and not to an overall fight strategy against social exclusion. This ascertainment has spurred us on to widen the field of observation and experiences of evaluation with the actual policy as well as of the single programmes and projects.

In the second part of the research we selected 17 evaluation cases.

CRITERIA OF THE CHOICE OF CASES

The work that we presented does not pretend to be exhaustive. However, we report some exemplary experiences or particularly meaningful at Italian level that cast a light on the strong and weak points of the evaluation of the discussed policy.

The evaluation cases have been identified and catalogued in function of some guidelines:

1. Range of the evaluation: policy, programmes, projects

Liliana Leone - Via Fontana della Girandola 24- 00040 Monte Porzio
Catone (Roma) ITALY
Tel. Fax. ++39 06 9422505 E mail: leone.l@microelettra.it

2. *Object of the evaluation: pertains to explicit intervention to fight against social exclusion and/or to promote of social inclusion..*

In relation to the first distinctions, it appeared to us that there is no need to give explanations or justifications; in any case, what has been asserted in the previous chapter needs to be pointed out, that is there has never been any development of integrated policies of a real and proper fight against social exclusion in Italy. In this sense it becomes inaccurate to speak about evaluation of these policies: if anything, it needs to seek and identify experiences of evaluation of measures, laws, programmes, partial projects that have some influence on significant elements of the phenomenon.

We have thus chosen to point out only evaluative researches related to some measures such as the recent Legislative Decree 237/98 on the minimal income.

As regards the creation of enterprises for youth in Southern Italy, managed by the Society of Youth Entrepreneurship (*IG S.p.A.*), we had some doubts. The intervention of *IG S.p.A.* does not concern the young people being in the “weak segment” (ex. low educational level, low social-economic level of the family of origin...).

Anyhow, one of our proposals, also as NGO, is to develop the spreading out and the debate on themes that are usually boached in universities or in institutional contexts.

We have tried to resume products and materials that have been already developed and to put them into the concept of “social inclusion” again. This is not the appropriate place to make a deep analysis of each case.

All in all, from such analysis, emerge the following evaluation typologies:

- Policies evaluation, in the strict sense of the word.

As regards this part of the evaluation, we have only rare experiences, among which some comparative and transversal studies on social policies in the Member States have been included.

One for all: “ESOPO” (research project for the analysis and comparison of policies fighting against current social exclusion in different European cities - among them, in Italy, there are Turin, Milan, Cosenza).

This project is co-funded by DG XII and has Chiara Saraceno (University teacher in Turin) as leader.

She is the current president of the Social Exclusion Commission.

- Laws evaluations.

The most important cases, as regards the policies we are discussing, are: the evaluation of “minimal income insertion” (RMI) experimentation, started in Italy since just few months and the law 285/97 Infancy and Adolescence, promoted by minister Turco.

Indeed, this legislative measure includes some clauses which are considered already “weak”: some articles in the statute make reference to evaluations and regional obligations that must draw up monitoring and evaluation reports each year.

- Programmes evaluation.

Liliana Leone - Via Fontana della Girandola 24- 00040 Monte Porzio
Catone (Roma) ITALY

Tel. Fax. ++39 06 9422505 E mail: leone.l@microelettra.it

Among these, we mention the Employment Community Initiative evaluation (still in progress) and the Operative Programme for Center-North-Socialization and youth creativity, managed directly by the Social Affair Department (carried out by AASTER).

As regards the explicit references to the theme of social exclusion within the evaluation of Employment Community Initiative, we can see the following considerations:

“The experiences that seem to be the most interesting, because of their innovative intervention modalities, even if being at an already initial phase, are:

- ° The experimentation of interventions aimed at “exclusion prevention” through planning and offering of targeted services for vocational inclusion. Such services are aimed at the specific needs the different objectives express. The experience of Employment underlines the importance of interventions that integrate measures for the guiding and increasing of work supply with measures and the aware of work demand and tutorship in the work.

- ° Creation and development of (local/national/European) networks involving different subjects typologies (public body, social parts, third sector and associations) and representing important experimental forms of “new strategies for local development”, based on partnership.

The Employment experience has shown the necessity to take part at the conceiving and planning phase of interventions at once, in order to support the sharing of objectives from all the local subjects.

- Projects evaluation.

To make an example, we have reported five evaluation experiences, carried out as projects of Employment Community Initiative (a Youthstart), as Lien programme and as initiative for vocational inclusion of disabled persons, increased by the social co-operation.

Anyhow, it must be considered that most of these experiences have been realized at such level, even if it is difficult to find papers which report methods and results.

- Observatories of poverty and social exclusion.

Because of different reasons, we have decided to mention also the observatories that, in some cases, become an instrument for Services “to analyze the new needs and also to observe one’s own policies impact”. The fight against the different forms of social exclusion seem to require new kinds of “proximity” observatories, that must be placed at territorial level and that require law acceding barriers (proximity services and services of law acceding barriers) to people who represent the social groups at risk of exclusion.

Emerging forms of social exclusion have features that are generally not much visible to civil service and only few recognizable also because of the overlapping of illegal and hidden phenomena (ex.: minor work, women and minors trade for sexual aims, illegal immigration, abuses and rapes of women and minors, etc.).

Finally we remind you that an Observatory on Social Inclusion ISFOL-Regions, has been instituted for about one and half a year.

This observatory has been promoted by Isfol (Rome) and by some Italian regions.

. Commission on Social Exclusion

This point is not mentioned as an evaluation “case”.

We only want to remind that the new national “Poverty Commission”, called Commission of Research (commission of inquiry on Social Exclusion) has been instituted in Italy.

This commission makes specific studies and researches and writes a report about the state of poverty in our country every year.

It must evaluate the impact of social policies of the Services on poverty in Italy and it also studies the different forms of social exclusion.

3° STEP: MEETING IN ROME ON NOVEMBER 11TH AND DIFFUSION OF RESULTS

Between September and October ‘99 an intermediate report was sent to a large number of people who had asked for it or had been involved as witnesses.

After the meeting of November in Anversa, a deep exigency of confrontation and participation among the persons contacted in the previous months has come out (they are persons in charge into central civil services, in the chair of AIV local Services, trade unions, universities, research institutes, being responsible for Employment Community Initiative and RMI evaluation in Italy).

Thanks to this project, there is the opportunity to compare and to share a large number of considerations with important networks and organizations.

Within such context, we have the opportunity to focus better on the issue of evaluation principles.

A second paper, titled “Report in progress. Hypotheses and suggestions for the development of evaluation systems of actions and policies for social inclusion”, was sent to a hundred persons in Italy (most of them are representatives of organizations) during the first half of November.

Such persons were asked to give one’s personal opinion and advice.

We have received a great deal of answers.

On November 19th, a meeting with 30-35 partakers took place in Rome.

They were institutional members (Social Affair Department, Municipality of Rome, etc.), evaluation experts (the president of the Evaluation Italian Association, a university teacher in the faculty of psychology in Rome, the CGIL Research Institute and others), NGO with NGO networks representatives (Cilap, Fivol, Voluntary Services, etc.).

Some evaluators from Genoa, Milan and Ascoli Piceno were also invited to take part.

4 STEP: CONCLUSIONS AND FINAL DISCUSSION WITH THE PARTNERS AND THE COMMISSION

The last step deals with considerations and advises come out all along the way.

They are:

- A) The evaluation situation of social policies in Italy;*
- B) The experience of governmental and non governmental organizations on participatory approaches of monitoring and evaluation at international level: which suggestions?;*
- C) The employment of social indicators;*
- D) Suggestions and proposals.*

A) THE EVALUATION SITUATION OF SOCIAL POLICIES IN ITALY

“There is a social evaluation deficit because of cultural and organizational reasons.

At the same time, we see the taking place of activities within this concept, even when they must still find the way to pass from an efficient expectation hierarchy into a concrete and coherent examination in processes and results”.

This is what Nicoletta Stame (the current president of the Italian Organization of Evaluation - AIV) says referring to the state of evaluation in Italy.

In order to explain the reasons of the origins of the Italian delay, N.Stame compares our context to the historical, political and cultural American one, in which evaluation has begun in the sixties.

“The valuation starts in connection with the idea of a precise programme, that must achieve a result in a precise period of time and with precise resources. It makes its first attempts into an institutional and political environment [...], that is characterized from a pragmatic political culture and a federal and devolved institutional system, in which are possible experimentations and initiatives at the level of different realities”.

We can find in our country a variety of actions, measures and laws, decrees, circulars and a cultural predominance, rather than wide-ranging programmes with specific policies within the civil service and the administrative law.

The evaluation in a such cultural reference model coincides with the level of adherence to the “standard”, being controlled and checked by predefinite practices and standards.

This cultural approach still influences deeply the use and the interpretation of instruments as: the development of standards in services, the quality of services, the indicators of effectiveness and efficiency.

Stame points out also another aspect about the difference between our evaluation and the overseas one: “the evaluation - she says - has started from a particular anomaly in the USA cultural policies according to which the effectiveness of a public intervention in economy and in social questions was doubted.

Therefore, they wanted to demonstrate the success of the intervention in order to justify the initial financial support and to ask for its prosecution after the conclusion of such intervention.

This initial scepticism has given a strong push: it is possible, it is due to measure and to check the (economical, social) benefits in every programme or intervention that is also taking place within the service activities.

A programme or intervention that doesn't correspond to such standards must not be carried on".

SOCIAL EVALUATION IN THE EIGHTIES

The evaluation is introduced in Italy during the eighties within the reform attempts of civil service and the support attempts to decisional processes and to policymakers.

It developed into different forms.

- The evaluation into the social sector has dealt mostly with devolved plannings carried out by public services and by non-profit organizations at different levels.

During these years some evaluation experiences of programmes against poverty (Municipality of Padua), evaluation of services (for ex: house care to elderly people and minors), especially in North-Italy, are developing. Some Societies and institutes of social services are real pioneers into the social evaluation: the Zancan Foundation in Padua, the IRS Institute of Social Research (Milan), the POSTER Institute, the ISTISS and the EISS (in Rome) as schools of social service.

Such organizations have given a big contribution to introduce the evaluation culture in Italy, in the social field, also through editorial production (social service magazines, editorial series, meetings...).

Self-evaluation experiences of territorial social services begins to develop, although a strong institutional commission is still lacking. In these years, kinds of evaluation of customers satisfaction are introduced even within the public service.

The medium-large consultant societies transfer models of organizational consulence also to the public services, borrowing them from interventions made by the world of enterprise.

Concepts as Total quality and Quality Assurance are introduced by the PPAA reform.

They will mark deeply and in different ways also evaluation cultures of social policies (even in a wrong way because they favoured confusion and misunderstandings). With reference to the theme of fight against poverty and promotion of social inclusion, we can see not only the case of Padua, but also the evaluation of the Communitary Programme, of Commission, POVERTY III.

The Communitary Programme for social and economical inclusion of disadvantaged groups, commonly called Poverty Programmes-3, starts from previous communitary initiatives and is called first and second European Programme for the fight against poverty (1975-1980 and 1984-1988).

With a field of action that was larger and more ambitious than the previous programmes, this programme includes 41 pilot projects: 29 Model Actions and 12 Innovative Initiatives.

Liliana Leone - Via Fontana della Girandola 24- 00040 Monte Porzio
Catone (Roma) ITALY

Tel. Fax. ++39 06 9422505 E mail: leone.l@microelettra.it

Model Actions, having a local base, experiment organizational models, a multimedial approach of poverty and participatory perspectives, while Innovative Initiatives try to solve situations present in specific groups, the particularly disadvantaged ones. The question of evaluation is largely discussed. A paper of two volumes has been written on such debates. Among the difficulties the evaluation has had, we see the tendency to evaluate in a way that is “too strictly observant of the project”.

That is, informations of evaluations remained within the projects and weren't shared. As regards the culture of projects and programmes management, it has had a growth that is still remaining in intervention strategies of other programmes (ex.: the importance of local partnerships).

Nevertheless, differently from the experience in Portugal, we can not attribute a complexive impact to the programme as regards the management of such policies at the level of local and central civil service involved.

From such experience, we have maintained network relations at EU level, but there isn't a real employment of evaluations developed for the single projects.

EVALUATION OF SOCIAL POLICIES IN THE NINETIES

We mention two macrophenomena that are transversally linked to PPAA.

They involve also the evaluation of social policies.

a) The reform of EU Structural Fundings, especially of FSE within the social field (insertion into labour market of weak phase etc.) has surely helped the development of the culture and praxis of evaluation: sometimes it has represented an obligation, even an unavailable bore, but it has been a real opportunity to learn and an important resource.

The working methods for EU programmes and the attention to their evaluations has deeply influenced both Services at central and periferical level and different realizers in the private social.

The realizers are asked to introduce also an evaluation phase into the process of project realization (I'm referring to Employment Community Initiative and Adapt for the social aspect).

Under the entry “evaluation”, a large quantity of economical resources are assigned (about 5% of all the approved projects) and some of them have produced worthy attempts to the development of internal monitoring forms and self-evaluation. Sometimes, they are supported by external evaluators-advisors or by small societies.

b) A second impulse to the introduction of evaluation experiences is given by the evident crisis (at the beginning of the nineties) of Welfare State, developed during the sixties and the seventies: this resources crisis, together with the untenability of the previous financial and fiscal model, the inadequacy of the model on the issues achieved, has started a debate in Europe as in every State. A revision is considered to be necessary.

In Italy we have the Welfare Mix, the Welfare Community and there is the necessity of more frequent private and social private interventions in the participatory management of services.

“All the countries with Welfare State have got problems.

They must tackle problems as inefficiency of services, ineffectiveness in the use of resources, a wrong distribution of benefits, deficit raise.

Beginning from the English motto “value for money”, standards for a “New Public Management” (based on the direct responsibility of realizers on results and quality- in Italy, decree 29/93-, on the principle to put users in the centre of services, on the recognizing and prizing of eventual successes) become effective.

New instruments are introduced in this field, in order to guarantee a more participatory and clear management, as the papers of the services.

It considers evaluation as an essential instrument to compare the point of view of the different subjects (between public and private, between public and public), in order to see successes and failures and to find the best way to employ fundings”.

As regards territorial sociomedical services (at Municipalities and local health enterprises level -ASL), we can see a multitude of evaluation experiences based on different methods and approaches.

Many local services develop quality Offices and institute Commissions, discussions, workgroups to introduce standards of service qualities to users (nurseries, residential services for not self-sufficient minors and elders, home care services for disabled persons, elders, minors) and to develop forms of direct credit in structures. Direct credit has been already experimented for the medical agreement with clinical laboratories or private clinics.

The Social Affairs Department itself institutes working groups to check the quality of social services with a strict cooperation among representers of organizations of the private social and writes a paper in which it suggests the general lines and “standards to orient, promote and control the quality in social and socioeducational services, directly managed by Local Authority and by private social or private enterprises.

This document shows a system that is original in comparison with the principles implemented in the Public Health Service, in the school and in vocational trainings.

It proceeds from the acquisitions reached into such sectors, but it admits the specificity of the social sector” [...] “In the financial act in 1997, a National Social Funding has been created (the D. Lgs. n. 112/98). It indicates the Regions as ruling bodies in quality matters (authorizations, agreements). According to this act, the State has got the task to define general standards. The frame-law for social services reform is actually analysed in order to discuss and modify the national social plannings with essential services. They should be placed according to common standards all over the national territory. The government has entered into an agreement with the Third Sector in order to increase the quality in services and to increase both production and purchase of services.

Some Regional Services have ruled the quality of services since a long time: typologies, standards, crediting for residential structures, service regulations, service access standards, contribution standards, suppliers register, regulation of agreements with social cooperations, etc.

Some experimentations of good-service are taking place: They are standards and procedures valid for the referring territory or for single sectors of intervention.

Within the social cooperation, there are many interventions for the quality of researches, production of guides and many enterprises are preparing for certifications, according to Iso 9000 standards.

Liliana Leone - Via Fontana della Girandola 24- 00040 Monte Porzio
Catone (Roma) ITALY

Tel. Fax. ++39 06 9422505 E mail: leone.l@microelettra.it

In Italy as in Europe, we don't have yet UNI standards for the certification of the social sector.

Evaluation is based only on standards and procedures that check the general quality and that are applied in sectors”.

Many organizations, for example in the private social, have used the Adapt II phase programme, in order to go by routes of self-training in the matter of quality certification of social enterprises.

The negative aspect of this phase is that “quality indicators”, both for services and social private, are the only possible evaluation form.

Experiences that report the real efficacy and consequences of receivers' benefits of programmes and projects are still rare.

The contribution of the Italian Association of Evaluation (AIV).

The rise of the Italian Association of Evaluation in 1996 has given a significant contribution to enrich the debate and to propagate materials, documents and papers about evaluation.

The association has also established the record to have started one of the first electronic editorial experiences in Italy, offering through internet numbers of the RIV (Evaluation Italian Magazine) gratis.

Within this context, many experiences have been done, starting a debate on the evaluation of social policies and social-health services (see the annual Meeting).

Societies and Institutes that “offer” evaluation are increasing in number.

Among these we report also new subjects (The famous IRS in Milan, Zancan in Padua, Cles etc.), that deal with evaluation of projects and services of social and health kind, both as single advisors and societies (PRO.VA Associations linked to the Master of Public Policies Analysis in the University of Turin, ASSCOMs linked to Psychology of Italian and American Community, I CRODUS (Perugia), AASTER, Emme&Erre in Padua etc.).

We are going to summarise the weak and strong points of “evaluation and evaluative practices” that concern interventions and actions and that can be included into the “policies for social inclusion” (not the interventions of the policies under discussion).

Strong points:

- During these last years, evaluations are being experimented at several levels (one learns along the way);
- There is an increasing in interest from central services (Social Affair Department) and from local services (Municipalities, ASLs, Provinces etc.).
- The working logic of projects is one of the priorities of services and administrations, even if the reorganization involved will be long-lasting and only partial.
- Organizations of private social are improving their capability in evaluating and they need help “to evaluate their own services”, also in order to legitimate themselves towards public services.

- The Commission for Social Exclusion has been reorganized with new functions as regards evaluations of government policies for the fight against social exclusion.
- We remind the presence of a legitimated organization (AIV), which develops and divulges the culture of evaluation, respecting the different approaches and the multidisciplinary contributions.

Weak points:

- The limited capability from public services to ask for valid “evaluation questions”.
- We have mostly the cultural model (which occurs also into the private social) that has been taken from administrative law and bureaucratic logic, so that evaluation has the same function of an administrative control and the same principles of a project-programme (for ex.: n. of service hours, n. receivers etc.).
- There aren’t clear boundaries between the concept of “pragmatic of quality” (often identified with ISO standards and procedures) and evaluative research (evaluation of policies, programmes, projects etc.).
- There is an abuse of terminologies and a risk of technicality in the employment of “indicators” that are not based on predefinite approaches, methods, evaluation systems, comprehension of evaluation demands (who, what, how, when!).
- There is confusion between monitoring and evaluation. “Services can gather informations on what happens in their inside, on order to monitor - I mean to keep under control - the attainment of precise results or process indicators, trying to document all that happens. Nevertheless, this flow of informations, [...], can not substitute the judgement concerning evaluation, as regards coherence among the different objectives and measures put into effect, efficiency of employed resources, effectiveness in getting results. Monitoring is not the same as “evaluation in itinere”, [...]; we need to understand why thing happened that way and how they could have been modified. A superficial Knowledge of all the situations is not sufficient at all; we need to stop on the critical aspects of a programme or action and to analyse them deeply or conversely on examples (whether expected or not), in order to see what is functioning in the right way and what needs an improvement” (N. Stame).
- As regards some cases, one for all the Employment Community Programme, there is an ambiguity about the rule of the evaluators at national level, because they are evaluators of technical assistance at national level but must be submitted to the control of Member State and Accompanying Commission.
- Fundings and evaluation tasks coincide with the realization time of a project and don’t last longer. They mean to make an “evaluation of results and impacts”, while they really realize results evaluation only in the first phase of the programme (the first two years) and not in the second one (towards the other States, in Italy the delay is due to a postponement in the starting of the programme and in the slow monitoring data collection).

In this second part of my report, I'm going to illustrate some propositive ideas about evaluation approaches and methods of the policies we are discussing.

B) THE EXPERIENCE OF GOVERNMENTAL AND NON GOVERNMENTAL ORGANIZATIONS ON PARTICIPATORY APPROACHES OF MONITORING AND EVALUATION AT INTERNATIONAL LEVEL: WHICH SUGGESTIONS?

International governmental and nongovernmental organizations for the cooperation development (for ex.: microcredit projects; growth projects for enterpreneurships, poverty reduction, the improving of health and social conditions; programmes for the management of natural resources etc.) and NGOs networks are discussing the necessity to use new monitoring and evaluation systems (M&V up to now).

Also the researches and the most important institutions involved in the evaluation of projects for "the development of Communities" (in the broadest sense: programmes), for the requalification of urban areas, the "possible development" in modern countries, have introduced and experimented evaluation methods of "participatory" kind.

In the USA, in Canada and in Great Britain, we can see very interesting developments of such approaches.

The debate on the fight against poverty and social exclusion at EU level is involving at present a multiplicity of subjects and public stakeholders in the private social (network of NGOs and "umbrella" at European and international level).

The debate on evaluation methods and approaches will probably extend more and more (I really hope so).

In a recent paper of EAPN English network (European Anti Poverty Network-England) and UK Coalition against poverty, there is a good contribution on the theme of the importance of participatory approaches aimed at the production of fight strategies against poverty.

The paper reports: "The ones who experiment directly poor living conditions know better than anyone else the difficulties of this kind of life and the impact that the instability of one's area of life has on the others".

Such people, having been "users" of services in the past, "can understand deeply the weak and the strong points, as well as the feasibility of the new proposed policies.

Moreover, they can give an essential contribution to monitoring and evaluation of processes".

The concept of "new" M&V systems refers, for example, to approaches, methods and systems able to:

- answer the exigencies of self-evaluation and selflearning from the involved subjects (the so called beneficiaries, local populations, associations and NGOs that make interventions, different stakeholders etc.);
- answer the exigencies of those (decision-makers and evaluators) who use approaches of participatory kind;
- answer for results according to evaluation principles, objectives and systems of "beneficiaries" value and not only of funding organizations;

Liliana Leone - Via Fontana della Girandola 24- 00040 Monte Porzio
Catone (Roma) ITALY

Tel. Fax. ++39 06 9422505 E mail: leone.l@microelettra.it

-evaluate the impact of hardly quantifiable programmes and results, as the empowerment level in a community, the growth level of the civil society and others, and also the results that develop in an unexpected way over the realization of the project (see goal-free approaches).

A common element of the approaches (we synthesise them with the abbreviation PM&E- Participatory Monitoring and Evaluation) is the involvement of a wide range of stakeholders with the employment of methods fit to guarantee the opportunity to express one's own point of view and to share learnings.

This movement of opinions has found a concrete form in methodologies and trends known as:

- **PRA or Participatory Rural Appraisal**
- **Beneficiary Assessment**
- **Collaborative, Participatory and Empowerment Evaluation**
- **Participatory assessment monitoring and evaluation**
- **Participatory and system-based process evaluation (Snyder Evaluation Model- Dick 1996)**

The reader can investigate these approaches using the sources in the notes. There are also applications and important experiences at UE level (Great Britain, Holland, German and other countries). Nevertheless the core of the debate is somewhere else.

C)EMPLOYMENT OF SOCIAL INDICATORS

As regards elaboration and employment of indicators to evaluate the effectiveness of fighting actions and policies against social exclusion (as for social inclusion), I'm reporting only some indicators at the level of Economic and Social Council of UN resulted from a summit on social development in 1995.

In such context, we have indicators related to the employment of statistical indicators in the social field.

I'm reporting the document: it deals with a deep analysis of a range of indicators related to different areas (demographic situation and growth conditions, uprooting of poverty, producing employment expansion and unemployment reduction, equal conditions between men and women, social inclusion).

I'm also reporting, to make an example, some passages related to indicators on social inclusion.

This concept is very similar to the one of "social inclusion", as it is meant at EU level.

As you can see, in such occasion, UN excluded the possibility to employ univocal indicators to measure social inclusion that could be valid for all the countries, arguing that the choice of possible indicators (we will give a possible representative set afterwards) depends on the nature of the groups considered as vulnerable.

A. Statistical indicators

70. It is not possible to define a single set of country indicators that can be used to monitor social integration. The choice of indicators will depend on the nature of the vulnerable groups identified, which will differ between countries.

71. The sort of indicators that are likely to be required for each group are:

- (a) Number of people in the group;
- (b) Age/gender structure;
- (c) Occupational profile;
- (d) Duration of unemployment;
- (e) Economic activity profile;
- (f) Income levels;
- (g) Position within overall income distribution;
- (h) Housing standards/amenities, such as access to safe water, sanitation and floor space per person;
- (i) People living alone and with little contact with close family;
- (j) Health status, such as infant mortality rate, age-specific mortality rates, expectation of life and nutritional intake;
- (k) Educational standards, such as adult literacy rate, number of years of formal education and participation rates (for children);
- (l) Crime victimisation rate;
- (m) Participation in volunteer work, sport, cultural activities and travel;
- (n) Proportion eligible to vote.

72. These quantitative indicators may not always fully describe the situation of disadvantaged groups; part of their disadvantage, for example, may be a lack of religious freedom. Such indicators may therefore have to be supplemented with indicators of subjective well-being.

73. The aim is to monitor progress in social integration, that is, the convergence between the situation of the identified groups with the rest of the population within the country. Therefore, indicators should be presented in time-series form with data for the rest of the population shown alongside for comparison. Countries may also find it helpful to compare both their identified population groups and the associated indicators with those of other countries within their region.

D) Suggestions and proposals

I'm going to point out some suggestions and proposals on current evaluation systems.

They are summarized into ten points, from general and methodical to technical ones.

1) Which evaluation and of what?

As we have seen before, the concept of “**policies for social inclusion**”, which is analyzed in the evaluation, **should be better focused and put in terms of priority** within the different plannings.

As evaluators, we should study how such policies become operative at all levels.

In fact, there are wide horizons as for strategies, but **we need to identify and choose more precisely the specific actions and policies we want to talk about.**

2) **It would be proper to give space to many evaluation approaches and to mixed methods, even at the same time** (at the EU level), to develop a cultural growth and to study the same phenomena, even considering the different demands and priorities.

Speaking about this point, the contributions made by evaluation theorists of the last generation (after 1980) and of the “third period” (as Weiss, Cronbach, Wholey, Patton and Chelimsky) are very important.

It would be also proper to promote, at EU level, evaluations based on **participatory approaches**, using contributions and **experiences developed on such themes as fight against poverty and social exclusion within the developing cooperation of governmental and non-governmental organizations** (for ex.: World Bank, UNDP-United Nations Development Program etc.) and of **American and Canadian theorists for empowerment and participative evaluation.**

Empowerment evaluation is part of the intellectual landscape of evaluation. It has been adopted in higher education, government, inner-city public education, non-profit corporations and foundations through the United States and abroad.

A wide range of programme and policy sectors use empowerment evaluation, including substance abuse prevention, HIV prevention, crime prevention, environmental protection, welfare reform, battered women's shelters, agricultural and rural development, adult probation, adolescent pregnancy prevention, tribal partnership for substance abuse, self-determination and individuals with disabilities, doctoral programmes and educational reform (Fetterman, Kraftarian, and Wandersman 1996).

Moreover, this approach has been institutionalized within the American Evaluation Association and is consistent with the spirit of the standards developed by the USA Joint Committee on Standards for Educational Evaluation (Fetterman 1995; Joint Committee, 1994), as well as the Guiding Principles for Evaluators (1995).

Empowerment evaluation is the use of evaluation concepts, techniques, and findings to foster improvement and self-determination. It employs both qualitative and quantitative methodologies.

Although it can be applied to individuals, organizations, communities, and societies or cultures, the focus is usually on programmes.

3)As regards “evaluation indicators”, opinions are conflicting. According to national and UN experts, **it is not possible to define a single set of country indicators that can be used to monitor social integration. The choice of indicators will depend on the nature of the vulnerable groups identified, which will differ between countries.**

Anyhow, each element that is considered to be a key-element should follow the integration level among (working, care, home etc.) policies, (too shattered) institutional competencies, programmes and services.

According to Stame’s words “When we talk about policies of social inclusion, we are talking about a process, an **inclusion process**, that is to start from a situation of poverty and difficulty with something or someone managing to modify such situation.

Therefore, **to evaluate an inclusion policy doesn’t mean to estimate how many poors there are; it means to see what has been done** to make a hundred poor to become ninety-eight or to lower the social desegregation level.”

“**The indicators we have at our disposal are indicators of a state of need** (their income, where and how they live, and other indications), that’s all.” I want to underline that Chiara Saraceno, current president of the Italian Commission for social exclusion, has expressed a similar opinion into her research report within ESOPO project.

Among result indicators of a social exclusion programme it is unthinkable to give too much importance to such result indicators as “n. of new employed”, because they can not indicate processes and phenomena that regard extreme marginalities and come near to illegal acts (for ex.: tract of women for prostitution, immigrants in clandestine conditions, illegal work in Rome communities etc.).

At this point, in Great Britain, the Scottish office of the Department for Education and Employment (DfEE) has made an attempt to use “soft” indicators into the Employment Community Initiative, in order to evaluate such results as: self confidence, motivation, attendance, social skills etc.

“Indicators system - N. Stame goes on- is effective especially into two cases: the first case regards a previous ex ante analysis of a need and the following result (indicated by such indicators) after the intervention.

This evaluation is not a process analysis and it doesn’t regard the policy in itself; it only evaluates

whether a situation has changed or not.

Of course, we know that a situation can be changed because of many other reasons than our intervention, as in the case of globalization phenomenon” or of other things not linked to our intervention.

“Then the problem is to find right systems to evaluate what we are doing.”

Not by chance, during our evaluations and considerations, “we have run into the participated evaluation; also theorists of participatory evaluation, involved in the policies against poverty, as in other fields and sectors, really link up these two moments.

Liliana Leone - Via Fontana della Girandola 24- 00040 Monte Porzio
Catone (Roma) ITALY

Tel. Fax. ++39 06 9422505 E mail: leone.l@microelettra.it

They say: matters as poverty and exclusion are relational facts [...] that need to be read and understood within a specific context. In order to understand such context, it is not sufficient that World Bank and EU set themselves some goals (things must change from this way to that way), because it is also necessary to project together with local partners” (the realizers) in order to understand together (with realizers and beneficiaries) if the project is right or wrong. “Projects can change. We have mentioned the case of the well-known Grameen Bank, in Bangladesh, which has been modified even four times during its development.

Now it is a microcredit bank for women and is an example of “best practice” at international level.”

Such experience couldn't have been well analyzed and understood without a process and a participative evaluation.

“The reality of actions and policies against social exclusion is so much complex that it can be well evaluated only if it is clear what we are doing; I mean, we must think very well about the right method to use.

We need proper instruments and indicators (financial indicators, service efficiency indicators) in order to comprehend the starting situation **and we need to make a distinction between the information requests** (for ex., from the European Commission), **so that the program is “accountable”, and the necessity to find evaluation methods fit for projects and programmes.**

Presently, we need a bigger effort to point out how contributions of participated evaluation can be useful.

At last, **what is social inclusion?**

This question should be answered at the conclusion of every right-managed evaluation”.

4) There has been an increasing interest in the theme of integration policies at local level and of **mainstreaming strategies** at EU level because it is necessary a synergy among the different structural funds (FSE, FGAOG-Orientation, FERS, SFOP).

As we have already said, almost any evaluation research is commissioned to evaluate the results at multidimensional level, because there isn't an integration of policies in the fight against social exclusion”.

Anyhow, in the regulations of structural funds 2000-2006 (the sections that concern with technical assistance and evaluation) it is possible **to develop “plurifund” evaluative researches, in which synergies and complex impact of some programmations are evident, as regards objectives of the fight against social exclusion and poverty, within precise territorial areas.**

5) The co-presence of **different monitoring and evaluation circuits that are not strictly linked to each other** (Es: ISFOL monitoring and selection of exemplary cases 10% in the Employment Community Initiative, selection and evaluation cases of ATI IRS-ISMERI the organization that evaluates the programme, self-evaluation of promoters and realizers of the projects at local level) comes often.

It should foster the putting in common of results and evaluations developed at different levels.

6) **When to evaluate?**

Liliana Leone - Via Fontana della Girandola 24- 00040 Monte Porzio
Catone (Roma) ITALY

Tel. Fax. ++39 06 9422505 E mail: leone.l@microelettra.it

It would be proper to commission and **to make evaluations that must follow the programme** even for a following period of time after its conclusion and to pay attention to unexpected issues as to any distortion coming from the realization of the programme in order to modify it, if necessary.

7) In the most part of evaluations we have analysed, it was possible to get back entire papers and reports.

Nevertheless, **an element of general weakness is the little willingness to make evaluation results public and to propagate them.**

Also studies and researches (made possible by communitary co-funds) are only little known and exploited by possible users, even being of popular kind.

We must put our energies in the diffusion of results and in the connection of possible users of the results with the sources in which such informations can be found (universities, research institutes, little organizations at local level, which represent the beneficiaries of NGO networks).

8) In some recent Italian legislative measures we can see the **attempt to include clauses concerning with the evaluation of results.**

Anyhow, such attempts could be improved putting “evaluation functions and competencies” beside clear objectives as beside economical and organizational resources.

It is also necessary to develop a parallel cultural growth into the operators employed in the services at different levels, in order to help them to orient and to express better their evaluation demands.

9) Some experiences of “**private and public social observatories**”

(CARITAS observatories on poverty, of homeless people, of school dispersion for provincial education superintendency, of work trends and market trends in work regional agencies, of infancy and adolescence as in l. 451/97) have been made on such themes as poverty, homeless people, employment at local, regional and national level.

These experiences seem to answer to the need of knowledge as regards the implementation of the different policies. In some cases, they are able to realize evaluative researches.

Observatories must be recognized and increased as evaluation sources at different levels (they are already part of the Commission on social exclusion, instituted by the Presidency of the Council of Ministers- Social Affairs Department) and must reinforce contacts with research institutes and universities.

10) The theme of **partnerships and evaluations of interorganizational dimensions** (see the project’s impact about learning organizations) has emerged **as a crucial theme**, especially in the question of structural funds and programs for local development (especially interventions that promote forms of social inclusion).

Nevertheless, we find generic indications on partnerships (as research of collaborative relations).

Collaborative relations at evaluation and research level should be enhanced, at EU level.

I'm referring, for example, to the evaluative research conducted by the Foundation in Dublin, financed by DGV, Local Partnership: A successful strategy for social cohesion?, European research report- European Foundation, and to the research conducted by the Tavistock Institute together with ECOTEC Research & Consulting Ltd, on request of DG XVI of EC: THE THEMATIC EVALUATION OF THE PARTNERSHIP PRINCIPLE”.

A further contribution has been given by Lea Battistoni in the meeting in Rome on November 19th, because she has referred to some recent evaluations of projects promoted by the Special Affairs Department, such as the frame-project “Socialization and youth creativity”.

The evaluation object in such cases is represented by the project impact at interorganizational level.

In other words, they try to understand which are the results in the networks (interorganizational networks, partnership network) of a project, even after its conclusion.

They try to analyze the impact at networks level and at increased learning level that are following the programme.

The outline of working we have decided after the conclusion of the meeting concerns with the necessity to compare constantly the various experiences and to focus models of reference frames and approaches able to answer the specificity of such policies.

ITALIAN EVALUATION CASES: Summary Table

Evaluation of Policy and Laws

TITLE	COMMISSIONER & AUTHORITY OF EVALUATION	PERIOD	OBJECT	USE OF THE EVALUATION
1.Evaluation of the Experimentation of Minimum Income (Legislative Decree 237/98)	<u>Ministry for Welfare Solidarity.</u> Study given to 3 Research Institutes: IRS (Milan), Zancan Foundation (Padua), CLES	June '99/ June 2001 Under-way	In 39 Italian Communities: Analysis processes of the realisation and allocation procedure of the RMI; Analyse results for beneficiary and organising impact,	Wording indication for generalisation of the institute and cost forecasts.
2.Project ESOPO	Research Co-financed by the European Commission DGXII – Headquarters University of Turin	1998	Analyse and comparison of the struggle against social exclusion realised by some European cities for Italy, Turin, Milan and Cosenza	Report of research commented on and returned to the Local Administrations involved other than at national (Poverty Commission and Department of Social Affairs and of the Commission.

EVALUATION OF THE PROGRAMMES

TITLE	COMMISSIONER & AUTHORITY OF EVALUATION	PERIOD	OBJECT	USE OF THE EVALUATION
3. Poverty 3 Report of the evaluation of the Community Programme Poverty 3-Italy	Commissioned by CE DGV & Member States Society of Technical Assistance at Community level GEIE.....Lille France		Different Evaluation modality: in the third year self-evaluation of 4 projects realised in Italy within the limit of the programme	The Poverty 4 programme was suspended. Conclusive Evaluation of Poverty 3 and accounting
4. Evaluation of medium term of the QCS of the Ob.3 in Italy, 1998	<u>Labour Ministry</u> <u>ISFOL</u>		Evaluation of the training actions of level 1° & 2° aimed at youths unemployed on a long term period, disadvantaged segment and women (Ob.3 FSE)	Report edited by Franco Angeli.
	<u>Labour Ministry -</u>	1997-	Evaluation of external PIC	Suggestions for

Liliana Leone - Via Fontana della Girandola 24- 00040 Monte Porzio
Catone (Roma) ITALY

Tel. Fax. ++39 06 9422505 E mail: leone.l@microelettra.it

5. Initiative Programme Community “Employment”	<u>DGV European Commission</u> ATI association temporary business IRS-ISMERI Europe	2000 (Phase II of evaluation underway)	Employment programme Phase I & II with analysis of regional cases. Analyses of progression of the programme with particular reference to the qualitative elements innovation of the programme (components, type of innovation included, ...) at the level of the different actors involved: Labour Ministry, CDA, ISFOL; Regions, promoters & accomplices .	Phase II of the PIC to the Escorting Committee and for PIC EQUAL period 2000-2006
6. PO FSE Ob.3 measure 3 Centre-north Socialisation and Youth creativity	<u>Management by the Department of Social Affairs</u> <u>Evaluated by AASTER</u>	June 1998 Sept 1999	Monitoring of the projects. Impact analysis on the partnership network structure	...in progress
7. Co-ordinate Experimentation of Project for adolescents in twelve areas in Southern Italy	<u>Managing Director of Civil Services and the Internal Ministry</u> The Operating Unit group has carried out functions of escorting and verifying (From the II° year self-evaluation with internal and external consultants to the group)	Three yearly with annual synthesis reports. 1.9.1991-31.8.1995	Analyse of a strategy (programme) of national experimentation to aid local projects for adolescents in the ambit of prevention of drug addiction (see. T.U. 309/1990)	Make public the results on the magazine of the sector and publications of the Internal Ministry Monitoring of the project via meetings on site, with the person in charge of the different agencies involved and with the referents of the 12 territorial areas.
8. Experimentation evaluation. Pilot project for the experimentation of models of intervention in favour of youths and minors	<u>Regional Councillor of social services of Veneto- Youth Policy Department</u> Task of the evaluation of the experimentation given to the POSTER Institute in Vicenza	1987-1990	Develop an evaluation model to observe the implementation of the results of the Youth Plans experimentally financed by the Veneto Region in ten Town Halls	
1. The inclusion of the welfare co-operatives in the Turin schools May 1998 (Case selected	Self-evaluation realised by the Councillor of the Educating System of the Town Hall of Turin in collaboration with confederations of	1998	It deals with a relative balance between the years 1994-1998 of an experimentation carried out in the schools of the city. The evaluation was intended as verifying the effect and efficiency of the route on	The report has been published (sector magazines, congresses, FORUM P.A. case,...) The evaluation has served to orient the

from “the 10 best partnership cases between local authority and private welfare” at FORUM P.A. '98 Rome)	the welfare co-operation and other local actors		behalf of the Administration and of the private welfare of the planned type. In the drawing up of the evaluation report we found opinions and perceptions expressed by the various actors: administration, co-operative, parents, trade unions.	evolution of the service according to planned approach, making the result public and communicating them to the towns and giving visibility of the policy to the various actors involved.
--	---	--	---	--

Evaluation of Projects

TITLE	COMMISSIONER & AUTHORITY OF EVALUATION	PERIOD	OBJECT	USE OF THE EVALUATION
10. The promotion of inclusion in the manpower of disadvantaged subjects Institute L. Luzzati, 1994	Research realised by Centro Studi CGM (Centro Gino Mattarelli) on a task given by the Italian Institute of Studies Cooperativi "L.Luzzati" and the Labour Ministry and Social Security.	1994	Analyses ex post effect and efficiency of inclusion in the manpower of disadvantaged subjects on integrated welfare (see Law 381/91, art.1, comma 1, point b) Intended as a new policy element. Comparison between different modality of intervention: for the single category of disadvantages or less. Analysis of a sample of 31 welfare in Northern Italy in the three year period 1991-1993	Diffusion of Research Report by the Institute "L.Luzzati" and of the CGM and development of a simplified evaluation scheme of the intervention for the promotion in the form of permanent monitoring.
11. Evaluation of intervention for drug addicts and minors at risk promised by the Internal Ministry June 1993	Researched commissioned by the Civil Services Management of the Internal Ministry to the Labos Foundation (RM)	1993	Analysis of 10 projects via interviews and the person in charge of project/service and the development of an evaluation “model” of said services.	The report has never being published and it does not seem that it was used by the commissioner for the evaluation of the financed project during the years successive years on the TU 309 and the Law 216 fund
12. Project Alphaville-Comune in Turin Councillor for social policies	Turin Town Hall-Counc. Social Policies- Working Group of Alphaville for the	1995-1997	Working group formed represented by the central and territorial referents of the Administration in charge of territorial instructive in Turin. Collaboration of external	The Administration has published a short report of the experience in which it in the order of methodological and

Evaluation of the territorial instructive	co-ordination and the evaluation of the territorial instructive		consultants. The experimentation, in collaboration with private welfare who handles the ET projects, micro-actions of evaluation of the territorial instructive projects (evaluation process: grade of participation of beneficiaries..) Simple elements of the are made available of the "layout of the groups and the results of the evaluation are not dealt with.	some survey elements. The approach used was the participating type which however seemed to support a growth in culture of the operators involved on ET in Turin..
13. Evaluation of a project PIC Employment Youthstart Phase I° (AP)	The Coop.Soc RES (Lido di Fermo-AP) promoter and accomplisher of a Youthstart project that involved youths from the Marche Region. External consultant for the evaluation.	1996-1998	Evaluation in itinere of the project Passarelle pour les Jeunes, the results will be analysed at receiver level temporary involved in the impact on the interorganisational network of regional Informagiovani.	Used for autoevaluate the project involving the various actors implicated. Wide diffusion of the results: the report has been published (Ed.Franco Angeli 1999)
14. Evaluation of a LIA Woman Immigrant Project (Palermo)	Palermo City Council- Council Department for social services; CISS NGO Association of women immigrants EXTRA Task of evaluation has been given to external consultant - University of Messina.	1997-1998	Evaluation of a LIA (Local Integration Partnership Action) project realised by a welfare co-operative with promoters - the Community of Palermo. The participatory approach was used. The study underlines a "potential conflict between two needs pulling in opposite directions. If, on one hand, the nature of a project focused on empowerment requires freedom of movement and flexibility, on the other, the obligations which derive from the European dimension demand the respect of pre-established and standardised parameters."	Work presented to public conference by AIV and in the European Evaluation Society Conference , Rome 29-31 Oct., 1998

Observatories

TITLE	COMMISSIONER & AUTHORITY OF EVALUATION	PERIOD	OBJECT	USE OF THE EVALUATION
15. Observatory on the social	Realised by "Forum degli Assessorati sociali" in	1998 - 1999	Evaluative analysis of some social services in Rome (SAISA Services for the	Informative relapse for the Councillor of Social Policies

Liliana Leone - Via Fontana della Girandola 24- 00040 Monte Porzio
Catone (Roma) ITALY

Tel. Fax. ++39 06 9422505 E mail: leone.l@microelettra.it

conditions in Rome Second Report – May 1999 -	convention with <u>the Councillor of Social Policies of Community in Rome</u>		Elderly and SPIS Emergency social services) and studies on the system of offer of these social services and the condition of need in the Roman district.	together with some other “studies of the welfare” activated by the other Councillors
16. CARITAS Diocesana Observatory on Poverty in Rome	<u>Researched realised by the Study Office of the Caritas Diocesana with contribution from Councillor of Social Policies of the Community</u>	1997-1998	Report on poverty in Rome with analysis of the poverty situation and marginalization and the system of response. Data on the Caritas studies of the city: centre for foreign and various services (housing, canteen, health..)	Wide distribution of the report whose end is to involve the territory and to the diffusion of the knowledge on social statistics
17. Regional Carta of health services in the Tuscany Region	<u>Tuscany Region Department of Right to Health Laws and Policies of Solidarity-</u> Quality Control Area (Del. Giunta Regionale n.184/97 e 1133/98) Managers of the studies: Subjects of the mixed group Region – Health Institutes	1997-1999 under-way	The study represents a control instrument of the quality received. It has also the task of monitoring the state of realisation <i>Carte dei servizi (art.14 del D.L.502/92)</i> and of the instruments activated at local level to promote participation and the protection of the citizens.	The use of quality indicators supplied by the study (internet network of all the regional ASL) and the analysis of complaints furnish the input to speed up the processes of improvement and changes.

NOTES ON THE PARTECIPATORY EVALUATION APPROACH

¹ **The power of participation, IDS Policy Briefing Issue 7: 1996, Institute of development Studies, Sussex, UK**

¹ **Dal "Partecipatory Approches and Methodologies- Toolbook of IDS, UK" ho tratto le seguenti note descrittive:** "One description of PRA has been: a growing family of approaches and methods to enable local people to share, enhance and analyse their knowledge of life and conditions, to plan, and to act. And now we can add and to monitor and evaluate. RRA, or rapid rural appraisal, is data collecting, with the analysis done mainly by us. (...)The main publication *RRA Notes* (Nos 1-21) has been renamed *PLA (Participatory Learning and Action) Notes* (Nos 22-). Participatory Learning and Action is closer to what many practitioners of PRA believe in and are doing, but PRA remains the usual label.

PRA is linked with a distinctive behaviour, attitudes and approach. We are not teachers or transferers of technology, but instead convenors, catalysts, and facilitators. We have to unlearn, and put our knowledge, ideas and categories in second place. We enable local people to do their own investigations, analysis, presentations, planning and action, to own the outcome, and to teach us, sharing their knowledge. We hand over the stick and facilitate their appraisal, presentation, analysis, planning and action, monitoring and evaluation. They do many of the things we thought only we could do - mapping, diagramming, counting, listing, sorting, ranking, scoring, sequencing, linking, analysing, planning...monitoring and evaluating. PRA is a term which many PRA practitioners and trainers consider should be reserved for a process which empowers local people.

Three common elements found in a PRA approach are:

- **individual responsibility and judgement exercised by facilitators**
- **a commitment to equity (especially the excluded, deprived, women)**
- **recognition and celebration of diversity "**

"Some of the methods come from social anthropology. Some, especially diagramming, were developed and spread in Southeast Asia, as part of agroecosystem analysis, originating in the University of Chiang Mai. For RRA, the University of Khon Kaen in Thailand was a major source of innovation and inspiration in the 1980s. Other methods, like matrix scoring, seem to be new. What is also new is the way they have all come together, and the way both RRA and PRA seem to know no boundaries of discipline or of geography. **Interestingly, RRA and PRA, developed in the South, are being transferred to and adopted in the North, having been tried and applied now in Canada, Germany, Ireland, Norway, Switzerland, and the UK (Scotland and England).**

Principles shared by RRA and PRA

- offsetting biases (spatial, project, person - gender, elite etc, seasonal, professional, courtesy..)
- rapid progressive learning - flexible, exploratory, interactive, inventive
- reversals - learning from, with and by rural people, eliciting and using their criteria and categories, and finding, understanding and appreciating RPK (rural people's knowledge)
- optimal ignorance, and appropriate imprecision - not finding out more than is needed, not measuring more accurately than needed, and not trying to measure what does not need to be measured. We are trained to make absolute measurements, but often trends, scores or ranking are all that are required
- triangulation - using different methods, sources and disciplines, and a range of informants in a range of places, and cross-checking to get closer to the truth

Liliana Leone - Via Fontana della Girandola 24- 00040 Monte Porzio
Catone (Roma) ITALY

Tel. Fax. ++39 06 9422505 E mail: leone.l@microelettra.it

- through successive approximations
- principal investigators' direct contact, face to face, in the field
- seeking diversity and differences

¹ **David Fetterman , Stanford University, Toolbook Empowerment Evaluation, 1999, Chapter 1**

"Empowerment evaluation is part of the intellectual landscape of evaluation. It has been adopted in higher education, government, inner-city public education, nonprofit corporations, and foundations throughout the United States and abroad. A wide range of program and policy sectors use empowerment evaluation, including **substance abuse prevention, HIV prevention, crime prevention, environmental protection, welfare reform, battered women's shelters, agriculture and rural development, adult probation, adolescent pregnancy prevention, tribal partnership for substance abuse, self-determination and individuals with disabilities, doctoral programs, and educational reform** (the Accelerated Schools Project - a national educational reform movement). Descriptions of programs that use empowerment evaluation appear in *Empowerment Evaluation: Knowledge and Tools for Self-assessment and Accountability* (Fetterman, Kaftarian, and Wandersman 1996(...)) In addition, this approach has been institutionalized within the American Evaluation Association and is consistent with the spirit of the standards developed by the Joint Committee on Standards for Educational Evaluation (Fetterman 1995; Joint Committee, 1994), as well as the Guiding Principles for Evaluators (1995). Empowerment evaluation is the use of evaluation concepts, techniques, and findings to foster improvement and self-determination. It employs both qualitative and quantitative methodologies. Although it can be applied to individuals, organizations, communities, and societies or cultures, the focus is usually on programs."

¹ **The American Evaluation Association has a Collaborative, Participatory, and Empowerment Evaluation topical interest group.** The group is dedicated to the exploration and refinement of collaborative, participatory, and empowerment approaches to evaluation. The Collaborative, Participatory, and Empowerment Evaluation TIG is currently conducting a virtual conference: Empowerment Evaluation Virtual Conference (1999), It is being hosted by David Fetterman.

¹ **Patton, M. (1997). Toward Distinguishing Empowerment Evaluation and Placing It In a Larger Context. *Evaluation Practice*, 18(2):147-163.**

Patton's introduction to his review is as follows: "**Words mark decades. Rock 'n roll** in the fifties. *Altered consciousness* in the sixties. *Paradigm shift* in the seventies. *Proactive* in the eighties. *Empowerment* in the nineties. It's what's happening now. Or what's not happening. Or what shouldn't happen, depending on your perspective and praxis. The bridge to the twenty-first century will be built with words. Some worry that that's all it will be built of. Vanderplaat (1995), writing from a European perspective, locates empowerment evaluation in the larger context of emancipatory research that grew out of Freire's liberation pedagogy (1970), feminist inquiry (e.g., Harding, 1987; Maguire, 1987), critical theory (ref. Forester, 1985) and communicative action (Habermas, 1984, 1987). More directly related to evaluation, empowerment evaluation draws on and raises the stakes of participatory action research (Whyte, 1991; Wadsworth, 1993; King, 1995) and collaborative evaluation (Cousins & Earl, 1992, 1995). Fetterman, (...) traces the roots of empowerment evaluation to community psychology, action anthropology, the school reform movement, and grassroots community development—influences reflecting his own professional and intellectual journey. The phrase "empowerment evaluation" gained prominence in the lexicon of evaluation when Fetterman, as President of the American Evaluation Association (AEA), made it the theme of the Association's 1993 National Conference. ... Karen Kirkhart, President of AEA in 1994, provided an additional platform for discussing empowerment by choosing "Evaluation and Social Justice" as the theme for the national conference over which she presided. "

¹ Scriven, M. (1997). **Empowerment Evaluation Examined.** *Evaluation Practice*, 18(2):165-175.

¹ **Patton and Scriven's comments have been followed by a few words by David Fetterman in *Evaluation Practice*, 18(3):253-266.**

¹ **Altman** Altman presents another insightful review of empowerment evaluation. "The community psychology audience would resonate with this perspective given that the intellectual and philosophical roots of community psychology emanate in part from these very values. This then begs the question, "so what's unique about empowerment evaluation?" First, mainstream evaluation is not as likely as community psychology to ascribe to these values. Indeed, the methodological purist might argue that empowerment evaluation compromises scientific objectivity." ... "leaders in community psychology have contributed chapters (e.g., Steve Fawcett, Jean Ann Linney, Roger Mitchell, Paul Florin) and Abe Wandersman is a co-editor, thus making the book even more relevant to the interests of community psychologists. "

¹ **The American Evaluation Association has a Collaborative, Participatory, and Empowerment Evaluation topical interest group.**

The group is dedicated to the exploration and refinement of collaborative, participatory, and empowerment approaches to evaluation. The Collaborative, Participatory, and Empowerment Evaluation TIG is currently conducting a virtual conference: Empowerment Evaluation Virtual Conference (1999). It is being hosted by David Fetterman.

¹ **UNDP Empowerin People- Guidebook on Partecipation, Cap 4, "Monitoring and evaluation of partecipation, INTRAC, Oxford, 1997**

2 Conceptual Issues

"It is important to understand that in the M and E of participation it is necessary to move beyond existing dominant models of project evaluation and to structure an approach which recognises participation's **quantitative** and **qualitative** dimensions. As we have seen, participation is not merely a one-off input or action in relation to a project; it is an ongoing **process** which should underlie the project's progress. As such, therefore, it cannot be understood by a simple snap-shot approach; it demands a radically different approach to project M and E. In this respect, more traditional approaches to M and E are not wholly appropriate for the following reasons:

- over concern with effort, effect and efficiency and the tangible and material performance of the project
- built in bias towards favourable quantitative outcomes and rarely capture unforeseen consequences
- limited and static and unable to capture adequately the outcomes of projects which are not quantitative in nature
- usually externally conceived and implemented, taking little note of the experiences of local people
- often time-consuming major evaluation exercises which absorb the time and energy of project staff

Alternatives to the more traditional approaches have focused less on **results** which are **quantitative** and more on **processes** which are **qualitative**. (...) There is now an increasing amount of literature which examines and explains current alternative approaches to M and E, most of which stress its process and participatory nature and which argue that the more traditional quantitative approaches are inadequate for understanding the outcomes and effect of

participatory development. One of the main problems with these traditional approaches is dependence entirely on external evaluators and their consequent failure to incorporate the views of local people. Yet the distinction between insider and outsider views is important and evaluation methods are needed which are able to bring these out. One of the great contributions of PRA has been the fundamental questioning of many areas of development where previously 'professional' opinions of outsiders were always given priority over those of local people. It challenges evaluators to ensure that the question of 'whose reality counts?', to use a term of Robert Chambers, is fundamental to the evaluation process."

3 Key Elements in the Monitoring and Evaluation of Participation

(...) " The key **principles** which should guide this exercise include the following:

Qualitative as well as quantitative:	Both dimensions of participation must be included in the evaluation in order for the outcome to be fully understood.
Dynamic as opposed to static:	The evaluation of participation demands that the entire process over a period of time be evaluated and not merely a limited snap-shot. Conventional <i>ex post facto</i> evaluation, therefore, will not be adequate.
Central importance of monitoring:	The evaluation of a process of participation is impossible without relevant and continual monitoring. Indeed monitoring is the key to the whole exercise and the only means by which the qualitative descriptions can be obtained to explain the process which has occurred.
Participatory evaluation:	In the entire evaluation process, the people involved in the project have a part to play. It is not a question of an external evaluator solely determining the project outcome; the people themselves will also have a voice.

(...)

Participation is not merely to do with outputs and results ; it is more to do with **change** in such things as organisational capabilities, people's attitudes and behaviour, institutional growth, differential access, the perceptions and reactions of other stakeholders and people's relationships with those who have power. It is a critical dimension of development projects since the changes which it could bring about in the political, economic and social aspects of poor people's lives are immense. For that reason, its M and E demands a more sensitive and relevant approach."

¹ **FAO (Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations) (1990), The community's toolbox: The idea, methods and tools for participatory assessment, monitoring and evaluation in community forestry", Community Forestry Field Manual2, by D'Arcy Davis Case, FAO, Roma**

¹ **Allen, W.J. Manaaki Whema, New Zeland, Towards Improving the Role of Evaluation Within Natural Resource Management R&D Programmes: The Case for 'Learning BY Doing', in Canadian Journal of Development Studies, XVIII, Special Issue, 1997, pp.629-643.**

¹ **UNITED NATIONS**

Economic and Social Council - Unofficial copy for information purposes prepared from the official electronic file. E/CN.3/AC.1/1996/R.4 , 24 January 1996, **SOCIAL STATISTICS: FOLLOW-UP TO THE WORLD SUMMIT FOR SOCIAL DEVELOPMENT** Report of the Expert Group on

Liliana Leone - Via Fontana della Girandola 24- 00040 Monte Porzio
Catone (Roma) ITALY

Tel. Fax. ++39 06 9422505 E mail: leone.l@microelettra.it

the Statistical Implications of Recent Major United Nations Conferences (Note by the Secretary-General)

1. At its twenty-eighth session (New York, 27 February-3 March 1995), the Statistical Commission, in its consideration of agenda item 12, "Measuring and monitoring economic and social development", requested its Working Group on International Statistical Programmes and Coordination to consider further the statistical implications of the follow-up to the World Summit for Social Development (Copenhagen, 6-12 March 1995). The Commission also established the Expert Group on the Statistical Implications of Recent Major United Nations Conferences to draw up a work programme reflecting the major action areas identified by the Summit and indicating where international statistical work in the social field should be concentrated, with due regard to the Programme of Action of the International Conference on Population and Development (Cairo, 5-13 September 1994) and the expected outcome of the Fourth World Conference on Women (Beijing, 4-15 September 1995). The Commission requested that, in the light of the policy areas identified, the Expert Group propose specific statistical activities for the period 1996-1998, and assign priorities to them based on the skills and financial resources likely to be available in international organizations and countries. ^{1/}

¹ **Valutazione e attuazione delle leggi: spunti dall'esperienza americana e riflessioni sul caso italiano, Alberto Martini**, Intervento tenuto al seminario Iter Legis del 30 novembre 1998, tratto da PROVA (pp.6-7)

3. Quali clausole valutative per le leggi italiane?

(...)La legge 285 del 1997 in materia di "Disposizioni per la promozione di diritti e di opportunità per l'infanzia e l'adolescenza" offre uno dei casi non più rari di introduzione di clausole valutative nei testi di legge, e ci consente di evidenziare tale incertezza.

L'art. 9 della legge (Valutazione dell'efficacia della spesa) dispone che: *"Entro il 30 giugno di ciascun anno, le regioni (...) presentano una relazione al Ministro per la solidarietà sociale sullo stato di attuazione degli interventi previsti dalla presente legge, sulla loro efficacia, sull'impatto sui minori e sulla società, sugli obiettivi conseguiti e sulle misure da adottare per migliorare le condizioni di vita dei minori nel rispettivo territorio."*

L'art. 10 (Relazione al Parlamento) (...)Infine, l'art. 11 (Conferenza nazionale sull'infanzia e sull'adolescenza e statistiche ufficiali sull'infanzia) (...) La differenza rispetto ai due esempi tratti dall'esperienza statunitense è evidente. Mancano alcuni ingredienti essenziali affinché si possa valutare in modo credibile il successo della legge 285. Manca lo stanziamento di risorse destinate alla valutazione, come pure alla produzione del flusso informativo auspicato da parte dell'ISTAT. Senza risorse adeguate, il rischio è ovvio che queste restino pure petizioni di principio. La delega della valutazione alle Regioni è un fattore di ulteriore debolezza, in quanto fa perdere la possibilità di mettere in piedi un disegno di valutazione all'interno del quale si confrontino i risultati ottenuti con diversi tipi di implementazione della 285.

¹ Geddes M. (1998), **Local Partnership: A successful strategy for social cohesion?**, **European research report**- European Foundation, Office for Official publications of the European Communities, Luxemburg

¹ **THE THEMATIC EVALUATION OF THE PARTNERSHIP PRINCIPLE**, February 1999 Prepared by The Tavistock Institute - Evaluation Development and Review Unit with the

assistance of ECOTEC Research and Consulting Ltd., John Kelleher, Sarah Batterbury & Elliot Stern

This thematic assessment of the partnership principle in the first major thematic evaluation of one of the guiding principles of the Structural Funds. The study aims to demonstrate the positive impacts of partnership at the different stages of the policy cycle as well as highlighting areas which need to be improved.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

A. BIBLIOGRAPHICAL DOCUMENTATION ABOUT "EVALUATION CASES"

1. ALSS (Autonomie Locali e Servizi Sociali), *Sperimentazione coordinate di progetti adolescenti in dodici zone del Mezzogiorno*, pp.59-72, n.1, 1995
2. Bernardi L., Campostrini S., Neresini F., Pozzobon G. (1990), *Sperimentare valutazione, idee e materiali per il progetto pilota per la sperimentazione di modelli d'intervento a favore dei giovani e dei minori*, Regione Veneto Assessorato ai Servizi Sociali e al Coordinamento delle Politiche Giovanili, Istituto POSTER Vicenza.
3. Borzaga C., Acler M. C., Failoni G. (1992), *L'inserimento lavorativo delle persone svantaggiate : il ruolo della cooperazione*, *Quaderni della Rivista della Cooperazione*, vol. 1, Istituto Italiano di Studi Cooperativi "Luigi Luzzatti".
4. CGM (Centro Gino Mattarelli) (1994) *La promozione dell'inserimento lavorativo dei soggetti svantaggiati*, Istituto italiano di Studi cooperativi "Luigi Luzzati"
5. Leone L. (1999), "Fare valutazione : analisi di un progetto Youthstart", in Leone L., Prezza M. *Costruire e valutare i progetti nel sociale*, Franco Angeli, Milano.
6. Leone L. (a cura di) (1998), *10 Buoni casi di partnership tra Terzo Settore ed Enti Locali*, 5.4 *La cooperazione sociale di tipo b) nelle scuole di Torino*, Rapporto di ricerca FORUM P.A. '98- Assoconsult
7. *L'inserimento delle Cooperative Sociali nelle Scuole Torinesi* (1998), Comune di Torino- Assessorato Sistema Educativo, Paper interno
8. CARITAS di Roma, *Povertà a Roma, Rapporto 1998* , Ed.Anterem, Roma
9. Di Mascio A. (1997), *Cooperazione sociale e diritto al lavoro per persone svantaggiate*, Animazione Sociale, Marzo, pp. 17-22. (Caso della cooperazione sociale nelle Scuole Torinesi)
10. Forestieri M. (1998), *Projects for participation and participation in projects. Implications for evaluation*, Department of Political and Social Studies "V. Tomeo", University of Messina, Italy. Paper for the European Evaluation Society Conference, Rome 29-31 October 1998.

11. Ministero dell'Interno, Ufficio Studi e cooperazione internazionale (1996), *Monografie Vol.I°, II°, III°, IV° - Sperimentazione nazionale coordinata di progetti adolescenti con finalità preventiva*, Roma
12. *Osservatorio Regionale Carta dei Servizi Sanitari* (1998), Regione Toscana- Dipartimento del Diritto alla Salute e delle Politiche di Solidarietà, Area Controllo di Qualità.
13. *Osservatorio sulla condizione sociale della città* (1998), II° Rapporto di ricerca (CD Rom e testi), Forum degli Assessorati, Roma. (Casi : 1. “Il Servizio di Pronto Intervento Sociale” ; 2. “Il Servizio per l’Autonomia e l’Integrazione Sociale della persona Anziana”).
14. *Project Esopo, Evaluating Social Policies : Evaluation of Income Support Policies at the Local Urban Level* (1998), Report finale Ricerca cofinanziata dalla Commissione Europea DGXII – Capofila Università di Torino, Coordinatore Chiara Saraceno, www.cisi.unito.it
15. *Rapporto Intermedio PIC Occupazione Italia (1997-2000)*, ATI IRS-ISMERI.
16. *Rapporto di Valutazione del Programma Comunitario Poverty-3* (1994), Italia.
17. *Report di valutazione: Socializzazione e Creatività Giovanile* (1999), Dipartimento Affari Sociali, AASTER.
18. *Valutazione della Sperimentazione del Reddito Minimo di Inserimento* (D. L. 237/98), (1999-2001 in corso), Ministero per la Solidarietà Sociale, IRS (Milano); Fondazione Zancan (Padova), CLES.
19. *Valutazione di Interventi per tossicodipendenti e minori a rischio promossi dal Ministero dell’Interno* (1993), Direzione Generale Servizi Civili del Ministero dell’Interno, LABOS, Roma. Paper non pubblicato.

B. SHORT BIBLIOGRAPHICAL DOCUMENTATION ABOUT ITALIAN POLICIES OF SOCIAL EXCLUSION FIGHT

1. AA.VV. (1996) *Barboni: per amore o per forza?* A cura della Caritas Ambrosiana - Edizioni Gruppo Abele, Torino
2. Commissione delle Comunità Europee (1994), *La politica sociale europea. Uno strumento di progresso per l'Unione- Libro Bianco Parte A. e B.*, COM(94) 333def./2 Bruxelles
3. Communication from the Commission, DGV, (1999) *A Concerted Strategy for Modernising Social Protection* www.europa.eu.int

Liliana Leone - Via Fontana della Girandola 24- 00040 Monte Porzio
Catone (Roma) ITALY

Tel. Fax. ++39 06 9422505 E mail: leone.l@microelettra.it

4. Communication from the Commission, *Social protection in Europe 1997* (COM (1998) 243)
5. DIPARTIMENTO AFFARI SOCIALI, Presidenza del Consiglio dei Ministri (1999), *Politiche del governo per l'infanzia e l'adolescenza 1996-1998*, Centro Nazionale di Documentazione ed Analisi sull'Infanzia e l'Adolescenza- Comitato Italiano per l'UNICEF, Istituto Poligrafico e Zecca dello Stato, Roma www.minori.it
6. DIPARTIMENTO AFFARI SOCIALI, Presidenza del Consiglio dei Ministri (1999), Vertice Mondiale di Copenhagen, *Contributo del dipartimento al Rapporto nazionale sullo sviluppo sociale*, Roma, luglio 1999
7. EAPN (European Anty Poverty Network) (1998), *L'insertion sociale : Un objectif prioritaire pour les nouveaux Fonds structurels*, Paper
8. Gui L. (1995), *L'utente che non c'è. Emarginazione grave, persone senza dimora e servizi*, Franco Angeli, Milano
9. ISFOL-FSE (1999) *La riforma dei fondi strutturali in una prospettiva di lotta contro l'esclusione sociale : analisi e proposte*, Atti del seminario nazionale promosso da CILAP, EAPN, MFD, Roma 12/3/98.
10. Commissione di Indagine sulla Povertà e sull'Emarginazione, Presidenza del Consiglio dei Ministri, (1997), *La povertà in Italia*, Istituto Poligrafico e Zecca dello Stato, Roma.
11. Messori E., Bursi G., Balestri T. (1997), *Unione Europea ed esclusione sociale*, Prospettive Sociali e Sanitarie, n°17, pp. 7-10.
12. Ranci Agnoletto D. (1998), *Azioni di contrasto del disagio e della povertà e azioni di benessere e di promozione sociale*, Prospettive Sociali e Sanitarie, n° 20, pp. 6-8.
13. Saraceno C., Negri N. (1996), *Le politiche contro la povertà in Italia* , Il Mulino, Bologna.

**Collana della Commissione di Indagine sulla povertà e sull'emarginazione
Presidenza del consiglio dei Ministri- Dip. Informazione ed Editoria, Roma**

14. *Le misure della povertà in Italia: scale di equivalenza e aspetti demografici*
15. *Verso una politica di lotta alla povertà. L'assegno per i figli e il minimo vitale*, Luglio 1995
16. *La povertà in Italia 1980-1994*, Marzo 1996
17. *Le politiche locali contro l'esclusione sociale*, Giugno 1996
18. *La povertà in Italia 1996*
19. *La povertà in Italia 1995*

Liliana Leone - Via Fontana della Girandola 24- 00040 Monte Porzio
Catone (Roma) ITALY

Tel. Fax. ++39 06 9422505 E mail: leone.l@microelettra.it

20. *Povert  abilitativa in Italia 1989-1993, Gennaio 1997*
21. *La spesa pubblica per l'assistenza in Italia*
22. *Valutazione dell'efficacia di interventi pubblici contro la povert :
Questioni di metodo e studi di casi, Giugno 1997*
23. *Povert  e istruzione: alcune riflessioni ed una proposta di indicatori,
Luglio 1997*
24. *La povert  in Italia 1997*

C. BIBLIOGRAPHY ON SOCIAL POLICIES EVALUATION and ON SOCIAL INCLUSION POLICIES and FIGHT AGAINST SOCIAL EXCLUSION

Battistelli F. (1992), “La qualità difficile. Produzione di servizi e rapporto con l’utente nella Pa”, Rivista trimestrale di Scienza dell’Amministrazione, n°1, pp. 9 – 44.

Battistoni L., Carbone A. E. (1996), “Il monitoraggio dell’azione transnazionale. L’approccio interorganizzativo : una metodologia possibile”, Osservatorio ISFOL, n°3, Anno XVIII, maggio-giugno.

Bel M., Le Doaré M. (1998), “Evaluer l’action publique dans le domaine de la construction de la formation professionnelle : une approche comparative des dynamiques sociétales”, Paper presented at the International Conference on Evaluation : Profession, business or Politics?, Roma 29-31 Ottobre.

Bertin G. (1996), “La valutazione come strategia di gestione dei servizi sociali e sanitari”, Rassegna Italiana di Valutazione, n° 3 Luglio-Settembre (www.valutazione.it).

Bertuzzi C., Vergnani P. (1997), “Un metodo di valutazione : l’utilizzo delle mappe semantiche”, Autonomie Locali e Servizi Sociali, n° 1, pp. 175-184, Edizioni ‘Il Mulino’, Bologna.

Bevilacqua M., Maurizio R., Pomo C. (1998), “Prevenzione del disagio giovanile a Torino”, Autonomie Locali e Servizi Sociali, n° 1, pp. 121-130, Edizioni ‘Il Mulino’, Bologna.

Bezzi C. (1997), “Assistenza Domiciliare Anziani. Linee guida per l’operatore”, bozza preliminare riservata, 10 Maggio.

Bezzi C. (1998), “Glossario della ricerca sociale e valutativa”, Rassegna Italiana di Valutazione, n° 11 Luglio-Agosto (www.valutazione.it).

Blasetti A. M. (1995), “I gruppi di lavoro multiprofessionali”, Seminario di Studio : La valutazione della riabilitazione in psichiatria. Perugia, 29 Marzo.

Borghese E. (1991), “Organismi non governativi e valutazione delle azioni di sviluppo di base nella pratica delle ONG”, Forum Valutazione, n° 1, CISP, Franco Angeli, Milano.

Boselli S., Anoni M. (1999) Partecipare alle politiche sociali. Il terzo settore come attore di democrazia, Carocci Editore, Roma

Bovina L. (1998), “Microvalutazione? Parliamone.....”, Rassegna Italiana di Valutazione, n° 9 Gennaio-Marzo (www.valutazione.it).

Bovina L., Naldini A. (1999), “La valutazione del programma ADAPT in Italia : un esempio di valutazione di politiche innovative”. Paper del Congresso Nazionale AIV, Napoli 15-17 Aprile.

Breakwell G. (19..), “Valutazione e cambiamento” in Regalia C., Scaratti G. “Conoscenza e azione nel lavoro sociale e educativo”, Armando Editore.

Bulgarelli A. (1997), “Formazione professionale e politiche strutturali nel centro-nord Italia”, Rassegna Italiana di Valutazione, n° 8 Aprile-Dicembre (www.valutazione.it).

Bussi F. “Project Cycle Manegement”, Modulo formativo, Corso Project Manegement per lo sviluppo locale INFORCOOP Calabria.

Bussi F. “GOPP (Goal Oriented Project Planning): Una metodologia strutturata di programmazione concertata”, tratto da caso Istituto FMA.

Cais G., Martini A. (1999), “Controllo (di gestione) e valutazione (delle politiche) : un (ennesimo ma non ultimo) tentativo di sistemazione concettuale”, Paper presentato al Congresso Nazionale AIV, Napoli 15-17 Aprile 1999, (Documento scaricato da Progetto Valutazione : www.prova.org).

Capra A. M., Vico A., Icardo S. (1998), “ La programmazione e la valutazione del lavoro domiciliare”, Politiche Sociali, n° 4, pp. 95-103.

Carbognin M. (1990), “Organizzazione e qualità dei servizi sociosanitari”, Collana Ricerche, n° 6, Aprile, pp. 1-36, Fondazione Corazzin. Analisi.

Carbognin M. (1990), “Organizzazione e qualità nei servizi sociosanitari” Presentazione di una ricerca organizzativa in una ULSS di Padova. Roma, 4 Luglio. Paper tratto da : Formez - Labos - Progetto Alone.

Cecchetti D. (1996), “La qualità nei servizi territoriali alla persona”, Rassegna Italiana di Valutazione, n° 3 Luglio- Settembre (www.valutazione.it).

CECOP R&D, (1999), IGLOO-Integra - Evaluation of Transnacional Activities- Interim report, May 1999, Bruxelles

CGM (Consorzio Gino Mattarelli)(1991),Ricerca/consulenza su : le cooperative sociali operanti nell'area degli anziani ad Aosta : efficienza, efficacia, innovazione, prospettive d'intervento, Centro Studi Brescia

Cipollone L. (1996), “Valutare, monitorare, promuovere la qualità dei servizi per l'infanzia”, Rassegna Italiana di Valutazione, n° 2 Aprile-Giugno (www.valutazione.it).

Colorni (1999) L'osservatorio sulla qualità della vita dell'Associazione MeglioMilano, Paper presentato al Congresso Nazionale AIV, Napoli 15-17 Aprile 1999.

Liliana Leone - Via Fontana della Girandola 24- 00040 Monte Porzio
Catone (Roma) ITALY
Tel. Fax. ++39 06 9422505 E mail: leone.l@microelettra.it

Comune di Genova (1997), “Progetto affido anziani : sperimentazione e primi risultati”, Politiche Sociali, n°1, pp. 93-102.

Chiarenza A. (1998), “I centri di prima accoglienza a Catania”, Autonomie Locali e Servizi Sociali, n° 1, pp. 111-120, Edizioni ‘Il Mulino’, Bologna.

Crepaldi C., De Ambrogio U., Setti Bassanini M. C. (1997), “Progettare, sostenere e valutare le politiche locali : l’osservatorio laboratorio”, Prospettive Sociali e Sanitarie, n° 18-19, pp. 32-35, IRS (Istituto Ricerca Sociale, Milano).

de Groot H., de Valk W. (1998), “Quantity and quality of policy evaluations : an auditors review of ex ante evaluations by the Dutch central government”, Paper presented at the EES- Conference, Roma 29-31 Ottobre.

dell’Orco G., Polli L., Ciavarella C., Saetti M. (1998), “La qualità degli interventi preventivi secondo i ragazzi. Un percorso di autovalutazione di una cooperativa in periferia di Milano”, Prospettive Sociali e Sanitarie, n° 20, pp. 9-14, IRS (Istituto Ricerca Sociale, Milano).

Department for Education and Employment, DFEE- The Scottish Office ESF (1999), Soft Indicators. Demonstrating Progress and Recognising Achievement, Report of a survey of EMPLOYMENT Projects

De Sanctis A., Lion C. (1999), “Valutare l’impatto della formazione continua. Questioni metodologiche e risultati operativi”, ISFOL- Struttura di valutazione. Paper del Congresso Nazionale AIV, Napoli 15-17 Aprile.

Dugone S. (1998), “ I piani di zona, strumenti per politiche di comunità”, Appunti, sett./ott.

ENAIIP, Valutazione Progetti Integra e Ledi. Appunti per una riflessione, ENAIIP Ente di Formazione Professionale, Roma 9.9.1993, pp. 1 – 7.

European Commission (1997), Evaluating EU expenditure programmes: a guide. Ex post and Intermediate Evaluation, Jan 1997- XIX /02 - Budgetary overview and evaluation

EUROPS - T.A.O. Employment (1997), Guide to self evaluation for Employment Projects, Bruxelles

Facco F. (1997), “La programmazione degli interventi psicosociali nel campo delle problematiche minorile”, Prospettive Sociali e Sanitarie, n° 22, pp. 15-18, IRS (Istituto Ricerca Sociale, Milano).

Forestieri M. (1998), “Project for participation and participation in projects. Implications for Evaluation”, Paper presented to the EES-Conference Evaluation : Profession, Business or Politics?, Roma 29-31 Ottobre.

Gallo C. (1999), "Polo sociale nel Ser.T.", Prospettive Sociali e Sanitarie, n° 1, pp. 7-11, IRS (Istituto Ricerca Sociale, Milano).

Garrione E. "Persone in situazione di grave emarginazione e senza dimora. Percorsi di lavoro degli assistenti sociali, risorse e servizi nel Comune di Vicenza", Rivista di Servizio Sociale, EISS (Ente Italiano Servizio Sociale, Roma), pp. 115-142.

Gay M. (1998), "Le prospettive dell'educazione allo Sviluppo in Europa", Forum Valutazione, n° 10, CISP, Franco Angeli, Milano.

Giusti M. (1998), "Progettazione, bambini e conflitto", Prospettive Sociali e Sanitarie, n° 18-19, pp. 19-39, IRS (Istituto Ricerca Sociale, Milano).

Goldsworthy D. V. (1993), "Evaluation partnership : myths and realities in evaluations of development assistance programs", Forum Valutazione, n° 6, CISP, Franco Angeli, Milano.

Grin J. "Participation, co-production and power. Rationale and praxis of interactively performed Technology Assessment : the example of the GIDEON project" (Università di Amsterdam, Dipartimento di Scienze Politiche).

Guaita F. (1997), Interventi di Prevenzione con Operatori di strada, Organizzazione, Operatività, Valutazione, Regione Veneto. Azienda U.L.S.S. 13, Mirano-Dolo.

Gueneau M. C. (1991), "Evaluation dreams and reality", Forum Valutazione, n° 1, CISP, Franco Angeli, Milano.

Hoyle M.H. (1998), "Conceptual and Methodological Lessons from the Evaluation of Transition and Institutional Reform Policies in Central and Eastern Europe", EES Annual Conference, Roma 29-31 Ottobre.

Hubers J., Linssen P. (1998), "Organizational Development and The Role of Evaluation", Provincie Noord-Brabant, EES Annual Conference, Roma 29-31 Ottobre.

Incostante M. F., Attademo G. (1997), "Napoli città solidale. Quattro anni di politiche sociali di Comune di Napoli", Prospettive Sociali e Sanitarie, n° 18-19, pp. 7-12, IRS (Istituto Ricerca Sociale, Milano).

InformaIres (1998), "Per una valutazione utilizzabile da chi decide : perché il Progetto Valutazione", Anno X - n° 2, (Documento scaricato da Progetto Valutazione : www.prova.org).

IRS Istituto per la Ricerca Sociale (1998), Fare ricerca economica e sociale, Ed.IRS Milano www.irs-online.it

IRS Istituto per la Ricerca Sociale - (a cura di Matteucci F.) (1998), Progetto finalizzato Pubblica Amministrazione U.O. Il controllo dei risultati nei servizi

Liliana Leone - Via Fontana della Girandola 24- 00040 Monte Porzio
Catone (Roma) ITALY

Tel. Fax. ++39 06 9422505 E mail: leone.l@microelettra.it

pubblici locali- Manuale di costruzione del sistema informativo per il controllo di gestione dei servizi comunali a domanda individuale

ISFOL (1996), “Il Fondo Sociale Europeo in Italia, sintesi del rapporto Isfol 1996”, Rassegna Italiana di Valutazione, n° 3 Luglio-Settembre (www.valutazione.it).

ISFOL (1998), Valutazione di medio termine del Quadro Comunitario di Sostegno dell'Ob.3 in Italia, Franco Angeli, Milano

Lazzarotto M., Porchia S., Selle P. (1998), (Ricercatori Emme & Erre) “Proposal for the construction of a model to evaluate the quality of social services : the Qu.E.S model”, International conference on evaluation : profession, business or politics?, ”, EES Annual Conference, Roma 29-31 Ottobre.

Lecomte B. J.(1991), “A proposito dell’autovalutazione”, Forum Valutazione, n° 1, CISP, Franco Angeli, Milano.

Lecomte B.J. (1987), L'aiuto progettuale. Limiti e alternative, Quale Sviluppo. Trimestrale ASAL Associazione America Latina, Roma

Klein G. B. (1998), “Osservare e valutare la comunicazione nelle & delle organizzazioni (II parte)”, Rassegna Italiana di Valutazione, n° 10 Aprile-Giugno (www.valutazione.it).

Leone L., De Angelis P. (1998) , La valutazione di progetti sulla prostituzione, In: On The Road , Manuale di intervento sociale nella prostituzione di strada, pp.211-228, Ed.CNCA, Capodarco di Fermo (AP)

Leone L., Prezza M. (1999), “Costruire e valutare i progetti nel sociale”, Franco Angeli.

Lepore L. (1996), “La struttura degli orari in Umbria. I percorsi dell’Utenza nella Ulss di Perugia”, Rassegna Italiana di Valutazione, n° 2 (www.valutazione.it).

Libro Bianco-Parte B (1994), “La Politica Sociale Europea. Uno Strumento di Progresso per L’Unione”, Commissione delle Comunità Europee, COM(94) 333 def./2, Bruxelles 27/7/94.

Mairate A. (1999), “Come valutare gli effetti dei programmi comunitari?. Il caso dei Fondi Strutturali”, (www.prova.org).

Mark M. M. (1998), “Planning Evaluations : a new realist perspective on evaluation purposes & inquiry families” Paper presented at the European Evaluation Society’ Annual Conference, Roma 29-31 ottobre.

Marleyn O. (1997), “Seminar’ Methodology for Development Projects”” Auxilium- Dum Dum (Calcutta), 17-22 Febbraio

Liliana Leone - Via Fontana della Girandola 24- 00040 Monte Porzio
Catone (Roma) ITALY

Tel. Fax. ++39 06 9422505 E mail: leone.l@microelettra.it

Marra M. (1998), “Formazione e valutazione : ingredienti dello sviluppo”, Rassegna Italiana di Valutazione, n° 9 Gennaio-Marzo (www.valutazione.it).

Martini A. (1997), “Valutazione dell’efficacia di interventi pubblici contro la povertà : questioni di metodo e studi di casi”, Testo elaborato su richiesta della Commissione di Indagine sulla povertà e sull’emarginazione sociale. (www.prova.org)

Martini A. (1998), “Valutazione e attuazione delle leggi : spunti dall’esperienza americana e riflessioni sul caso italiano”, Testo riveduto e corretto dell’intervento tenuto al seminario IterLegis del 30.11.1998 (Documento scaricato da Progetto Valutazione : www.prova.org).

McCollum A.(1998), “Working in partnership”, Forum Valutazione, n° 10, CISP, Franco Angeli, Milano.

Ministero dei Lavori Pubblici (1999), Intervento del Ministro dei lavori pubblici Dr. Enrico Micheli al convegno " Il programma Urban e l'innovazione delle politiche urbane", Convegno internazionale, Roma - Campidoglio 9-10 luglio 1999

Ministero Pubblica Istruzione, Documentazione-Educativa, La dispersione scolastica in Italia in aree di rischio e disagio educativo, Roma

Ministero del Tesoro, del Bilancio e della Programmazione Economica “Interventi del Ministro. La valutazione in Italia ed in Europa : situazione e prospettive”, International Conference on Evaluation : profession, business or politics?, EES Annual Conference, Roma 29-31 Ottobre 1998.

Ministero Del Tesoro, Del Bilancio e Della Programmazione Economica “Politiche per lo sviluppo del Mezzogiorno. Primo rapporto”, Estratto dalla Relazione Previsionale e Programmatica per il 1999.

“National Committee for Quality Assurance an Overview” (Documento scaricato da internet : www.ncqa.org).

OCSE, Gli incubatori di imprese in Italia (Parigi, 1997). L’esperienza della SPI, Quaderno 25 LEED

Oliva D., Samek Lodovici M. (1999), “Le politiche formative tra occupazione e valorizzazione delle risorse umane. Alcuni spunti di riflessione per la valutazione”, IRS (Istituto di Ricerca Sociale). Paper del Congresso Nazionale AIV, Napoli 15-17 Aprile.

Patassini D., Mambelli T. (1998), “Hints for evaluation research on planning and plans in Italy”, Paper presented at the Conference of European Evaluation Society on Evaluation-Profession, business or politics?, Roma 29-31 Ottobre.

Pennisi G. (1996), “La valutazione del rendimento delle politiche sociali. Una nota di metodo”, Rassegna Italiana di Valutazione, n° 2 Aprile-Giugno (www.valutazione.it).

Pio A. (1991), “ Analisis e interpretacion de los datos de costo para el monitoreo y evaluacion de proyectos sociales”, Forum Valutazione, n° 1, CISP, Franco Angeli, Milano.

Pioli S. (1996), “Se la formazione è cambiamento, quale strumento per la valutazione?”, Senzamargine, n° 2 marzo/aprile, pp. 8-11.

Piva P. (1994), “Horizon Sardegna. Rapporto di valutazione”, LABOS – Fondazione Laboratorio per le Politiche Sociali, Dicembre, pp. 1 – 38.

Piva P. (1997), “La valutazione dei servizi sociali territoriali”, Rassegna Italiana di Valutazione, n° 6 Aprile-Giugno (www.valutazione.it).

Policlinico di Modena (1999), Dimissioni protette , Direzione Affari Generali. (documentazione interna)

Regalia C., Marta E., Bruno A., Confalonieri E. “ Il compito impossibile. La valutazione dell’azione educativa. Una ricerca empirica” (Dipartimento di Psicologia, Università Cattolica, Milano, Aprile 1999, Riservato Ricerca in corso).

Regione Emilia Romagna- Assessorato ai Servizi Sociali (a cura di Merlo R.) (1990), Sistemi di verifica per i progetti di prevenzione delle tossicodipendenze

Regione Toscana (1998), Sperimentazione Alzheimer, Giunta Regione Toscana- Dipartimento del diritto alla salute e delle politiche di solidarietà - Area controllo qualità

Regione Lazio, Osservatorio Epidemiologico Regione Lazio, Sperimentazione operatore di strada sui tossicodipendenti - Rapporto ricerca 1998

Reich H., Wittek D. (1991), “ The education of children of migrant workers”, Forum Valutazione, n° 1, CISP, Franco Angeli, Milano.

Robertson A. (1993), “La valutazione delle politiche sociali”, Paper non pubblicato presentato al seminario “Nuovi indirizzi per le politiche socio-sanitarie nel Mezzogiorno”, Programma Alone Formez-Labos, Roma 22-24 Settembre 1993.

Robinson M. (1991), “Participatory impact evaluation”, Forum Valutazione, n° 2, CISP, Franco Angeli, Milano.

Sacchi A. (1997), “Alcune riflessioni e proposte sulla valutazione nella riforma scolastica. Un’ipotesi di navigazione scolastica”, Rassegna Italiana di Valutazione, n° 6 Aprile-Giugno (www.valutazione.it).

Salmen L. F. (1991), “La valutazione con i beneficiari”, Forum Valutazione, n° 2, CISP, Franco Angeli, Milano.

(a cura di) **Sintema Srl** (1998), “Tracce, sentieri e percorsi. I luoghi nuovi dell’educazione”. Programma sperimentale di ricerca sull’educativa di strada in Lombardia.

Sisti M., Vecchia M. (1999), “Quando la concertazione incontra la valutazione : l’attuazione della legge Turco nella provincia di Torino”, Paper presentato al Congresso Nazionale AIV, Napoli 15-17 Aprile 1999, (Documento scaricato da Progetto Valutazione : www.prova.org).

Sr. Castelino A. (1997), “Training Manual – OOIP. Based on a training workshop in : Objective Oriented Intervention Planning (OOIP) and workshop moderation”, Febbraio.

Stame N. (1990), “Valutazione <<ex post>> e conseguenze inattese”, Sociologia e Ricerca Sociale, n° 31, pp. 3 – 31.

Stame N. (1996), “Note sui progetti pilota e la valutazione”, Rassegna Italiana di Valutazione, n° 2 Aprile- Giugno (www.valutazione.it).

Stame N. (1998), “L’esperienza della valutazione”, Edizioni SEAM

Stame N. (1999), “Presentazione del libro : L’esperienza della valutazione”, (Documento scaricato da Progetto Valutazione : www.prova.org).

Stame N. (199.) “La valutazione in Italia : Esperienze e prospettive”, Rassegna Italiana di Valutazione, n° (www.valutazione.it).

Tazzioli G. (1996) “L’operatore di strada e un percorso di formazione possibile”, Senzamargine, n° 2 marzo/aprile, pp. 12-17.

Tendler J. (1992), “Progetti ed effetti. Il mestiere di valutatore.”, Liguori Editore.

Uphoff N. (1993), “La valutazione partecipativa dei progetti di sviluppo rurale”, Forum Valutazione, n° 6, CISP, Franco Angeli, Milano.

Vecchia M., Palumbo M. (1996), “La valutazione : Teoria ed Esperienze”, Rassegna Italiana di Valutazione, n° 3 Luglio-Settembre (www.valutazione.it).

Veney J. E., Magnani R., Gorbach P. (1992), “Measurement of the Quality of Family Planning Services” Working Paper, 6 Ottobre, Carolina Population Center – University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill – Tulane University & The Futures Group, EES – European Evaluation Society.

Verdi-Virghetti L. (1995) “Pacchetto di formazione sulla valutazione di progetto”. Paper ENAIP

Vicarelli G. (1999), “La valutazione dei servizi sanitari da parte dei cittadini : un progetto territoriale”, Università degli Studi di Ancona, Facoltà di Economia. Paper del Congresso Nazionale AIV, Napoli 15-17 Aprile (sessione : La valutazione nella sanità).

Villante C.(1998), The evaluation of actions to promote women’s participation in the labour market, International Conference on evaluation : Profession, business a politics, ISFOL- ESF Evaluation Unit.

D. SOCIAL INCLUSION POLICIES and EVALUATION ON THE WEB

Commissione di Indagine sulla povertà e sull'emarginazione, Dipartimento Affari Sociali- Presidenza del Consiglio dei Ministri (Ministro per gli Affari Sociali On. Livia Turco) www.affarisociali.it (v.servizio FAX Povertà)

Istituto per la Ricerca Sociale- Milano www.irs-online.it

Sito dell'ISFOL - Osservatorio sull'inclusione sociale/ Struttura Tecnica di Valutazione del FSE/ Assistenza Tecnica per il PIC Occupazione www.isfol.it

EUROPS Assistenza Tecnica a livello UE per il PIC Occupazione, Banca dati su tutti i progetti approvati www.europs.be

Centro nazionale di Documentazione ed Analisi sull'Infanzia e l'Adolescenza www.minori.it

Sito ufficiale dell'AIV Associazione Italiana di Valutazione www.valutazione.it

Sito del Progetto Valutazione di Torino www.prova.org