

FINAL EVALUATION REPORT

Project

Bridging Troubled Waters on Air: Listening to Minority Voices

Implemented by BaBe! within Country Based Support Scheme of the European Instrument for Democracy and Human Rights

Evaluator: **Sandra Benčić**

Supervisor: **Mirta Vukelić**

In Zagreb, October 2011



This project is funded by the European Union. The content of this document are the sole responsibility of Babel and can in no way be taken to reflect the views of the European Union.

Preface

Acknowledgments

The Evaluation Team would like to thank all individuals who participated in this evaluation process. Your co-operation and contributions are highly appreciated and made this exercise possible.

Every effort has been made to ensure that the information given here is correct, and any factual errors which might remain are unintended, and are the responsibility of the evaluators.

This Report represents exclusively the views of the Evaluation Team, and does not necessarily represent the views of BaBe!, partner organizations or any other organisation or individual referred to in the Report.

Evaluation team

Abbreviations

A1	Activity no 1.
CA	Contracting Authority (DEU)
Babe!	Applicant, Be Active Be Emancipated
CBSS	Country Based Support Scheme
CSOs	Civil Society Organisations
DEU (to RC)	Delegation of the European Union (to the Republic of Croatia)
EC	European Commission
EIDHR	European Instrument for Democracy and Human Rights
(EQ1)	Evaluation question no. 1
EU	The European Union
GB	Grant Beneficiary (Babe!)
GOs	Governmental organisations
LF(A)	Logical Framework (Approach); Logframe
NGOs	Non-governmental organisations
OO	Overall objective
PCM	Project Cycle Management
R1	Project Result no 1.
SO	Specific objective

Contents

I.	Executive Summary.....	4
II.	I. Introduction: Evaluation Subject, Purpose and Method.....	7
1.1	Subject and Purpose of Evaluation.....	8
1.2	Evaluation Methodology and Tools	8
III.	II. Evaluation	12
2.1	Intervention Strategy.....	11
2.2	Evaluation Criterion 1 - Effectiveness	14
2.3	Evaluation Criterion 2 - Efficiency	16
2.4	Evaluation Criterion 3 – Sustainability.....	18
2.5	Evaluation Criterion 4 - Relevance.....	20
2.6	Evaluation Criterion 5 - Impact.....	22
IV.	III. Findings, Conclusions and Recommendations	23
V.	Annexes	24
A.	Methodological Basis & Contractor’s Tasks.....	24
B.	Action Plan.....	24
C.	Detailed Methodological Design	24
D.	List of Informants and Main Sources of Information.....	24
E.	Questionnaires for Students, Teachers, Associates	24

Executive Summary

Subject, purpose and methodology of evaluation

The central subject of this evaluation is project Bridging Troubled Waters on Air: Listening to Minority Voices implemented by three non-governmental organisations, Babe!, Delfin and GORD in period from 15.12.2009. to 14 September 2011.

The Project was a human rights based initiative focused on improvement of ethnic minority representation in media and capacity building of minority groups for articulation of their policy and local initiatives. Project is implemented in the Western and Eastern Slavonia; municipalities: Daruvar, Pakrac, Vukovar, Erdut, built around the work with radio stations on the production of 48 radio shows. The Project was developed mid 2009 and following competitive procedure selected for financing within **Country Based Support Scheme**, funded from the European Instrument for Democracy and Human Rights (**EIDHR**) and managed by The Delegation of the European Union (DEU) acting as Contracting Authority.

The evaluation was commissioned by the Babe! and its' purpose is typically manifold. First of all, the function of evaluation is to **assist Grant Beneficiary in focusing future planning** through the provision of objective perspective and articulation of lessons and experiences relevant for management and decision making (institutional learning). Secondly, as budgeted project activity the evaluation is a contractual obligation and as such its' purpose is to **assist the Contracting Authority in objective judgement** of the project achievements. Finally, through wider dissemination of the Evaluation Report the evaluation serves the purpose of **deepening and accumulating knowledge and understanding** among all relevant parties. In practical terms evaluation was executed shortly after the Project's closure, during September and October 2011 in total duration of 10 work days by an external evaluation expert and supervisor.

The methodological basis of the evaluation is assessment against criteria typical to PCM methodology: **relevance, efficiency, effectiveness, sustainability and impact**. These criteria were in consultation with the Grant Beneficiary further developed into 8 evaluation questions in order to focus evaluation work and allow better reflection, targeted data collection and in-depth analysis. Further detailing of this methodological base typically included determination of **judgement references** (i.e. factors that answer the questions) and accompanying **indicators** (i.e. evidence of the answer, numerical or descriptive). The starting point has been **the Project Logframe** which has been improved with additional indicators of success. Main **evaluation tools** applied during the fieldwork were analysis and inspection of project documentation and secondary resources; face-to-face interviews and phone consultations and written exchange with the project team and stakeholders. Although limitations in time and resources did not allow extensive personal consultations with all stakeholders located in targeted areas, the Consultant was able to get a direct feedback from the field through participation at final project event held on 6th of July 2011: **Conference about minority representation in the local media with specific goals: to promote Charter on minority representation in the media and to create precise and transparent criteria for Fund for Promotion of Pluralism and Diversity of Electronic Media and to advocacy all key stakeholders so the proposed criteria would become mandatory for the Fund**. The target group of journalists were also approached more systematically, through questionnaires and expectedly the evaluation relied also on already existing monitoring/evaluation data collected by the Project team, summarized in Final Project report.

The Project

The evaluation typically started with examination of the **intervention strategy** because without looking into *what the project said it will do*, it is impossible to assess *what the project has done*.

Intervention rationale of the project is embedded in the actual needs as well as priorities of the Call. The overall goal was to increase awareness about minority rights, their needs and specific role within specific

local communities as well as communication and collaboration between majority and minority ethnic groups. This challenging task was approached through increased media representation of ethnic minorities in Slavonia in order to contribute to building a tolerant, inclusive and diverse society at the local level.

<p><i>Overall objective and final beneficiaries:</i></p>	<p>To increase awareness about minority rights, their needs and specific role within specific local communities as well as communication and collaboration between majority and minority ethnic groups</p> <p><i>Final beneficiaries:</i> population of Vukovar, Daruvar, Pakrac and Dalj, and other multi-national communities and broad public</p>
<p><i>Specific objective and target groups:</i></p>	<p>To increase media representation of ethnic minorities in Slavonia in order to contribute to building a tolerant, inclusive and diverse society at the local level.</p> <p><i>Target groups:</i> minority organizations; councils for national minorities; local governments in war affected areas; MPs and the Government of Croatia; journalist and editors of local radio stations; Agency for electronic media; Fund for Promotion of Pluralism and Diversity of Electronic Media</p>
<p><i>Expected results:</i></p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Created capacities of eight selected radio stations on minority shows production and mainstreaming the minority issues in the majority media program 2. Raised awareness of majority and minority population on necessity of public communication among different ethnic groups and increased acceptance of minority radio shows in targeted communities 3. Raised awareness among decision-makers on necessity to enforce legal provisions of Constitutional Law on National Minorities regarding TV and radio program for minorities and to finance minority radio shows through national budget
<p><i>Project activities:</i></p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1.1 One day consultation with local representatives of national minority groups in Erdut, Vukovar, Pakrac, Daruvar 1.2. One day consultation with women representatives of national minority groups in Erdut, Vukovar, Pakrac, Daruvar 1.3. One three-day training for editors and journalists from 8 local radio stations 1.4. Production and broadcast of six (6) radio shows about minority issues at 8 local radio stations 2.1.Public discussion about representation of minorities in the local media with representatives of minority and majority groups in Erdut, Vukovar, Pakrac, Daruvar 2.2.Mainstreaming the issue of lack of information on minority rights trough TV show Prizma 2.3. Local conference on media presentation of minorities 3.1. Session of 4 Parliamentary Committees about minority representation in electronic media 3.2. One national conference about minority representation in the local media

Intervention logic is based on capacity building of media, journalists to produce in cooperation with local minority organizations radio shows on minority issues and to build capacities of minority organisations to

pro-actively advocate their problems and policy solutions to local and national decision makers. In order to secure local ownership and commitment, as well as increase sustainability, due attention was paid to preparatory activities and networking with local community.

Evaluation findings

Analysis of **effectiveness** was exclusively concerned with achievement of results. However, due to already mentioned problems with articulation of results in the original project logframe, the evaluation decided to examine how successful the project was in: (EQ1) implementing *reform*, i.e. changing the attitudes of target groups; (EQ2) enabling *participation*, ensuring active involvement of target groups in implementation of activities and attainment of objectives and (EQ3) *empowering* participations, i.e. providing target groups with knowledge and skills to change their environment. Evaluation findings suggest that in terms of effectiveness the project did **very well**, providing target groups with knowledge, skills and collaboration networks sufficient for continuation and extension of similar activities on collective and individual level (journalists, editors). The Project was particularly effective in fostering *participation* both on the level of journalists/editors and on the level of local authorities and minority organisations.

Analysis of project **efficiency** was concerned primarily with implementation of activities and technical and financial management. The criterion is covered by two evaluation questions, one (EQ4) assessing technical management (implementation of activities in terms of timing, outputs, resources, monitoring arrangements, coordination and communication with partners, stakeholders and Contracting Authority) and the second one (EQ5) looking into financial management (value for the money, regularity of expenditure, book keeping). Evaluation suggests **excellent** project performance, even though project needed extension. Furthermore, consumption of budget and utilisation of resources in general is highly efficient in relation to implemented activities and results they have produced. Both technical and financial management were well organised and professionally executed with minor discrepancy caused by change of project manager in final semester of the project. Cooperation and coordination between partners was smooth and successful continuously prior, during and after project implementation. Administration was efficient and management in general compliant with contractual procedures and obligations towards Contracting Authority.

Analysis of project **sustainability** dealt primarily with follow up activities that should ensure continuation of project benefits in the longer term. Evaluation question (EQ6) is assessing to what extent there is a continuation of project activities and benefits (services, products and outcomes) after external assistance and is there a likelihood and opportunity for their replication / extension in wider context. Performance of the project with respect to sustainability is **very good**. The continuation of positive outcomes is already occurring on several levels – firstly through high impact which project findings and policy recommendations had on criteria for Chapter 23 and Platform 112 formulated by informal NGO network whereas Babe! where main expert for inputs concerning minority rights, specially in area of their media representation; secondly through networking and developed cooperation linkages through Minority charter in local communities ; thirdly through new knowledge and perceptions acquired by journalists, management skills of local partner (Delfin).

Analysis of project **relevance** was concerned with appropriateness of project and risk management, i.e. degree of flexibility to adapt to changes in environment, if appropriate. Evaluation question (EQ7) is assessing to what extent the needs and problems were properly identified and addressed, including the response to different situation on the field and unforeseen circumstances. Findings in relation to relevance suggest that the Project's performance was **excellent**.

Analysis of project **impact** was dealing with long-term effects of the project so the evaluators articulated impact evaluation question (EQ8) as examination of how much the Project has succeeded in influencing personal attitudes stimulating long lasting sustainable societal change. Assessment of impact is somewhat hard considering limited scope of the project and timing of the Evaluation. However, probability is the Project's performance in this respect was **very good due to** secured multiplication of its outputs and results; Babe! and their partner organisations are now recognised as expert organisations for issues related to minority representation in media. During the project and after the project end, Babe were

invited to present publication "Isolation or integration" and issues of media representation of minorities in Croatia at: Faculty of Political sciences, M.A. programme for international students of journalism (prof. Car), for SEEMO- South-East Europe Media Organisation at their Conference held in Tirana in November 2011. Long-term multiplication of project results is secured through integration of publication "Isolation or integration" in obligatory literature for students of Faculty of political science (prof. Kanižaj).

Conclusions and recommendations

Project has succeeded to achieve :

- a) Raised capacities of journalists and editors from local radio stations for production and presentation of minority related content through more attractive and more relevant form, thus contributing to popularity of the show among majority population as well
- b) Avoidance of "ghettoisation" of minority shows through new production format and careful selection of themes of each show
- c) Raised capacities of local radio stations and partner organisations for on-going cooperation in relation to promotion of minority rights and higher visibility of minorities in local media
- d) Detection of weaknesses in support system for national minorities' media representations (*Fund for Promotion of Pluralism and Diversity of Electronic Media- the Fund for electronic media*) and definition of recommendations for its improvement
- e) Increased visibility of problems related to media representation of national minorities by putting it into context of obligations in Chapter 23

In the future Applicant and partners should:

- a) Secure open discussions on criteria and process of financial distribution of funds of the Fund for electronic media
- b) Secure proper policy change in provision of financial support and obligations of local radio stations to produce and broadcast minority radio shows and mainstream those issues into regular radio program

I. Introduction: Evaluation Subject, Purpose and Method

This section explains approach to the evaluation process – first **Chapter 1.1** is devoted to the description of the subject and purpose of evaluation, its' scope and core methodological basis. The next **Chapter 1.2** explains process in more detail, describing the development of methodology from criteria to actual data collection plan and providing rationale for evaluation questions chosen to focus the evaluation work.

1.1 Subject and Purpose of Evaluation

The central subject of this evaluation is project Bridging Troubled Waters on Air: Listening to Minority Voices implemented by three non-governmental organisations, Babe!, Delfin and GORD in period from 15.12.2009. to 14 September 2011.

The Project was a human rights based initiative focused on improvement of ethnic minority representation in media and capacity building of minority groups for articulation of their policy and local initiatives. Project is implemented in the Western and Eastern Slavonia; municipalities: Daruvar, Pakrac, Vukovar, Erdut, built around the work with radio stations on the production of 48 radio shows. The Project was developed mid 2009 and following competitive procedure selected for financing within **Country Based Support Scheme**, funded from the European Instrument for Democracy and Human Rights (**EIDHR**) and managed by The Delegation of the European Union (DEU) acting as Contracting Authority.

The evaluation was commissioned by the Babe! and its' purpose is typically manifold. First of all, the function of evaluation is to **assist Grant Beneficiary in focusing future planning** through the provision of objective perspective and articulation of lessons and experiences relevant for management and decision making (institutional learning). Secondly, as budgeted project activity the evaluation is a contractual obligation and as such its' purpose is to **assist the Contracting Authority in objective judgement** of the project achievements. Finally, through wider dissemination of the Evaluation Report the evaluation serves the purpose of **deepening and accumulating knowledge and understanding** among all relevant parties. In practical terms evaluation was executed shortly after the Project's closure, during September and October 2011 in total duration of 10 work days by an external evaluation expert and supervisor.

The methodological basis of the evaluation is assessment against criteria typical to PCM methodology: **relevance, efficiency, effectiveness, sustainability and impact**. These criteria were in consultation with the Grant Beneficiary further developed into 8 evaluation questions in order to focus evaluation work and allow better reflection, targeted data collection and in-depth analysis. Further detailing of this methodological base typically included determination of **judgement references** (i.e. factors that answer the questions) and accompanying **indicators** (i.e. evidence of the answer, numerical or descriptive). The starting point has been **the Project Logframe** which has been improved with additional indicators of success. Main **evaluation tools** applied during the fieldwork were analysis and inspection of project documentation and secondary resources; face-to-face interviews and phone consultations and written exchange with the project team and stakeholders. Although limitations in time and resources did not allow extensive personal consultations with all stakeholders located in targeted areas, the Consultant was able to get a direct feedback from the field through participation at final project event held on 6th of July 2011: **Conference about minority representation in the local media with specific goals: to promote Charter on minority representation in the media and to create precise and transparent criteria for Fund for Promotion of Pluralism and Diversity of Electronic Media and to advocacy all key stakeholders so the proposed criteria would become mandatory for the Fund**. The target group of journalists were also approached more systematically, through questionnaires and expectedly the evaluation relied also on already existing monitoring/evaluation data collected by the Project team, summarized in Final Project report.

The core methodological basis of the evaluation and the point of departure in evaluation work was an agreement between the Beneficiary and the Consultant on **evaluation criteria** against which the project is to be analysed. Typically to the EU methodology (project cycle management (PCM) and logical framework approach (LFA)), five usual evaluation criteria are applied: **relevance, efficiency, effectiveness, sustainability and impact**. Upon discussion that took into account contextual limitations, conclusion has been reached on order of priority and interpretation of each criterion:

- effectiveness will look into ability of the project to deliver the objectives planned. Practically this criterion will examine *how far and in what way the project has delivered planned results*.
- efficiency will examine the extent to which the outputs and/or desired effects have been achieved with reflection to the use of resources/inputs (funds, expertise, time, etc). This criterion concerns *the implementation of activities*, so the evaluation examines the quality of both technical and financial management and actual course of implementation. In line with intended purpose of the evaluation, technical management and content of the activities are given the preference over financial and procedural compliances, which are thoroughly scrutinised by the CA.
- sustainability will be concerned with the continuation of benefits from the intervention after the termination of external assistance. Due to the lack of longer-term perspective, typically the evaluation here assesses the *probability* that the benefits continue in the long-term in a way that is resilient to risks, by examining follow up actions and synergies achieved with other ongoing / planned initiatives.
- relevance typically examines the extent to which the objectives of the project are consistent with actual requirements and needs and it can be examined in two points in time – before and after the intervention. Hence the evaluation needs to answer two questions: “was the project needed?” (checking out the validity of initial problem analysis) and “did the project satisfy actual needs?” (checking if the project addressed the problems and did the management adequately responded to changed circumstances, if appropriate)
- Impact will be concerned with positive and negative, primary and secondary long-term effects produced by the intervention, directly or indirectly, intended or unintended. Practically this criterion examines the *achievement of project objectives, specific and overall*. Similarly to sustainability, due to long-term nature of objectives and lack of time distance, evaluation here estimates the *probability* that desired long-term effects would be achieved.

1.2 Evaluation Methodology and Tools

Coherently following principles and rules applied by the EC the core methodological basis was in consultation with the Beneficiary developed into full and detailed evaluation methodology. Normally this process started with articulation of evaluation questions for all five criteria in order to focus evaluation work on a limited number of key points that will allow better reflection, targeted data collection and in-depth analysis and thus a more useful report. Consequently five criteria were transposed into **eight evaluation questions** covering all key aspects of the Project. The next step in evaluation methodology was determination of **judgement references** (i.e. factors that answer the questions) and accompanying **indicators** (i.e. evidence of the answer, numerical or descriptive). Normally the starting point for the definition of judgement references and indicators should have been **the Project Logframe**. The next and final stage in methodological design was the definition of **data collection strategy** - process, sources of information, data collection tools, participants and timings. Final agreement on full, detailed methodological design has marked the finalisation of evaluation desk phase and commencement of the fieldwork - data collection.

Main evaluation tools applied during the fieldwork were analysis and inspection of project documentation and secondary resources (press clipping, Internet, related reports and publications, etc); face-to-face interviews and phone consultations (free-form or semi-structured) and written exchange with the project

team and stakeholders. With the exception of core Project Team (Grant beneficiary and Partners) that was individually and personally interviewed on all aspects of the project, limitations in time and resources did not allow extensive personal consultations with other stakeholders and main target groups – journalists and local policy makers. To an extent the Consultant was able to get a direct feedback from the field through participation at final project event held in July 2011 in Zagreb. This was a valuable opportunity to observe the effects of the Project in local community and gain understanding through informal and spontaneous interaction with project participants. Expectedly the evaluation relied also on already existing monitoring/evaluation data collected by the Project team such as trainings’ evaluation sheets, trainers’ reports, transcripts from events and meetings, etc.

Respecting priority order of evaluation criteria, intended purpose and contextual limitations, the following 8 questions were articulated:

Effectiveness – questions 1 to 3 examining achievement of results (re-invented by the Evaluators):

No.	Question	Rationale / justification
1	To what extent the project achieved planned results and specific objective of the Action?	The analysis of the intervention strategy revealed that the original logframe objectives are appropriate for simple articulation of evaluation questions, but that additional indicators of success need to be additionally developed.
2		
3		

Efficiency – questions 4 & 5 examining the quality of technical and financial management:

No.	Question	Rationale / justification
4	The extent to which the activities were implemented as planned (in terms of timing, resources and outputs planned), including efficiency of management (problems and solutions, monitoring arrangements, coordination with partners and relationship with Contracting Authority).	Assessment from an operational level perspective – looking into the course of action, how were activities realised in terms of timing, outputs, resources, how was the process managed in terms of action planning and monitoring, coordination and communication with partners, stakeholders and Contracting Authority.
5	The extent and way of utilising financial resources – were they spent regularly (for purpose intended) and efficiently (value for the money).	Assessing financial management of the project will provide general assessment on the efficiency of financial management, but without detailed examination of every single supporting document, since the same subject is under comprehensive scrutiny of the Contracting Authority.

Sustainability – question 6 examining capacity to produce long term benefits:

No.	Question	Rationale / justification
6	The extent to which there is a continuation of project activities and/or benefits (services, products, outcomes) after external assistance and there is a likelihood and opportunity for their replication /extension in wider context.	Aim is to estimate the influence and the effects that the Project has had / could have on the developments in post-implementation period. Furthermore the Evaluator tries to estimate the probability that these effects will continue in the long term and/or that they can be replicated/extended to wider context in terms of geography, sector, target group. In that respect under this criterion the evaluation partly tackles the Action in its’ extended scope.

Relevance – question 7 examining consistency of original project design and degree of adaptability to changes in environment:

No.	Question	Rationale / justification
-----	----------	---------------------------

7	The extent to which the Project satisfied actual needs and problems and the extent to which project management adequately adapted to different situation on the field and unforeseen circumstances (if appropriate).	Assessing the validity of basic pre-assumptions made in project proposal on problems and needs of the target group, as well as the appropriateness of actions designed to tackle them. Assessing relevance is furthermore concerned with the validity of envisaged risks and mitigation measures, as well as their actual realisation and responses in order to estimate whether an effort was made to maintain validity of intervention throughout the implementation.
---	--	---

Impact – question 8 evaluating probability of producing long term effects, i.e. attainment of overall objective:

No.	Question	Rationale / justification
8	The extent to which the Project succeeded in stimulating long lasting sustainable societal change through increased awareness about minority rights, their needs and specific role within specific local communities as well as communication and collaboration between majority and minority ethnic groups?	Estimating the achievement of project special and overall objectives on the basis of factual evidence is somewhat problematic due to restricted resources and especially the lack of longer time perspective. Hence the evaluation here assesses the probability of the achievement of higher level goals articulated specifically for the evaluation.

II. Evaluation

This section presents factual evidence and formulates evaluation findings for each evaluation criterion – effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability, relevance and impact, **Chapters 2.2 to 2.6**. Each Chapter firstly describes the methodology (questions, judgement references and indicators, evaluation process and its' limitations) and than the findings summarised at the end in analysis which out of convenience uses very rough judgements – categories excellent ("score" 5), very good (4), good (3), satisfactory (2) and poor (1). The first **Chapter 2.1** is devoted to the description of the project proposal which is essential as a baseline for comparison with achievements which are subject of the evaluation.

2.1 Intervention Strategy

Examination of the **intervention strategy** is the first stage of the evaluation process and indeed very important one, because without looking into *what the project said it will do*, it is impossible to assess *what the project has done*. Although the intervention strategy can be examined by looking into its' **rationale, logic** and **related policies**, the preference here will be given to the first two aspects, in line with the chosen scope of evaluation. Intervention rationale is concerned with context and justification for an action (needs to be satisfied and problems to be solved), while intervention logic refers to the methodology of the action, i.e. coherence and consistency between identified activities, outputs, results and various levels of expected impacts (objectives) connected through logical cause-and-effect links. Intervention rationale is an answer to question *why* the action is needed and intervention logic answers *what and how* should it be done.

Intervention rationale of the project Bridging Troubled Waters on Air: Listening to Minority Voices

is solid and embedded in the actual needs as well as priorities of the Call. Main intervention logic, as defined by applicant in the Project proposal is:

<p><i>Overall objective and final beneficiaries:</i></p>	<p>To increase awareness about minority rights, their needs and specific role within specific local communities as well as communication and collaboration between majority and minority ethnic groups</p> <p><i>Final beneficiaries:</i> population of Vukovar, Daruvar, Pakrac and Dalj, and other multi-national communities and broad public</p>
<p><i>Specific objective and target groups:</i></p>	<p>To increase media representation of ethnic minorities in Slavonia in order to contribute to building a tolerant, inclusive and diverse society at the local level.</p> <p><i>Target groups:</i> minority organizations; councils for national minorities; local governments in war affected areas; MPs and the Government of Croatia; journalist and editors of local radio stations; Agency for electronic media; Fund for Promotion of Pluralism and Diversity of Electronic Media</p>
<p><i>Expected results:</i></p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Created capacities of eight selected radio stations on minority shows production and mainstreaming the minority issues in the majority media program 2. Raised awareness of majority and minority population on necessity of public communication among different ethnic groups and increased acceptance of minority radio shows in targeted communities

	3. Raised awareness among decision-makers on necessity to enforce legal provisions of Constitutional Law on National Minorities regarding TV and radio program for minorities and to finance minority radio shows through national budget
<i>Project activities:</i>	<p>1.1 One day consultation with local representatives of national minority groups in Erdut, Vukovar, Pakrac, Daruvar</p> <p>1.2. One day consultation with women representatives of national minority groups in Erdut, Vukovar, Pakrac, Daruvar</p> <p>1.3. One three-day training for editors and journalists from 8 local radio stations</p> <p>1.4. Production and broadcast of six (6) radio shows about minority issues at 8 local radio stations</p> <p>2.1. Public discussion about representation of minorities in the local media with representatives of minority and majority groups in Erdut, Vukovar, Pakrac, Daruvar</p> <p>2.2. Mainstreaming the issue of lack of information on minority rights through TV show Prizma</p> <p>2.3. Local conference on media presentation of minorities</p> <p>3.1. Session of 4 Parliamentary Committees about minority representation in electronic media</p> <p>3.2. One national conference about minority representation in the local media</p>

Intervention logic is in essence quite straightforward and in line with project's rationale and overall goal of the project; in order to secure greater media representation of the minority groups, Applicant has chosen to implement pilot radio shows on 8 different local radio stations which is justified with the fact that majority of local population daily listens local radio stations. Secondly, in order to upgrade direct communication between majority and minority groups radio shows and other media presentations didn't only include minorities but also representatives of majority population. Finally, project envisaged policy impact on national level, local levels (Charter) and on the level of main policy stakeholder Fund for electronic media.

In summing up the above review of project proposal it can be argued that the project has a very strong rationale and intervention logic which is sound and justified, but that some risks haven't been taken into account enough. Evaluator thinks that more effort should have been placed on securing financial sustainability of radio shows through advocacy towards Fund for electronic media to finance this type of shows in the future.

2.2 Evaluation Criterion 1 - Effectiveness

Evaluation approach in assessment of effectiveness is exclusively concerned with **achievement of results**. The effectiveness is assessed through 1 evaluation question examining how successful the project was in achieving those results and contributing to achievement of specific and overall objective of the project. Therefore **judgement references and indicators** were :

1. Has the project secured capacities of eight selected radio stations on minority shows production and mainstreaming the minority issues in the majority media program?
2. Has the project raised awareness of majority and minority population on necessity of public communication among different ethnic groups and increased acceptance of minority radio shows in targeted communities?
3. Has the project raised awareness among decision-makers on necessity to enforce legal provisions of Constitutional Law on National Minorities regarding TV and radio program for minorities and to finance minority radio shows through national budget?

Evaluation findings in relation to first question : Has the project secured capacities of eight selected radio stations on minority shows production and mainstreaming the minority issues in the majority media program? have been based on indicators set by Applicant in LF and additional indicators developed by Evaluator: No of minority shows produced and broadcasted, No of Charters signed by local authorities, No of minority representatives actively participated at the consultation process, No of editors and journalists participated in training and in producing the minority shows, No of news about minority mainstreamed in ordinary radio programme, Criteria for Fund established, No of majority population actively participated at the public discussions. The radio shows were produced both in collaboration between the local radio stations themselves, as well as other crucial actors – local CSOs and local ethnic minority groups – which testifies to high level of cooperation between local media, as well as majority and minority members. They have managed to produce the most valuable part of the project, the shows themselves, which remained in the possession of the radio stations and local community as examples of good practice for future reference. There were several unforeseen positive results in relation to this project. On the local level, radio stations in East and West Slavonia created an informal network while working on the episodes of "Kvaka 22" that enabled them better access to information, as well as better overall quality of the programme. In that sense, they increased their capacities both as journalists and as editors of the minority programme. Hrvatski Radio Vukovar went even further and has agreed to be a partner organisation for B.a.B.e. on several other EU projects, which would not have happened prior to their experience with this project. Further on, the publication "Isolation or Integration" that was created as one of the outputs of this project in cooperation with experts on the subject of media and national minorities was established as part of the curriculum on the Faculty of Political Sciences University of Zagreb. This is a great success for the project team that proves not only the overall value of this project, but also testifies that there is a need for such in-depth analysis on the level of university education.

Negative occurrences and realizations emerged from this project as well. The refusal of two radio stations (Bjelovarsko-Bilogorski Radio and Radio Baranja) that initially accepted the invitation to participate in the project, due to the fact that shows were mainly supposed to target Serbian national minority as the most vulnerable minority in Croatia. This shows that even though on declaratory level of acceptance and peaceful coexistence between Serbs and Croats is considered high, in some local communities the situation is still far from acceptable. In that sense, this project helped to enlighten such places and communities where further efforts are needed to achieve the desired level of equality and acceptance. In the same manner, this project demonstrated the persistent lack among Croatian politicians in general to deal with such issues seriously and professionally, as they lack both professional expertise and political will to implement necessary changes. The only effective way to pressure and achieve any changes in the system is still most efficiently achieved through media visibility, and the politicians themselves choose to

give their support for the activities only if they can be guaranteed media visibility. However, there are some notable exceptions among politicians, such as Slobodan Uzelac (Deputy Prime Minister for Social Issues and Human Rights) and Furio Radin (MP and President of the Parliamentary Committee for Human Rights and National Minorities) who are themselves members of national minorities.

Evaluation findings in relation to second question: . Has the project raised awareness of majority and minority population on necessity of public communication among different ethnic groups and increased acceptance of minority radio shows in targeted communities? has been more challenging to answer since it would require public opinion pool in order to directly answer the question. Nevertheless, evaluator has used indirect indicators in order to detect the impact on majority and minority population. Firstly, it has been testified by all contacted stakeholders, that radio shows, due to their modern and listener-friendly concept have been highly accepted among majority population as well. Secondly, minority shows have been broadcasted in e.g. Vukovar by Radio Vukovar as well which is perceived as "Croat radio" as opposed to Radio Dunav which is Serbian radio station. Evaluator finds that this fact that radio Vukovar had minority programme shows that project has succeeded to do what nobody else has until now; to break the media divides in Vukovar. Evaluator finds that this is also one of the best successes of the project.

Evaluation findings in relation to third question: Has the project raised awareness among decision-makers on necessity to enforce legal provisions of Constitutional Law on National Minorities regarding TV and radio program for minorities and to finance minority radio shows through national budget?

Evaluator finds that policy impact of the project is one of the strongest features of the Action; although there have been some changes in implementation of activities related to advocacy of Parliamentary Committees, due to Applicant good perception of context of minority rights, policy impact has been put in the frame of Negotiations in Chapter 23; recommendations for improvement of system of financial support for media representation of national minorities was put in the context of obligations of RoC in Chapter 23 (Judiciary and Fundamental rights) under minority rights issues. Evaluation of the project finds this particularly important for enhancing policy impact of recommendations, because applicant and partners have recognised importance of negotiations in Chapter 23 and have integrated their activities with broader initiative of CSOs advocating for full implementation of obligations under Chapter 23 thus contributing to much broader dissemination of project's conclusions and recommendations. Upon project implementation all those findings have been included into Platform 112: list of requests of NGOs towards new Government in relation to democratisation and respect of human rights and have been continuously advocated by 52 organisations which have signed the Platform.

Summarised evaluation assessment of the project effectiveness is based on detected successes of the project:

- a) Raised capacities of journalists and editors from local radio stations for production and presentation of minority related content through more attractive and more relevant form, thus contributing to popularity of the show among majority population as well
- b) Avoidance of "getoisation" of minority shows through new production format and careful selection of themes of each show
- c) Raised capacities of local radio stations and partner organisations for on-going cooperation in relation to promotion of minority rights and higher visibility of minorities in local media
- d) Detection of weaknesses in support system for national minorities' media representations (*Fund for Promotion of Pluralism and Diversity of Electronic Media*) and definition of recommendations for its improvement
- e) Increased visibility of problems related to media representation of national minorities by putting it into context of obligations in Chapter 23

2.3 Evaluation Criterion 2 - Efficiency

Evaluation approach in analysis of project efficiency is concerned primarily with **implementation of activities** and technical and financial management. The criterion is covered by two evaluation questions, one (EQ4) assessing technical management (implementation of activities in terms of timing, outputs, resources, monitoring arrangements, coordination and communication with partners, stakeholders and Contracting Authority) and the second one (EQ5) looking into financial management (value for the money, regularity of expenditure, book keeping). In response to those questions, the following **judgement references and indicators** were chosen:

(EQ4) Majority of project activities were realised as planned (in terms of the scope, timing, resources and outputs); Modification of activities was justified and approved by Contracting Authority (Amendment of the Contract in relation to extension of the Project) The division of tasks between team members was carefully planned beforehand and regularly controlled; Action plans were regularly updated and their realisation was closely monitored; Management was observant of visibility requirements and public relations; Project documentation was systematically collected and filled in orderly fashion; Communication and coordination with partners was smooth and regular.

The extension of the project has been approved on account of unfavorable political situation that would compromise the outcomes of the project in case that additional time for final project Conference has not been approved.

The funds were spent for purpose intended; value for the money was satisfactory; financial documentation is complete and filed in orderly fashion; regularity of secondary procurement and bookkeeping was respected. It should be noted with respect to the implementation of activities the evaluation report is presenting only the basic factual data needed for comparison between planned and realised, in order to detect variations and reason behind them and thus assess the efficiency of the management and project in general. Detailed description of activities in evaluation report is deemed unnecessary, since it is provided in the final narrative report prepared by the Grant Beneficiary. Evaluation of the activities have a formal limitation though - in some cases it was impossible to give accurate and rigorous assessment of achieved scope simply because certain activities were not sufficiently quantified in the Description of the Action and the Budget did not allow outputs to be clearly distinguished.

Evaluation findings with respect to **realisation of activities** indicate accomplishment of all activities in planned scope. In terms of the *schedule of activities and timings*, no particular delays and alterations were observed except postponement of the Conference on minority representation in the media. In terms of the foreseen *physical outputs* of activities, the Project did very well, delivering everything as planned.

Coordination and communication with Partners was smooth and intensive, due to equal division of responsibilities and work load both prior and during the implementation. Delfin and GORD, the project partners were actively involved from the very beginnings and has contributed equally to the development of project idea and preparation of proposal to actual implementation of activities. Due to its previous experiences in work with local media, Delfin as partner has been mostly involved in that part of the action.

Office management and administrative work was carried out from the Babe! office in Zagreb. In general it can be concluded that both technically and administratively project was efficiently and professionally managed. The only discrepancy in project management was caused by the fact that project manager has been changed during April/May 2011 but even so, the new manager has been properly introduced to the Action and successfully finished the project. Administration was well organised also with respect to the **project documentation** which is logically filed – documents are stored chronologically in separate folders for different aspects of project implementation: grant contract and related documentation; press clipping and dealings with the media; time sheets and contracts with

outsourced experts; content-related documents (invitations to events, attendance sheets, evaluation sheets and reports, lecturing materials, etc.) and other..All public documents and project publications were without exception aligned with **visibility requirements**. In addition, management acknowledged the EU financing during all public events, dealings with the media and direct contact with stakeholders, through oral presentation and exhibition of EU logo on presented materials.

Financial management of the project was carried out by the Grant Beneficiary (GB), under the responsibility of the Project Manager who authorised all payments. Having implemented all activities in planned scope, at the end of the day the Project was very effective and the budget was consumed entirely. Supporting financial documentation seems to be in order (time sheets, travel sheets, hotel invoices, etc) although it has not been thoroughly crosschecked with accounts by Evaluators, as it runs out of the scope of this evaluation mission.. General assessment suggests compliance with procedures and rules of sound financial management.

Summarised evaluation assessment with respect to efficiency suggests **excellent** project performance although project has been implemented in highly specific political context of finalization of negotiations in Chapter 23 which also includes minority rights. This fact has postponed some of the event sof the project, but Applicant has been very prudent in adjusting timing of some activities to political and social context.

2.4 Evaluation Criterion 3 – Sustainability

Evaluation approach in analysis of project sustainability is concerned primarily with **follow up activities** that should ensure continuation of project benefits in the longer term. Evaluation question (EQ6) is assessing to what extent there is a continuation of project activities and benefits (services, products and outcomes) after external assistance and is there a likelihood and opportunity for their replication / extension in wider context. The following **judgement references and indicators** were chosen:

(EQ6) The same or similar activities are continuing after the project end (targeting the same beneficiaries and/or having the same objectives); Local community has developed a sense of ownership over the Project results and benefits and displays commitment towards their continuation; Project partners are aware of the lessons learned and this experience has been applied to other/wider context. *Indicators:* Number and type of activities / initiatives in the same area / with same objectives implemented by partners and/or stakeholders; Descriptive answer to judgement references.

Evaluation findings with respect to sustainability are:

The evaluator finds that applicant organisation has raised their internal capacities (partnerships with other CSOs, media, and academia and policy makers, technical capacities of employees in relation to functioning of the media and in relation to minority rights in divided communities, management capacities in relation to project management and partnership management) and visibility as organisation with significant expertise in issues related to minorities' representation in media. Partner organisations have significantly raised their capacities for on-going cooperation with local media (radio stations) in promotion of minorities' rights, but also for further enhancement of minority rights in their communities. Proof for this statement is continuation of cooperation between applicant, partner organisations and radio stations in Slavonia (plus local TV stations) in two new project proposals applied for financing under IPA Component I and IPA Component IV.

This project represents good practice example in cooperation of national and local CSOs with equal engagement in activity implementation and development of cooperation with external stakeholders; it is evident that management capacities of local partners have increased not only on the level of project management, but also in relation to strategic planning and orientation of those partner organisation and their further engagement on full implementation of minorities' rights in their local communities with emphasis on creation of sustainable partnerships with local authorities and local media.

Project results and outputs have been disseminated through Platform 112 (non-formal coalition of CSOs monitoring progress in relation to obligations deriving from Chapter 23 of negotiations with EU), to representatives of Parliamentary committees and representatives of Government of RoC, through Faculty of political science to current and future students (obligatory literature for B.A. students) and on international level through SEEMO which expressed intention to translate publication and disseminate it on EU level. Main findings and conclusions in relation to sustainability of media promotion of national minorities have been included into 112 demands of CSOs (Platform 112) and disseminated to electronic and press media in Croatia, all parliamentary political parties and presented to general public through series of media events.

Evaluator finds that most successful outcome of the project is secured multiplication of its outputs and results; Babe! and their partner organisations are now recognised as expert organisations for issues related to minority representation in media. During the project and after the project end, Babe were invited to present publication "Isolation or integration" and issues of media representation of minorities in Croatia at: Faculty of Political sciences, M.A. programme for international students of journalism (prof. Car), for SEEMO- South-East Europe Media Organisation at their Conference held in Tirana in November 2011. Long-term multiplication of project results is secured through integration of publication "Isolation or integration" in obligatory literature for students of Faculty of political science (prof. Kanižaj).

Project had strong impact project on straightening of cooperation between CSOs and media on local level and due to important policy impact of main recommendations derived from the project; recommendations for improvement of system of financial support for media representation of national minorities was put in the context of obligations of RoC in Chapter 23 (Judiciary and Fundamental rights) under minority rights issues. Evaluation of the project finds this particularly important for enhancing policy impact of recommendations, because applicant and partners have recognised importance of negotiations in Chapter 23 and have integrated their activities with broader initiative of CSOs advocating for full implementation of obligations under Chapter 23 thus contributing to much broader dissemination of project's conclusions and recommendations.

One of the main targets of the project was impact on funding criteria of the Fund for electronic media; The recommendations defined through the project were subsequently addressed to Agency and its Fund for Promotion of Diversity and Electronic Media, as well as to three responsible Parliamentary Committees (Committee for Human Rights and National Minorities, Committee for Gender Equality and Committee for Media) (see Activity 3.1.). The recommendations mainly concerned the establishment of more transparent criteria for financing, as well as necessary institutional changes in the governmental bodies concerning national and local electronic media to ensure future sustainability and existence of programmes for national minorities.

Summarised evaluation assessment is that with respect to sustainability the project is **excellent**. The continuation of positive outcomes is already occurring on several levels – firstly through project outputs, through continuous advocacy secured through inclusion of findings and recommendations of the project in Platform 112, through inclusion of publication "Isolation or integration" in obligatory literature for students of Faculty of political science.

In support to above listed elements of sustainability that were built in the Project is the fact that Beneficiary institutions have an extensive experience (and consequently capacities, resources and wide network of partners, associates and supporters) in its core area of expertise (media production), as well as in civil society agendas, activism and generally socially conscience behaviour and initiatives.

2.5 Evaluation Criterion 4 - Relevance

Evaluation approach in analysis of project relevance deals with **appropriateness of project** and risk management, i.e. degree of flexibility to adapt to changes in environment, if appropriate. Evaluation question (EQ7) is assessing to what extent the needs and problems were properly identified and addressed, including the response to different situation on the field and unforeseen circumstances. The following **judgement references and indicators** were chosen:

(EQ7) Problems originally identified were evidenced on the fieldwork and addressed with appropriate actions; all risks were taken into account and appropriate mitigation measures were devised; Project Management appropriately responded to all foreseen and unforeseen risks and issues. *Indicators:* List of problems & risks from AF and reported on the field; Reactions of the beneficiaries; Descriptive answer to the judgement references.

Evaluation findings indicate that the Project Team was very well aware of all risks associated with the implementation of activities, although formally project proposal is not too elaborated in that respect.

Problems addressed by the Action	Solutions provided by the Action
Low level of representation of minorities in mainstream local media and sensational and unprofessional informing of the public on minority rights issues	48 radio shows (Kvaka 22) implemented on mainstream local media Radio shows implemented in co-production of journalists and minority and majority NGOs, activists, Councils for national minorities Radio shows had modern concept and therefor were listened by majority population as well
Return and reconstruction are not considered to be topics on which local radio stations should report	Topics for the show have been defined through Consultation process with minority and majority population in targeted area and therefor enlightened all major economic and social problems of the minority population
Non-transparent financing by the Fund for Encouraging Pluralism and Diversity of Electronic Media of programs for national minorities on radio stations.	Detected problems in financing and recommendations have been incorporated in publication "Isolation or Integration" with recommendations on how to improve Agency performance in financing minority media and programmes and the Agency representatives stated that they will consider that in their future work and suggested changes. In the end, the recommendations in the publication "Isolation or Integration" were also passed to all members of the three responsible Parliamentary Committees (Gender Equality, Human Rights and National Minorities, and Media) to help sustain the achieved benefits and results of this project and have been integrated into Platform 112.
Low awareness of local and national policy makers on obligations deriving from Constitutional Law on national minority rights	Since B.a.B.e. project team and partners secured the support of Slobodan Uzelac, Vice Prime Minister for Social Issues and Human Rights and MP, the cooperation of key stakeholders on this project was realized very successfully. In the regions under the scope of this project, local government representatives signed the Charter on minority representation in the electronic media, which is an official guarantee that they will continue to enforce and support the

	execution of Constitutional Law on National Minorities, in particular the rights of national minorities to access and participate in local and national media.
--	--

Risks activated during the project and mitigation strategies applied:

RISKS		MIGRATION STRATEGIES
Political risks	<p>1) Local parties oppose to broadcasting of minority radio shows or use the broadcasting of the shows to radicalise political opinion of the citizens</p> <p>2) Parliamentary parties and Fund for Promotion of Pluralism and Diversity of Electronic Media are not willing to accept transparent criteria for financing minority programs in electronic media</p>	<p>Envisaged mitigation strategy applied: Applicant has implemented Local conference on media presentation of minorities – Local government Charter on minority presentation in electronic media which enabled them to formalise support of the local governments to broadcasting of the minority shows and provided long term solution for their commitment.</p> <p>Mitigation strategy was applied through securing high level political representatives Mr. Slobodan Uzelac and Furio Radin as main supporters of the project activities and promoters of its recommendations. Additionally, by putting those recommendations in the framework of Chapter 23, Babe and partners have created a very strong pressure towards Government in relation of their future implementation.</p>
Social risks	Strong antagonism of majority population toward broadcasting of minority shows	In order to prevent radicalisation of ethnic relations in targeted communities due to promotion and broadcasting of minority shows Babe have implemented broad consultation process and public discussions with minority and majority population in targeted communities which has presided to broadcasting. Through this process they have created save space for local population where they can openly discuss their problems with broadcasting minority shows and find solutions for those problems, but at the same time educated targeted communities on constitutional and legal rights of minorities and present them good practices in minority's media representation in other parts of Croatia.

Summarised evaluation assessment with respect to relevance is that the Project's performance was **excellent**. Original project proposal has properly detected risks and project designed has incorporated

mitigation strategies into project activities. Evaluator finds that Applicant has been very sensitive towards local situation and issues between majority and minority and has applied broad consultation process prior to broadcasting of radio shows; this has certainly (together with distinguished guests on the shows) supported successful implementation and prevention of risks.

2.6 Evaluation Criterion 5 - Impact

Evaluation approach in analysis of project impact deals with ***long-term effects of the project*** and typically should be concerned with contribution to overall objective. Since evaluation of broadly defined and long term project objectives on the basis of factual evidence is somewhat problematic due to restricted resources and especially the lack of longer time perspective, the evaluation here assesses the *probability* for these improvements.

Evaluation findings with respect to long term effects such as increased awareness about minority rights, their needs and specific role within specific local communities as well as communication and collaboration between majority and minority ethnic groups is assessed through indirect indicator: Existence of the local and national mechanisms to empower and finance minority representation in the mediae.g. Precise Fund criteria established and Parliamentary decision made to finance minority local and national shows from the budget. Although project has defined precise criteria for the Fund for electronic media, presented those criteria to policy makers and has secured very broad political and civil society, including academia, support for their implementation, Fund still hasn't changed those criteria. Nevertheless, after the project ended, Babe! have continued with advocacy towards national government on introduction of more transparent criteria regarding Fund; it has incorporated those findings into Platform 112-list of requests fo civil society towards new Government and during pre-election campaign has secured broad support of almost all parliamentary parties for it.

Summarised evaluation assessment with respect to impact is hard to assess considering limited scope of the project, lack of long term perspective. However, probability is the Project's performance in this respect was ***very good***, mostly because the project has strong sustainable potential, and chances for continuation of positive effects.

Nevertheless, Applicant should in future secure open discussions on criteria and process of financial distribution of funds of the Fund for electronic media and secure proper policy change in provision of financial support and obligations of local radio stations to produce and broadcast minority radio shows and mainstream those issues into regular radio program.

III. Conclusions and Recommendations

- Core project strength which influenced its methodology and determined performance is in its rationale – working with journalists, editors and local communities on enhancing representation of minority issues in regular radio programme thus avoiding ghettoization of minority issues in media
- Raised capacities of journalists and editors from local radio stations for production and presentation of minority related content through more attractive and more relevant form, thus contributing to popularity of the show among majority population as well
- Avoidance of “getoisation” of minority shows through new production format and careful selection of themes of each show
- Raised capacities of local radio stations and partner organisations for on-going cooperation in relation to promotion of minority rights and higher visibility of minorities in local media
- Detection of weaknesses in support system for national minorities’ media representations (Fund for Promotion of Pluralism and Diversity of Electronic Media) and definition of recommendations for its improvement
- Increased visibility of problems related to media representation of national minorities by putting it into context of obligations in Chapter 23

Evaluator finds that most successful outcome of the project is ***secured multiplication of its outputs and results; Babe! and their partner organizations are now recognized as expert organizations for issues related to minority representation in media.*** During the project and after the project end, Babe were invited to present publication “Isolation or integration” and issues of media representation of minorities’ in Croatia at: Faculty of Political sciences, M.A. programme for international students of journalism (prof. Car), for SEEMO- South-East Europe Media Organisation at their Conference held in Tirana in November 2011. Long-term multiplication of project results is secured through integration of publication “Isolation or integration” in obligatory literature for students of Faculty of political science (prof. Kanižaj).

Specific added value of the project ***is change in attitude of Radio Vukovar editors and journalists in relation to presentation of themes related to Serbian minority; until this project there was prevailing opinion that Serbian minority has their own radio station (Radio Dunav) and that Radio Vukovar is “Croat” radio.*** After implementation of radio shows, attitude of journalists and some editors has changed in that respect and they have accepted and even initiated new cooperation with Babe! and partner organisations on new projects.

Annexes

- **Methodological Basis & Contractor's Tasks**
- **Action Plan**
- **Detailed Methodological Design**
- **List of Informants and Main Sources of Information**
- **Questionnaires for Students, Teachers, Associates**