



Intellectual Output 1 Counselling migrants and refugees

Summary of main outcomes of reviews

Authors

Academia + Project Working Team

Editing:

Prof. Dr. Jane Porath

Prof. Dr. Clinton Enoch

Dr. Rebeca García-Murias

University of Applied Labour Studies (HdBA)

April/May, 2020





Table of contents

1. First review process (planned as face-to-face training): Summary of main outcomes.....

.....3

2. Second review process (planned as online training): Summary of main outcomes.....

.....4





1. First review process (planned as face-to-face training): Summary of main outcomes

O1 builds on outcomes and products having been developed in a previous EU-funded project. In the Erasmus+ KA2 Strategic Partnership project 'CMinaR' partners from DE, IT, SE, TK and the UK developed Higher Education courses and courses for practitioners of counselling to teach and train (future) counsellors in educational and vocational guidance for their work with refugee clients. Basing on the outcomes of the analysis of the target group's specific needs carried out in this outputs first phase as well as specifics of the Academia+ (i.e. considerably shorter training periods), the materials from the CMinaR project have been adapted to the more practical training for guidance practitioners.

Theses adapted structure plans and description are part of the first review process. Its main outcomes are the following:

Every unit includes an introduction section in the morning of each day. Content and method are very similar for each unit. Since the participants will be the same every day during face-to-face training this seems unnecessary to be included in units 2,3 and 4 as participants will have already introduced themselves, become aware of the structure of the week, been aware of the rules of communication and agreed on the best ways of working with one another (non-judgemental, engaging etc) in unit 1. The suggestion is to remove the introduction part from units 2, 3 and 4 and by that provide more time for participants to learn the course content. Furthermore a short summary from the last day could be included into the introduction of the following day.

It is recommended to enlarge the section for understanding topic related terms during unit 1 by defining the terms multiculturalism, interculturalism and integration more in detail and identify challenges by the participant.

Especially unit 2 and 3 should be re-structured a little, since some sections (not combined with each other) seem to cover very similar aspects of the topic. It is therefore



recommended to combine the activities from the different sections to ensure that all learning of this topic is together.

The reviewers agree that the learning methods are good and so are the goals and content. In some sections however they struggle to see how learning goals, methods and content relate to one another. It should be made clearer, how the method will address the content and how the content will meet the learning goal. (example: learning goal is to understand the meaning and benefits of using methods and tools, content refers to learning challenges but does not mention discussing benefits, method is a self-reflection task about understanding the experiences of migrants and refugees).

Regarding planned methods and media it would be helpful to add more information on how to use the specific method, add advice for media handling and maybe give short explanations why specific methods and media were chosen.

If group work is planned, all groups should work on the same tasks (but from different perspectives or for different countries). It makes it easier to combine findings and results with each other.

All in all the units should provide more time during each day to bring in different national perspectives from the project partner countries and the participants countries.

2. Second review process (planned as online training): Summary of main outcomes

O1 is supposed to be held in April and May in form of face-to-face training weeks for up to 10 participants in each of the project's partner countries, Germany, Luxembourg, Portugal and the UK. Due to the COVID-19 crises and in order to make possible the C-STEP in a time of heavily restricted mobility, C-STEP 1 is adapted to online format.

This shift from face-to-face to online implies the following major changes:



- Instead of 4 separate national C-STEPs for up to 40 participants in each country, one transnational C-STEP will be held that targets a wider number of participants
- Beyond the participants who had registered originally for the national C-STEPs, the transnational online-C-STEP will be opened up for other participants as well
- Due to the fact that it is challenging to work in an online environment full-time for 4 consecutive days, the course will be split up to two weeks, with two days per week.
- In case participants cannot participate for the full 4 days of the course, they can also participate at single days.
- The courses will include a mix of different didactical settings and methods. They e.g. will start with an hour of lecture including questions from the participants, the division of participants into smaller groups (moderated by the different national partners), letting participants discuss certain aspects and prepare something for the bigger group, which will meet afterwards again etc.

Changing the first exchange week into online training, the didactical framework and the unit structure plans have to be adapted to these new circumstances which leads to a second review process.

Its main outcomes are the following:

Unit1:

Overall opinion:

The structure plan makes sense and gives a vague idea on what the workshop aims at, but the whole plan should be more detailed. It is noticeable that the focus on the methodology that is proposed to teach career counsellors is job placement. In this case the integration of themes, objectives and methods used in employment services, in the usual career counselling



processes, including those aimed at refugees is positive. There are, by the way, recommendations from psychological research with unemployed people for such integration in career intervention processes. If the focus is not exclusively on the employment placement of the target population, it seems to be lacking more visibility to other objectives of social insertion and welfare of these population groups.

If by „Discuss challenges arising from learning and using a second language as a medium for acting and responding in education, working environment and counselling communication” it is intended to discuss challenges arising from the need to use a second language for counselling refugees, it seems a properly (realistic) goal for the whole unit.

Coverage of necessary topics and contents:

All in all everything is covered, but outcome should be more precise, for example: knowledge in differences: What differences? It is recommended to better in the proposal, with some examples in brackets, what exactly is meant by “methods of empowerment of refugees and migrants” in order to be easier to evaluate if relevant content is considered (e.g., life and work values, specific career attitudes and behaviours essential to be empowered and prepared to integrate a new society, ...)

Context between learning goals/outcomes and planned methods:

The learning outcomes are consistent with each content unit; well formulated and realistic. However learning goals/outcomes and methods/activities are sometimes mixed in the description. It is therefore recommended to clearly differentiate this.

Evaluation of timetable:





If the timetable for each planned topic clearly depends on the number of participants.

Unit2:

Overall opinion:

Appears logical and the sequence of contents can be followed rather easily; outcome and methods that are used should be differentiated. Also, learning outcomes could be formulated more to the point. Also for this unit it is noticeable that the focus on the methodology that is proposed to teach career counsellors is job placement. In this case the integration of themes, objectives and methods used in employment services, in the usual career counselling processes, including those aimed at refugees is positive. There are, by the way, recommendations from psychological research with unemployed people for such integration in career intervention processes. If the focus is not exclusively on the employment placement of the target population, it seems to be lacking more visibility to other objectives of social insertion and welfare of these population groups.

Coverage of necessary topics and contents:

Overall, relevant topics are covered. But focus seems to be on analysis and learning specific methods. Possibly, more focus on structural elements could be beneficial, e.g. understand different types of labour market models rather than specific markets. Examples in brackets could make the meaning of each topic a bit more obvious.

Context between learning goals/outcomes and planned methods:



The learning outcomes are consistent with each content unit; well formulated and realistic. However the stated methods are rather unclear. For example "analyse" and "discuss" should be made more specific, since it is not clear how analysis is conducted specifically or how discussion is guided.

Evaluation of timetable:

Overall the timetable seems realistic, but tight especially for input parts. Challenges might also remain for discussion of results of 5 groups. Very likely some relevant points will not be heard in such a discussion. Possibly, also a voice and a chat channel could be run in parallel to mitigate this.

Unit3:

Overall opinion:

In general, the mapping between these units and the proposed agenda can be seen, but it is not clear yet, how they build up on each other.

Coverage of necessary topics and contents:

The coverage seems fine when looking at topics and outcomes of the agenda. Luxembourg and Germany are good examples. It is recommended to add more time to also focus on other national systems for example from the participants countries.

Context between learning goals/outcomes and planned methods:



Again the connection between learning goals/outcome and planned methods seems fine in general, but wording could be more precise. Unclearness may be driven by outcome and activities being mixed up in the formulation (just taking a semantic point of view here). This may confuse non-proficient readers, who are not already familiar with the topic.

Evaluation of timetable:

A short break between agenda items 1 and 2 might be beneficial to give the audience some time to digest what was discussed in the first agenda item.

For both items before lunch break the timetable seems realistic; for agenda item 3 it is challenging as topic is a rather personal one and a workshop planned. Agenda item 4 as a lecture should be manageable, but a more interactive exercise is strongly recommended for the desired outcome/objective like "Develop an understanding of empowerment and empowerment methods".

Unit4:

Overall opinion:

In general, the mapping between these units and the proposed agenda is understandable. But likewise to unit 3 a clear link between the concrete themes that are part of the agenda is missing, i.e. it is not clear enough how they build up on each other.

Coverage of necessary topics and contents:



The coverage seems fine when looking at topics and outcomes of the agenda. Luxembourg and Germany are good examples. Possibly staying in one national system is more beneficial or integrating even more different national perspectives.

Context between learning goals/outcomes and planned methods:

Again wording could be more precise. Beside that the context between learning goals/outcomes and planned methods is good.

Evaluation of timetable:

The evaluation of the timetable for unit 4 is similar to unit 3. It should be considered to plan more time for the last topic. 50 minutes are a bit to short for the context. Also, a short break between agenda items 1 and 2 might be beneficial to give the audience some time to digest what was discussed in the first agenda item. Agenda item 4 could be improved by using an interactive method to help reaching the desired outcome of „Developing an understanding of empowerment and empowerment methods“

Conclusions:

On the basis of these reviews the structure plans will be more detailed and specific in the wording, the amount of time for discussion and communication of the participants will be enhanced. All this will be visible in the detailed unit descriptions. To make the timetable more realistic more time will be planned for some sections. If group work is planned more than one person will be in charge to moderate the group work and group results. Speakers

GEFÖRDERT VOM



Bundesministerium
für Bildung
und Forschung


Academia+



Co-funded by the
Erasmus+ Programme
of the European Union

and participants will get technical support by a second person (to keep the speaker free from solving technical problems and help them focus on content and presentations).

