



# CRISCO Local Process - Reporting

#### A. Local Process - Introduction

Local Panels of Stakeholders (LPS) are central in CRISCO.

- Each CRISCO participant sets up a motivated, active and well-balanced LPS (based on these proportions: 1/3 of citizens or citizens' organizations, 1/3 non-profit and civil society organizations, and 1/3 experts, officials and local authorities), that will meet regularly to experiment and review (new or existing) local integration initiatives.
- In each CRISCO partner, the LPS is composed of at least 18 formal members (at least one signed attendance list per reporting period is necessary 4 in total), but may be widely enlarged by the informal participation of the wider local community.
- Building on their existing mechanisms of local democracy, each partner town will maintain
  existing or develop new instruments to involve local stakeholders and citizens in the project,
  especially the "hard-to-reach" groups.
- For this purpose, different participatory approaches, adapted to their specific conditions and needs, are expected to be maintained or developed by the CRISCO partners
- Local activities could be of two main types:
  - Reflection: debates, workshops, in-field visits, review of existing local initiatives (including interviews or questionnaires), invitation of external 'experts' or 'resource persons' (including from other CRISCO partners), etc.;
  - o Action: launch, activate, enrich or adapt (new or existing) local integration initiatives with a focus on the theme for the reporting period (4 in total).
- Local activities reported in the CRISCO reports may be activities that take place in the context of other local initiatives but <u>must be relevant for and linked to CRISCO (logos...).</u>

Important note: CRISCO partners may take part as 'experts', 'external resource persons' or 'interested persons' in the local process of another partner (2 missions per CRISCO partner), following rules that will be established for CRISCO (relevance, cost efficiency...).

Please submit (at <a href="mailto:crisco@etterbeek.irisnet.be">crisco@etterbeek.irisnet.be</a>) each local process report and its annexes not later than 1 month after the end of the reporting period (4 in total).

Reports must be written in English language.

Please send pdf documents and keep all original documents in your possession and in good conditions until five years after the end of the project.





















## B. Local Process - General information for the reporting period n°.3.. (4 in total)

- Name of the partner: Jonava district municipality
- Reporting period:
  - 1. From September 2017 to March 2018 (theme: "Cultural and social barriers to integration")
  - 2. From March 2018 to September 2018 (theme: "Prejudices and precarious individual situations")
  - 3. From September 2018 to January 2019 (theme: "Language barriers to integration")
  - 4. From January 2019 to August 2019 (theme: "Lack of (public) places for inclusion activities")
- Summary of the local process for the reporting period (max. 10 lines):
- In December 2018 responsible for the implementation of the project specialists were gathered for meetings on the implementation of the event and its objectives;
- A program of the event was developed, topical issues were discussed, the course of the event was considered in detail, event venue and potential participants were discussed;
- Inhabitants of the Center of the refugees were selected as the main participants of the event;
- The specialists, the head of the relevant departments, the city elder of Jonava district municipality, representatives of the government from the Center of refugees were also selected as participants of the event;
- Jonava city Culture Center selected as the venue of the event;
- We sent invitations to the event,
- We prepared for the event;
- About the coming event was publicized in the local press;
- In December 27<sup>th</sup>, 2018 Jonava District municipality organized an event /activity "Language barriers to integration" for CRISCO project, which took place in Jonava Culture Center;
- Jonava district municipality administration took care of arrival & departure of the participants;
- Duration of the event one day;
- We sent a press release to promote the activity of the organized event objective and project;
- The information about the training was in local media;

• What are the 3 things you consider successful and 3-unsuccessfull about the local process for the reporting period (max. 10 lines):

#### Succes:

We are very happy that there was a lot of interest to join to panel group and mobilised the persons who wanted help and also did it (Jonava district municipal authority, Jonava Culture Center, Rukla's Center of refugee authority). So the preparation of responsible persons was





















excellent and very motivated. We included people from different cultural and social groups such a variety of religions, young and old, families and singles etc. The participants had a great desire to participate. Prepared programs points was correct and actual as for the event participants as for representatives. The questions, themes discussed was interesting for everybody. By the creating/analysing situations and communicating process the audience was united, not divided into small groups. It was successful managed to create a warm, cozy, informal atmosphere / environment of the event.

#### Unsuccessfull:

- The first meeting, which focused on familiarization, the identification of relevant points, rather on the interaction;
- For the next time it schould be more specific and may be more individually identifiable and focused on the participants (refugess) problem points and finding out / discussing practical & legally correct tips, solutions on solving them, maybe with active representatives of ministries;
- During the event not all the participants felt free /some were locked up (because of their current situation), what really could prevented as much as possible the identification and discussion of the topics raised during the event;
- Due to religious differences, some thoughts were wrongly treated by refugee, making it difficult to talk;
- Number of participants could be higher;
- It would be more effective if it were involved representatives of higher level authorities, ministries may be;
- How did the local process support the preparation and contribution to the forthcoming transnational thematic event (max. 5 lines):

The local process offers a large spectrum of language barriers towards integration, as well as an overview of the actual organisations, other methods, solutions dedicated to overcome these. Also offers offers possible help in solving individual issues.

 During this reporting period, representatives of the partner have taken part as 'experts', 'external resource persons' or 'interested persons' in the local process of another partner (2 missions per CRISCO partner):

0 YES	0 NO
Name(s)	of the person(s):
Name(s)	of the visited partner(s):
Motivatio	n, reason of the visit(s):
Summary	of the mission(s):

• During this reporting period, representatives of another partner have taken part as 'experts', 'external resource persons' or 'interested persons' in the local process of the partner:

0 YES <b>0 NO</b>	
Name(s) of the person(s):	
Name(s) of the visiting partner(s):	
Motivation, reason of the visit(s):	
Summary of the mission(s):	



















#### Annexes:

- x At least one signed attendance list per reporting period (obligatory)
- 0 Signature(s) of the representative(s) of other partner(s) who came on visit in the partner's local process (obligatory)
- x Pictures (obligatory)
- x Evidence documents for the local process: invitations, meeting reports, local on-line and paper press, leaflets... (obligatory)
- 0 Other.....





















# C. Local Process – Activities during the reporting period n°...

#### C.1. Activity 1

Name of the activity: "Language barriers to integration"

Venue: Žeimių street 15, Jonava

Date: 2018-12-27

Number of participants: 30

Attendance list:

0 YES: see annex

0 NO: reason .....

Representative(s) of another partner have taken part as 'experts', 'external resource persons' or 'interested persons' in this activity:

0 NO:

0 YES:

Type of activity:

1Reflection (e.g. meeting, debate...): discussions, themes analysis;

1Action (e.g. activity, course, social event...): activity/ social event;

1Mixed (e.g. workshop, in-field visit...): workshop;

### Description of the activity (about 10 lines):

- Welcoming and Introduction by one of the event organizators Mantas Petrauskas the head of repairs and Construction department of Jonava district municipality;
- Presentation & overview of the Agenda of the day;
- The event started with the film about "Emilia. Breaking Free" review (related to the event theme,) in the Jonava Culture Center movie theatre;

The next part of the event was followed different activities:

Language barriers to integration

- Presentation of the next part of the event;
- During the prepared coffee break which has created an informal atmosphere, representatives of Jonava district municipality shared their own experience, video material, related to the event theme, who working now in the municipality but for many years had been as emigrants in foreign lands, sharing good and bad practice, know-how, analysis, raised discussions with participants;

The result was cheerful, because after that the participants started to show more courage, to express, tell, ask, share and even ask for help;

- Then followed the Workshop discussions about language barriers to Integration. Questions-answers from both sides, discussions between event organizators representatives of Jonava district municipality and other participants refugees;
- Translation was required by communicating with some participants, due the lack of language;
- Summary & analysis of event activities;



















• Sharing the project to a larger group by publicity, social media;

#### Results and outcomes of the activity (max. 10 lines):

Event organisators, project implementors distinguished and summarized the thoughts from the activity from the event:

- Refugees are of different religions, from different countries, but communicate nicely, friendly, respect and tolerance each other;
- Low level in local language proficiency or English. Most speak Russian. Who doesn't speak the language gestures;
- Unemployment. Language barrier creates another barriers lack of access to work, lack of making relationship with local society;
   First of all, the documents about the work permit in Lithuania are processed, the second is
- Misunderstanding of the whole process of integration in social cohesion, their own position, as confusion, "what schould I start from?"; misunderstanding of local language knowlegde importance;
- Lack of knowledges of access to information about city events, entertainment;

the lack of knowledge of the language, which is necessary for employment.

- Lack of economic resources which affects the access to information, services; entertainment; etc.
- Refugees miss employment, activity, and feel disadvantaged, and don't realize that first of all, they need to learn local language to do the next steps. Do not exhaust the available resources;
- Not everyone understands that language is the beginning of everything, and that in order to achieve the goal it is necessary to make efforts to show the initiative, to go through the difficult path;
- Fresh thoughts, advises, knowledges, information, of whole situation and individually, their own positions in this process;
- An understanding of refugees own position, next important first steps, priority;
- Review, find out, and identify obstacles that come from language barriers. Use the processed material for further events.
- During the event, the identified needs, problems and real situations changed the approach in practice, provided a lot of new information and opportunities for self-realization of opportunities in Lithuania;

### Relevance for and link to CRISCO (max. 5 lines):

- The event gave us relevant points, thoughts for the next organising event;
- Identification of new topical challenges in which we should work;
- The organised event made us start our reflection on language barriers; it made us a good opportunity to meet the same –minded in solving problems in the same direction and make different kinds of organizations, NGO's, volunteers, municipality institutions, Refugee



















Center etc., refugees equal in the work for preventing language barriers, for social cohesion.

• Greater motivation to promote wider social goals, that requires very different professional skills, humanity than "dry" rules etc.

# Other comments on the activity: *Nothing*

### Annexes for the activity:

- 0 Signed attendance list
- 0 Signature(s) of the representative(s) of other partner(s) who came on visit at the activity
- 0 Pictures (obligatory at least 5 per activity)
- 0 Evidence documents for the activity: invitation, meeting report, local on-line and paper press, leaflet...
- 0 Other: .....

Please submit (at <a href="mailto:crisco@etterbeek.irisnet.be">crisco@etterbeek.irisnet.be</a>) a draft report (+ annexes) of the activity not later than 1 month after the end of the reporting period

Please send pdf documents and keep all original documents in your possession and in good conditions until five years after the end of the project















