



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.;
 - *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 <u>crisco@etterbeek.irisnet.be</u>) 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°... (4 in total)

- Name of the partner: ALDA
- Reporting period:
 - 1. 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):

During this fourth period, ALDA's staff has worked on the development of the activities, with the aim of getting citizens involved and to gather recommendations for improving the inclusion of public places. In order to attract participants, there has been a communication campaign that includes a promoted Facebook event and an invitation sent my e-mail to our network. We have started the process with an artistic activity and then continued with a guided visit of the city, which follows the path of thought from the personal side (inside) to the public side/places (outside). Moreover, the process has addressed specifically the situation of Strasbourg, with the wide perspective of a diverse range of participants. Some of them have participated in both activities and three among them will attend the event in Etterbeck. Both activities have contributed to the overall objective of CRISCO and to the transnational thematic event.

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

Regarding the successful things, we would highlight the diversity of the participants, which made the discussion more enriching and the recommendations more relevant. Another thing would be the originality of the activities: instead of doing just a conference, we decided to get people involved in the topic in a different way, through a field visit and an artistic activity. The third successful thing is the active involvement of the participants, that really contributed to the project by sharing thoughts and recommendations.

Among the unsuccessful things there is the lack of participation in the second activity, due to external conditions: the activity took place outside and the weather forecasted a storm. Moreover, we had already rescheduled it due to weather conditions. Another unsuccessful thing is the difficulty of the first activity, as sometimes participants found it was hard to follow it.

- How did the local process support the preparation and contribution to the forthcoming transnational thematic event (max. 5 lines):

The first activity will be reproduced at the end of the transnational thematic event. At the second activity the participants have made recommendations that will be presented in the same event. The places visited are part of the mapping of inclusive place that has been done in order to prepare the event. Moreover, three participants of these two activities will go to Etterbeck.

- 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 X NO Name(s) of the person(s): Name(s) of the visited partner(s):











Motivation, 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 X	NO
Name(s) of the person(s):	
Name(s) of the visiting partner(s):	
Motivation,	reason of the visit(s):
Summary o	f 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°4

C.1. Activity 1

Name of the activity: Atelier artistique et interculturel pour explorer l'inclusion dans les espaces publiques de la ville de Strasbourg (Artistic and intercultural workshop to explore inclusion in public spaces of the city of Strasbourg). Venue: Bastion XIV. Rue du Rempart, 67000 Strasbourg Date: 30/04/2019 Number of participants: Attendance list: X 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: X NO: 0 YES: Name(s) of the person(s): Motivation, reason of the visit(s): Type of activity: *0* Reflection (e.g. meeting, debate...): 0 Action (e.g. activity, course, social event...): X Mixed (e.g. workshop, in-field visit...): Workshop

Description of the activity (about 10 lines):

The main idea of the activity was the use of different artistic techniques, and specifically the Image Theatre, to reflect on a situation of inclusion that each person has experienced in Strasbourg. It started with some warming-up activities and icebreakers in which participants started to get closer as a group and to get familiar to the concept of Image Theatre. Indeed, this technique created by Augusto Boal consists on arranging participants in dramatic images: one participant would mould the others into a particular sculpture, then another participant would alter the image to create his or her own image, and so on. For this activity, the sculpture had to be a situation of inclusion that they have experienced in a public space of Strasbourg. As they were divided in two groups, when the participants of one group were doing the sculpture, the others represented the final images with other artistic techniques: modelling clay, painting, taking pictures and writing. Once everyone sculpted their own situation of inclusion, there was a group reflection on these situations and their relation the public places where they took place.

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

Participants have explored in a creative way what inclusion means for them, as well as which places of the city of Strasbourg are the most inclusive. Therefore, it was a mixed process of self-exploration and city-exploration. The conversations were really enriching, as some participants were newly arrived to the city and the nationalities were quite varied. The concept of inclusion was largely discussed. All of them found the activity to be innovative and interesting.







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

People from different origins, age and gender participated in this activity, thus the discussion about inclusion was made among a diverse range of people, such diverse as a city. From a personal and artistic perspective, participants exchanged about the public places in Strasbourg that they found the most and the less inclusive. These thoughts were taken into account for the second activity and will be brought to the transnational thematic event.

Other comments on the activity:

Annexes for the activity:

X Signed attendance list

- 0 Signature(s) of the representative(s) of other partner(s) who came on visit at the activity
- X Pictures (obligatory at least 5 per activity)

X Evidence documents for the activity: invitation, meeting report, local on-line and paper press, leaflet...

0 Other:

Please submit (at <u>crisco@etterbeek.irisnet.be</u>) a draft report (+ annexes) of the activity not later than 7 days after the activity, and a final 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







C.2. Activity 2

Name of the activity: Strasbourg, ville inclusive ? - Visite guidée surprise (Strasbourg, an inclusive city? – Surprise guided tour) Venue: Different places of Strasbourg Date: 25/05/2019 Number of participants:
X 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:
X NO:
0 YES:
Name(s) of the person(s):
Motivation, reason of the visit(s):
Type of activity:
 0 Reflection (e.g. meeting, debate): 0 Action (e.g. activity, course, social event): X Mixed (e.g. workshop, in-field visit):

Description of the activity (max. 10 lines):

The activity consisted on a guided tour around different social and cultural public places in Strasbourg. The places visited were: a street that has been transformed throughout a participative process, a cinema that screens films in original version and hosts events, a café that is called Europe but is not as inclusive as the name might suggest, and an associative centre and café that hosts LGTB organisations and is open to everyone. In some cases, the staff of ALDA did the presentation, while at the others, there was someone from the place presenting it. At the end of each visit, participants filled a form, stating: a 1-4 rating, 3 elements that made the place inclusive, 3 elements that made it non-inclusive and how to make it more inclusive. In the middle of the tour we carried out an activity, "Take a step forward", tor reflect on social inequality. Moreover, we had discussion about the topic of inclusion in public places, around some drinks and snacks.

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

Participants were enthusiastic about the activity and wished we would do it again the future. They were proactive, as they shared their own experiences when we were visiting the different places, and they informally discussed among each other when walking through the city. They expressed their will to come back to the place that we have visited and to share them among their contacts. The discussion was quite lively, and participants were truly engaged in the topic. Some of the recommendations that they made are: less expensive prices, more visibility, easier access for people with reduced mobility, to have information in other languages (specifically in English), more participative activities, wider spaces. Most of the participant have shown interest on attending the transnational event in Etterbeck.

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







This activity has helped to raise awareness about the specific problems and specific advantages of concrete public places in Strasbourg, regarding inclusion. Moreover, it has contributed to raise awareness about this specific issue and whom should be responsible to make public spaces more inclusive; taking into account the different members of society that should be included. At the end of the activity, thy made recommendations which will be presented at the international event.

Other comments on the activity:

Annexes for the activity:

X Signed attendance list

0 Signature(s) of the representative(s) of other partner(s) who came on visit at the activity

X Pictures (obligatory – at least 5 per activity)

X Evidence documents for the activity: invitation, meeting report, local on-line and paper press, leaflet...

Please submit (at <u>crisco@etterbeek.irisnet.be</u>) a draft report (+ annexes) of the activity not later than 7 days after the activity, and a final 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







C.3. Activity 3

Etc.

