



European Union

European Regional
Development Fund
Investing in your future

Minutes of the **PEACE III Review Panel Meeting**

Monday 03 October 2011, 11.00am
SEUPB Offices, Belfast

In Attendance:	Pat Colgan	SEUPB (Chair)
	Pamela Dooley	MC Panel Member
	Denis Galway	MC Panel Member
	Audrey McKeown	Independent Member
	John Cherry	SEUPB (Secretariat)
	Anna Slotwinska	SEUPB (Secretariat)

1. Introductions

The Chair welcomed everyone to the meeting.

2. Agenda

The Agenda was agreed.

3. Register of Interests/Conflicts of Interest

None

4. Review

The Review of the Teach Oscail - TC Border Youth Project (Ref: 032302)

Representatives from Teach Oscail and the Consortium (Pobal) were invited to enter the room.

In Attendance:	Patricia Walsh, Teach Oscail
	Noreen Sudbury, Teach Oscail
	Susan Smith, Teach Oscail
	George Marshall, Teach Oscail
	Jennifer McCormack, Teach Oscail

Paddy McGinn, Pobal
Colette Nulty, Pobal

After introductions, the Chair outlined the procedures to be followed. The Chair then invited the Project Promoters to outline the reasons for their request for a review.

The representatives for Teach Oscail presented their case. The main points included:

- The promoters feel that the outcome of the assessment was unreasonable.
- Only 2.5% points were required to give the project a chance of progressing to the second round of the assessment process.
- The project received very negative comments in the debrief notes that referred to questions not asked in the application.
- During the assessment process the project was not asked to clarify any points in the application.
- The scoring information supplied by SEUPB was only received on 26 September 2011.
- The Consortium should have been aware of the process of taking the findings of the attitudinal survey to the design, training and implementation phase of the bespoke workshops and training.
- The Consortium has on file the current projects Attitudinal Survey results, reports and the bespoke workshop and training modules designed as a result.
- There was no question in the application on Legacy. However the assessment panel concluded that the proposed project had no capacity to provide a lasting legacy to the PEACE III Programme. The promoters are confident that the information they provided in the application clearly demonstrated that the project has a very distinct peace and reconciliation legacy.
- The application asked for ultimate impacts and did not request information on short, medium and long term impacts. If requested, these could have been provided.
- Information on recruitment or selection strategy for participants was not asked for in the application, but could have been provided on a request.
- Information on pathways towards reconciliation for current and participants/ community leaders was not asked for in the application, but could have been provided on a request.

The Chair thanked the project promoters for their presentation and invited the Consortium to respond.

Representatives from the Consortium made the following points:

- The Consortium provided the background to the call and criteria;
- Each application must provide evidence as to how the project would contribute to the priority and theme objectives as detailed within the PEACE III Operational Programme, Theme 1.2 Objectives and the targeted information provided in the open call information. Only those applications which meet the required Score of 65% on both Programme & Theme Objectives will progress to Economic Appraisal;
- The project achieved an overall score for PEACE III Programme/Priority Objectives of 62.5%;
- All applications received in advance:
 - Guidance Notes for applying;
 - Information workshops;
 - One to one meeting information.
- The peace and reconciliation needs for the target areas and target groups of the proposed project are vague within the application. There was no evidence of an analysis of the current conflict related issues for young people in the Tullacmongan and Cavanaleck areas;
- The focus of the project was on delivering courses/workshops in Cavan and Fermanagh in terms of skills for peace building. However, the application did not clearly outline how this training will impact or make a difference in local communities;
- The application does not explain the added value of repeating the courses;
- No recruitment or selection strategy for participants was provided;
- Pathways towards reconciliation for current and new participants/community leaders was not specified;
- The schools programme has not been fully explained e.g. which schools will be part of the programme and what will they do and how will they benefit from this action?
- The application outlines that this project will encourage those not already involved in peace building, but there is no clear evidence as to who these potential participants will be;
- No letters of support with the application.

The Chair thanked the Consortium for their comments.

There then followed a detailed question and answer session between the Panel Members, the applicants and the Consortium.

The key points of which are:

- Applicants had the opportunity for one to one meeting with the Consortium and Case Officer if necessary.
- Engagement with schools was raised as an issue, and the Promoters stated that the schools, sport and youth organisations were not individually identified in the application. However they had some letters of support from schools on file and they offered The Consortium copies in support of the application, which the Consortium declined.
- A Review Panel Member referred to schools in Cavan and Fermanagh and asked how the project selected those schools, which ones should be involved and what will be the outcome? The Promoter stated that young people from those schools will understand better what the conflict is and how to live together. The young people organised workshops together. There is still high risk of alcohol and drugs problem in those areas, this project will bring people together. A lot of children will be trained from schools they use school modules to break the barriers.
- The Chair noted that the project felt disappointed as only 2.5% points were required to process to the next stage of assessment and asked the Consortium for comment.
- The Consortium stated they had considered the application very carefully from the start to finish. In terms of dealing with the past the project mentioned schools but did not specify which schools, which workshops and specific training events. The project did not provide the letters of support and little evidence as regards changes in attitudes after working in previous PEACE programme
- A Review Panel Member asked how this project in relation to victims and survivors will show the results of how people move on from conflict. The Promoters stated that victims and survivors who lived in these areas will get specific training on how to deal with difficult issues.

The Chair asked for any final statements.

The Consortium stated there is specific need as regards young people and dealing with the past. However, this application lacked specific evidence as to how the project will encourage young people to be involved and how they will be selected.

The Promoters stated that this is community project and they feel that the project should go at least to the second stage of the assessment process. They felt the project met the criteria. They agreed the current application did not provide enough information. The Promoters are concerned that it would be huge loss if they lose this project at this stage as lots of children and young people have grown up with this project and it is of huge benefit to them. However, the Promoters acknowledged their application could have been stronger in certain key areas.

The Chair then asked the Project Promoters and the Consortium if they were satisfied with the way the Review Panel had been conducted, and if they felt they had been given the opportunity to convey all the main points of their argument. Both the Project promoters and the Consortium confirmed that they were happy with the process.

The Project promoters and the Consortium exited the room.

The Review Panel discussed the application and information presented and noted:

- This project is a continuation of previous project.
- Project did not provide enough evidence in the application.
- The decision was taken based on the information provided in the application.
- The kind of activities outlined in the application could be funded through the Local Peace and Reconciliation Action Plans.

After considerable deliberation, the Review Panel concluded that the Steering Committee decision had not been unreasonable. It also confirmed that there had been no failings in the procedures followed.

It should be noted the Review Panel recognises the value of the work of Teach Oscail and as such the PEACE III Programme remains committed to the development of a “grass roots up” approach to projects that address shared issues and concerns. The Review Panel would encourage community and voluntary groups such as Teach Oscail to contact their local authority for information on their cluster’s or County Council’s “Peace and Reconciliation Action Plan”, which may contain a small grants programme and opportunities for Teach Oscail to secure alternative funding.

5. Review

The Review of the Curriculum Development Unit – Education for Reconciliation (Project Ref: 032090)

Representatives from Curriculum Development Unit (CDU) and the Consortium (Pobal) were invited to enter the room.

In Attendance: Aidan Clifford, CDU
 Mary Gannon, CDU
 Andy Pollack, Centre for Cross-Border Studies
 Paddy McGinn, Pobal
 Colette Nulty, Pobal

After introductions, the Chair outlined the procedures to be followed. The Chair then invited the Project Promoters to outline the reasons for their request for a review.

The representatives for CDU presented their case. The main points included:

- On all the previous four phases of the education for reconciliation projects funding was granted on a provisional basis and subject to recruitment of the required number of targeted schools. It is unreasonable now to change those conditions for a project focused on the education sector.
- Schools are not in a position to effectively commit to participating unless funding is secure. Given the pressures and changing conditions that schools operate under, the management authorities need to be both secure in the details of the resources made available and aware of the demands that will be made upon them before real promises can be made.
- On all the previous phases of the Peace funded "education for reconciliation projects" the specific targets within the education sector have been met and exceeded. This has been achieved through a process of discussion with schools after the funding has been secured. The recruitment of the targeted schools was essentially a pre-condition of the project.

- The Education for Reconciliation project is a strategically important project covering the targeted schools throughout the whole of Northern Ireland and the Border region an impacting on the education systems in both jurisdictions.
- Teachers need to develop the capacity to teach controversial issues, to acknowledge and deal with the past.
- The Curriculum Development Unit has a long history of managing teacher education and curriculum development projects, working with teachers and schools since the 1970s.
- The project will target schools situated in interface areas, segregated communities, and alternative educational centres, which typically have a high proportion of marginalised and disadvantaged young people. CDU did not provide a list of schools as they were still progressing issue.
- This is unique project and teachers will work in difficult areas. Through building the capacity of teachers and schools to deal with the past in a safe and constructive ways, the project will help teachers and young people to acknowledge the past and its legacy, and to move on to build a better future for their communities and society.

The Chair thanked the project promoters for their presentation and invited the Consortium to respond.

Representatives from the Consortium made the following points:

- The Consortium provided the background to the call and criteria.
- Each application must provide evidence on how the project contributes to the priority and theme objectives as detailed within the PEACE III Operational Programme, Theme 1.2 Objectives and the targeted information provided in the open call information. Only those applications which meet the required Score of 65% on both Programme & Theme Objectives will progress to Economic Appraisal.
- The overall score for the PEACE III Programme/Priority Objectives was 62.5% and the threshold for progression to Stage 2 Assessment was 65%.
- The applicant has not identified specific schools as regards participation and the application makes little reference to the impact or potential outcomes.

- There are no specific details on the selection criteria for participating teachers or schools.
- There is no evidence that target groups and areas have participated to date and the subsequent impacts and therefore it is difficult to identify current need.
- The application outlines that schools situated in interfaces areas, segregated communities will be targeted, however, no examples or recruitment and selection criteria have been provided.
- This project has been funded by previous and current PEACE Programmes and there is no evidence of impact to date in these areas and/or where there are now potential gaps.
- The project has provided limited information in terms of targeting and selection of schools for participation it is difficult to assess the potential impact in reducing levels of sectarianism and racism.

The Chair thanked the Consortium for their comments.

There then followed a detailed question and answer session between the Panel Members, the applicants and the Consortium.

The key points of which are:

- There was a lack of evidence as to how this application differs from previous work. The Promoters suggested the difference would be that by dealing with controversial issues it would bring about real discussion in the classroom.
- The Chair noted that evidence of these issues was not in the application and asked the project if they agree with that. The Project Promoters agreed.
- The application did not provide sufficient evidence of engagement with key stakeholders, namely the schools.
- Overall the application lacked specific evidence in key areas.

The Chair asked for any final comments.

Both the Project Promoters and the Consortium briefly restated some of the arguments as previously outlined.

The Chair wish to note the contribution that CDU had made to the Programme and recognised their good work in this area.

The Chair then asked the Project promoters and the Consortium if they were satisfied with the way the Review Panel had been conducted, and if they felt they had been given the opportunity to convey all the main points of their argument. Both the Project promoters and the Consortium confirmed that they were happy with the process.

The Project promoters and the Consortium exited the room.

The Review Panel discussed the application and information presented and noted:

- Project has considerable experience in this area and should have provided more detailed information in the application;
- Overall the Project Promoters could have provided more evidence in support of their application.

After considerable deliberation, the Review Panel concluded that the decision had not been unreasonable. It also confirmed that there had been no failings in the procedures followed.

It should be noted the Review Panel recognised the value of the work of the Curriculum Development Unit in the area of Education for Reconciliation.

6. Conclusion

The Chair thanked the Review Panel members for attending and informed them that he would write, on behalf of the Review Panel, to inform both project applicants and the Consortium of the Review Panel's decisions. He also stated that the minutes from the meeting would be e-mailed to Review Panel members in due course for their approval.