

**European Foundation for the
Improvement of Living and Working
Conditions**

**Ex-post evaluation of the 2001-2004
programming period**

Final report – August 2007

Executive summary

BACKGROUND AND TERMS OF REFERENCE

1. The European Foundation for the Improvement of Living and Working Conditions (hereafter the Foundation), based in Dublin, was established by Regulation (EEC) 1365/75 of the Council of 26 May 1975. The role of the Foundation is to provide information, advice and expertise for key actors in the field of EU social policy on the basis of comparative information, research and analysis. The Foundation's main areas of expertise include industrial relations, working conditions and living conditions (social cohesion/quality of life).
2. The Foundation's work is set out in a series of four year programmes, the first beginning in 1977 and the current programming period running from 2005-2008. In March 2006, the Foundation commissioned PricewaterhouseCoopers LLP (PwC) to undertake an independent evaluation of the Foundation during its 2001-2004 programming period. Drawing on the terms of reference, this evaluation has two specific objectives:
 - To conduct an *ex-post* evaluation of the Foundation's 2001-2004 programming period, to determine how resources were used, and assess whether the outputs and outcomes were consistent with the objectives set; and
 - To conduct an interim evaluation of selected areas of the Foundation's work and processes.
3. Therefore, while the primary focus of the evaluation is on the 2001-2004 programming period, the study will also cover selected ongoing activities that are included under the current 2005-2008 programme. The *ex-post* evaluation will be conducted in line with a series of key questions that form the framework for analysis. These include: relevance; coherence; efficiency; effectiveness; impact; and, added value.

METHODOLOGY

4. The methodological approach to the evaluation included the following 5 elements:
 - **Document research:** The first step of the evaluation involved conducting a documentation review. This phase helped to build a resource of information on the activities, management and governance of the Foundation, and the 2001-2004 and 2005-2008 Work Programmes;
 - **Key informant interviews:** 25 in-depth interviews were carried out with stakeholders within the Foundation and other external stakeholders in the EU and international organisations;
 - **Focus groups with Foundation staff:** the participants for the focus groups were carefully selected using a number of explicit variables including: department, grade nationality, gender and length of service;
 - **Survey of stakeholders:** a telephone survey was administered to a range of stakeholders including: Foundation Board members, contractors, academics, and

representatives from the European Commission, Council and the Parliament. The following table provides an overview of the survey sample and the number of interviews conducted across the stakeholder groups. The final response rate for the survey at 36% is relatively high in comparison to the average expected response rates for a telephone survey of this nature.

Table 1: Survey interviews conducted across stakeholder groups

Stakeholder/association to the Foundation		Sample provided	Interviews achieved	% of sample achieved	% of interviews conducted among stakeholder groups
Contractor		52	19	37%	15%
Academic		28	8	29%	6%
Representatives of EU institutions/ pan EU organisations	Representative of the EC	25	5	20%	4%
	MEP or Research Assistant	50	12	24%	9%
	Representative of a social partner organisation	25	14	56%	11%
Board Member	National government representative	60	29	48%	23%
	Employers representative	64	19	30%	15%
	Employee representative	51	22	43%	17%
Total		355	128	36% (average)	100

- **Case studies of 5 projects/initiatives:** the case studies included an evaluation of the European Monitoring Centre on Change, monitoring trends, communications for enlargement, establishment and development of the Brussels Liaison Office, and tendering and procurement processes.
5. This report draws on the findings from the research conducted and highlights the main conclusions and recommendations that emerged as a result of this evaluation. These are outlined in the subsequent paragraphs.

RELEVANCE

6. The European Foundation's 2001-2004 rolling programme was conceived during a period of momentous changes within the European Union that included the implementation of Economic and Monetary Union, further enlargement of the Union and the shift to the Lisbon Strategy with its emphasis upon 'more and better jobs'. These

changes created a challenging and complex environment for developing the work programme and outlining areas and issues of relevant research.

7. At the same time, the internal dynamics of the Foundation were subject to significant developments which impacted on the development of the work programme. These included the fall of the Santer Commission and the subsequent focus on promoting greater transparency, the incorporation of the Social Chapter in the Treaty of Amsterdam which gave prominence to the economic and social agendas, and the change of personnel with the Directorate.
8. Despite these external and internal changes, the Foundation has responded well to the EU policy agenda and worked to address stakeholder needs. The assessment of relevance, for example, shows that:
 - The work programme has addressed the areas of priority in the EU social agenda. While the programme incorporates many of the themes such as social inclusion and gender equality in which the Foundation has a history of publication and research, other areas included in the Lisbon Strategy are also given emphasis. Better employment, enlargement and competitiveness, for example, are also given attention;
 - By focusing on competitiveness and core areas within the EU social agenda, the objectives of the Foundation in the 2001-2004 period have been set in line with the needs of key stakeholders. Over two-fifths (87%) of respondents (academics and representatives of EU institutions), for example, stated that the outputs of the Foundation were either effective or very effective in addressing their needs;
 - By facilitating a participative planning process, the Foundation gained an insight into the views of different stakeholders and enabled them to anticipate their needs. In addition, the planning process promoted a more strategic approach and ensured stakeholders had input and greater ownership of the work programme;
 - The BLO has played an important role in assisting the Foundation to anticipate the needs of its key stakeholders and ensure that activities are relevant to the EU policy agenda. In this light, the BLO can be seen to act as the antennae function for the Foundation to detect ongoing changes and needs among representatives of the EU institutions and within the broader EU policy agenda; and
 - The Foundation has broadly worked to meet a balance between the medium/longer term outputs. The work programme provided for the opportunity for flexibility which has helped the Foundation to balance research and monitoring activities. This approach has also assisted the Foundation to be responsive to the more short term information needs. Indeed, 84% of respondents (academics and representatives of EU institutions) stated they the Foundation was responsive or very responsive to addressing current social policy developments.
9. Despite these external and internal changes, the Foundation has responded well to the EU policy agenda and worked to address stakeholder needs. The assessment of relevance, for example, shows that:
 - While the Foundation has placed a strong emphasis on participative planning processes and anticipating needs, interviews with staff from the Foundation indicate that less attention has been afforded to receiving comprehensive feedback on current

activities. The Foundation has undertaken surveys to profile users of its services, including 3 user surveys conducted during the 2001-2004 period, which focused on issues related to the website, but to date, no general surveys focusing on the work of the Foundation have been conducted to profile users of services;

- Indeed, this finding was supported and validated through survey research of stakeholders, who are external to the Foundation, (i.e. representatives of the EU institutions and academics). Although 59% of respondents considered that their organisation provided feedback to the Foundation to a great extent or somewhat, a significant proportion, 39%, stated a more negative response. Although the responses of representatives of the EU institutions were slightly less negative at 36%, as a key stakeholder group of the Foundation, the findings indicate that more consideration should be given to surveying stakeholders for feedback;
- The evaluation has also identified a number of areas in which the Foundation could give further attention to going forward. More specifically, while the 2001-2004 Work Programme supported some research on migration, reflecting on the extent to which this issue began to dominate the national and European policy making agendas during this period, it is considered that more weight could have been given to research in this area. Indeed, it is acknowledged that further research on migration is being supported during the current programming period for 2005-2008, further opportunity also exists to examine this area in the forthcoming work programme; and
- The evaluation identified a niche research area, foresight analysis, which could have been given more consideration in the 2001-2004 Work Programme and could be supported moving forward into the next work programme. While some studies in this field were completed prior to 2001 (such as the study on the social and economic impact of teleworking), the Foundation did not give much attention to foresight analysis during the 2001-2004 period outside of assessing the impact of the knowledge-based society on living and working conditions. As a result, during interview research, some representatives of the EU institutions (a key stakeholder group of the Foundation) indicated that the Foundation could be more proactive by taking a prospective look at emerging economic and social issues. Indeed, going forward, the Foundation, in partnership with other relevant research bodies, could also take a prospective look at environmental issues and how they may impact on living and working conditions, and quality of life.

COHERENCE

10. Reflecting on the concerns that were outlined in the previous evaluation report, the Foundation has made much progress in terms of establishing greater linkages and coherence within the organisation. In addition, notwithstanding the diversity of stakeholders, co-operation since 2001 has increased with key EU institutions and agencies. The assessment of coherence, for example, shows that:

- The Foundation's planning process, in conjunction with the development of a communications strategy, had helped establish a longer-term programme framework and facilitated greater direction and linkage between the research and communication functions. In particular this was illustrated by the use of a 'campaign method' to communicate the Foundation's research. This has enhanced and developed further internal linkages between the research functions and information and communications;

- Given that the Foundation supports three different monitoring instruments (European Industrial Relations Observatory [EIRO], European Working Conditions Observatory [EWCO], and the European Restructuring Monitor [ERM]) in addition to the EurLIFE database, some concerns have been raised over compatibility and duplication. This evaluation, however, found no evidence to suggest that the diversity of format and methodologies was a problem or alternatively, that there should be a conscious strategy of harmonising the instruments. Each of the four research elements focus on a very clear and distinct audience and are 'pitched' at different dimensions and provide a niche in terms of trend data;
 - Over the 2001-2004 programming period, the Foundation has increased linkages with the European Commission, as evidenced through the publication of joint reports and surveys. Survey analysis across all stakeholder groups supports this view and responses from representatives of the EU institutions, show that the Foundation has also co-operated well with the European Parliament; and
 - There is no evidence of any duplication or inconsistencies between the EU Agencies. Indeed, through the establishment of memorandum of understandings or other formal agreements, the Foundation has developed formal linkages with a number of other core EU Agencies which provides a framework for co-operation. Co-operation has also been established across other EU Agencies in functional areas such as ICT, evaluation and human resources.
11. Notwithstanding this progress, the evaluation has highlighted a number of areas in which greater linkages and complementarity could be advanced. These are examined below:
- While the Foundation developed formal linkages with its core group of EU Agencies during the 2001-2004 period (CEDEFOP, the European Agency for Health and Safety at Work), the level of co-operation between the Foundation and other EU bodies is variable. This was identified in both the interviews with key stakeholders and the survey findings, which showed that in all stakeholder groups, the responses were mixed on the extent to which the Foundation developed synergies with other EU Agencies. The survey findings, for example show that 36% of respondents think that the Foundation has developed synergies with other EU Agencies either well or very well, but that 36% also think that the synergies have been average, poor or very poor; and
 - With regard to other relevant international organisations such as the International Labour Organisation (ILO) and the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD), interviews with staff in the Foundation and with external stakeholders indicate that the level of co-operation with the Foundation is variable. While some links exist with these organisations (particularly more so with the ILO), such as networking at various seminars and conferences, conducting some research and producing publications, and although acknowledging that co-operation has continued in the 2005-2008 period, it is considered that more opportunity exists to develop and deepen joint actions.

EFFICIENCY

12. While the analysis of programme spend shows that the costs of delivery increased over the 2001-2004 period, overall, the Foundation has made much progress in terms of

implementing measures to improve efficiency. The analysis has highlighted the following key areas of improvement:

- The introduction of project management and finance processes has improved budget monitoring and enabled greater financial planning. This has allowed the Foundation to transfer funding to areas of need and ensure full utilisation of the budget. In addition, efforts to enable Project Managers to take greater responsibility for their budget has established processes to improve financial management;
- The Foundation has enhanced the appraisal procedures by introducing a competency based performance management system. The procedures have assisted to identify training needs but some staff have concerns that the training provision should be more closely tailored towards the individual;
- Although some stakeholders did express concerns that expansion of the EU could blur the research vision due to the increasing variance between new and existing Member States, the Foundation has been particularly effective at addressing enlargement and ensuring that all groups and countries are represented within the organisation; and
- While some concerns have been raised about the unwieldy nature of the Board, the Foundation has established an approach to governance in which Board members feel involved within the organisation and that their contribution is valued. 73% of Board members agreed or strongly agreed that their contribution to the European Foundation is valued, while only 11% disagreed or disagreed strongly. This demonstrates that the Foundation has balanced the participation of each of the social partner organisations.

13. There are a number of areas, highlighted in the evaluation, in which further attention needs to be focused. These include:

- Over the 2001-2004 period, analysis shows that research and information and communication activities have broadly stayed the same but that administrative costs have increased. Indeed, the administrative costs have increased from 12%-18% which highlights that 'cost of delivery' is an area which would need to be regularly monitored to ensure that efficiency levels are enhanced. This increase in administrative costs, however, may also be accounted for by the enlargement of the EU during this time and the addition of 10 new Member States to the Board of the Foundation. That being said, it will be important to 'take stock' of the administration costs and monitor them going forward;
- The absence of Key Performance Indicators (KPIs) for the 2001-2004 period at the organisational level makes it difficult to assess the performance of the different research units and support functions. This provides evidence that a more performance based approach to management within the Foundation should be adopted, which would provide for the assessment of organisational performance against set targets. This would build on the progress that has been made in regard to giving Project Managers greater empowerment to manage direct costs and indeed, the Foundation has recently established an indicator-based performance measurement framework using the Balanced Scorecard; and

- Within the Foundation, much debate surrounds the role and value of the Advisory Committees. While Advisory Committees provide an opportunity for Board members to become more involved in the work of the Foundation and to have a role in overseeing specific projects, concerns have been raised that the Committees could be linked more effectively to Foundation activities and kept informed about on-going developments. Indeed, some of members of Advisory Committees, interviewed for this evaluation, expressed a degree of uncertainty as how the Committee could directly input into the work of the Board and what were the formal procedures for doing so. In addition, concerns have been raised over the continuity of membership¹ and attendance in the Committees with the increasing workload of Board members being cited as one of the main constraints to participation. These findings highlight the importance of reinvigorating the role of the Advisory Committees.

EFFECTIVENESS

14. In assessing effectiveness, this section examined four themes outlined in the 2001-2004 Work Programme that included: research and monitoring activity; communication and dissemination; levels of awareness; and, evaluation. Although not including SMART objectives, the analysis has highlighted that the Foundation has made much progress in meeting the broad objectives across each of the four themes, as highlighted below:

- The Foundation has conducted significant levels of research activity over the 2001-2004 period, as evidenced by the number of publications. Overall, the quality of this research is of a high standard and the Foundation can be considered to be an authority in the areas of industrial relations, the labour market, quality of life and quality of work. External stakeholders (representatives of EU institutions and academics) were pleased with the quality of the Foundation's outputs with 87% rating it as either good or very good and only 11% rating it as average;
- The European Foundation has placed an increased emphasis on communication and dissemination. This has helped to establish greater integration between the communication and research functions and ensure that communication plans are developed alongside, and in accordance with, each element of research. The Foundation, for instance, has promoted a more proactive press strategy and has maximised opportunities for communication by creating synergies with high level events and forums;
- In general, the Foundation has been effective in communicating activities and outputs to its key target audience. The communication processes have raised awareness and invited interest from a range of stakeholders across the EU. Indeed, following on from initial contacts, the Foundation has been asked to participate in other meetings and events and provide inputs into the policy process; and
- The BLO has played a central role in raising awareness of the Foundation. In particular, by targeting and attending events and meetings, the BLO has built a network of stakeholder contacts and worked to facilitate linkages and the flow of information between the EU institutions and the Foundation.

15. Notwithstanding this progress, there are a number of areas in which the effectiveness of the Foundation could be enhanced. These are examined below:

¹ European Foundation (2002) *Minutes of the 67th Meeting of the Administrative Board of the European Foundation*, 22nd March, 2003, Dublin.

- Much debate within the Foundation has been focused on the extent to which the Foundation should extend the scope of its work programme to other global regions. While understanding the importance of ensuring that Europe remains the central focus of the Foundation, further opportunity exists in future programming periods to build on the existing research supported by the Foundation in this area. This will be important for setting the developments in Europe within an international context and also benchmarking progress with other global regions or blocs;
- While the Foundation has made much progress in communicating and disseminating its activities to a wider stakeholder base and increasing the levels of awareness, overall, a balance needs to be met between focusing on key EU institutions, national governments and employee and employer organisations, and other stakeholders within broader civil society. To date, no evidence suggests that a broadening of the stakeholder base has impacted on the capacity of the Foundation but there is a potential danger, going forward, that resources could be spread too thinly given the range of other stakeholders that could be included beyond the key EU institutions, national governments and employee and employer organisations; and
- Given the lack of monitoring information on Key Performance Indicators (KPIs), external evaluation has played a more important role in the Foundation. The first external evaluation of the Foundation in 2002, for example, outlined a series of recommendations with a view to enhancing the efficiency, effectiveness and impact of the Foundation's activities. In the main, the Foundation has worked to implement these. However, although this ex-post evaluation provides the opportunity to assess the full impacts from the 2001-2004 programme, there are also disadvantages to conducting an evaluation at this stage of an organisation's programme cycle. This particularly relates to the practicalities of focusing on a programme and an organisation two years after the event.

IMPACT

16. The analysis at the stakeholder level and on Community policy has highlighted that the Foundation has made an impact in the following ways:
 - There is a high level of usage of Foundation outputs among key external stakeholders (academics and representatives of the EU institutions). The work of the Foundation has been used by EU and international stakeholders and has permeated broader academic and research circles;
 - The work of the Foundation has fed into the policy process. The 'EU impact tracking function', for example, has identified a range of cases in which the EU institutions cited the work of the Foundation in papers, reports and policy submissions; and
 - As well as informing policy, some examples can be identified of cases in which the Foundation has made a contribution towards influencing some policy debates at both the national and EU level.
17. Measuring the impact on stakeholders and Community policy, however, is a very challenging task. Stakeholder actions and policy is informed by a range of factors and issues and it is difficult to identify at what point information has an influence. Indeed, when examining the level of influence of the Foundation's research in terms of enhancing an organisation or changing policy, the picture is less clear, as highlighted below:

- Survey evidence shows that representatives of the EU institutions had mixed views over the benefits which the information provided. Therefore, although using the information, some representatives, albeit a small proportion (16%), did not agree that the added value of the information was not such that it enhanced their individual or organisational work. This finding probably reflects the diverse nature of the information needs of representatives of EU institutions;
- In addition to this, survey findings show that the level of internal dissemination of Foundation outputs within stakeholder organisations is variable for representatives of the EU institutions. While it is difficult for the Foundation to have any influence on dissemination activities within organisations, the survey findings suggest that more effort could be potentially made by Board members, and particularly representatives of the European Commission, to internally promote the work of the Foundation;
- While representatives of the EU institutions (a key stakeholder group as they are more likely to have an, 'on the ground' knowledge of the impact of the Foundation's activities) were more positive than other stakeholders in regard to the extent to which the Foundation has made a difference in the EU policy process. However, the number of concrete examples that can be identified in which the Foundation's research has influenced policy appears low; and
- In general, the overall impact of the Foundation on stakeholders and EU policy has largely rested on raising awareness of key issues and providing information. The extent to which this information actually influences policy decisions or actions is more difficult to ascertain and quantify. Going forward, further attention should be given to developing and introducing key performance indicators that will regularly monitor and assess impact on core audiences. These concerns were also outlined in the previous evaluation report and while it is understood the Foundation has recently developed indicators, greater attention should be given to this task to ensure that a comprehensive system of indicators are introduced for the next programming period.

ADDED VALUE

18. The Foundation delivers added value in three key areas, through its tripartite structure, research expertise and by providing an objective and neutral information source. More particularly, the section identified that:

- The tripartite structure provides a guarantee that the research focuses on the practical needs of social partners and public authorities. While this added value is difficult to quantify, evidence from in-depth interviews highlights that by working in a tripartite structure, the Foundation has been able to transfer best practice to those countries that are new to social partnership agreements and processes of social dialogue;
- By acting at the EU level, the Foundation can provide comparative analysis across all Member States and facilitate the exchange of information and best practice. The Foundation has developed a niche in terms of trend data that offers both long term scientific data together with qualitative depth studies and extensive reporting across key social issues. The tripartite structure also provides a wide network of key stakeholders which forms a research policy community from which the Foundation can utilise key expertise; and
- While the European Commission are represented on the Board of the Foundation and provides an important link between research and policy, the Foundation is an

independent and neutral body. This increases the credibility of its data, findings and activities, and provides an opportunity for the Foundation to focus on research that is 'beyond the mainstream'.

19. While it can be concluded that the Foundation does provide added value, the evaluation identified one area in which the role of the Foundation could be strengthened. When interviewed as part of this evaluation, representatives of social partnership organisations, particularly representatives of employee and employer organisations, commented that to date they have mainly acted in a decision making capacity or as a 'control panel'. It was generally felt that the Foundation should be more ambitious about the possible uses of the tripartite structure.

RECOMMENDATIONS

20. Overall, this evaluation has shown that the Foundation has made much progress over the 2001-2004 period and has worked towards delivering the objectives of its work programme. The Foundation has closely focused attention on addressing the needs of its key stakeholders, has established linkages with other relevant EU organisations and produced high quality research. There is also evidence to show that the Foundation has informed the EU policy process. In general, therefore, this evaluation does not envisage any great need for change in the Foundation.
21. That being said, the evaluation has highlighted a number of areas that require improvement or further attention. The following recommendations, therefore, are framed in this regard and are centred on enhancing the role of the Foundation going forward into the new programming period.

Recommendation 1: Stakeholder/customer insight. It is recommended that consideration is given to introducing approaches that gain feedback from key stakeholders in a systematic and periodic way. This would help the Foundation to gain a more detailed understanding of its stakeholder or customer base, enhance responsiveness and ensure that the needs of key stakeholders are continuously addressed. To avoid survey fatigue, this feedback could be conducted at set periodic intervals and questionnaires could be attached to publications or given to participants at conferences / seminars facilitated by the Foundation. This feedback could be used as part of the ongoing reviews of the work programmes and employed as a key performance indicator to regularly monitor whether the Foundation is addressing stakeholder needs.

Recommendation 2: Supporting research for emerging issues. It is recommended that the consideration in the new programming period is given to focusing more attention on niche areas of research. This includes providing support for conducting research in foresight analysis. This will allow the Foundation to be more proactive by taking a prospective look at emerging economic, social and even environmental issues.

Recommendation 3: Deepening co-operation with international organisations. It is recommended that the Foundation enhance the level of co-operation with international organisations beyond seminars and conferences and conducting some research and producing publications, towards developing joint actions which involve a deeper level of co-operation. This could involve co-operation in terms of planning and reviewing work programmes and proposals for research. It is recommended these joint actions would be conducted within a clear strategic framework, agreed by both organisations, but would only focus on subject areas in which synergies and learning can be maximised.

Recommendation 4: Monitoring administrative costs. It is recommended that consideration, moving forward, is given to regularly monitoring unit costs of delivering programmes and projects to ensure efficiencies are enhanced.

Recommendation 5: Enhancing performance based management. It is recommended that consideration is given to further developing a performance based approach to management within the Foundation. This involves devolving greater financial responsibilities to Project Managers for monitoring and managing costs, and introducing Key Performance Indicators, including targets and baselines, to monitor costs and progress, and assess the performance of research units and support functions.

Recommendation 6: Invigorating the Advisory Committees. It is recommended that consideration is given to enhancing the role of Advisory Committees in the Foundation. This review could involve increasing their remit or functions, enhancing their role or input by providing a regular agenda item on the work of the Board or Bureau to provide update reports, or in some specific cases, reporting directly to the Director. In addition to this, other methods of holding Advisory Committees should be explored including using video conferencing or inviting special experts, where appropriate, to focus on specific issues.

Recommendation 7: Global comparative analysis. While understanding the importance of ensuring that Europe remains the central focus of the Foundation, it is recommended that consideration is given to further developing more comparative analysis with other global regions in future programming periods. This will be important for setting the developments in Europe within an international context, but also in benchmarking progress with other global regions / blocs.

Recommendation 8: Focusing on the key target audience. It is recommended that consideration is given to taking stock of the communications and dissemination activity which is focused on increasing the stakeholder base of the Foundation. As part of this process, it is recommended that the Foundation outlines its key target audience and its secondary audience and continues to take stock of the balance of resources and attention which one audience receives compared to the other. Going forward, it is recommended that more attention should increasingly focus on the key target audience. This includes understanding their needs and requirements (this could be facilitated through increasing feedback as previously discussed) and deepening their familiarity with the work of the Foundation.

Recommendation 9: Developing a flexible evaluation strategy. It is recommended that the Foundation gives consideration to reviewing the process of conducting external evaluations. While the European Commission may still require the Foundation to commission an ex-post evaluation, it is proposed that the Foundation also conduct other ongoing evaluations throughout the life of a programming period. This would enhance the direct practical relevance of the findings. The Foundation could also ensure that any external evaluator, who is conducting an ex-post assessment, uses the information from the ongoing studies. This would provide an opportunity to restrict the scope and the budget of the ex-post evaluation and ensure that the costs for external evaluation would be maintained at current levels.

Recommendation 10: Promoting the Foundation within representative organisations. It is recommended that the Foundation gives consideration to encouraging Board members, and particularly representatives of the European Commission, to promote the work of the Foundation. This could include providing the Board members with support, including developing ideas, approaches and tools, which could be used by individuals to facilitate dissemination.

Recommendation 11: Developing indicators to measure impact. It is recommended that the consideration is given to developing and implementing a comprehensive system of indicators for the next programming period. In addition to management/efficiency indicators (as previously discussed), these performance indicators will provide the opportunity to assess the impact of the Foundation's activities. Indeed, the indicators could be integrated into the feedback processes to allow the Foundation to regularly see how their activities are viewed by their core audiences.

Recommendation 12: Enhancing social partnership organisational involvement. It is recommended that consideration is given to enhancing the role of social partnership organisations in the Foundation and working with them to further utilise their role and input. This includes seeking a greater role and input of the social partners in Advisory Committees and the annual review of the work programme, and utilising the social partners to increase networks and the stakeholder base, and progress communication and dissemination activities.