



Intellectual Output 5

Création de cours pilote sur plusieurs niveaux d'action

Executive summary and consolidation of national findings

This project has been funded with support from the European Commission.
This publication reflects the views only of the author, and the Commission cannot be held responsible
for any use which may be made of the information contained therein.

Table of contents

Cities by Heart: An Introduction	3
Intellectual Output 5 – Pilot Studies and Validation of Training	4
Intellectual Output 5 – Timeline and schedule of activities	5
TASK 1 – An overview from project’s partners	6
Selecting Senior Participants	6
Training Sessions	6
Selecting Visitors	7
How did the visits unfold?	8
TASK 2 – Knowledge transfer: from Seniors to Juniors	9
Selecting Junior Participants	9
Transfer of knowledge and skills	9
<i>Knowledge</i>	9
<i>Skills</i>	10
VALORISATION – Capacity building and 1-on-1 coaching for participants	11
Moderators’ experience: key takeaways from training staff	12
Planning and implementation of the work	12
Classroom management	12
Final comments	13
Partners’ perspective: conclusive remarks	14
Replicability of the project	14
Risk Management	14
Sustainability and long-term impact	16
ANNEX 1 – Seniors’ evaluation feedback form	17
ANNEX 2 – Juniors’ evaluation feedback form	21
ANNEX 4 – Visitors’ evaluation feedback form – Seniors’ itineraries	24
ANNEX 5 – Visitors’ evaluation feedback form – Juniors’ itineraries	28

Cities by Heart: An Introduction

In Europe, successive waves of immigration have shaped cities and their suburbs. The cultural mixes built by the international immigration represent an underestimated treasure unknown by European citizens. In terms of tourism and social issues, this European cultural heritage is an opportunity to seize.

Cities by Heart: A Unique Journey in the Heart of Cities – a cross-national project co-financed by the Erasmus+ Programme of the European Commission – embraces a goal of social inclusion through the very concept of its training offer. The idea is to promote a type of responsible tourism “at zero kilometre” in which protagonists are citizens with a family or individual migratory path (whether new entrants or settled in the neighbourhood for several generations).

Official data from EU sources confirm that the tourism sector is one of the highest employability potentials for migrant people. On this premise, the CHB’s partnership envisioned a training programme for targets based on skills and competences that would favour their integration in the labour market as touristic guides.

The objective is two-folded: to create a link between the residents of these urban areas to avoid communal conflicts and to trigger an economic dynamic to respond to the precariousness of the inhabitants of disadvantaged neighbourhoods. To this extent, partners designed, developed, implemented and finalised five intellectual outputs:

Intellectual Output 1 – [Practical guide on prospecting and how to engage participants in the project](#)

The organisation representing the partnership, together with local and associated partners, selected and shared best practises to find, select, motivate and mobilise participants in the project.

Intellectual Output 2 – Development of training material and delivery

Conscious that the role of an intercultural guide is different from that of a professional tourist guide, partners developed [training material](#) that leaves sufficient room to creativity and to the unique experience of the person giving the visit. In particular, participants: were equipped with the instruments necessary to involve key players active in the tourism sector at the local and national level; familiarised with cultural policy, learnt about the cultural heritage and study the basic principles of intercultural mediation; learnt how to design an intercultural touristic itinerary and how to conduct it; how to communicate effectively; linked their personal experience with the local tourist resources; learnt how to organise and promote visits.

Intellectual Output 3 – Mapping of tourist itineraries

Partners identified an easy-to-use software to collect the itineraries (Routey) and [two five-stop itineraries](#) were developed by each partner in collaboration with participants according to the principle “anything can be a tourist attraction”. These tours are addressed to two types of targets:

1. Primary audience: inhabitants of disadvantaged territories, to bring them to an understanding of all migratory strata and this perpetual human movement.
2. (International) tourists, in search of new forms of circuits, closer to the population, in order to promote past and contemporary Europe under the lens of cultural diversity resulting from migration.

Intellectual Output 4 – Development of an OER Platform.

A dedicated online [resource centre](#) to: facilitate the exchange of information among partners; provides participants with the training material tailored to their needs; showcases the project and its achievements; allows for the evaluation and visibility of the project from external parties.

Intellectual Output 5 – Pilot Studies and Validation of Training

Intellectual Output 5 consisted of the formal training and education of migrants with focus on empowering their transversal skills that partners identified in IO2 as instrumental to favour their integration in the tourism sector, and more in general, in the overall labour market.

More in detail, IO5 has been formally developed following a three-staged approach:

TASK 1	TASK 2	TASK 3
Partners prepare a protocol where they agree on a common methodology to run pilot studies. All partners agreed on the same criteria to select senior participants and train them on the basis of the material developed in IO2.	Partners update the protocol with methods, criteria and indicators needed to test the transfer of the newly acquired knowledge and skills from the senior participants to junior participants with a similar background.	Customised evening workshops ensure participants (seniors and juniors) on their newly acquired skills and learn how to successfully showcase their experience on their CVs.
After that, visits are organised in each city on the basis of the itineraries developed in IO3.	Partners and senior participants then select junior volunteers, who develop a new itinerary and deliver a visit themselves.	
Feedback is to be collected from both seniors and visitors and are analysed in the country report of each partner.	The visitor test group remains the same. At the end, new feedback is collected from visitors, and the final report is updated accordingly.	

Each partner implemented IO5 in their respective operational context and prepared a brief quality assurance report to share with colleagues' insightful lessons learned and their overall experience in carrying out IO5's activities.

The scope of this report is to inform readers about the pilot and validation of CBH's training material and how targets and relevant stakeholders involved in the process *reacted* to the project. In the following pages, we will highlight what partners did (or did not) to achieve their results, what challenges they faced and how they overcome them, what have been their good practices and how they managed to nurture (and retain) the interest of the involved audience.

From a different perspective, this document represents the formal "legacy" of the CBH project and it can be perceived of strategic relevance for any group of interest operating, by scale and scope, in the same socio-economic domain addressed by the project, and maybe, interested in replicating CBH-like initiatives. Based on partners' takeaways in fact, other international stakeholders might design, develop and pursuit similar projects sharing a mission that is related to the one envisioned by CBH.

This is what partners actually refer to with the term *Multiplier Effect*: by sharing significant notes on IO5, they expect to trigger interest, involvement and engagement of other communities of professionals so as to give informal continuity to CBH's life cycle and nurture new policy discussion on migrants' integrations in EU societies.

Intellectual Output 5 – Timeline and schedule of activities

	2020			2021							
	M14 Oct	M15 Nov	M16 Dec	M17 Jan	M18 Feb	M19 Mar	M20 Apr	M21 May	M22 June	M23 July	M24 Aug
O5 Creation of pilot courses on several levels of action											
Template of the Protocol form IDP to all partners	■	■	■								
Feedback from Partners and Final Version of the Protocol			■								
Selection of participants and visits guided by Seniors + collection of feedback				■	■	■					
Visits guided by juniors and collection of feedback						■	■	■			
National Country Report							■	■	■		
CV session / valorisation of competences										■	
Final report										■	■

TASK 1 – An overview from project's partners

Selecting Senior Participants

In the following paragraphs, we listed the processes (i.e. strategy) that partners carried out to find senior participants.

First of all, it is important to consider that most of the activities pertaining to “Selecting Senior Participants” have been carried out from the end of 2020 to mid-2021, where there were still many uncertainties related to COVID-19's infection curve, and in some cases, restriction rules were still particularly strict.

In that regard, the testimonial from Portuguese colleagues is quite significant since, as highlighted by their report, *almost all of the contacted migrants were not interested or were afraid to participate in the piloting (training and tours) [...] finding migrants willing to engage in our project was very difficult.*

Nonetheless, all partners have been able to achieve the minimum quorum of three participants. In general partners relied on their network of stakeholders and associate partners to enlarge as much as possible the impact radius of the project, its visibility, and the engagement opportunities of interested parties. This allowed them to overcome COVID-related challenges relatively easily.

For instance, the Portuguese partner AEVA reached out to five different organisations established in the national territory. The same has been done by the Spanish partner INFODEF which concluded the selection process by involving local associations that operates with migrant people, and by engaging their own social media public. The Italian partner IDP and the French partner Sud Concept followed a similar approach as well by getting in contact with large no-profit organisations operating at national levels with disadvantaged people at risk of severe socio-economic marginalisation, including migrants. The Austrian partner BEST invited ten training experts with a migration background, they have been guided through project's objectives, Open Educational Resource platform and training contents thanks to the help and support of an internal moderator. Last but not least, Quarter Mediation selected their cohort of targets on first hand based on the following selection criteria: migratory background, different periods of time spent in the hosting country, coming from at least three different countries, both men and women, different employment situation.

Speaking of selection criteria, partners followed a homogeneous approach by targeting people with a migratory background and assuring – whenever possible – a diverse cohort in terms of gender and countries of origin. Most of participants were unemployed and they were all proactively seeking a job occupation. The fact that partners reached out to such a diverse network of supporting organisations, allowed them to include in CBH's activities people with quite significantly different backgrounds (i.e. education, knowledge of hosting country's language).

Training Sessions

The common methodology agreed on by partners took into consideration several key guidelines to help them in better orienting the pilot sessions. These guidelines provide for general recommendations, rather than strict rules. As a matter of fact, partners wished to retain certain degrees of flexibility in planning, organising and delivering the piloting sessions based on IO2 material. Partners scheduled the training event in compliance with the overall timeline of IO5 and consistently with their operational settings.

Duration and calendar of the training sessions were also up to partners' agreement depending of the availability of training staff and beneficiaries. On the same note, both online and f2f events were allowed depending on what the safest option and most suitable solution were for the people involved.

In general, training activities covered the period from February to April 2021 so as to kick off and conclude the visits before the summer period. Topics of the training sessions were all four training modules as identified below:

Module 1 Know your territory and identify tourism stakeholders

Unit 1 Identifying stakeholders and important information

Unit 2 Make an appointment with key people

Unit 3 Knowing a territory: cultural policies, tourism, heritage conservation

Module 2 Design intercultural tourist routes

Unit 1 Consider the tourist offer of your territory and link it to your personal story

Unit 2 Developing an excursion or tourist circuit program: steps and methods

Unit 3 Federate and involve the stakeholders of a territory (local merchants, elderly people with stories to tell etc.)

Module 3 Conduct intercultural tourist routes

Unit 1 Organize the logistics of the visits

Unit 2 Identify the elements of your personal story that will particularly interest the public and know how to tell them

Unit 3 Accompany visitors and animate the visit in a participative way

Module 4 Present your project

Unit 1 Create a presentation file (marketing and communication)

Unit 2 Know how to argue and convince an audience of professionals

Unit 3 Understand how to identify a target among potential visitors and communicate with this target on the service

Once again, partners were also in the position to arrange the structure of lessons as they thought was better to sustain and facilitate the learning process for targets. Both IDP and INFODEF reported for instance the languages barrier as a key factor that could have weakened the impact of lectures, partners managed to overcome such difficulty by streamlining the ‘tones’ of the discussion and the overall teaching approach, and by enriching the conversation with numerous examples and references from real-life scenarios that were more relevant to targets’ personal experiences. Highly relevant was also the initiative undertaken by AEVA which decided to plan capacity building sessions on social media management, and social media management interrelated to tourism industry.

All partners were also able to tackle the priority of equipping targets with basic transversal skills that are instrumental to ease their transition in the labour market. Participants reported great excitement in having the opportunity to nurture and empower daily-life skills that can be of interests for all of their social interactions, not only in respect to potential employers or for employment purposes.

This specific testimony was a result proactively desired and foreseen by partners, as one of the most important outcomes expected by the training sessions.

Selecting Visitors

The methodology shared among partners at the launch of IO5 contained also detailed information on what *kind* of visitors should have taken part in itineraries. Visitors have been profiled based on their interests and cultural background. In total, partners identified 5 potential profiles reflecting the following characteristics:

1. A curious traveller who wants to get off the beaten path, mostly interested in cultural and educational travel (i.e. **the slow traveller**)
2. A local who wishes to learn more about its own city (i.e. **the green traveller**)
3. A person who shares the same migratory background of the participant and is willing to exchange ideas (i.e. **the neighbour**)
4. A person with an academic background in urban diversity and intercultural communication (i.e. **the academic**)
5. A tourism professional curious to see how the project plays out (i.e. **the innovator**)

Partners managed to identify, engage and involve people that comply with the selection criteria described here above. Even visitors belonging to the same profile mirror the great diversity tackled by the project in terms of cultures, education and personal experiences.

All and all, CBH brought together people from very different backgrounds that nurture interest for “unconventional” experiences that challenge ordinary perceptions upon ordinary phenomena.

How did the visits unfold?

When it came to the actual visits and the piloting of itineraries, this is when the COVID situation created some minor issues for partners and participants as well. As aforementioned, upon compliance with few essential guidelines (e.g. minimum number of seniors to be involved, timeframe in which to conclude activities, etc.), partners were in the position to schedule and arrange both training and piloting visits as it was more suitable for their operational context. This means that partners collaborated with participants, visitors and training staff so as to assure the safest conditions for piloting’s implementation.

Partners from BEST arranged three groups of seniors in two separate dates, the facilitator made sure that all participants were compliant with safety measures (i.e. social distancing, use of masks, etc.). IDP and Sud Concept managed to assure on-site visits as well, the groups of seniors accompanied visitors through the two itineraries in the considered period. AEVA, Sud Concept and Quarter Mediation transferred their piloting online, since there were not the conditions to perform the task otherwise. INFODEF relied on a hybrid formula based on the availability of participants and visitors. Restriction at national level posed the major challenge for partners to implement and conduct the activity as per Project Management Plan. Nevertheless, partners “on remote” have been able to replicate a virtual experience of the itineraries and exploit the situation as an opportunity for targets to train and digital skills and empower their familiarity with IT tools.

Feedbacks have been collected by all partners from both seniors and visitors as a mean to evaluate and assess the impact of this experience for both groups. Results are reported in ANNEX 1.

TASK 2 – Knowledge transfer: from Seniors to Juniors

At this stage of the piloting, partners were required to recruit a group of seniors willing to share their experience with five juniors that would be trained to replicate the task just performed with the same group of visitors (and based on a third itinerary of their own elaboration).

With their great pleasure, partners reported that seniors have shown great excitement in the opportunity of being of support. Such feeling commonly perceived among participants is symptomatic of the value detained by such experience, not only in terms of employability's perspectives but especially as an occasion to favour new conditions for their own socio-economic emancipation, networking and inclusion.

Selecting Junior Participants

The approach followed by each partner was similar to the one previously tested with seniors – as it proved to be highly effective and efficient. By relying on external support groups of interest (i.e. stakeholders in the domain of employability and/or migrant integration, third sector representatives, associate organisations, etc.), some of which not familiar with the project yet, partners had the opportunity to magnify the scale of the proposal in terms of dissemination, and generate favourable conditions for project's visibility and validation beyond the formal perimeter of the partnership.

No major challenges have been reported by partners. Relevant to mention however is the fact that three organisations (IDP, Sud Concept and INFODEF) noted that the engagement of juniors was a bit more difficult due to participants' conflicting schedule with the training programme. Partners noted that job-hunting and employment remained the main concerns for juniors, in view also of the approaching summer season. Compared to seniors, young people face an additional series of challenges (i.e. lack of knowledge of national language) hindering their access to welfare state's benefits.

As such, while for seniors it remains very important to widen their set of transversal skills and explore new domains of qualification and professionalisation, young people have (or at least, perceive to have) other priorities that do not necessarily match with education and training.

It is also to be considered that many junior participants came from difficult backgrounds characterised by severe conditions of socio-economic marginalisation. More in general, even in the case of seniors, partners invested extra-efforts and time in introducing targets to the very same concept of benefits from education and training, regardless of the specific topic of the related training material. This step was essential to help targets in switching their focus and make them acquire a renewed mindset that proved to be instrumental for their upskilling and capacity building.

The minimum quorum has been reached by all partners and new mixed classrooms emerged very spontaneously in which seniors took the formal role of project's mentors/facilitators and training staff.

Transfer of knowledge and skills

The transfer was envisioned to facilitate exchange of knowledge and skills from seniors to juniors:

Knowledge

By transfer of knowledge, partners refer to the actual transfer of very practical notions addressing the overall scope of the project and what IO5's objective is about, in other words: tasks that juniors are expected to perform (i.e. design of itinerary and piloting). This stage took form of workshops, f2f presentations, etc., depending on seniors' wills and how themselves envisioned the most suitable solution for their needs.

Some juniors, as in the case of BEST and Quarter Mediation’s piloting, had the opportunity to join previously visits conducted by seniors, or more in general, to gain some insights on what was coming for them by familiarising with the media material prepared by partners (as in the case of IDP).

Partners wanted to give seniors maximum flexibility on how to structure and conduct the transfer sessions so to put both targets at ease and let seniors experiment on their own what were their strengths in public speaking and communication (for instance, participants were allowed to speak in their native language if this was instrumental to make their presentation smoother and more impactful).

Partners reported that the classrooms’ climate was very “relaxed” and informal, while still very professional and diligent. Seniors found great advantage in relying on partners’ material (i.e. the transcript of visits from Routey to PDF, IO2’s training modules, etc.) as a key tool to support their presentation and overall delivery.

Skills

In the second stage, seniors introduced juniors on *How* to do all of the above. This was a very interesting scenario to observe in third person since partners had the opportunity to experience seniors’ unfiltered perception upon the work and efforts carried out so far (an outcome that would have been difficult to catch solely from the evaluation questionnaires distributed by partners).

Seniors shared their feelings and personal challenges that they overcome to test their self-efficacy and adaptability to new contexts. For example, many partners reported that seniors “confessed” to juniors the great improvement of their self-esteem and how this brief experienced benefitted many of their transversal abilities and competences – regardless of what was strictly related to the tourism sector.

Together, and with the help of facilitators from partnership’s organisation and associated, juniors elaborated their own visiting tour and pitched their delivery. Towards the end of Spring 2021 and mid-Summer, juniors took visitors at the discovery of “hidden urban gems” through their eyes and personal experiences.

Results from evaluation feedback form filled in by juniors and visitors are resumed in ANNEX 2.

VALORISATION – Capacity building and 1-on-1 coaching for participants

The valorisation phase was one of the most delicate tasks included in this Intellectual Output. By “Valorisation” we meant a series of activities and meetings conceived to help both seniors and juniors in consolidation the experience and to translate it into a relevant and interesting professional background for job hunting purposes.

Valorisation activities took place in the months of June/July 2021 and have been carried out upon completion of visits from both target groups.

In conjunction with roll-out of vaccines and flattening of the infection curve, summer months gave partners a break from COVID-related fears, most of organisations managed to plan and arrange the validation sessions in f2f format. The ways in which these capacity building sessions unfolded are various: workshops, roundtables and 1-on-1 counselling plans.

Partners took time to present learners how to structure a CV following instructions from the Europass platform – since it was largely unknown among participants – and how to fill-in/showcase their personal information in a pleasant “fashion”. Coherently with targets’ needs, Partnership’s organisation helped target groups also with the very essential of a presentation letter: tutors and mentors sustained learners in navigating the basics of HR’s practices and theory and helped them to better understand what happens from the employer’s perspective. Another important element of discussion was the motivation letter, most of targets did not have adequate experience with formal documents anticipating the submission of a CV, and consequently, they considered the experience extremely beneficial and insightful.

All partners tailored the workshops in consideration of the specific needs carried by their audience. For instance, organisations shared with participants useful tricks to establish a trustful and reliable image on LinkedIn so as to widen their horizons and employability opportunities, “pills” of knowledge in intercultural marketing and ICT literacy overall. As for what happened with seniors’ training, the valorisation panel have been carried out in very relaxed atmosphere: at this moment of IO5’s implementation, targets established a personal connection with coaching staff in a way that goes beyond the formal trainer-trainee relationship.

The Valorisation’s sessions proved to be very useful for the external stakeholders that sustained partners throughout the process as they had the opportunity to familiarise with third approaches and practices applied by other professionals in the domain of education and training.

Partners reported interesting exchange of views with the aforementioned on many different topics: from tourism and tourism industry per se, to EU policies on migration and social equality; scales of EU-founded programmes for migrants’ inclusion; further resources for international and strategic partnership in CBH-related domains. In other words, CBH gave partners the opportunity to mainstream the Erasmus+ programme to external parties that by nature and scope of their daily-activities are perfectly eligible for EU co-financed initiatives.

Moderators' experience: key takeaways from training staff

In the following section, we will bring to readers' attention few comments and remarks pointed down with partners' training staff involved in the project as facilitators of coaching sessions, delivery and piloting, valorisation and reporting.

All members involved are experienced and seasoned professionals in the domain of education and training, both in formal and non-formal setting. Coaches from partnership's organisation can rely on multiple years of (international) experience in designing, planning, developing, implementing and testing innovative training curricula aimed at people with disadvantaged background or at severe risk of socio-economic marginalisation.

Trainers detain unique know how and professional experience that they discussed and validated with other members of the consortium so as to guarantee for their pedagogical impact and reliability once finally deployed in piloting phase.

Planning and implementation of the work

Before the official kick-start of on-field activities, partners agreed on a common methodology to use as an operative framework and a supporting tool. The work at national level has been planned accordingly, in full compliance with the aforementioned document.

First, partners mapped and involved stakeholders of interest for IO5's implementation, seniors and other supporting external parties. Then, they moved on with the display of the project, the training topics based on IO2 material and the detailed presentation of itineraries. Coached scheduled with participants the timeframe of visits and other logistic arrangements (i.e. meeting point, means of transport, etc.). At the same time, it was essential to "recruit" visitors with the same characteristic as per methodology. What followed after was the involvement and engagement of junior participants, the moderation of "transfer events", and in conclusion, the management of validation's workshops.

All and all, coaches stucked to a liner approach. Regular virtual calls within the partnerships' organisation allowed training staff to remain updates on colleagues' work and share valuable inputs and recommendations on the basis of the experience gained up to that moment.

The only disrupting factor was represented by the many uncertainties related to COVID-spread, partners were experiencing different scenarios at country level that would have made highly unpractical, and counterproductive, a one-solution-fits-all guideline. That is exactly why, as mentioned already, partners were given maximum flexibility on how to define their work plan as long as they were able to remain consistent with the delivery date expected upon major results (i.e. end of the recruiting process).

Classroom management

By assessing each national report delivered by partners, the section related to classroom management seems to be the one of greatest heterogeneity. From what we observed, this really depended on several factors, that can be reconducted to targets' education background.

For instance, AEVA was dealing with a cohort of seniors with some kind of experience in conducting visits, BEST invited ten migrants with a background as trainers themselves, but on the other hand, the audience addressed by IDP was subject to (highly) disadvantageous conditions (i.e. unemployment, social marginalisation, poor knowledge of Italian language, etc.). Readers can clearly envision by themselves the implication that come by working in such different scenarios.

In most cases, training events needed to be “streamlined” to help targets in better understanding the content of the discussion. In fact, many partners agreed that, at times, the supporting material seemed to be “too sophisticated” and as such it needed to be re-elaborated in real time to retain students’ attention and engagement. Coaches from partnership’s organisation acknowledge as well that informal tones are much more effective in establishing a personal connection with targets.

A trust-based relationship with targets proved to be instrumental in facilitating the emergence of collaborative dynamics. This is achievable firstly and foremost by denaturalising the sessions from the typical and sterile classroom approach.

Final comments

Specifically in the case of juniors, a top-down transfer of knowledge would lead to emotional distance between trainers and trainee that poorly satisfy the goals and objectives of piloting. People want to be engaged and involved, and they wish to perceive themselves as both recipient and co-creators of lectures’ content.

The established and strengthening of a robust perception of mutual trusts helps targets in feeling much more confident to open-up about personal experiences, which in turn is instrumental in favouring a bottom-up approach as described at the end of the previous paragraph (switching their perceptions from “passive recipients” to “contributors”). All partners managed to do so by “tuning” themselves to their specific audience.

Overall, what partners realised is that targets wished to be educated/trained, not schooled. At times, the border line between the two areas might appear blurred and very thin, it is coaches’ responsibility to keep in mind that it is their duty finding a common ground that facilitates dialogues, exchange of knowledge and a long-term impact.

Partners' perspective: conclusive remarks

In the last section of this report, readers can find available few additional notes that partners compiled together for to use of external stakeholders potentially interested in replicating the idea within their operational ecosystem. These comments emerged from a multilateral final discussion involving: the moderator and his/her project team, the moderators from each participating's organisation, project's staff.

Replicability of the project

CBH involved six organisations from six different EU member states. Such a diverse sample of interested countries allow us to validate the idea that CBH might be neutral to the geographical context.

Now that the project is moving toward its formal conclusion, we as project partners have enough experience to reassure other organisations on the fact that an initiative designed as CBH is far from being overly energy consuming and resource-demanding.

Our targets have been migrants and people with a migratory background in general, but we do strongly believe that CBH can be finetuned in consideration of other categories exposed to risks of socio-economic marginalisation.

All IOs have been developed following a consequentiality approach, meaning that each task is instrumental in developing the one that comes next. The implementation of a working framework of such kind might appear a bit time consuming at first, as it definitely requires strong engagement and commitment, but it will turn to be extremely beneficial in the long run.

Risk Management

Leaving aside extraordinary events that might intervene as causes of disruption (i.e. a global pandemic), there are some risks that are intrinsic to the project itself.

The actual implementation of the work plan for IO5 includes micro-management efforts. Stakeholders are recommended to keep track of their progresses and action list with great precision so as to avoid overlapping in schedule and streamline as much as possible a process that otherwise might appear too demanding.

The second one follows the footsteps of the previous and addresses targets and stakeholder management. Involving seniors and juniors was the most challenging task among all of those previously performed by partners. If readers feel like that their organisation might experience some difficulties in reaching out for the audience of reference, they are highly recommended to identify from the very beginning some external parties that can be of support.

If this is not the case, meaning, if readers are confident on their PR potentialities, they are advised to proceed with the identification and invitation of participants as early as possible, consistently with their working plan. Moreover, it is pivotal for project's success that the involved organisation manages to establish (and nurture) a local network of groups of interest (e.g. representatives of Academia, Public and Third sectors, municipal policy makers in the field of employability, social inclusion and equal opportunities) that can boost the initiative's visibility and its valorisation.

About the actual content of the training material, readers are invited to stick to the notorious K.I.S.S. principle (i.e., Keep It Simple and Smart) so as to avoid unnecessary redundances. The content should follow an academic methodology but it should not be academic per se, otherwise it is very probable that it will generate a perception from targets of alienation, discomfort and boredom.

For what concerns the training sessions, readers are highly recommended to come prepared. At the very beginning of the piloting cycle, it is possible to assume that the attention span of targets will be very low: make sure that the supporting material is ready to be distributed and fully available so as to avoid unpleasant delays (i.e. PPTs are printed, the projector is turned on, the blackboard is clean, the smartboard/screen works properly, for online activities the internet connection is appropriate, etc.). By coming prepared we mean also getting to know the background of your audience – if no information are available, try to seek for them from reliable sources. This is a very strategic task from two different perspectives: it gives trainers the opportunity to familiarise with participants and establish a human connection starting from the very first greetings, it allows trainers to better understand what kind of audience they will deal with (i.e. what is the demographic? What is the gender proportion? What is the average education level? etc.).

Finally, aspiring developers of CBH-similar initiatives should always keep in mind that the coaching scenario that worked best was when partners managed to settle an informal context but carried out in formal tones. In other words, targets should feel like they are making the best use of their free time in the company of pleasant people.

Sustainability and long-term impact

Based on feedback evaluation forms from participants, and overall comments shared by associated, partners are glad to consider the aim of CBH fully achieved. Of course, it will be too pretentious from us affirming that we trained professional touristic guides, the contribution of the project is much broader than that. CBH demonstrated that alternative and innovative ways for migrants' socio-economic integration are both feasible and practically achievable.

The true legacy of the project is represented by the intangible outcomes that came out from the piloting sessions. Participants felt encouraged in pursuing new self-development programmes that can make them much more proactive and resilient: at the end of each session of training, piloting and validation, participants appreciated a renewed sense of empowerment and motivation that some of them lacked for too long. The long-term impact should be considered by looking at their newly acquired transversal skills – public speaking, as one among many others – beside their knowledge of tourism industry.

Potential replicators of CBH-like initiatives are also recommended to do not underestimate the relevance detained by all cross-functional tasks that support the development and implementation of training. Communication and dissemination of results (as CBH's partners are doing with the publication of this report) are of essential importance to generate public awareness upon the initiative, and hopefully, to stimulate a renewed cycle of policy dialogue among stakeholders on inclusion and migration policies at local, regional and national level.

ANNEX 1 – Seniors’ evaluation feedback form

SENIOR PARTICIPANTS SATISFACTION QUESTIONNAIRE					
For each question, please shade the area with your answer (if applicable)					
		Absolutely agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly disagree
1	The course topics were relevant to me	73%	25%	2%	0%
2	I am satisfied with the provided training	78%	22%	0%	0%
3	The CITIES BY HEART OER platform is easy to use and navigate	70%	28%	2%	0%
4	The CITIES BY HEART Training material is easy to identify, access and use	67%	23%	0%	0%
5	I felt like the visitors and I were on the same wavelength after all	63%	33%	4%	0%
6	I did not experience issues organising the visits	66%	22%	12%	0%
7	I would be happy to repeat this experience	78%	20%	2%	0%
8	This exchange inspired me to do something else to foster intercultural understanding / to collaborate with the participants for new projects	59%	35%	6%	0%
9	My favourite part of the visit was	<p>FRANCE <i>When we present each other at the beginning of the visit. Visit of Belsunce.</i></p> <p>SPAIN <i>Conversation with visitors during the visit. Everything! Getting to know new places in the city. Seeing how my companions overcame their fears. Socializing with other people. Seeing new places. Realizing that I can interact with people from other cultures. Applying the knowledge I acquired and developing skills I didn't think I had Interacting with visitors and my classmates.</i></p> <p>AUSTRIA Route 1(50%) Route 2 (50%)</p> <p>PORTUGAL</p>			

		<p><i>Interaction with participants (knowledge exchange, learning from visitors and answer their questions) 100%.</i></p> <p>THE NETHERLANDS</p> <p>Visit in Assen: Statue of Bartje (22.22%) Deer Park (22.22%) Drents Museum (22.22%) Palace of Justice (11.11%) St.Jozef Church (11.11%) De NieuweKolk (11.11%)</p> <p>Visit in Groninger: Martini Tower (22.22%) University of Groningen (22.22%) Groninger Museum (22.22%) City Hall Groningen (11.11%) Aa Church (11.11%) St. Josef Cathedral (11.11%)</p> <p>ITALY</p> <p><i>All of them</i> <i>Flaiano Bridge</i> <i>Ancient Railway Bridge</i> <i>Milo's murales</i> <i>Statue of Pope Paolo VI</i></p>
<p>10</p>	<p>Next time, I could work more on</p>	<p>FRANCE</p> <p><i>Better communicate with juniors audience.</i> <i>The part of the walk starting from the Hôtel Dieu.</i></p> <p>SPAIN</p> <p><i>Self-esteem.</i> <i>To be more fluent and confident when making the site's presentation.</i> <i>My nerves.</i> <i>My Spanish.</i> <i>Punctuality.</i> <i>Better organise my thoughts.</i> <i>Show more enthusiasm while presenting the site.</i></p> <p>AUSTRIA</p> <p>Module 1 (33%) Module 2 (17%) Module 3(17%) Module4 (33%)</p>

		<p>PORTUGAL Include new stories (50%) Include more information (50%)</p> <p>THE NETHERLANDS Digital skills (33.33%) Communication skills (22.22%) Storytelling (11.11%) Intercultural skills (33.33%)</p> <p>ITALY <i>On myself..so to better collaborate with others</i> <i>Public speaking</i> <i>Pick up itineraries on my own</i></p>
11	What was the most interesting module?	<p>FRANCE <i>Design intercultural tourist routes.</i></p> <p>SPAIN Module 1: 11% Module 4: 11% All of them: 78%</p> <p>AUSTRIA Module 1 (20%) Module 2 (30%) Module 3(30%) Module 4 (20%)</p> <p>PORTUGAL Social media (75%) Marketing and sales strategies</p> <p>THE NETHERLANDS M1.U3 (44.44%) M2.U2 (11.11%) M2.U3 (22.22%) M3.U2 (11.11%) M3.U3 (11.11%)</p> <p>ITALY <i>The first set of slides (module 1 and 2)</i> <i>The second set of slides (module 3 and 4)</i></p>
12	What was the least interesting module?	<p>FRANCE <i>All of them were interesting</i></p> <p>SPAIN <i>None</i></p>

		<p>AUSTRIA Module 1 (30%) Module 2 (30%) Module 3(10%) Module 4 (30%)</p> <p>PORTUGAL None (50%) Topics that had already been covered in previous training courses (50%)</p> <p>THE NETHERLANDS M1.U2(22.22%) M2.U1 (11.11%) M3.U1(22.22%) M4.U1 (11.11%) M4.U2 (11.11%) M4.U3 (22.22%)</p> <p>ITALY <i>None of them</i></p>			
13	Overall, did the visits live up to your expectations?	54%	44%	2%	0%
14	General comments and suggestions	<p>FRANCE <i>Bravo! Follow this path with the project and continue disseminating it!</i></p> <p>AUSTRIA <i>This could be part of funded courses, I would slightly extend the scope of sightseeing to the surroundings of Vienna, the outcomes are interesting for touristic stakeholders, it was not exactly the right time because of pandemic. In Vienna, there are not many disadvantaged neighbourhoods, I wish there would have been no restrictions due to COVID-19, prospecting and mobilising participants is not easy during COVID-19restrictions, training contents are suitable also for my training course.</i></p> <p>PORTUGAL <i>I think if there was a course focused on social media and online marketing it would be perfect. Continue the excellent work!</i></p> <p>THE NETHERLANDS <i>Each module has something interesting to learn about.</i></p>			

		ITALY <i>Everything was beautiful</i>
--	--	---

ANNEX 2 – Juniors' evaluation feedback form

JUNIOR PARTICIPANTS SATISFACTION QUESTIONNAIRE					
For each question, please shade the area with your answer (if applicable)					
The term "visit" here refers to the visit you conducted					
		Absolutely agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly disagree
1	The transfer of experience was relevant to me	60%	40%	0%	0%
2	I am satisfied with the transfer of experience I received	61%	39%	0%	0%
3	The CITIES BY HEART OER platform is easy to use and navigate	65%	35%	0%	0%
4	The CITIES BY HEART Training material is easy to identify, access and use	59%	41%	0%	0%
5	I felt like the visitors and I were on the same wavelength after all	71%	29%	0%	0%
6	I did not experience issues organising the visits	42%	36%	22%	0%
7	I would be happy to repeat this experience	35%	65%	0%	0%
8	This exchange inspired me to do something else to foster intercultural understanding / to collaborate with the participants for new projects	55%	42%	3%	0%
9	My favourite part of the visit was	<p>FRANCE <i>Vallon des Auffes</i> <i>Port de Malmousque</i></p> <p>SPAIN <i>Learn new possibilities with which to earn income.</i> <i>Interact with the visitors and feel their interest in what I was telling them.</i> <i>Interact with visitors.</i> <i>Receiving feedback from the monitor on how I can improve.</i></p> <p>AUSTRIA Route1 (17%) Route 2(50%) Route 3 (33%)</p> <p>PORTUGAL <i>To be able to show my favourite places and the ones that have an important meaning for me during my stay in Portugal.</i></p> <p>THE NETHERLANDS</p>			

		<p>The creation of a new route (75%) The stories told by seniors (25%)</p> <p>ITALY <i>All of them</i></p>
10	Next time, I could work more on	<p>FRANCE <i>Preparation</i> <i>Presentation</i></p> <p>SPAIN <i>Self-confidence.</i> <i>To respect the time of the plan and not to overextend myself.</i> <i>Be more self-confident.</i> <i>Ask visitors about their interests in order to improve the places to visit.</i> <i>Speak more from the heart.</i></p> <p>AUSTRIA Module 1(67%) Module 4(33%)</p> <p>PORTUGAL <i>My presentation and information about the identified spots.</i></p> <p>THE NETHERLANDS Stories (50%) Visual aids (25%) Language (25%)</p>
11	What was the most interesting insight you gained as a result of the knowledge transfer?	<p>FRANCE Exchanges (3) Testimonials (1) Personal experiences (1)</p> <p>SPAIN All of them (80%) Module 4 (20%)</p> <p>AUSTRIA <i>Encounters during the visits.</i> <i>Historical knowledge of the city.</i> <i>Intercultural issues.</i> <i>Intercultural awareness and presentation skills, there are many other people with same problems and also background in the city.</i></p> <p>PORTUGAL <i>Marketing and stakeholders</i></p>

		<p>THE NETHERLANDS Ability to work individually (25%) Group work skills (25%) Storytelling (25%) Taste of history (25%)</p> <p>ITALY <i>Everything</i></p>			
12	What was the least interesting insight you gained as a result of the knowledge transfer?	<p>FRANCE <i>Find specific places</i></p> <p>SPAIN <i>All of them were interesting</i></p> <p>AUSTRIA <i>Designing routes, mobilising participants, organising meetings with stakeholders.</i></p> <p>PORTUGAL <i>Searching information in internet</i></p> <p>THE NETHERLANDS <i>The fact that due to Covid restrictions we had to do everything online, as the national regulations didn't allow 2 people to be together on the street.</i></p>			
13	Overall, did the visits live up to your expectations?	68%	32%	0%	0%
14	General comments and suggestions	<p>AUSTRIA <i>This was a new experience; I could learn new things I did not know before like history, communication and self-presentation.</i></p> <p>PORTUGAL <i>It was fun to deliver the tour.</i></p> <p>THE NETHERLANDS <i>The activities were cool, even they were just online I am willing to repeat the experience at any time.</i></p>			

ANNEX 4 – Visitors' evaluation feedback form – Seniors' itineraries

VISITOR SATISFACTION QUESTIONNAIRE		For each question, please shade the area with your answer (if applicable)			
		Absolutely agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly disagree
1	The participants were good storytellers	58%	42%	0%	0%
2	The participants told interesting things that one cannot find online / in official booklets	68%	28%	4%	0%
3	The participants were open to respond to questions from the visitors and eager to discuss issues further	71%	27%	2%	0%
4	I could easily sympathise with the participants	83%	17%	0%	0%
5	The visits were well-organised	73%	25%	2%	0%
6	I would be happy to repeat this experience	71%	29%	0%	0%
7	This exchange inspired me to do something else to foster intercultural understanding / to collaborate with the participants for new projects	54%	42%	4%	0%
8	My favourite part of the visit was...	<p>FRANCE</p> <p>Visit 1: (history) <i>The visit of Belsunce (3)</i> <i>The Alcazar</i> <i>The opening onto the port at the end</i></p> <p>Visit 2: (stories and anecdotes) <i>The anecdotes about the old buildings</i> <i>Learning about the Rue Bernard Dubois</i> <i>The visit of the Rue Bernard Dubois</i></p> <p>Visit 3 : (exchanges) <i>The last part on the Place des Moulins when the guide addressed more questions to the participants and made them participate in the construction of the subject.</i></p> <p>SPAIN</p> <p><i>To be able to see my culture from the perspective of outsiders and what it means to them. This is enriching.</i></p> <p><i>To have details explained about the food and customs of other countries, and how these are connected in some way to the culture of the city and its people.</i></p> <p><i>To learn about a different perspective of tourism.</i></p> <p><i>To get to know corners of the city that had gone unnoticed.</i></p> <p><i>That those who explained the visit talked about their own experiences.</i></p>			

		<p>AUSTRIA Route 1(40%) Route 2 (20%) Route 3(40%)</p> <p>PORTUGAL <i>I didn't know much about the city, I learned a lot of new things.</i> <i>Curiosities about the Japanese in Lisbon.</i> <i>The Real Barraca.</i> <i>All the visits.</i> <i>The definition of alicarius - curiosities that I was completely unaware of.</i> <i>The story of the devil running loose.</i> <i>Everything.</i> <i>The story about the city's coat of arms.</i> <i>S. Gonçálinho.</i></p> <p>THE NETHERLANDS Visit in Assen: Statue of Bartje (33.33%) DeerPark (33.33%) Drents Museum (16.67%) St. Jozef Church (16.67%) Visit in Groninger: Martini Tower (33.33%) University of Groningen (16.67%) Groninger Museum (33.33%) Aa Church (16.67%)</p>
9	Participants could work more on ...	<p>FRANCE Visit 1: <i>Conviviality, exchange</i> <i>Interaction and exchange with visitors</i> <i>The visuals</i> <i>The overall path of the visit</i> Visit 2: <i>Knowing the tourism market</i> <i>Dialogue and questions with the participants</i> <i>Diversifying the type of venues</i> Visit 3: <i>The links between the different subjects dealt with.</i> <i>The active participation of the visitors in the story of the visit, for example by starting from what they already know or would like to discover.</i> <i>The adaptation to the level of language and knowledge of the public.</i></p>

		<p><i>The regular verification that the participants are following and understanding what is being proposed to them.</i> <i>Reducing the moments of passivity of the public.</i></p> <p>SPAIN <i>I loved the experience in general, I could not say</i> <i>Mention other aspects of the culture such as dance, music, art.</i> <i>Make a deeper analysis of the cultural mix. This strength can be exploited much more.</i> <i>Better lead the visit, take the reins more confidently.</i> <i>Know how to communicate better your internal experiences.</i></p> <p>AUSTRIA <i>Maybe on having bigger groups, intercultural meetings it would be more fun with more people in one group.</i></p> <p>PORTUGAL <i>Online tours could be improved.</i> <i>Make the online presentation more dynamic.</i> <i>I do not know. I enjoyed everything.</i> <i>Include new information on the route as visitors share it with them.</i> <i>Everything was fine.</i></p> <p>THE NETHERLANDS Digital skills (33.33%) Communication skills (16.67%) Interpersonal skills (16.67%) Storytelling (33.33%)</p>			
10	The CITIES BY HEART OER platform is easy to use and navigate	39%	58%	3%	0%
11	Overall, did the visits live up to your expectations?	63%	34%	2%	0%
12	General comments and suggestions	<p>FRANCE Visit 1: <i>Engage the group.</i> Visit 2: <i>Try to put in one of the visits, well known places and bring a history of migration that is not known.</i> <i>Very interesting visit, with many anecdotes. Very complementary to the first one.</i> Visit 3:</p>			

I think that the objectives and the steps of the tour could be explained more clearly at the beginning so that the visitors know better what to expect. I think that these objectives are really valuable but that we need to find techniques and moments of dialogue involving the public more and taking into account their age, interest, knowledge so that they manage to follow the visit from beginning to end.

AUSTRIA

It was interesting to gain knowledge about intercultural issues, cultural policy and stakeholders, and present my ideas and design routes, I liked the experience, it offers new sights on the neighbourhoods, a very interesting afternoon, in Vienna, there are already some “alternative” route descriptions, I think this is innovative.

PORTUGAL

Online visits limit the presentation of the sites.

THE NETEHLANDS

It was a very good idea to motivate migrant people by bringing them together.

ANNEX 5 – Visitors' evaluation feedback form – Juniors' itineraries

VISITOR SATISFACTION QUESTIONNAIRE		For each question, please shade the area with your answer (if applicable)			
		Absolutely agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly disagree
1	The participants were good storytellers	64%	36%	0%	0%
2	The participants told interesting things that one cannot find online / in official booklets	14%	82%	4%	0%
3	The participants were open to respond to questions from the visitors and eager to discuss issues further	62%	38%	0%	0%
4	I could easily sympathise with the participants	71%	29%	0%	0%
5	The visits were well-organised	67%	33%	0%	0%
6	I would be happy to repeat this experience	43%	57%	0%	0%
7	This exchange inspired me to do something else to foster intercultural understanding / to collaborate with the participants for new projects	21%	75%	4%	0%
8	My favourite part of the visit was...	<p>FRANCE Vallon des Auffes</p> <p>AUSTRIA Route 1 (40%) Route 2 (20%) Route 3 (40%)</p> <p>PORTUGAL <i>Learn more about the juniors' experiences in the city.</i> <i>Learn about places that I didn't know they existed.</i></p> <p>THE NETHERLANDS The stories created by juniors (25%) The novelty of the sights (50%) The video about Sisyphus (25%) The video about Bartje (25%)</p>			
9	Participants could work more on ...	<p>AUSTRIA <i>Maybe or having bigger groups, intercultural meetings, it would be more fun with more people in one group.</i></p> <p>PORTUGAL <i>Storytelling</i></p>			

		<p>THE NETHERLANDS Self-confidence (50%) Non-verbal communication (25%) Pace of voice (speed) during storytelling (25%)</p>			
10	The CITIES BY HEART OER platform is easy to use and navigate	58%	42%	0%	0%
11	Overall, did the visits live up to your expectations?	79%	21%	0%	0%
12	General comments and suggestions	<p>FRANCE <i>Special visit but it was interesting to see how these are built.</i></p> <p>AUSTRIA <i>It was interesting to gain knowledge about intercultural issues, cultural policy and stakeholders, and to present my ideas and design routes, I liked the experience, it opens up new perspectives on the neighbourhoods, a very interesting afternoon, there are already some “alternative” routes in Vienna, I think this is innovative.</i></p> <p>THE NETHERLANDS <i>It was nice to hear stories about places. The visits were interesting I learned a lot and I would recommend the activities to my colleagues.</i></p>			