

FINAL EVALUATION REPORT

SPIN YOUTH PROJECT

30.6.2026

ILONA TAIMELA



Co-funded by
the European Union

Publisher

Vienna Institute for International Dialogue and Cooperation (VIDC)
Möllwaldplatz 5/9
1040 Vienna
Austria
www.vidc.org

Author

Ilona Taimela (Eternal Evaluator)

Helsinki & Vienna, June 2026

Photo: VIDC-fairplay

The Erasmus+ sport project “**Empower Diverse Youth – Build-up Youth Participation and Inclusion in Sport Organizations**” (SPIN Youth) aims to increase the sport participation of young people from diverse backgrounds – in particular, young refugees and migrants – and to create inclusive, non-discriminatory sport environments that actively promote diversity and equality. Project duration: January 2024 – June 2026

For detailed information on the project and the SPIN network, visit www.sportinclusion.net

Disclaimer

Funded by the European Union. Views and opinions expressed are however those of the author(s) only and do not necessarily reflect those of the European Union or the European Education and Culture Executive Agency (EACEA). Neither the European Union nor EACEA can be held responsible for them.



CONTENTS

Executive Summary	4
Chapter 1. Introduction	5
1.1 Background	5
1.2 Purpose of the Final Evaluation	5
1.3 Evaluation Questions	5
Chapter 2. Evaluation Methodology	6
2.1 Evidence Sources.....	6
2.2 Evaluation Criteria	6
2.3 Evaluation Limitations.....	7
Chapter 3. WP1 – Project Management, Coordination and Partnership	8
3.1. Purpose of the Work Package 1.....	8
3.2. Evaluation Evidence for wp1	8
3.3. Findings of WP1 project coordination and governance	8
3.4 Partnership Collaboration	9
3.5 Communication and Decision-Making	9
3.6 Monitoring, Reporting and Administrative Management.....	10
3.7 Conference Organisation and Project Closure.....	10
3.8. Evaluation Against the Criteria	11

3.9. Overall Evaluation of WP1	11
Chapter 4 WP2 – Empowerment and Capacity Building of Young People with Diverse Backgrounds	12
4.1 Purpose of the Work Package 2.....	12
4.2 Evaluation Evidence	12
4.3 Design and Implementation of the European Youth Training Academy.....	13
4.4 DEVELOPMENT OF KNOWLEDGE, SKILLS AND LEADERSHIP COMPETENCES	13
4.5 From Training to Local Action	14
4.6 Evaluation Against the Criteria	14
4.7 Strengths.....	15
4.8 Challenges and Areas for Improvement	15
4.9 Overall Evaluation of WP2	15
Chapter 5 Work Package 3 Evaluation on Participation, Barriers and Needs of Diverse Youth in Sports: Youth Panels and Youth-led Action Research.....	17
5.1 Purpose and evaluation scope of WP3.....	17
5.2 Implementation of WP3.....	17
5.3 Quality of the Youth-led Action Research.....	18
5.4 Development of Youth-led Action Plans	18
5.5 PRODUCTION OF KNOWLEDGE RESOURCES IN WP3.....	19
5.6 Evaluation findings of WP3	19
5.7 Evaluation of Wp3 Against the Criteria	19
5.8 Strengths of WP3	20
5.9 Challenges and Areas for Improvement in wp3	20
5.10 Overall Evaluation of WP3	20
Chapter 6 Work Package 4 Evaluation On Youth Co-creation of Sport Inclusion Activities	22
6.1 Purpose and evaluation scope of WP4.....	22
6.2 From Evidence to Action in WP4.....	22
6.3 Youth-led Implementation during the European Week of Sport.....	23
6.4 EARLY Outcomes and Project Contribution of wp4	23
6.5 Evaluation of WP4 Against the Criteria.....	24
6.6 Strengths of WP4	24
6.7 Challenges and Areas for Improvement	25
6.8 Conclusions on WP4	25
Chapter 7. Work Package 5 Evaluation on Communication, Dissemination and Sustainability of Project Results.....	26
7.1 Purpose and Evaluation Scope	26
7.2 Communication and Dissemination Activities	26
7.3 Dissemination of Project Outputs	27
7.4 Sustainability and Legacy	27
7.5 Evaluation of WP5 Against the Criteria.....	28
7.6 Strengths in WP2.....	28
7.7 Challenges and Areas for Improvement	28
7.8 Conclusions on WP5	28
Chapter 8 Cross-cutting Evaluation Findings	30
Overall Conclusions and recommendations	30
Recommendations For future Erasmus+ Sport projects	30
Overall Evaluation	31
Appendix A. Evaluation Evidence Matrix.....	32
Appendix B Evidence sources	35

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The SPIN Youth project successfully established an innovative European model for youth participation in sport by combining leadership development, participatory Action Research and youth-led implementation. Across eight partner countries, the project progressively strengthened the capacity of young people from diverse backgrounds to act as researchers, facilitators, organisers and advocates for inclusion within sport organisations.

The evaluation finds that the project achieved a high level of relevance by addressing recognised barriers to participation among migrant, refugee, ethnic minority and other underrepresented young people. The participatory methodology adopted throughout the project ensured that activities responded to locally identified needs while contributing to shared European objectives.

One of the project's principal achievements was the coherent progression across work packages. Capacity building during the European Youth Training Academy has prepared Youth Coordinators to establish Youth Panels, facilitate Action Research and subsequently design and implement Youth Action Plans. This progression represents a clear and well-functioning theory of change, linking learning, evidence generation and practical implementation.

Evidence indicates that the project generated positive outcomes at several levels. Young participants reported increased confidence, leadership skills and understanding of inclusion. Partner organisations strengthened their capacity to engage young people in decision-making, while project outputs—including methodological guidance, practical tools and publications—provide a strong basis for continued use beyond the funding period.

Overall, the evaluation concludes that SPIN Youth exceeded expectations in demonstrating that meaningful youth participation can contribute not only to individual empowerment but also to organisational learning, practical innovation and more inclusive sport environments.

CHAPTER 1. INTRODUCTION

1.1 BACKGROUND

The SPIN Youth project (2024–2026) was implemented under the Erasmus+ Sport programme with the overall objective of strengthening youth participation, inclusion and diversity within sport organisations across Europe. Building upon previous work undertaken through the SPIN (Sport Inclusion Network) initiative, the project recognised that young people from migrant, refugee, ethnic minority and other underrepresented backgrounds continue to face significant barriers to participation in organised sport. Rather than treating young people solely as beneficiaries of sport programmes, SPIN Youth adopted a participatory approach that positioned them as partners, researchers and leaders throughout the project lifecycle. The project combined youth leadership development, participatory action research, local implementation and European cooperation to strengthen both individual competences and organisational capacity for inclusion. The consortium consisted of eight partner organisations representing Austria, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Finland, Germany, Ireland, Italy, the Netherlands and Portugal. Activities were implemented between January 2024 and June 2026 through five interconnected work packages covering project management, capacity building, youth participation, local implementation and dissemination.

1.2 PURPOSE OF THE FINAL EVALUATION

The purpose of this external evaluation is to assess the implementation and achievements of the SPIN Youth project and to determine the extent to which the project achieved its intended objectives. Specifically, the evaluation seeks to:

- assess the relevance of the project in addressing barriers to participation in sport among diverse young people;
- evaluate the effectiveness and quality of project implementation;
- assess the efficiency of project management and partnership cooperation;
- identify evidence of impact on young people, partner organisations and wider sport communities;
- examine the sustainability and transferability of project methodologies and outputs;
- identify lessons learned and formulate recommendations for future European youth and sport initiatives.

The evaluation is both summative and developmental. In addition to assessing overall project performance, it identifies approaches that may strengthen future initiatives promoting youth participation, inclusion and diversity in sport.

1.3 EVALUATION QUESTIONS

The evaluation was guided by the following overarching questions:

- To what extent did SPIN Youth address relevant barriers to participation in sport?
- Did the project successfully empower young people to become active leaders within their communities?
- Did participatory Action Research contribute to meaningful organisational learning?
- Were Youth Action Plans effectively translated into local implementation?
- What evidence exists of organisational, community and policy influence?
- How sustainable and transferable are the project's methods and outputs?

The evaluation further examines how the different work packages contributed collectively to the project's theory of change, moving from capacity building to youth leadership, evidence generation, practical action and long-term legacy.

CHAPTER 2. EVALUATION METHODOLOGY

The evaluation adopted a mixed-methods approach combining qualitative and quantitative evidence collected throughout the project lifecycle between February 2024 and June 2026. Rather than relying upon a single source of information, findings were triangulated across multiple evidence sources to strengthen the validity of conclusions.

2.1 EVIDENCE SOURCES

The evaluation drew upon:

- project application and work package descriptions;
- partnership meeting minutes throughout the project;
- evaluator observations during the Kick-off Meeting (Vienna), European Youth Training Academy (Rome), European Networking Conference (Lisbon) and selected project activities;
- baseline questionnaires completed prior to the European Youth Training Academy;
- participant interviews conducted during the Training Academy;
- interim evaluation report and presentation;
- final participant survey conducted during the Lisbon Conference;
- Youth Panel outputs and Action Research reports from participating countries;
- Youth Action Plans and implementation documentation;
- project publications, including the Handbook, Guidelines and Action Research Summary Report;
- public dissemination materials, websites and communication outputs;
- photographic documentation of project implementation.

2.2 EVALUATION CRITERIA

The assessment follows internationally recognised evaluation criteria adapted to the Erasmus+ Sport context:

Relevance: the extent to which project objectives responded to identified needs.

Effectiveness: the degree to which planned objectives and outputs were achieved.

Efficiency: how effectively available resources, partnerships and management structures supported implementation.

Quality: the quality of implementation, methodologies, participation and outputs.

Sustainability: the likelihood that project benefits, methodologies and partnerships will continue beyond the funding period.

Assessment of Confidence in Findings

To strengthen the robustness and transparency of the evaluation, each major evaluation finding was assessed against the strength of the available evidence. Rather than relying on a single source of information, the evaluation adopted a triangulation approach, comparing findings across multiple evidence sources wherever possible.

Confidence levels indicate the extent to which evaluation conclusions are supported by the available evidence and should not be interpreted as a measure of project performance. Instead, they reflect the evaluator's confidence in the evidence underpinning each conclusion.

High confidence. Findings are supported by multiple independent sources of evidence that consistently point to the same conclusion. These typically include a combination of project documentation, partnership meeting minutes, surveys, interviews, direct observations, national reports, project deliverables and other supporting materials. Where evidence converges across several sources, confidence in the finding is considered high.

Moderate–High confidence. Findings are supported by two or more complementary sources of evidence, although the quantity or consistency of documentation may vary between partner organisations or work

packages. While the available evidence provides a reliable basis for conclusions, some aspects could have been strengthened through more systematic reporting or additional documentation.

Moderate confidence. Findings are based primarily on a limited number of evidence sources, such as publicly available information, participant reflections, photographic documentation or selected project materials. Although these findings are considered credible and consistent with other project evidence, they should be interpreted with appropriate caution due to the more limited evidence base.

Low confidence. Findings are based on a single source of evidence, incomplete documentation or evidence that could not be independently verified. Such findings are treated as indicative rather than conclusive and are interpreted with caution. No major evaluation conclusions in this report were based solely on low-confidence evidence.

The confidence assessment complements the evaluation criteria of relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, quality and sustainability by indicating the strength of the evidence supporting each judgement. Throughout the evaluation, higher confidence was achieved where findings could be verified through triangulation across several independent sources.

Confidence Levels

High	Findings supported by multiple independent evidence sources (e.g. meeting minutes, surveys, observations, reports and deliverables).
Moderate–High	Findings supported by two or more complementary evidence sources, although some documentation varied between partner countries.
Moderate	Findings based primarily on publicly available information, participant reflections or limited documentation. Conclusions remain credible but should be interpreted with appropriate caution.

2.3 EVALUATION LIMITATIONS

Several limitations should be acknowledged.

- Documentation varied between partner organisations, particularly regarding local implementation reporting and Youth Panel documentation. Also internal social media analytics and website statistics were not available; therefore, dissemination was assessed through a rapid public desk review of partner websites, project publications and publicly available communication outputs rather than platform analytics.
- While long-term societal impacts cannot yet be fully assessed within the project timeframe, sufficient evidence exists to evaluate early organisational and community-level outcomes together with the project's contribution to future practice.
- Triangulation across multiple evidence sources helped mitigate these limitations and strengthened confidence in the overall findings.

CHAPTER 3. WP1 – PROJECT MANAGEMENT, COORDINATION AND PARTNERSHIP

3.1. PURPOSE OF THE WORK PACKAGE 1

Work Package 1 (WP1) provided the organisational and operational foundation for the SPIN Youth project. Its purpose was to ensure effective project coordination, financial and administrative management, communication among project partners, monitoring of implementation, and the timely delivery of project outputs. As a transnational Erasmus+ Sport project involving partners from multiple European countries and diverse organisational contexts, effective coordination was essential for maintaining project coherence while allowing sufficient flexibility for national adaptation. Beyond administrative coordination, WP1 also played an important role in fostering collaborative decision-making, supporting partner organisations throughout implementation, facilitating communication between work packages, and ensuring that youth participation remained central to the project's implementation and governance.

The evaluation of WP1 therefore considers whether management processes functioned effectively, and also whether coordination mechanisms created favourable conditions for the successful delivery of the project's objectives.

3.2. EVALUATION EVIDENCE FOR WP1

The evaluation of WP1 is based on multiple complementary sources of evidence collected throughout the project lifecycle. These include:

- partner meeting minutes from 2024–2026, including the final implementation phase; - the Interim Evaluation Report;
- observations from project meetings and the Lisbon Closing Conference;
- responses to the final evaluation questionnaire completed by project partners, youth coordinators and other project stakeholders;
- participatory workshop outputs (round-table flipcharts) produced during the Lisbon conference;
- project documentation and internal reporting materials.

The use of multiple evidence sources enabled triangulation between documented project processes, participant experiences, and reflective discussions at project closure, increasing the robustness of the evaluation findings. This combination allowed conclusions to be verified across several independent sources rather than relying on a single perspective.

Evidence Box 3.2 Evaluation Approach

Evidence sources

- **Partner meeting minutes (2024–2026)**
- **Interim evaluation**
- **Final evaluation questionnaire**
- **Lisbon conference observations**
- **Round-table workshop reflections**
- **Project documentation and deliverables**

3.3. FINDINGS OF WP1 PROJECT COORDINATION AND GOVERNANCE

Throughout the project, coordination was characterised by regular communication, collaborative planning and a willingness to adapt to changing circumstances. Monthly partner meetings provided a structured forum for reviewing progress, identifying implementation challenges and agreeing on concrete next steps. Meeting documentation demonstrates that responsibilities were clearly assigned, deadlines regularly reviewed, and actions revisited during subsequent meetings. Rather than functioning as one-way reporting sessions,

meetings became collaborative working spaces where partners jointly solved implementation challenges. This became particularly visible during the final project phase when preparations for the Lisbon Conference, completion of deliverables and financial reporting were managed simultaneously. Responsibilities for conference sessions, workshops, logistics, dissemination activities and remaining outputs were distributed across the partnership according to expertise and available capacity. An important strength observed throughout the project was the partnership's ability to adapt its management practices when circumstances changed. Delays in deliverables, changing timelines and staff transitions did not halt project implementation but were addressed through collective decision-making and revised planning. For example, during the final implementation phase the consortium jointly agreed to request a short project extension to enable meaningful participation of young people in one remaining deliverable rather than producing a lower-quality output without their involvement. Overall, project governance demonstrated a high degree of flexibility while maintaining focus on the project's strategic objectives.

Evidence Box 3.3. Adaptive Project Management

Examples of adaptive management identified during the evaluation include:

- redistribution of responsibilities when implementation challenges emerged;
- revision of timelines where justified;
- preparation of an extension request to ensure meaningful youth participation in remaining outputs;
- continuous review of deliverable status during monthly coordination meetings.

These examples illustrate a management approach that prioritised project quality while remaining responsive to practical implementation realities.

3.4 PARTNERSHIP COLLABORATION

The partnership demonstrated a strong culture of collaboration throughout the project. Meeting minutes consistently show partners contributing beyond their own contractual responsibilities by sharing resources, commenting on deliverables, supporting dissemination activities and assisting with implementation challenges experienced by other organisations. The final conference preparations further illustrate this collaborative approach. Rather than assigning sessions to individual organisations, programme design was undertaken jointly, with partners contributing according to their thematic expertise. Youth coordinators were intentionally integrated into conference sessions, ensuring that project participants were positioned not only as beneficiaries but also as contributors to knowledge exchange. The final evaluation responses also indicate a high level of ownership among respondents. Participants described themselves not only as project partners but also as organisers, coordinators and active contributors to implementation. Several responses emphasised the positive learning experience created through the partnership and the value of working together across countries. At the same time, the evaluation identified some dependence on key individuals. One respondent noted that the departure of a core staff member required remaining coordinators to assume additional responsibilities, with potential implications for management quality. This observation suggests that future projects would benefit from stronger succession planning and more systematic transfer of organisational knowledge.

3.5 COMMUNICATION AND DECISION-MAKING

Communication within the consortium was generally effective and transparent. Regular online meetings, shared documentation and clearly assigned action points created a common understanding of project priorities and upcoming tasks. However, communication also required continuous facilitation. Throughout the project, recurring discussions focused on reporting requirements, deliverable status, financial procedures and clarification of responsibilities. Rather than indicating poor communication, these recurring discussions reflect the complexity of coordinating a multi-country Erasmus+ project with numerous interconnected outputs. The participatory workshop discussions held during the Lisbon conference provide additional insight into communication from the perspective of project participants. Across several workshop groups, participants

repeatedly identified communication, regular check-ins, role clarity, empathy, listening and follow-up meetings as essential ingredients for successful youth participation. These reflections suggest that effective communication should be viewed not merely as an administrative process but as an enabling condition for meaningful participation and co-creation.

Evidence Box 3.5 Participant Reflections from the Lisbon Conference

Across multiple workshop groups, participants independently highlighted:

- regular communication and check-ins;
- clearly defined roles and responsibilities;
- empathy and active listening;
- structured follow-up;
- consensus building;
- maintaining relationships beyond project activities.

The consistency of these reflections across different discussion groups suggests that communication was recognised as both a project strength and an area requiring continuous attention.

3.6 MONITORING, REPORTING AND ADMINISTRATIVE MANAGEMENT

Monitoring and reporting systems supported the overall implementation of the project but also represented one of the most demanding aspects of project management during the final implementation phase. Meeting minutes demonstrate sustained attention to financial reporting, narrative reporting, deliverable tracking and preparation for possible audits. Templates were continuously refined, partners requested clarification regarding reporting requirements, and additional guidance was provided whenever European Commission requirements evolved. Although these discussions required considerable time and administrative effort, they also demonstrate proactive management rather than reactive problem-solving. Project coordination invested substantial effort in supporting partners through reporting processes, preparing common templates and clarifying responsibilities.

Nevertheless, the evaluation also indicates that monitoring relied heavily on regular communication and partner commitment rather than on a structured performance monitoring system with predefined indicators or implementation dashboards. Progress was effectively monitored through meetings and shared documents, but the project would likely have benefited from more systematic monitoring tools that enabled earlier identification of implementation risks.

3.7 CONFERENCE ORGANISATION AND PROJECT CLOSURE

The Lisbon Closing Conference represented both a dissemination event and an opportunity for collective reflection on project achievements. Conference planning was characterised by careful logistical preparation, collaborative programme development and strong emphasis on youth participation. Youth coordinators were actively integrated into conference sessions, while interactive workshop formats were prioritised over traditional presentations. Feedback collected through the final evaluation indicates that participants particularly valued opportunities for networking, learning from project experiences, increasing their understanding of youth participation and becoming more aware of project outcomes. The conference therefore fulfilled both dissemination and capacity-building functions.

The workshop reflections produced during the conference also generated valuable qualitative evidence for this evaluation. Participants discussed not only project achievements but also future improvements, highlighting themes such as sustaining youth participation, strengthening communication, supporting role transitions, and embedding action research more firmly within organisational practice. These discussions demonstrate that project closure was used not merely to celebrate achievements but also to critically reflect on future development.

3.8. EVALUATION AGAINST THE CRITERIA

Relevance of the project coordination. WP1 remained highly relevant throughout the project. Coordination mechanisms successfully supported increasingly complex implementation activities while remaining aligned with the project's objective of promoting meaningful youth participation and inclusive sport.

Effectiveness of project coordination maintaining implementation was high across all work packages despite delays, changing circumstances and evolving project needs. Regular meetings, collaborative decision-making and adaptive planning enabled the partnership to address emerging challenges without compromising the overall project direction.

Efficiency was assessed as moderate to high. Coordination processes were generally well organised and responsive. However, the administrative burden associated with reporting, financial management and documentation increased considerably during the final implementation phase, requiring substantial partner resources.

The quality of project management was high. Evidence demonstrates transparent communication, collaborative leadership, shared ownership and consistent commitment to project objectives. The partnership culture supported constructive problem-solving and mutual assistance throughout implementation.

Sustainability of the project. The partnership established strong relationships and collaborative practices that are likely to continue beyond the project lifetime. Participants repeatedly discussed continuation of youth panels, future cooperation and further development of project outputs. However, sustaining youth participation beyond project funding will require continued organisational commitment and dedicated resources.

3.9. OVERALL EVALUATION OF WP1

Work Package 1 successfully provided the organisational framework required to deliver a complex transnational Erasmus+ Sport project. Project coordination combined structured management with sufficient flexibility to respond to emerging implementation challenges while maintaining a strong focus on youth participation and collaborative working. The evaluation identified several notable strengths, including a highly committed partnership, adaptive management practices, transparent decision-making and effective coordination of the final project phase. The consortium demonstrated resilience in responding to staff changes, evolving reporting requirements and implementation delays while continuing to progress towards project objectives. The principal areas for improvement relate to monitoring and knowledge management. Future projects would benefit from more systematic implementation tracking, clearer performance indicators, and stronger mechanisms for transferring knowledge when key staff members change roles. Overall, WP1 created favourable conditions for the successful implementation of the remaining work packages and made a substantial contribution to the overall success of the SPIN Youth project.

Final evaluation of WP1

Criterion	Assessment
Relevance	High
Effectiveness	High
Efficiency	Moderate–High
Quality	High
Sustainability	Moderate–High

CHAPTER 4 WP2 – EMPOWERMENT AND CAPACITY BUILDING OF YOUNG PEOPLE WITH DIVERSE BACKGROUNDS

4.1 PURPOSE OF THE WORK PACKAGE 2

Work Package 2 (WP2) formed the foundation of the SPIN Youth project by equipping young people from diverse backgrounds with the knowledge, skills and confidence required to become active leaders within their communities. While subsequent work packages focused on youth panels, action research, youth-led action plans and dissemination activities, WP2 established the human capacity necessary for these activities to succeed.

The work package was built around the European Youth Training Academy (EYTA), held in Rome in September 2024, followed by online support meetings throughout the implementation period. Rather than functioning as a stand-alone training course, the Academy was intentionally designed as the first stage of a longer capacity-building pathway. Participants were expected to return to their countries as Youth Coordinators, establish local Youth Panels, facilitate participatory Action Research, co-design local Action Plans and ultimately contribute to the European Networking Conference and project legacy. The evaluation therefore examines not only whether the training was successfully delivered, but also whether it enabled participants to translate learning into sustained youth leadership throughout the remainder of the project.

4.2 EVALUATION EVIDENCE

The evaluation of WP2 draws upon a comprehensive range of qualitative and quantitative evidence collected before, during and after the European Youth Training Academy.

Evidence sources include:

- Project brochure and Youth Coordinator recruitment materials;
- European Youth Training Academy curriculum and training programme;
- Action Research guidance, Focus Group guidance and supporting methodological materials;
- Baseline questionnaires completed by Youth Coordinators and partner organisations prior to the Academy;
- Semi-structured interviews conducted with Youth Coordinators during the Academy;
- Evaluator observations from the Academy in Rome;
- Mentimeter reflections collected during training;
- Project meeting minutes documenting implementation and follow-up;
- Final participant survey conducted during the Lisbon Conference;
- Round-table reflections produced by participants at the final conference;
- Photographic documentation of the Academy and learning activities.

The combination of documentary evidence, participant perspectives, direct observation and end-of-project reflections enabled the evaluation to assess both immediate learning outcomes and longer-term application of knowledge throughout the project lifecycle.

Practice Example: A Capacity-Building Pathway

Unlike many short-term training activities, the European Youth Training Academy was designed as the starting point of a longer developmental process.

Youth Coordinators progressed through successive stages of responsibility:

Recruitment → European Youth Training Academy → Youth Panels → Action Research → Youth-led Action Plans → European Week of Sports → Continued youth leadership.

This progression became one of the defining characteristics of the SPIN Youth project and distinguishes WP2 from a conventional training intervention.

4.3 DESIGN AND IMPLEMENTATION OF THE EUROPEAN YOUTH TRAINING ACADEMY

The Academy brought together Youth Coordinators from all project countries to establish a common understanding of youth participation, inclusion and diversity in sport. Recruitment was undertaken through an open call targeting young people aged approximately 15–27 years with an interest in inclusive sport and youth participation, while actively encouraging applications from young people with diverse backgrounds, including migrant, refugee and ethnic minority communities. The curriculum demonstrates that the Academy was intentionally designed around experiential learning principles rather than traditional classroom teaching. Learning activities combined theoretical input with practical exercises, reflection, collaborative problem-solving and movement-based learning. Participants were introduced to Action Research methodologies, qualitative research techniques, facilitation skills, group dynamics, inclusive leadership and youth participation models before applying these concepts through practical group exercises. Observation during the Academy confirmed a highly participatory learning environment. Rather than relying on lectures, facilitators consistently used small-group discussions, simulations, role-play, outdoor learning, reflection circles, collaborative planning and sport-based activities. Participants progressively assumed greater responsibility for discussions and presentations as the training advanced, reflecting the curriculum's emphasis on learning by doing. The photographic documentation further supports these observations. Images from the three training days illustrate an intentional progression from relationship-building and trust exercises on the first day, towards collaborative planning, practical facilitation exercises and participant-led presentations during the later stages of the Academy. Blindfold activities, teamwork exercises and outdoor reflection sessions demonstrated how experiential methodologies were used to develop empathy, communication and inclusive leadership skills. The Academy therefore provided not only technical knowledge but also a psychologically safe environment in which participants could develop confidence, build relationships across countries and experience participatory leadership in practice.

Evidence Box: Evaluator Observation

Observation of the European Youth Training Academy indicated that the training environment consistently reflected the pedagogical principles described in the curriculum. Participants worked in mixed-nationality groups, regularly rotated roles, engaged in experiential exercises and participated in structured reflection sessions. Facilitation progressively shifted responsibility from trainers towards participants, reinforcing ownership of learning and encouraging peer-to-peer exchange.

4.4 DEVELOPMENT OF KNOWLEDGE, SKILLS AND LEADERSHIP COMPETENCES

The baseline questionnaires and interviews conducted during the Academy indicate that participants entered the project with diverse educational backgrounds, levels of experience and expectations. While many expressed strong motivation to promote inclusion through sport, several also reported uncertainties regarding how to establish Youth Panels, recruit participants from diverse communities or facilitate participatory research within their organisations.

These findings demonstrate that the Academy addressed genuine capacity-building needs rather than duplicating existing knowledge.

The curriculum responded directly to these needs by combining conceptual understanding with practical skill development. Participants developed competences in:

- facilitating inclusive group processes;
- designing and conducting Action Research;
- developing research questions;
- organising focus groups;
- communication and active listening;
- intercultural cooperation;
- project planning and facilitation;
- reflective practice;

- collaborative decision-making.

Interviews conducted during the Academy suggest that participants increasingly viewed themselves not simply as project beneficiaries but as facilitators capable of creating change within their own communities. Many described gaining confidence in leading discussions, engaging with diverse young people and applying participatory methods within their organisations. The educational design also supported personal development beyond technical competences. Trust-building exercises, peer learning and collaborative reflection encouraged empathy, mutual respect and intercultural understanding among participants from different national and cultural contexts. These softer competences later became visible in the facilitation of Youth Panels and local activities.

Practice Example: Learning Through Experience

Rather than teaching inclusion as a theoretical concept, participants experienced inclusive facilitation directly through collaborative exercises, simulations and reflection. Activities such as blindfold football, cooperative problem-solving and role-switching encouraged participants to experience barriers, trust, communication and leadership from different perspectives. This experiential approach was repeatedly reflected in participant interviews and observations throughout the Academy.

4.5 FROM TRAINING TO LOCAL ACTION

One of the strongest findings emerging from this evaluation is that the European Youth Training Academy functioned as the beginning of a structured implementation pathway rather than an isolated educational event. Participants did not leave Rome with only theoretical knowledge. They returned with practical resources that enabled implementation within their own organisations, including:

- Action Research guidelines;
- Focus Group guidance;
- templates for developing research questions;
- SMART planning tools;
- implementation timelines;
- online mentoring and follow-up meetings.

The curriculum deliberately prepared participants for the subsequent work packages by introducing the methods that would later be applied within Youth Panels and Action Research. This continuity between learning and implementation represents one of the strongest design features of the SPIN Youth project.

Evidence from later work packages supports this conclusion. Youth Coordinators established Youth Panels across participating countries, facilitated Action Research, developed local Action Plans and presented their experiences during the European Networking Conference. While implementation varied between countries according to local contexts, the overall progression demonstrates that learning was transferred into practice. Rather than ending with participant satisfaction, the evaluation therefore considers successful implementation of WP3 and WP4 as evidence that the objectives of WP2 were largely achieved.

4.6 EVALUATION AGAINST THE CRITERIA

Relevance

WP2 demonstrated a high level of relevance. Baseline questionnaires and participant interviews confirmed that young people required practical knowledge and facilitation skills to promote inclusion within their organisations and communities. The curriculum directly addressed these identified needs through participatory, practice-oriented learning rather than theoretical instruction.

Effectiveness

The Academy successfully achieved its immediate capacity-building objectives. Participants acquired practical competences in facilitation, Action Research, group leadership and participatory planning. Evidence from

subsequent work packages indicates that these competences were subsequently applied through Youth Panels, Action Research and youth-led Action Plans.

Efficiency

Resources were used efficiently through the integration of multiple learning objectives within one coherent training process. Rather than providing separate courses on research, facilitation and leadership, the Academy combined these elements into one structured programme supported by subsequent online mentoring. The follow-up meetings further increased the likelihood that learning would be transferred into practice.

Quality

The quality of the educational design was high. The curriculum demonstrated strong pedagogical coherence, combining experiential learning, reflection, peer exchange and practical application. Observation confirmed that facilitation methods consistently reflected the principles promoted within the curriculum, creating an inclusive and highly participatory learning environment.

Sustainability

WP2 achieved moderate to high sustainability. Rather than producing short-term learning outcomes only, the Academy established a network of Youth Coordinators who continued working together throughout the project. The practical tools, Action Research methodologies and facilitation competences developed during the Academy continued to be applied through subsequent work packages, increasing the likelihood that knowledge and methods will remain within participating organisations beyond the project lifetime.

4.7 STRENGTHS

Several strengths emerged consistently across the evaluation evidence. The Academy successfully combined leadership development, research methodology and inclusive facilitation within one integrated learning process, enabling participants to apply knowledge immediately upon returning to their countries. The educational methodology reflected good practice in adult and non-formal education. Learning was highly participatory, experiential and reflective, allowing participants to build confidence through practical application rather than passive instruction. The continuity between the Academy and subsequent project activities represented a significant strength. Participants received not only training but also practical guidance, tools and continued mentoring, supporting implementation throughout the remainder of the project. Finally, the emphasis on intercultural dialogue, diversity and peer learning created a strong sense of community among Youth Coordinators, strengthening both personal development and transnational cooperation.

4.8 CHALLENGES AND AREAS FOR IMPROVEMENT

Although the overall assessment of WP2 is highly positive, several challenges emerged during implementation. Participants entered the Academy with varying levels of previous experience, requiring facilitators to balance different learning needs throughout the programme. The ambitious scope of the curriculum also meant that participants were introduced to numerous concepts within a relatively short period, making the subsequent online follow-up meetings particularly important for consolidating learning. Implementation after the Academy depended heavily on the organisational capacity of partner organisations and the local contexts in which Youth Coordinators operated. Consequently, the pace and scale of implementation varied across participating countries. Future projects could strengthen this model by providing additional structured mentoring during the first months following the Academy and by introducing more systematic monitoring of participant progression between the training event and local implementation.

4.9 OVERALL EVALUATION OF WP2

Work Package 2 represents one of the strongest components of the SPIN Youth project. Rather than functioning as a stand-alone training event, the European Youth Training Academy established a comprehensive capacity-building pathway that enabled young people to become facilitators, researchers and community leaders within their own countries. The evaluation demonstrates that the Academy successfully

combined high-quality educational design with practical implementation tools, creating favourable conditions for the successful delivery of subsequent work packages. Evidence from Youth Panels, Action Research and youth-led Action Plans indicates that participants transferred learning into practice, suggesting that the Academy generated outcomes extending well beyond the immediate training period. The principal contribution of WP2 therefore lies not only in increasing participants' knowledge, but in creating a sustainable network of empowered Youth Coordinators capable of promoting inclusive sport through participatory leadership, research and local action. This developmental pathway represents one of the most innovative and valuable aspects of the SPIN Youth project and provides a model that could be replicated in future European youth and sport initiatives.

Final evaluation of WP2

Criterion	Assessment
Relevance	High
Effectiveness	High
Efficiency	High
Quality	High
Sustainability	Moderate–High

CHAPTER 5 WORK PACKAGE 3 EVALUATION ON PARTICIPATION, BARRIERS AND NEEDS OF DIVERSE YOUTH IN SPORTS: YOUTH PANELS AND YOUTH-LED ACTION RESEARCH

5.1 PURPOSE AND EVALUATION SCOPE OF WP3

Work Package 3 represented the core participatory component of the SPIN Youth project. Building on the capacity development achieved through the Youth Training Academy (WP2), WP3 transferred responsibility to young people themselves. Rather than positioning youth merely as participants or beneficiaries, the project established them as researchers, co-creators and advocates for inclusive sport.

The work package sought to:

- establish Youth Panels in each partner country;
- support youth-led action research on barriers and enablers to sport participation;
- enable young people to analyse local needs and develop evidence-based recommendations;
- prepare youth-led action plans for implementation in WP4; and
- produce practical resources to support wider uptake of youth participation approaches in sport organisations.

This evaluation draws upon project documentation, national action research reports, Youth Panel outputs, action plans, survey findings, photographs documenting implementation, dissemination materials, and the final project publications, including the Handbook on Youth Participation in Sport, Guidelines for Establishing Youth Action Plans for Sport, and the Action Research Summary Report.

5.2 IMPLEMENTATION OF WP3

Following the Youth Training Academy in Rome, Youth Coordinators established Youth Panels within their respective countries. Each panel brought together young people from diverse backgrounds, including migrants, refugees and ethnic minority communities, reflecting the project's commitment to inclusion and representation.

Unlike traditional consultation approaches, the Youth Panels operated as active working groups. Young participants selected research topics relevant to their local communities, designed research activities, gathered information through interviews, surveys and discussions, analysed findings and presented recommendations to project partners and local stakeholders.

Evidence collected across partner countries demonstrates that Youth Panels developed into collaborative spaces where young people gained confidence to express opinions, negotiate priorities and engage directly with organisations responsible for sport provision.

Implementation followed a common methodology while allowing flexibility for national contexts. Consequently, research topics reflected local priorities, including:

- barriers preventing young migrants from participating in organised sport;
- financial and bureaucratic obstacles;
- language and cultural barriers;
- accessibility for young people with disabilities;
- representation of diverse youth in leadership roles;
- community cohesion through sport;
- reconciliation between communities; and
- inclusive club environments.

Although research questions differed between countries, they collectively addressed the overarching objective of improving inclusion through youth-led evidence generation.

Evidence Box 5.2 **Evidence supporting implementation**

- Youth Panels established across eight partner countries.
- National action research reports completed.
- Youth-led interviews, surveys and discussion groups conducted.
- National presentations of findings.
- Documentation of Youth Panel meetings and research activities.
- Action research summary report synthesising findings across Europe.

5.3 QUALITY OF THE YOUTH-LED ACTION RESEARCH

One of the most innovative aspects of WP3 was the use of youth-led action research. Rather than conducting research about young people, the project enabled young people themselves to investigate issues affecting participation in sport. This participatory methodology strengthened both the quality of evidence and the educational value of the process. Youth Coordinators acted primarily as facilitators while research decisions increasingly rested with panel members. Across countries, the evaluation identified several strengths.

First, research questions emerged from local realities rather than external assumptions. This resulted in investigations that reflected practical challenges experienced by young people within their own communities.

Second, combining interviews, surveys, observations and group discussions generated rich qualitative evidence that would have been difficult to obtain through standard consultation methods alone.

Third, involvement in research substantially strengthened participants' confidence and leadership capacities. Young people reported increased ability to facilitate discussions, communicate with stakeholders and present evidence publicly. The cross-national Action Research Summary Report further demonstrates that, despite different national contexts, similar barriers emerged across Europe. Financial constraints, transport difficulties, bureaucratic requirements, language barriers, discrimination, limited representation and lack of welcoming environments consistently influenced participation among young people from diverse backgrounds.

This consistency strengthens confidence in the overall findings while highlighting the transferability of recommendations developed through the project.

Evidence Box 5.3

Evidence of research quality

- Eight national youth-led action research projects completed.
- Cross-country synthesis identifying common barriers and enabling factors.
- Youth-led presentations to stakeholders.
- Comparable findings emerging across partner countries despite different local contexts.

5.4 DEVELOPMENT OF YOUTH-LED ACTION PLANS

The research phase directly informed the development of Youth Action Plans. Rather than producing generic recommendations, Youth Panels translated research findings into practical, locally relevant actions using a SMART planning framework. This represented an important transition from identifying problems towards designing achievable solutions. Action plans addressed issues such as improving recruitment of diverse participants, reducing practical barriers, creating buddy systems, strengthening cooperation with schools and community organisations, increasing female participation, improving accessibility and expanding opportunities for young people to assume leadership roles within sport organisations. The evaluation found a clear logical progression between research findings and proposed interventions. This strengthened the internal coherence of the work package and prepared a solid foundation for implementation during WP4. Importantly, youth remained central throughout the planning process. Action plans were developed collaboratively with support from partner organisations but retained clear youth ownership.

Evidence Box 5.4

Evidence supporting action planning

- SMART-based action plans developed in every partner country.
- Research findings directly informed planned activities.

- Youth participated in planning, prioritisation and presentation of actions.
- Action plans prepared implementation during the European Week of Sport.

5.5 PRODUCTION OF KNOWLEDGE RESOURCES IN WP3

Beyond local implementation, WP3 generated three significant intellectual outputs designed to support wider transfer and sustainability. The *Handbook on Youth Participation in Sport* translates project experience into practical guidance for clubs and sport organisations seeking to strengthen meaningful youth participation. It presents principles of youth participation, practical implementation steps, participation models and lessons learned from the Youth Panels. The *Guidelines for Establishing Youth Action Plans for Sport* provide a practical framework for organisations wishing to replicate the SPIN Youth methodology. The publication explains youth-led action research, stakeholder engagement, SMART planning and implementation processes, supported by examples from partner countries. Finally, the *Action Research on Sport and Inclusion – Summary Report* synthesises findings from all participating countries. Rather than presenting isolated case studies, it identifies common European barriers and demonstrates how participatory action research can generate locally relevant evidence while supporting youth empowerment. Together these publications significantly enhance the sustainability of WP3. They ensure that methodologies developed during the project remain accessible beyond the funding period and can be adapted by other organisations across Europe.

Evidence Box 5.5 Knowledge outputs

- Handbook on Youth Participation in Sport.
- Guidelines for Establishing Youth Action Plans for Sport.
- European Action Research Summary Report.
- Transferable methodologies supporting replication beyond the project lifetime.

5.6 EVALUATION FINDINGS OF WP3

Overall, WP3 was implemented successfully and represented one of the strongest examples of meaningful youth participation within the SPIN Youth project. The evaluation indicates that young people moved well beyond consultation towards genuine participation in research, analysis, planning and decision-making. The work package successfully combined individual learning with organisational development, producing benefits both for participants and partner organisations. The participatory research methodology proved particularly valuable, generating locally relevant evidence while simultaneously developing leadership, communication and analytical skills among Youth Panel members. Furthermore, WP3 established a clear bridge between capacity building (WP2) and practical implementation (WP4). Evidence generated through the Youth Panels directly informed locally tailored action plans, increasing the likelihood that subsequent activities addressed genuine needs identified by young people themselves.

The production of high-quality guidance materials further strengthened the project's long-term impact by making the methodology accessible to external organisations interested in youth participation and inclusive sport development.

5.7 EVALUATION OF WP3 AGAINST THE CRITERIA

Relevance. WP3 demonstrated a high level of relevance by placing young people at the centre of identifying barriers to sport participation within their own communities. Rather than investigating predefined themes, Youth Panels selected locally meaningful research questions while contributing to the broader objectives of improving inclusion, diversity and participation in sport. This participatory approach ensured that research reflected genuine community needs and strengthened ownership among young participants.

Effectiveness. The work package successfully established Youth Panels across the partner countries and supported the completion of youth-led Action Research projects addressing a wide range of inclusion challenges. Research findings were synthesised at both national and European levels and were subsequently used to inform the development of Youth Action Plans under WP4. The production of the Handbook, Guidelines and European Summary Report further demonstrates that the work package achieved its planned intellectual outputs.

Efficiency. WP3 made efficient use of resources by building directly on the competences developed during the European Youth Training Academy. Common methodological guidance, templates and reporting structures provided consistency across the consortium while allowing flexibility for local adaptation. The integration of Youth Panels, Action Research and Action Planning created a coherent implementation process that avoided duplication between work packages.

The quality of WP3 was strengthened by its participatory methodology. Young people acted as researchers, facilitators and presenters rather than simply respondents. Common guidance documents supported methodological consistency, while local flexibility enabled partners to investigate issues that were relevant within their own contexts. The resulting research demonstrated strong thematic consistency across countries despite differing research questions.

Sustainability. WP3 generated substantial resources that extend beyond the lifetime of the project. The Handbook on Youth Participation in Sport, the Guidelines for Establishing Youth Action Plans for Sport and the European Action Research Summary Report provide practical methodologies that can be adopted by other organisations. Furthermore, the Action Research directly informed WP4 activities, demonstrating sustainability within the project itself by ensuring that research findings influenced implementation.

5.8 STRENGTHS OF WP3

The evaluation identified several notable strengths. The most significant strength was the successful implementation of a genuinely participatory research model. Young people were positioned not as research subjects but as co-researchers, enabling them to investigate issues affecting their own communities while developing leadership, communication and analytical skills. A second strength was the integration between work packages. The progression from Youth Training Academy (WP2) to Youth Panels and Action Research (WP3), and subsequently to Youth-led Action Plans (WP4), created a coherent project pathway in which learning, evidence generation and implementation reinforced one another. The production of high-quality methodological outputs—including the Handbook, Guidelines and Summary Report—also strengthened the long-term value of the work package by making project learning accessible beyond the consortium. Finally, despite differing national contexts, the Action Research projects consistently identified similar structural, cultural and organisational barriers to participation, increasing confidence in the overall European findings.

5.9 CHALLENGES AND AREAS FOR IMPROVEMENT IN WP3

Implementation varied between partner countries according to organisational capacity, local partnerships and participant availability. As a result, the scope and scale of Youth Panel activities differed across contexts. While methodological guidance was comprehensive, documentation of Youth Panel meetings was uneven. More systematic collection of meeting records, attendance data and participant reflections would have strengthened the evidence base for evaluating implementation processes. Future projects could also benefit from introducing a common monitoring framework for Youth Panels, allowing more consistent reporting of participation, research activities and stakeholder engagement while preserving flexibility in local implementation.

5.10 OVERALL EVALUATION OF WP3

Work Package 3 represents one of the defining components of the SPIN Youth project. It successfully transformed young people from project participants into researchers, facilitators and contributors to organisational development. Through Youth Panels and participatory Action Research, the project generated

locally relevant evidence while simultaneously strengthening youth leadership and civic engagement. The work package also established a strong bridge between research and action. Evidence generated by young people informed the development of locally tailored Action Plans and contributed directly to implementation during the European Week of Sport. The accompanying Handbook, Guidelines and European Summary Report further ensure that the methodologies and lessons learned remain available for future projects and organisations. Overall, WP3 demonstrates that meaningful youth participation can generate both high-quality evidence and practical organisational change when supported through structured capacity building and participatory methodologies.

Final Evaluation of WP3

Criterion	Assessment
Relevance	High
Effectiveness	High
Efficiency	Moderate–High
Quality	High
Sustainability	High

CHAPTER 6 WORK PACKAGE 4 EVALUATION ON YOUTH CO-CREATION OF SPORT INCLUSION ACTIVITIES

6.1 PURPOSE AND EVALUATION SCOPE OF WP4

Work Package 4 (WP4) represented the implementation phase of the SPIN Youth project. Building directly on the knowledge, skills and evidence generated through Work Packages 2 and 3, WP4 translated youth-led research into practical community action. Rather than designing activities centrally, the project enabled Youth Panels to develop locally relevant Action Plans based on the barriers, needs and opportunities identified through participatory Action Research. The objective of WP4 was therefore not simply to organise sport activities, but to demonstrate that young people can meaningfully contribute to designing and implementing inclusive sport initiatives that respond to local realities. Across participating countries, Youth Panels developed SMART Action Plans and implemented activities during and around the European Week of Sport 2025. These activities were intended to increase participation of young people from diverse backgrounds, strengthen dialogue between youth and sport organisations, raise awareness of inclusion and diversity, and test practical approaches that could continue beyond the project. This evaluation assesses the quality of implementation, the extent to which activities reflected the evidence generated during WP3, and the contribution of WP4 to the project's overall impact.

6.2 FROM EVIDENCE TO ACTION IN WP4

One of the strongest features of WP4 was the clear progression from research to implementation. Action Plans were not developed independently of previous work but were explicitly informed by the findings generated through Youth Panels and Action Research. Across participating countries, Action Plans followed a common methodological framework based on SMART objectives while allowing sufficient flexibility to respond to local priorities. As a result, implementation differed between countries but remained aligned with the overall objectives of improving inclusion, increasing participation and strengthening youth leadership.

Evidence Box 6.2

From research to implementation

Across all participating countries the implementation process followed a coherent progression:

Youth Training Academy

↓

Youth Panels

↓

Youth-led Action Research

↓

SMART Action Plans

↓

European Week of Sport implementation

↓

Reflection and dissemination

This intervention pathway demonstrates that project activities were evidence-informed rather than activity-driven.

Examples include:

- organising inclusive sport tournaments and festivals;
- youth-led discussion circles on diversity and inclusion;

- workshops with local sport clubs and community organisations;
- awareness campaigns promoting inclusive sport participation;
- activities engaging migrant and refugee youth;
- initiatives encouraging girls and young women to participate in sport;
- stakeholder dialogue with municipalities, schools and clubs.

The evaluation found a strong logical connection between the Action Research findings and the activities subsequently implemented. Rather than delivering predetermined events, Youth Panels designed interventions that addressed barriers identified within their own communities. This significantly strengthened the relevance of WP4.

6.3 YOUTH-LED IMPLEMENTATION DURING THE EUROPEAN WEEK OF SPORT

The European Week of Sport provided the principal implementation period for WP4 and represented the point at which project planning became visible within local communities. Photographic documentation and implementation materials demonstrate that activities were organised across multiple partner countries and reflected considerable diversity in both format and target groups. Activities included sport tournaments, dialogue sessions, public awareness events, workshops, focus groups and community engagement initiatives. Importantly, young people assumed active leadership roles throughout implementation. Rather than participating solely as beneficiaries, Youth Panel members facilitated discussions, organised events, presented project findings, engaged with stakeholders and represented SPIN Youth publicly. Observation of implementation materials indicates that activities consistently reflected the participatory principles promoted throughout the project. Discussions, collaborative exercises and sport-based methodologies remained central, while formal presentations were balanced with practical engagement and peer learning. The visual documentation also demonstrates consistent use of SPIN Youth branding across countries, contributing to a coherent European identity while allowing partners flexibility in designing locally appropriate activities.

Case Example: The Netherlands

In the Netherlands, implementation focused on increasing participation among newcomer youth through a community sport event. Activities responded directly to barriers identified during Action Research, including lack of information, limited access to organised sport and social integration challenges. The event combined sport participation with informal community engagement, demonstrating how locally identified needs informed implementation.

Case Example: Ireland

Irish implementation brought together sport clubs, community organisations and local stakeholders through an inclusive community event. Activities promoted dialogue on diversity and inclusion while strengthening partnerships between organisations supporting young people from migrant backgrounds.

6.4 EARLY OUTCOMES AND PROJECT CONTRIBUTION OF WP4

Although the project timeframe limits assessment of long-term impact, evidence indicates several important early outcomes. First, WP4 demonstrated that youth-generated evidence can successfully inform practical community interventions. The transition from Action Research to implementation represents one of the project's strongest achievements and confirms that young people were able to apply the knowledge and skills developed during earlier work packages. Second, implementation strengthened youth leadership in practice. Final evaluation responses indicate that participants acted as organisers, Youth Panel coordinators, facilitators and active contributors rather than passive participants. Several respondents described organising activities together with their clubs, implementing Youth Panel ideas and coordinating local project activities. Third, implementation strengthened cooperation between youth, sport organisations and local stakeholders. Activities frequently involved clubs, schools, municipalities, volunteers and community organisations,

increasing the visibility of youth participation within local sport systems. Finally, implementation contributed to wider awareness of inclusion in sport. Public activities organised during the European Week of Sport increased opportunities for dialogue on diversity, migration and participation while demonstrating positive examples of inclusive practice.

Evidence Box 6.4

Evidence from the final participant survey

Final evaluation responses demonstrate active implementation across partner countries:

- Respondents reported that their organisation hosted a SPIN Youth activity.
- Participants described organising youth dialogue circles, football tournaments, focus groups and community events.
- Respondents reported acting as organisers, Youth Panel coordinators and active project contributors.
- Activities combined sport participation with discussion, awareness raising and stakeholder engagement.

These findings indicate that implementation extended beyond project partners and reached local communities through youth-led activities.

6.5 EVALUATION OF WP4 AGAINST THE CRITERIA

Relevance. WP4 demonstrated a high level of relevance. Activities responded directly to barriers identified through Youth-led Action Research and reflected local priorities rather than predetermined project outputs. The flexibility provided to Youth Panels enabled implementation to remain context-sensitive while contributing to common European objectives.

Effectiveness. The work package successfully translated Action Plans into visible implementation across participating countries. Evidence confirms that Youth Panels organised activities, engaged local stakeholders and implemented initiatives during the European Week of Sport. Youth leadership remained evident throughout implementation, indicating that the objectives of promoting meaningful participation were largely achieved.

Efficiency. Resources were used efficiently through integration with existing community structures, including local sport clubs, schools, municipalities and European Week of Sport activities. Existing partnerships increased the reach of activities while reducing duplication of effort. The use of common planning templates also supported consistent implementation across countries.

Quality. Implementation quality was strengthened by the participatory methodology developed throughout the project. Activities reflected youth ownership, collaborative planning and evidence-informed decision-making rather than one-off awareness campaigns. The diversity of implementation models demonstrated adaptability while maintaining fidelity to the project's overall objectives.

Sustainability. WP4 established favourable conditions for sustainability by embedding activities within local organisations and producing practical experience that informed subsequent project outputs. Although continuation will depend upon partner organisations and local resources, the project successfully demonstrated approaches that can be replicated beyond the project period.

6.6 STRENGTHS OF WP4

Several strengths emerged consistently across the evaluation evidence. A major strength was the successful translation of youth-generated evidence into practical community action. Rather than separating research from implementation, the project established a coherent pathway linking Youth Panels, Action Research and local activities. The flexibility afforded to partners enabled Action Plans to respond to local circumstances while maintaining consistency with the project's objectives. This strengthened both relevance and local ownership. Youth leadership remained visible throughout implementation. Young people acted as facilitators, organisers and ambassadors, demonstrating that meaningful participation extended beyond consultation and into practical decision-making and implementation. Finally, implementation during the European Week of Sport significantly increased the visibility of project activities by connecting local initiatives with a recognised European platform for sport promotion.

6.7 CHALLENGES AND AREAS FOR IMPROVEMENT

Implementation varied across participating countries according to organisational capacity, local partnerships and available resources. While this flexibility represented a strength, it also created variation in the scale, documentation and visibility of activities. Monitoring of implementation could have been strengthened through more systematic collection of participant numbers, stakeholder feedback and short outcome reports following local activities. Such information would have supported more detailed assessment of immediate outcomes and facilitated comparison across partner countries. Several activities also relied heavily on the commitment of Youth Coordinators and partner organisations. Future projects could strengthen sustainability by establishing formal mechanisms for continuing Youth Panels and integrating successful Action Plans into the regular programming of participating sport organisations.

6.8 CONCLUSIONS ON WP4

The evaluation concludes that Work Package 4 successfully transformed youth-generated knowledge into practical community action. The implementation phase demonstrated that young people were capable of designing, organising and delivering locally relevant sport inclusion initiatives while engaging a broad range of community stakeholders. Rather than implementing identical activities across Europe, partners adapted Action Plans to their local contexts while maintaining a common participatory methodology. This flexibility strengthened relevance without compromising coherence. The principal achievement of WP4 therefore lies not simply in the number of events organised, but in demonstrating a replicable model through which young people can identify barriers, develop solutions and lead implementation within their own communities. By connecting evidence generation with practical action, WP4 represents the culmination of the project's participatory approach and provides a strong foundation for the sustainability and transferability of the SPIN Youth methodology.

Final evaluation of WP4

Criterion	Assessment
Relevance	High
Effectiveness	High
Efficiency	Moderate–High
Quality	High
Sustainability	Moderate–High

CHAPTER 7. WORK PACKAGE 5 EVALUATION ON COMMUNICATION, DISSEMINATION AND SUSTAINABILITY OF PROJECT RESULTS

7.1 PURPOSE AND EVALUATION SCOPE

Work Package 5 (WP5) aimed to maximise the visibility, dissemination and long-term sustainability of the SPIN Youth project. Building upon the activities implemented throughout the project, WP5 focused on communicating project achievements, sharing knowledge products, promoting inclusive sport practices and ensuring that project methodologies remain available for future use beyond the funded project period. Unlike previous work packages, which focused primarily on implementation, WP5 concentrated on extending the project's reach and supporting its long-term legacy through communication, dissemination and exploitation of results.

This evaluation is based on a review of project documentation, public project websites, partner websites, publicly available dissemination materials, publications, conference outputs and other publicly accessible communication channels. Internal communication analytics (e.g. website traffic, social media reach and engagement statistics) were not available for review; therefore, dissemination has been assessed primarily through evidence of publicly visible outputs, communication quality and sustainability potential.

7.2 COMMUNICATION AND DISSEMINATION ACTIVITIES

Dissemination was implemented throughout the project rather than being concentrated at its conclusion. Communication accompanied each major project milestone, including the European Youth Training Academy, Youth Panel activities, Action Research, European Week of Sport implementation and the final European Networking Conference in Lisbon.

Public dissemination occurred through multiple complementary channels, including:

- the central SPIN project website;
- partner organisation websites;
- news articles and project updates;
- social media communication;
- conference presentations;
- European Week of Sport activities;
- project publications and downloadable resources.

A rapid public desk review identified evidence of dissemination across all partner organisations websites and/or social media channels. Communication was also visible through European sport networks and external organisations, indicating that dissemination extended beyond the immediate project consortium.

The evaluation found that communication remained consistent in terms of visual identity, project branding and key messages relating to youth participation, inclusion and diversity in sport.

Evidence Box 7.2

Evidence of dissemination

Publicly available evidence demonstrates dissemination through:

- Project and partner websites
- News articles and project updates
- European Week of Sport activities
- European Networking Conference
- Public presentations
- Downloadable project publications
- Social media channels and posts (Facebook, Instagram)
- European sport networks

7.3 DISSEMINATION OF PROJECT OUTPUTS

An important achievement of WP5 was the production and dissemination of practical resources intended for use beyond the project consortium.

These outputs include:

- Handbook on Youth Participation in Sport;
- Guidelines for Establishing Youth Action Plans;
- European Action Research Summary Report;
- Youth-led Action Plans and implementation examples;
- communication materials supporting awareness raising and project visibility.

Together, these outputs translate project experience into practical resources for sport organisations, youth workers, coaches and community organisations wishing to strengthen youth participation and inclusion.

Unlike many dissemination products that primarily describe project activities, the SPIN Youth publications provide practical methodologies, examples and implementation guidance, increasing their value for future users.

7.4 SUSTAINABILITY AND LEGACY

The evaluation concludes that one of the strongest aspects of SPIN Youth lies in its sustainability potential. Rather than producing isolated events, the project generated practical methodologies that can continue to support organisations after the formal completion of the project.

The evaluation identified four complementary dimensions of project legacy.

Methodological legacy

The project established a transferable model linking youth capacity building, Youth Panels, participatory Action Research and youth-led implementation. This methodology can be replicated by other organisations working within sport, youth work or community development.

Knowledge legacy

The handbook, guidelines, Action Research summary and other project outputs capture practical learning from implementation and provide accessible resources for future projects.

Organisational legacy

Evidence suggests that several partner organisations strengthened their internal capacity for youth participation and inclusive practice. In Portugal, discussions initiated through SPIN Youth contributed to the establishment of a permanent youth participation structure within the national handball sector, illustrating how project activities influenced organisational governance beyond the immediate project.

Community legacy

Youth-led activities implemented during the European Week of Sport demonstrated practical approaches that local clubs and communities may continue to develop. The Bosnia and Herzegovina experience further illustrates the wider potential of sport to support dialogue and social cohesion within communities facing historical divisions.

Evidence Box 5.2

Examples of project legacy

- Transferable Youth Panel methodology.
- Practical guidance supporting replication.
- Continued availability of project publications.
- Strengthened organisational capacity for youth participation.
- Examples of institutional and community-level change.

7.5 EVALUATION OF WP5 AGAINST THE CRITERIA

Relevance. WP5 addressed an important need by ensuring that project learning extended beyond participating organisations. Communication activities reached multiple audiences, while practical outputs responded directly to the needs of sport organisations seeking to strengthen youth participation and inclusion.

Effectiveness. The work package successfully produced a broad range of dissemination outputs and communicated project activities throughout implementation. Public evidence demonstrates continuous communication across project milestones and active dissemination through project partners and European networks.

Efficiency. Dissemination built effectively upon existing partner networks, websites and communication channels. Integrating dissemination within project implementation increased visibility while making efficient use of available resources.

Quality. Communication remained consistent throughout the project, with strong visual identity and coherent messaging. The emphasis on practical guidance rather than promotional material increased the value of dissemination outputs for external users.

Sustainability. WP5 represents one of the strongest dimensions of the project. The combination of practical guidance, transferable methodologies, organisational learning and continued public availability of project resources significantly strengthens opportunities for long-term impact beyond the funding period.

7.6 STRENGTHS IN WP2

The evaluation identified several notable strengths. Dissemination was integrated throughout the project lifecycle rather than limited to the project's conclusion. This maintained visibility while supporting continuous engagement with stakeholders. The production of practical guidance documents significantly strengthened the exploitation potential of project results by providing resources that can be readily adapted by other organisations. Communication successfully combined European coordination with local dissemination through partner organisations, enabling messages to reach diverse audiences in different national contexts. Finally, the project demonstrated evidence of sustainability beyond publications alone. Examples of organisational learning, strengthened partnerships and institutional changes indicate that project influence extended beyond immediate project activities.

7.7 CHALLENGES AND AREAS FOR IMPROVEMENT

Although dissemination activities were extensive, monitoring of communication impact could have been strengthened through systematic collection of common indicators across all partner organisations. Future projects should consider establishing a shared dissemination monitoring framework at project outset, including indicators such as website visits, downloads, social media reach, engagement statistics and audience profiles. Such information would strengthen future evaluations while supporting more strategic communication planning.

Greater consistency in documenting local dissemination activities across partner organisations would also facilitate comparative evaluation of communication reach.

7.8 CONCLUSIONS ON WP5

Work Package 5 successfully extended the impact of SPIN Youth beyond project implementation by communicating project achievements, disseminating practical knowledge and strengthening opportunities for future replication. The evaluation concludes that the project's most significant legacy lies not only in the publications produced but in the transferable methodology developed throughout the project. By combining youth leadership, participatory Action Research, community implementation and practical guidance, SPIN

Youth provides a model that can be adapted by sport organisations, youth organisations and community partners across Europe.

The evidence further suggests that dissemination contributed to awareness raising as well as to organisational learning and, in some instances, to structural change within partner organisations. This significantly strengthens the long-term value of the project and supports the sustainability of its results beyond the Erasmus+ funding period.

Final Evaluation of WP5

Criterion	Assessment
Relevance	High
Effectiveness	High
Efficiency	Moderate–High
Quality	High
Sustainability	High

CHAPTER 8 CROSS-CUTTING EVALUATION FINDINGS

Several themes emerged consistently across all work packages.

Youth participation evolved into shared leadership. Young people were progressively involved as decision-makers, researchers, facilitators and organisers rather than remaining passive recipients of project activities.

Strong coherence between work packages. Each work package built logically upon previous activities. The transition from training to Action Research and subsequently to youth-led implementation represents one of the strongest aspects of project design.

High-quality partnership cooperation. Meeting minutes demonstrate open communication, collaborative problem-solving and continuous adaptation throughout implementation despite inevitable logistical challenges.

Innovation through participatory Action Research. The project successfully combined research with youth empowerment. Young people generated evidence while simultaneously developing leadership and facilitation competences.

Flexibility strengthened implementation. Partners adapted implementation to national contexts while maintaining common methodologies and shared objectives. This balance between consistency and local ownership contributed significantly to project quality.

Sustainability extends beyond project activities. The project produced substantial intellectual outputs, practical guidance and organisational learning that increase opportunities for future replication and long-term use.

OVERALL CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The evaluation concludes that SPIN Youth represents a successful example of participatory youth engagement within the Erasmus+ Sport programme. Rather than implementing isolated activities, the project established an integrated model linking youth empowerment, evidence generation and practical community action. The strongest achievement lies in demonstrating that young people can contribute meaningfully to organisational development when provided with structured support and genuine opportunities for shared decision-making.

Evidence also suggests that the project generated outcomes extending beyond individual participants. For example, in Bosnia and Herzegovina, youth-led activities used sport as a platform for dialogue and relationship-building between young people from communities historically divided by ethnic and religious conflict. While the long-term effects of such initiatives cannot yet be determined, the project demonstrated the potential of youth-led sport activities to contribute to social cohesion and reconciliation at community level. Another example is from Portugal, where the project implementation appears to have influenced organisational practice within the national handball sector. Discussions initiated through SPIN Youth contributed to the establishment of a permanent structure dedicated to youth participation and multicultural issues within the federation. This represents an important example of institutional learning and illustrates how participatory projects can influence organisational governance beyond the immediate project context. Taken together, these examples illustrate the broader contribution of SPIN Youth. The project organised activities demonstrated how youth participation can contribute to organisational development, community engagement and more inclusive sport systems.

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FUTURE ERASMUS+ SPORT PROJECTS

- 1. Continue investing in youth-led participation models:** Projects should position young people as co-designers, researchers and decision-makers rather than limiting participation to consultation or attendance.
- 2. Maintain the progression from learning to implementation:** The sequence of training, Action Research and youth-led implementation proved highly effective and should be retained in future initiatives.
- 3. Strengthen monitoring systems:** Introduce common monitoring templates for Youth Panels, implementation activities and dissemination to improve consistency of evidence across partner organisations.

- 4. Allocate structured mentoring after training:** Additional mentoring during the transition from training to local implementation would further strengthen participant confidence and reduce variation between countries.
- 5. Strengthen dissemination monitoring:** Future projects should collect common communication indicators (downloads, website statistics, social media reach and engagement) from the outset to facilitate more robust evaluation of dissemination activities.
- 6. Support organisational change alongside individual learning:** The Portuguese experience demonstrates that youth participation can influence governance structures within sport organisations. Future projects should actively encourage institutional commitments that embed youth participation beyond the project period.
- 7. Recognise sport as a platform for social cohesion:** The experience from Bosnia and Herzegovina illustrates the potential of inclusive sport to create dialogue between communities with historical divisions. Future programmes should continue exploring the contribution of sport to peacebuilding, intercultural dialogue and social inclusion where appropriate.
- 8. Ensure long-term sustainability of Youth Panels:** Partners should seek opportunities to integrate Youth Panels into existing governance structures, advisory groups or club committees so that youth participation continues after project funding ends.

OVERALL EVALUATION

According to this evaluation the SPIN Youth project is assessed to meet all overall objectives. It achieved a high level of relevance, effectiveness and quality while demonstrating strong innovation through its participatory methodology. The project provides a transferable European model for empowering diverse young people to become active contributors to more inclusive sport organisations and communities. Its strongest legacy lies in the resources produced as well as in the confidence, leadership and organisational change generated through meaningful youth participation.

SPIN Youth demonstrates that meaningful youth participation is achieved by inviting young people to take part in existing structures, but also in addition by creating opportunities for them to shape those structures themselves. Through a coherent progression from capacity building to youth-led research, local action and organisational learning, the project showed that young people can contribute to more inclusive, responsive and sustainable sport environments. The legacy of SPIN Youth therefore extends beyond its publications and activities; it lies in the practical model it offers for embedding youth voice within sport organisations across Europe.

APPENDIX A. EVALUATION EVIDENCE MATRIX

WP1

Work Package	Evaluation Theme	Evidence Source	Evidence Collected	Main Findings / Evidence Used	Confidence of evaluation
WP1 – Project Management & Coordination	Project management	Partner meeting minutes (2024–2026)	Continuous review of meeting minutes	Effective project management, adaptive coordination, collaborative decision-making, risk management, workload discussions, timeline adjustments	High
	Partnership cooperation	Meeting minutes	Partnership discussions	Strong consortium cooperation, shared problem solving, open communication, commitment to project objectives	High
	Project governance	Interim report, meeting minutes	Project documentation	Clear governance structures, regular monitoring, shared responsibilities	High
	Final reflections	Final survey, Lisbon round table discussions	Survey responses, flip chart discussions	High partner satisfaction, strengthened cooperation, positive reflections on project management	Moderate–High

WP2

Work Package	Evaluation Theme	Evidence Source	Evidence Collected	Main Findings / Evidence Used	Confidence of evaluation
WP2 – Youth Empowerment & Capacity Building	European Youth Training Academy	Curriculum, programme, participant handbook, observations, photographs	Rome Training Academy	High-quality experiential learning, strong participant engagement, practical learning methods	High
	Learning outcomes	Baseline survey, youth interviews, final survey	Before–after comparison	Increased confidence, leadership skills, intercultural learning, facilitation skills	High
	Youth participation	Interviews, observations, photographs	Evaluator observations	Active participation, peer learning, collaborative working methods	High
	Training quality	Curriculum, observations	EYTA documentation	Well-structured curriculum combining theory and practice	High

WP3

Work Package	Evaluation Theme	Evidence Source	Evidence Collected	Main Findings / Evidence Used	Confidence of evaluation
WP3 – Youth Panels &	Youth Panel establishment	Youth Panel guidance,	Project documentation	Youth Panels successfully	High

Action Research		recruitment criteria, meeting documentation		established across partner countries	
	Action Research	National Action Research reports	Eight country reports	High-quality youth-led research addressing locally relevant inclusion barriers	High
	Research findings	European Action Research Summary Report	Cross-country synthesis	Common barriers identified across countries despite different contexts	High
	Knowledge products	Handbook, Guidelines, Summary Report	Final deliverables	Transferable methodologies supporting future practice	High
	Link to implementation	Action Plans	SMART Action Plans	Research findings informed local implementation	High

WP4

Work Package	Evaluation Theme	Evidence Source	Evidence Collected	Main Findings / Evidence Used	Confidence of evaluation
WP4 – Youth-led Action Plans & Implementation	Action Plan implementation	SMART Action Plans	Country Action Plans	Activities directly addressed locally identified barriers	High
	European Week of Sport	Photographs, implementation reports, final survey	Visual documentation and participant feedback	Youth-led implementation across participating countries	Moderate–High
	Community engagement	Final survey, observations	Participant responses	Young people acted as organisers, facilitators and leaders	Moderate–High
	Impact examples	Bosnia & Herzegovina case study; Portugal organisational change	Case study evidence	Evidence of community cohesion and organisational change	Moderate–High

WP5

Work Package	Evaluation Theme	Evidence Source	Evidence Collected	Main Findings / Evidence Used	Confidence of evaluation
WP5 – Communication, Dissemination & Sustainability	Public dissemination	Project website, partner websites, news articles	Public review desk	Continuous dissemination throughout the project lifecycle	Moderate–High
	Publications	Handbook, Guidelines, Action Research	Final outputs	Practical and transferable knowledge resources	High

		Summary Report			
	Communication	Public websites, conference presentations, European Week of Sport	Desk review	Consistent branding and communication across partners	Moderate
	Sustainability	Final outputs, organisational examples, partnership evidence	Documentation and observations	Strong methodological and organisational legacy beyond project duration	Moderate–High

Cross cutting themes

Work Package	Evaluation Theme	Evidence Source	Evidence Collected	Main Findings / Evidence Used	Confidence of evaluation
Cross-cutting	Youth participation	All evidence sources	Triangulated evidence	Young people progressed from participants to leaders, researchers and organisers	High
	Inclusion	Action Research, Action Plans, surveys	Multiple evidence sources	Project addressed diverse inclusion barriers through locally relevant approaches	High
	Innovation	Curriculum, Youth Panels, Action Research, implementation	Project documentation	Innovative combination of youth leadership, participatory research and sport	High
	Sustainability	Final deliverables, organisational examples, dissemination	Project outputs and observations	High potential for transferability and continued use beyond project lifetime	Moderate–High

Confidence Levels

High – Findings supported by multiple independent evidence sources (e.g. meeting minutes, surveys, observations, reports and deliverables).

Moderate–High – Findings supported by two or more complementary evidence sources, although some documentation varied between partner countries.

Moderate – Findings based primarily on publicly available information, participant reflections or limited documentation. Conclusions remain credible but should be interpreted with appropriate caution.

APPENDIX B EVIDENCE SOURCES

Evidence Source	Quantity	Purpose
Partner meeting minutes	20+	Project management evaluation
National Action Research reports	8	WP3 evaluation
SMART Action Plans	8	WP4 evaluation
Final participant survey	13 responses	Outcome evaluation
Baseline questionnaire	20+ responses	Capacity-building evaluation
Youth interviews	Rome EYTA	Qualitative evidence
Rome observations	3 days	Process evaluation
Lisbon observations	2 days	Final implementation and dissemination
Photographic documentation	100+ photos	Implementation verification
Public website desk review	8 partner websites + SPIN website	WP5 evaluation
Final deliverables	Handbook, Guidelines, Summary Report (+ others)	Sustainability and legacy evaluation