

**GOOD PRACTICES IN SOCIAL SERVICE DELIVERY  
PRE-TEST TRAINING**

**WORKSHOP MANUAL**

International Labour Office  
Subregional Office for Central and Eastern Europe

Radisson SAS Béke Hotel, Budapest, Hungary  
8-12 December 2003

Prepared by:

Martin B. Tracy, Ph.D.  
Social Insurance Research International  
103 Lowry Lane  
Wilmore, Kentucky 40390-1218  
USA

Email: [mbtracy@uky.edu](mailto:mbtracy@uky.edu) or [socinsres@aol.com](mailto:socinsres@aol.com)



## Attachments

1. Overview of Good Practices in Social Service Programs in France, Germany, and England
2. France: Social Services - Jacqueline Ancelin
3. Germany: Social Services - Inge Bode
4. England: Social Services – Margaret Moodie
5. Czech Republic Social Services – Vylítová Markéta
6. A Framework for Legal and Administrative Oversight of Local Social Service Delivery and Community-Based NGOs.
7. Guidelines for U. S. Federal Government Projects with NGOs
8. National Reports

## INTRODUCTION: PURPOSE OF WORKSHOP

The purpose of this pre-training workshop is to engage participants in reviewing the proposed content of a training module aimed at strengthening social service programs in South Eastern Europe, including the countries of: Albania, Bosnia, Bulgaria, Croatia, Macedonia, Moldova, Romania, and Serbia/Montenegro. The discussion will particularly focus on identifying strategies that establish “good practices” through enhanced interaction between government, non-government organizations, social work education, civil society, employers, and trade unions in participant countries.

### PROCESS

- ❑ Opening ceremony by ILO-CEET officials.
- ❑ Introduction of participants, including facilitators from France, the Czech Republic, and the U.S.A.
- ❑ Distribution of workshop manuals to participants.
- ❑ Discussion of the overall goals and specific objectives of the workshop.

### GOALS

The goals of the workshop are to:

- ❑ Review recent legislative trends and reforms in social service programs and policies.
- ❑ Review the organization of social service delivery, including decentralization, de-institutionalization, and the development of community-based alternative services.
- ❑ Review government expenditures for social services in participant countries.
- ❑ Identify major policy and programmatic issues related to direct social services.
- ❑ Ascertain good practice social service delivery models in South Eastern Europe, including both government and NGO direct practice models.
- ❑ Examine good practices of social services in selected European nations.
- ❑ Consider how social services can best address gender inequalities.
- ❑ Examine impediments to establishing good practices.
- ❑ Explore ways of transferring good practices of established programs to emerging programs.
- ❑ Explore ways to strengthen partnerships between government ministries and NGOs engaged in providing social services.
- ❑ Consider the role of employers and trade unions in guiding, monitoring, and supporting social services aimed at assisting the most vulnerable citizens.
- ❑ Discern mechanisms of increasing interaction among government social service ministries, NGOs, social work educators, researchers, and program evaluators relative to improving knowledge of social service processes.

- ❑ Consider sustainable performance standards and procedures for evaluating performances.
- ❑ Examine the role of social services in the context of community capacity building, social capital, and civil society.

## OBJECTIVES

At the end of the workshop, participants will be able to:

- ❑ Describe the characteristics of social service good practice models.
- ❑ Recognize impediments to implementing good practices.
- ❑ Explain how social service programs contribute to community capacity building, social capital, and civil society.
- ❑ Identify and prioritize specific social service needs in their respective countries.
- ❑ Explain the processes required to establish and sustain effective and efficient social service programs for the most vulnerable populations, including women, children, elderly and people with handicaps.
- ❑ Design strategies for strengthening social services through formal and informal relations involving government, NGOs, employers, trade unions, and social work education.
- ❑ Develop a process for designing, implementing, managing, and evaluating social service interventions in government and non-government programs.

## WORKSHOP METHODS

Each session has a series of focal points for discussion and exercises. The intent of the exercises is to facilitate interaction among the participants and to generate critical thinking. The primary format for this will be small group activities and focus group discussions. The purpose of using the group discussion format is to provide a structured format for discussing specific issues and exchanging ideas in an open forum. It is designed to help participants learn why and how people perceive and think about a specific issue (Stern, 1999; Kreuger, 1994).

The sessions include four basic stages: Introduction, Transition, In-Depth Investigation, and Closure.

### Stage 1. Introduction

- ❑ Establish a high-energy, yet supportive environment so that participants are comfortable disclosing opinions and creative ideas.
- ❑ Inform participants as to what to expect during the discussions and work sessions.
- ❑ Cover the ground rules for discussion. This includes introducing the process for using round-robin questions, flip charts, rank ordering of responses, and summary statements and conclusions.

### Stage 2. Transition

- ❑ Obtain an idea of the participants' overall perceptions or views about the Session using questions that are can be answered quickly and identifying characteristics that the participants have in common.
- ❑ Ask questions that promote dialogue and discussion.

### Stage 3. In-Depth Discussion

- ❑ Questions that solicit detailed, substantive information about participants' views toward the most important issues that relate to the core purpose of the discussion.
- ❑ Questions that enable participants to elaborate on responses about the Session.

### Stage 4. Closure

- ❑ Ask participants for feedback and reactions at the end of each session.
- ❑ Allow participants to alter or clarify positions they may have made at the end of each session.
- ❑ Verify conclusions drawn across the session by giving a short overview of the purpose of the session and a summary of the results.

## Opening Ceremony & Overview

Monday Morning  
8 December 2003

### Welcome and Opening Statements by:

- ❑ Petra Ulshoefer, Director, ILO Subregional Office for Central and Eastern Europe, Budapest.
- ❑ Elaine Fultz, Senior Specialist, Social Security, ILO Subregional Office for Central and Eastern Europe, Budapest.

### Introduction of Workshop Facilitators:

- ❑ Martin B. Tracy, ILO Consultant, Social Insurance Research International, USA.
- ❑ Jacqueline Ancelin, ILO Consultant, Former Assistant Director of the National Family Allowances Agency in France.
- ❑ Markéta Vylítová, ILO Consultant, Research Institute for Labour and Social Affairs, Prague, Czech Republic.
- ❑ Judit Wirth, Executive Director, Women Together Against Violence Against Women (NaNE), Hungary.
- ❑ Nino Žganec, ILO National Researcher, Assistant Minister of Labour and Social Welfare, Republic of Croatia.

### Break

#### Introduction of Workshop Participants and ILO National Researchers:

- ❑ Albania
- ❑ Bosnia/Herzegovina
- ❑ Bulgaria
- ❑ Croatia
- ❑ Macedonia
- ❑ Moldova
- ❑ Montenegro
- ❑ Romania
- ❑ Serbia

### Introduction to Manual

### Lunch

SESSION #1  
Monday Afternoon  
8 December 2003

**GOOD PRACTICES IN FRANCE**

This session is intended to provide a forum for discussion on prevailing good practices in social services. It will draw upon examples from France in the context of the participant countries.

OBJECTIVES

- ❑ To be familiar with the primary features of good practice in social service programs in France as they apply to situations in participant countries.
- ❑ To explore how France addresses service needs of vulnerable populations, especially women.
- ❑ To examine the respective roles of government, NGOs, social work education, businesses and trade unions in good social service practices in France, including partnerships.
- ❑ To recognize impediments to good practices.
- ❑ To explore how agencies with good practices have overcome impediments.

BACKGROUND

**Definition of Social Services**

Social services in this workshop are defined as care services for vulnerable people, including those with special needs because of violence to women, old age or physical or mental disability, and children in need of care and protection. Examples are residential care for older people, home help for the elderly, meals services, day care centers, and support services provided by social workers. In some countries local authorities have statutory responsibilities for these services.

**Definition of Good Practice**

Good practices in social services are those that are effective, efficient, and accountable to providers and consumers.

**The Basic Characteristics of Good Practices**

- ❑ Transparent decision-making processes.

- ❑ Multi-disciplinary teams.
- ❑ Cooperation with local government and civil society.
- ❑ Informal and formal networks among service providers and other partners.
- ❑ Sustainable performance standards
- ❑ Program evaluation processes.

### **Prevailing Models of Cooperation in Good Practices**

There are three prevailing models of cooperation in good practices based on public-private partnerships. These are:

- 1) *Simple*: Direct cooperation between a government agency and the private sector through contracts and grants.
- 2) *Complex (traditional)*: Cooperation among multiple levels (federal/state/local) of government with the private sector for particular projects and goals.
- 3) *Complex (new)*: Multi-stakeholder partnerships that include government, businesses, social service care providers, religious institutions, social work education, health care, NGOs, consumers, etc. For example, some of the most familiar New Complex programs in Central and Eastern Europe are connected with Strategies and Tools against Social Exclusion and Poverty (STEP), PHARE, and Tacis projects.

### **Social/Economic Factors that Contribute to a Demand for Good Practices**

- ❑ A reduction in government financial resources available for social service programs.
- ❑ Increases in unemployment, poverty, and inflation rates that escalate the need for social services.
- ❑ Inefficiency in the administration of social service programs due to complex and inflexible laws and regulations, insufficiently trained personnel, and a shortage of personnel.
- ❑ Low level of public confidence and trust that programs are sustainable and well administrated.
- ❑ Reduced capacity of family to cope with emerging social and economic conditions, such as: single parents, abandoned children, isolated elderly, people with disabilities, drug abuse, domestic violence against women, and child abuse.

### **Social Economy as Good Practice**

Social economy is a major feature of the ILO's Strategies and Tools against Social Exclusion and Poverty (STEP) program. The concept was defined at the 1995 Copenhagen World Summit and the Ostend Conference on the Role of Social Economy in the North and the South in 1997. Social economy encompasses economic activity from co-operatives, mutual aid societies, and other non-profit organizations, which subscribe

to the following principles:

- ❑ Finality of service to the members of collectives rather than profit.
- ❑ Managerial autonomy.
- ❑ Democratic decision-making processes.
- ❑ Primacy of people and labour over capital in the distribution of income.

### **Good Practices in Social Services in France, Germany, and England**

Most European nations are attempting to develop social services that are responsive to rapid changes in work life, family life, populations with more elderly, and exclusion from society by decentralizing administration (European Foundation, 2003). Reduced resources and a shift in responsibility for social services to municipalities and communities accompany these changes. However, not all countries approach decentralization in the same way. Approaches in France, Germany, and England illustrate alternative programs related to good practices aimed at addressing the multiple and complex social problems that flow from these trends.

Principle of Subsidiarity: The principle of subsidiarity is prevalent in France and Germany systems of social service and social assistance. The subsidiarity principle is intended to ensure that decisions are taken as closely as possible to the citizen and that constant checks are made as to whether action at the community level is justified in the light of the possibilities available at national, regional or local level.

Partnerships, Participation, and Accountability: In all three of these nations a critical aspect of social services is the development of viable partnerships and participation that contribute to accountability. Good practices are characterized by partnerships at all levels of delivery (local, national, regional) across all sectors that provide social services and with consumers.

One-Stop Service Centers: One emerging approach to improving service coordination and integration in each of these three nations is to provide multiple services at one location or “one-stop” centers.

### **Specific Examples of Good Practices**

Children Social Assistance (France). This community-based program provides protection for at-risk children. What makes for good practice in this approach is the teamwork among social workers and the partnerships with other social service providers that often results in a complex treatment plan, in particular with in-home services that overlap with other programs. Partnering is critical for success and many organizations contribute to Children Social Assistance, including CAF with its Social Assistance program and family allowances. Services include cash and in-kind benefits to families; prevention of violence, delinquency, and social exclusion; foster care; prevention and treatment of child abuse and neglect; emergency shelters for children and mothers; and parental education by teams of social workers. Services vary according to the peculiarities of each county government and according to contractual agreements with

private service providers.

National Association of Mother Centres (Germany). These are self-help centers that were founded in Hamburg, Germany in 1989 as an alternative to formal, professional NGO welfare organizations such as CARITAS (Catholic Church), Diakone (Protestant Church), and Arbeiterwohlfahrt (Social Democratic Party). The Mother Centres are informal, flexible mother-children neighborhood centers aimed at combining professional and voluntary non-professional. The centers provide a place for women to network and become integrated into society. They have a strong focus on prevention. The approach is listed as a “best practice” by UN-Habitat (<http://www.bestpractices.org/>).

Social-Educational Family Services (Sozial Pädagogische Familienhilfe in Germany). This is an intensive “wrap around” model in Germany for families who do not have access to traditional social work.

Save the Children Centers (England). These are family-centered programs that are similar to the German self-help initiatives. It emphasizes services for both mother and child. The centers provide assistance with practical problems of daily living and child rearing, as well as day care. They serve a vital role in networking and integration into society.

John Grooms (England). This is a Christian-based charity that provides services for people with disabilities. Its aim is to enable people with disabilities to be as much a part of the community as possible. One of its initiatives is *Lifestyle Options*. A Lifestyle Worker helps to empower and support the person with disability so that he or she can become increasingly involved in social, leisure, or educational activities within the local community. The project helps people to develop their interests, hobbies and education by providing information, guidance and support that helps the individual to achieve his or her personal goals.

## LESSON

### **Overview of Good Practices in France**

Presentation by Jacqueline Ancelin, ILO Consultant and former Assistant Director of the National Family Allowances Agency in France. The presentation is based on the attached document: *France: Social Services*.

## EXERCISE

1. Breakout into three groups to discuss the following:
  - a. The most relevant lessons to be drawn from the French experience.
  - b. How these lessons can be applied to the participant’s countries.
2. Return to the large group for a general discussion, listing major points on a flip chart and prioritizing those points.

## CRITIQUE AND CLOSURE

Participants critique content and method of presentation.

<p><b>SESSION #2</b>  <b>Tuesday Morning</b>  <b>9 December 2003</b></p>
--

### **GOOD PRACTICES IN THE CZECH REPUBLIC:**

This session is intended to continue the discussion on prevailing good practices in social services by focusing on examples from the Czech Republic within the context of the participant countries.

#### OBJECTIVES

- ❑ To be familiar with the primary features of good practice in social service programs in the Czech Republic as they apply to situations in participant countries.
- ❑ To explore how the Czech Republic addresses service needs of vulnerable populations, especially women.
- ❑ To examine the respective roles of government, NGOs, social work education, businesses and trade unions in good social service practices in the Czech Republic, including partnerships.
- ❑ To recognize impediments to good practices.
- ❑ To explore how agencies with good practices have overcome impediments.

#### LESSON

##### **Overview of Good Practices in the Czech Republic**

Presentation by Markéta Vylítová, ILO Consultant, Research Institute for Labour and Social Affairs, Prague, Czech Republic.

#### EXERCISE

1. Breakout into three groups to discuss the following:
  - a. The most relevant lessons to be drawn from the Czech Republic experience.
  - b. How these lessons can be applied to the participant's countries.
2. Return to the large group for a general discussion, listing major points on a flip chart and prioritizing those points.

## CRITIQUE AND CLOSURE

Participants critique content and method of presentation.

**SESSION #3**  
**Tuesday Afternoon**  
**9 December 2003**

**GOOD PRACTICES IN SOUTH EAST EUROPE**

This session is intended to continue the discussion on prevailing good practices in social services based on examples from South East Europe, including NaNE (a Hungarian women's rights NGO) and Croatia.

### OBJECTIVES

- ❑ To examine how good practices are implemented in a Hungarian women's rights organization – Women Together Against Violence Against Women (NaNE).
- ❑ To explore how NaNE addresses impediments to program development and implementation.
- ❑ To examine the respective roles of government, NGOs, social work education, businesses and trade unions in good social service practices, including partnerships in NaNE and in Croatia.
- ❑ To explore how NGOs in Croatia have overcome obstacles in implementing good practices.

### LESSON #1

#### **Good Practices in a Women's NGO in Hungary**

Presentation by Judit Wirth, Executive Director, Women Together Against Violence Against Women (NaNE), Hungary.

#### **Questions and Comments**

### LESSON #2

#### **Good Practices in Croatia**

Presentation by Nino Žganec, ILO National Researcher and Assistant Minister of Labour and Social Welfare, Republic of Croatia.

#### **Questions and Comments**

## CRITIQUE AND CLOSURE

Participants critique content and method of presentation.

SESSION #4  
 Wednesday Morning  
 10 December 2003

**OVERVIEW OF EXPENDITURES AND LEGISLATIVE REFORMS**

This session focuses on expenditures for social services and current legislative trends and reform measures relative to social services in participant countries. The material reflects information documented in the *National Reports* prepared by representatives from each participant country. It includes information from government, World Bank, and NGO documents, interviews with key individuals, as well as input from focus groups of individuals from government, NGOs, and social work education. The discussion will examine the importance of the legislation in terms of promoting good practices.

### OBJECTIVES

- ❑ To be familiar with the level of expenditures for social services.
- ❑ To understand current trends and reforms in social service delivery impacting the most vulnerable populations (women, children, elderly, persons with handicaps).
- ❑ To facilitate ideas about the development of new alternative approaches to services.
- ❑ To appreciate the complexities of dilemmas associated with reforms, with particular attention on decentralization and creating alternative services at the community level.

### LESSON

#### **Overview of Expenditures for Social Services**

- ❑ Level of resources.
- ❑ Resource allocation.
- ❑ Targeting needy populations.
- ❑ Geographic distribution of services.

#### **Recent Legislation and Reforms**

- ❑ Decentralizing programs: shifting authority for administering and funding programs to the local level (regional government, municipalities, local councils).

- ❑ De-institutionalizing children services: Removing children from institutions and providing alternative care in families, foster families, and community-based facilities.
- ❑ Addressing social exclusion and social isolation by increasing participation of community stakeholder, civil society, NGOs, local government, businesses, trade unions, and users.
- ❑ Establishing partnerships between government and NGOs in delivering social services at the local level.
- ❑ Establishing legislation to regulate NGOs: setting requirements for NGOs, provisions for contracting for services through bids and subsidies, setting and implementing performance standards.
- ❑ Focusing on inter-disciplinary case management approaches to social services.
- ❑ Developing research and evaluation institutes and networks.
- ❑ Linking social services to the reduction of poverty and increase in employment.

### **Selected Administrative and Cultural Impediments**

- ❑ *Stigmatization of Reputation*: People with the greatest need are sometimes unwilling to apply for services because they fear harming their reputation in the community.
- ❑ *Desire for Anonymity*: Potential beneficiaries do not want to reveal details about their personal circumstances to a third party, especially to a member of the community or a government official.
- ❑ *Unknown rights and services*: Even in areas with 100 percent literacy, information on rights to social service is frequently unknown or is subject to misunderstanding.
- ❑ *Difficult application process*: Often eligible individuals do not apply because of complicated administrative procedures (providing required documents), costly or time-consuming process (office is far away from home, transportation problems, long queues), and unfamiliarity with bureaucratic procedures.
- ❑ *Biased administrative discretion*: Officials who make decision on eligibility or type of services, especially local officials, may deny services to potential recipients for religious, ethnic, political, personal, or other reasons (Beattie, 2000).
- ❑ *Demeaning process*: Sometimes staff treats the applicant in a demeaning way, including in-take workers who conduct the initial assessment of the consumer's request.

### EXERCISE

Conduct focus group on identifying effective strategies in establishing good practices within the context of policy and program trends. Rank the strategies in order of importance and realistic chances of successful implementation.

## CRITIQUE AND CLOSURE

Participants critique content and method of presentation.

SESSION #5  
 Wednesday Afternoon  
 10 December 2003

**CRITICAL ASPECTS OF PARTNERSHIPS**

The purpose of this session is to examine partnering among service providers, social work educators, researchers, and program evaluators that contribute to good practices. It will also explore how people in the community, business, and trade unions, as well as users of services can be more involved in the planning and implementation of services at the local level.

### OBJECTIVES

- ❑ To identify the major advantages of, and perceived impediments to, partnering among service providers and between providers and educators.
- ❑ To understand the differences between NGOs and government agencies in prioritizing social service programs for good practices.
- ❑ To analyze potential strategies for improving services through partnerships.
- ❑ To explore ways of including people in the community, employers, trade unions, women and other special interest groups, as well as consumers in decision-making processes.
- ❑ To explore the merits of establishing procedures for program evaluation.

### LESSON

#### **Definition of Partnerships**

Partnerships are systems of formalized cooperation, grounded in legally binding arrangements or informal understandings, cooperative working relationships, and mutually adopted plans among a number of institutions. They involve agreements on policy and program objectives and the sharing of responsibility, resources, risks, and benefits over a specified period of time. Social service partnerships can refer to a wide-range of cooperative arrangements, including formal agreements between government agencies and a single NGO or groups of NGOs. Partnerships can also exist between NGOs without direct government involvement, especially at local or regional levels.

### **Primary Advantages of Partnering**

There are numerous advantages of partnering that facilitate good social service practices. Some of the more obvious benefits are:

- ❑ Avoid duplication of services.
- ❑ Share experiences.
- ❑ Share information.
- ❑ Increase transparency and accountability.
- ❑ Increase access to information.
- ❑ Increase accountability in the use of public funds.

### **Possible Impediments to Partnerships among Government, NGOs, and Social Work Educators**

While partnering offers many advantages, there are numerous possible impediments. Below are some of the impediments to partnership organized into three categories: government, NGOs, and general.

#### Government Related Impediments

- ❑ The frequent change of directors and personnel in government ministries can make collaboration difficult in terms of additional expenses, time, and energy for new projects.
- ❑ There may be a legislative vacuum concerning NGOs and the definition of the rules of cooperation.
- ❑ Government may not have the financial resources required to support NGOs in a viable partnership.
- ❑ Poor, rural communities may not have the capacity to support local NGOs with money and volunteers.

#### NGO Related Impediments

- ❑ NGOs may be concerned about the possibility of excessive government monitoring of their activities.
- ❑ There may be a loss of independence when solely reliant on government funding.
- ❑ NGOs may be reluctant to share information on their activities with government (lack of trust).
- ❑ NGOs can become “politicized” and assumes an anti-government position.
- ❑ There may be a domination of large, successful NGOs over smaller, local community-based NGOs due to greater financial stability and opportunity to take more risks.

#### General Partnership Impediments

- ❑ Turf protection (organizations are unwilling to truly compromise organization

- boundaries and instead consistently seek their self-interest).
- ❑ Reluctance to share credit (a partner in the collaboration seeks to claim responsibility for success and deny other partners a share in the “glory.”).
  - ❑ “I” instead of “we” attitude (harboring a self-centered attitude, a partner in the collaboration is unable to recognize that what the collaboration does is not solely for an individual organization’s good but for the good of the whole community and the people they serve).
  - ❑ Independent decisions made without consulting partners.

### **Elements That Assist in Building Partnerships**

- ❑ Clear identification of the benefits to be gained by working together.
- ❑ Norms of trust and reciprocity (relationship that is open and transparent).
- ❑ Strong leadership, especially in the early phases.
- ❑ Contextual and structural factors: laws and regulations, urban/rural location, community culture.
- ❑ Organization and program resources.
- ❑ Skilled management and project staff.
- ❑ A strong shared local identity.
- ❑ Active involvement of all partners in shaping and implementing strategy and activities.
- ❑ Seeing new solutions to problems.
- ❑ Co-operating to obtain new resources and maintaining a solid resource base.
- ❑ Appropriate training to strengthen skills and knowledge.

### **General Strategies to Improve Partnerships**

- ❑ Bring together the appropriate partners (broad-based representation).
- ❑ Establish a consensual strategy based on a shared vision, trust, and transparency.
- ❑ Establish a sense of “ownership” of the strategy.
- ❑ Develop the organizational structures and procedures to implement an action plan.
- ❑ Provide incentives for partnering through: a) legal mandates, b) financial incentives (state and private foundation grants).
- ❑ Find the skills and resources needed.
- ❑ Establish effective links at the local, national, and transnational levels.
- ❑ Develop horizontal relationships between local actors (links between formal and informal local networks).
- ❑ Develop vertical relationships with national and international stakeholders.
- ❑ Co-sponsor activities (festivals, informational fairs) with local government.
- ❑ Build relationship with local and national politicians.
- ❑ Celebrate all achievements.

## EXERCISE

Break into three groups to discuss and list specific steps in which NGOs and social work educators can best contribute to building partnerships with government. Return to group

for discussion using flip chart to list and prioritize strategies.

For example, NGOs might contribute by:

- ❑ Being more familiar with needs at the local community level.
- ❑ Providing government with a mechanism for contracting out services at the local level.
- ❑ Being more capable of providing services in remote areas.

Social work educators could possibly contribute by:

- ❑ Conducting research that builds knowledge.
- ❑ Assisting in quality assurance by conducting program evaluation.
- ❑ Providing students for field placement (practica) and a future work force.

### CRITIQUE AND CLOSURE

Participants critique content and method of presentation.

SESSION #6  
 Thursday Morning  
 11 December 2003

**ROLE OF SOCIAL SERVICES IN BUILDING COMMUNITY CAPACITY  
 AND SOCIAL CAPITAL**

This session is designed to explore how the process of establishing community-based social services can contribute to social capital and assist in building community capacity. It also examines the definitions and characteristics of social capital as an instrument of social policy or a process to improve the delivery of social services.

### OBJECTIVES

- ❑ To gain an awareness of the basic principles and characteristics of social services relative to community capacity building and social capital, including trust and reciprocity.
- ❑ To become familiar with processes of establishing social services that contribute to social capital.
- ❑ To understand community-based programs and social capital in the context of democracy.
- ❑ To examine social service programs in South East Europe in terms of social capital.
- ❑ To understand the respective roles of informal and formal networks among all

stakeholders in developing social capital and social services.

## LESSON

### **Definition of Social Capital**

Social capital is a utilitarian approach, which draws on social network and social resource theories. Three perspectives that have been particularly influential in developing current conceptual frameworks reflect the thinking of Pierre Bourdieu, James Coleman, and Robert Putnam which have been summarized in terms of definition, purpose, and analysis, as below:

#### **Definition, Purpose, and Analysis of Social Capital**

	<b>Definition</b>	<b>Purpose</b>	<b>Analysis</b>
<b>Bourdieu</b>	Resources that provide access to group goods	To secure economic capital	Individuals in class competition
<b>Coleman</b>	Aspects of social structure that actors can use as resources to achieve their interests	To secure human capital	Individuals in family and community setting
<b>Putnam</b>	Trust, norms and networks that facilitate cooperation for mutual benefit	To secure effective democracy and economy	Regions in national settings

Source: Ian Winter. *Towards a Theorised Understanding of Family Life and Social Capital*. Working Paper, 21, 2000. Melbourne, Australia: Australian Institute of Family Studies.

### **Current Definitions**

Social capital is “the institutions, relationships, and norms that shape the quality and quantity of a society’s social interactions” (World Bank, 2000).

Social capital “\_\_ involves formal and informal social networks among individuals who share norms and values, especially the norm of reciprocity (mutual assistance). Two types of social capital are distinguished: localized social capital, found among people who live in the same or adjacent communities; and bridging capital, which extends to individuals and organizations that are more removed” (Wallis, 1998).

Social capital is “\_\_ the mutual relations, interactions, and networks that emerge among human groups, as well as the level of trust (seen as the outcome of obligations and norms which adhere to the social structure) found within a particular group or community. There is an implicit understanding that social capital will be useful for enhancing some other

feature such as learning, social mobility, economic growth, political prominence, or community vitality”(Wall, Ferrazzi, & Schryer, 1998).

### **Common Features**

It has been suggested that despite the variations on specific characteristics of social capital, all perspectives have three common features.

- ❑ All link economic, social, and political spheres and implicitly recognize that social relationships influence how markets and states operate.
- ❑ All focus on relationships and the ways in which reliable, stable relationships among actors enhance the effectiveness and efficiency of both collective and individual action and interaction.
- ❑ All presuppose that social capital can be strengthened and that the process requires resources.

### **Three Dimensions**

A conceptual framework for distinguishing between different dimensions of social capital has recently been developed by the World Bank (2000). The framework suggests that there are three basic aspects of social capital: bonding social capital, bridging social capital, and linking social capital.

- ✓ *Bonding social capital* refers to the strong ties connecting family members, neighbors, close friends, and business associates.
- ✓ *Bridging social capital* refers to networks of people with broadly comparable economic status and political power.
- ✓ *Linking social capital* is a third dimension that in the past has been largely ignored. This refers to the vertical ties between vulnerable groups and people of influence in formal organizations (social inclusion). The dimension is critical to developing a sustainable social capital approach as it addresses the problem of exclusion (by overt discrimination or lack of resources) from the places where major decisions relating to welfare are usually made

### **Indicators of Social Capital’s Influence on the Social Fabric and the Common Good**

There are various indicators that social capital has a positive impact on the social fabric and the common good when the following questions are addressed.

- ❑ Does the policy (program) increase people’s skills to engage in social activities with people they do not know?
- ❑ Does the policy (program) target some groups at the expense of others, or create feelings of blame or exclusion?
- ❑ Do the forms of service delivery allow the building of informal relationships and trust with all stakeholders?

- ❑ Do participants increase their capacity to deal with conflict and diversity?
- ❑ What message does the policy (program) offer to people about their own values and roles?
- ❑ What impact does the program have on attitudes to formal institutions of governance?

### **Transparency and Accountability**

A critical feature of successful social capital development through NGOs is a process of transparency and accountability that helps to prevent corruption. An effective process in NGOs consists of the following:

- ❑ A multi-stakeholder board of directors.
- ❑ Clear goals.
- ❑ Measurable objectives.
- ❑ Broad-based community participation and involvement.
- ❑ Systematic evaluation procedures (discussed further in Session #7).

### **Social Pragmatism and Democracy**

Social pragmatism provides one theoretical orientation to civil society and democracy. The philosopher John Dewey argued that: The success of the community depends upon cooperative efforts to seek the common good in a democratic way.... In our attempts to build and further democratic community, the process of developing shared activity and values held in common is what matters. We need to foster the kind of long-term focus that sees beyond particular issues to the cultivation of dialogue and long-term cooperation. We should continue to trust in community life in spite of occasional and even severe setbacks because democracy is a moral ideal (Campbell, 1998).

Dewey's basic principles of democracy included the following:

- ❑ Democracy is the faith that the process of experience is more important than any special result attained (Campbell, 1998).
- ❑ The purpose of democracy is the fulfillment of the capacities of its citizens (Savage, 2002).
- ❑ Meaningful inclusion requires self-directed and well-informed citizens with opportunities to participate in an open and non-threatening environment.

### **Strategies Designed to Promote Social Capital**

- ❑ Decentralizing government.
- ❑ Expand alternative social services (child care, job training, skill development, life coping strategies, individual and family support programs, etc.).
- ❑ NGOs that provide direct services.
- ❑ Partnerships among state-local, private-public agencies, women's and other interest groups, businesses and trade unions.

- ❑ Volunteers.
- ❑ Consumers as volunteers (family, parent, customer, etc.).
- ❑ Civic organizations (Rotary, Lions, etc.).
- ❑ International initiatives (ILO, UNESCO, EU, Foundations).

### EXERCISE

Break participants into three groups to make a list of government, NGO, and social work education activities that contribute to social capital. Return to large group and discuss by rank ordering the list on the flip chart.

### CRITIQUE AND CLOSURE

Participants critique content and method of presentation.

SESSION #7  
 Thursday Afternoon  
 11 December 2003

ADMINISTRATIVE OVERSIGHT AND QUALITY ASSURANCE IN  
 SOCIAL SERVICE PROGRAMS

The purpose of this session is to have a discussion about the multiple aspects of establishing mechanisms for quality assurance, setting performance standards, and establishing procedures to ensure that service providers are adequately meeting them. The material for the session is drawn from the attached document: *A Framework for Legal and Administrative Oversight of Local Social Service Delivery and Community-Based NGOs*.

### OBJECTIVES

- ❑ To understand the basic elements of monitoring and evaluating social service programs.
- ❑ To understand how to formulate and utilize performance measures in the monitoring and oversight process.
- ❑ To become familiar with how performance measurement information can be used in evaluation and decision-making processes.
- ❑ To identify and understand the roles of the various stakeholders in monitoring and oversight

### **Definition of Quality Assurance**

Quality Assurance refers to monitoring that ensures services meet pre-established performance standards of a quality that is acceptable to funding sources, advisory boards, users, and service providers.

### **Definition of Performance Standard**

A performance standard is a statement of general criteria that defines a desired result without specifying the technique for achieving that result.

## **LESSON**

**Highlights from the Attached Document:** *A Framework for Legal and Administrative Oversight of Local Social Service Delivery and Community-Based NGOs*

### **TOPICS:**

- ❑ The Contract.
- ❑ Standards and Measurements.
- ❑ Organizational Standards.
- ❑ Service/Performance Standards.
- ❑ Monitoring Process.
- ❑ Evaluation of Programs and Services.
- ❑ Roles in Monitoring and Oversight
  - Local government.
  - NGOs.
  - Advisory Boards (See section on Board Responsibilities in attached document).
  - Consumer groups.
  - Employers.
  - Trade unions.
  - Civil society.
  - General public/community.

## **EXERCISE**

Assign three groups to discuss what they consider to be the most important aspects of the framework for legal administration and oversight in their country. Return to the large group and put the ideas on a flip chart for discussion.

## **CRITIQUE AND CLOSURE**

Participants critique content and method of presentation.

Final Session  
Friday Morning  
12 December 2003

## SUMMARY AND CLOSING CEREMONY

The purpose of this final session is to provide an opportunity for participants to raise any additional questions or comment on the content and format of this pre-test training workshop. It also gives participants the chance to evaluate the workshop and make suggestions on what should be included in the training module for administrators and front-line workers.

### OBJECTIVES

- ❑ To identify need for additional materials in the workshop.
- ❑ To reach a consensus on the content and format of a training package for administrators and front-line workers.
- ❑ To evaluate the workshop.

### LESSON

- ❑ Discuss content covered in this workshop.
- ❑ Discuss format and exercises of workshop.
- ❑ Make suggestions for content and format for preparing a training package for administrators and front-line workers.
- ❑ Identify the need for any additional materials to be attached to a training package.
- ❑ Complete workshop evaluation form.

### CLOSING CEREMONY

Closing remarks by:

- ❑ Petra Ulshoefer, Director, ILO Subregional Office for Central and East Europe, Budapest.
- ❑ Elaine Fultz, Senior Specialist, Social Security, ILO Subregional Office for Central and Eastern Europe, Budapest.
- ❑ Markus Ruck, Specialist, Social Security, ILO Subregional Office for Central and Eastern Europe, Budapest.
- ❑ Jacqueline Ancelin, ILO Consultant, Former Assistant Director of the National Family Allowances Agency in France.
- ❑ Martin B. Tracy, ILO Consultant, Social Insurance Research International, USA.

## **APPENDIX 1**

### List of Selected Potentially Confusing Terms

The following are some of the terms that can cause confusion in training and need to be defined when used based on local application.

Accountability  
Advisory board  
Alternative services  
Child abuse  
Civil society  
Community-based  
Cooperation  
Cooperatives  
Consumer, client, recipient, customer, beneficiary, user  
Devolution  
Domestic violence  
Drug abuse  
Elderly  
Effectiveness  
Efficiency  
Foster care  
Good practice  
Human capital  
In-kind services  
Licensing  
Management information system  
Mainstreaming  
Monitoring  
Multi-disciplinary services  
Mutual benefit societies  
One-stop services  
Orphans  
Oversight  
Partnerships  
Performance standards  
Personal social services  
Poverty  
Practicum  
Quality assurance  
Rehabilitation  
Reintegration  
Social assistance  
Social capital  
Social care services

Social cohesion  
Social exclusion  
Social inclusion  
Social insurance  
Social integration  
Social pedagogy  
Social pragmatism  
Social services  
Stakeholder  
Subsidiarity  
Sustainable services  
Transparency  
Volunteerism  
Wrap-around services

## **APPENDIX 2**

### **Selected Web Sites**

#### **ASSOCIATIONS/CENTERS**

*Association for Research on Nonprofit and Voluntary Action (ARNOVA)*

<http://www.arnova.org/>

The Association for Research in the Voluntary and Community Sector

<http://www.charitynet.org/arvac/>

Canadian Centre for Philanthropy

<http://www.ccp.ca/>

Center for Civil Society (London School of Economics)

<http://www.lse.ac.uk/Depts/CVO/>

Centre for Civil Society International Working Paper Series

<http://www.lse.ac.uk/collections/CCS/publications/iwp/int-work-papers.htm>

Community Problem Solving (Harvard University)

<http://www.community-problem-solving.net/>

International Center for Non-Profit Law

<http://www.icnl.org/>

Leader to Leader Institute

<http://www.pfdf.org/>

National Center for Nonprofit Boards

<http://ncnb.org/global/partners.htm>

## PRIVATE FOUNDATIONS

The Aspen Institute

<http://www.aspeninst.org/>

Casey Foundation. Rebuilding communities initiative

[www.aecf.org](http://www.aecf.org)

Ford Foundation. Asset building and community development

<http://www.fordfound.org/>

The Kettering Foundation

<http://www.kettering.org>

Pew Charitable Trust

<http://www.pewtrusts.com>

## GENERAL

European Union and Countries of Eastern and Central Asia

[http://europa.eu.int/comm/external\\_relations/ceeca/index.htm](http://europa.eu.int/comm/external_relations/ceeca/index.htm)

George Soros Open Society Fund

<http://www.soros.org>

International Center for Nonprofit Law

<http://www.icnl.org/>

INC: Information About Nonprofit Organizations

<http://www.nonprofits.org/>

Jossey-Bass: Nonprofit Management Series

<http://www.jbp.com/nonprofit.shtml>

Personal Social Services Research Unit (United Kingdom)

<http://www.pssru.ac.uk/>

Public Engagement Media Center

[http://roundtablemedia.com/pemc/re\\_capital\\_books.html](http://roundtablemedia.com/pemc/re_capital_books.html)

PRAXIS

<http://caster.ssw.upenn.edu/~restes/praxis.html>

Strategy for Social Cohesion and Quality of Life (Council of Europe)

<http://www.social.coe.int/en/cohesion/strategy.htm>

United Nations NGOs

<http://www.globalpolicy.org/ngos>

The World Bank - NGO and Civil Society Unit

<http://www.worldbank.org/poverty/scapital/>

World Wide Web Resources for Social Workers

<http://www.nyu.edu/socialwork/wwwrsw>

### APPENDIX 3

Bibliographic References
--------------------------

- Alderman, Harold (2002). Do local officials know something we don't? Decentralization of targeted transfers in Albania. *Journal of Public Economics*, 83(3), 375-404.
- Allavida (2000). *Review of the Romanian NGO sector*. Retrieved 10 February 2003 from the World Wide Web at <http://www.allavida.org>.
- Alexandrescu, Gabriela (2002). *Romania: Working Street Children in Bucharest: A Rapid Assessment*. ILO Series: Investigating the Worst Forms of Child Labour, No. 19. Geneva: ILO.
- Ainscow, Mel & Haile-Giorgis, Memmenasha. (1998). *The education of children with special needs: Barriers and opportunities in Central and Eastern Europe*. Innocenti Occasional Paper. Economic and Social Policy Series no. 67. Socicille, Italy: UNICEF.
- Andersen, H.T. & Van Kempen, R. (2001). *Governing European cities: Social fragmentation, social exclusion and urban governance*. Aldershot: Ashgate.
- Archambault, Edith (2001). Historical roots of the nonprofit sector in France. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, 30(2), 204-220.
- Beattie, Roger (2000). Social protection for all: But how? *International Labour Review*, 139(2), 129-148.
- Béland, Daniel & Hansen, Randall (2000). Reforming the French welfare state: Solidarity, social exclusion and the three crises of citizenship. *West European Politics*, 23(1), 47-64.
- Bode, Ingo (2003). A new agenda for European charity: Catholic welfare and organizational change in France and Germany. *Voluntas: International Journal of Voluntary and Nonprofit Organizations*, 14(2), 205-225.
- Bouget, Denis & Brovelli, Gérard (2002). Citizenship, social welfare system and social policies in France. *European Studies*, 4(2), 161-184.
- Brush, Lisa D. (2002). Changing the subject: Gender and welfare regime studies. *Social Politics: International Studies in Gender, State & Society*, 9, 161-186.
- Bulgaria elderly pensioner community research project*. (2002). Research report prepared by the American Red Cross, Bulgaria Red Cross, & Vitosha Research. Funded by USAID Bulgaria Mission.

- Bulgarian Law on Legal Persons with Non-Profit Purposes* (2000). International Center for Not-for-Profit Law. Retrieved from web: <http://www.icnl.org/press/15.htm>
- Campbell, James (1998). Dewey's conception of community. In Larry A. Hickman (Ed.), *Reading Dewey: Interpretations for a postmodern generation* (pp.23-42). Bloomington, Indiana: Indiana University Press.
- Centre for Independent Living (2002). *From handicapped people to persons with disabilities: Disability rights in Bulgaria, a survey*. Sofia: Author.
- Centre for Independent Living (2002). *Report of the Centre for Independent Living-Sofia for the period 2001-2002*. Sofia: Author.
- Centre for Resources and Information for Social Professions (CRIPS). (2003). Results in the implementation of reform. *In the Interest of the Child*, No. 1, p. 3.
- Charities Aid Foundation. (2000). *An introduction to the non-profit sector in Bulgaria*. Kent, England: Author.
- Clarke, John; Langan, Mary; & Williams, Fiona (2001). Remaking welfare: The British welfare regime in the 1980s and 1990s. In Allen Cochrane, John Clarke & Sharon Gewirtz (Eds.), *Comparing welfare states* (pp. 71-111). London: Sage Publications.
- Cutt, James & Murray, Vic. (2000). *Accountability and effectiveness evaluation in non-profit organizations*. New York: Routledge.
- Davis, Rebecca T. (undated). *A profile of social work in Romania today*. Unpublished paper funded by a grant from USAID.
- Dickens, Jonathan & Serghi, Catalin (2000). Attitudes to child care reform in Romania: Findings from a survey of Romanian social workers. *European Journal of Social Work*, 3, 247-260.
- Dimova, Lilia (1999). *Social assistance programs in Bulgaria: Public perceptions and attitudes*. Retrieved 3 April 2003 from the web at: ([http://asa-bg.netfirms.com/documents/social\\_assistance.htm](http://asa-bg.netfirms.com/documents/social_assistance.htm)).
- Emigh, R.J. & Szelényi, I. (Eds.) (2001). *Poverty, ethnicity, and gender in Eastern Europe during the market transition*. Westport, CT: Praeger.
- European Foundation (2003). *The future development of social public services in Europe*. Retrieved from the Internet on 18 April 2003 at [http://www.eurofound.ie/living/socpub\\_cstudies/future.htm](http://www.eurofound.ie/living/socpub_cstudies/future.htm).
- EU/Romania: Boost to efforts to improve child protection. (2001). *European Report*, July 25, p. 502. Retrieved from the Internet on 20 November 2003 at

[http://www.nbromania.org/about\\_romania.htm](http://www.nbromania.org/about_romania.htm)

- Evans, Martin E. (2001). Britain: Moving towards a work and opportunity-focused welfare state? *International Journal of Social Welfare*, 10(4), 260-266.
- Fröschl, Elfriede (2002). Gender aspects of the social work profession in Europe. *Social Work in Europe*, 9(1), 49-55.
- HelpAge International. (2002). *State of the world's older people 2002*. London: UK: Author.
- Hentic, Isabelle & Bernier, Gilles (1999). Rationalization, decentralization and participation in the public sector management of developing countries. *International Review of Administrative Services*, 65, 197-209.
- Hook, Mary van (2000). Responding to gender violence in Albania: A partnership effort. *International Social Work*, 43(3), 351-363.
- Hysenaj, Arkida (n.d.). *Models of collaboration: Networks of local zones and the processes of the individualized service*. Tirana: GASS.
- Imbrogno, Salvatore (2001). States in transition: Family and health care policy in Moldova. *International Social Work*, 44(2), 211-227.
- International Labour Office (1999). *Decent work*. International Labour Conference 87<sup>th</sup> Session. Geneva: Author.
- International Labour Office. (2000). *World labour report: 2000*. Geneva: Author.
- Knežević, Mladen & Butler, Lauren. (2003). Public perceptions of social workers and social work in the Republic of Croatia. *International Journal of Social Welfare*, 12(1), 50-60.
- Kreuger, Richard A. (1994). *Focus groups: A practical guide for applied research* (2<sup>nd</sup> Edition). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- LaCava, Gloria & Nanetti, Rafaella (1999). *Albania: Filling vulnerability gap*. Washington, DC: World Bank.
- Lane, George (1998). The future prospects for social care in central and eastern Europe. In Munday, Brian & Lane, George, (Ed), *The old and the new: Changes in social care in Central and Eastern Europe* (pp. 207-213). Canterbury, England: The European Institute of Social Services.
- Lavill, J-L., et al (1999). Third system: A European definition. Retrieved 11 March 2003 from <http://www.jhu.edu/~istr/networks/europe/laville.evers.etal.pdf>

- Mahon, Rianne (2002). Child care: Toward what kind of “social Europe?” *Social Politics*, Fall.
- Manion, Kathleen (2002). Trafficking in women and children for sexual purposes: A growing threat in Europe. *Social Work in Europe*, 9(2), 14-22.
- Mark, Melvin, Henry, Gary, & Julnes, George. (2000). *Evaluation: An integrated framework for understanding, guiding, and improving policies and programs*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass Publishers.
- Molnar, Maria (2000). Poverty measurement and income support in Romania. In Sandra Hutton & Gerry Redmond (Eds.), *Poverty in transition economics* (pp. 109-124). London: Routledge.
- National Social Rehabilitation Centre (2002). Social services for improving quality of life of people with disabilities. Sofia: Author.
- Olson, Mancur (2002). *Power and prosperity: Outgoing communist and capitalist dictatorships*. New York: Basic Books.
- Organization for Economic Co-Operation and Development (1997). *Contracting out government services: Best practice guidelines and case studies*. Public Management Occasional Papers, No. 20. Paris: OECD.
- Peters, Roland K., & Hassan, Fareed (undated). *Social safety net and the poor during the transition: The case of Bulgaria*. Washington, DC: World Bank.
- Petrescu, Dan (2000). Civil society in Romania: From donor supply to citizen demand. In Mariana Ottaway & Thomas Carothers (Eds.), *Funding virtue: Civil society aid and democracy promotion* (pp. 269-292). Washington, DC: Carnegie Endowment for International Peace.
- Pinnock, Katherine (2002). The impact of the NGO sector and Roma/Gypsy organizations on Bulgarian social policy. *Journal of Social Policy*, 31(2), 229-250.
- Pollert, Anna (2003). Women, work and equal opportunities in post-Communist transition. *Work, Employment and Society*, 17(2), 331-357.
- Portes, Alejandro. (1998). Social capital: Its origins and applications in modern sociology. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 24(1), 1-24.
- Quigley, Kevin F. F. (2000). Lofty goals, modest results: Assisting civil society in eastern Europe. In Mariana Ottaway & Thomas Carothers (Eds.), *Funding virtue: Civil society aid and democracy promotion* (pp. 243-268). Washington, DC: Carnegie Endowment for International Peace.

- Rennie, Frank; Greller, Wolfgang, & MacKay, Mary (2002). *Review of international best practice in service delivery to remote and rural areas*. Edinburgh: Scottish Executive Social Research. Available on the web at:  
<http://www.scotland.gov.uk/library5/social/ribp.pdf>.
- Rodriguez, Eunice (2001). Keeping the unemployed healthy: The effect of means-tested and entitlement benefits in Britain, Germany, and the United States. *American Journal of Public Health*, 91(9), 1403-1411.
- Savage, Daniel M. (2002). *John Dewey's liberalism: Individual, community, and self-development*. Carbondale, IL: Southern Illinois University Press.
- Schaarschuch, Otto H-U (1999). A new social service professionalism? The development of social work theory in Germany. *International Journal of Social Welfare*, 8 (1), 38-46.
- Sen, Amartya. (2000). Work and rights. *International Labour Review*, 139(2), 119.
- Sen, Amartya. (1999). *Development as freedom*. New York: Anchor Books.
- Simon, Karla W., & Irish, Leon F. (2000). *Legal mechanisms to encourage development partnerships*. Retrieved from <http://www.icnl.org/journal/vol1iss1/istr.htm>.
- Snively, K., & Tracy, M. B. (2002). Development of trust in rural nonprofit collaborations. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, 31(1), 62-83.
- Snively, Keith & Desai, Uday (2001). Municipal government-nonprofit sector collaboration in Bulgaria: An attitudinal analysis. *American Review of Public Administration*, 31(1), 49-65.
- Stativă, Ecaterina (2002). *Child abuse in residential care institutions in Romania*. Bucharest: Extreme Group.
- Stern, Gary J. (1999). *The Drucker foundation self-assessment tool: Process guide*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass Publishers.
- Struyk, Raymond J. (2002). Nonprofit organizations as contracted local social service providers in Eastern Europe and the Commonwealth of Independent States. *Public Administration and Development*, 22, 429-437.
- Terracol, Antoine (2002). Analyzing the take-up of means-tested benefits in France. Preliminary Version. Retrieved 11 March 2003 from web at:  
<http://www.rennes.inra.fr/jma2002/pdf/terracol.pdf>.
- Turner, Sandra (2003). European voluntary action for an inclusive society. *Social Work in Europe*, 10 (1), 53-55.

- Van Hook, Mary P., Haxhiymeri, Edlira, & Gjermeni, Eglantina (2000). Responding to gender violence in Albania: A partnership effort. *International Social Work*, 43(3), 351-363.
- Walker, Robert & Wiseman, Michael (2003). Making welfare work: UK activation policies under new Labour. *International Social Security Review*, 56(1), 3-29.
- Wehrmann, Kathryn Conley. (2003). *Romanian child welfare reform: Progress on deinstitutionalization*. Unpublished draft manuscript.
- Winter, Ian (2000). *Towards a Theorised Understanding of Family Life and Social Capital*. Working Paper, 21. Melbourne, Australia: Australian Institute of Family Studies.
- Woolcock, M. (2000). Friends in high places? An overview of social capital. *Id21 Insights*, #34. Retrieved October 12, 2003 from <http://www.id21.org/insights/insights34/insights-iss34-art02.html>.
- World Bank (2001). *Albania - social services delivery project*. Report no. 22203. Washington, DC: Author.
- World Bank (2000). *Social capital for development*. Retrieved from web at: <http://www.worldbank.org/poverty/scapital/index.htm>.
- World Bank Group (2000). What is civil society? Retrieved from web at: <http://www.worldbank.org/poverty/scapital/sources/civil1.htm>.
- Ymeraj, Arlinda & Kolpeja, Vilma. (1998). Social services in Albania. In Munday, Brian & Lane, George, (Ed), *The old and the new: Changes in social care in Central and Eastern Europe* (pp. 29-44). Canterbury, England: The European Institute of Social Services.
- Zamfir, Elena (1997). Social services for children at risk: The impact on the quality of life. *Social Indicators Research*, 42(1), 41-77.

<b>Evaluation</b> <b>Good Practices in Social Service Delivery: Pre-Test Training</b>
--

*Please answer the following statements. Strongly Agree (SA), Agree (A), Disagree (D), Strongly Disagree (SD).*

### **Content and Process**

1.	Main objectives were clear.	SA	A	D	SD
2.	Training was well organized.	SA	A	D	SD
3.	Topics were appropriate.	SA	A	D	SD
4.	Distributed material was helpful.	SA	A	D	SD
5.	Class exercises were beneficial.	SA	A	D	SD

### **Specific Course Content**

The workshop helped me to better:

1.	Describe how government and NGOs can develop good practices.	SA	A	D	SD
2.	Recognize the characteristics of good practices.	SA	A	D	SD
3.	Explain the processes necessary to sustain effective social service programs.	SA	A	D	SD
4.	Design strategies for building community-based service partnerships.	SA	A	D	SD
5.	Develop procedures for performance standards.	SA	A	D	SD

### **Presenter Skills**

The presenters were:

1.	Knowledgeable about the subject.	SA	A	D	SD
2.	Well prepared.	SA	A	D	SD
3.	Able to hold my interest.	SA	A	D	SD

**Logistical Arrangements**

1. The workshop facility was satisfactory. SA A D SD

**Comments and Suggestions for Improvement:**

Please make any suggestions for improving content and format that you believe will strengthen the training.