Best4 OLDER LGBTI

Co-funded by the Rights,
Equality and Citizenship (REC)
Programme of the European Union

D2.9 Recommendations factsheet:
Awareness face-to-face actions

www.best4older-lgbti.org

Objectives

- The main aim of the face-to-face actions was to transfer to participants key-messages related to sexuality and gender in older age and to help participants:

  - Understand key LGBTI concepts and issues

  - Understand gender identities, sexual orientations and sex characteristics, and make clear distinctions between them

  - Identify and avoid stereotypes based on age

  - Identify and avoid stereotypes based on Sexual Orientation, Gender Identity and Sex Characteristics (SOGISC)

  - Understand the ways in which ageism and anti-LGBTI stereotypes create unique challenges for older LGBTI people

  - Respond to such stereotypes and prejudices with true facts

Session Plan

- Each session lasted approximately 2 hours and included the following activities

  - Introductions & Presentation of the project

  - Basic LGBTI terminology

  - Common myths and stereotypes towards older LGBTI people

  - Combating stereotypes & Supporting older LGBTI people

  - Closing & Feedback

Participants

- The awareness face-to-face actions targeted 6 specific groups

  - Health & Social professionals

  - Third level education students

  - Public Servants

  - Employers

  - Educators

  - General public

- Each action was originally designed for 6-8 people to foster active participation and interaction between participants, but adaptations were made aiming to reach the total number.

Participants

- In the following table are the number of participants per target group and per country*

	Italy	*Portugal*	*Romania*	*Greece*	*Ireland*	**Group total**
Educators	9	13	31	16	10	**79**
Employers	8	16	7	-	*47*	**68**
General public	10	10	12	12	-	**44**
Students	8	16	20	11	-	**55**
Health & Social professionals	10	10	8	12	-	**40**
Public servants	-	6	7	4	-	**17**
Country total	*45*	*61*	*85*	*55*	*57*	*303*

Participants

- Differences were noted in the involvement of each target group.

  - Public servants were the most difficult target group to reach out to in all five countries.

  - Employers were also difficult to reach out to in almost all countries, with the exception of Ireland.

  - In Greece and Italy the target group of employers was broadened to include people who work in human resources or other managing positions. In Ireland a webinar was organized targeting specifically employers in two private sector companies.

Participants

- In Romania, the MUPIS that were created as part of the project's awareness campaign received intense backlash, which could have had a negative impact on the numbers of participants reached, as people might have felt reluctant to participate in the actions.

Online implementation

- All actions were implemented online due to the covid-19 restrictions, utilizing Zoom and other online platforms.

- This had some advantages in terms of participation, as partners had the possibility to address a wider audience and reach out to people who live in other cities and would otherwise not have the chance to participate.

- However online implementation limited the potential for interaction between participants and required adjustments to the format of the event, e.g. utilizing "breakout" rooms for working on smaller groups, or preparing the actions in a webinar format.

Evaluation

- Since the actions were implemented online participant did not fill out an evaluation form at the end of the session. An online form was sent out after the end of the session. This resulted in some cases in fewer participants filling in the evaluation.

- The majority of participants in all countries who filled in the evaluation forms reported being satisfied with the content of the actions and the methods used and that they would recommend them to others.

- The responses of participants showed that, although originally tailored as face-to-face actions, the online implementation was successful.

Recommendations

- Based on the partners experience of implementing the face-to-face awareness actions, as well as the feedback received from participants, we have compiled a list of recommendations for future replications of the actions. These include:
  - Marketing each action separately for each target groups, putting emphasis on the specialized knowledge and information they will acquire.
  - Organizing actions in cooperation with organisations, companies, schools, or other relevant stakeholders, to ensure participation.
  - Inviting experts on the respective field and/or people with personal experience to increase people's interest and motivation to participate.
  - Stating clearly the objectives of the face-to-face action while disseminating them, so that participants know what they can expect to gain from their participation

Recommendations

- Adapting the contents of the action to the specific needs of each group, by adding information most relevant to their field (e.g. cases of work discrimination based on age and/or SOGI for employers, introducing family diversity to the classroom for educators, etc.)

- Encouraging participants to express their questions, by offering them ways to do it anonymously (e.g. with post-it notes or anonymous polls in the case of online implementation), as some participants may feel reluctant to openly ask questions.

- For actions implemented online: Sending evaluation questions as an online poll before they leave the session, in order to ensure a higher response rate.

- Preparing an info-pack that can be sent to participants after the actions, with educational material on LGBTI terminology, legal framework, stereotypes / myths and information debunking them, good practices and contact information for LGBTI / human rights organisations.

- Following up with participants, e.g via chat or email, for questions that may arise after the session.

www.best4older-lgbti.org

PROJECT PARTNERS: