

HJV /15 June 2011

## Minutes from the fourth partner meeting in Gent, 10 - 12 June 2011

### Agenda of the meeting

1. Appoint a moderator and a reporter
2. Approve the agenda of the fourth meeting and the minutes of the third meeting
3. Since last time: Info on matters not included in the items below
4. Status on the work programme
  - a) How far have we come?
  - b) What remains to be done?
5. Prepare a revised amendment to the project with deadline 15 June.
  - a) Conclusions from the monitoring visit in Bruxelles 6 May with the EU agency
  - b) Guidelines for the revised amendment
6. Evaluation of the publications
  - a) Evaluation of the compendium of Best Practise, including follow-ups
  - b) Compendium on Grundtvig courses
  - c) The Survey report
7. Evaluation of the pilot courses in Ljubljana
  - a) Conclusions from the participants' evaluation questionnaires
  - b) Internal evaluation in the project group of the planning and completion
  - c) Plan for follow-up contact to the participants
8. Plan for the completion of the tools
  - a) Time schedule for the completion of the tools
  - b) Other matters
9. Plan an improved monitoring and evaluation procedures in the project
10. Plan a comprehensive valorisation strategy for the last phase, Aug – Nov 2011
11. Complete a general project evaluation
  - a) Internal evaluation round
  - b) Fill-out the general project evaluation questionnaire
  - c) Fill-out evaluation questionnaire for the first, second and third partner meeting
12. Summary of decisions on time schedule
13. Evaluation of the fourth partner meeting in Gent
  - a) Internal evaluation round
  - b) Fill-out the meeting evaluation questionnaire (soon after the meeting)
14. A.O.B. (any other business)

## Annexes to the agenda

### Item 2:

LOAC, minutes third partner meeting, hjv,25.11.2010

### Item 4:

LOAC, task plan 2009-2011, revised November 2010, version 3

LOAC, Project description, text from application, version 1 (THE BIBLE)

### Item 5:

Interim report to EU-agency, Nov 2010

EU agency's approval of interim report (with critic and warnings), 1 Feb 2011

See page 20 – 22, Project Handbook, Guidelines for administrative and financial management and reporting, 2009

Amendment request to EU-agency, Nov 2010

EU Agency's answer to the amendment, changes of workplan

Text from the e-mail correspondence on the report and amendment and the monitoring visit

### Item 6:

Bente Schindel (ed.): The Compendium on Best Practise, web-version

Report on learning outcome, see article on "The learning view in the LOAC project", 18 May 2011

### Item 7:

Participants' Evaluation, presentation in excel, HJV, 8 June 2011,

### Item 8:

Manual for the online tool, version 1, HJV, 23.01.2011

Guide A, edit section

Guide B, the machine room

### Item 10:

See page 23 – 27 in Project Handbook, Guidelines for administrative and financial management and reporting, 2009

Outline of a revised dissemination & exploitation plan, hjv, version 1

### Item 11:

04 LOAC - Template, general project evaluation, version 1

01 LOAC - Template, evaluation of first meeting, version 1

01 LOAC - Template, evaluation of second meeting, version 1

01 LOAC - Template, evaluation of third meeting, version 1

### Item 13:

01 LOAC - Template, evaluation of fourth meeting, version 1

## Minutes

### Participants:

Wies Rosenboom, KF: Jan van den Eijnden; KF (left Saturday noon); Bente von Schindel, KSD; Marjeta Turk, JSKD; and Hans Jørgen Vodsgaard, IF.

### Item 1: Appoint a moderator and a referent

HJV was appointed as moderator and as keeper of the minutes.

### Item 2: Approve the agenda of the second meeting and the minutes of the first meeting

The proposed agenda, version 1 was adopted, and the minutes from the third partner meeting were approved.

### Item 3: Since last time: Info on matters not included in the items below

Nothing to mention

### Item 4: Status on the work programme

After the completion of the pilot courses we have concluded phase 3 and partly phase 4, where we must finish the different language editions of the tools and publish the three reports (where Best practise has been published). Ultimo June the tools must be finished and primo August the three publications must be published.

Then the last phase 5 remains with dissemination and exploitation, which starts primo August, and the project ends ultimo November 2011. Furthermore, we need to improve our procedures of monitoring and evaluation.

These improvements are necessary to avoid an assessment as "weak project implementation" and consequently 25 pct. reductions of the salary budget of the EU-grant. The initial budget had nearly 140.000 euro for salary, but after the withdrawal of BKJ the total salary cost is approx. 120.000 euro, and we get 75 pct. refunding, like 90.000 euro. With a reduction of 25 pct. - the total salary costs are reduced to 90.000 and the 75 pct. refunding is only 67.500 euro. Thus, the risk is a loss of 22.500 euro to divide between the partners according to their relative part of the total salary amount.

This risk should imply that we cannot get our costs in the last phase refunded before the project reporting has been approved by EU.

### Item 5: Prepare a revised amendment to the project with deadline 15 June.

#### a) Conclusions from the monitoring visit in Bruxelles 6 May with the EU agency:

The first message was that we should secure higher quality in the remaining period of the project to avoid an assessment as weak implementation. The risk points are especially evaluation and the dissemination and exploitation in the last phase.

#### b) Guidelines for the revised amendment

The second message was that we needed to make a new amendment with specification of the following Work packages

- WP 13 and 14 regarding work load of publishing an English tool.
- WP 17 regarding our dissemination plan in the last phase
- WP 18 (management and evaluation): 2. Susana Vargas: "Please pay special attention to Evaluation and Quality Assurance activities, as they are one of the main weaknesses of your project. The partnership should design a new plan for Evaluation and at the final report stage, the EACEA expects to see evidence that these activities took place."

The deadline for our revised amendment has been postponed to 15 June 2011. Decided, that HJV as coordinator can make the amendment with reference to the discussions and decisions on this meeting. BS must as representative of the beneficiary organisation sign and send the amendment.

## **Item 6: Evaluation of the publications**

### a) Evaluation of the compendium of Best Practise

The Compendium has been published, and BS has distributed the Compendium to the partnership both as paper edition and virtual edition. The compendium has also been used as course materials at the pilot Grundtvig course and workshop in Ljubljana.

The course evaluations gave in general the Compendium a high mark as useful to clarify the perspective of learning outcome in amateur art and voluntary culture, however some mentioned that they more saw the examples as examples of "good practise" and not as "best practise", because this could imply a baseline to compare the practise from.

The meeting discussed whether the Compendium was an example of "good" or "best" practise, and whether we should have used a method that presented a baseline to compare with. The conclusion was that we did not need to do this, because the idea of "best practise" here was to present the use of a learning perspective (with reference to the learning view in the project) on the activities of amateur art and voluntary culture. This perspective establishes in itself new quality standards for the outcome of the activities and new means of assessments. The examples may not be the best, but they were good to present and promote the concepts of new quality standards with reference to a learning concept with focus on personal formation and a learning perspective that incorporated EU's main goals of lifelong learning.

### b) Compendium on Grundtvig courses

The outline of the compendium is presented in the application: "The compendia on European week courses on learning dimensions of amateur culture including valuation of personal learning outcome for learners and organisational outcome for leaders and organisers of the activities. English edition. 30 - 40 pages. Publishing in print 900 items."

This Course Compendium must be made in relation to the experiences of the two pilot courses. Bente is primarily responsible. The deadline is primo August, i.e. 8 August 2011.

### c) The Survey report

The Report must be made with reference to the surveys in the first phase, the final tools and the methodological approach presented in the article to the pilot courses: "The learning view in the LOAC project".

English edition. 60 - 80 pages. Publishing in print 900 items.

HJV is responsible. The deadline is primo August, i.e. 8 August 2011.

## **Item 7: Evaluation of the pilot courses in Ljubljana**

### a) Conclusions from the participants' evaluation questionnaires

The overall impression is very positive, but there can be areas to improve.

- The course papers with practical information and course materials should have been released at least two weeks before start earlier and not just one week before.
- The participants asked for more knowledge of the other participants and their organisation before the course. Their presentations in Questionnaire 1, which they send to the course leaders, could have been released to all participants before the course.
- The organisation of the course schedule and workshops could be improved; the common information could be clearer, and changes of the time schedule of the one-day excursion and farewell party should have been avoided.
- The logistic between the hotel, meals and course venue was excellent, but the plenum room was too narrow and had a bad acoustic, the few times both groups were together (Sunday Evening and Friday morning).

The evaluation data and the comments from participants are presented in the attached excel-file.

### b) Internal evaluation at the partner meeting

Conclusions from the internal course evaluation at the meeting were regarding

#### *Points of strengths:*

- the learning terms and approach in LOAC gave meaning and could be used also after the course by the participants
- the participants saw strong possibilities in the tool and expressed interest in using it
- the participants had a high interest in assessment of best practise with a perspective of learning dimensions and goals.
- the participants could use the learning terminology of the LOAC project in their promoting of the core values of their activities to main stakeholders.
- there could be a broader interest /potential participants to similar Grundtvig courses after the conclusion of the project
- the projects results thus can have an potential strong and sustainable impact, and therefore we can plan an ambitious dissemination strategy

#### *Points of weaknesses:*

- The division of responsibilities in the planning process was not clear enough. Too many cooks spoil the preparation and serving of the meal.
- The course papers were released too late to the participants
- The final lists of participants were not made before the start, because we missed the list of the Slovenian participants.
- Practical information about the cultural visits and the excursion should have been released at least in the start of the courses.
- The instructors needed to have a meeting before the course to plan the final details of the programme

#### *Points of improvements:*

- When independent organisations especially from different countries cooperate on providing European courses there is a strong need for a clear division of responsibilities as well as one single course leader , who can take the final decisions of the programme and the enrolment procedure and distribution of course papers.
- The course information could be improved, if we have had a virtual base camp, where the participants before course start could find and download course materials, and during and after the course upload information about their organisations, presentations, pictures and exchange experiences and advices.

### c) Plan for follow-up contact to the participants

The participants' high commitment to the course objectives emphasises the need for a planned follow-up, and we should also see the participants as potential ambassadors for the dissemination of the project results, including the planning of the three national one-day conferences in October 2011.

The meeting decided that

- All materials including the participants' presentations from the workshops must be distributed to all participants and downloaded to the project's website.
- The three national organisations are responsible for collecting the presentations and other materials of their participants and for sending it to all participants and to HJV for uploads at the project website.
- The final list of participants with contact information (e-mails, telephone, mobile) must be distributed. Each organisation send address lists to HJV who make and distribute a common list for all participants and instructors.

- Bente establishes a Picasa Web Album and uploads our pictures and asks the participants to upload their pictures as well.
- Kunstfactor subscribes on the "base camp- programme". Jan clarifies, if and how we can use this "base camp" as a common work space for the participants as a common virtual information centre.

These tasks must be completed as soon as possible and latest 20 June.

### **Item 8: Plan for the completion of the tools**

#### a) Time schedule for the completion of the tools

According to the time schedule of the work the different language editions of the tool must be finished just after the completion of the pilot courses. The meeting decided that the deadline of the completion of the tool was as soon as possible and latest before the start of the summer holidays of the project leaders of the consortium. The latest deadline is 25 July, where the holiday for Marjeta, JSKD starts.

#### b) Other matters

Each edition of the tools must include the logo of the LLL-programme and a disclaimer. HJV contact the IT-firm to secure this demand.

### **Item 9: Plan an improved monitoring and evaluation procedures in the project**

The message from the monitoring visit in Bruxelles with EACEA was clear: We need to improve the documentation/ monitoring of the project progress, we must use for the evaluation. We thus need to collect and provide documentation on the project progress until now as well as secure more elaborated documentation for the remaining part of the project.

The meeting discussed the issue and decided that our our new plan for monitoring and evaluation should include:

A focus on progress (formative) evaluation using primarily

- 1) The minutes from the four partner meetings including internal evaluation of the preceding project phase.
- 2) The partnership fills out evaluation questionnaires for all four partner meetings latest 30 June.
- 3) The evaluation questionnaires filled out by the participants at the pilot courses can be used both for progress and impact evaluation.
- 4) A questionnaire for general project evaluation with focus on progress evaluation. This will be filled out by the partners just after the fourth meeting and latest 30 June before the start of the last and fifth project phase of valorisation and one more time at the end of the project.
- 5) Internal reports (using common guideline for questions to answer) by the partners from the three national conferences in October 2011 used both for progress and impact evaluation
- 6) Each partner makes a log of their actual valorisation activities (with reference to their detailed valorisation plan) in the fifth and and last project phase. This log starts from 13 May just a week after the monitoring visit in Brussels on the 6. May.
- 7) The project coordinator makes a log of the main mail correspondence during the whole project with and by the consortium, which can be used for progress evaluation

A focus on impact (summative) evaluation using

- 8) The questionnaires and interviews in the survey phase (WP 02) with learners and learning providers, which provide documentation to the need and impact analysis
- 9) The evaluation questionnaires from the pilot courses can be used both for progress and impact evaluation
- 10) Furthermore, each partner will before August 2011 make an interview with 3-4 participants from the pilot courses (potential end users of the results) to get some extra information on the out-

come of the courses and the potential impact of the project results. This should be done before summer holiday and latest 25 July, so we can use the conclusions for refinements/adjustments of the dissemination plan.

- 11) HJV make a questionnaire guide for these interviews latest 27 June.
- 12) Internal reports by the partners from the three national conferences in October 2011 with focus on impact evaluation and guidelines for a sustainable exploitation of the project results.
- 13) HJV make an questionnaire for evaluation of the valorisation activities latest Mid August, which the partners must fill out in the start and again in the end of the valorisation phase.

This documentation will be analysed and presented in the final project evaluation report, which will be an annex to the final confidential report to EACEA. Furthermore we will make a shorter public evaluation report as an annex to the final public report to EACEA, which will be published at the project website.

#### **Item 10: Plan the dissemination & exploitation strategy of the last phase, Aug – Nov 2011**

Another main message from the monitoring visit in Bruxelles with EACEA was that we need to «provide concrete details regarding the dissemination activities and its channels, and especially the ones related to the English dissemination to take place in countries outside the partnership. »

In general WP 15, 16 and 17 are strongly interrelated. WP 15 and 16 have primarily focus on dissemination, while WP 17 has primarily focus on exploitation. The detail planning started at the fourth partner meeting and latest 1 August each organisation must have prepared a comprehensive valorisation plan. The full plan of the three work packages includes

- 1) That the three national umbrella organisations must complete a comprehensive dissemination and exploitation plan for their own country, latest 1 August.
- 2) Each organisation has special responsibility for completing a focussed multiplication to the sector of amateur art, voluntary culture and liberal adult education and a focussed mainstreaming to decision-makers, opinion-formers, researchers and other multipliers in selected neighbour countries and European regions:
  - KSD (DK) for the other Nordic countries and United Kingdom.
  - IF (DK) for the other countries in The Baltic Sea Region including the Baltic States, Poland, North Germany and Northwest Russia
  - Kunstfactor (NL) for Belgium, Germany and Northwest France
  - JSKD (SI) for Croatia, Hungary and Austria
- 3) Furthermore, the consortium has a shared responsibility for the completion of a comprehensive trans-European dissemination and exploitation using main European network in the area of amateur art, voluntary culture and lifelong learning. We will at least use the following
  - a) trans-European umbrella organisations and network in amateur art and voluntary culture:
    - Amateo,
    - ENCC - European Network of Cultural Centres
    - Trans Europe Halles - Independent Cultural Centres in Europe
    - European Choral Association - Europa Cantat
  - b) trans-European cultural news media:
    - Culture Action Europe
  - c) trans-European network for liberal adult education:
    - EAEA
    - BNAL
    - NVL
  - d) trans-European Research area:
    - Compendium of Cultural Policies and Trends in Europe
    - LabforCulture.org
  - e) trans-European network for transfer and exploitation of EU projects :

- E.N.T.E.R
- Eve

The procedure of refinement of the transnational valorisation plan is that KSD make a preliminary list of target groups and send it to the partners latest 18 June. The partners then propose extra transnational organisations and return the lists to KSD latest 30 June.

4) Furthermore, the dates of the three national were decided:

In Slovenia	Tuesday, 18 <sup>th</sup> of October
In Copenhagen	Wednesday, 2 <sup>nd</sup> of November
In Holland	Thursday, 10 <sup>th</sup> of November

The programme of the conferences must be planned and announced latest mid August. HJV was asked to participate in all three conferences as a speaker with presentations of the learning view and objectives in the LOA project.

5) Finally, we decided that HJV prepare a standard template /guide for planning a comprehensive valorisation plan (including main questions regarding why, what, to whom, how, when and by whom. This template must be send to the consortium latest 27 June.

### **Item 11: Complete a general project evaluation**

#### a) Internal evaluation round

We had a comprehensive general project evaluation at the meeting. Furthermore we decided that each partner fill out the questionnaire for general project evaluation latest 30 June.

Main statements from the oral evaluation at the meeting were the following:

*First main point focussed on the quality of the initial project plan:*

HJV mentioned that some problems of the project implementation had reference to structural weaknesses of the initial project plan and succeeding approved application (compared to the quality standards of a European multilateral development project / the advices from the new Survival Kit):

- The competence profile of the consortium was too unilateral – the partners represent nearly the same area of work or expertise. It made it more difficult to plan a clear division of tasks and responsibilities. Most work packages did not have a clear lead partner with special expertise regarding this particular task. Instead all were responsible and it proved to be quite ineffective.
- There should have been a start-up phase before the kick-off meeting, where conditions and demands could have been clarified, the tasks and work load for each partner could have been discussed, means of communications, rules of procedures and Partner Agreements could have been prepared, etc. Even better – we should have had a preparatory meeting to clarify the project plan before the final application.
- The internal communication and use of ICT could have been more elaborated by the use of a virtual work space, common calendar, project planning software, web telephones and conferencing, etc.
- The dissemination and exploitation activities should have been more integrated in all phases of the project, and not only planned for the last fifth phase of the project.
- The quality assurance with monitoring, documentation and evaluation should have been more elaborated and integrated in the work programme with clear tasks and responsibilities for the whole partnership circle.

WR mentioned that the issue of the project has proved to be an interesting topic for many (amateur) arts organisations, teachers and participants in all partner countries. We could learn that it is important to develop a working method for partners so they can be better prepared at first hand.

BS mentioned that the initial project plan had shown to be very good and clear. However, there should have been a plan on the overall responsibility in relation to each work packet.



MT mentioned that the participating organisations had a very different profile and working area. Sometimes it was difficult to find mutual interest within the project. Anyhow, we learned a lot from each other and about different approaches to the theme.

*Second main point of the general evaluation focussed on the quality of the project implementation:*

BS mentioned that the dissemination plan should have started from the beginning of the project; and there should have been a better evaluation procedure, where everybody should have made a written evaluation of each meeting and every meeting should start with a discussion of the evaluation and which working tasks everyone had.

JvdE mentioned that at the leave of our German partner could have had a more practical approach based on EU-guidelines. It seemed as if we didn't realise enough the impact of such a major change; and we weren't able to find a suitable new partner in the available timeframe.

HJV mentioned that we at the kick-off meeting should have had a clearer focus on the partner agreement and rules of procedure, especially when partners miss to adhere to the agreed workplan and deadlines. Such rules should from the start clarify the coordinators right and obligation to reduce the degree of salary refunding from 100 pct to 0 pct in a defined period (for example a period of 30 days) after the deadline, and the procedure of a faster exclusion of partners. Instead the partnership circle had developed a too "friendly project culture", where deadlines should not be taken too seriously or delays are understandable and excusable.

MT mentioned that even though we have had an unreliable partner from Germany, the remaining partnership showed a positive approach to solve the problems and to ensure the sustainability of the project.

*The third main point focussed on the quality of project management and co-ordination:*

BS mentioned that we from the beginning of the project should have clarified procedures, when partners do not meet deadlines. It puts too heavy workload of the coordinator, when he continually has to ask for results.

WR mentioned that we should have been more aware of the very important issue of language and translations; and had developed ways or give advice on how to address effectively semantic and lingual problems when working on a multilateral scale.

MT mentioned that some of the project coordinators didn't have enough time and resources to fulfil the tasks on time. However, we have had a very reliable project leader, who took all the measures needed to fulfil the tasks.

HJV mentioned that the initial work programme had lacked a clear division of work and/or lead partners for each work package, and when all are responsible the result can easily be that nobody is responsible or the process of decision making become ineffective.

*The fourth main point focussed on the quality of the transnational partnership:*

HJV mentioned that the initial project plan had lacked an equal sharing of roles and responsibilities amongst partners; however the equal sharing has improved during the project. From the start of the project we should have used the necessary time and effort first to gain intercultural knowledge of the other partners work and experiences with the project topic, and secondly to gain relevant knowledge of the state of the art and needs regarding the project topic in a trans-European context. Thereby the European added value can be better integrated from the start of the project.

WR mentioned that working together on a transnational scale became easier and more enjoyable during the project. Based on mutual respect and awareness of responsibilities we grew in our roles and obligations.

BS mentioned that it has been a fantastic experience to work transnational with experts within you own field (though mutual). Maybe it is not possible to avoid that partners leave the project, but maybe there should be a fee to pay to do that. In order to avoid the situation we stood in, five partners or more should be recommended for a project.

MT mentioned that it had been difficult to coordinate schedules of all the partners and the tasks; however the European dimension of the project and the mutual responsibilities had been a strong point in the project.

*The fifth main point focussed on the quality of our own performance and outcome:*

WR and JvdE mentioned that within Kunstfactor they could have developed a better way of internal preparation before the first partner meeting. Anyhow, we took the project very seriously after the first partner meeting. In a team of three we developed an efficient way of working together. We had monthly meetings regarding the continuity and progress of the project.

MT mentioned that she did not have had enough time to fulfil the tasks on time, and at least at the start, not enough knowledge on the topic. Her priority has been to look at the practical points of the results of the project.

BS mentioned that she as financial administrator could have been more demanding in terms of delivering of annexes of the German partner. Then we might have anticipated his lack of commitment in time. Further she could have been in contact with the partners more often.

HJV mentioned that his performance as project coordinator of a European multilateral project can be improved:

- First, by a stronger focus on the preparatory planning of the project and the start-up phase with the objective to secure a truly multilateral consortium, a clear division of work and responsibilities, a strong commitment from all project members and their organisations, clear rules of procedures and internal communication, a strong integration of documentation and evaluation in the work programme, and a comprehensive valorisation plan with shared responsibilities during the whole project period.
- Secondly, by coordination that combines “friendly” guidance and support to the partners’ task solving with consequent and fast “unfriendly” sanctions, if the partners don’t solve their tasks as agreed and on time.
- Thirdly, by seeking useful support from external agencies and expertise and especially to get advice and secure an ongoing dialogue with EACEA, if or when problems occur and changes of plans are needed.

#### b) Fill-out the general project evaluation questionnaire

The questionnaire for general project evaluation had been attached to the invitation to this meeting. Decided that each partner fill out the questionnaire for general project evaluation latest 30 June.

#### c) Fill-out evaluation questionnaire for the first, second and third partner meeting

The questionnaires for retrospective evaluation of the first three partner meetings has been attach to the invitation to this meeting.

Decided that each partner fill out the questionnaire for the first, second and third partner meeting latest 30 June.

### **Item 12: Summary of decisions on time schedule**

- 1) The revised amendment must be sent to EACEA latest 15 June. HJV is responsible and BS sd send.
- 2) The tools must be translated and finished before the summer holiday and latest 25 July  
Each edition of the tools must include the logo of the LLL-programme and a disclaimer.  
HJV contact the IT-firm to secure this demand.
- 3) This Course Compendium must be made in relation to the experiences of the two pilot courses.  
Bente is primarily responsible. The deadline is primo August, i.e. 8 August 2011.
- 4) The report must be make with reference to the surveys in the first phase, the final tools and the methodological approach presented in the article to the pilot courses: “ The learning view in the LOAC-project “. HJV is responsible. The deadline is primo August, i.e. 8 August 2011.
- 5) Follow-up on the pilot courses:

- a) All course materials including presentations of instructors and participants, contact list of participants, links and pictures must be distributed to all and uploaded to the project web-site. Each organisation is responsible for collecting the different materials and distributing it to all - as soon as possible and latest 20 June.
  - b) Kunstfactor subscribes on the "base camp- programme". Jan clarifies, if and how we can use this "base camp" as a work space for the participants and virtual information centre. Must be done as soon as possible and latest 20 June.
- 6) Improved monitoring and evaluation:
- a) The partnership fills out evaluation questionnaires for all four meetings latest 30 June.
  - b) The partnership fills out the general evaluation questionnaire latest 30 June.
  - c) Each partner makes a log of their valorisation activities (with reference to their detailed valorisation plan) in the fifth and last project phase. This log starts from 13 May just a week after the monitoring visit in Brussels on the 6 May.
  - d) The project coordinator makes a log of the main mail correspondence during the whole project with and by the consortium, which can be used for progress evaluation.
  - e) Each partner will before August 2011 make an interview (real or virtual by phone and e-mail) with 3-4 participants from the pilot courses, latest 25 July.
  - f) HJV makes a questionnaire guide for these interviews latest 27 June.
  - g) Each partner make a short Internal reports from their national conference in October 2011 with focus on impact evaluation and guidelines for a sustainable exploitation of the project results. Latest 1 November.
- 7) Improved valorisation (dissemination and exploitation)
- a) HJV prepares a standard template /guide for planning a comprehensive valorisation and send it to the consortium latest 27 June.
  - b) Each national umbrella organisation prepares a comprehensive valorisation (dissemination and exploitation) plan for their own country, latest 1 August.
  - c) Each partner prepares an extra valorisation plan for their neighbour countries and/or European region, latest 1 August.
  - d) The consortium prepares a common valorisation plan targeting trans-European organisations and network. KSD send the first proposal of target groups latest 18 June, and the other partners supplement the list latest 30 June.  
KSD then make a plan for distribution of responsibilities (who contacts which network)
  - e) Each organisation prepares the programme of their national conference in October, and announces this programme latest Mid August.

### **Item 13: Evaluation of the fourth partner meeting in Gent**

#### a) Internal evaluation round

We had an evaluation round of the fourth meeting. Main statements were the following:

#### *1) Regarding the preparation of the partner meeting:*

WR mentioned that we due to the limited time availability of all the partners had to skip cultural activities and exchange in Gent, which is a pity of course.

MT mentioned that the materials for the meeting were sent a little bit too late. However, since the meeting didn't have a host, the participants connected better, because tasks of a host were shared.

BS had had some problems with getting everyone to attend full-time.

HJV mentioned that the final planning and information about the meeting place were very late

*2) Regarding the quality of the content of the programme:*

JvdE mentioned that we after several meetings and the course week now are able to work very much more effectively and consistent. Also on a personal field we now understand and value each other better and know the differences in competencies: working together is easier and had become a pleasure.

MT mentioned that the point of the summer vacation time wasn't realistically taken into account. Time schedule for future tasks was too tight.

BS mentioned that the evaluation and the dissemination were determined with the necessary details and distributions of tasks.

HJV saw no weaknesses to mention. When we compare the four meetings, we can see an ongoing progress in the focus and collaboration at the meetings and a still higher level of the multilateral commitment.

*3) Regarding the quality of other factors:*

BS mentioned the good hotel and good meeting facilities.

WR mentioned that at this meeting we worked fast and intensively and didn't take much time for social and cultural activities. (This can, to a certain extent, also been seen as a point of strength).

MT saw nothing to mention.

HJV mentioned that the meeting place in Ghent was good and furthermore optimal for the partners travel time, because two were already in the city and the rest had easy travel time. Ghent is an interesting medieval European city that brought some extra European added values to the meeting.

*4) Regarding the multilateral attitudes:*

BS mentioned that we now know each other very well and work as a strong team.

WR mentioned that the meeting was effective and very constructive based on mutual respect and understanding of our responsibilities in the LOAC project as a whole.

HJV mentioned that the positive attitude to multilateral cooperation had increased compared to the former three meetings; a major reason could be the positive experiences from the preceding pilot courses two weeks before in Ljubljana.

*5) Regarding evaluation, follow-up and overall rating:*

HJV mentioned that we at this meeting had managed to decide a detail task plan for the final project phase, including adjustments to the approved amendment; and we have now implemented comprehensive evaluation procedures including procedures for feed back after the meeting.

b) Fill-out the meeting evaluation questionnaire

The questionnaires for evaluation of the fourth partner meetings has been attach to the invitation to this meeting. Decided that each partner fill out the questionnaire for the fourth partner meeting latest 30 June.

**Item 14: A.O.B. (any other business)**

This was the last project meeting for the partnership circle, and all expressed a strong interest in finding ways to continue the contact and cooperation after the conclusion of the LOAC-project. Such cooperation could imply plans of new multilateral projects, planning of Grundtvig mobility activities, etc.

As a first step BS will propose one or more Grundtvig in-service training courses in 2012, which could have an interest for the project leaders to participate in. BS will send a proposal latest Mid August.