

22. 06.10 / hjv

LOAC, wp3

Presentation of the survey results, version 1

Content

1. SUMMARY OF THE WORK PROGRAMME.....	2
1.1 <i>Idea and main output.....</i>	2
1.2 <i>Objectives of the survey (WP 2) and the following guidelines (WP3).....</i>	3
1.3 <i>Objectives of the second partner meeting in Holland (WP 4).....</i>	3
2. CONTENT AND PERSPECTIVES OF THE SURVEY.....	4
2.1 <i>Presentation of Mission and learning profile.....</i>	4
2.2 <i>The method of the questionnaire.....</i>	4
2.3 <i>The questionnaire for learning providers.....</i>	5
2.4 <i>The questionnaire for learners.....</i>	6
2.5 <i>Interviews.....</i>	7
3. GUIDELINES FOR THE TWO ONLINE TOOLS.....	8
3.1 <i>Conclusions of the survey.....</i>	8
3.2 <i>Possible guidelines.....</i>	10
3.3 <i>Different models for the implementation of tools.....</i>	10
4. GUIDELINES FOR THE COMPENDIUM ON BEST PRACTISE.....	11
5. OUTLINE OF THE REPORT.....	12
ANNEXES TO THIS PRESENTATION.....	13

1. Summary of the work programme

1.1 Idea and main output

The idea of the project is to promote a valuation of amateur culture from the perspective of lifelong learning with the purpose to improve the learning quality and outcome of the voluntary cultural activities, and thereby to make them more attractive and transparent for the actual and potential participants.

The main output is first of all the development of two types of interrelated on line tools, one type for the learners' valuation of the personal learning outcome, and another for the providers' valuation of the organisational learning. Each type will consist of a series of one Danish, one German, one Flemish and one Slovenian edition used by the four national umbrella associations participating in the project.

The two types of tools can validate the same learning process from two different angles. The providers can compare the learners' outcome with the providing association's objectives, and the documentation can improve the work with monitoring, quality assurance and management of the adult learning. The data will be saved at a common database by the same domain; and it means that the data can be used for research on several levels, from a single organisation, to a group of local associations or a group of thematic associations, to a national and most important to a transnational European level. This network of national associations that uses the common transnational database can easily and by relative small costs be expanded with new umbrella associations from other European countries after the conclusion of the project.

The framework of the tools' questionnaire is formed by a humanistic learning theory that defines learning as an interrelated unity of the three dimensions: Competence, knowledge and personal formation (Bildung); and these dimensions are constituted of six elements, and each element is measured by up to five questions.

The second main output of the project is the initiation of a transnational course programme for active in Europe's amateur culture associations. The courses are first targeting teachers, tutors, facilitators and other pedagogical staff by offering Grundtvig-in-training courses, and secondly targeting board members and other leaders by offering Grundtvig workshops.

An integrated part of the courses will be exchange of experiences regarding innovative products and best practise in different learning areas, including an introduction to the methodology and practical use of the personal and organisational valuation tool.

The third main output is three English project publications.

The first is the report on valuation of learning qualities and outcome in voluntary cultural amateur activities including results of questionnaires and interviews in the partnerships associations.

The second is the compendia on best practise with focus partly on the main aims of active citizenship, cultural cohesion, personal fulfilment and employability; partly on a broader view on learning as composed of the three interrelated dimensions: competence, knowledge and personal formation; partly an aim of social inclusion of people of all ages, including those with special needs and disadvantaged groups ; and last an improving possibilities of transnational European activities as part of the ordinary activities of the cultural associations.

The third is the compendia on European week courses on learning dimensions of amateur culture, including annexes on announcements, organisation and economy.

1.2 Objectives of the survey (WP 2) and the following guidelines (WP3)

The first phase of the project includes a documentation survey and report (WP 2) and development of guidelines for the two evaluation tools (WP 3).

The overall objective of the mapping tasks in WP 2 is to achieve new knowledge and reflexion of learning goals and learning valuation, which may qualify the tasks of

- developing the guidelines (WP 3) for the development of the two pilot tools (WP 5 and 6)
- developing the methodology and data about learning qualities and learning profiles in the partner community, which must be presented in the project's first report (part of WP 2 - the final publishing happens in WP 12)
- clarifying the content of the Compendium of Best practice of learning activities related to EUs main learning aims (WP 7)
- preparing the programme of the two pilot courses (WP 9 and 10), which include the use of the the report of learning qualities, the two pilot tools and the compendium on best practise.

1.3 Objectives of the second partner meeting in Holland (WP 4)

The objectives of the Second Partner Meeting in Holland are to discuss the outcome of the survey (WP 2) with the objectives

- to adopt the guidelines (WP 3) for the development of the two pilot tools (WP 5 and 6)
- to clarify the outline of the report of learning qualities (part of WP 2)
- to clarify the outline of the Compendium of Best Practise (WP 7)

These tasks must be completed before our Third Partner Meeting in Slovenia, November 2010. Here we must evaluate the results and start planning the programme of the two pilot courses that must be completed latest in March 2011 (WP 9 and 10).

2. Content and perspectives of the Survey

2.1 Presentation of Mission and learning profile

The data of the missions learning profile are presented in ./ "LOAC, wp 2 - Data on mission, questionnaires and interview, version 1", and first worksheet named "missions". All partners have filled out the mission paper.

In relation to EU's main objectives for learning it can be seen that the overall highest assessment is given to personal fulfilment (average of 0,88) followed by social inclusion (0,81), active citizenship (0,75), cultural cohesion (0,69) and lowest for employability (0,31). But the assessment varies between the organizations: All organisations give the highest value to personal fulfilment (from 0,75 to 1,00) and the lowest to employability (from 0,00 to 0,50). It can be a surprise that JSKD value active citizenship lower than social inclusion and that BKJ give cultural cohesion a relatively low weight.

In relation to the learning outcome it can be seen that the overall highest assessment is given to Personal formation (average of 0,88), followed by competencies (0,75) and lowest Knowledge and skills (0,69). It is only KSD and BKJ that give personal formation the highest valuation, while JSKD and Kunstfactor give the same value to the three dimensions.

In relation to the life sphere perspective the overall highest assessment is given to the personal sphere as human being (0,88) followed by the civil and public sphere ad citizen (0,75) and as fellow human being (0,63), and the clearly lowest value is given to the sphere of work life and formal education as employee and student. But it is only KSD and Kunstfactor that gives the lowest value of these to spheres, while JSKD and BKJ give them a quite high valuation.

2.2 The method of the questionnaire

The questionnaires include questions for the learning providers (WP 2.2) and for the learners (WP 2.3). The task for the organisations were to collect 5-8 answers from learning providers and 10-15 answers from learners. I have received from

KSD: 10 answers from learning providers and 6 answers from learners

JSKD: 9 answers from learning g providers and 4 from learners.

Kunstfactor: 5 answers from learning providers and 2 from learners

BKJ: None

Only the first sections of the questionnaires have factual questions about background, while the main part of the questions is related to attitude issues. These questions regarding attitudes and values cannot be measured directly but only indirectly through indicators, typically through indications of degree of adherence to an attitude issue. To ensure a greater certainty of the measurement of attitudes the questions include several questions on the same issue, where the response values are added together and their average is found.

The numerical values of the attitude answers are derived from a five point Likert scale, where the series of five response categories consisted of

Decisive importance /high importance /moderately importance /low importance /not important

Decisive effect /High effect / moderately effect / low effect / no effect

Fully agree / mostly agree / neutral / mostly disagree / totally disagree

Thereby the respondents assessment of the statements can be value on a point-scale ranging from 1.0 (100 %) / 0.75 (75 %) / 0.50 (50 %) / 0.25 (25 %) / 0.0 (0 %). This type of conversion requires that the five response categories is approximate continuous.

2.3 The questionnaire for learning providers

The data of the questionnaire for learning providers are presented in “LOAC, WP 2 - Data on mission, questionnaires and interview, version 1”, by the second worksheet named “answers of leaders”.

This worksheet only presents the basic data. There is not yet made extractions for different variables of subpopulations.

The overall average for the answers from the learning providers (from KSD, JSKD and KF) regarding EUs main goals of lifelong learning shows the following tendencies:

In the general question on the five main goals the tendencies are, that “cultural cohesion” get the highest value (a average of 0,75) followed by “personal fulfilment” (0,70), “active citizenship” (0,60), and “social inclusion” (0,55) and the lowest value for “employability” (0,42).

But with the three extra questions regarding these goals the picture is slightly different. The “cultural cohesion” is still highest (0,68) but now followed by “active citizenship” (0,67) and then “personal fulfilment” (0,65). “Social inclusion” is still second lowest (0,59) and “employability” is still lowest (0,53), but with a higher value.

When we compare the assessments from the learning providers with the project leaders in the mission statements we can see some differences. The project leaders can be seen as more “progressive” or less instrumental than the active learning providers in the same organisation.

- For KSD the learning providers follow Bente’s valuation with personal fulfilment as the one with highest value and employability with the lowest value, but they give especially a higher valuation of “cultural cohesion”.
- For JSKD the learning providers don’t follow Marjeta, but assess “personal fulfilment” lowest (0,56) and “employability” quite high (0,75).
- For Kunstfactor the learning providers agree with Jan, that employability is of lowest value (0,42) and they value “personal fulfilment” highest (0,65).

In relation to possible attitudes the learning providers overall give a clear priority to the humanistic value (0,53) while Christian and other religious values are very low (0,03 – 0,05), and they express high valuation of the goals of liberal adult education (0,65 – 0,68 – 0,44) and thereby confirm the close relation between art based learning and liberal adult education.

In relation to the learning outcome of the actual activities of the organisations the learning providers overall estimate that the dimension of personal formation (Bildung) has the highest outcome (0,64), while the dimension of knowledge (0,58) and competences (0,58) is given a lower importance. The elements of personal formation that get the highest value is “authenticity” (0,68) and “autonomy” (also 0,68). Here the learning providers more or less follow their (project) leaders, who also stated the highest value to the dimension of personal formation.

In relation to future priorities of the organisations learning outcome the learning providers give nearly the same valuation of the three dimensions (0,67 – 0,67 – 0,64).

It can be mentioned that there was very few “don’t know” answers. All could answer the questions, and the most important conclusion could be that the learning providers show a positive attitude to humanistic values and they accept the questions regarding personal formation and give them in average the highest valuation. They hereby support a learning view that integrates the dimension of personal formation.

2.4 The questionnaire for learners

The data of the questionnaire for learners are presented in “LOAC, WP 2 - Data on mission, questionnaires and interview, version 1”, by the third worksheet named “answers of learners”. This worksheet only presents the basic data. There is not yet made extractions for different variables of sub-populations.

The answers from the learners (from KSD, JSKD and KF) regarding their actual learning profile show the following tendencies:

The overall average express the same value to personal formation (0,73) and competences (0,73) and lowest knowledge & skills (0,65). The average for each organisation show the same tendency learners’ value under their own learning profile weighted formation and competencies with 0.64, while knowledge is weighted slightly lower with 0.53.

The learners’ overall valuation of the actual learning is quite similar to the learning providers answers and the project leaders mission statements

In relation to the dimension of personal formation the overall average of valuation of the six elements are in prioritized order Autonomy (0,76), Moral Sense (0,74), Aesthetic Sense (0,74), Authenticity (0,73), Reflexive knowledge (0,70) and Versatile personal development (0,70).

For KSD the two highest are Autonomy (0,83) and Authenticity (0,75) and the two lowest are Aesthetic Sense (0,66) and Reflexive Knowledge (0,63). For JSKD the three highest are Moral sense (0,73), Knowledge (0,70) and Authenticity (0,70); and the two lowest are Autonomy (0,65) and Versatile personal development (0,61). For Kunstfactor’s answers the two highest are Versatile personality (0,80) and Autonomy (0,80), and the lowest is Authenticity (0,73).

In relation to the dimension of knowledge & Skills the overall average of valuation of the six elements are in prioritized order Knowledge of main topic (0,72), Knowledge of culture (0,67), Knowledge of human conditions (0,67), Skills of main topic (0,66), Knowledge of society (0,60) and didactics (0,60).

For KSD the two highest are Knowledge of main topic (0,80) and knowledge of culture (0,75) and the two lowest are Knowledge of human conditions (0,61) and knowledge of society (0,54). For JSKD the two highest are knowledge of culture (0,66) and of human conditions (0,66); and the two lowest are Didactic (0,59) and knowledge of society (0,54). For Kunstfactor’s answers the two highest are Knowledge of human conditions (0,75) and knowledge of main topic (0,73) and the lowest is Didactic (0,58).

In relation to the dimension of competences the overall average of valuation of the six elements are in prioritized order Intercultural (0,78), Self Management (0,76), Creative (0,73), Communicative (0,71), Learning (0,70) and Social (0,68).

For KSD the two highest are Self Management (0,83) and Intercultural (0,78); and the two lowest are Creative (0,64) and Social (0,64). For JSKD the two highest are Intercultural (0,78) and Communicative (0,73); and the two lowest are Self management (0,62) and Learning (0,62). For Kunstfactor’s answers the two highest are Self Management (0,83) and Creative (0,83); and the two lowest are Communicative (0,73) and Learning (0,73).

Regarding the learners assessment of the learning benefits of the activities of their association the overall average are quite high. For personal formation the importance is valued with 0,66, for knowledge with 0,58 and for competences with 0,60.

2.5 Interviews

The interviews indicate new tendencies. It is only Kunstfactor which for the time being has made and send the interview.

These interviews with learners and learning providers present compared with the mission statements and the questionnaires slightly different assessments of the learning outcome and learning perspective.

Kunstfactor (NL):

In relation to the use or application of the learning outcome in the different life spheres the learning provider emphasises that the young learners don't choose the theatre activities as a preparation for a future professional artistic career, but as a mean primarily for a personal development in the "personal sphere" and only secondary for the public sphere as active citizen or the formal study or work life. The learning provider gives priority in her classes to the personal sphere of life and the sphere of live as a fellow human being.

The two learners from theatre and dance also emphasise the personal sphere or the personal development (personal fulfilment). The activities develop their ability to express feelings and to relax and to feel more whole or authentic and secondary this can also strengthen their competences in other spheres.

The learning provider emphasises in relation to the dimensions of learning in general the personal formation and competencies, because the pupils don't have the skills and ambition to be professional actors.

Regarding the learning outcome of the dimension of personal formation the highest priority is given to the versatile personal development (the whole person), the Aesthetic sense and Authenticity.

Regarding the dimensions of knowledge and skills it has an ambiguous importance. On the one hand the knowledge and skills of the artistic topic are in front when the activity is promoted and they also have the main focus of the lessons. On the other hand very few participants have ambitions of a professional artistic career and the most important learning outcome is related to the two other dimensions of the learning.

Regarding the dimensions of competencies they are an important goal for and outcome of the activities and all six elements are important.

The two learners from theatre and dance emphasises in line with the learning provider that the learning outcome in relation to personal formation and competences is more important than the specific artistic education.

Regarding the dimensions of personal formation they both see authenticity and aesthetic sense as the most important, and even though they talk about the importance to be a whole person, they don't see versatile personal development as a distinctive element, but more as a sum of the previous five element of personal formation.¹

Regarding the dimension of knowledge and skills they both prioritise the specific skills of art, but they also give importance to the general knowledge of man and especially the ability to learn.

Regarding the dimension of competencies they regard the development of all the competencies as important.

¹ This is an important argument. You could say - that when you have both authenticity and autonomy, you also have the ability to swift between them, sometimes in control and self determinant and using your reason, other times spontaneous and self forgetting and using your feelings. Maybe.

You could also say – that when you have developed your abilities both for cognitive judgements, moral judgements and aesthetic judgements, you also naturally can combine and integrate them to a full judgement. Maybe. Because maybe you only use different abilities in different situations and don't integrate their use. To be a versatile person means you have the ability to integrate your different abilities, and this ability for personal integration could also be something you must learn. This is the reason why it here is presented as a distinctive element.

As final recommendations both the learning providers and the two learners recommend that it is the artistic topic which should be used in promoting, but at the same time it is important to communicate the importance of the other elements of learning outcome. It is the artistic topic you can use to find new participants, but the success of the activities depends on their ability to develop the other learning elements, especially authenticity in relation to the sphere as a personal human being.

It can be mentioned that neither the learning provider nor the learners considered that the terminology and questions were difficult to understand or were too “academic”. It seems that the concepts and learning frame gave meaning and could be used for further reflexion and self-reflexion.

3. Guidelines for the two online tools

3.1 Conclusions of the survey

The common tendencies of the mission statement of the project leaders, the questionnaires with learning providers and learners and the interviews can be summarised as followed:

1. In relation to EUs five main goals of lifelong learning the project leaders and learning providers in general give highest priority to personal fulfilment and lowest priority to employability, and thus emphasises a more humanistic view on lifelong learning.
2. There is an understanding of the different live spheres where the learning outcome can be used. The involved emphasise that the most important life spheres for their amateur activities are the personal and civil sphere and not the formal studies or work life. It must be mentioned because the main stream understanding in EU is that the main value of non-formal learning in liberal adult education and informal learning in the voluntary associations in civil society is that it can improve the employability of the learners. The involved show a more humanistic understanding of learning and confront directly and indirectly the more instrumental and economic view on lifelong learning.
3. The learning concept with three dimensions give meaning for the involved, and it must be pointed out that especially the dimension of personal formation has stayed the course, even though the European main stream more instrumental learning theory don't incorporate this dimension (of Bildung).
4. Regarding the dimension of personal formation it can be seen that
 - 4.1. The element of authenticity has a high priority especially for the young learners. It is interesting because this is an element, which is typical underestimated or blind in the learning theories even in the theories with reference to Bildung, where autonomy is in focus.
 - 4.2. The three elements of cognitive, moral and aesthetic judgement (with reference to the three main forms of communicative reason) make sense
 - 4.3. The last element of “the whole person” (versatile personal development) or better “personal integration” is seen as maybe the most important outcome, but at the same time is questioned as a distinctive element because it can be seen as the sum of the other elements. I think we need to discuss this and maybe revised the name and questions, so the ability of integration (of reason and feeling, of the three judgements) is more in focus.
5. Regarding the dimension of knowledge and skills it can be seen that
 - 5.1. Even though the main artistic topic should be expected to be in front, it seems like the more general knowledge of human conditions, society and culture also play an important part of the total learning outcome, both actual and as a priority for the learning providers and learners.
 - 5.2. The concrete artistic knowledge and skills is important for promoting the amateur culture activity and important for the learners to choose this activity, but the value of the learning outcome is valued broader both of the learning providers and learners, when they have joined in.

- 5.3. The consequences for the promoting of the activities to the stakeholders can be open. The possible participants could have an interest in viewing their outcome in a broader learning perspective. The political decision makers could need to be more conscious about this extra learning outcome, especially of the more humanistic and democratic perspective. Because they will typically not value the artistic outcome, but the possible indirect effect on the learners' future employability or ability for formal education in other subjects.
6. Regarding the dimension of competencies it can be seen that
- 6.1. This dimension has a general high valuation both from the project leaders, the learning providers and the learners. All elements are with minor variations seen as important by all the involved.
- 6.2. Especially competences are recognised by the EU-system and the political decision makers and have a high priority in the main stream learning debate. Because the idea is that these transversal competencies acquired in one learning area (here by informal art activities/ non-formal art education) can be transferred to and used in other areas such as formal studies and work life.
- 6.3. Therefore it can be important to emphasise that these competences also can be used in the personal, civil and public sphere outside the work life as humans, fellow human beings and active citizens. The reproduction of a good society not only needs work life with a high instrumental reason but also a personal, civil and public life with a high communicative reason. We can with Jürgen Habermas and the Critical Theory say, that the importance of competences is not only to support an effective system world but also to support the life world with a high level of communicative and expressive reason.
- 6.4. If the amateur culture organisations try to legitimize their existence by primary reference to their contribution to competence building for the system world they have lost the agenda and the ideological initiative. Partly because relevant competences for a competitive business sector at the global market can be better developed in other learning arenas such as adult vocational education, formal education and in work training; and partly because the dimension of Bildung (personal formation) at best is irrelevant and at worst is problematic for a market work life. But general competences and especially Bildung is important for the part of society with reference to a communicative life world and a free civil society.

In general the learning concept of three dimensions gives meaning for the learning providers and learners in the amateur culture or voluntary cultural sector; and it brings light on other parts of the learning, than the main stream learning theory and their tools for assessments can provide.

But this broader learning concept must at the same time be substantiated or supported by a broader view on the learning perspective with reference to the equal importance of different life spheres and life roles (as a modern man in the personal sphere, as a fellow human being in the civil sphere, as a citizen in the public sphere and as an employee in the work life – as *l'homme*, *citoyen* and *bourgeois*).

And this differentiation of learning perspectives is important for the sake of the general reproduction of a modern civilised society with both an effective system world and a communicative life world with a high learning capacity in civil society. The two worlds cannot do without each other. But the instrumental rationality rooted in the system worlds of the market and state has a tendency to colonize the communicative rationality of the life world, even though the system depends on a free life world, because its three main functions - to ensure cultural meaning, social solidarity and personal identity – cannot be produced commercially or administratively.

A modern society has not only a need for updated employees but also for active citizens and enlightened human beings. A society without a rich life world is not just a poor society in spiritual and human terms, it is a one-dimensional society, where society's lifeblood - a vibrant culture, a free public and active democracy with free enlightened citizens – is drying out, and the long term reproduction of the society is at risk.

3.2 Possible guidelines

An important purpose of the surveys has been to qualify our decisions regarding the guidelines for the development of two interrelated on line tools, it means one tool for the learners' valuation of the personal learning outcome, and another tool for the learning providers' valuation of the organisational outcome. The two types of tools should validate the same learning process from two different angles. The learners can assess their personal outcome, and the providers can compare the learners' outcome with the providing association's objectives, and this documentation can improve the work with monitoring, quality assurance and management of the adult learning.

For the time being we have a quite developed frame for the learners' valuation, but not for the organisational valuation. The questions for the learners' tool include for the time being 3 dimensions x 6 elements x 5 questions about the actual learning profile and 3 x 6 questions about the artistic activities impact on the learning outcome, a total of 108 questions. But this frame doesn't have questions about the importance of EUs main objectives for lifelong learning, and about the learning perspectives of life spheres. We have the questionnaire for the learning providers, which include questions for EUs main goals of lifelong learning and for the three dimensions of learning, but only partly for the learning perspectives of live spheres (in section 6 on attitudes on common conditions).

The two tools must be more integrated, if they shall compare the same parts from different angles. But the frame is already big with many questions, so it can be necessary to reduce not the 3 dimensions or 6 elements but the 5 questions for each element to maybe 3 questions.

It means both tools could include

- A main section with 3 learning dimensions and 6 elements and 3 questions pr. element plus one questions of impact pr. element, a total of 72 questions, where the learners assess their actual outcome and the learning providers state their priorities. Thereby the learners' outcome and the providers' priorities can be compared.
- A minor section regarding EUs five main goals of lifelong learning and maybe some extra goals for artistic quality and liberal adult education. IT can give 8 goals with 3 questions pr. goal, a total of 24 questions.
- A minor section regarding the perspectives of life spheres for the use of the learning outcome. Here we have 5 main spheres (the personal, the civil, the public, the study and the work life) and 3 questions pr. sphere, a total of 15 questions
- The integrated frame then has 72 + 24 + 15 questions, total 111. It is still a very long questionnaire; we can need to reduce it further. Especially if some organisations want to have some extra questions with special relevance for their organisation.
- The main section must be mandatory for the learners, if they shall produce the document of their personal learning profile; but the two minor sections could be voluntary for the learners. Hopefully many will fill them out because it will bring extra information both for themselves, and especially for the organisations.

3.3 Different models for the implementation of tools

The idea of developing the tools imply to different aims. On the one hand the tools must be adapted to the organisations special learning profile and needs for documentation, and this imply different tools; on the other hand the tools should so general that they can be used of different type of organisations and secure comparative analyses of the learning outcome between different cultural organisations, and this imply a common tool.

Hopefully this project consortium can agree on a common frame for the tools, so the only difference is the language of the same text and some differences of presentation of the organisations name, colour, logos etc. But if it is impossible to reach consensus of the elements and questions, an alternative could be to open for some variation of the questions, where some parts of the frame are common and other parts vary for each organisation. For the common part there can be comparative data, for the special parts a comparison are impossible. This solution will be more demanding for the ITC-firm and it will be more expensive, and maybe only possible if the organisations will contribute with own financing.

4. Guidelines for the compendium on best practise

According to our revised task plan we shall in the period June to October 2010 prepare a Compendium on best practise (Work package 7). This compendium must have references to the same issues as the survey such as EUs goal of lifelong learning, a learning concept which include the three dimensions and furthermore it must also present issues of social inclusion of people of all ages, including those with special needs and disadvantaged groups; and present possibilities of transnational European activities as part of the ordinary activities of the cultural associations

In the project application approved by EU the output was described in the following manner:

A compendium of best practice of voluntary cultural activities of the associations of the partnership that promote

- the main aims of the lifelong learning programme - active citizenship, cultural cohesion, personal fulfilment and employability;
- a broader view on learning as composed of the three interrelated dimensions - competence, knowledge & skills, and personal formation (Bildung);
- social inclusion of people of all ages, incl. those with special needs and disadvantaged groups;
- and transnational European activities as part of the ordinary activities of the cultural associations

In work package 12 the result to publish are described in this way:

The compendia on best practise of the partnerships activities with focus partly on the over arching aims of lifelong learning, partly on a valid view on learning including both competence, knowledge and personal formation, partly on the possibilities of transnational European cooperation. English edition. 60 - 80 pages. Publishing in print 900 items.

The budget are for WP 7 a total of 5 days for JSKD, KF and BKJ and 15 days for KSD as editor, and i WP 12 there are 4.000 euro for translation of the article to English (with 10 articles it gives 400 euro pr. articles to each organisation for translation from mother tongue to English.

A minimum of articles could be 2-3 for each four objectives and 1-2 common articles, approx. 12 articles of 5-6 pages, total 60 – 70 pages.

It is in my point of view important that the articles relates to the broad learning concept and the more humanistic goals of lifelong learning and the perspective of the personal, civil and public spheres, and thereby promote a non-instrumental learning view on best practice.

5. Outline of the report

According to the project application a report on learning qualities and valuation should be prepared in work package 2 and 3, and the final report should be published in work package 12. The report is planned to be in English and with a size of 60 – 80 pages.

The outline of the report is the following:

Preface

I. Aims and methods (5 pages)

1. Presentation of the project and the partnership circle
2. Problem formulation
3. The approach

II. Theory (25 pages)

4. Critical Theory
5. Differentiations in Modern societies – life world and system world
6. Paradigm struggle of learning – instrumental and humanistic agendas
7. Paradigm struggle of civil society – instrumental and democratic agendas
8. Antinomies of the views on learning qualities and learning valuation
9. Critical perspectives

III. The survey (30 pages)

10. Methodology and procedure
11. The mission statements
12. The questionnaires for learning providers
13. The questionnaires for learners
14. The interviews
15. Conclusions of the survey

IV. Guidelines for the learning tools (10 pages)

16. The background and tendencies for learning tools
17. Learning goals and perspectives of application
18. The learning concept – dimensions and elements
19. The double tool - combining the valuation of personal and organisational learning
- 20 Outline of the online questionnaires

V. Perspectives and recommendations (5 pages)

21. The valorisation of the tools
22. Perspectives and impact

Annexes

Bibliography

Annexes to this presentation

Mission statements

Interviews with learners and learning providers

Work sheets with

Data from the mission statements

Data from the learning providers

Data from the learners