

02.07.2010 / hjv

Minutes, Second Partner Meeting in Utrecht, 28 - 29 June 2010

Agenda

1. Appoint a moderator and a reporter
2. Approve the agenda of the second meeting and the minutes of the first meeting
3. Since last time: Info on matters not included in the items below (Presentation Lotte etc.)
4. Status of budget and cost refunding, by Bente
5. Status of work programme, by Hans
6. Presentation and discussion of the surveys on learning qualities and outcome (WP 2)
 - a. The mission paper – priorities of learning qualities (WP 2.1)
 - b. The questionnaires of learning providers (WP 2.2)
 - c. The questionnaires of learners (WP 2.3)
 - d. The interviews with learning providers and learners (WP 2.4)
 - e. Summary and conclusions
 - f. Present the outline of the survey report for WP2, by HJV
7. Discuss and adopt guidelines of the two online tools (WP 3 and WP 5 and 6)
8. Discuss and adopt guidelines for the Compendium of Best Practice (WP 7)
9. Discuss and adopt the task plan of the second project phase (WP 5 – 7 in the autumn, before the third partner meeting in Slovenia, November 2010)
10. Evaluation of the first phase of the project (WP 1 – 3)
11. Evaluation of the second partner meeting in Holland (WP 4)
12. A.O.B. (any other business)

Annexes to the agenda

Item 2:

LOAC, minutes first partner meeting, hjv,13,01.2010

Item 4:

LOAC, Template, Cost refunding of travel and accommodation, version 1, 10.11.2009

LOAC, Template, cost refunding of work task, version 2, 13.12.2009

Item 5:

LOAC, task plan 2009-2011, revised November 2009, version 2

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

Item 6:

WP 2-1, Presentation of mission and learning profile, version 1,

WP 2-2, Questionnaire, learning providers, version 1,

WP 2-3, Questionnaire for learners, version 1,

WP 2-4, Interviews, view on learning, version 1

LOAC, WP 2 - Data on mission, questionnaires and interview, version 1

Presentations of the survey results, version 1, Section 2 and 5

Item 7:

Questionnaire for learners (WP 2.3) – can be used as a standard model for revisions

Presentations of the survey results, version 1, Section 3

Item 8:

Presentations of the survey results, version 1", Section 4

Item 9:

LOAC, task plan 2009-2011, revised November 2009, version 2

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

Minutes

Participants:

Jan van den Eijnden; KF; Wies Rosenboom, KF; Lotte Volz, KF; Bente von Schindel, KSD; Marjeta Turk, JSKD; Rolf Witte, BKJ; and Hans Jørgen Vodsgaard, IF.

Item 1: Appoint a moderator and a referent

Hans Jørgen Vodsgaard was appointed as moderator and as referent.

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

The proposed agenda, version 2 was adopted, and the minutes from the first partner meeting were approved.

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

As coordinator and administrator of a Grundtvig multilateral project it is compulsory to participate in at least two EU meetings per year.

Hans participated in a two-days “Leonardo Da Vinci, Grundtvig, KA4, EQF, ECET Projects ‘meeting” on 21st and 22nd January 2010 in Brussels. Among several things he learned that the budget has some flexibility, for example that we can move subcontractor tasks such as translation to our organisations with salary; and that it is compulsory that the partnership have a written Agreement or Contract about the work programme of the project. Now all have signed the Partner Agreement for our project.

Bente participated in the two-days Lifelong Learning conference “A decade of European innovation in adult learning” in Brussels on 26 – 28 January 2010. The participants were divided in thematic workshops, and the amateur art workshop was characterized by “pedagogical” plays and not by a political-theoretical focus on the sectors objectives and challenges.

Item 4: Status of budget and cost refunding, by Bente

Bente gave a status of the cost refunding to the partnership. Reimbursement of expenses and tasks of Work Package 1 isn’t concluded, because enclosures of tasks and expenses from BKJ are still missing.

The future reimbursement of travel expenses are unchanged 75 pct, but the reimbursement of subsistence costs will use a the method of flat rates per day deducted the actual costs of the participants to accommodation, meals and course venue. A 3 days meeting with two nights stay can be counted as 2,5 days, and each participant can – subtracted the average of the actual costs - receive 2,5 x the daily rate of subsistence (387 € in Denmark, 280 € in Germany, 307 € in Holland and 240 € in Slovenia. The figures can be read at the budget of our application, last worksheet named “Ceilings”). It will typical mean (depending on the level of the actual costs of the meeting) that the participants don’t need to contribute with a 25 pct own financing of the subsistence costs, but instead will receive a minor surplus because of the high level of daily rates.

Bente pointed out that the partners must remember to send all enclosures and to signed and stamp all the cost templates.

Item 5: Status of work programme, by Hans

At the first partner meeting we revised the task plan 2009 – 2011 with the following time schedule for the first three phases:

First phase: Documentation survey and guidelines for tools, Oct 2009 – June 2010

1. The first partnership meeting, Medium December 2009 in Denmark
2. Survey on learning qualities and outcome, Dec. 2009 – May 2010
3. Guidelines for two tools of valuation, May – June 2010

Second phase: Develop tools for valuation, June – October 2010

4. The second partnership Meeting, June 2010 in Nederland
5. Develop the pilot valuation tool of personal learning, June – Oct. 2010
6. Develop the pilot valuation tool of organizational learning, June – Oct. 2010

7. Prepare compendia on best practise, June – Oct. 2010

Third Phase: Develop and complete four pilot courses, October 2010 – March 2011

8. The third partnership meeting, November 2010 in Slovenia

9. Develop and complete a 6days pilot Grundtvig in-training course, Nov. 2010- March 2011

10. Develop and complete a 6days pilot Grundtvig workshop course, Nov. 2010 – March 2011

We haven't managed to keep the schedule regarding work package 2 and 3, which should have been completed before our second partner meeting in Utrecht (WP 4), but now must be completed in august. If we manage this, we can still complete the planned tasks of work package 6 and 7 before our third partner meeting in Slovenia in November 2010.

Item 6: Presentation and discussion of the surveys on learning qualities and outcome (WP 2)

a. The mission paper – priorities of learning qualities (WP 2.1)

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 followed by social inclusion, active citizenship, cultural cohesion, and lowest for employability.

In relation to the learning outcome it can be seen that the overall highest assessment is given to Personal formation followed by competencies and lowest Knowledge and skills. 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 followed by the civil and public sphere ad citizen and as fellow human being 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.

b. The questionnaires of learning providers (WP 2.2)

The task for the organisations was to collect 5-8 answers from learning providers. The results were

KSD: 10 answers from learning providers

JSKD: 9 answers from learning g providers

Kunstfactor: 5 answers from learning providers

BKJ: None

Regarding the general questions on EU's five main goals of lifelong learning 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). 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.

Regarding the possible attitudes the learning providers overall give a clear priority to the humanistic value, and they express high valuation of the goals of liberal adult education and thereby confirm the close relation between art based learning and liberal adult education.

Regarding 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, while the dimension of knowledge and competences is given a lower importance. Here the learning providers more or less follow there (project) leaders, who also stated the highest value to the dimension of personal formation. In relation to the future priorities of the organisations learning outcome the learning providers give nearly the same valuation of the three dimensions.

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 av-

erage the highest valuation. They hereby support a learning view that integrates the dimension of personal formation.

c. The questionnaires of learners (WP 2.3)

The tasks for the organisations were to collect 10-15 answers from learners. The results were

KSD: 6 answers from learners

JSKD: 4 from learners

Kunstfactor: 2 from learners

BKJ: None

The answers from the learners regarding their actual learning profile show the following tendencies:

The overall averages express the same value to personal formation and competences and lowest knowledge & skills. 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, Moral Sense, Aesthetic Sense, Authenticity, Reflexive knowledge and Versatile personal development.

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, Knowledge of culture, Knowledge of human conditions, Skills of main topic, Knowledge of society and Didactics.

In relation to the dimension of competences the overall average of valuation of the six elements are in prioritized order Intercultural, Self Management, Creative, Communicative, Learning to learn, and Social competencies.

Regarding the learners assessment of the learning benefits of the activities of their association the overall average are quite high (between high importance and neutral). Personal formation gets the highest priority, followed by competencies and lowest knowledge & skills.

d. The interviews with learning providers and learners (WP 2.4)

Kunstfactor by Lotte, JSKD by Marjeta and KSD by Bente presented the tendencies of their interviews. All three mentioned that they needed to explain the used terminology of learning perspectives and learning dimensions and elements, because the providers and learners were not used to value their activities from this broader view on learning. But when explained the terminology seems to give meaning and to motivate further reflexions from the providers and learners.

Regarding the learning perspective the Dutch provider emphasizes 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 Danish provider also emphasizes the personal perspective or the personal satisfaction. The Slovenian emphasizes a more professional focus, because for many participants these workshops are preparations for entrance exams at the Academy for Theatre, Film and, Television.

Regarding the valuation of the learning dimensions the Dutch provider valued the personal formation and competencies, because the pupils don't have the skills and ambition to be professional actors. In relation to the dimension of personal formation she gave the highest priority to the versatile personal development (the whole person), the Aesthetic sense and Authenticity. The Danish provider didn't make a clear valuation of one dimension or some elements, but mentioned the different forms of outcome for all the elements. The Slovenian Provider gave the highest valuation to the knowledge and skills of the artistic topic because the teaching primarily could be seen as a form of vocational adult courses for art teachers.

The interviews with the learners' valuation of the learning perspective and learning dimensions showed some different tendencies. The two Dutch learners from theatre and dance also emphasized 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 could

also strengthen their competences in other spheres. The three young Slovenian found it important that their work in theatre group is reflected in perceptions of their own personality. Knowledge, acquired during practice in theatre group, is used in private and professional – educational fields. It is presented in higher self esteem while displaying own knowledge in school, at presentations and displays of school work, during creation and defence of own opinions in various matters. The two Danish learners didn't point out directly in which sphere they use the music, but Bente's interpretation was, that for Lise (working consultant, 52 years) it means "Modern man" and for Sarah (27 years) "Modern man" as well as "Employee and student".

Regarding the valuation of the learning dimensions the two Dutch learners 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. For personal formation they both see authenticity and aesthetic sense as the most important, and for 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. For competencies they regard the development of all the competencies as important. The three Slovenian learners in general emphasize the personal formation, for example all three find that the most important facet of theatre practice is spontaneity: to show their real feelings and reactions, resulting in greater spontaneity in other 'live' roles and more gratifying satisfaction in life. All three pointed out that the most important result of theatre or any other form of art is the multidisciplinary approach. The two Danish learners didn't express a clear priority of the dimensions of elements, but gave high value to most of them. But as Lise put it: "No doubt in my mind: You get a great personal satisfaction, improved self-esteem and a great joy through participation in amateur music."

e. Summery and conclusions

It is difficult to summarise a clear conclusion of the discussions of the meeting, but it can be pointed out that the different parts of the survey showed that the concepts and learning frame gave meaning for the involved and could motivate further reflexion and self-reflexion on the personal and organisational learning outcome, and it seems that the frame can bring a light on other parts of the learning, than the main stream learning theory and their tools for assessments can provide.

At the same time the survey could be a help for the partnerships clarification of the guidelines for the frame of the two tools for personal and organisational valuation (see below item 7).

Jan advocated for the importance of the dimensions of knowledge & skills as the backbone of the learning process, and he referred to the Dutch professor Barend van Heusden, from University of Groningen, faculty of arts.

f. Present the outline of the survey report for WP2, by HJV

Hans presented the planned outline of the survey report (Third part of Work Package 2). In the granted application the Description of work package 2 were

"Document learning qualities and learning outcome in the cultural associations of the partners:

1. Present theories of art based learning and methods of valuation, Oct - Nov 2009 by IF
2. Document learning qualities and outcome. Data from mission papers, programmes etc; and questionnaires and interviews of leaders, teachers and participants in the associations. Nov 2009 – Feb 2010 by the partners
3. Prepare draft of report. Marts 2010 by IF and the partnership circle."

The report thereby can/should as part 3 combine part 1 and 2, it means partly the learning theory and methods that determined the frame and content of the questionnaires' and guidelines of the interviews and partly the documentation results and partly the combined perspectives and recommendations in relation to the guidelines for the online tools.

In the Memo "Presentation of the survey results, version 1", section 5 the planned outline of the Report is presented, and in section 3.1 Conclusions of the survey the lines of possible interpretations were presented.

The meeting discussed the report and the interpretations, and it can be mentioned that

- the data amount of the questionnaires is so low that the idea of the "survey" cannot be to document actual learning profiles of the involved amateur culture organisations, but rather to pilot test the meaning and usefulness of the learning concepts and learning frame in relation to develop guidelines for the design of the online tools.
- the content of the interpretation especially in point 6.3 and 6.4 could be too strong for a conclusion, but should more be seen at possible perspectives.
- the use of the 5-point Likert Scale as a interval or percentage scale were discussed, because Lotte saw possible methodological problems with this. This point could need some clarifications and should be presented in a problem conscious manner (with reference to possible reservations) when used.

For deadlines of the report see item 9 below.

Item 7: Discuss and adopt guidelines of the two online tools (WP 3 and WP 5 and 6)

Hans mentioned, that an important purpose of the surveys has been to qualify the decisions of the partnership circle regarding the guidelines for the development of two interrelated on line tools, where one tool is for the learners' valuation of the personal learning outcome, and the other tool is for the learning providers' valuation of the organisational outcome.

The development of the tools should oblige two different purposes. On the one hand the tools must be adapted to the organisations special needs and this can imply different tools, and on the other hand the tools should be 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.

The meeting concluded as general guidelines that

- The purposes of the tools were 1) to promote more knowledge of the learning in amateur culture; 2) to strengthen the knowledge for political arguments of the learning qualities in the amateur culture; 3) to secure better statistical documentation of the learning processes and thereby improve the possibilities of research in the area.
- The preferred aim was to develop two common tools for the partnership circle (where the only difference is the language of the same text and some differences of presentation of the organisations name, colour, logos etc.)
- The questionnaires should be shorter; it means have fewer questions, so it could be filled out in a shorter time and thereby be more user friendly.
- The questions should be short and clear (without any possible double questions)
- The extra question for each element regarding the importance of the organisations activities for developing learning outcome could be excluded, when the questions were reformulated in relation to the artistic activities importance for the learning outcome. Rolf will give examples of this reformation.
- The interrelation of the two tools could be secured by the same questions, but so that the personal tools looked at the learners outcome and the organisational tool looked at the learning providers priorities
- The extra series of questions for the learning providers regarding EUs 5 main goals for lifelong learning should be answers indirectly by combining questions from the three dimensions. It means there will not be a need for separate extra questions.
- There wasn't any conclusions regarding how to assess the learning perspective of life spheres, but maybe it can be incorporated in the basic questions, too? (HJV).

With these guidelines the meetings looked at the learner's questionnaire (WP 2.3) with the goal to reduce the amount of questions partly by reducing the amount of elements and the amount of questions per element. The meeting concluded

1. to keep the three main dimensions
2. to keep the six elements of the dimension of personal formation, but to reduce the questions for each element from five to three.
3. to reduce the elements of knowledge & skills from six to (two) four by
 - combining the three elements of knowledge of human conditions, society and culture to one element;
 - maybe combining the elements of knowledge and skills of the artistic topic to one element – but this were open for further reflexions;
 - Maybe by skipping the element of didactic, but Jan was against this, and he will propose some other questions for this element, before the any conclusions are made.
 - the amount of questions of each element could here still be 5, and Marjeta proposed to expand the amount of questions to six (if the amount of element were reduced to two?).
4. to reduce the elements of competencies from six to (four) five by
 - skipping the element of intercultural competencies and incorporate part of this in the social and communicative competencies
 - by maybe combining social and communicative competences to one new competence called the "social-communicative" competence?
 - and by reducing the amount of questions for each element from 5 to 4?

For deadlines of procedure and decisions see item 9 below.

Item 8: Discuss and adopt guidelines for the Compendium of Best Practice (WP 7)

Bente referred to the description in the application, where the Compendium of Best Practice of voluntary cultural activities of the associations of the partnership should focus on

- 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: An English edition. 60 - 80 pages. It means that the Compendium can include 10 -12 articles of 5 – 6 pages with approx. (2-)3 articles from respectively JSKD, KF, BKJ and KSD (Interfolk hasn't tasks in this work packet).

Bente proposed that she as editor write the introductory article and prepare the frame of the articles from proposals of the involved. The meeting pointed out that the articles could/should include references especially to issue 1 (EU's main goals of lifelong learning) and issue 2 (the broad learning concept with the three dimensions). For the time being decided that Jan and Bente cover issue 1, all writers incorporate issue 2, Bente makes an article on social inclusion and Rolf makes an articles of the transnational cooperation.

For deadlines of procedure and decisions see item 9 below.

Item 9: Discuss and adopt the task plan of the second project phase

The last activity of phase two (and start on phase three) is the Third Partner Meeting in Slovenia (WP 8), where the tasks of WP 2 – 7 must be completed.

The dates of the third partner meeting is Friday – Saturday the 19th – 20th of November with arrival latest Thursday Evening and with a possibility to stay longer in Slovenia after the meeting. Marjeta is responsible for the course venue and culture activity and she can help with booking of accommodation; Hans is responsible for the agenda.

The deadline for the draft Report was not concluded, but it can be the 1st of November.

Then comments on the draft report are welcome latest the 10th of November, and it will also be an item on the agenda of the third meeting.

The procedure for clarifying and adopting the final questionnaire should be the following

- 1) Proposals regarding the tools are send before 16th of August with
 - a) Proposals regarding the categories of valuation (for the time being from very low degree to very high degree) – by ALL
 - b) Priorities of 3 questions for the 6 elements of personal formation – by ALL
 - c) Priorities of 2-4 elements of knowledge & skills – shall the knowledge of the art topic and the skills of the art topic be combined to one element? And shall the amount of questions per element be 3, 4,5 or 6 – by ALL
 - d) Shall didactic as element be kept or skipped. Jan will send a proposal for revised questions!
 - e) Priorities of 4 – 5 elements of competencies. Shall social and communicative competencies be combined and what shall be the name of this hybrid competence? – by ALL
 - f) How many questions shall we have for the elements of competencies: 3, 4 or 5? – by ALL
 - g) Examples of the revision of all questions to activity related questions - by Rolf.
 - h) Proposal regarding the use of questions to measurement of EU's 5 main learning goals in the provider tool – by Hans
 - i) Proposal regarding the use of questions to measurement of learning perspective of life spheres in the provider tool – by Hans
- 2) Decisions of the final online questionnaires
 - a) Integration of the proposal to one draft proposal – by Hans latest 23rd of August
 - b) Virtual dialogue in the partnership circle concluded – by Hans latest 30th of August
- 3) The IT-firm design the pilot tools
 - a) The final questionnaires of the two tools are send to the IT-firm latest 6th of September
 - b) The IT-firm launch the pilot tools for testing by the partners latest 1st of November

The procedure and deadlines for the Compendium on Best practise are

- 1) Bente send a frame of the tasks and disposition of the articles soon and latest in two weeks time.
- 2) All send proposals of at least 4 articles to Bente latest the 16th of August
- 3) Bente send the final disposition (who write what) latest the 23rd of August
- 4) The deadline for the final articles is the 4th of October

Decisions regarding the two pilot courses and the fourth partner meeting in the autumn of 2011

- 1) Rolf will latest 9th of August send a proposal for the dates of the Grundtvig workshop course in Germany including the dates of the fourth partner meeting, which will be at the end of the course. It can be in April 2011
- 2) All will comment the proposals latest the 16th of August and the decision is made
- 3) Marjeta and Jan will latest the 16th of August decide when and where (in Holland or in Slovenia) the Grundtvig in-training course shall be. It can be in March 2011.

Item 10: Evaluation of the first phase of the project (WP 1 – 3)

There was a round of opinions:

Marjeta mentioned that the project plan now seems to be in focus, and she expected that we will develop fine tools and conclude the other tasks, but the challenge will be in the last phase to secure the dissemination and exploitation of the results.

Jan agreed with Marjeta. In the start of the project it had been difficult to overview the project objectives and the work programme, but now they seem much clearer, and the division of tasks were now in a clear focus. Lotte couldn't evaluate the first phase because she has first been related later in this phase to the project. Wies agreed with Marjeta that the main challenge were to exploit the tools and to disseminate them to the end users.

Rolf too saw the main challenge in the dissemination and exploitation of the project results in the organisations activity after the end of the project period.

Bente mentioned that the process were as important as the results of such a transnational cooperation. She found it very inspiring to meet different organisations and to exchange experiences.

Hans emphasized as Bente the process with cooperation across national and institutional borders. It is important that the partners also gain learning from each other and the project task, and especially gain new knowledge of how to collaborate in the context of the Grundtvig programme.

The start of the project has been influenced by the fact that the application with its different demands from EU was planned by one organisation, and thereby the knowledge and ownership of the project were unequal distributed in the partnership circle.

Jan agreed that the start were influenced by this disparity, but saw it as a necessity with complicated applications, because it won't gain quality or better chances of granting by ending as a collective work with several preparing meetings. Instead the chances can be better and the use of resources lower if one organisation does the main task with forming the project plan.

Item 11: Evaluation of the second partner meeting in Holland (WP 4)

All agreed that the frame of the meeting have been fine with good meetings rooms and a nice hotel nearby; and the programme have been focussed and effective.

Item 12: A.O.B. (any other business)

None