



Minutes
version 2 - approved

5th partner meeting in Copenhagen, 23 – 24 March 2022

Content

I: Meeting information	2
Time and place	2
Participants – onsite & online	2
Topics of the meeting	2
II. Minutes	3
1. Formalities.....	3
2. Decide competence descriptions including job roles and levels.....	3
3. Clarify how certification units can be transformed to training modules.....	4
4-5. Discuss examination systems for the certification, incl. micro certification	4
6. Group visit to FFD – The Association of Folk High Schools in Denmark	4
7. Onsite excursion in the old city	5
8. Formalities.....	5
9. Clarify how the examination (and certification) can take place?.....	5
10. Clarify how the examination for continued certification can take place?	6
11. Status of our dissemination and plans for the concluding dissemination.....	7
12. Plans for the Structured Democratic Colaboratory in Cyprus,.....	7
13. Evaluation and final matters.....	8
14. A.O.B. (any other business)	8

I: Meeting information

Time and place

Time:

Wednesday, 23rd March, 9:00 – 12:00 (13:15 – 14:00 visit to FFD)

Thursday, 24th March, 9:00 - 12:00

Place:

Vartov, Farvergade 27 D, 2nd floor, DK-1463 Copenhagen K

Participants – onsite & online

Onsite:

Agnieszka Dadak, FAIE (PL)

Rafał Dadak, FAIE (PL)

Jerzy Kraus, FAIE (PL)

Aron Weigl, EDUCULT (AT)

Oliver Löscher, EDUCULT (AT)

Hans J. Vodsgaard, Interfolk (DK)

Online

Camille Lechoux, FWC/CNTI (CY) ¹

Yiannis Laouris, FWC/CNTI (CY) (2nd day)

Ana Carneiro, RightChallenge (PT)

Lorenza Lupini, COOSS (IT)

Topics of the meeting

The objectives of the meeting were to clarify:

- The competence descriptions including job roles and levels (homework)
- The examination system for the certification, including micro certification
- How the examination (and certification) can take place
- How the training units can be transformed to training modules and exam questions
- How to secure examination system for continued certification
- The status of our dissemination and plans for concluding dissemination

¹ Future Worlds Center - Cyprus Neuroscience & Technology Institute

II. Minutes

1st day: Wednesday, 23rd of March,

1. Formalities

Hans welcomed the meeting and provided some practical information.

Agnieszka was appointed as moderator, and Hans as reporter.

The agenda, v2, 7.3.2022 was approved.

The attendance list for the 1st day were signed, and print-screens of the online participants.

2. Decide competence descriptions including job roles and levels

During the last partner meeting in Porto, the team discussed the competence descriptions from the PMC Triangle (Project Management Competence Triangle) that had been developed in the preceding 1st-TIP PM Project. Here the model with 10 competences in each leg were reduced to six competences per leg.

The team members had as homework to refine the final descriptions in the 3-legged competence model including job roles and levels to be used in the certification model. The homework was divided like this between the partners:

- FAIE and Rightchallenge – Technical competences
- COOSS and Interfolk - Leadership competences
- EDUCULT / FWC – Strategic and Business Management competences

Firstly, the proposed refined descriptions of the competences were discussed:

- The descriptions of “technical competences” were relatively long compared to the descriptions in the other two legs, but they were approved without changes. 6 units of competences were included.
- The descriptions of “leadership competences” included soft competences regarding empathy and feelings. Discussed if this type of more personal abilities should be included but decided to keep the descriptions unchanged. 6 units of competences were included.
- The descriptions of the “strategic and business management competences” were reduced from 6 to 5 units; and even though the other legs had 6, it was approved because the 5 could cover the content of the former 6 in a simpler way.

Secondly, the degree and descriptions of competence levels for the job roles were discussed.

- Unchanged agreed that we have 4 job roles: 1. Partner & national coordinator; 2. Project developer & designer; 3. Project coordinator & manager; and 4. Mentor.
- Agreed that we only need one qualification or examination level for each job role, like “passed” / “good enough”, partly because it simplifies the model, and partly because no one would have much interest to be certified with a lower level.
- Agreed that we still for the competence units in each leg could differentiate between the needed competence levels for the 4 job roles, for example a job role as partner would not demand the same competences regarding knowledge of the EU funding programmes as for the project designer.
- Furthermore, that it could be enough to use the 3 main levels of qualifications, like
 - Basic
 - Competent (intermediate)
 - Proficient (advanced – expert)

Hereby the guidelines for the final PMC model for the examination system was clarified.
 ./ See attached: *PMC -certification frame incl JR and qualification levels, approved*

3. Clarify how certification units can be transformed to training modules

Agnieszka outlined key points from the virtual Vienna partner meeting, 6- 7 Sept 2021, where the relations between the competence & certification units and the training modules were discussed, including:

- The training modules should refer to the competence triangle model and its main competence units from the FIRST project, which we also have used to elaborate the certification model at this meeting.
- The number of competence units in the initial model should be reduced and clustered, so they could be used. Hans, Oliver and Aron said that a reducing or clustering of these already defined competences could be used to create a structure content-wise for the courses.
- The training approach may try to cluster the competence units with focus on how the work in practice is structured, like the three stages we developed in the further training courses in the FIRST project: 1. Planning & Designing; 2. Realising & Implementing; and 3. Evaluating & Transfer.

The meeting took note of the outline and did not discuss the many aspects of transforming the certification units to training modules due to the lack of time.

4-5. Discuss examination systems for the certification, incl. micro certification

The 1st day we had an initial discussion of the challenges for an examination system in a multilateral and European context.

- Agnieszka mentioned that many comparable examination systems use multiple-choice questions, which both can imply a simple objective validation and it can be easy to use in a virtual international context.
- The meeting agreed it would be essential, but that it probably not should stand alone. It could also be useful to include some sort of initial self-assessment, possible case study examinations, and concluding personal interviews with the “students”.
- It was also discussed, if we could demand that “students” should follow some obligatory course modules, before they could be certified, but we mostly agreed that such compulsory demands should be avoided.
- There was also a special question about micro-unit certification. Here it seems more reasonable only to use a multiple-choice approach.

The topics were discussed more systematic the next day.

6. Group visit to FFD – The Association of Folk High Schools in Denmark

The onsite group the main office of the Association of Folk High Schools in Denmark in the centre of the old city, where the development consultant Søren Børsting and former principal at Den Rytmiske Højskole presented the Folk High School tradition and the unique pedagogical approach with no admission requirements, no formal qualification demands to the pedagogical staff, and no formal examination nor formal documentation of the students’ competence development.

The presentation was engaging, and the group had many follow-up questions.

7. Onsite excursion in the old city

The onsite excursion in the old city was cancelled. Instead we agreed to meet again at 19 to dinner at the Riz-Ras restaurant.

2nd day: Thursday, 24th of March,

8. Formalities

Agnieszka was appointed as moderator, and Hans as reporter.

The agenda, v2, 7.3.2022 regarding the 2nd day was approved.

The attendance list for the 2nd day were signed, and print-screens of the online participants were made.

9. Clarify how the examination (and certification) can take place?

Agnieszka distributed a query for group work to clarify the *Q1: "recommendations for the examination system to recognise and validate competences for each job role, leading to certification"*.

There were two groups: group 1 for the onsite participants, and group 2 for the online participants.

The recommendations from the group work regarding the sub-questions were the following:

Q1a: Would any training be compulsory before being able to take the exam? Shall self-assessment be included/offered? Shall the prior learning be somehow included?

Re Compulsory training: Overall the groups did not want to make preliminary training compulsory for any of the four job roles. Rafael did not agree.

Re including self-assessment: Overall the two groups agreed that an initial self-assessment by filling-in a premade online assessment form would be useful before starting the "examination" process, and it could be orientated by the 17 competences and their attributed levels for the job role certification, the student wishes to get.

The groups also agreed that the self-assessment could be useful for all 4 job roles; but it was more open, if it was needed for possible micro-certifications. However, the online group also proposed that the certification of JR1: The national coordinator / international partner may be handled just with a multiple-choice test.

Re if the prior learning could be included: Both groups agreed that it could be part of the application process to get a certification that the "student" did fill-in C.V. data, including statements / self-assessment of achieved competences during prior learning.

These C.V. data and self-assessments could also be useful to have for a possible concluding interview after the main part with either multiple-choice questions or case studies presentations. Again, the groups also agreed that prior learning documentation & assessments could be useful for the examination process for all 4 job roles; but it was more open, if it was needed for possible micro-certifications.

Q1b: What would you recommend for the form of the exam? I.e. single choice test/multiply test; test only or test + interview/written assignment, else?

Both groups agreed that multiple-choice tests could / should be combined with an initial self-assessment, a written assignment / case study / presentation of own former application etc. and/ or a concluding interview. And such combined examination forms could be relevant for all four job roles, but again, not necessarily for a micro-certification, where a multiple-choice test could do it.

The online group mentioned that

- JR1 - Project partner: may only need an online test
- JR2/JR3/JR4: Here an interview plus a test would be more appropriate
- The questions developed at the Porto meeting for each job role, could be useful for assessment of competences in the interview.

Q1c: How the level of the competence in the specific job role could be assessed (basic – intermediate – advanced)? Depending on the score in the test? Else? Your recommendations.

As already recommended during the 1st day, both groups confirmed that we should only use 1 certification level for the job roles (passes or not passed) and 3 qualification levels regarding the competence units.

It was not further specified how the 3 qualification levels of competence units could be defined, neither in the tests or the written assignment or interviews for any of the job roles, while it for the multiple-choice tests in the micro-certifications it will be defined by numbers of right questions.

Q1d: How can the examination (and certification) take place? Individually, computer based testing online? In an exam room twice a year? During a meeting? Else? Your recommendations.

Both groups recommended that the examination should take place online both for the multiple-choice tests, written assignment, case studies and interviews, so there is no need for using a specific exam room or physical meeting place somewhere in EU.

The examination could take place two times a year in a specific week in the spring and the autumn period. The reason to limit the examination to two weeks was mainly to reduce the time used by the examiners.

Q1e: Possible recommendations for micro-certification: How? When? For whom? Any prerequisites?

In general, both groups agreed that it could be handled with a multiple-choice test. Again, it should also take place in the two reserved weeks in the year.

The online group mentioned that micro certification could help to increase the competences needed to pass from one job role to another, by increasing the numbers and levels of competence units.

It can be mentioned that it still needs to be clarified, how the units for micro-certification can be defined. Will the unit correspond to one of the competence units in the triangle model with in all 6+6+5, like 17 units, or can the micro-units be transversal to include parts of more competence units.

Q1f: Any benchmark for the examination system?

The two most relevant examination systems seem to be:

- The Project Management Institute with main office in Philadelphia, USA – see www.pmi.org Their PMI Triangle gave inspiration to the Project Management Competence Triangle, which were developed in the previous FIRST Project.
- The PM² Alliance, supported by the EU Commission. They use certification of 6 (six) levels for international project managers – see <https://www.pm2alliance.eu/pm2-certification/>

10. Clarify how the examination for continued certification can take place?

Agneska also distributed a query for group work to clarify the *Q2: Discuss the recommendations for the 'examination' / check leading to renewing the certification, for each of the 4 JR separately:*

The recommendations from the group work regarding the sub-questions were the following:

Q2a: How long from the 1st certification shall the 'renewal of the certification' take place? 2 years? 3 years? Else?

Both groups agreed that a certification must be renewed latest after 5 years. This period can also correspond to the sequence of the new and changed EU-programmes.

Q2b: On which basis shall the certification of the competences be renewed? Another exam? Proofs of being active in the job role and proof of further training? Else?

Both groups agreed that it can happen by providing proof of continued experiences with the related job role. No need for new tests or interviews.

If a continued work experience in the job role cannot be documented, then the "student" must complete the examination process again to regain the certification.

11. Status of our dissemination and plans for the concluding dissemination

Summary by Ana, Rightchallenge presented a summary of the dissemination status report for the period: June 21 – Feb 22.

./ The AER-V Dissemination Status is attached to these minutes.

Key points from the status were:

- Not all partners have sent their dissemination report from June 21 – Feb 22, so it was not possible to make a full status.
- Instead, the report recommended important dissemination activities to provide for all partners.

Agnieszka asked, if there was data on how many recipients have been reached until now? Ana replied that she could try to make it in the next report, when she has received all the dissemination reports.

Agnieszka also reminded the partners that the EPALE can be used, and the website of the FIRST Network can also be used to add dissemination articles. She also referred to page 55 – 58 in the Short-cut of the Project Application, which includes information about the initial dissemination plan.

12. Plans for the Structured Democratic Dialogue in Cyprus,

The final project event, the Structured Democratic Dialogue will as planned take place in Nicosia, Cyprus, May, Monday – Friday, 16th - 20th. However, the SDD will only be a 3-day process, Tuesday – Thursday, so there will time the day before to start and the day after to conclude.

NB: Agnieszka emailed 28.3.2022 that

- The SDD will start on Monday, May 16th, in the afternoon (after lunch), and end on Friday, May 20th, by lunch.
- The subsequent partner meeting will take place Friday, May 20th afternoon + Saturday, May 21st, morning.

Yiannis presented the SDD methodology, which is a unique democratic methodology to find common decisions and conclusions on complex positions and situations.

The Methodology of Structured Democratic Dialogue has a strong potential to mobilize the participants. In addition, the SDDP methodology is based on scientific laws, which have been repeatedly validated, empirically and scientifically, in the arena of practice. Hereby the methodology supports groups of diverse stakeholders with conflicting opinions and interests to effectively discuss a matter of joint concern, integrate their knowledge, and democratically redesign their socio-organizational systems and practices reaching consensus agreement for effective collaborative action.

Yiannis emphasised that the process can also be a fun and enlivening process to take part in, and he looked forward to (re-)introduce it to the partnership and its stakeholders. The process is furthermore not open for live-streaming or online participants. The process takes place in real live face-to-face.

Agnieszka clarified, the partners can invite stakeholders as participants, even though they not are members or paid or voluntary staff in our organisations. Because this relation can be established by making a Volunteering Agreement, where they agree to be volunteering for our organisation in a short period before, during and after the workshop. So, the only real demands for the participants are that they:

- Have a functional English.
- Come from the CSO area (or have experiences working with the EU funding programmes).
- Have a relation to the sending organisation (fx by signing a Volunteer Agreement)

Clarified that EDUCULT after the workshop will send the participants a link to an online evaluation-form, so they and we all can evaluate the process and methodology.

13. Evaluation and final matters

We did not have time to complete an oral evaluation round of the meeting and decided instead to have a more informal evaluation at the subsequent lunch. Here the overall message among the onsite participants were that

- It had been a constructive meeting, including an interesting visit to FFD to hear about the Folk High Schools, and some fine restaurant and cafe visits.
- It was really a positive difference to meet each other in live again.

14. A.O.B. (any other business)

Nothing to mention.