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## Time & form

* Tuesday, 9th of March: 9:30 – 14:30 CET
* Thursday, 11th of March: 9:30 – 14:30 CET

We use zoom for the virtual meeting, and the meeting room is open during the whole meeting always opening 15 min before official start – and you can use the same link to get direct access to the meeting room. There is no waiting room and you do not need a password to enter the meeting room.

## Invited participants

Aron Weigl, EDUCULT (AT)

Angela Wieser, EDUCULT (AT)

Oliver Löscher, EDUCULT (AT)

Damien McGlynn, VAN (IE)

Robin Simpson, VAN (UK)

Agnieszka Dadak, FAIE (PL)

Rafał Dadak, FAIE (PL)

Jan Pirnat, JSKD (SI)

David Krasevec, JSKD (SI)

Marjeta Turk, JSKD (SI)

Bente von Schindel, KSD (DK)

Hans Jørgen Vodsgaard, Interfolk (DK)

In all 12 (can be divided in 3 groups of 4 persons)

Topics of this zoom partner meeting

* O1, conclude baseline survey, Oct – March 2021

Summarise the baseline surveys, provide recommendations for the subsequent design of the Benchmark Tool, and give feeds for the final Baseline Report.

Lead partners: Interfolk and EDUCULT

* O2a, design BT, Feb – June 2021

Discuss the design of the Benchmark Tool and clarify the methodological approach as well as the pilot course programme (the task plan was decided by written procedure, 23rd February).

Lead partner of O2a: EDUCULT (and Interfolk, O2b and JSKD, O2c)

* O3a, develop PM, May – Oct 2021

Discuss the approach and plan for designing the Practice Methods.

Lead partner: VAN (and FAIE, O3b and KSD, O3c)

* P3, plan two trilateral meetings in Dublin and Bielsko-Biala, June 2021, part of O3a

Clarify the frame, objectives, and content as well as the reporting and evaluation form.

Hosts are: VCC and FAIE

* M2a, website, whole period

Discuss and refine the website and related social media

Lead partner: VAN

* M2b, dissemination, whole period

Discus the dissemination activities and reporting, evaluate the 1st period and outline the s2nd period.

Lead partner: Interfolk (and VAN)

* Px, zoom meetings for whole team and/or lead partner groups.

Decide possible next zoom meetings before the trilateral meetings in June.

* M3, evaluation, whole period

Evaluation of the preceding phase and the virtual partner meeting

Lead partner: EDUCULT

## Minutes of the meeting

### TUESDAY, 9TH OF MARCH: 9:30 – 14:30

**1. Formalities**

Participants:

* Aron Weigl, EDUCULT (AT)
* Angela Wieser, EDUCULT (AT)
* Oliver Löscher, EDUCULT (AT)
* Damien McGlynn, VAN (IE)
* Agnieszka Dadak, FAIE (PL)
* Rafał Dadak, FAIE (PL)
* Jan Pirnat, JSKD (SI)
* David Krasevec, JSKD (SI)
* Bente von Schindel, KSD (DK)
* Hans Jørgen Vodsgaard, Interfolk (DK)

Moderator: Aron Weigl

Reporter: Oliver Löscher

Agenda was approved by the partners.

The attendance ist was signed by each participant (all register at chat and we make screenshot of all participants).The screenshot was took by Oliver.

**2. Plenary session: Baseline survey**

Following relevant points from the Baseline Survey have been highlighted during the presentations:

EDUCULT:

* Time and place as inclusive factors,
* Participation and co-creation instead of pure consumption,
* Low-threshold through communication and language,
* Networking between social groups as the supreme discipline,
* Social media and digitalisation for more reach,
* Funding and cooperation at the interface between the cultural and social sector,
* Reflection and diversity in the team for authenticity.

JSKD:

* Sustainability of the project (“ecological”), you should know why you do this project – you need to make your project sustainable, why is it needed and how can it last
* it’s not necessary to develop recipes, dealing with art is never easy answers, you ask questions
* activities should open up questions, include wishes and needs,
* topic-related participation,
* organiser should be present at activities in order to follow-up with participants and be flexible,
* bring in new members through **topic** (example theatre of the oppressed, when we are covering social injustice topic than ppl who are in the situation will join it) – i.e relevance,
* network crucial, in most of the projects many partners – either a NGO that works with the target group,
* networking as the prerequisite.

FAIE:

* member perspective vs. client perspective,
* importance of cooperation with stakeholders,
* context factor and quantity of target groups influence access to target group – in which environment are organisations working,
* specialisation on inclusive activities or artistic work 🡪 inclusiveness as side effect,
* Democratic activity factor – not something like a group effect.

Voluntary Arts:

* Art for art sake - focus on artistic work instead of social inclusion– artistic quality, no focus on social inclusion but on art, but if art is good and has a positive effect on individuals it also has an impact on society
* main drivers for participants are enjoyable factors,
* inclusiveness are side-effects,
* time as important factor,
* long-term activities,
* small amount of time and funding are challenges,
* honesty and integrity of work – being open and involve community in early stages of work, do more listening than talking.

KSD:

* Covid-19 as inhibiting factor for implementing the survey and also for inclusive activities,
* high interest from Danish organisations in benchmarking social inclusion.
* focus on art, not on social inclusion,
* organisations doing focus on migrants, refugees and elderly people.

Due to the time frame and the lack of reports, joint recommendations and overlaps were not discussed in more detail here.

IF will send out questions in terms of the structure, headings and outlines.

**3. Group work & plenary: Recommendations to Benchmark Tool (O1-O2a)**

**Group 1: Aron, Bente and Damien (Reporter).**

* Articulation of the relevance of the project,
* using the right language,
* inclusive language (also in the BT),
* responsiveness and useful for different users,
* ownership and co-creation as part of the BT,
* policy-level of recommendations,
* BTs should/could be instructional as well as assessment-oriented,
* accommodation of different interests (cultural, social, policy sector).

**Group 2:Agnieszka, Rafal and Angela**.

* Competence of person/team on social inclusion,
* network for resources,
* knowledge/learning about target group/end-users,
* context of organisation (rural/urban/local, regional, etc.).

**Group 3: Hans, David (Reporter), Oliver.**

* Space and time (duration) as basic means,
* networking of different organisations,
* BT as awareness raising tool on social inclusion,
* diversity and variety in team.

**4. Design the Benchmark Tool (O2a)**

The task plan and the tasks (Research one BT and Relevance Paper) for O2 were presented by Aron (EC) and approved by the partners.

Instead of breakout rooms we had a plenary discussion about the possible design of a BT.

It was mentioned that we should keep in mind the (technical) implementation of the BT. BT should be an awareness rising instrument.

Questions raised:

* How to create a responsive BT considering all different contexts?
* Should we use an existing framework and integrate our data there or create an alone-standing benchmarking system?
* In general: it seems senseful to integrate possibilities for assessment, development possibilities, and benefits for the organisations; how to arrange it is not clarified yet.
* Shall we collect the data that the BT asks for? Pro: data for further projects, relevant information on the sector, etc.; Contra: data protection challenges, possibly discouraging

🡪 BT should be open from the beginning and not set strict guidelines.

Next step:

🡪 EDUCULT will send an e-mail on how to start the research on one BT.

**5. Detail-plan the transnational training (T1/O2a)**

The framework and agenda of the TT was presented by Oliver and accepted by the partners. The invitation of two external speakers was welcomed and the coordinator proposed a budget redistribution to pay the fees for external speakers. It was noted that we should try to pay less than £1000 as an approximate guide for two external speakers. EC as host has here the responsibility to go in deeper research.

The partners agreed that a total of 5 participants from one partner country each are allowed in the training. The coordinator checks the type of connection to the participating organisation, as normally there must be a formal connection of the participants to the partner organisation due to the programme requirements. It was discussed that the existing agenda is a good mix of involving external people in order to also include new perspectives and to spread the project or get in touch with a possible target group, and working on the project's internal BT.

🡪 EC has declared to provide a programme in the form of a PDF document that can be used as an official invitation.

**6. Interim evaluation of the partner meeting:**

Bente: Misses to talk physically together and developing. There is still a little confusion about the common understanding of benchmarking and the content. External people can be an inspiration for the development and the project.

Angela: Good structure of the meeting and good discussions at this point.

Jan: Not boring, got an image what direction the benchmark tool goes to. Meeting was well organized.

Damien: Zoom can be tiring, but we had a good day and got a common understanding of different points.

Hans: Successful meeting. The same structure but more breakout rooms. Translating the survey into a benchmarking tool as the biggest challenge.

Aron: Cannot add many things here. It would be better to have all national reports, that would be a better starting point for discussions on content.

Agnieszka:

It is smart to stop the meeting at midday. Breakout rooms are helpful.

Oliver: Thankful for the meeting. Found it helpful to go into the content discussion and start the development of the benchmark tool.

Overall, people were very satisfied with the meeting, especially the breakout rooms were highlighted.

### THURSDAY, 11TH OF MARCH: 9:30 – 14:30

**1. Formalities**

**Participants:**

Aron Weigl, EDUCULT (AT)

Angela Wieser, EDUCULT (AT)

Oliver Löscher, EDUCULT (AT)

Damien McGlynn, VAN (IE)

Agnieszka Dadak, FAIE (PL)

Rafał Dadak, FAIE (PL)

Jan Pirnat, JSKD (SI)

David Krasevec, JSKD (SI)

Marjeta Turk, JSKD (SI)

Bente von Schindel, KSD (DK)
Hans Jørgen Vodsgaard, Interfolk (DK)

The agenda was approved and the attendance list was signed by all participants (all register at chat and we make screenshot of all participants). Oliver took a screenshot.

**2. Design Practice Methods (O3a) and first trilateral meetings in June 2021 / 9.35 – 11:05 (90 min)**

Last time we got in touch with the results of the baseline survey as well as the recommendations for the BT and now we will go further to the Practice Methods (PM).

* 1. **Outline design methodology, by Angela & Damien**

Methodology: Damien presented a document for an overview for the methodology of the practice methods. Aim is to test with stakeholders the findings from the survey and the BT, we will try to integrate our learnings in the daily work of the stakeholders.

* Step O3a) Development of PM
* Step O3b Test of PM
* Step O3c) Publication of PM in five languages and also the Manual for Social Inclusion

These WPs are linked to the trilateral meetings, which are implemented in two rounds.

* 1st Round, Developing, planning
* 2nd Round plan piloting test, plan publishing

Six parts of the process:

1. Identify
2. Assessment
3. Defining areas of improvement at first trilateral meeting
4. Develop practice methods for new or adopted activity,
5. Implementation
6. Publication

We will work in two teams:

Team A: KSD & VCC (Consulting Partner: IF) + 1 stakeholder from each practice country (= 2 Learning Providers)

Team B: FAIE & JSKD (Consulting Partner: EC) + 1 stakeholder from each practice country (= 2 Learning Providers)

Angela: The development of the PM is interconnected and -related to other project steps. The most challenging part for this WP is the quality of the teamwork. After the draft of the BT we want to go into a reflection process with learning providers how our tool can support this field.

Aron: Learning from BRIDGING project: More collaborative work, smaller teams to intensify the project work. That was the reason for the two groups.

Hans: It’s unlikely, that we can have the first trilateral meetings on site in June due to COVID-19. Proposal: Moving them in August/September? It would be good to include the four stakeholders to the trilateral meetings.

Aron: Can we invite the stakeholders from the other countries to the trilateral meetings (it depends on the budget)?

Damien: Though moving the trilateral meetings, we should start in May with developing the practice methods. It would be fine to start early enough.

Jan: Would it be good to integrate the stakeholders at earlier stages?

Agnieszka: Wonders if the same organisation should be at the TT and the practice methods. It is a lot of work for the organisations. We need really interested organisations.

Angela: We have some kind of consulting function. We give them something and they do not only offer sth. to us.

* 1. **Outline the role of the trilateral meetings, by Aron, and the programme frame (objectives, content, work division), by Agnieszka**
* Has prepared similar contents like Damien.
* Aim Of the trilateral meetings: developing the PM.
* Idea: Going into intensively teamwork, what is the learning and the outcome from the BRIDGING project.

Propositions for the trilateral meeting:

 It may be good to have a common initial online meeting for both groups in May, where

the work with O3 is introduced also for the involved learning providers; and likewise they could be invited to the European Symposium in Kraków that takes place May 2022 during the months after the conclusion of O3

* Each team decides if to meet physically/hybrid/virtually.
* Each team defines the timeframe for the meetings.
* Flexibility and own decision of the small teams.

Open questions: Should we move the trilateral meetings? Perhaps it’s good to let decide the teams on their own

* 1. **Group discussions with lead questions on the methodology (incl. trilateral meetings)**

Decision: The groups won’t be like the teams.

Discussion questions:

* Describe how your team (A or B) will work with the national learning providers to develop the practice methods?
* Previous experienced organisations vs. unxperienced organisations.
* What kind of learning provider would be best?
* What is the commitment that we require from the learning providers?
* How will your team develop the ideas and the process for testing and refinement?

**Group 1: Agnieszka, Rafal, Jan, Oliver**

Who is the target group? Experienced, unexperienced or subconscious social inclusive and motivated organisations. In the survey and the testing of the BT we were working with more experienced partners and in the PM we can work with more unexperienced but subconscious social inclusive and motivated partners to test the function of our BT. We can offer the learning providers to be a consultant for a certain time and to do an accompanying process. It should not be an abstract or theoretical offer, we should work with them practically, e.g. in preparation for a certain activity and to give advice.

**Group 2: Damien, Aron, Hans, David**

Who could be the learning providers? The improvement could be the incentive for the organisation. No problem to find a committed partner. At which stage of social inclusive work should we join in? We should meet something who is not really aware of its social inclusiveness. Perhaps it’s good to have a local umbrella organisation. We can use them also for dissemination. The consulting partners are not so close as the practice partners who are in direct contact with the learning providers. The trilateral meetings could have a common start with both teams. The consulting partner could have a bigger role in the impact assessment. An invitation for the learning providers to the symposium would be an additional offer.

**Group 3: Angela, Marjeta, Bente**

Should it be somebody who is working on social inclusion? Do we have learning providers in the partner countries? We are looking for organisations who are in the in-between. Inclusiveness is not their main objective but nevertheless, they are working social inclusively.

We should emphasize that we have a dialogue with the learning providers as an interactive process. Organisations who are not only interested in extending the audience but in the structure of the audience.

Jan: A popular strategy in Slovenia: Bringing new audiences in the cultural sector and then changing the structure of the audience. We will test the function of the BT. In Slovenia it is pretty common to bring new audiences and then we have a diversification.

Angela: Audience development is a good example of what practice methods can be. This can create a common understanding how we can work with.

Oliver: Focus group in Austria had the common opinion that the supreme discipline/challenge is to bring different target groups together and to extend the audiences. With this category we would not only help the unexperienced but the experienced organisations.

**Coffee Break: 11.05 – 11:20**

**3. Refinements of the website & social media / 11:20 – 12:00**

* 1. **Outline key points of website and social media, by Damien**

Key outcomes, key target groups and key messages should still be kept in mind. Key moments are important points to disseminate. Additionally, we have other opportunities. We want to tell a project story which is an ongoing process and increases the awareness. It’s good to update regularly to tell multiple story lines and to range the content (article, image, video, podcast). Using the existing channels & networks, to work with the #hashtags, to work with the project website and channels is meaningful. We should invite people to follow our FB page and to subscribe in the newsletter. What are the specific target audiences? We should think about our content we want to share on our channels and how we can ensure that we reach these audiences?

* 1. **Group discussions with lead questions – 3 groups of 3-4 persons**

Decision: Instead of the groups we will discuss in plenary.

**Who are the specific, target audiences for the BOOST website and social media?**

Types of learning providers we talked before, local municipalities and policy makers, administrations; target groups like they are already defined in the application

**What is the content that will be interesting and relevant to these audiences?**

Share output through an interesting way with people we were already in contact with, summarize outputs in graphic/visual way. Videos from practice methods perhaps? Giving definition of social inclusion? Giving the users first a piece of the cake and then to lead them to more (through links) To tell more about the content than our project implementation.

**How can we make sure that we reach these audiences and get them to see our content?**

Via newsletters, explaining the content and the project work attractively to own audience, using contacts from further project steps, direct contact (phone or mail), to build a stakeholder to list to update them continuously and to inform them about participation possibilities.

**Lunch break: 12:00 – 13:00**

**4. Refinements of the dissemination planning and reporting / 13:00 – 13:45**

* 1. **Summary of dissemination reports, 1st period, by Hans (15 min**)

The idea of reporting the dissemination is to make our process better and more efficient. We have many experts in dissemination in the partner consortium. The challenge is to use it in the project context and to motivate each other and our target groups. Therefor we should try to optimize it without using too much time because we have not much budget for this task. We are working with different standards, so it is more difficult to coordinate it. We are using website/newsletter and social media, but we have no flyers, leaflets or handouts. We should use written documents as well as Epale. Perhaps IF and FAIE could organize Epale and create a platform on it to discuss. We also should not forget to promote our activities at external events. Put more focus on other European countries and use transnational channels. The cascade effects are very important (see in the Danish report) and we should focus on that. We can find a way to reach more indirect target groups. Funding for dissemination is not high, but we have 2-3 days per period in frame of the project budget

* 1. **Group discussions with lead questions – 3 groups of 3-4 persons (15 min)**

**GROUP 1: (Hans, Agnieszka, Jan, Angela)**

1. What dissemination means is most important to use (gives the best effect for time used)?

2. How can we best use EPALE for our project dissemination?

3. How can we secure we also target groups in other EU countries than the project partners?

-

A. How can we improve our dissemination without using much extra time? What shall we maximise?

We talked about the best means to use. Social Media is a good way, but is it the only channel? Should we specify this again and create mailing lists? Epale would be good. Every organisation could use the international contacts.

**GROUP 2: (Damien, David, Bente, Oliver)**

4. How can we find “objective” standards for estimating the cascade effects from direct to indirect target groups?

5. How can we find means to estimate targets at own and other websites and at social media (instead of using N/A)?

A. How can we improve our dissemination without using much extra time? What shall we maximise?

In some areas it’s good we can measure indirect reached people and in other areas we cannot do that. We need to be realistic and give good figures. We have to think about cascade effects beforehand and not try to estimate it afterwards. Beside memberships we can use multiplier effects.

**GROUP 3: (Marjeta, Aron, Rafal)**

7. What could be the norm for number of hours/days used on dissemination in the reporting periods (typically 6 months)?

8. What is the smartest way of providing documentation of the activities (news-mail, websites, social media, presentations at events, etc).

Is it by links in the reporting template to own dissemination archives or a common archive?

9. How can we best reduce the 3 columns: Key moments, Key messages, Intended Impact just to 1 column?

--

A. How can we improve our dissemination without using much extra time? What shall we maximise?

Ideally 1 day per month, but due to the limited project budget only plan ½ a day per months, and thereby up to 3 days per period is the best solution for the dissemination effort. We need to have platforms where we can link to and share our content. We can also shorten our dissemination template and to reduce the columns. “Key moments and intended impact” are perhaps not necessary. In terms of sending the project newsletter. Idea: Should we share the task to prepare the newsletter? Each partner has once the responsibility to prepare it.

Hans will send a short summary and then we will have a written procedure about our optimization processes.

**5. Zoom meetings this spring before trilateral partner meetings (13:45 – 13:55)**

We agreed on a short virtual partner meeting in May where we can schedule possible trilateral virtual meetings in June and we will later on have two physical meetings in August/September. We can have a meeting as an intermediate step in form of a virtual meeting between the transnational training and the trilateral meetings. Damien will create a Doodle for a meeting in May and send it out to the partners for an exchange meeting which will last 2h. There will be opportunity to reflect O1 and to talk about the work for O1 and O2. If there is a need we can have more meetings, and the lead partner of the outputs can decide if it is necessary and are responsible for the initiative. These meetings can be at the interfaces from the three phases of the benchmark tool.

**6. Evaluation (13:55 – 14:25)**

Decision: Oral evaluation round of the project work until now and oral evaluation round of this partner meeting are combined

Marjeta: Quite satisfied of the survey results, very dedicated and is sharing the information with the colleagues, at the beginning it was quite difficult to explain what the project is about and what tasks are to do.

Agnieszka: The biggest challenge is the language and dealing and translating the categories “social inclusion, social cohesion, active citizenship”, but it gets clearer, the survey was very interesting and want to invite the interviewees to the next project steps.

Damien: His predecessor Kevin was really interested in the project and the topic, though he forgot some tasks he has now to catch up. But he liked to jump in the project, feel like it is getting clearer but it is still challenging, to work with the practitioners showed that it can be difficult to translate these theoretic approach in practice. Aim is to build up a relationship with the stakeholders.

Jan: The project is developing well, the meetings are efficient, initial language and terminology problems, and so it is hard to work because the language depends on which kind of people we are talking to. Builds up a picture for the further development and publishing of the BT, can see now the direction.

Bente: Problems of time, because starting late. Had a luxury problem: too many people wanted to join in the interviews. It’s a pity cannot talk to them, you have to send mails, missed the conversations. It was unclear what the topic and the questions were about, wishes more precise guidelines. Dissemination is always difficult, but in the daily life we are doing other dissemination. Not all of us have the same form of dissemination. This meeting was good, had good discussions, nice to see you all and hopefully soon on site.

Oliver: The partner consortium gets more familiar, that supports the developing process. Likes to go in deeper content-related discussions, what brings us further. Would have been good to have all national reports before the meeting, so it wasn’t possible to go deeper in the topic. Sees big potential in the dissemination activities because of the website and the Fb page, and the goal should be to use this potential.

Rafal: Was confused about this project stage and about the tool we are going to develop. After this meeting it is much clearer. So far he wasn’t really involved but the next steps he will have more tasks. Appreciates the whiteboards and to summarize results.

Angela: Agrees visualisation of discussions on the results.

Aron: Has the feeling that we managed this meeting well but is frightened about that we are going too familiar with virtual meetings. Wasn’t too much involved in the survey but liked the internal process, including many team members. 5h of meeting are enough and feels a good team spirit.

David: Still getting used to this process, it’s a different process and wonders how the BT could look like and is curious about the next steps. He enjoyed the interviews because getting in touch with people you wouldn’t have met otherwise. Nice to see all and wants just to make the BT.

Hans: Pleased with the process but BOOST is the most difficult project he has been involved in, it is very ambitious but we are on track. Happy that the interviews were positive experiences and the interviewees assess the project as relevant. Deadlines are a problem and he doesn’t know how to solve it. Asks for a compliance with deadlines. Wants to optimize the dissemination and agrees with Bente’s point that every partner is doing different dissemination. Liked the format, structure and content of the meeting. Could imagine that this could be a tool for also after the pandemic.

**7. A.O.B. (any other business)**No comments here.