BRIDGING
Bridging social capital by participatory and co-creative culture

Version 2, approved

Minutes of first meeting, 16 – 17 October 2017 in Copenhagen

Content

Participants

Bente von Schindel, KSD (DK), Kristoffer Brodersen, KSD (DK), Hans Jørgen Vodsgaard, Interfolk (DK)
Damien McGlynn, VAN (UK), Agnieszka Dadak, FAIE (PL), Angela Wieser, Educult (AT),
Gintaras Karosas, LPDA (LT), Marjeta Turk, JSKD (SI), Matjaz Šmalc, JSKD (SI), Hans Noijens, LKCA (NL)
and Ingrid Smit, LKCA (NL)

Minutes

1: Formalities – welcome, moderator and reporter, approve agenda

1a: Welcome and practical information

Bente welcomed the participants, told about Vartov and informed about practical matters.

1b: Appoint a moderator and a reporter

Bente was appointed as moderator and Kristoffer and Hans as reporter.

1c: Approval of the agenda

The proposed agenda, version 3 was approved.

1d: Sign Attendance list

Signed the list of the first day (and next morning the list for the second day as well)

2: Present persons, organisations and expectations

2a. Present persons, organisations and experiences with international projects

JSKD (SI)

is the public fund for cultural activities. It's an organisation working with amateur art and culture. Established in 1991, with the introduction of a new more decentralised system of local government, going from 68 to 212 municipalities in the country. As a result, there came a lack of coherence and consensus to the approaches toward funding amateur culture. JSKD was established as a way of creating a coherent structure and approach to amateur arts and culture.

LKCA (NL)

is the national centre for Expertise for Cultural Education and Amateur Arts. It was founded six years ago. LKCA tries to involve social parties, actors in the field of arts and artists to create what they term, "social arts". They have four thematic activities: 1) To improve the quality of education inside and outside of formal education; 2) To renew infrastructure for improved cultural participation; 3) To strengthen the active cultural participation; 4) To promote the appreciation and valuation of active cultural participation, and cultural education. They focus more on the professional sector of arts and culture.

Voluntary Arts (UK)

was established in 1991. "The current situation is very complicated". VA covers activities in the five countries: Ireland, Wales, Scotland, Northern Ireland and England. The funding is not from the government(s), but rather from arts councils. VA works to promote and create active participation in arts and culture activities, in a supportive manner, rather than an actively creating manner. The funding covers employing volunteers, research, publications and more. Fewer than 20 people work in

the Voluntary Arts, and most are working part-time. The big annual project VA is undertaking in collaboration with different partners is the "Get Creative"-project.

FAIE (PL)

stands for the Foundation of Alternative Educational Initiatives. It's a rather young organisation. The main goal of FAIE is to promote lifelong learning by supporting and promoting vocational and personal development through culture and art. It's a project-based organisation. FAIE supports many all-ages and/or third age educations. FAIE also supports NGOs in their development of international collaborative projects.

LPDA (LT)

is the Lithuanian association of Castles and Manors. It is an NGO established in 2005. It unites approx. 40 manors and castles. The mission is to preserve and to foster the unique heritage of Lithuania's castles and manors. A logical extension of this work is to strengthen the local communities and cultures. LPDA also participate in many international projects in the field of culture and heritage. The castles and manors often act as cultural centres, in the form of exhibition halls, museums, festival venues etc.

Educult (AT)

is a research institute for cultural policy and management. In contrast to most of the organisations in this project, EDUCULT hasn't been very active in the field of voluntary arts and culture, but instead has had focus on professional arts and educational actors and organisations. Educult is involved in a lot of different research projects and general national and transnational cultural projects.

KSD (DK)

is the national organisation of the municipalities' cultural councils in Denmark. Currently there are about 43 local cultural councils – a cultural council is an umbrella organisation that works on behalf of all cultural associations in the municipality. They are the political voice for these associations, so to speak. KSD provides counselling for the local councils with regards to culture policy, education and more. KSD also participates in a lot of international and/or transnational European projects. KSD is also a member of DFKS, which is an umbrella organisation for 9 national arts and heritage associations that specialise in bridging the collaborative work between volunteers and professionals. Bente is the only employee of KSD.

Interfolk (DK)

is a non-governmental institute, founded in 2008. The goals are to promote humanistic and democratic learning (Bildung) in a civil society context. The activities of Interfolk are research, development work and educational activities in Danish, Nordic and European context. Interfolk coordinates and participates in a variety of Nordic projects with partners ranging from Greenland in the West Nordic area to Arkhangelsk in Northwest Russia and European projects with partners from other EU member states.

2b. Expectations to the project

LKCA (NL): Hans expected to learn from the other participants with regards to cultural production. Also, what do we mean by social capital? These are the two main things to be delivered.

EDUCULT (AT): Angela looked forward to work in this new field of amateur arts and voluntary culture and gain new experiences and develop the contacts in this sector.

KSD (DK): Bente mentioned that in Denmark there has been a large focus on co-creation between the municipalities, local institutions and the NGO's. It seems, however to a high degree to be a way for the municipalities to acquire free labour. Therefore KSD wants to find a way for NGO's to operate in a "clean" manner.

Interfolk (DK): Hans overall expects that the project will be completed successfully and we all during the project will gain new experiences and knowhow about social bridging by participatory culture and arts activities.

LPDA (LT): Gintaras looked forward in general to gain new experiences and knowhow about international project collaboration and especially to gain new knowhow about promoting social bridging by culture and arts.

JSKD (SI): Marjeta mentioned the importance of promoting the potential of amateur arts to strengthen the social capita, to make the societal benefits more visible. Here this project can be a great opportunity to develop the ability to apply culture as means for societal progress and to complete activities with this effect.

VAN (UK): Damien saw new possibilities in the strong societal objectives of the project, which many UK stakeholders find very important not least to promote social cohesion after the increasd social divisions in the wake of the Brexit. In general there can be a lot of knowledge to be gained by international projects. There are many differences between the countries with regards to the situation for voluntary arts and culture when looking at social aspects such as class, race, religion etc. This project will very much generate new knowledge with a focus on how to understand these differences.

FAIE (PL): Agnieszka mentioned that the project's subject matter is near and dear to FAIE's heart, because they work with NGO's and volunteering. Therefore, the integrating aspects of cultural volunteering are very strong, and this project will further develop our understanding and capacity.

3. The project idea and good examples presented by all partners

3a. Short Introduction of the project idea, by Hans
With reference to the project summary (see the project bible, page 6 -7)

- The need refer to the decline of trust as one of the central challenges of our societies, where the voluntary culture associations can help to counter this trend
- The aim is to promote bonding of social capital by new co-creation activities, not only collective creative activities between similar subgroups, but co-creative activities between former segregated social groups, which can promote inclusion, cohesion and trust.
- The main contexts of such bridging activities can be Inter-social, inter-generational, inter-regional, inter-cultural and inter-European.

3b. Present good examples of co-creative activities bridging social capital, by all partners
The power-point presentations by some partners can be seen at the project archive here:

Inter-social examples - by Hans, Interfolk and Damien, VA
Hans referred to the liberal adult education tradition in general, where the non-formal learning context imply that different social groups meet without any segregation or admission requirements, and the activity include a learner-centred approach with focus on the participants different life

experiences and a Shared and collaborative learning process. The Nordic Folk High School tradition inspired by the Grundtvigian Bildung tradition has elaborated this learning context with 6 – 12 months courses at residential schools, where people with different social, cultural, generational and geographic background learn together and from each other in an open, free and egalitarian learning environment. The approx 80 – 100 boarding schools in each of the Nordic Countries (except Iceland) have since their start in the mid and late 1800s functioned as living learning laboratories for social bridging for in average 15 pct of the adult citizens and been a main generator of social capital in the Danish and other Nordic societies.

Damien referred to "Fun Palaces". It is an ongoing campaign and annual festival. The idea came from an architect in the 1960s, where you build a huge building, where everybody would be able to come in and be a designer, artist and such. This idea originally failed, but got picked up again recently, where they use all sorts of places and existing buildings as Fun Palaces, to invite people to join shared cultural activities. It creates an ideal context to work together and engage with people, who do not generally participate in cultural activity. Fun Palaces brings together people of all ages, backgrounds and abilities, and contributes to a genuine sense of community.

The concept has expanded into happening in 9 different nations. The volunteers who have participated in the Fun Palace events have come from a diverse range of e.g. social classes and ethnicities. This was also the case with regards to the attendees. This approach has changed how some of these communities and cultures think about how to make events, and to get people from many different cultures and backgrounds to attend. Any space is in principle, a viable space to act as a "Fun Palace".

Inter-generational examples - by Matjaz, JSKD
Matjaz presented a JSKD project that focused on teaching the elders to use the new technologies. They connected primary schools with elder centres and community centres, where they coordinated courses and events, where the students teach the elders in computer technology. It evolved into a fully-fledged program, entitled "Symbiosis", that revolves around students teaching elders about computer technology – and it has since expanded to other areas of technical education.

Inter-cultural example - by Bente, KSD and Hans, LKCA
Bente presented a project, where KSD worked together with Save the Children (Red Barnet). Here they invited the refugees, children and their parents, to meet and interact with children and parents from Danish schools. They had dance events and a drum teacher who taught and engaged the children and their parents from both groups. The Danish children came with both parents or primarily the fathers, while the refugee children only brought their mothers along.

Hans told about a theatre project in Hoekveen, where the participants were 23 Syrian refugees. It was initiated by the local municipality as well as professional theatre workers.

Inter-European example - by Agnieszka, FAIE
Agnieszka referred to an EU programme full of examples. It's the "Europe for Citizens" programme, and it also includes an aspect focusing on historical remembrance. Here culture and arts are often used to bring the subject matter closer to the public. An example was teaching the concept of citizenship to the youth, by employing an artist who created an installation that travelled by train around in Europe, and at each stop the local attendees could add to and elaborate the installation, and in this way all the involved experienced a shared European citizenship by way of artistic expression.

4. Information about the Grant Agreement including reporting tools

4a. Guidelines for working in a project as partner, administrator and coordinator, by Bente

Bente outlined what we should expect and require of a partner, administrator and coordinator.
KSD must as administrator make the legal contract with the Danish NA and be responsible for distributing the funds and checking the work in progress. Parts of the coordinating and reporting tasks can be delegated to other partners, such as Interfolk. Hans and Bente have the responsibility to ensure that the work is performed within the prerequisites of the EU-organisation and specifically the Danish branch.

Partners are every participating organisation, and lead partners are the specific partner organisation who manages a certain area of operation. This means that the specific lead partner is the main responsible for this specific part of the work programme.

4b. Key aspect of the Grant Agreement

The Grant Agreement including all the appendices is uploaded to the Google archive here.
Hans presented the key aspect by using an English translation of the Danish power-point that was used at the Danish Erasmus+ information meeting, 8th September in Copenhagen. The essential messages are:

1. Type of project:
   * The project belongs to the adult education part of the Erasmus+ programme
2. Payment and reporting:
   * Projects up to 2 year (as ours) implies that the 1st rate of 80 % will be paid after signing the contract and the 2nd rate of 20 % after approval of final report
   * There is no need for an interim report, but only a final report after the end of the project.
   * The final report demands we fill-in the final data in the mobility Tool+ og Project Results Platform latest 60 days after end of project.
3. Budget flexibility without amendment
   * The budget items (partner meetings, multiplier events and intellectual outputs) can be increased/decreased 20%.
   * The budget lines of management support and exceptional costs can only transfer up to 20% to other budget lines, but not receive.
   * Changes within the same budget line, such as transfer between partners is allowed
   * All changes must be explained in the report
   * An amendment request is only needed in case of changes with more than 20 pct between budget lines.
4. Documentation of costs
   * We must In general distinguish between unit costs og actual costs/real costs
   * Unit costs are based on a fixed rate – so it is not necessary to document the actual cost, but to prove that the activity has taken place!
   * Real costs are actual expenses, which must be documented with invoices, etc.
   * The meeting unit support must be documented by an original signed list of participants and a travel ticket/boarding card to prove place of departure to proof the travel distance.
   * The unit support to intellectual output must be documented by the original signed timesheet and proof of the delivered output.

- The unit support to multiplier event must be documented by the original signed list of participants (not from the project organisations) and the programme to document the event.
- Only exceptional costs demand the original cost documents as invoices, etc.

5. Possible audits or spot checks by the Danish NA
    - Keep the cost documents and account 5 years from the date of receiving the last instalment
    - The administrator is responsible for having a traceable expenses account.

It is possible to have spot-checks during the project, especially if the Danish NA by desk check can see that we haven't updated the information in the Mobility Tool+ and Project Results Platform. Therefore, we need to keep the data in the mobility tool+ updated and to upload the demanded information and outputs to the Project Results Platform as soon as they are delivered.

4c. Annex 3 - Financial-and-contractual-rules

Hans mentioned

- Because the project is only 24 months, 80% of the grant is paid up front.
- There is 20% budget flexibility between the main budget lines, but we don't recommend using this, as it will complicate the management, and the total support will not be increased by this.
- For conversion of national currency to Euro, we must use the specific EU conversion rates to euro with the date of the incurred cost, see
  http://www.ecb.europa.eu/stats/policy_and_exchange_rates/euro_reference_exchange_rates/html/index.en.html
- In relation to exceptional costs, the responsible partner organisations pays the costs 100% and will get 75% back from the grant, and the remaining 25% own financing must be shared equally between the 8 partners.

4d. Procedures for reporting via the Mobility+ Tool and Project Results Platform

This project differs from past projects with regards to the reporting. Here we must use two types of online reporting, partly the Mobility+ tool for financial data and partly the Project Results Platform for specific outputs. This will primarily be done by Bente and Hans that have edit rights, while the other partners only have view rights.

The financial reporting as well as the content or outcome reporting can be done when the activity has been completed and the output delivered.

5. Work programme and budget – present, discuss and adopt

5a. Introduction of the Project Bible and internal budget by Hans

The project bible includes the text from the application plus the latest adjustments and detail schedules of the work, so it should contain most of the needed project information. It is in word format, so it can be edited and it is easier to find the needed information by using the hyperlinks in the table of the content in the start of the document.

The applied budget was not fully approved y the Danish NA, so some of the planned activities had to be cancelled such as pilot courses in Lithuania and most of the intellectual outputs got 20% reduction of work days and thereby reduced salary refunding. This means that the overall funding is reduced from 300.000 euro to 236.198 euro.

5b. Revisions of Work Programme and budget demanded by the Danish NA

Hans mentioned that the work programme is structured in work packages (WP1, WP2…). This is different from the new Erasmus+ structure, where they divide the work into different categories such as intellectual Outputs, multiplier events, partner meetings, and management, which blurs the sense of the integrated progression of the work programme.

Many of the tasks or work packages, however time consuming are rather straightforward to deliver in terms of purpose and content, whereas WP06 (Idea compilation and thematic compendia) is less defined and properly the most demanding part of the project. This key task to compile and present innovative practise of culture activities with a high degree of social bridging is the essential part of the project and properly also the main reason for the actual approval and funding of the project.

Because the Danish NA removed the provision of Erasmus+ courses (IO-8), they as a logical extension removed the test of the European pilot courses in Lithuania (part of IO-6 and T1-T2). Hereby we get less refunding but at the same time also lesser work to do. In general the work programme has been simpler to complete with these reductions and adjustments.

5c. Clarify the budget of the adjusted work programme

The meeting took note of the adjustments of the work programme and the reduced budget as demanded by the Danish NA. The adjustments and reductions are presented in the project Bible, v1b, page 8 – 14.

5d. Clarify the time schedule – do we need more time for some tasks, and less to others

The meeting approved the revised time schedule for the work programme as presented in the project Bible, v1b, page 85.

6. Partner Agreements and Rules of Procedure – present, discuss and adopt

6a. Partner agreement, v2

Hans mentioned that the proposed partner agreement, v2 was based on a standard example for international project teams, which the EU Agency, EACEA did provide some years ago. The format has been used in former EU project by KSD and Interfolk, and we have never had problems with it.

The proposed Partner Agreement, v2 was approved by the meeting.

6b. Rules of procedure, v1

Hans mentioned that normally the important decisions are taken at the partner-meetings, however we may also need to take urgent decisions by Skype-meetings or by written procedure. If there is a proposal, and people do not answer before the deadline, then they passively accept or agree with the proposal. The procedure for decision making must be open and transparent, so any partner can present a proposal to a partner meeting or initiate a written procedure between the meetings.

The proposed Rules of Procedure, v1 was approved by the meeting.

7. Financial management – present, discuss and adopt

7a. Financial Guidelines, v2

Hans mentioned that the adjusted second version, that was sent a few days ago, was inspired by some potential project risks observed at another Erasmus+ project as well as questions asked by some of our partners to the first version.

In the first version, there were only the "atomic bomb"-solution to weak performances from a partner; i.e. the termination of a partner's participation. Now there is a tier-list of economic actions that can be implemented, if a partner doesn't live up to the agreements and task deadlines. This is: the reduction of refunding (with exceeded deadlines), the transference of the task to another partner (with weak performance or incomplete performance), termination of partnership and subsequent transference of the remaining funds to a new engaged partner (with unacceptable performance).

There is an element of questionable quality assessment with the term "weak or incomplete performance", and the implementation of the new tier-list. Therefore these decisions can always be appealed to the rest of the group. Hans is the first gate-keeper with regards to assessing the quality of work from the partners. If a problem arises, he will contact the person involved, and if it doesn't resolve it or the partner disagree with the assessment, then the partner can appeal the assessment to the Project Management Group (the 8 partners' project leaders); and the question will be tackled by the whole group at large; but the coordinator can in utmost outliers ask the Danish NA about their opinion, and then their advice must be followed.

The proposed Financial Guidelines, v2 was approved by the meeting.

7b. Financial templates

Hans mentioned that there will be made templates for all payments, so that it is easier to use by every partner. This includes making a template for time-sheet registrations of work hours. As the project progresses, we will properly see a need for revisions of some of the templates or to make extra templates for some special cost categories.

The meeting took note of the information.

7c. Procedure for cost reporting and refunding

After the first partner-meeting, Bente will fill-in the costs of hosting the meeting, and include the partners' share of the cost in the template for refunding of the meeting unit support. The partners must remember to send a copy of the signed meeting template plus a copy of their travel cost or better their boarding card.

There are many templates matching different tasks and activities that must be filled as they happen during the project. Bente will prefer the partners bring the demanded original documentations such as the time-sheets signed by the engaged staff and the director as well as the signed participant lists from the concluding national conference (the multiplier event).

8. Plan the Internal Communication, use of ICT, archive etc.

8a. Possible guidelines for use of ICT, web meetings, etc.

There is a limit to the project archive (old Google Sites) of 100mb, but if it gets filled up, then Hans will either edit the content, or create a new archive for different parts. For photos and video, you can use Google Photo and for extra heavy document, Google Drive and for both Dropbox to circumvent the storage issue. Approved that Hans must try to clarify and implement the best solution.

Video conferences are done through Skype. If a partner cannot participate, he or she will as the other partners get the agenda at least a week before; and can send written comments to the agenda.

8b. Netiquette

The key question for a good netiquette is the response time. How long response time is the norm? Up to 3 days was proposed by Agnieszka; Hans preferred 1 day; Bente proposed that if we cannot answer fast, we can send a short message that "I will answer this latest ... or as soon as possible". No decision was made.

If there is a decision to be made (typical a written procedure), there will be mentioned a deadline of 1 week, where a failure to respond equates to a compliance with the specific proposal.

8c. Needs for document archive and Dropbox for photos

See above, section 8a.

9. Plan intellectual output 1: The Portal

9a. Outline the draft design and structure of the portal, by LKCA

LKCA did before the meeting email an outline to the partners, entitled: "WP03 - outline of design and structure of communication portal, v2".

Before making a complete design, LKCA wished to hear the partners' opinion about target group of the Portal. After some debate, Angela proposed that we changed the agenda, so we started to clarify the state of the arts survey before we clarified the target groups of the portal which was approved.

During the debate of the Survey, we didn't manage to gain a detailed presentation of the target groups. Hans, Interfolk, says that the approved application did defined the main target groups, and the main direct target groups are the learning providers from the European cross-cultural sector of amateur arts, voluntary culture and heritage. The focus will be to promote and provide new knowledge and methodologies about initiating and implementing new culture bridging activities.

Hans, LKCA proposed five menus:
1. Inspiration – share good practices and pilot works on a wider European Scale, state of Art.
2. Knowledge – provision of new culture policy trends and research results
3. Funding – info about new funding opportunities for cross-national and multilateral pilot work
4. Formats and courses – a promotion service for the developed sustainable Erasmus+ training courses, national courses and new seminars and conferences
5. Help, Q&A - a partner contact service for voluntary culture associations and culture agencies; dialogue forum

We must try and find a way, where correspondences and dialogue can be made through the site. Elaborate presentation of the project overall, should perhaps be on an "about"-page. All partners

have responsibility to create awareness of the portal, and link to it in their respective disseminations, when the Portal has been designed and provide the basic content.

9b. The visual design of the project materials and the website, by LKCA

Damien presented 3 logos, and number 2 was agreed upon democratically. Damien will prepare high quality editions and send to the partnership and they will added to our project archive for future use.

9c. Plan time schedule next half year: who does what and when?

LKCA did present a time schedule in the emailed proposal: "WP03 - outline of design and structure of communication portal, v2". The schedule is also presented in the Project Bible, v1b, page 92.

The meeting approved the proposed time schedule with the following revisions and extra schedules:

- Hans, LKCA will latest 27 October send a more detailed description of the tasks that the partners must deliver.
- Latest 15 February 2018, the partners doing local surveys will send their national summaries, so that they can be published on the portal, as well as send these to Angela. It might just be key points, rather than the complete summaries.
- It is JSKD that is the lead partner/responsible for managing the innovative observatory and dialogue forum for exchange of ideas and new practises; and FAIE and LPDA is co-partners.

The meeting approved the following time schedule:

No	Who	Key activities:	Deadlines
1	LKCA	Present design and menu structure etc 1 week before the partner meeting	9 Oct 2017
	LKCA	Send a more detailed description of the tasks that the partners must deliver.	27 Oct 2017
2	LKCA	Design and publish the initial portal	15 Nov 2017
3	All	All partners validate the initial design of the Portal, test the functionality of the website and provide recommendations for improvements.	1 Dec 2017
4	LKCA	publication of the first version of the portal	15 Dec 2017
	MOST	Partners doing local surveys send national summaries to be publish at the portal	15 Feb 2018
5	LKCA + EC, IF	Provide desk research on culture policy trends and new primary research results	15 Feb 2018
6	VA, KSD, JSKD	provide information about the state of art, sharing good practise in the European communities (summaries of national surveys)	15 Feb 2018
7	FAIE, IF	Provide information about new funding opportunities for cross-national and multilateral pilot work in the field.	15 Feb 2018
8	JSKD + FAIE, LPDA	Manage the innovative observatory and dialogue forum for exchange of ideas and new practises.	15 Feb 2018
9	LKCA	Manages the news service, and the project library as well as presentation of the project, its informative contents and main outcome.	28 Feb 2018
10	IF + LPDA	promote service for sustainable Erasmus+ training courses, national courses, and new European seminars	28 Feb 2018
11	LKCA + Educult, IF	LKCA coordinate information for the Portal, in collaborating with Educult (AT) and Interfolk (DK) and by ongoing dialogue with the other partners.	28 Feb 2018
12	LKCA	Design, refinement and on-going updates	ongoing

Hans, Interfolk will latest 27 October update the time schedule in the project Bible with the extra points and distribute the updated Bible together with the minutes from the first meeting.

10. Plan Intellectual output 2: The State of Arts survey

10a. Outline the draft methodology for the State of the Arts Surveys, Angela, Educult

EDUCULT did before the meeting email an outline to the partners, entitled: "WP 17 – EVALUATION Methodology, v1".

Angela mentioned that the state of the arts survey is the first output to be finalised. Angela proposed that everyone should consider how the survey can be used. The survey attempts to provide an overview of the sector, examples of co-creation activities in the sector, the need of the sector and lastly an analytical summary of the main trends revealed by the research.

The survey will be carried out in two ways: through a qualitative survey, and a quantitative survey. These will both be carried out among the three respondent groups: learners, learning providers and stakeholders. The questionnaire will be drafted by Educult, then translated by each partner into their own languages and distributed among the respondent groups.

Angela requested that each partner compiles a 3-4 description of contexts and frames for the specific country. The second part, the qualitative survey, will be interviews with up to three representatives for the three main respondent groups. Educult will prepare questions/subjects for these interviews. Angela recommends that the interview-sessions will be recorded as a base for making a protocol of the interviews (and not a transcript which is not needed and also too time-consuming).

Agnieszka asked about clarifying the co-creation concept. This is, according to Bente, that municipalities must make co-creative projects where they engage or employ the civil society, local culture institutions and voluntaries in activities. Also, the definition of social capital is discussed. Hans, Interfolk proposed that the basic term for the level of social capital is "mutual trust" between different groups of people.

However, the use of "trust" and "happiness" is difficult to measure according to Angela. If there is an emphasis on trust it risks being too vague in the assessment of the impact of the project. What could a more specific impact be? Knowledge, friendships, contacts and establishing contacts. Angela would focus more on exchange, in the interaction with the respondents, as it is more easily understood and measured. These terms can be used in the outlines, and in the broader writing from the partners. Hans objects, that there have been multiple surveys on trust, quality of life and happiness, but the problem may be according to Angela that the respondents probably would answer too positively if framed around the specific activities' impact on trust. Therefore, it is, according to Angela and JSKD, preferable to ask about trust indirectly.

Agnieszka asked, what are we trying to capture? Angela: We are trying to use the survey as indicators for what is helpful, and what is not helpful; what is a good activity and what is not in relation to strengthen the social capital.

Angela mentioned the problem about number of respondents. How many would we be able to reach with the questionnaire and the interviews? If it only is 25 per country, then these results cannot be used as representative of the sector at large. Agnieszka mentioned that it is not a survey project, but the initial survey more should be seen as a help to clarify the needs for the succeeding compilation of good practise in the thematic fields of bridging activities and the subsequent design of relevant curricula and course programmes.

The meeting took note of the issues discussed and approved that Angela can continue to develop the survey methodology that incorporates the presented point of views.

10b. Discuss and clarify the outputs and division of work

Angela asked if we shall use a division of work in the surveys corresponding to the division of work with the compilation in Intellectual Output-3 , so each have focus on a specific inter-x activities instead of all five inter-x's .

Marjeta mentioned that most of the potential respondent groups are very diverse, and consists of inter-generational, -social, -regional and so on, backgrounds; and if each local survey focus on a specific inter-x group, then the data will be more limited and they may not so useful for JSKD or the other partners. The meeting decided that all local surveys should try to map all five inter-x areas of activity.

Furthermore, the initial research plan only included local surveys by KSD (DK), Voluntary Arts (UK), FAIE (PL) and JSKD (SI); but more partners wanted to make local surveys. Angela mentioned that Educult would try to get extra national funding to make a similar survey in Austria, because it was a research issue which haven't been done before and it may provide new interesting knowledge. Hans, LKCA mentioned that LKCA also would like to make their own national survey.

The meeting approved that Educult and LKCA could join the field survey, even though there weren't extra days in the budget for such an extra task.

Angela asked about the specific questions we should use in the study:
- Character of the organisations, activities, target groups, range of experiences, what social groups have participated, positives/negatives.
- What type of answers would we want from learning providers? Which social groups have been included – methods of including them. With regards to trust – which type of cooperation. Have you (the learning providers) had events, activities that include groups from so-and-so.
- A valuation of the impact these activities.

Agnieszka requests surveying the motivation, both on the part of the learning providers, and how they motivate participants.
Hans, LKCA, wants to uncover what is meant by inter-social? It could be high-low educated, left-wing-right-wing?

For Angela, the qualitative interviews are the important part of the survey; and the easiest way, according to Angela, is to record the interviews – then listen to them and summarise every section in English. The more detailed summary, the better. The more information, the better possibility for interpretation – to a point. She also proposes to make a quantitative questionnaire that is more general. Also, if this quantitative survey includes the focus on motivation with a ranking of benefits, then it can be more applicable. Rankings and comparisons are a good way of mapping the potential benefits of these activities.

The meeting could approve the proposed guidelines for the further design of the survey methodology.

10c. Plan time schedule Oct. 2017 – Mar 2018: Who does what and when?

The main milestone for the survey is to deliver the English Summary Report at least 1 week before the second partner meeting and the start of Intellectual Output-3, Idea compilation of good practise for five thematic compendia, Mar – Sept 2018. But the translation of the six national editions can be done after the second meeting and while the Compilation of good practise has started.

The meeting approved the following time schedule:

No	Who	Key activities:	Deadlines
1	P5, EC	Lead partner outlines research methodology	10 Oct 2017
2	All	Quantitative questionnaires and qualitative guides are sent to everybody in English by EC, partners translate questionnaires and sent them back to EC	27 Oct 2017
3	EC	EC puts surveys online and sends links back to partners	1 Nov 2017
3	KSD, VA, FAIE, JSKD	The four associations start disseminating the surveys and start with interviews.	15 Nov 2017
4	EC	The online surveys are closed, EC begins with analysis	22 Dec 2018
6	KSD, VA, FAIE, JSKD	The four partners present/sent summaries of the interviews to EC	5 Feb 2018
7	EC	Lead partner, Educult collates the partners' summaries and results of the surveys in a Summary Report, draft	1 Mar 2018
8	All	All partners comment the draft Summary report	5 Mar 2018
9	All	The draft Summary Report is discussed at second meeting	12 – 13 March
10	EC	Lead partner, Educult prepare the final version incl. layout and publish English master version	25 March 2018
11	ALL, except VA	All partners (except the UK partner) translate the English master edition to their national languages (DK, PL, DE, LT, SI and NL).	20 April 2018
12	ALL, except VA	All partners (except the UK partner) adjust the common layout and complete proof-reads and publish the reports as PDF-publications.	1 May 2018

Hans, Interfolk will latest 27 October update the time schedule in the project Bible with the extra points and distribute the updated Bible together with the minutes from the first meeting.

11. Plan the transversal dissemination

11a. The overall dissemination strategy, Damien, VA

VAN did before the meeting email an outline to the partners, entitled: "WP16 Dissemination Strategy, v2-dm"

The dissemination strategy is related to all the previously discussed activities. When the portal is launched, for example, there is a responsibility on behalf of all the partners for providing content and promoting the portal. Damien and Hans J. will make a summary leaflet that summarises the project at large, and which can function as a simple introduction for the participants. There will be added a deadline for the translations of this leaflet. After this every partner share this with the audience.

All must remember to document, what they have disseminated, so they can collect and show the overall dissemination activities. Damien will make a template for documenting the dissemination ASAP. This must be done with every completed task, and the filled-in template must be send by all to Damien at the end of February 2018.

This will mean that by the time we have reached March, Damien will have evidence of the completion of all the different tasks.

11b. Local dissemination strategies, all partners

As soon as the communications portal is launches, the partners should begin the early stages of spreading awareness and recognition of this project. Some partners have already started to disseminate the project start by news-mails, social media and presentations at their own website.

11c. The dissemination budget, including payment from management support

The budget for extra dissemination tasks for the lead partner, VAN calculates with extra 5 days of 214 euro, in total 1070 euro, which can be shared by the partners with 1/8 for each, including VAN. This amount per partner of 133.75 euro can be subtracted from each partner's management unit support.

The meeting approved the proposed budget for the extra dissemination tasks of the lead partner.

11d. Plan time schedule next half year: Who does what and when?

The schedule presented in the dissemination strategy by Damien, was altered slightly to accommodate the above agreements.

The meeting approved the following time schedule:

No	Who	Activity	Deadline
1	VA	Draft of the overall dissemination strategy	16 Oct 2017
2	VA	Design visual identity and logo	31 Oct 2017
a	ALL	First news-mail about the project	ASAP
b	ALL	Mention BRIDGING at own websites	ASAP
c	VA	Prepare and send template for reporting dissemination	ASAP
3	VA, KSD, FAIE, JSKD, LKCA, EC	Begin dissemination of the State of the Arts surveys	15 Nov 2017
4	All	Compile initial mailing lists of planned target groups	15 Nov 2017
5	VA, IF	Design and produce project information leaflets	30 Nov 2017
5a	All	Translate leaflet to own languages	15 Dec 2017
6	LKCA	Publication of first version of communication portal	15 Dec 2017
7	All	Project information leaflets shared on partner websites and project communication portal	20 Dec 2017
8	All	Links to communication portal active on own websites	19 Jan 2018
9	All	Initial social media promotion of communication portal	26 Jan 2018
10	All	Promotion of project/leaflet/portal in own newsletters	2 Feb 2018
11	All	Promotion of project in at least one organisation meeting	28 Feb 2018
12	ALL	Fill-in the reporting template	28 Feb 2018

Hans, Interfolk will latest 27 October update the time schedule in the project Bible with the extra points and distribute the updated Bible together with the minutes from the first meeting.

12. Plan the transversal evaluation and QA

12a. Outline the evaluation methodology, by Angela, Educult

EDUCULT did before the meeting email an outline to the partners, entitled: "WP 17 – EVALUATION Methodology, v1".

The method combines process evaluation (focusing on whether it has been implemented well and the quality of the work) and impact evaluation (focusing on outputs themselves and their impact on the planned target groups).

After the national pilot courses, Educult will provide a printed questionnaire for the course participants at the end of the event. After the multiplier events in 2019, there will also be written questionnaire. In both cases, the questionnaires will be sent to Educult and they will process them later. On this meeting we will focus on an oral evaluation. There will also be a possibility for written evaluation, which will be prompted through e-mail by Educult. Everyone agrees to this proposal.

12b. The evaluation budget, including payment from management support

The budget for extra evaluation tasks for the lead partner, EDUCULT calculates with extra 10 days of 241 euro, in total 2410 euro, which can be shared by the partners with 1/8 for each, including EDUCULT. This amount per partner of 301.25 euro can be subtracted from each partner's management unit support.

The meeting approved the proposed budget for the extra dissemination tasks of the lead partner.

12c. Plan time schedule next half year: Who does what and when?

No detailed time schedule was decided.

13. Guidelines for transversal management

13a. The management approach, by Bente and Hans

The intention is to apply a participative and democratic approach, where we share ideas, work and responsibilities, and we will from the start seek to generate ownership and high commitment amongst all team members and keep a high level of mutual dialogue and reporting of the project progress.

We will achieve this by ensuring team members are fully informed what is going on (transparency), can contribute to all the important project aspects (involvement), have a say (participative decision-making), are encouraged to create benefits for themselves and their institution (acceptance of individual motives), and are going public with the achievements (increase of image and reputation).

Furthermore, the team spirit will grow, because we can envisage cooperation beyond the end of the funding period by means of sustainable results such as Erasmus+ training events, and other possible follow-up projects.

The meeting took note of the management approach.

13b. The management budget

We don't budget with extra costs for coordinator, which the partners must share and pay from their management unit support, because KSD gets 250 euro extra per months to take care of the coordination, financial management, and reporting to the National Office.

13c. Time schedules for the management

In terms of management everyone has their responsibilities, and Hans and Bente will be charged with reminding everyone if they do not live up to these agreements.

14. Plan the next partner meeting(s)

14a. WP 05: The second partner meeting in Poland, March 2018, proposal by FAIE

Agnieszka proposed the third week of March. It was counter-proposed to be the 12th and 13th instead. The latter was agreed upon.

So, the meeting will be the 12th and 13th of March in Bielsko-Biała, Poland.

The nearest airports are Krakow or Katowice. It is also easy to reach by fast train from Warsaw. Agnieszka will provide travel information, hotel information and more.

14b. Need for Skype partner meetings before second partner meeting? What and when?

It can be productive to have a Skype meeting before Christmas, to get an update of the work on the surveys and the portal.

Decided to be 14th of December at 11:00 CET (Central European Time), which include all partner countries except LT, which is 1 hour ahead and UK, which is 1 hour behind. It means 10:00 for Damien and 12:00 for Gintaras.

If a partner is unable to participate, they will as other partners get the draft agenda from Hans latest 1 week before the Skype meeting, so they have the possibility to comment and be heard.

15. Evaluation of previous work

15a. Oral evaluation round of WP 01: Start-up planning

We didn't have a specific evaluation of the start-up work package.

15b. Oral evaluation round of WP 02: The first partner meeting

Angela moderated the oral evaluation, and started to ask: What were your expectations in terms of organisation, etc. – were they met?

Gintaras, LPDA: Very happy about this meeting. It has clarified many things about this project. Very professional work by Hans.

Ingrid, LKCA: Had no expectations, as she had no prior experience of this type of project. It was well structured and informative. The schedule held up. Good information beforehand.

Hans, LKCA: IT was structured, and the atmosphere was very nice. He would have liked a bit more discussion on the different IO tasks.

Damien, VA: Agree that it has been very positive – very well organised. His expectations were to move from where we were from the start, to know more about what the project is about. The planning and the documents are good and important, but being able to discuss the ideas more openly will affect how everyone will approach the work. It was a very good thing that this was discussed for a while today (day 2). The work of the budget and planning on day 1, enabled a better discussion on the project overall. Well planned and hosted. Next meeting probably will be more involved, given that we have established a lot from this meeting.

Angela, EDUCULT: The nature of this first meeting has a standard frame, where it must focus a lot on the organisational aspects, such as budget and planning. The discussion on day 2 got a bit lost, so I'm a bit nervous if the idea is very clear for everybody to move forward. I am however very satisfied with the meeting. If there are questions with regards to the questionnaires and interview guides, then I don't feel like I can be the only expert on how to use this. Perhaps Hans should be cc'd or perhaps it will be done in plenum. It will be distributed by mail as a Word document, where everyone can comment by mail on the content.

Agnieszka, FAIE: I don't have much to add. I was very overwhelmed by the amount of materials to read beforehand. Very good planning on the hosts' part, with good practical and historical information for visitors. I'm really satisfied with the meeting. There was time for discussion, which was nice. I feel more motivated to work. It was good to have a presentation of every organisation; who they are and what they do. It cannot be 100% clear from the start, as many things will be revealed in the process.

Bente, KSD: When I prepared the kick-off with Hans, I had to think about the experiences I have gained from other projects. You should think about the organisation and planning, and all the minutiae, but it is also important to discuss the content of the project. Therefore, I tried to make time for this. It is of course not finished yet, as there will be continuous discussions.

Marjeta, JSKD: We were not surprised by the well-prepared organisational aspects of this first meeting and start-up, given that we have worked with Hans and Bente before. The structure and responsibilities are very clear: who does what and when. I was a bit more worried about the content and the aims of the project, and if it meets our objectives in JSKD. We did a great job this morning in clearing this up, but there is more to discuss. This will be clearer perhaps when Angela have prepared the survey. Generally, we are satisfied.

Matjaz, JSKD: The meeting was very well prepared and completed. Good that we clarified a lot of management questions, so now we can focus more on the content. The project goal seem very wide, now in the coming development work we need to narrow and specify the objectives. We expect the results of the survey to lead the project in a narrower direction. A concern and challenge was that every partner is very different from each other, so the discussion on day 2 was really important. Everyone will do it in their own way.

Hans, Interfolk: I think it has been a good kick-off meeting. I was moved by seeing old partners coming to the yard here in Vartov, as well seeing the new partners. We perhaps could have had more content issues on the agenda yesterday, even though we had a start session with focus on good examples. Anyhow, it was important to process the organisational and planning aspects, and I think we succeeded in clarifying all these management papers of the project. There is a good feeling and atmosphere in the group. It will be a fine project.

16. A.O.B. (Any other business)
No further business was put forth.