

27.04.2018 / hjv

Version 2, approved

Minutes of second meeting in Bielsko-Biala, 9 – 10 April 2018

Content

Participants	1
Aims and key activities of the second meeting	1
Minutes	2
1. Formalities – welcome, moderator and reporter, approve agenda.....	2
2. Since last time: Info on matters not included in the items below	2
3. Status of Intellectual Output 1: The Portal.....	3
4. Status of Intellectual Output 2: The State of Arts survey	4
5. Plan Output 3: Five Thematic Compendia, seven language ed., Mar – Sept 2018.....	5
6. Plan Intellectual Output 4: Provide Curriculum Guidelines, March – May 2018	5
7. Budget adjustment	6
8. Plan Output 5 (and T1-T7): Design and test 7 national pilot courses, June – Oct 2018	6
9. Status of the transversal dissemination activities	6
10. Status of the transversal progress and impact evaluation	8
11. Status of the project management	8
12. Plan the next partner meeting(s)	9
13. Evaluation of the previous work	9
14. A.O.B. (any other business)	10

Participants

Bente von Schindel, KSD (DK), Hans Jørgen Vodsgaard, Interfolk (DK), Damien McGlynn, VAN (UK), Rafal Dadak, FAIE (PL), Jerzy Kraus, FAIE (PL), Aron Weigl, Educult (AT), Noé Bex, Educult (AT), Aira Andriksone, LACM (LV), Jan Pirnat, JSKD (SI), Hans Noijens, LKCA (NL) and Ingrid Smit, LKCA (NL).

Apologies: Agnieszka Dadak, FAIE (PL).

Aims and key activities of the second meeting

The overall aim of this second meeting is to summarize the state of the project and lead the way forward for the project and for the partners. The objectives are:

- To bridge the results of the survey (WP 04/IO-2) to the succeeding compilation of good practise in thematic fields of bridging (WP 06 /IO-3),
- To prepare the provision of Curricula Guidelines (WP 07/IO-4),
- To prepare the design and test of the national pilot courses (WP 08/IO-5).

Minutes

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

1a: Welcome and practical information

Rafal welcomed the participants, told about the venue and informed about practical matters.

1b. Appoint a moderator and a reporter

Bente was appointed as moderator and Hans as reporter.

1c. Approval of the agenda

The proposed agenda, version 2 was approved.

1d. Sign Attendance list

The attendance list, first day was signed (and next morning the list for the second day as well)

2. Since last time: Info on matters not included in the items below

2a. Presentation of new Latvian partner

Aira Andriksone, managing director, presented LACM, the Latvian Association of Castles and Manors. The meeting welcomed the new partner.

2b. News from the partners

Aron Weigl, Educult (AT) informed about changes in the positions in EDUCULT, where he is the new director and Michael Wimmer, the former director now is part of the research staff.

2c. News from the coordinator

None.

2d. Other issues: Summary of work programme

Hans, Interfolk gave an overview of the work programme. After completing the second intellectual output, IO-2 (Survey), we now start the second project phase, where we shall provide the main development work before our next third partner meeting, Nov 2018 in Latvia namely:

IO-1: Continued tasks for Portal, second half year with approx. 2 - 3 days per partner.

IO-3: Provide five Thematic Compendia, seven language editions, Mar – Sept 2018, which is the most demanding part of the project, having most work days with approx. 28 days per partner or 1,4 months work (Net work days per month is approx 18 days: 365 days minus reduction of weekends/104 days, statutory holidays/30 days and bank holidays/14 – like 365 – (104 + 30 + 14), like 217 per year and 18,08 days per month).

IO-4: Provide Curricula Guidelines, English edition, March – May 2018, which is lesser demanding with approx 5 days for partners to give feedback on the initial outline and the subsequent draft.

IO-5: Design and test national pilot courses, June – Oct 2018, which also is a demanding part with approx 12 days per partner to plan, complete and evaluate the 1-2 day pilot course.

IO-6: Design new course packages/provide recommendations for final curricula report (the two European pilot courses is cancelled), June – Nov 2018, which isn't very demanding, even though there are approx. 8 days per partner to do nearly nothing.

It means that In the 6 months period until next partner meeting in Nov 2018, each partner has approx. 56 project days, like approx. 3,1 months full time work (53 days / 18 days per month) or approx. a half time project employment the next half year to fulfil the tasks.

For more information see

- [the outline of the work programme in the Project Bible, v2b, page 85](#)
- [the work day budget in the Revision of budget, 6.4.2018](#)

3. Status of Intellectual Output 1: The Portal

3a. Status of work

[See the outline of sections at portal, hjv, 6-4-2018 at the archive here.](#)

Re Review of the design and structure of the Portal, by Hans, LKCA:

Hans Noijens presented the design and structure. The meeting approved it without new proposals for adjustments.

Re 1st Section about culture policy trends, by Educult, Interfolk and LKCA:

Can include overviews of

- Trends in the member states. EC has provided a preliminary overview of European countries ex Nordic-Baltic area. Here Interfolk must make a supplementing overview.
- Trend in European associations. EC will provide.
- Trends in EU's official culture policy. IF will provide.
- Trends in EU supported projects in Erasmus+, Creative Europe programme and Europe for Citizens. LKCA will provide.

Re 2nd Section about sharing good practice, by VA, KSD and JSKD:

We can focus on our five project topics of inter-relations, where the responsible partners from the thematic compendia provide examples:

- Inter-social: Voluntary Arts (UK) as lead and Interfolk (DK) and LKCA (NL)
- Inter-generational: JSKD (SI) as lead and LACM (LV) and FAIE (PL)
- Inter-regional: KSD (DK) as lead and Voluntary Arts (UK) and FAIE (PL)
- Inter-cultural: LKCA (NL) as lead and KSD (DK) and EDUCULT (AT)
- Inter-European: FAIE (PL) as lead and EDUCULT (AT) and Interfolk (DK)

The examples can be presented with the order: What, Why, potential benefits plus links to more info. The presentation of each example can be of max 500 words (½ standard page).

Re 3rd Section about funding possibilities for international work, by FAIE and Interfolk:

FAIE has provided outline of European funding programmes. It can be elaborated.

Interfolk shall deliver outline of Nordic-Baltic funding programmes, where most are open for partners outside the area.

Re 4th Section about dialogue (and contact) forum for innovative practice, by JSKD, FAIE and LACM:

A dialogue and contact forum imply some form of interactive functions; and a simple and cheaper solution can be to use a Facebook site. No need to use Twitter. JSKD, FAIE and LKCA will clarify.

Re 5th Section about European training events, by Interfolk and LACM:

Info about relevant European events, like transnational seminars and conferences and in-service training courses during and after the end of the project. Can mainly be found at EPALE, the electronic platform for adult learning in Europe (<https://ec.europa.eu/epale/en/>), where European courses are announced. Interfolk and LACM must find and present an initial group of relevant events and supplement it during the project period.

Re 6th Section about news service, by LKCA:

Approved that LKCA sends English news-mail to trans-European associations and key European target groups, while the partners send to their own target groups. At least a news-mail per half year.

For dissemination LKCA can use “ENTER - The European Network for Transfer and Exploitation of EU Project Results” – see <http://www.enter-network.eu/>

To be member see <http://www.enter-network.eu/membership/membership-levels>

Re general project presentation of the partners and the aim, activities, and results by LKCA:

Some parts must be adjusted or shorter, and others still need text. LKCA will soon provide.

Other issues:

None to mention.

3b. Plan time schedule:

- All partners provide their tasks ASAP and latest 1st May
- LKCA check status 1nd May and send reminder of tasks, if some haven't delivered.

4. Status of Intellectual Output 2: The State of Arts survey

4a. The local surveys – what can we learn on how to plan and complete it

We had an evaluative round by the involved partners.

Hans N. mentioned the need to have clearer target groups (to clarify by each partner before invitation), so they have the needed motivation and will use the needed time to reply.

Aron mentioned that such a clarification also will be important to complete the later impact evaluation.

Aron told that they as survey tool had used Lime Survey, which is better than Monkey Survey to compare and present different language editions.

4b. Present and discuss the Survey Summary report. Presentation by Aron, Educult

Aron can ask the partners for more feeds if needed.

Decided that the master version only needs to have the English questionnaire as annex; while the national editions can use the national questionnaire as annex.

Elements of the original interviews can be used at the project website

4c. Clarify recommendations for the subsequent O3: Thematic Compendia

The key objective of the Survey was to present a baseline and provide recommendations for the subsequent development work with

- Thematic Compendia (IO-3), lead partner Damien, VAN
- Curricula Guidelines (IO-4), lead partner Hans, IF

We need to clarify the possible recommendations, and here the lead partners for the Thematic Compendia and Curricula Guidelines must prepare key questions and the frame, which the partners can use for their recommendations.

4d. Plan time schedule

Prepare English master edition:

20th April – Aron sends master edition to Damien for proof-reading

27th April – Damien returns the proof-read edition

Provide seven translated versions

2nd May – Partners receive the Final English Master edition

15th May – Partners have translated the survey
 1st June – the final versions are published as PDF-editions.

Related tasks

20th April - Damien and Hans send Frame / questionnaire for recommendations
 1st May – Partners reply/send recommendations about – what have we learned from the survey
 15th May – Damien and send summary of their conclusions of the recommendation

5. Plan Output 3: Five Thematic Compendia, seven language ed., Mar – Sept 2018

5a. Outline the methodology for five thematic Compendia, by Damien, VA

The approach and frame of the compendia are outlined in the application. [The IO-3 is presented in the Project Bible, v2b, page 101 – 104](#)

5b. Discuss and clarify the outputs and division of work

The division of work has the following plan:

- 1st compendia: Inter-social: Voluntary Arts (UK) as editor and Interfolk (DK) and LKCA (NL)
- 2nd compendia: Inter-generational: JSKD (SI) as editor and LACM (LV) and FAIE (PL)
- 3rd compendia: Inter-regional: KSD (DK) as editor and Voluntary Arts (UK) and FAIE (PL)
- 4th compendia: Inter-cultural: LKCA (NL) as editor and KSD (DK) and EDUCULT (AT)
- 5th compendia: Inter-European: FAIE (PL) as editor and EDUCULT (AT) and Interfolk (DK)

The meeting confirmed the division of work. The initial main task is to clarify the recommendations from the survey, which can be used as guidelines for the compilation of good practise.

5c. Plan time schedule Mar – Sept 2018: Who does what and when?

20th April: Damien sends Frame and questionnaire regarding recommendations from the survey.
 1st May: Partners send recommendations
 10th May: Damien sends detailed task plan

6. Plan Intellectual Output 4: Provide Curricula Guidelines, March – May 2018

6a. Outline the methodology for the Curricula Guidelines, by Hans, Interfolk

Hans send a proposal for the task, see [BRIDGING, O4, Plan for providing Curricula Guidelines, v1](#)

The main change compared to the application text is that the focus on certification methods has been replaced with a focus on assessment of learning outcome and the transfer of the learned to the work at home. The meeting approved the plan.

6b. Discuss and clarify the outputs and division of work

The Curricula Guidelines can be approx 26 standard pages and only provided as an English PDF-edition. The main tasks of the partners are to compile recommendations from the survey and to read and comment the draft Guidelines.

6c. Plan time schedule Mar – May 2018: Who does what and when?

20th April: Hans send Frame / questionnaire regarding recommendations from the survey
 1st May: Partners send recommendations
 14th May: Hans send draft Curricula Guidelines for comments
 21st May: Partners comments the draft
 25th May: Hans publishes the final English PDF-version.

7. Budget adjustment

7a. Proposal for budget adjustment, by Hans

Hans send a proposal for the budget revision, see [BRIDGING - revision of budget, 6-4-2018](#)

The revision transfers some extra days to LKCA for proving the local survey and at the same time LACM had some days reduced due to no survey tasks. Hans and Aira had talked about the revision before it was distributed.

The meeting approved the budget revision.

8. Plan Output 5 (and T1-T7): Design and test 7 national pilot courses, June – Oct 2018

8a. Outline the methodology for the pilot courses, by Jan, JSKD

Jan outlines a possible approach for testing the outcome of the courses by evaluation the results for a group of culture providers that have participated in the course and another group that hadn't.

Hans V. mentioned that the budget for the course costs was exceptional costs, and here the National Agency didn't approve a common support of 100 euro pr partner, but only 100 euro for some partners and then reductions relatively to the differences in salary levels. This may imply some limits for the ambitions; or rather, partners can only provide more ambitious courses and testing if they increase their own-financing.

The meeting discussed the possibilities and approved that as a minimum all partners complete a 1-2 day pilot course for up to 20 participants and provide an impact evaluation as planned by Educult.

8b. Discuss and clarify the outputs and division of work

Decided, that the partners must showcase at least their own topic from the Thematic Compendia, so we have a variety of topics to test and evaluate. It means that in the course planning:

- Voluntary Arts (UK) must focus at least on the Inter-social context
- JSKD (SI) must focus at least on the Inter-generational context
- KSD (DK) and Interfolk (DK) must focus on least at the Inter-regional context
- LKCA (NL) must focus at least on the Inter-cultural context
- FAIE (PL) must focus at least on the Inter-European context
- LACM (LV) must focus at least on either the inter-generational or inter-social context
- EDUCULT (AT) must focus at least on the inter-cultural or the inter-European context

8c. Outline the evaluation methodology (also the impact evaluation), by Aron, EC

Decided that the evaluation approach for the pilot courses can depend on the programme frame and Curricula Guidelines, so the proposal must await we decide the programme frame.

8c. Plan time schedule June – Oct 2018: Who does what and when?

- 1st May: Jan send task plan for clarifying the frame
- 21th May: Partners comments and send proposals for programme frame
- 15th June: Aron sends proposal for evaluation
- 28th June: Skype meeting – to discuss the programme frame and evaluation approach

9. Status of the transversal dissemination activities

9a. The overall status, by Damien, VAN

[Status reports, 1st half year can be seen here](#) - only KSD, FAIE and Educult did fill-in the dissemination template that Damien provided. Damien mentioned it is Important to show evidence of tasks. He will provide a list of minimum tasks to do in next period, where all are welcome to do more.

9b. The local status, by all partners

We had a round, where partners presented their completed dissemination activities:

Rafal, FAIE:

- Made link to project website
- Translated the leaflet to Polish
- Put article about the project on our website
- Promoted the project at meetings, especially in our euro-desk network

Hans, LKCA:

- Announced the project, July at website,
- Disseminated Dec that the survey had started.

Not more, because in LKCA the webmaster of the website and facebook will only allow content news.

Jan, JSKD:

- Announced the project at JSKD's website for international activity
- Used the Slovenian edition of Epale
- Distributed newsletter at the start of project

Damien, VAN:

- Will register at Epale and use it for national dissemination
- Will also try to use ENTER, when Hans send the link

Aron, Educult:

- We have dissemination at our website both in German and English versions
- We use our European contacts and European heritage network

Aira, LACM

- No activities to report, because we have just be approved as a project member
- But now it is time to start the dissemination

Bente, KSD:

- Promoted at various events
- Translated the leaflet to Danish
- Send news mail with info about the projects
- Announced it on own website
- May promote it at the Amateo network

Hans, Interfolk:

- Announced at own website with link to the project website
- Send news-mails to Danish targets
- But not to international targets, which will be done now
- Promotion at own meetings and project meetings
- Will promote the project idea at our Nordic – Russian project, where we have a conference for future cooperation in Arkhangelsk 30 – 31 May for 45 Nordic and Russian NGOs
- Have unfortunately not provided an article yet

9c. The reported dissemination activities, ultimo March 2018, using the dissemination template

Before the meeting, only reports from KSD, FAIE and Educult, but the reminder was also send late. The meeting confirmed it would be helpful, if Damien remind us about missing dissemination tasks, because it are tasks that tend to get lower priority than the development tasks, even though they likewise important. Furthermore, all partners must remember to inform the other partners, when

they have done a task, so we can gain mutual inspiration and also bad conscience, when we can see that others deliver while we haven't.

9d. Plan time schedule: Who does what and when?

ASAP: Partners that haven't filled-in the dissemination report, 1st half year must do it now.

20th April: Damien make new time table of new tasks, including report template for contact to target groups in other countries than the partner countries. Remember it is better to have fewer good contact, than a lot of weak contacts.

10. Status of the transversal progress and impact evaluation

10a. Status of the progress evaluation, by Aron, Educult

Aron send a process evaluation template for the 2nd project step before the meeting for all to fill-in.

[The filled-in reports can be seen here.](#)

Aron also asked for supplementing oral evaluations especially about the workloads of the Survey and the division of work for the Portal.

Hans mentioned that even though the Survey may have been a demanding and time consuming task it also had a budget of more than 1 months work, including the coming translation of the report.

The meeting confirmed that it was ok and needed for this work package as well as other work packages that the lead partner reminds others to do their tasks.

Aron will provide the next progress reporting template for the 3rd step before next third partner meeting in Nov 2018.

10b. Outline the planned impact evaluation, by Aron, Educult

Aron mentioned it has two parts with feeds from:

- The pilot courses, including a questionnaire and common oral feeds
- The concluding national conferences at end of project

10c. Plan time schedule next half year: Who does what and when?

As mentioned above point 8c, we need to clarify the frame for the pilot courses, before the evaluation frame can be provided. Therefore decided:

15th June: Aron sends proposal for outcome evaluation of pilot courses

28th June: Skype meeting – to plan the frame of the pilot courses and the evaluation approach

6th Sept: Skype meeting – to conclude the planning of the pilot courses and their evaluation.

11. Status of the project management

11a. Status of the coordination and internal communication – proposals for improvements.

Hans V mentioned that the management seems to be in good shape, but it can always be better, and he asked for comments and advices for improvements.

The meeting discussed if the internal communication could be improved by having a sort of social forum for mutual info and dialogue; but the experiences from other projects is that it isn't used, so we will stick to emails and Skype meetings between the meetings.

11b. Status of the financial management, including next payments.

Hans V. commented the financial templates for refunding meetings costs etc. The unit support for meeting costs can be refunding, when we have the account of shared costs from the host.

11c. Status of project reporting in the EU tools

Some of the partners have started to use the national editions of EPALE, which is very good and an example for all to follow.

Hans V mentioned that

- The data in the Mobility+ Tool shall be updated now,
- The Project Results Platform hasn't been updated yet, beside the basic data that the national Agency has provided. It must also be updated now.
- The project hasn't been disseminated in general at EPALE. Hans V. will talk with Damien how that can be handled.

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

ASAP: Hans V update the Mobility Tool and Project Results Platform

ASAP: Damien and Hans V. clarify how the EPALE can be updated on a continued basis.

ASAP: All partners seek to use their national editions of EPALE for dissemination

12. Plan the next partner meeting(s)

12a. Third partner meeting in Latvia, Nov 2018 (WP 10)

Decided, that the third partner meeting can take place Monday – Tuesday, 26 – 27 November in Latvia. The place can be Riga, which is a beautiful and interesting city to visit and it will also make the travel time and logistic more simple, than to have the meeting at one of the manors at the countryside (members of LACM).

12b. Need for Skype partner meetings

Until now we have only had one Skype meeting, 14 December. The meeting confirmed that it in general is good to have Skype meetings to keep the project on track between the physical meetings.

Decided to have two Skype meetings before third meeting:

- Thursday 28th June, 12:00 CET - just before the summer holidays to plan the pilot courses and the evaluation approach
- Thursday, 6th Sept, 12:00 CET - after the summer holidays

12c. Other issues?

None to mention.

13. Evaluation of the previous work

13a. Oral evaluation round of the project work until now

Aron mentioned that the written evaluation indicated too much work for the survey and an unequal division of work for the portal. He asked for more comments:

Jan, JSKD: We had delayed work with the portal, especially a too late discussion about using facebook as dialogue forum.

Hans, LKCA: The tasks for portal have been a challenge to provide. The design was clarified in good time. But many of the functions have been delayed. He did send a reminder 25.2 (the day before deadline) with questions about tasks for the sections. Here LKCA could also have been more stringent to coordinate the tasks

-

Damien, VAN: For the Survey we used much time to find respondents. This problem may come again when we shall find participants to the pilot courses

Bente, KSD: Agreed that it was hard to get people to answer the questionnaire and be engaged in the interviews.

Hans V: In general the project is progressing well, especially because all partners act pro-active and take responsibility as lead partners.

13b. Oral evaluation round of this second partner meeting

Hans V: It has been a good meeting, efficient and with good atmosphere, where we managed to complete the agenda in good time. .

Bente: Thank to the host, greetings to Agnieszka. A good meeting with positive and engaged partners.

Aron: Good meeting. Happy to be here and meet the partners.

Noa: A good experience.

Damien: Positive atmosphere. Good to spend time to clarify the fluid issues. At our first meeting we had focus on the project idea, and here at the second meeting, we have had more focus on how to handle specific problems. Really good experience. Thanks to host.

Jan: Did not attend the first meeting, and positive to come to this second partner meeting. The main topics have been handled. The host organisation has provided good conditions. Thanks to all.

Hans N: Good to see partners again and to see Aira. Hope you feel good to be here. The agenda was completed well. Good to have place and time to meet each other.

Ingrid: Thanks to the host for organising the meeting. Thanks to Hans V. for making the agenda. Important to see how the wok packages fit into the whole work programme and to get specific issues clarified.

Jerzy: Happy to participate and to help to organise the meeting.

Rafal: It brings added value to meet people. Personally I have not been so much involvement in the start and I didn't participate in first meeting. But we will catch up.

Aron: Thanked all for a pleasant and efficient meeting. Also a special thank to Noa, who will go back to his studies this summer. Bente asked if Noa could help to find French partners for future cooperation projects.

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

None to mention.