03.06.2019

Hans Jørgen Vodsgaard

**Version 2 - approved**

**Minutes of fourth meeting in Vienna, 22nd – 23rd of May 2019**

*Content*

[Participants 1](#_Toc10640872)

[Aims and key activities of the fourth meeting 1](#_Toc10640873)

[Minutes 2](#_Toc10640874)

[1. Formalities 2](#_Toc10640875)

[2. Evaluate translations of five Thematic Compendia (IO-3). P3, VAN 2](#_Toc10640876)

[3. Evaluate the completion of the last national pilot courses (IO-5). P7, JSKD 2](#_Toc10640877)

[4. Evaluate the Curricula Report, seven languages edition (IO-7). P2, IF 3](#_Toc10640878)

[5. Evaluate national multiplier events / conferences (E1-E7). P4, FAIE 3](#_Toc10640879)

[6. Evaluate the Communication Portal and plan prolonging (IO-1). P8, LKCA 4](#_Toc10640880)

[7. Plan the last output, the Project Summary Report (IO-9). P1, KSD 5](#_Toc10640881)

[8. Evaluate current and schedule remaining dissemination activities. P3, VAN 6](#_Toc10640882)

[9. Evaluate current and schedule remaining evaluation. P5, EC 6](#_Toc10640883)

[10. Evaluate and schedule remaining project management. P2, IF 6](#_Toc10640884)

[11. Plan possible follow-up activities. All 7](#_Toc10640885)

[12. Plan possible Final Skype meetings in remaining period, May – Aug 2019 8](#_Toc10640886)

[13. Overall evaluation of the project 8](#_Toc10640887)

[14. Evaluate the fourth partner meeting 9](#_Toc10640888)

[15. A.O.B. (any other business) 10](#_Toc10640889)

[To find documents 10](#_Toc10640890)

## Participants

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

## **Aims and key activities of the fourth meeting**

The overall aim of this fourth and concluding meeting is to evaluate the project and plan possible follow-up activities.

The key points of the meeting are:

* To evaluate the provision of the translated five Thematic Compendia (IO-3). P3, VAN
* To evaluate the completion of last national pilot courses (IO-5). P7, JSKD
* To evaluate the Curricula Guidelines, seven languages ed (IO-7). P2, IF
* To Design and promote Erasmus+ courses – cancelled (IO-8)
* To evaluate the completed seven national multiplier events / conferences (E1-E7). P4, FAIE
* To evaluate the Communication Portal and plan possible refinements and prolonging after end of project (IO-1). P8, LKCA
* To plan the last output, the Project Summary Report (IO-9). P1, KSD
* To evaluate the current and schedule the remaining dissemination activities. P3, VAN
* To evaluate the current and schedule the remaining progress and impact evaluation. P5, E
* To evaluate the current and schedule the remaining project management, incl. the needed project documentation as well as project reporting in the Mobility+ Tool. P2, IF
* To plan possible follow-up activities
* To have an over all evaluation of the project
* To evaluate the fourth partner meeting

## **Minutes**

### 1. Formalities

Bente was appointed as moderator and Hans as reporter.

The proposed agenda, version 2 was approved.

The attendance lists were signed.

### 2. Evaluate translations of five Thematic Compendia (IO-3). P3, VAN

Damien summarised that all have provided the translated versions, and they had also been added to the Portal.

In general, all partners assessed that the budgeted work days for the translations of the five compendia were too low. Jan mentioned that a standard norm for professional translators is per day: 8 – 10 pages from English to national language, where 1 page includes 250 words (approx. 1500 characters).

Bente asked if it could be possible to have minor adjustments or proof-reads of the text of some compendia. Damien confirmed that small adjustments from partners can be delivered the next two weeks, and he can provide an adjusted PDF-version.

### 3. Evaluate the completion of the last national pilot courses (IO-5). P7, JSKD

Jan mentioned that all had completed the national pilot courses in a frame that was appropriate for their specific conditions and contexts.

Damien reported that the UK course had been a success. Lots had registered, and many came. The condition of no fee helped to get participants. Three speakers had also been authors of articles to the thematic compendia.

In general, the partners saw it both as a strength and weakness that the series of pilot courses due to different contexts had different target groups and varied contents, forms and approaches. It was a strength, because it made the planning more flexible and open for specific needs and contexts and it also implied more varied experiences; but it could also be seen as a weakness, because it made it more difficult to draw common conclusions for a standard curricula.

Hans mentioned that the series of courses didn’t function as a test of common curricula guidelines, but more as a possibility to gain diverse experiences about possible short local courses about the project topics. It could have been different, if we had got the opportunity to design and test a common European pilot course.

Bente asked if the partners expected to provide courses about the project topic in the future.

* Jan mentioned that JSKD intended to add this topic about bridging and social capital in future courses, maybe not as a separate course but as a topic that could be integrated in many type of courses.
* Agnieszka mentioned there was a high interest in the topic in the Polish sector of lifelong learning and participatory culture, and FAIE intends to develop future training events in the area of bridging and co-creation.
* Aron also saw a clear interest for the topic and EDUCULT intends to provide future events in the area.
* Damien expected that VAN also would get more focus on the topic, especially the inter-generational theme, maybe not in separated courses but as part of many type of events.
* Hans N. mentioned that LKCA already were planning new courses and events with reference to the topics of inter-social, inter-cultural and inter-generational bridging.
* Aira mentioned that training courses also in this topic were difficult to arrange without some external funding.
* Bente mentioned that KSD would continue to work with the issue, and the next Theme-Day event (a yearly open event for all members and networks) would focus on how voluntary culture could help to promote social inclusion.
* Hans V. mentioned that he hoped it would be possible to have European courses about the topic (with support from the Erasmus+ mobility programme) for paid and voluntary staff in the cross-cultural sector of amateur arts, voluntary culture and heritage.

### 4. Evaluate the Curricula Report, seven languages edition (IO-7). P2, IF

Hans summarised that in his point of view the Curricula Report fulfilled the planned objectives, and it included many interesting assessments in chapter 3 with recommendations from the partnership. It could hopefully be relevant especially for course leaders and providers in the cross-cultural sector of participatory culture.

Unfortunately, the tasks of translation were budgeted too in the application. FAIE and KSD were behind schedule, but they would soon deliver the translated versions.

Jan told that many of JSKD’s learning providers have a professional background as teachers, and they are familiar with the terminology of curricula and course planning, and they are motivated to use the developed Curricula material.

Hans N emphasised that even though we had different contexts and used different course formats, we still gained interesting experiences that can be used to develop future courses.

### 5. Evaluate national multiplier events / conferences (E1-E7). P4, FAIE

Agnieszka summarised that FAIE had provided the common programme frame for the event planning, and the partnership at the Skype meeting, 20 Feb, clarified that combined events to disseminate the project could be used. All partners have completed and reported their multiplier events.

Aron told that EDUCULT completed the event the 8th May at the Austrian Museum of Folk Life and Folk Art in the framework of the "Weeks of Integration" in Vienna. The event combined the topic of bridging and co-creation, and all five inter-relation topics were presented.

Jan told that JSKD completed the event 16th April at the Slovenian Institute of Adult Education in Ljubljana as part of a bigger programme about lifelong learning in the area of participatory culture. There was a high interest in the topic of promoting social capital with co-creative cultural activities.

Hans N mentioned that LKCA had two combined multiplier events, partly 7-8th April at the Turn Camp GLOBAL THINKING in Amsterdam and partly the 16th April at Stage Circular in Boxel.

Damien told that VAN’s event took place 2nd May in Manchester as part of the Age of Creativity Festival, where the focus was on active ageing with co-creative and inter-generational culture activities. It was a great success with lots of people attending. The Thematic Compendia, especially the work book was used as event materials and the presentations had the form of short provocations about intergenerational issues as a start of discussions in many small groups.

Aira mentioned that LACM had a big conference 24th April in the EU House in Riga with 40 participants. The main topic was about cultural heritage and tourism, where the BRIDGING topic of promoting social capital by participatory activities was an integrated part of the programme.

Agnieszka told the FAIE event took place 11th of April in Bielsko-Biala. It was organised to take part in the frame of the XIV meeting of the Europa Cafe network (built by organisations interested in European issues). There were 33 persons participating.

Bente told the Danish multiplier event took place 1st April in Odense as part of the bigger conference about co-creative culture in the municipalities. There were 43 participants with a mix of culture NGOs and culture staff from the municipalities.

It was a shared impression that the topic of promoting social capital by participatory and co-creative culture activities for many participants was a new and interesting perspective on their cultural activities, and it is a topic that can have many follow-up approaches.

### 6. Evaluate the Communication Portal and plan prolonging (IO-1). P8, LKCA

Ingrid presented the updated and final Portal. In general, the planned part of the Portal have been elaborated and implemented. The two remaining questions are 1) how to integrate Facebook in the Portal; and 2) how to prolong the Portal after the end of the project.

**Re Facebook:**

We decided to try to use the special Facebook site for the Bridging Project. Jan has prepared the site and he will invite all partners to join the group. Decided that all partners also invite their participants at their pilot courses and multiplier events to join the group.

**Re prolonging the Portal:**

We decided:

* To keep the Project Portal at least three year ahead, it means 2020, 2021 and 2022. Hans N. mentioned the total yearly cost was 72 euro. LKCA will pay the web-hotel and domain name each year; and Ingrid will soon send an invoice for the total costs, which can be refunded as part of the project budget.
* To just mentioned at the front page that the project has been concluded in August 2019, but the Portal are kept the next three years, so all interested here can find information about the project and download the many Project publications. Hereby we avoid to use work on keeping the site updated and to pretend it is updated with the needed work this will imply.

### 7. Plan the last output, the Project Summary Report (IO-9). P1, KSD

Hans V referred to the application text, where the Project Summary Report shall “be used to large scale dissemination and to strengthen the sustainability of the project and to reinforce the replicative potential of the project.”

The output description mentions that “The Project Summary Report will comprise a concise overview of the development history of the project, the key target groups, the main aims and objectives and the methodology employed to achieve the project outputs, and a critical discussion and evaluation of the project. It will also direct readers to the projects' Communication Portal, Surveys, the five thematic Compendia, the national and European Training Packages, the Curriculum Report, the concluding multiplier events and the new offerings of national and European in-service training events after the end of the project.”

The application also mentions that “the Report will only be in English and approx. 40 standard pages (like 2400 characters per page, 40 lines of 60 characters) plus illustrations will include exemplary photos from the surveys, compilation of best practise examples and training sessions during the project. The Project Summary Report is preliminary planned with the following disposition:

1. Foreword on background and objectives of the Report (1-2 page)
2. Introduction of the need and objectives, results and perspective of the project (4-5 pages)
3. Overview of development history of intellectual outputs and multiplier events (10 pages)
4. Summary of the impact evaluations completed after the national and European pilot courses as well as after the final multiplier events (10 pages)
5. Summary of the critical discussion and evaluation of the project by the project team and key stakeholders (7-8 pages)
6. Concluding perspectives on the project issue and recommendations for strengthening the sustainability of the project outcome after the end of the project (4-6 pages). “

The work with the report can according to the application be divided in the partnership, so KSD is editor and Interfolk co-editor, while EDUCULT can provide special evaluation data and other partners mostly just give feedback or possible comments to the draft text.

The meeting decided to follow the aim, output description, disposition and work division as presented in the application. Furthermore decided that EDUCULT provides partly a short summary of the process evaluations including the first four steps plus the final fifth step with the fourth meeting, where the summary can be part of chapter 3 in the report, and partly a short summary of the impact evaluations from the pilot courses and multiplier events, where the summary can be part of chapter 4 in the report. Finally, Hans will prepare a short query for the partnership to get assessments of the project to be used in chapter 5 and recommendations for the sustainability of the project to be used in the final chapter 6.

The extra evaluative work for EDUCULT for providing these two short evaluation summary reports can be rewarded with 2 extra days (more than the budgeted 10 days) provided by ¼ day from each project partner.

**Schedule of key activities**

* ASAP: Partners, who haven’t provided impact evaluation feeds from the multiplier events, send

a summary of answers or a link to their online questionnaire. Most are still missing. Only KSD and LACM have sent the filled-in questionnaire. [See the Google archive here.](https://sites.google.com/site/bridgingworkplan/2-work-packages/wp17---a3---evaluation/impact-evaluation-from-multiplier-events)

* ASAP: EDUCULT sends small 5th step process questionnaire including questions about sustainable follow-up activities.
* 31 May: All partners reply the 5th step process questionnaire
* 10 June: Aron/Angela sends a short draft Summary memo of impact evaluation
* 20 June: Aron/Angela sends a short draft Summary memo of process evaluation
* 25 June: Bente sends a draft Project Summary Report
* 1 July: Partners can comments the draft Project Summary Report
* 15 July: Bente provides final Project Summary Report, English PDF-edition

### 8. Evaluate current and schedule remaining dissemination activities. P3, VAN

Damien emailed 14th May the template for reporting dissemination activities in the third period, Dec 2018 – May 2019. Most have filled-in and send. Only missing from VAN, IF and LACM. They must fill-in and send ASAP.

**The final dissemination in May – Aug 2019:**

Damien provided a dissemination strategy, 31.10.2017, which we have adopted. [See the Google archive here.](https://docs.google.com/viewer?a=v&pid=sites&srcid=ZGVmYXVsdGRvbWFpbnxicmlkZ2luZ3dvcmtwbGFufGd4OjdhZmUxNzY5NzdlODU3Yzc) Here we planned that

* each partner is responsible for the dissemination in their own countries,
* each partner is responsible for dissemination to some extra European countries, and
* LKCA, EDUCULT and Interfolk had added responsibilities for dissemination to European decision-makers and multipliers.

**Schedule of key activities**

* 10 June: Damien sends a short 1-2 page summary of the project and the key outputs with links to

downloads at the Portal, as a help for partners’ final dissemination in June.

* 1 July: All partners report before their holidays their completed dissemination

### 9. Evaluate current and schedule remaining evaluation. P5, EC

The evaluation activities were discussed and decided above in item 7: The Project Summary report.

### 10. Evaluate and schedule remaining project management. P2, IF

Hans proposed to focus the evaluation on some main points such as how to keep the schedule and to avoid possible information overload.

**Re how to keep the schedule:**

Marjeta, JSKD: It seems like a recurring challenge for all international projects, and it is very difficult to avoid. Maybe we shall just learn to plan to live with it.

Jan, JSKD: It didn’t seem to be a big problem in this project. The delays were mainly related to the translations of the five Thematic Compendia, which for all became a bigger task than expected.

Agnieszka, FAIE: Yes, the main challenge has been the translations. It is important to keep the deadlines, but it is also important to consider the quality of the outputs, and sometimes thing take more time than anticipated.

Rafal, FAIE: Agreed that the translations were a big and very time-consuming task.

Aron, EDUCULT: Mentioned that the delays were not only related to the translations, but anyhow, we managed to complete the planned tasks in time at the end, so the overall schedule was kept.

Damien, VAN: It seems normal with delays, but still we managed to complete the main tasks and deliver all the output in the end.

Ingrid, LKCA: Agreed with Marjeta that delays seem difficult to avoid. All are very enthusiastic at the partner meetings and keen to keep the schedules, but at home we tend to let other necessary local tasks get first priority.

Hans, LKCA: Didn’t have the impression that the delays were a big problem in this project, but good with the recurring status mails from the coordinator to keep the focus on the planned tasks.

Aira, LACM: Mentioned it is quite normal that schedules don’t hold, so it is important and good to receive reminders of the upcoming tasks.

Bente, KSD: There can always occur unforeseen issues that delay the work, and it is fine with the reminders and status mails from the coordinator, but there may be a structural issue with an unclear work division between the overall coordinator and the lead partners of the work packages, so it nearly only becomes the responsibility of the coordinator to monitor the work progress. So it may be useful to discuss and outline the tasks and responsibilities of the lead partner function more clearly from the start of the project.

Damien mentioned that a project management tool as Slack or Trello may help to get an easier overview of the work plan and its completion. Aron was sceptical, if that would solve anything, at least not with the management tools he knew of.

Hans, Interfolk: Was also sceptical about the advantage of management tools. It could easily just increase the work load not only for the coordinator, but also for the partners to use it. The problem didn’t seem to be that partners didn’t know what they had to do, but that they gave other home task a higher priority. Agreed with Bente, that it could be useful to discuss and outline the tasks and responsibilities of the lead partner function more clearly from the start of the project.

**Re possible information overload:**

The meeting agreed that it is important to find a balance between the need to share information and to avoid too much information. But it was difficult to state some clear principles or guidelines, except for all to use their common sense.

### 11. Plan possible follow-up activities. All

The moderator proposed a round, where all partners could tell about their follow-up plans:

Marjeta, JSKD: We will continue with the BRIDGING-topic, especially in the field of intergenerational activities, where we are planning new initiatives to take place in the autumn 2019.

Agnieszka, FAIE: We have also planned follow-up activities with focus on the inter-European or international cooperation, and here we will work with Erasmus+ mobility events in the field of co-creation and we have also started to develop an international network support to beginners in international cooperation.

Aron, EDUCULT: We collaborate with FAIE in the international network support and in new mobility activities in the field of co-creation, and we are also engaged in another Erasmus+ project about co-creation. So we will continue to focus on the bridging issues, especially with focus on co-creative activities, and their societal benefits, which now have a high interest in Austria.

Damien, VAN: We will continue to work with the BRIDGING issues, especially with focus on inter-generational and inter-social topics. We are now working with a Scottish network about inter-generational activities. In general, socio-economic benefits of participatory culture are hot now in UK.

Ingrid, LKCA: We give high priority to arts and culture as a social domain, including priorities to issues about benefits of cultural activities for elder people, younger people, emigrants, etc.

Hans N, LKCA: I can add that LKCA also intends to apply the BRIDGING methodology with focus on social capital in new courses and training events, where we also can build on our experiences from the national pilot course.

Aira, LACM: We have plans for continued activities in the field, but the main challenge is the lack of financial resources to provide new activities without fees for the participants.

Bente, KSD: The next period our organisation will give priority to engage more young people in the cultural councils and cultural associations and here we will also focus on the inter-generational topic of bridging activities and social inclusion to bring will be a transversal issue of all our activities. And we will continue to work with the topic of co-creation in the meaning cross-sectoral cooperation between civil society associations / citizen groups and local authorities / public culture institutions.

Hans: Interfolk: Our new main priority is to work with co-creation in the cross-sector context as a mean to empower the civil society as a more equal partner in the provision of new welfare services; and a transversal priority is to promote social capital and social inclusion in the area of non-formal lifelong learning and participatory culture. So the objectives of the BRIDGING project have still a high priority in our future project plans.

NB: Below in item 13, we also discussed possible new follow-up projects for the partnership-.

### 12. Plan possible Final Skype meetings in remaining period, May – Aug 2019

Decided to have a final Skype meeting, Tuesday, 27th of August, 12 CET. Hans will call the partners.

### 13. Overall evaluation of the project

The moderator proposed a round with evaluation comments from all participants:

Marjeta, JSKD: The project went well, we didn’t have serious problems. We tried to achieve something big, maybe too big. Could more easily been successful with a smaller and more focussed topic.

Jan, JSKD: Maybe we didn’t develop new methods, but we gained much knowhow about the issue, which can start to be very trendy. So we are up-to-date with a new field of work, and it has opened windows to new approaches in the field.

Agnieszka, FAIE: The project puts focus on the social dimension of arts and culture activities, and the issue is promising. We have for example been invited to speak and train about the topics at the Academy of Arts in Krakow. I prefer the meaning of “co-creation” that promote cooperation between different citizen groups in a civil society contexts, instead of the cross-sector meaning, because in Poland the civil society groups are glad for their independency and they can be sceptical about loosing this independence and free status as NGOs by a more close cooperation with the local authorities.

Rafal, FAIE: We succeeded in deliver outputs, but still we need to work with the final disseminating and exploiting to other target groups.

Jerzy, FAIE: The idea of co-creation is trendy now, and it can open new possibilities for future project planning and good chances for project funding.

Aron, EDUCULT: I like the project idea of BRIDGING very much, including co-creation in the meaning that different people and associations are working together. The idea of co-creation needs to be pursued. I think the project work included a mix of flow and stopping, but at the end we reached the goals. It was good to provide courses, but it could have been fine to have some partners to work more closely with in the course planning. Unfortunately, we didn’t have any initial survey in Austria.

Damien, VAN: The inter-regional topic was difficult, while the intergenerational and intersocial topics were easier to work with. The overall BRIDGING issue is very relevant, but maybe we had too many themes. But it may be normal and needed in applications to promise too much to get the grant.

Ingrid, LKCA: It has been a good project, but maybe we had too many themes. I missed the relations between the pilot course participants and conference participants.

Hans, LKCA: I don’t think the many themes prevented us to give priority to only some of the themes in our pilot courses and multiplier events. It has been inspiring to hear the experiences from other partners. Personally, I could like, we had more time to learn more from each other, especially about more specific practice experiences; and I missed the international course, which the Danish Agency cancelled.

Aira, LACM: We became partners due to a withdrawal of the Lithuanian partner, so we had a delayed start; but we are happy we got the opportunity to take part in this project. The Bridging idea is also very relevant in our area of cultural heritage. It has been an interesting pilot course and conference, and we are interested to continue with the work, especially with the inter-generational and inter-social topics.

Bente, KSD: The BRIDGING idea about promoting social capital by participatory culture is for us another issue than “co-creation” in the meaning of cross-sector cooperation between civil society associations and public institutions. Anyhow, both approaches are very relevant for our organisation, and we see many possibilities and needs for new projects in this cross-over area.

Hans, Interfolk: I agree with Marjeta that this project had very ambitious objectives and it could have been easier and better with a more defined or delimited project plan; but on the other hand it also gave as Jan mentioned a window to many new approaches and experiences and it opens for future more specific projects. As mentioned by most partners, there should be many possibilities for planning a more specific Erasmus+ project, where we focus on a varied series of pilot work and international courses and events as a mean to elaborate the BRIDGING methodology.

The concluding message from the partnership was that the gained knowhow hopefully could be used in more specific and innovative development project that could strengthen the dissemination and sustainability of the project idea.

### 14. Evaluate the fourth partner meeting

Marjeta, JSKD: It has been nice to see you all again after the one and half year break since the kick-off meeting in Copenhagen, where Jan took over with the ongoing tasks. But I have all along followed the project progress in dialogue with Jan, and it has been a very fine and efficient meeting here in Vienna.

Jan, JSKD: I was happy to be engaged in the project work and being part of the project team. It has been my first experience with a bigger project, and it has been a positive learning process. I am also glad that I managed to provide the planned tasks and pleased to take part in this fine project.

Agnieszka, FAIE: I am glad we can conclude this project in a good manner; but somehow it seems unfinished. I would like to use the experiences and knowledge, we have elaborated in some follow-up projects. It has been a pleasure to be here, and thank you Aron for organising this fine meeting,

Jerzy, FAIE: It has been a really fine meeting, and I am very pleased to be here the second time.

Aron, EDUCULT: I am happy to hosting the meeting, but sorry with the rainy weather.

Damien, VAN: First time I have been in Vienna. It was interesting to visit the Brunnenpassage and the dinners have been excellent. It has been a very fine meeting with positive conclusions.

Ingrid, LKCA: It has been a very efficient and fast meeting. I have enjoyed it very much to be here first time in Vienna.

Hans, LKCA: It has been a nice and very interesting meeting. Thank to Aron for hosting us. Happy to see everybody again and sorry it will take time, before we can see each other again. I hope we can find a way for a follow-up project, and I will be happy to help with preparing a new project application.

Aira, LACM: Very fine meeting, and a good team. Pity it ends.

Bente, KSD: Glad to visit the Brunnenpassage. It has been a really good meeting and it has been enlivening that all partners express such enthusiasm to find ways to continue the international project cooperation.

Hans, Interfolk: I agree that it has both been both an efficient and very pleasant meeting with a good and positive atmosphere in the project team. I wish to thank Aron for organizing the interesting visit to Brunnenpassage, where the extra cultural and social activity during the meeting gave opportunity to meet other stakeholders and hear about their activities in the field of participatory culture.

I would like to add that it has been a joy and honor to cooperate with you all, and I really hope we can find ways to have a follow-up project.

### 15. A.O.B. (any other business)

Nothing to mention.

### To find documents

See

[The Google archive for initial documents](https://sites.google.com/site/bridgingsocialcapital/)

[The Goggle archive for work plan documents](https://sites.google.com/site/bridgingworkplan/home)

And

[extra Google drive for the Thematic Compendia](https://drive.google.com/drive/folders/12s5R51XG68SfgG_p4s2xJfEAbIiQBASU)