



Version 2, approved

Minutes of second partner meeting in Helsinki, 11 – 12 March 2019

Content

Participants	1
Aims and key activities of the first meeting	1
Minutes	1
1. Formalities.....	1
2. Good practise and survey report (WP4).....	2
3. Curricula guidelines and pilot course packages, April 2019 (WP5)	2
4. Three national pilot work courses, June 2019 (WP6).....	3
5. European pilot course, September 2019 in Askov, DK (WP8)	4
6. Dissemination and website (WP13)	6
7. The evaluation methodology (progress and impact)	6
8. Next partner meetings	8
9. Evaluation of the previous work.....	8
10. A.O.B. (any other business)	8

Participants

Kati Nurmi, Hanna Lamsa, Ira Vihreälehto, Aron Weigl and Hans Jørgen Vodsgaard.
Apologies from Bente.

Aims and key activities of the first meeting

The aim is to summarize the state of the project and bridge the first phase's founding activities with the second phase's development and testing activities.

Minutes

1. Formalities

1a. Welcome and practical information

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

1b. Appoint a moderator and a reporter

Aron was appointed as moderator and Hans as reporter.

1c. Approval of the agenda

The proposed agenda, version 1 was approved.

1d. Sign Attendance List

The attendance list was signed

2. Good practise and survey report (WP4)

2a) Present and clarify case studies of good Practices, by Kati, Aron and Bente

Kati presented the Finnish case studies. Aron the Austrian case studies, and Aron and Hans presented the Danish case studies.

2b) Present and clarify key competence profile for successful co-creation, by Hans

The competence profiles have been presented in the conclusions of the case studies, so there is no need for a special summary of the key competences. Aron will also summaries the competence profiles in the concluding chapter.

2c) Present and clarify key findings and recommendations, by Aron

Aron will elaborate the final chapter of the Survey regarding key findings and recommendations after the dialogue at this partner meeting.

2d) Guidelines and schedule for possible refinement of final Survey Report

12 March: The draft report has been delivered by Aron, emailed to the partners

18 March: Partners look at the chapters (except the final chapter on recommendations) and give a feedback on their own sections

26 March: Aron incorporates partner feeds and makes final section with recommendations

3 April: All can comment the recommendations

8 April: Aron prepares final text, makes layout and published Survey report as English PDF-ed.

3. Curricula guidelines and pilot course packages, April 2019 (WP5)

3a) Clarify outline of Curricula Guidelines, by Hans

Hans mentioned it can be important to clarify, which context we intend to design curricula for (and provide pilot courses for)? Because different contexts can need different competence profiles and thereby different learning outcomes of the courses!

He stated we can have these two typical contexts:

1) Initiate/start a co-creative activity in a community, where it hasn't been used before and people know little about it. This implies:

- First that an actor "from outside" (mainly from CSO area) introduces co-creation / and gets the local culture CSOs engaged to start new co-creative cooperation with the municipality.
- Secondly that an actor (from outside or from the community, because he or she has been introduced to co-creation fx at an initial course) organises a start-up idea workshop to develop new ideas, select some and plan how to initiate the new co-creative activities.

NB: These two steps can in some cases be just one step / a training event with more sessions.

Needed competences to be such an initiator:

- Theoretical and practice knowledge about co-creation
- Strategic political competences on how to involve and engage key stakeholders in the area
- Competences as idea workshop organiser

2) Engage in on-going co-creative processes (designing, planning, implementing)

- Stakeholders (representatives from local culture CSOs, local public culture institutions and even culture department staff) get training to function better in co-creative activities as facilitators and / or co-facilitators.

Needed competences:

Knowledge:

1. General knowledge of co-creation – basic history, theory and practice.
2. Strategic knowledge - insight into different types of contexts and tasks of co-creation
3. Specific knowledge of an empowering and inclusive co-creative cooperation

Skills:

4. Process facilitating
5. Moderation of idea workshop
6. Situational project management
7. Act as liaison in an attentive and responsive manner

Behaviours (attitude and values):

8. Attentive and responsive
9. Risk willingness
10. Open and dialogue oriented

3c) Plan time schedule: Who does what and when?

5 April: Hans provides query about key competences and curricula issues, for two types of “training events”: For start-up of co-creation and for implementation of co-creative cooperation.

15 April: Partners reply

20 April: Hans provides draft curricula guidelines

26 April: Partners comment

30 April: Final Guidelines are published

4. Three national pilot work courses, June 2019 (WP6).**4a) Clarify frame of local pilot courses, by Hans****Budget frame:**

No course support, only salary support of 4 days per partner.
So a small afternoon event can be ok – no costs for lunch.

Number and type of participants:

No defined frame, only what can be pedagogical acceptable, like 6 – 16
Maybe not fifty-fifth pct of CSOs and public staff; a priority of most CSOs can be reasonable.

Programme frame:

Clarify which context: For start-up or for people already engaged.

Clarify geographical level: A local, regional or national target groups? In one municipality or for whole country.

Clarify which target groups: A municipality or CSO network?

4b) Initial plans for pilot courses (where, when, how and whom), by Kati, Aron and Bente

SKS: Prefer to make it in August

KSD: Late Aug or even Sept could give time to apply for some local funding

Aron: Is flexible

Decided each partner can schedule their courses as it fits best; just be aware that the local courses must be placed in good time before the international course in Copenhagen, mid October.

4c) Methodology for testing and evaluation, by Kati

The course evaluations shall give feeds for adjusted course packages. The plan and questionnaires are made by Kati; and they may include:

- Pre-questionnaire

- Oral evaluation at end of course with short report – Aron may give Kati a draft guide
- 2 weeks after questionnaire for trainees (can be in English, but all are welcome to translate and then fill-in the answers in afterwards in English in the common query)

The courses can also give feeds for the Curricula report. Hans will make questionnaire to gain recommendations for the curricula Report

- for course providers (course team) to fill-in 2 weeks after the course

4d) Plan time schedule: Who does what and when?

15 May: Kati provides evaluation plans and forms for comments

20 May: Partners can comment the evaluation plans and forms

25 May: Kati send final plan and online forms in English. Partners can have copy to translate for own course evaluations.

25 May: Partners plan with reference to the Curricula Guidelines the course frame and send to the partnership:

Time and place, context (for upstart or for support to ongoing activity), geographical level, target groups, planned learning outcome, pedagogical form, etc.

Latest Mid Sept: When courses are completed, send course programme, signed participant lists, possible presentations at the meeting, photos, etc.

Latest Mid Sept: When courses are completed, send summary of course evaluations

Latest ultimo Sept: Kati send summary of evaluations.

5. European pilot course, Oct 2019 in Copenhagen (WP7)

5a) Clarify group of participants:

Each partner country brings 4 trainees + 1(2) trainer. In total 12 trainees + 4 trainers, like 16 persons.

Trainers: 4 project leaders that act as course leaders

Trainees: 4 from each country, with 2 from CSOs and 2 from public culture institutions/departments

We shall select trainees with some experience with / pre-knowledge of co-creation, fx by having participated in the preceding local/national pilot course. So they may be picked from the group of participants from the national pilot course, but they don't need to be.

5b) Clarify budget and use of external speakers and excursions

We plan for 2½ day + ½ day travel (return), like 3 days with support. only 2 nights at hotel, and 2 days meals (plus extra during travel)

According to Momondo.com the costs levels for flights in Oct 2019 were:

Flights: Finnish group

- HEL – CPH : Sunday 13: 35 – 14:15 (400 dkk / 55 euro)
- CPH – HEL: Tuesday 20:15 – 22:50 586 dkk /75 euro)

Flights: Austrian group

- VIE – CPH: 10:05 – 11:45 (290 dkk /40 eur)
- CPH – VIE: 20:05 – 21:50 (595 dkk / 80 eur)

Income:

Support for trainees /unit support transnational training: Travel 275 euro + subsist: 3 days of 106 euro, like 318 euro. In all: 275 + 318, like 593 euro

Support for trainers/ unit support partner meeting + transnational meetings: Meeting support (travel + extra day): 575 euro + 3 days of 106, like 318. In all 575 + 318, like 893 euro

Salary per partner: 3 cat 2 + 1 cat3

Other costs:

Travel + hotel and meals for two days, maybe surplus 100 euro per travel, while subsist should balance.

Rent of venue: 2500 dkk / 333 euro

Possible fees for a scientist: 1 x 3000 dkk / 400 euro. Others as politician(s) from Copenhagen Municipality and leader of culture house etc can be free

Transport local excursions: maybe 4 cars: 4 x 100 km of 2 dkk, like 800 dk / 110 euro

In all 843 euro or maybe 210 euro per partner. Can be paid by possible travel surplus for trainer/project leader.

5c) Clarify the practical frame and logistic, by Bente**Approach:**

Each partner organises own travel and 2 nights at hotel incl. breakfast. Or maybe host book a hotel for all participants, so they also can have some social time at hotel bar.

Host organises meals: dinner first evening, lunch and dinner second day, lunch third day

Place:

Copenhagen, Vartov + local excursions / meetings with stakeholders

Time:

2½ day with 3 days of support. Preferred dates were: 9 - 11 Oct, Wednesday 16:00 – Friday: 15:00, (plus possibly Saturday, 12th for partner meeting). As alternative we had week 43. The host, DFKS must confirm the dates.

5d) Clarify guidelines for programme

First day: afternoon - evening:

17:00 – 18:00: Welcome and presentations of programme and participants

18:15 – 19:30: Dinner

19:45 – 21.00: Introduction to co-creation

Second day:

Morning: Some introduction / group work

Afternoon: Excursion & meeting with stakeholders

Evening: Some theme related culture event

Third day:

Morning: Idea and need workshops, provide ideas for possible initiatives at home

After lunch: 13 – 15; Plenary presentations of idea, conclusions and farewell

Homework: Trainee prepare presentations of own cases.

5e) Methodology for testing and evaluation, by Kati

The course evaluation shall give feeds for adjusted cross-national course packages. The plan and questionnaires are made by Kati; and they may include:

- Oral evaluation at end of course with short report. Provide guide for moderation of evaluation.
- 2 weeks after questionnaire for trainees (English questionnaire)

The courses can also give feeds for the Curricula report. Hans will make questionnaire to gain recommendations for the curricula Report

- for course providers (course team) to fill-in 2 weeks after the course

5f) Plan time schedule: Who does what and when?

ASAP: Clarify time and frame of course

15 May: Kati provides evaluation plans and forms for comments

20 May: Partners can comment the evaluation plans and forms

25 May: Kati send final plan and online forms in English. Partners can have copy to translate for own course evaluations.

Mid June: Bente presents draft programme frame

17 June, 12:00 CET: Skype meeting to discuss and approve programme

6. Dissemination and website (WP13)

6a) Status of initial dissemination ex website, by Bente and partners

Aron: Co-creation in general seems as an upcoming area.

Kati: People / civil society area don't know the concept, but understand when told about it, can see they to some degree already are doing it.

Hans: Agreed. The challenge can be to move the cooperation and participation to co-creative steps.

Decided to make an extra dissemination effort, when the Survey Report has been published. The first real output to valorise.

6b) Status of website, by Hans

The Website will be updated, when the report has been published. Decided that partners make short abstracts of their local reports to be presented at the websites with links to the pages in the full report, where the cases are presented.

Kati and Aron mentioned they didn't get the website when they searched on co-creation. Decided that Hans try to present combined key words to optimize the search results; and minor costs for improving the search machines is ok.

Hans mentioned that the best way to get people to find and look at the website is that we all promote with links the project website in our news-mails, own websites, other pr-materials, and mention the project website with links also in the project publications.

(When you on Google search for "co-creative", you get 2.760.000.000 sites, so we need some extra help to get on top of the nearly 3 billion sites)

6c) Clarify work schedule. who does what when?

1 April: Partners send abstracts including country context and two case studies;
In all, 3 paragraphs of 10 lines, 30 lines or ½ page to max 1 page

10 April: Website updated

10 April: You can disseminate and link to the website when you promote the Survey report.

7. The evaluation methodology (progress and impact)

7a) Clarify the evaluation methodology, by Kati

We handle the progress evaluation by work package online questionnaire and oral evaluations at partner meeting and Skype meetings.

The challenge is the impact evaluation, especially for a project with a small budget. The application mentions: "We complete impact evaluations by means of questionnaires and interviews with representative target groups and end-users in the participating countries - at the end of the national pilot

courses, June 2019 and the end of the European pilot course, Sept 2019 as well as in relation to the concluding multiplier event, Nov 2019.”

Aron mentioned it would be difficult to document impact, while the less ambitious aim to document some “outcome” could be realistic; and it could be difficult to interview or make impact questionnaire for conference participants about impact, because they may not have been involved in the project activities. The participants at the pilot national and European pilot courses may be the best witnesses or best respondents we have in this project.

Hans mentioned that the project consortium also could be used and they may be better to assess the possible outcome of the project (than the conference participants).

The meeting decided:

For national courses

- the pre-query about the trainees qualifications to participate (gives feeds for the course planning)
- oral evaluation at the end of the course (give more traditional course evaluation)
- after questionnaire shall have focus on outcome (online English version)

For European course

- No pre-query needed, because we know have selected the trainees due to their pre-qualifications
- Oral group sessions: course evaluation combined with transfer gives some hints of outcome
- After questionnaire online English version with focus on outcome

National conferences

No special outcome evaluation, but maybe get feeds from panel debate which you can use in your own outcome assessment.

Instead we make our own outcome assessments with reference to the possible stakeholder input we have got during the project and from short interviews with 3-5 stakeholders after the conference.

Kati will make a short guide on the focus points for our “self-assessment” of outcome.

The frame may be that each partner can write 1-2 pages assessments, and they can be collected in one document with some concluding summary remarks from Kati.

NB: WE shall try to keep it simple and easy to do.

7b) Plan time schedule: Who does what and when?

Progress evaluation:

- ASAP: Kati deliver online questionnaire of the 2nd meeting,
- 8 April: (date when Survey is delivered) Kati provides online questionnaire for WP3: Survey

Impact evaluation:

Evaluation regarding national pilot courses

See schedule above, point 4d

Evaluation regarding International course

See schedule above, point 5f

Final outcome evaluation by project consortium:

- 15 Oct: Kati provides draft self-assessment query (also for feeds from stakeholders by panel debate or interviews)
- 25 Oct: Partners can comment the draft query
- 1 Nov: Kati sends final query
- 8 Dec: Partners answer self-assessments of outcome with references to stakeholder comments

20 Dec: Kati provides Draft version of Summary Outcome evaluation (summary of the four outcome assessments or maybe just the four collected with some concluding summary remarks from Kati.

15 Jan: Partners can comment

25 Jan: Kati deliver the final version that can be an attachment to the final project reporting in the Mobility Tool.

8. Next partner meetings

8a) Third meeting in Denmark (during or after the European pilot course) (wp8)

The pilot course venue will be in Vartov, Copenhagen, so we will also have the third meeting here, properly the day after the end of the course, it means Saturday, 12 Oct. We must later clarify the exact time frame.

8b) Skype meetings (Decide possible Skype meetings before third meeting, Sept 2019)

Decided to have a Skype meeting, 17 June, 12 – 13 CET. Main topics are

- To discuss the national pilot programmes and especially how to handle the evaluations
- To discuss and clarify the programme for the International course in Copenhagen, 9 – 11 October, including the evaluation approach.

9. Evaluation of the previous work

9a) Oral evaluation round of the previous work

No specific evaluation.

9b) Evaluation of the meeting

Hanna: Positive expectations to the co-creation topic. Good to see you all here.

Aron: Glad to be here. Good to have completed the agenda. The work load can seem easier to overview.

Kati: The work load is higher than expected. Glad to get the evaluation approach clarified, and to get the plan for the pilot courses clarified. Have now better overview of the work plan and what to do.

Hans: Well done, we managed to clarify and plan the next key steps, nearly the remaining project activities. The nearly concluded survey seems the most demanding part of the project. It has been good to see this beautiful place get a better impression of you work conditions.

Ira: It was really nice to see you all again. And good we managed to have a good and efficient meeting.

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

Nothing to mention.