



MINUTES

v.2.

First transnational meeting of all Partners (kick-off meeting) Bielsko-Biała, Poland, 09 – 10 January 2019

1

Time and place:

Time: Thursday, 9th of January 2020, 9.00 – 17.00 – Friday, 10th of January 2020, 9.00 – 14.00 (followed by lunch).

Place: The NGO Centre (Centrum Organizacji Pozarządowych), 43-300 Bielsko-Biała, Poland, Plac Opatrzności Bożej 18.

The Participants

Lorenza Lupini, COOSS (IT), Luca Bordoni, COOSS (IT), Hans Jørgen Vodsgaard, Interfolk (DK), Aron Weigl, EDUCULT (AT), Oliver Löscher, EDUCULT (AT), Carla Vanessa Gomes, Rightchallenge (PT), Andreas Andreou, FWC/CNTI (CY), Agnieszka Dadak, FAIE (PL), Rafał Dadak, FAIE (PL), Jerzy Kraus, FAIE (PL).

Goals of the first meeting:

1. To meet Partners face-to-face and to introduce key persons involved.
2. To agree on tools of communication & information exchange.
3. To detail and discuss, step-by-step, activities planned.
4. To discuss the project dissemination strategy and evaluation.
5. To review the Partners responsibilities and deadlines.
6. To establish the Project Management Committee.

Expected outcomes:

1. Finalised and agreed format of each project activity at national & European level.
2. Finalised and agreed common detailed methodology and key-aspects of project implementation and dissemination plan.
3. Finalised and agreed internal management and financial rules; Partnership Agreement officially signed.
4. Ground set for the mapping process.





Course of the meeting

1. Welcome. Appointing the moderator & reporter. Possible changes to the agenda.

Signing the attendance list, 1st day.

Agnieszka Dadak welcomed the participants.

Rafał Dadak was appointed as a moderator and Agnieszka Dadak as a reporter.

The attendance list 1 was signed day 1; the attendance list 2 was signed the day 2.

Changes in the Agenda: There was one additional point proposed to the Agenda: presentation of an option for the network development – Erasmus+ KA3 call for proposals. This point would be included in point 14, the 'Any other issues' section, day 2.

2. Background of the project: Short presentations of the participating organisations and the Partners' representatives. Partners expectations concerning the project, personal and organisational benefits.

The Partners shortly presented themselves, their organisations, expectations towards the project. The additional question to the Partners concerned the potential stakeholders and associates to involve in the project activities.

Concerning the expectations, personal and organizational benefits:

Lorenza, COOSS, mentioned that the COOSS expectation is to contribute in the correct way and effectiveness to the success of project activities; to validate the project manager course realized within related 1stTIPPM project and to develop a model to support the recognition of skills, knowledge and competences of the project manager (PM).

The benefits seen by COOSS would be to increase their own competences in the Research and Training Department in order to 'do better ourselves'; to have a strong network of CSOs and lifelong learning associations for future collaboration; to insert a new validated course in their future training offer, both for externals and new internal colleagues.

The potential stakeholders and associates would be: some training centers outside the CSO sector, universities COOSS is working with around organizing masters concerning working in the 3rd sector and organisations contacted (and participating) in the 1stTIPPM project.

Hans, Interfolk, among the organizational benefits mentioned new inspiration, new contacts, new development areas. Among the personal benefits: New impulses, new persons to know, new places to visit.

The potential stakeholders and associates would be mostly volunteers, CSO organisations.

Aron, EDUCULT, among the potential benefits mentioned continuing to work with the FIRST Network – developing it further, gaining more experience in the recognition and validation area, learning how the recognition and validation systems can be implemented, possibly – starting a dialogue with





existing validation organisations; also the SDD methodology is of interest. The possible stakeholders and associates would be two organisations in Austria issuing some certifications in the adult education area.

Vanessa, Rightchallenge, mentioned that validation and certification of competences is an important subject nowadays in Portugal – the public authorities are just implementing such a system for adults with low qualifications. There is no such a system existing for the international projects managers. Possible stakeholders and associates would be the Portuguese Institute of Employment and Vocational Training, and the *ASEP Association* (??) researching the adult education and LLL.

3

Andreas, FWC mentioned that this is his first experience with an Erasmus project. Has experience in implementing the Horizon projects and is a certified SDD facilitator and supervisor. Since involved in the AER-V project very recently, did not present at the moment neither the expectations nor potential stakeholders FWC could include.

Agnieszka, FAIE, mentioned that the subject of supporting international cooperation of the CSOs has been FAIEs aim from the very beginning, it is a part of the FAIE's development strategy. In the years 2012 – 2016 FAIE realised three national project around this subject (local, regional and all-Polish), since 2018 continuing on the international level – within the 1stTIPPM project. AER-V is a logical, next step. Concerning stakeholders – it would be mostly the CSO sector organisations and supporting bodies (such as social economy support centres or NGO centers).

Inspirations & Challenges to consider:

- International project managers in the CSOs is quite a little group. The support/ recognition and validation system would need to be very focused. It would differ from country to country. The Danish CSOs would probably see it as a kind of interfering into 'their business'. (Hans)
- Including the 'idealistic approach', focus on democracy, human development... characteristic for the volunteers and the 'professional approach' represented by the staff (managers) of the CSOs (Hans). In Austria the word 'competences' would also be challenging for the CSO sector (are critical about it); we would need to develop something that fits the CSO sector (Aron).

3. Background of the project: Overview of the competence recognition, validation and certification systems applicable for civil society organisations active in the adult education field, already functioning in the partner countries. Possible benchmarks.

The Partners shortly presented the possible benchmarks:

Luca, COOSS, presented the National Repertory of educational and training qualifications, relating both to informal and formal education and the The Citizen's Training Booklet of Competences. The system is now being tested in some few regions in Italy; not including the Marche Region.





Possible benchmark?: The system is not very clear yet; it may be seen as a general scheme for validation and recognition of competences.

Hans, Interfolk, presented the Prior learning in civil society associations (Realkompetencer i foreningslivet) Developed by The Danish Adult Education Association (Dansk Folkeoplysnings Samråd).

It was developed around 10 years ago to validate CSO sector competences for further education/job market; there is an online tool available, still it hasn't been updated since then. It allows to self-assess: social competences, organisational competences, self-management, creative and innovation competences; intercultural, communication, learning and democratic competences.

Possible benchmark?: The system does not seem very useful, we could rather 'learn from not-very-successful example'. We should rather refer to the competence triangle (developed within 1stTIPPM) – specific competences needed for a specific job.

Oliver, EDUCULT, presented three systems: Two individual competences r&v systems - ZTEB (Zertifizierter Trainer in der Erwachsenenbildung – Certified Trainer in the Adult Education) and WBA certification (of Austrian Academy of Continuing Education) and Ö-Cert, for the organisational level. Since all of these systems are quite well recognised and frequently used, their popularity depends on the CSO sector – for ex. the cultural field CSOs seem not very enthusiastic about them.

Possible benchmark?: The systems seem well structured, are working in practice, are being used. It is worth to take a closer look to them.

Vanessa, Rightchallenge, presented three competences r&v systems: the certification of trainers as an element of the CCP (Certificate of Pedagogical Competence), the Certification of Training Institutions within the National Certification System of training entities is coordinated by the Directorate General of Employment and Labour Relations and the RVCC process (Recognition, Validation and Certification of Lifelong Learning Skills).

Possible benchmark?: The first two systems seem well structured, are working in practice, are being used. It is worth to take a closer look to them. The RVCC process have some weaknesses concerning the reliability of the competences it certifies.

Andreas, FWC, presented the Structured Democratic Dialogue (SDD) Certificate Scheme developed (and still being in a process of updating and further developing) by FWC.

Possible benchmark?: It seems to be a good example for certifying specific skills on various levels of advancement, joining theory and practical competences development, developed by the CSO and updated according to current needs.

Agnieszka and Jerzy, FAIE, presented two r&v systems: 1. Project Management Institute certifications (general project management skills for business sector) and 'Certification' system of the STOP Association (competence, knowledge and coaching skills of the members in the field of improving soft skills of trainers working with the NGO community).

The first one is recognised internationally; the second used just by one Polish NGO. The PMI Talent Triangle idea was already used in the 1stTIPPM project.





Possible benchmark?: The main disadvantage of the STOP certification system seems to be that it is available only to members of the Association of NGO Trainers. Good benchmark seem to be the PMI maintaining the certificate system, where you must regularly improve your competences and work in the field to be eligible for continuing certification. PMI certificates are mainly developed for business requirements, still many solutions could be adapted to the needs of the Civil Society Organisations active in the adult learning education.

Inspirations & Challenges to consider:

- Reliability of the potential recognition and validation tool. Self-assessment tools do not seem to have value for potential employers.
- A question raised, if the Partnership is to develop some competence validation and recognition system fitted for national needs, or rather to focus on the European level? It was agreed that, since we are building an international network, the European level would be more relevant. Still – it is worth to consider including some ‘country-specific’ aspect in it.
- For sure it would be necessary to clearly define the levels of the competences recognized and validated: What does it mean ‘intermediate’? What does it mean ‘advanced’ etc.

4. Contractual terms: Short overview of the project implementation strategy: Project idea, timeframe and budget. Links with the other initiatives: FIRST Network.

Agnieszka presented the project implementation strategy according to the project application. There were several propositions made by the project Coordinator:

- The 1stTIPPM project, closely related to AER-V, was presented to the two new Partners. Rightchallenge and FWC were invited to send their representatives to the European Conference officially launching the FIRST Network that will take place in Kraków, Poland, 21-22 of September 2020.

- It was underlined, that due to exchange-of-experiences character of the subsequent meetings, the meetings participants may be not only the ‘project staff’, but overall – the persons who have the necessary expertise. It might be the researchers, staff active in education and training, practitioners or other experts, specialists and professionals. Concerning other stakeholders – it may be the key staff from other organisations the Partners have strong network relation to. This wider circle of possible project participants is also related to the planned project results concerning increasing awareness of the value of: assessing prior learning, recognition and validation of competences, benefits of international cooperation and confidence in the Partnership - and the results obtaining measurement planned. The meeting participants filled in the related self-assessment at the beginning of the meeting.

- Rafał Dadak presented the project budget explaining the two positions where the costs would be equally shared by the Partners, within the Management and Implementation unit support: equal share of the Partners in the 25% of the exceptional costs (since these costs are covered by the grant up till 75%) and a reserve for additional merits work managed by the project leader.



- Agnieszka proposed that concerning the TPM2-TPM5 meetings: The host (lead Partner) is responsible for making the minutes and developing the final conclusions from the meeting.

It was also discussed how long should the meetings last and how should they be organised. It was agreed that the meeting should be planned for 1,5 day; the host Partner proposes the scenario of the meeting and the way the other Partners should prepare to the meeting.

Concerning financial management – it was proposed by Hans, Interfolk, that the meeting costs would be reimbursed to the Partners directly after the meeting, while part of the Management Unit support should be kept by the Coordinator until the balance payment is made by the Polish NA (20% of the grant, to be paid after accepting the final report by the Polish NA). This solution will be included in the Partnership Agreement.

6

5. Contractual terms: Deciding on tools of internal communication & information exchange. Planning the information & promotion campaign.

Agnieszka presented the propositions concerning communication, based at the project application plan.

Some internal communication rules were proposed. Concerning Skype meetings – they shall be scheduled when needed. The Partnership shall use Trello as a common storage space for the common project documents.

It was clarified who shall be included in the AER-V mailing list.

Aron, EDUCULT, proposed to combine the monitoring process with the ‘process evaluation’ process. FAIE and EDUCULT shall have a dialogue to agree the monitoring questions to be included in the evaluation process. Hans, Interfolk, proposed that the monitoring/evaluation reports would be shared with the Partners in-between meetings, before each next meeting.

Vanessa, Rightchallenge, presented dissemination plan and template for reporting the dissemination activities. It was agreed that the dissemination report should be prepared by the Partners every half year.

Concerning dissemination, Agnieszka proposed that conclusions from the subsequent meetings would be published on EPALE, as articles within the Community of Practicioners founded in 1stTIPPM project.

Hans, Interfolk, observed that the main focus for dissemination should be the potential members of the network.

The Partners gave each other their formal, oral consent for publishing pictures from the project meetings in the Internet media used by the Partners.





6. Contractual terms: Grant Agreement. Project reporting, documentation and finances. Discussion and clarification. Discussing the Project Agreement proposed (PA), possible refinements.

Agnieszka presented the Partnership Agreement all the Partners received 13-12-2019.

There were two refinements implemented, based on the earlier presented budget propositions:

1. Article 8 /the budget/: There was additional point added:

7) There is a reserve for additional merits work managed by the project Coordinator foreseen within in the budget of gross minimum EUR 1.166,00 (i.e. max. EUR 9,00 per month). These amounts will be distracted from the Project Management and Implementation budget category.

2. Article 9 /Distribution on EU funding/: There was a change introduced in point 2:

2) To support the financial flow for the project, after signing the Partnership Agreement the Coordinator will transfer each Partner 40% of the Project Management and Implementation (PMI) unit support calculated as described in Article 8. The transfer would be made under condition of receiving the first instalment of the grant from the Polish National Agency. Within the PMI support the shall be realized activities described in the “Management” part of the application, namely: project management; information, promotion and dissemination; monitoring, evaluation and quality assurance; overall administration and documentation.

The balance payment of the PMI unit support, 60%, will be transferred after accepting the final report by the Polish National Agency and payment of the balance to the Coordinator.

The Partnership Agreement was signed by the authorised persons: Aron Weigl, Educult, Hans Jørgen Vodsgaard, Interfolk and Agnieszka Dadak, FAIE. The document was passed to Andreas, FWC, who will have it signed by the FWC President and then will bring the document to the 2nd TPM in Ancona, to be signed by the COOSS President.

Appointing the Project Management Committee (PMC) members and naming the project personnel: It was decided, that the PMC members are: Lorenza Lupini, COOSS, Hans Jørgen Vodsgaard, Interfolk, Aron Weigl, EDUCULT, Carla Vanessa Gomes, Rightchallenge and Agnieszka Dadak, FAIE.

7. AER-V step by step – Partners ideas & propositions: Mapping existing solutions for recognition and validation of knowledge, skills and competences available for the adult learning CSOs in all Partner countries.

Agnieszka, FAIE, shortly presented ideas for the mapping process. It was proposed that all the Partners would present 2 recognition and validation systems they see as an inspiration for AER-V works, in some structured way – the same for all. By January 31st FAIE prepares a template for presentation of the R&V systems. Additionally – FAIE makes some further analysis of possible benchmarks and competitors – the European offer. The Partners are welcome to search for possible benchmarks and competitors as well.





8. AER-V step by step – Partners ideas & propositions: TPM2 organisation with main focus on: General review of the existing competence recognition and validation systems, applicable for the adult learning CSOs, in all Partner countries. Good practices and success stories.

Lorenza, COOSS, shortly presented initial ideas concerning the meeting. COOSS will cooperate with FAIE, that is developing the mapping report.

Partners discussed the possible dates of the partner meeting in Ancona, Italy, planned in April-May 2020. It was agreed that the 2nd TPM in Ancona will take place between 12 and 14 of May 2020, with preference for May 13-14. Andreas, FWC, was to confirm his availability these dates. It was confirmed. The 2ndTPM in Ancona will take place May 13th-14th 2020.

9. AER-V step by step – Partners ideas & propositions: TPM3 organisation with main focus on: Review and analysis of the training offer for acquiring/upgrading competences, preceding the recognition and validation process (for ex. the exam) – the ‘certification’ as a specialist in a certain field. Good practices and success stories.

Aron, EDUCULT, shortly presented initial ideas concerning the meeting. The initial idea is to develop some training content during the meeting, cooperating in some working groups; maybe some study visit could be included. The issues to discuss would be, among others: shall we have one training concept for all, or country-specific? Shall the training be a ‘must’, or could the candidates prove they have the knowledge otherwise? What could be the pre-conditions to participate in the training? Shall the network offer something also for more experienced project managers? How to deal with the decision making process?

Partners discussed the possible dates of the partner meeting in Vienna, Austria, planned in Sept – Oct 2020. It was agreed that the 3rd TPM in Austria will take place 22 – 23 of October 2020.

10. AER-V step by step – Partners ideas & propositions: TPM4 organisation with main focus on: Review and analysis of the examination systems to recognize and validate certain competences. Good practices and success stories.

Hans, Interfolk, shortly presented initial ideas concerning the meeting. It could possibly include some study visits, for ex. to the Danish Folk High Schools Association, some further education institutions; some stakeholders could be also visited/invited.

The meeting organization will be more clear after the preceding meetings.

Hans observed that the certification is only important if the network that issues it is important. So the network must be strong. In Ancona we could discuss what for could people need our certification.



11. AER-V step by step – Partners ideas & propositions: TPM5 organisation with main focus on: Review and analysis of the requirements for maintaining the ‘certification as a specialist in a certain field’ - continuing certification requirements.

Vanessa, Rightchallenge, shortly presented initial ideas concerning the meeting. It would be important to decide on the fields of expertise. The meeting organization will be more clear after the preceding meetings.

12. AER-V step by step – Partners ideas & propositions: Short-term joint staff training event with main focus on: Experiencing the Structured Democratic Dialogue co-laboratory in order to develop recommendations for developing competence validation systems for the adult education sector CSOs.

Andreas, FWC, shortly presented the Structured Dialogic Design methodology and the co-laboratory organisation . Andreas also presented the exemplary report from the co-laboratory.

The Partners asked some clarifying questions. The methodology was also shortly discussed.

13. AER-V step by step – Partners ideas & propositions: TPM6 organisation with main focus on: developing the Exit Strategy.

Agnieszka, FAIE, shortly presented the idea behind the Exit Strategy – it shall include the concept of a new project initiative.

14. Any other issues. Meeting evaluation. Closing the meeting.

Other issues – Erasmus+ KA3 option:

Rafał, FAIE, presented the Key Action 3: Support for policy reform Lot 2: Adult education: Networks and partnerships of Adult Education providers call for proposals, with a deadline February 25th. It was shortly discussed by the Partners if this could be an option for supporting the FIRST Network.

The Partners expressed their interest in taking the chance, still the basic thing to check is if FIRST Network – as a fresh and small network - would qualify for support. This is to be checked by FAIE.

Meeting evaluation:

Jerzy: It was a small step for us and a big step for the future network.

Hans: The project is funny in a way – there is no intellectual outputs (IO); but it is also easier in a way. The Agenda was realized. Waiting for the mountain excursion.

Vanessa: The meeting was productive for planning the next steps. Also is not being used to project with no IOs. Is excited about the next steps.



Andreas: *Likes the dynamics of the group, hopes for good cooperation.*

Luca: *There are new interesting associates; thinks we have a positive future.*

Lorenza: *Thanks for organizing the meeting. Is positive about this working group. Looking forward to the next steps.*

Oliver: *It was quite interesting to hear all the experiences, discussing rounds, Is looking forward to the next steps. We know what to do, but we don't know how yet. We are able to develop something good.*

Aron: *Thanks for the organization. Happy to have new faces in the team. Has a good feeling - that it grows already. It's quite relaxing – there are no IOs. It is an important step in between, it is important we do it.*

Rafał: *Thanks for coming to Bielsko-Biała, it was a pleasure to meet all. This is a group of fantastic people with different experience, it is good for the future network.*

Agnieszka: *Thank you for the meeting, the future cooperation has good perspectives. Hopes that the lack of the IO money will not discourage anyone and that AER-V will not be pushed aside for 'more important' initiatives.*

The meeting was closed.

Decisions and deadlines:

Concerning 4. Contractual terms: Short overview of the project implementation strategy: Project idea, timeframe and budget. Links with the other initiatives: FIRST Network:

Decisions:

4.1 Concerning the TPM2-TPM5 meetings: The host (lead Partner) is responsible for making the minutes and developing the final conclusions from the meeting.

The meeting should be planned for 1,5 day; the host Partner proposes the scenario of the meeting and the way the other Partners should prepare to the meeting.

4.2. Concerning financial management - the meeting costs would be reimbursed to the partners directly after the meeting, while part of the Management Unit support should be kept by the Coordinator until the balance payment is made by the Polish NA (20% of the grant, to be paid after accepting the final report by the Polish NA). This solution will be included in the Partnership Agreement.



Concerning 5. Contractual terms: Deciding on tools of internal communication & information exchange. Planning the information & promotion campaign.

Decisions:

5.1. The Partnership shall use Trello as a common storage space for the common project documents. Concerning Skype meetings – they shall be scheduled when needed.

5.2. The monitoring process will be combined with the process evaluation process. FAIE and EDUCULT shall have a dialogue to agree the monitoring questions to be included in the evaluation process. The monitoring/evaluation reports would be shared with the Partners in-between meetings, before each next meeting.

5.3 It was agreed that the dissemination report should be prepared by the Partners every half year, according to the template proposed by Vanessa, Rightchallenge.

5.4. Concerning dissemination, conclusions from the subsequent meetings would be published on EPALE, as articles within the Community of Practicioners founded in 1stTIPPM project.

5.5. The Partners gave each other their formal, oral consent for publishing pictures from the project meetings in the Internet media used by the Partners.

Concerning 6. Contractual terms: Grant Agreement. Project reporting, documentation and finances. Discussion and clarification.

Decisions:

6.1. There were two refinements to the Partnership Agreement proposed 13-12-2019 accepted:

1. Article 8 /the budget/: There is additional point added:

7) There is a reserve for additional merits work managed by the project Coordinator foreseen within in the budget of gross minimum EUR 1.166,00 (i.e. max. EUR 9,00 per month). These amounts will be distracted from the Project Management and Implementation budget category.

2. Article 9 /Distribution on EU funding/: There is a change introduced in point 2:

2) To support the financial flow for the project, after signing the Partnership Agreement the Coordinator will transfer each Partner 40% of the Project Management and Implementation (PMI) unit support calculated as described in Article 8. The transfer would be made under condition of receiving the first instalment of the grant from the Polish National Agency. Within the PMI support the shall be realized activities described in the “Management” part of the application, namely: project management; information, information, promotion and dissemination; monitoring, evaluation and quality assurance; overall administration and documentation.

The balance payment of the PMI unit support, 60%, will be transferred after accepting the final report by the Polish National Agency and payment of the balance to the Coordinator.





6.2. The Project Management Committee (PMC) members appointed are: Lorenza Lupini, COOSS, Hans Jørgen Vodsgaard, Interfolk, Aron Weigl, EDUCULT, Carla Vanessa Gomes, Rightchallenge and Agnieszka Dadak, FAIE.

Concerning 7. AER-V step by step – Partners ideas & propositions: Mapping existing solutions for recognition and validation of knowledge, skills and competences available for the adult learning CSOs in all Partner countries.

12

Decision:

7.1. By January 31st FAIE prepares a template for presentation of the recognition and validation systems chosen by the Partners for the mapping report, to further analyse at the next TPM in Ancona.

Concerning 8. AER-V step by step – Partners ideas & propositions: TPM2 organisation with main focus on: General review of the existing competence recognition and validation systems, applicable for the adult learning CSOs, in all Partner countries. Good practices and success stories.

Decision:

8.1. The 2nd TPM in Ancona will take place between 13 - 14 of May 2020.

Concerning 8.

Decision:

9.1. The 3rd TPM in Austria will take place 22 – 23 of October 2020.

Concerning 14. Any other issues – Erasmus+ KA3 option:

Decision:

14.1. FAIE will check FIRST Network's eligibility for funding and will come back to the Partners with the answer.

Prepared by: Agnieszka Dadak,
FAIE, 27-01-2020, v2