

VALMOPRIS

Skype Meeting 6: Record of Meeting and Action Points

10am (GMT) – 24th May, 2016

Present: Dominique Antony (DA), Enrica Pautasso (EP), Maren Satke (MS), Alina Zamosteanu (AZ), Erica Kubic (EK), Marisa Farrell (MF)

Apologies: Aina Vilcane (AV) and Ed Santman (ES)

Item 1 – Desk Research & Progress

- Partners seemed to agree that the first draft of IO1 (part 1) represented a fairly good start. Partners will work on each of their sections, editing, redrafting and undertaking a balancing (and where possible) harmonising exercise. **(MF to liaise – action point)**
- **All partners to continue to provide comment**
- Layout and design will be looked at as part of a longer term project, though functional aspects of formatting should be undertaken asap (referencing, page numbers etc, LEVEL 5). Check contents in cover insert (including Erasmus disclaimer)
- The conclusions should be strengthened, with particular focus on the embedding of KC1 – Learning to Learn
- Elements of good practice should still be considered as part of IO1. Also consider including information about evidence of class sizes and educational resources as part of prison-based desk research. **(MF – action points)**
- The research methodology has also been further updated and clarification/elucidation provided by AZ. This is to be circulated to partners **(MF action point)**
- EK asked for clarification of whether a questionnaire for the validation activities had been developed yet. AZ explained that a process is being written up for teacher and stakeholder evaluation of process. **(AZ action point)** However, MS explained that LEVEL 5 doesn't have to follow a uniform approach to learner validation, rather it should be individualised

Item 2 – Pilot Activities

- MF gave an update to partners outlining that all but Latvia's pilot activities were designed and submitted for response. There were some institutional delays for Latvia. However, prior to these notes being circulated, all submissions are now complete and posted in our shared area.
- Compiled activity proposals to be considered and developed in line with LEVEL5 methodology. **(MF & EP action point)**
- MF asked for clarification over the inclusion of a work-based activity focused on the development and conclusion of a brief – partners agreed that this is likely to be a useful inclusion.

Item 3 – Next Steps (timeline re. C1)

- Plans are in place for C1 training in Rotterdam.
- Schedule of the event is written up and will be finalised when all local arrangements are in place, after partners confirm timings, and pilot activities are analysed.
- MS gave feedback from a previous training programme held as part of the VALLEY project. She feels that our plan has significant benefits in terms of pre-defined concrete plans for pilot activities and a reduction in common dinners to provide more downtime and cost efficiencies.
- All partners to ensure accommodation is booked imminently
- EK to distribute 'arrival and departure schedule' to partners **(EK Action point)**

Item 4 – Payments and Budget

- MF informed partners that Jim O'Donnell at New College Lanarkshire is in the process of finalising accounts and will send off payments for partners in the next few weeks. **(MF to follow up – Action Point)**

Item 5 – Other Business

- MS raised a point for urgent consideration and action. She has been contacted by Paul – the original architect for the project who enquired as to why Romania had not applied for the EPEA conference. AZ explained that we have no influence over decision-making at this level. The partners will need to present an alternative solution to present to the National Agency.

EK tells partners about the Living Memory Conference in Marseille.