VALMOPRIS

Skype Meeting 7: Record of Meeting and Action Points

10am (GMT) – 12th July, 2016

Present: Dominique Antony (DA), Maren Satke (MS), Erica Kubic (EK), Aina Vilcane (AV), Marisa Farrell (MF) and Ed Santman (ES)

Apologies: Alina Zamosteanu (AZ) and Enrica Pautasso (EP)

Partners spent the majority of the meeting discussing agenda item 1, the forthcoming training and steering group meeting in Rotterdam in October. The rest of the agenda items were only covered in brief and will be managed via email or bilateral discussion.

Item 1 – Training and Steering Group Meeting in Netherlands – Update and Discussion

---

- Partners discussed the training schedule day by day to ensure that it meets the requirements of the project and fulfils the obligations of the original application. Partners who gave their apologies are encouraged to provide any feedback they feel necessary.

- Given budgetary restrictions and its impact on full partner attendance, some concerns were raised about whether LEVEL5 was given enough focus as partners want to ensure that teachers feel very well prepared to manage the teaching pilots and the validation methodology.

- In particular, there was some dubiety over whether the application specified that the training need to focus on validation of informal learning competences as a whole or on LEVEL5 specifically. MS made two key points: a) that some background and introduction to the sector, learners, learning opportunities and validation was necessary to prepare trainees and is good practice, and b) that LEVEL5 is only one form of validation and the training should consider the process more broadly. This has worked well in previous training of a similar nature. Nevertheless, MS is going to revisit the application to ensure we are meeting our obligations for the national agency **(MS – action point)**.

- MS also sought to reassure partners that Tuesday PM, Wednesday and Thursday MS will be focused very carefully on the practicalities and steps of using LEVEL5 as a validation tool and will allow her and EP to manage any challenges and concerns that might arise around issues such as certification, language and reporting. Friday will be utilised to wrap up and clarify any outstanding questions.

- **All partners made suggestions and gave comment on the programme so far. The following changes or actions were agreed:**
  - Aina Vilcane's section on Learning to Learn (L2L) would be best placed near the beginning of the training, given the findings of the Dutch pre-pilot activity, where L2L was a more difficult competence to validate.
  - The content on Tuesday morning around the target group and presentation of good practice might more helpfully be reworded as Exchange of Experience (I&II) or something similar, to clarify that these sections are about sharing information relating to learning settings and the target groups as some differences exist across partner countries.
  - The webinar should not be included in the training programme. This is more to do with wider dissemination of the project and its outputs. MS did explain that the e-platform is a suggestion which would allow teachers to liaise during the pilots and seek clarification about any problems arising. The partners felt that MS and EP should deliver this content and it will be moved from Friday to Thursday – and restated in the summary on the final day of training.
  - Partners discussed whether some content on day 1 could have a greater focus on LEVEL5, including the introduction to the project and a discussion about how Erasmus+ projects work. The possibility also exists to have a written input session on validation and LEVEL5 for teachers, allowing them to highlight strengths, weaknesses, opportunities or threats as well as expectations for the training. This will allow us to ensure that these are addressed and met over the course of the training. MS strongly recommends that LEVEL5 content would confuse teachers at this stage. Instead, she suggests that we should step into the topic step by step, using the first day as an introduction about what the project is, what informal learning is, what competence based learning is...
  - The content of day 1 is still not finalised because there is still some dubiety about Jaap can Lakerveld's attendance. MS suggested that it is looking unlikely that we will be able to find an appropriate slot which suits both parties. **(MF – action point, to follow up with EP)**
  - Any excursions and group activities should be linked somehow to Validation of learning - development of competences in informal learning.
  - **EK will send out details of venues for training and shared dinners.**

  (MS - action point to make changes)

- MF also raised as a point of clarification whether we should be covering the case study model and socio-ecological model specified in our application and research strategy. MF is going to liaise with AZ in order to find out if this is necessary or, indeed, beneficial **(MF - action point)**.

- EK and ES have been struggling to finalise arrangements for the excursions during to budgetary cuts. They are striving to complete this and will liaise with partners as soon as possible **(EK and ES – action point)**.

- Our Dutch partners confirmed that the training will be held in the Art College of Rotterdam, who have been very supportive of our programme and its goals. ES asked the partnership whether it would be appropriate to allow some students (roughly 5) of the college to attend parts of the training. Furthermore, one student has been carrying out work with homeless groups and would like to present to the group. In the spirit of collaboration and to support wider discussions about the value of informal learning and its validation, partners agree that it would be positive to find appropriate slots to allow these collaborations.

- EK and ES have organised collective dinners on the Monday and Thursday evenings, one of which involves transport. **EK will send out invoices to partners for payment**.

- EK and ES also reported the successful completion of their Bosch parade project which was attended and enjoyed by a great many visitors. They report that the learners made great progress in collaborative learning. The partnership offer their congratulations. **ES to disseminate video evidence to partners.**

Item 2 – Workplan – update on actions

- MF will send out an update on actions required as part of the workplan as soon as the training schedule has been finalised. This will be an action list which includes broader targets and tasks pertaining to the intellectual outputs as well as tasks relating to the delivery of the training, validation and research process

Item 3 – Dissemination – update on progress and actions

- MF explained that the dissemination document which has been updated to include all three phases is vital for ensuring the legacy of the project and for meeting the dissemination targets set out in the application.
- Some partners raised concerns that their reach is significantly more limited due to the sector they are operating within. Partners are assured that this is not a problem, but each partner should commit to disseminating content and information as widely as possible to ensure the reach of the project.
- We will need to look at dissemination and access options at our next meeting.

Item 4 – Payments confirmation and procedure update

- MF informed partners that she has drawn up a draft procedure document for payments to partners to ensure that this process is completed timeously and according to an agreed framework. This will be distributed alongside these minutes.

Item 5 – Other Business

- Partners are asked to look over the draft agenda for the steering group meeting which was distributed on Monday 11th July by MF. They will be redistributed with these minutes. All suggestions regarding content and timings are welcome.
- Partners who are still to complete the sustainability questionnaire and the dissemination template are reminded to do so as soon as possible and before the agreed deadlines.

End.