

## VALUE Network Management Group Meeting



Thursday 17<sup>th</sup> June 2010  
(Re-scheduled from 21/4/10)  
Ankara, Turkey

### Minutes of Meeting

Present: Carol Stewart, Alison Hughes, (University of Liverpool, UK), Nick Ockenden (IVR, UK), Dr Andrea Waxenegger (University of Graz, AT) Ksenija Fonovic (CSVnet, IT), Malgorzata Kolodziejczyk (BPU, PL)  
Item 9 onwards: Nuray Yildirim (METU CEC), Emrah Yildirim (ILKYAR)

*Note: Some papers related to this meeting are dated 21 April 2011. The meeting had to be re-scheduled to June 17<sup>th</sup> because of flight disruption owing to Icelandic volcano ash.*

### 1. Minutes of meeting 4 November 2009

These were accepted.

### 2. Administrative Update

CS reported on administrative matters in line with the circulated written report.

- *Interim Report*  
The 1<sup>st</sup> phase of the Network has been given a score of 80% by the EACEA assessor. Some comments in the assessor's report were inaccurate and CS had pointed these out in a formal response. AW supported this and thanked the Coordinator.
- *Partner Issues*  
Contracts for SGF and CEV are now in place.  
Use of sub-groups to communicate with partners had been very helpful. CS thanked AW and MK for this. CS to follow up on outstanding issues by telephone and email. AW reported that RD (Pro Vobis) is unclear about the status of 2<sup>nd</sup> RO partner, the University of Babes-Bolyai. CS agreed to write to both partners to clarify the issue.
- *Budget*  
Network is operating within budget.
- *Website*  
Website has been updated with:
  - new home page
  - new resources
  - new search facility on experts page
  - new profile pages for partnersAdditional minor refinements will be carried out to meet RPG recommendations
- *Quality*  
The RPG held a remote meeting during the week of 24<sup>th</sup> May and its report has been circulated. Consideration of issues held over for email discussion

### 3. Website Resources

- *National Reports*

NO reported that most of the submitted national reports are now in EN as well as native language.

Individual reports :

**DE** - There is confusion as to the status of DE report. Is the version on the web draft or final?

NO to clarify with authors and to chase EN version.

**RO** - AW reported she has a copy of the 1<sup>st</sup> draft of the RO report from RD and will pass to NO & CS

**HU** - The HU report is outstanding and CS will follow up with EM

**SI** – EN version of SI report received but not yet on website. CS to publish and chase SI version

**NL** – Dutch version required. AH reported that this was discussed at her subgroup and that RD will provide a summary in NL. CEV may have a volunteer translator.

**TR** – the TR report in DE could be improved in terms of the use of terminology (rather than the grammar). Help from BBE or CVE to be sought.

NO reported that the draft summary overview of the reports is based on the workshop in Jonkoping and requires further refinement. It was agreed that this will be an important output.

- *Glossary*

The top level glossary page needs to be finalised. NO to pursue this.

The glossary could pick up definitions contained in the national reports. (These could also be used in the reports summary to highlight any differences between country approaches).

It was agreed that any general terminology arising from sub-group glossaries should move to the top level. Only terminology related specifically to the theme of the sub-group should be on its web page. Visitors could be referred also to the top level glossary.

The glossaries currently on the page should be retained and an explanation inserted that sub-groups may also have working definitions/glossaries on their pages.

- *Bibliography*

It was noted that references are building up. It was agreed really important to have materials in partner languages wherever possible

- *Case studies*

There are none published as yet. It was agreed that these should be brief snapshots of activity only and could be picked out from national reports.

KF reported that the Citizenship sub-group has devised a case study structure which could be useful.

NO and KF to liaise on this.

CS reported that EM will send a full case study. MK reported that she would be able to translate this and the MG gratefully received this offer with thanks

- *Experts*

It was agreed that it has been quite difficult to identify individuals who could be truly called experts across both sectors and it was noted that the introduction to this page attempts to explain this.

KF pointed out that the Network has created new experts and has built capacity across the 2 sectors, and this is an important output which should be noted in the final report.

- *Web Links*

It was noted that references are building up

## 4. Sub-groups Update

Sub-group leaders provided short verbal reports to explain/supplement the written/emailed reports previously circulated.

Referring to the original bid, the required outputs for each group were clarified. It was noted that each sub-group should produce a dissemination plan arising from their discussions. This would help with network exploitation and would add further value to the project.

The MG agreed with points 5a, 5b and 5c in the Employability report. Point 5d to be considered later in the project.

## 5. 3<sup>rd</sup> Network Meeting

- With reference to the recent MG email correspondence about the scheduling difficulties associated with the CEV meeting, it was agreed that the venue for the 3<sup>rd</sup> meeting would be changed to Lille
- It was agreed that Value would offer a workshop to CEV – possibly NO/MH or KF- and that MH should be invited to speak to the Network. An alternative might be Susanne Szabo (France Benevolat and CEV board)
- KF had raised the opportunity of Value input to the launch of EYV in Budapest Jan 11, the focus being competences for volunteering. It was agreed that Markus should be asked about this
- It was noted that 2 Experts could be invited to support the ICD & Citizenship sub-group input to the meeting. MK and EY to investigate the ICD expert. NO suggested Linda Milbourne (IVR) as a possibility for the Citizenship group. KF agreed that NO should investigate availability. The experts could be part of any round table as part of the proposed debate on obstacles to collaboration between the sectors.
- NO reported that IVR colleague(s) had met both MEPs and EYV task force staff (J McDonald) who have expressed an interest in Value and it was agreed that they could help with eg. use of EYV logo, conference promotion etc. and that this should be followed up. The best way to approach this to be discussed via email.
- The MG thanked MK for her sub-group's suggestions for sessions at the conference and it was agreed that the Lille meeting would be a good opportunity to pilot the suggested approaches.
- The Employability sub-group will make a small presentation regarding the piloting of a questionnaire investigating stakeholder perceptions of volunteering

## 6. Dissemination and Valorisation

It was agreed that it would be helpful if partners could produce some kind of reflective summary which considered the ways in which they have used Value in their work and in relationship to the networks in which they operate. This would not only be a learning experience for them as professionals but would be useful way to record outcomes that are not captured elsewhere. It would also be evidence of Value's contribution for the EC. Partners to be asked for this in Lille.

The various options for printed materials for dissemination/valorisation were discussed. It was agreed that these should probably cover: sub-group work, national reports, case studies, conference

proceedings. Translation of some materials into TR is desirable and it would be good to get sponsorship for this.

## **7. Evaluation**

CS reported that she had thanked Phillip Stemmer for his supportive evaluation report which has been circulated to all partners.

## **8. Other Business not Related to the Conference**

- EUCEN has asked if Value could supply a contribution to the Granada conference in May 2011. It was agreed that it would
- AW made a presentation to EUCIS and distributed Value materials to participants  
This is good visibility for the Network and should be mentioned in the final report.
- KS suggested that Value develops a shorts statement about how it contributes methods and approaches for cooperation which could be used in plans for 2011. KS will look at this.

## **9. Value Conference**

The MG was joined by EY (ILKYAR) and NY (METU)

NO gave a brief summary of the visit (by NO, CS and AH) to CEC (METU), the METU convention centre and various hotels which had taken place on 16<sup>th</sup> June.

### ***Dates***

It was recommended that the best dates for the conference would be 10-12 May 2011 and this was agreed. The schedule would be:

Mon May 9<sup>th</sup> –travel  
Tues 10<sup>th</sup> - MG  
Wed 11<sup>th</sup> - Day 1 of conference (TR CECs to attend)  
Thurs 12<sup>th</sup> - Day 2 – Value only  
Fri 13<sup>th</sup> – Day 3 and close.

It was noted that there could be up to 110 people on day 1 and 50 on day 2.

### ***Venue***

It was recommended that the METU convention centre be used as the venue because of the excellent facilities, the lack of space in other potential venues and the fact that it would be good for a partner to physically host the event. This was agreed.

### ***Programme & Accommodation/Transport***

The programme for the conference was discussed. Issues included:

- What might be most useful to include in Day 1 when the Turkish CECs would be present?  
Perhaps a session on networks and how they operate?
- The timing of sub-group workshops – might these be better on Day 2? Would this detract from the overall balance of the presentation of Value?

- Perhaps Day 1 should address more general themes and move to the more specific on Day 2. Themes could include: Grundtvig opportunities, Networks, Volunteering across Europe, ULLL
- Alternatively, there may be 2 approaches - 1 practical case study type presentations and the 2nd – more issues based.
- Turkish CECs may want to offer a workshop
- It is important to include a presentation of METU
- The structure of the sessions might not just be restricted to plenaries and workshops – possibly a World Cafe as suggested by the IDC sub-group
- Rather than study visits to volunteering organisations (which could be problematic in practical terms) might it be better to invite them to some kind of poster / exhibition event where informal networking could take place? eg. university representatives pick up on 2 points from each volunteering organisation and feedback to other participants

Provisional Programme:

<b>Day 1 - 11<sup>th</sup> May</b>	<b>Day 2 - 12<sup>th</sup> May</b>	<b>Day3 - 13<sup>th</sup> May</b>
9.00-11.00 Registration	9.00-10.00 Plenary <i>Lecture room C (55)</i>	9.00-10.00 Plenary <i>Lecture room C (55)</i>
11.00 Opening presentations <i>Lecture room for 110 (D)</i>	10.00-10.30 Coffee	10.00-10.30 Coffee
	10.30-12.30 Workshop X 4 <i>C + 3 breakout rooms</i>	10.30-12.30 The Way Forward World cafe <i>Downstairs space.</i>
12.30-14.00 Lunch (up to 110)	12.30-14.00 Lunch (up to 55 people)	12.30-14.00 Lunch (up to 55 people)
14.00-15.30 Workshop X 4 <i>D + 3 breakout rooms</i>	Volunteering Poster Sessions	
16.00-17.30 Workshop X 4 <i>D + 3 breakout rooms</i>		

The Group also discussed accommodation and transport to & from METU.

### **Translation**

It was agreed that simultaneous translation (EN-TR) would be very useful on day 1. EY reported on costs. This would be reviewed once budgets were clearer.

### **Marketing**

A hard copy and electronic leaflet will be produced for wide distribution

It was agreed that potential participants (from outside the Network) should be encouraged to apply for grant funding to attend – possibly from Grundtvig. Information will be produced to make this process as straightforward as possible.

### **Next Steps**

- CS agreed that she would follow up with METU about the detail of responsibilities and budgets
- Partners would be asked to nominate none-network colleagues/contacts who might benefit from attending. There is a budget to support this. It is possible that the funding may not provide 100% funding but may make a contribution – depending on nominations.