

VALUE Network Management Group Meeting

Tuesday 29th March 2011
Rome, IT (*Continued 9.30 Wednesday
30th March*)



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)

1. Minutes of meeting 16th November 2010

These were accepted.

2. Value Conference Planning

Individual components of the conference programme were discussed:

Plenary Inputs

- It was agreed that CS would provide all necessary background information to Marian Harkin for her video welcome and that she could also be asked to contribute to the conference proceedings. It is difficult to know whether the video message may need editing. 2-3 minutes was agreed as an ideal length. To be reviewed once received.
- The Introduction to Value should reflect the 3 years of work and include a description of the major outputs and achievements. The overview could also lead into the sub-group sessions.
- Donna Keher is a very good presenter but needs to be encouraged to make a strong link to lifelong learning
- John Annette would need a tight brief and asked to be careful about terminology.
- There was a wide ranging discussion about the need to get a speaker from the EC. This can be good from a strategic point of view although it also presents problems and it can be very difficult to get someone suitable who would be available. EYV means that everyone is very busy. Various options were discussed and it was finally decided that KF should approach John McDonald when she meets him in Venice.
- It was agreed that mini biographies (5 lines maximum) would be requested from plenary speakers. This would illustrate the range of contributors. Ideally these would be available for the conference packs.
- The idea of moving the plenary session from mid-afternoon to the end of the day (Day 1) was discussed. This might allow for housekeeping announcements and a sense of both reflection and continuity. This was finally rejected but it was agreed that session Chairs need to remind delegates about the overall programme.

Workshop Sessions

It was agreed that workshop session C should be split and that the 2nd strand of workshops should become session D starting at 12.00

Eucen (AW)'s networking session was discussed. It will focus on what can you do with a network and upon setting up a national network. Ppts will be translated into TR in advance

Subgroup Workshops

The organisation of the workshops was discussed. It was agreed that all sub-group members must go to their themed session. Each sub-group will also need to provide an abstract and title for its workshop. As far as possible titles should reflect the achievements of Value. MK reported that she will consult her group about the format of the ICD session.

Poster Session/Displays

TR volunteering organisations might want to present a display about their work. This might be more realistic than asking them to make a formal presentation in a workshop. Possible exhibitors are TUSEV and OGD. Both options are to be offered – the only problem being that doing a presentation (in session B) would mean that the TR VOs would not be able to attend the session being run in Turkish as they would be parallel in the same strand

It was agreed that poster session should also be offered to partners.

The poster session will run on both days. CS to liaise with NY about stands, sizes, space, bluetack velcro etc.

Student Participation

It was agreed that places would be offered to METU CEC students for the morning of Day 2. They would not be full delegates but we would ask them to let us know in advance. Unfortunately we could not offer lunch.

Student Helpers

These would not be delegates but welcome to join if not working. CS to liaise with NY

Closing Session/Expert Panel

Initial discussion focused on the idea of a closing session comprising inputs from an expert panel made up of plenary speakers and a representative from CEV. It was suggested that each individual could be given 5 minutes to reflect on the major challenge facing volunteering and ULLL collaboration. They should be asked to bring their own institutional perspective rather than to refer to their earlier plenary contributions this could be followed by SC's World Cafe feedback - maybe 10 points in a ppt presentation. The Moderator would then invite the audience to respond.

However AW suggested that an alternative to a formal final plenary session would be to close the conference immediately after the World Cafe. This way the energy generated by the discussion would not fall flat in a formal setting. Following the close of the feedback from the World Cafe – there could be a few short votes of thanks and farewells. This would end the conference on a positive note. This suggestion was unanimously supported and CS agreed to amend the conference programme accordingly.

World Cafe

CS reported that Sue Cross had agreed to run the session and will produce an introduction and guide which will go in conference packs. This will stress what we are trying to achieve.

It was agreed that there should be 8 tables. Ideally there should be no more than 5 people at each table otherwise discussion becomes too long and difficult to control. Each group should have 15 minutes per discussion – SC to manage the breaks.

There was a long discussion about the World Cafe questions. It was agreed that these should not be too tied to Value and should be formulated as simply as possible. However, they should also reflect cross-sectoral issues. It might be interesting to have questions at both an individual level and at institutional level. It is important that table hosts help with questions and use prompts to encourage discussion

Suggested possible questions were:

- What are the barriers to University- VO interaction?
- What actions should be taken to break these down and & who should take them?
- Suggest a title for a project that universities and VOs should do together – how can they learn from each other?
- What are the social objectives that ULLL and volunteering have in common?
- Where is it best for ULLL to concentrate – which volunteering sectors?
- What should be the target volunteer groups for ULLL?
- What is the impact of volunteering in terms of ULLL??
- How can universities and VOs support fragile learners?

It was agreed that the final questions would be decided via an email discussion.

Pre-Conference Administration

The revised programme and guidance for speakers and chairs will be circulated.

Speakers be asked to bring their presentations to the conference on a memory stick

Papers should be submitted 2 weeks before conference start.

Conference Promotion

Potential delegates were discussed.

IVR will follow up on some contacts in the Ukraine

KS reported good links with the Balkan countries eg SEEYN (South East European Youth Network), the Novi Sad volunteer centre (Serbia), the National Foundation for the Development of Civil Society (Croatia). KF to pursue and let us know.

2. Sub-group Work

Employability

AH reported that the dissemination/exploitation plan is now written and is on the website.

The final subgroup report has been drafted. On-going Subgroup work includes preparation of the workshop in Ankara and building of resources on the webpage e.g. bibliography

Older Volunteers as Learners

AW reported that she is encouraging SW and RD to contribute to the final report. She noted that problems arose from the small group size although the time spent together was very useful - particularly in the Graz meeting. Tasks should be determined to fit into the time. However there is minimum amount of time needed to do anything meaningful. There is a need to find common ground across sectoral issues, cross country issues, language issues. AW will make some suggestions for the workshop.

Highlight both process and content. She will re-send the Graz minutes

Intercultural Dialogue

The ICD group had suffered from a lack of continuity. This had proved very challenging and had limited progress. On the other hand the face to face meetings were very fruitful and engaging and had made a contribution to the topic. It would have been helpful to have had an expert to give more theory but all the methods how to teach/behave had generated valuable exchange of ideas. The definitions that have been developed are very useful.

Citizenship

The group has been very useful for group members; there has been a strong interest in the topic. Time was a factor as well as the development of an intellectual framework within which to work. A lesson is to have the expert input at the beginning to set the parameters for the discussions. The group members have showed much good will and creativity. The final report is not yet complete.

4. Website Resources

National Reports

KF will forward details of HU contact who might be able to supply a report. NO will edit RO to make it final and will edit the summary to be available at the end April

Glossary

This is based on Employability Sub-Groups work. It was accepted by the Group. The Sub-group glossaries will stay separate

Experts

The total number of experts is likely to remain at around 60

Case studies

It was agreed that NO would try to generate more from the national reports and would look at the content of SM's presentation. The Citizenship practice bank and conference workshops may also provide case studies. NO and MH to pursue.

Sustainability

The resource bank will stay as a complete resource after project end. It could be updated in a minimal way and also linked into any new work.

5. Administrative Update

See *Coordinator's report*.

The Group received the Coordinator's report. The following item was discussed:

Extension to Value Contract

It was agreed that an extension is desirable and that CS should formally contact the EACEA with a request. It was agreed that an exploitation meeting opens up potential for the future and would be very useful. This is an opportunity that is usually missing from projects. It was agreed that partners should be expected to provide ideas and research funding strands. A 3rd possibility for a time extension would be to commission a piece of work which added to the resources.

6. Evaluation and Quality

The Group reviewed the report from the external evaluator. The following comments were made:

- The report needs a bit more analysis and there should be a sense of general evaluation eg the lessons learned etc.
- Included comments should be anonymous – individuals are easily identifiable. References to countries and institutions should also be removed.
- The graph on page 8 (C2) looks as if only 2 completed and 3 did.
- On Page 7 – graph C1 is not useful – the comparison is not helpful.
- A lot of comments eg positive comments have been excluded. The report does not seem balanced and it does not provide a sense of the positive experiences generated by Value.
- There should be more reporting rather than just raw data.
- The final report needs to show the methodology

It was agreed that it would be helpful for PS to speak to people at the conference eg 2 volunteering and 2 university representatives. CS to offer to facilitate this.

7. Any Other Business

Meeting Dates:

Suggested dates for the next MG meeting were 19th and 20th in London. To be confirmed.
If the contract is extended – Graz was suggested as a venue (December 13-15)