

VALUE Network Management Group Meeting

Tuesday 7th June 2011
Ankara, TR



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)

Apologies: Malgorzata Kolodziejczyk (BPU, PL)

In Attendance: Matthew Hill (IVR, UK)

It was agreed that the running order of the Agenda would be changed as indicated below.

1. Resources

Matthew Hill reported that resources have been reviewed by the RPG but no further formal meeting has taken place. Generally the resource base has grown and looks impressive although there are still some gaps. This can be emphasised at the Business Meeting and a request made for additional materials and links. More translated material would be useful – this can also be discussed.

NO reported that he will circulate a summary of the national reports. The only change to date in terms of individual reports is that the DE final version has now been added and the draft of RO report has become final. It was agreed that if we do not have a HU report it would not be a major problem as we have over-delivered in other areas. KS suggested that Susana Szabo may be able to help with a HU report - NO to approach to her to discuss. A formal deadline of the end August was agreed for finalisation of the resource base.

2. Evaluation

a) External Evaluation

The report supplied by Philipp Stemmer was reviewed. Philipp is unable to attend the business meeting but a shorter version will be made available for the partners. The following points were made about the report:

- There appear to be a few inaccuracies eg in the number of people reported as having answered individual questions.
- Direct quotes from comments that were included in questionnaire returns make it easy to identify people. It is preferable that comments remain completely anonymous.
- It would be helpful if the report could include fewer facts and more 2nd level analysis and qualitative impressions about, eg. What did we learn from the project? What would we do differently next time? What were the strategic outputs and spin-offs?
- It does not cover the resources.
- It would have been helpful for Philipp to speak to people in depth. CS reported that she had offered to set up interviews with partners at the conference but this was not taken up. It was agreed that this should be offered again. A conversation with MG members may also be useful.

CS agreed to review the interim report to identify any additional points that should be made in relation to the final evaluation report. CS will ask for the draft version of this for the next MG meeting in Graz.

b) Conference Evaluation

The importance of a good conference evaluation questionnaire was discussed and potential questions for inclusion suggested. These included: What did you take out of the conference? What has been the impact of your attendance? What was most important for you? Personally? Professionally? How useful was it as a networking event? Who should receive the Value publications?

It was agreed that CS would consult with METU about the best way to evaluate the TR experience and would send a draft questionnaire to the MG

3. Partner Budgets

CS reported that all partners would be contacted over the Summer about the submission of Year 3 timesheets. Now that it was clear who was able to attend the Conference, final balances on individual partner budgets were becoming more clear. After the Ankara conference the main partner expense would be travel and subsistence for the London exploitation meeting.

4. Workplan to December 2011

a) Management Group in Graz

The arrangements were confirmed: travel Monday 19th September, meet full day Tuesday 20th, travel home Wednesday. Information about accommodation will be circulated.

b) Exploitation Meeting

This was confirmed as a full day on November 9th in London – to finish by 16.00. If possible, the MG will meet for a short time late afternoon/early evening on 8th.

To date all members of the MG and InHolland University have expressed interest

Partners will be informed again that the UoL is not intending to submit a bid for a phase 2 of Value and that they need to come to the meeting with ideas and proposals.

Arrangements, including hotel recommendations, will be circulated by email to all partners.

c) Publications

It was agreed that the final publications for Value should comprise: the conference proceedings (hard copy and on a CD), the summary of the national reports, some kind of summary of the sub-groups reports. There was a lot of discussion about the form the sub-group summaries should take as they are all different in their approach. It was agreed that the MG should reflect in this and discuss at the next meeting.

5. Value Conference

The Group reviewed practical arrangements for the conference programme session by session. The following points were confirmed/discussed:

- Translation will be only EN to TR. It will be simultaneous in the plenary sessions and informal by NY, EY and helpers in the workshops
- Guidance has been sent to session chairs and workshop leaders. Timing is important so as to keep on schedule.
- The MG should be ready to ask questions at the end of the plenary sessions if they do not come forward from other delegates
- Delegates will be asked to nominate their workshop preferences via sign-up sheet at the registration desk. If there are large numbers in any one workshop we may ask partners and MG to change their preference. The room for the Older Learners workshop may change if there are v high numbers
- AH will provide “housekeeping” information at the beginning of each day.
- The World Cafe: the arrangements were explained; the venue will require some setting up to accommodate all the delegates. It was suggested that all table hosts meet Sue Cross over lunch to confirm the approach
- It was agreed that the MG would be available in the Dedeman lobby 17.00-18.30 to meet delegates.
- Delegates would be welcome to join the MG for dinner at 7.15 on Tuesday. Wednesday would be the conference dinner and Thursday a free choice.

The Management Group then visited the conference meeting rooms to review layouts, sign requirements, catering arrangements etc.