

VALUE Network Management Group Meeting

Tuesday 20th September 2011
Graz, AT



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)

1. The minutes of the 2 previous meetings were accepted

2. Review of Conference

a) Feedback

The group reviewed the feedback from conference delegates. It was agreed that overall this was very positive. A few key points had emerged from the comments:

- Turkey was seen as a very good choice as a host country. Delegates commented that they had learnt a lot from visiting the country and networking with Turkish delegates. It was also felt to have been a good choice given Turkey's current emerging dialogue and relationship with the EU. There had been very good input from TR partners – their role was critical. AW reported that the EUCEN Steering Committee has decided to recommend (to the membership) that TR universities are offered full membership (The MG noted that use of a university as both facilitator and venue for cross-sectoral dialogue could be a model of working: universities have a capacity that the voluntary sector does not necessarily have).
- The inter-sectoral platform was much appreciated. By bringing together 2 sectors which generally do not meet in formal networking situations, the conference raised awareness and stimulated ideas for new projects and initiatives. Feedback included concrete examples of this.
- The World Cafe feedback was very good and some respondents noted that they would use it in their future practice.

Generally it was agreed that the discussions had impacted on people's thinking and had opened up important networking opportunities. It was noted that not all partners had returned feedback but that the number of returns from non partners had been high.

CS reported that Nuray had not been able to get any feedback from the TR CEC network and agreed to ask her to follow up at the next meeting of the CECs. Even informal feedback would be very valuable. CS also agreed to;

- ask Mr Bilgen and Professor Vural for feedback
- to send comments to partners and to the Evaluator
- to draw out key points for the final report (anonymised comments)
- Put some quotes in the proceedings if possible
- To include a methodology in the consolidated feedback papers

b) World Cafe Outcomes

It was agreed that Sue Cross's introductory paper required some explanation as to its purpose. It would also be helpful to include an introduction that covered information such as: the rationale for the

session, names of the table hosts, names of moderators, how participants were prepared, how the summaries were put together, the purpose of the feedback forms.

It would be useful to stress the diverse nature of participants who had different levels understanding ie lots of invited speakers / participants working alongside partners who have been talking together for 3 years. It was also agreed that, as far as possible the raw data should stand as it is – we cannot put to many layers of interpretation on to it.

CS agreed to:

- send the question summaries to the London meeting participants.
- to bold sections in the question summaries to highlight key points.

The group discussed the need to avoid losing the richness of the materials generated and the following suggestions were made:

- to distribute publications in the final EYV Warsaw in December. John McDonald is the contact. CS to approach him to ask if we can ask how we can do this. Daniella Bosioc is an alternative possibility. Value could offer to run a workshop.
- to distribute to all projects in EYV compendium, ULLL networks and Grundtvig Agencies in partner countries
- As a speaker, NO can distribute materials at the PL Grundtvig Agency event in November

2. **Exploitation Meeting**

a) Structure of the Meeting

CS reported on the likely attendance at the meeting – it is roughly 50-50 VOs and Universities.

Logistics: the MG will meet informally at 17.00; NO will advise on a dinner venue for all partners arriving that evening; CS & AH will be available on the morning of 10th if partners have any questions

The structure of the days was discussed and it was agreed that:

- We need to allow discussion of different projects – not just one. This means breaking into groups. What structure would allow this?
- We should allow time for consideration of the wider networking issues. This could be assisted by pulling out key items of feedback eg the small differences that have been created by the project.
- We need to make best use of time as we only have 1 day together. This is a unique chance to discuss things face to face.
- We need to manage expectations eg turning up will not guarantee participation in a future project, although it would be possible to offer some partners more limited roles eg as associate partners coming to a final event.
- It is important to be aware of funding constraints and of the key priorities for the various funding schemes. These may not fit neatly into our interests.

It was agreed that in advance of the meeting participants would be asked to consider the following issues:

- The conditions under which they would be involved in a project eg as coordinator, as a partner, the role they would play
- The project idea and the associated timeline
- The funding sources and how the priorities fit the project theme.

- The kind of partners required (universities/VOs). If cross-sectoral - what is wanted from other sector?

Those who have submitted project ideas will be asked to address these issues in a presentation to the meeting. The information received to date will also be circulated in advance.

The structure of the day will be:

- am: Introductory discussion focusing on wider networking issues
 Individual presentations of project ideas
 Questions/Clarifications
- pm: Open discussion - at lunch time we ask people to indicate any specific interests in order to
 best structure the afternoon eg small group discussions.
 Next steps

It was agreed to include a dissemination discussion in this meeting and to record this.

b) Project Suggestions

Members of the MG outlined their specific interests:

- UoL (AH) would consider coordination of a small project. However, like other universities it does not want to just carry out a service function so the administrative load would need to be limited
- The UoG would want a project to i) focus on older learners, ii) produce something very concrete probably for volunteers themselves. On behalf of EUCEN, AW reported that it has limited capacity and has to focus on strategic issues. It cannot restrict collaboration to one sector although it is important. There are other sectors that could be seen as equally important.
- IVR would be very interested in work on volunteer managers (volunteers managing volunteers) This is under-researched. Additionally work on older volunteers would be useful. There is a huge amount on young volunteers but there is a gap in information about older people. Even if this topic is not mentioned in the priorities the work would be an asset as it is still on the agenda - even more so in coming years.
- CSV would be interested in solving the problem of developing understanding across sectors. Often VOs have to educate stakeholders in other sectors eg university professionals or public officials. What are the issues/problems for the voluntary sector? There would also be interest in some kind of helpdesk or expert access point. This would feed into analysis of current and past projects which are relevant to the Value theme. Another interest is the motivation of volunteers - this links to learning pathways/stories and triggers for involvement in volunteering.

Other project possibilities that were discussed included:

- Mapping of current volunteer training programmes (as suggested by Sabine Remdisch). However this might need a lot of partners to be representative across Europe. Perhaps a sectoral approach would be easier.
- The development of a "European" course: development of curriculum – piloting – training trainers – evaluation – refinement. This touches on accreditation issues.
- AW reported that the University of Innsbruck could be a partner.

3. Publications

CS explained the plan for the final Value publications (see the written report). The following comments were made:

a) Conference Proceedings

- We need to show the separate character of the 2 workshops that were designed for the TR network. (B1 & 2)
- The abstracts of B1 & B2 workshops should be included
- TR Grundtvig Agency web link should be added to abstract B1
- The delegate list all should include the names of all who registered
- The publication should finish with a list of partners, websites etc.

b) Summary of National Reports

- NO thanked those who had made comments
- He will add in the HU information once the report is received
- The length of the report will fit reasonably onto the proposed format.
- We will also make a single pdf document with the summary and all the reports. This will include an introductory explanation and information about relevant references and language formats. It will be only in EN

c) Sub-group Reports

- The methodology for the sub-groups should be included. This could be based on the initial introductory sub-group information sheet. This is also a general point for the final report to the EC where we need to show that we have considered the methodology and the creation of a learning environment
- The introduction also should explain the mixed sector groupings
- CS to send an indication of the no. words required for the summaries

Translation:

- The designer will produce a document with header and footer that people can use to print off the translated versions. These will be sent back to go on the website.
- For DE we will ask Sonia Moissidis.
- The deadline for translation should be the London meeting
- The fees available should be clear – these will be based on the LLP maximum salary scales
- External translators can be used where agreed with CS

4. **Evaluation Report**

CS reported that she had not received the evaluation report by the specified date (5th September)

It was agreed:

- very disappointing not to receive the report as a) the Graz meeting was the last formal opportunity to discuss the document and b) the date for submission of the report was agreed in Ankara.
- that a 2 week extension could be granted as A 4 week extension would take us beyond the end of the period of the contract between zze and the University of Liverpool

4. **Any Other Business**

AW and KF reported on the conference of volunteering organisations taking place in Gorizia, IT. AW will join the expert panel at the close of the event. This is an output from Value.