



## Partner/Management Group Meeting Closed Session

Thursday/Friday 6-7 November 2008 \*  
Tallinn, EE

### MINUTES

#### Present:

Unison NW, UK	Frank Hont & Lynne Morris
University Liverpool, UK	Alison Hughes (co-ordinator) & Carol Stewart
University of Vaasa, FI	Jouko Havunen
	Aki Ojakangas, Jouko Reijonen, Sirpa
METALL Murikka, FI	Lähteenmäki
CGT, FR	René Bagorski
University of Versailles SQ, FR	Elena Poles, Sandrine Gihl
University of Primorska, SI	Klemen Sirok
Gh. Asachi Technical University of Iasi, RO	Gabriela Atanasiu, Milica Draguita
Sindic. Salar, RO	Stefan Grigoras
Kaunas University of Technology, LT	Aura Draksaitė
University of Tartu, EE	Ülle Kesli
External Evaluator	Kari Seppälä

\* Meeting convened over 2 days to accommodate the TULIP sessions open to EUCEN Conference delegates.

#### 1-4. Project Outcomes and Activities & Financial/admin matters

The co-ordinator gave an overview of activities to date (see also attached AJH PowerPoint presentation).

- Bibliography
- Websites
- Case Studies
- Learner descriptive Papers
- National reports
- Experts - that should include all of us – partners to send their details to the co-ordinator

It was agreed that the website contained good resources to date that would be enhanced next year with the addition of resources from some of the other partner languages and also ensuring that there continues to be material re university-based WLLL of direct relevance to the TUs and to their members.

The feedback from the editing/ resources piloting group meeting about changing the home page of the website was noted and would be implemented early in Year 2.

The co-ordinator asked all partners to complete all their financial/admin paperwork for Year 1 (including time sheets/personnel reports) by 23 November.

Partners to ensure their own website links to TULIP and report the link to AJH on the dissemination report.

### **Update from FI partners:**

The FI partners gave a Powerpoint presentation about their work to date on their Case Study and review of their collaborative work (the drama presentation for shop stewards) from the learners' perspective (attached). Lessons learned included the fact that the content needed to be very relevant to current issues of importance to the TU members.

The evaluation they carried out has incorporated the different perspectives of different stakeholders in the activity. An organised discussion afterwards captured good feedback.

The plan is to run the workshop again for a different constituency (15 owner-managers). And then the plan would be to combine both workers and employers in the same sessions.

The added value has been the development of new training methods (drama as LLL) and future development could be to review how to manage this form of learning when there may be very differing views in the audience (eg employers/workers).

They will also review issues of transferability of experience e.g. tips on what to do/what not to do (from both a practical and pedagogic perspective) when devising this type of learning activity.

### **Update from FR partners:**

The FR partners had two Powerpoint presentations (attached) about their collaborative work for the National Report and also their Case Study which is focusing on the role of Accreditation of Prior Learning (APL). This has brought about new collaboration between these two partners.

## **5. Discussion re Final Conference in Iasi**

See also co-ordinator Powerpoint slides re conference. The following was noted and agreed:

- draft timetable was accepted. The co-ordinator will update and circulate it to all partners after this meeting with details of some of the suggested speakers
- content – the majority of the time should be for workshops allowing for discussion and so fewer keynote speakers. A RO (Prof Brataniu) and DE (Manfred...) had been suggested as keynote speakers by partners and the FI – based Dr Olavi Manninen to lead a workshop. The Vice Rector of the University would open the conference at the evening opening welcome session. Partners agreed to continue to review and suggest attendees and workshop leaders.
- The questions at the round table session in EE could be used to frame some of the workshops in RO as well as workshops showcasing lessons learned from the network's Case Studies.
- In addition to partners being paid to attend, each partner country is able to have one place paid for by the project. It was noted that where possible we should endeavour to get as many TU members(learners) as possible to attend e.g. the UK will be using its place for that purpose and hopes to fund more than one learner to attend.
- the TULIP website will host all the conference details.

- the university in Iasi would provide a list of 2-3 suggested hotels (ranging prices €70-80) for delegates to book themselves.
- Cost of taxi transport to hotels from airport is about €5. If there are large numbers of people arriving at the same time the university *may* arrange some transport but it does not have to do this.
- The social programme is not part of the project and so the university should not feel obliged to offer anything. It may offer a half-day tour on the Friday afternoon or a full day on the Saturday but this would depend on interest shown. Payment for this would be made by delegates directly with Iasi in RO currency and not the project.
- Two air routes to Iasi are via Vienna and Bucharest.
- Thanks were expressed to Gabriela Atanasiu and her colleagues for all their work to date. The co-ordinator is working closely with them and Gabriela is using the working guidelines for the conference.

## 6. Interim report to the Commission

The co-ordinator will send the draft to all partners for comment before it is submitted to the Commission.

## 7. Network Evaluation and Future (Kari Seppälä, University of Turku)

The presentation (see attached) and resulting discussion noted that there had been a very good response rate for the first questionnaire. Responses indicated:

- good practice for working together in a project
- There was a clear impetus from the partners in wishing to engage in the TU/University LLL issues at European level.
- There was a willingness to 'learn from mistakes' and share what does not work as well as what does.
- There is a good deal of expertise amongst the partners – make sure we include this in the project e.g. make sure all of us are 'experts' listed on the website.
- The relationship between the project and partners' everyday work was considered important – make sure we inter-relate these
- Support for under-represented groups in employment was noted – this would need embedding in longer term targets for any future phases of the network
- Ensuring there are common plans and strategies with other networks is important
- Many partners felt there should be a phase 2 of the Network – and exploitation opportunities were being taken and should continue to be developed.

The external evaluator's interim report for us to send to the EC will reflect on the partner involvement in the project but not on the administrative aspect of this

## 8. Any other business

The co-ordinator asked for verbal feedback about the benefits of attaching this partner meeting to the EUCEN Conference and having sessions open for any conference delegates to attend. Feedback included:

It had been a good dissemination/exploitation opportunity and partners had been able to engage in some good discussion with external delegates over the 2 days.

Some had made contacts both in their own country and beyond that would be pursued afterwards.

It also allowed the TU sector to hear some of the EUCEN conference keynote speakers talk about the current state of ULLL across Europe and to engage with a European-wide ULLL network. Also feedback from Uni conference delegates had been that it was good to engage with the TU sector in informal discussions.

Although it was alongside the EUCEN conference the partners had to attend all the TULIP meetings and would have liked to attend some of the other workshops, although it was recognised that the project could only pay for them to work on the project. So it might be a good idea for any future co-ordination of another meeting like this to arrange for the project meeting to start a day earlier and then some partners could pay themselves if they wished to stay for the extra day to attend the conference.

It was noted though that this format should always provide sufficient time for just the partners to meet together.

TULIP/ajh12.2008