

## Management Group Meeting MINUTES

Tuesday 22 September 2009 9.00-17.00  
Tampere, FI

### Present:

Unison NW, UK	Frank Hont & Lynne Morris
University Liverpool, UK Evaluator	Alison Hughes (co-ordinator) & Carol Stewart
Arbeit und Leben, DE	Kari Seppälä
University of Vaasa, FI	Bernd Bischoff
METALL Murikka, FI	Ville Tuomi
CGT, FR	Aki Ojakangas, Jouko Reijonen,
University of Versailles SQ, FR	René Bagorski
University of Primorska, SI	Alain Nicolas, Francis Rogard, Elena Poles,
Gh. Asachi Technical University of Iasi, RO	Klemen Sirok, Valentina Franca
EUCEN	Mihai Zaharia
	Oliver Janoschka

### 1. Overview of the Partner Conference and preparation of Conference Proceedings

- Partners are sending in their dissemination reports regarding the conference.
- Proceedings will be produced (both print and electronic versions) and circulated to partners to disseminate. Copies will be taken to the EUCEN Conference in SE in November.
- Thanks was expressed to Gabriela Atanasiu and her colleagues, especially Milica Dragulita for hosting the conference so well.
- Thanks was expressed to those who brought TU delegates to the conference. The SI TU is interested in continuing the dialogue with our SI Uni partner.
- One output as a result of the conference was an article written jointly for the Slovenian Association of Work Councils by Valentina Franca and Barbara Filipova, which is on the TULIP website under 'other resources' in SI and is being translated into ENG also.
- It was noted that the conference gave all partners time to go deeper into the findings of the national reports and case studies

### 2. Final report to the Commission

MG was asked to suggest any items to go in the report. It will be circulated to all partners for their comment before it is sent to the EC.

### 3. Financial and administrative details

#### Contractor and Project Co-ordinator reported

- A detailed review of finances will be made after all Tampere travel reports have been submitted. It is possible that there will be some money left from the travel and other budget headings and if so the project may be able to pay partners for some extra staff time associated with conference preparation for example.

- Additional delegates funded for Iasi Conference – the costs of travel/subsistence for these additionally funded delegates has largely been on-budget
- Time sheets for Year 2 are due soon from partners – co-ordinator to advise on this in due course.

#### **4. Project outcomes and activities**

##### **MG reviewed materials produced on website to date:**

- Bibliography and Websites links
- Case Studies and Learner Descriptive Papers
- National reports
- Experts
- Dissemination and exploitation reports
- Translation of materials – co-ordinator reminded MG that if they wished to translate some materials currently on the website they should contact the co-ordinator.
- An additional resource was suggested – a short document in English providing an overview from each partner of one or two points that summarise findings from their work in the project. It was agreed that all partners would email to the co-ordinator a short paragraph in English which sums up 1 or 2 key findings about the national scene of TU and ULLL engagement, arising from their work in the project. It would then be edited for consistency and will go on the website. It can be translated by the partners into their own language if they wish. This could also be developed as a longer document for Phase 2 of TULIP.  
Co-ordinator to email all partners re this.

#### **5. Presentation by Murikka**

Aki Ojakangas gave a short presentation about the role of Murikka in the METALL Trade Union. One of the points made was that 1/3 of the students who attend courses there are less than 30 years old and this raises the issue of how to meet the different pedagogic needs of engaging youth in the TU movement and LLL

#### **6. External evaluation – Kari Seppälä**

Presentation attached. 13 responses to the questionnaire had been received.

Key points noted were:

- The motivations for working on the project have changed little since the first questionnaire
- Professional benefits tie into this well and also identified challenges that lie ahead
- Ways of learning in the project were identified as including discussion with other partners and also the research/ writing of materials for the web-based resource.
- Contact with other networks was mentioned by most partners
- TULIP concretely helped partners establish links between TUs and Unis. Unis felt better at being able to listen to client needs after the project. Important to stress this point to the EC.
- It also concretely strengthened links between partners – made them contact each other and work together. Shared responsibility in producing some of the materials helped. Important for us to stress the bridging of the sectors – not just one sector talking to colleagues within same sector.
- TULIP is being used within partners own countries e.g. the FI ULLL strategy was helped by the project work.
- Staff development involving other colleagues is a strong point for the project. Also the partners visiting each other's premises

- Answers noted a link to other topics within networks eg NQF, ageing, intergenerational solidarity
- Most useful resources – all found something useful – and the overall picture maps to all the project outcomes
- Not so useful resources –main comment that more time was needed for discussion – ie longer time when we meet together
- Might have been useful resources – one person had suggested possibly provision of a political and theoretical background to the subject. It was noted that this could be included in Phase 2.
- Unexpected outcomes – nothing particular – but see some useful comments in the presentation.

## **7. Future of the Network – small group discussion**

The discussion paper from the Conference about the future of the network had been considered by the MG. The Co-ordinator made a short presentation about suggested possible developments as Phase 2. The MG then divided into TU and Uni partners and the 2 groups had extensive discussion about the future of the network, including the following areas:

- Structure /roles of existing partners in potential future project
- Process of future activities
- Content of future activities e.g. themes
- Potential future resources

They then fed back their ideas and discussion to the whole MG, which included:

- Working task groups a good idea – enables focused deeper activity – which does not have to be the same for all groups e.g. some may be more practical- resources based and another may be more research focused.
- The 4 themes are useful as a starting point but also the need to reflect the current debate about issues such as the current economic crisis and its implications for future learning needs and the need for better citizens; EQF, APEL, informal learning, access and qualifications and the pedagogy associated with this. Not all themes have to be equally relevant to all partners.
- It would be helpful to develop some practical resources that TUs can use in preparing their members to access and use ULLL along their professional individualised pathway
- Need to widen the geographical spread of the network and gain an overview of the national scene of new partner countries
- Transferability of findings and resources/tools to newer member states where TU-ULLL interaction is in some cases less developed
- Some deeper research into theoretical/ political national contexts for TU and ULLL interaction
- Need to expand the engagement with the wider stakeholder base – e.g. through inviting them to observe, engage in study visits, a conference etc – whilst maintaining the TU- Uni axis as the main focus. Not all partner countries would have to engage with these additional stakeholders in the same way.
- National ambassador roles a good idea.

## **8. Any other business - none**