

REMO – 2nd partnership meeting

May 4th-5th 2015 / Varaždin, Croatia

MINUTES

List of Participants

Organisation:	Name:
P1; Auxilium (AT)	Georg Müllner Veronika Rechberger
P2; SystemCERT (AT)	Uwe Hackl
P3; Varaždinska županija (HR)	Larisa Križan Mirko Lukavečki
P4; TREBAG (HU)	Enikő Nagy Zsófia Schwikker
P5; Cramars (IT)	Sara Danelon
P6; SEC (RO)	Zsófia Pál
P7; GZS – CCI (SI)	Mojca Umek

Monday, May 4th – meeting day 1

10.30 Official welcome by hosts and project coordinator (Varaždinska županija / Auxilium)

§ Larisa and Georg welcome the project group and officially open the meeting.

10.45 Short report about the past project months – actual status quo of the REMO project (Veronika, Auxilium)

Presentation of status quo attached (Annex 1)

§ Veronika sums up the tasks fulfilled during the last six project months. No questions arise.

11.15 O1 /WP5 – Research study (Veronika, Auxilium)

Presentation of research study attached (Annex 2)

§ First results from the research study are presented, also including deductions for O2 the process descriptions and O3 the platform development.

§ Partners exchange their experiences made during the research phase. Research data collection was a challenge in all countries. In Italy, mobility activities are not much done and possibilities not much used. It appears abstract and not practical which makes it difficult for process descriptions as well. From the perspective of companies also the length of mobility actions matters. In Hungary, VET schools have been active as sending organisations for a long time already and are confident in their role. For companies the tradition of hosting VET learners is not established and they do not seem to be open for this. The Romanian situation is very similar to the Hungarian one, as hosting is almost non-existent except of in the capital city. Also in Croatia a lot of VET organisations are very active concerning mobility during traineeship within a programme. In Austria organisations are interested to send VET learners because of organisational and intercultural skills, not because of specific ones. Generally small companies do not send at all and huge companies have their own mobility system within the company.

§ To summarise it can be said that European quality and transparency instruments are hardly known which means that we need to be very precise and have readable and easily understandable process descriptions. In some way we also need to involve the instruments but the added value is not transparent for users as it is too complex. There needs to be transparency on what is meant by the titles in the VET system as it is not understood by especially companies. The strong focus in the process description must be given on before mobility actions for a high quality mobility stay in an easy understandable way. It will also be important to have a focus on the difference to other platforms and networks. How can we underline the importance of the regional aspect of the platform and network in a practical way? The different languages on the platform will be as well important to consider.

12.15 Lunch

13.15 O 2 / WP 6 – Process description development (Sara, Cramars / Uwe, SystemCERT)

Presentation of process description development (Annex 3) and future work plan (Annex 4) attached

- § Sara opens the session on the intellectual output two, the process description development with a national investigation done in Italy concerning national rules that need to be taken into account when it comes to the process steps for mobility actions. She highlights the importance of considering the national requirements when working on the REMO process descriptions. Also the Europemobility quality document should be used for the work on them.
- § Uwe presents the steps that need to be done to be able to precede towards ISO 9001 coherent process descriptions for the project. Important for the accomplishment of the task is a structured and step by step procedure by first working on the quality mobility charter, then including the ISO principles before adopting towards the ECVET principles as well including instruments and the finalising ISO 9001 coherence certificate.
- § In plenum the next tasks are discussed. Uwe takes notes on the flipchart, scratching a working plan within the second intellectual output until the next project meeting. Sara will create the discussed template for the gap analysis of the Mobility Charter to nowadays requirements and send it out to partners until the middle of May. All partners are then asked to have a look at all 10 principles out of their national perspective and provide Sara with the data until the end of June. Until the end of August, Cramars will define the 10 adopted principles on basis of the European Mobility Charter. Afterwards, Uwe will send out a template for the adoption to the ISO principles to partners in the middle of September, asking partners to fill it in based on their national perspective again within one month. On basis of those again adopted principles by SystemCERT, Auxilium will then work on including the ECVET principles.

15.15 Coffee break

15.30 Summary and end of day 1 (Georg, Auxilium)

15.45 Bilateral talks

- § The coordinating organisation Auxilium has individual talks to all partners of the consortium to discuss specific issues. Partners were also encouraged to have bilateral talks to each other concerning the upcoming cooperation and tasks.

17.30 City tour through Varaždin

19.00 Common dinner

Tuesday, May 5th – meeting day 2

09.30 WP 1 Contractual, financial and administrative issues (Georg, Auxilium)

- § Georg gives an overview of the first internal progress report. Some additional subjects are being addressed, discussed and clarified as well.
- § Dissemination is part of the management apart from concrete dissemination activities that are part of an intellectual output like it is for example the case for O1 Research Study as O1-A4 is Dissemination of survey results. Informing partners about outstanding working days for O1, Georg summarises that in addition to this activity, the translation of the executive summary is still open for O1. Also the time spent at project meetings is part of the management costs and cannot be declared in the time records for intellectual outputs.
- § The progress report will be prepared by P1 and needs to be submitted to the National Agency by the end of October. As the deadline is on 30.10.2015, Georg asks all partners to provide P1 with their progress reports by the 15th of October the latest. The National Agency has 60 days to check the progress report.

10.15 WP 3 Dissemination (Zsófia, SEC)

Presentation of REMO dissemination attached (Annex 5)

- § Zsófia gives a summary on the dissemination activities done so far by partners and the national dissemination plans with activities still planned during the project lifetime. It is again underlined that for the dissemination progress report due by the end of September, it is important that all partners include proof to their dissemination activities reported.
- § A Facebook dissemination plan involving the entire consortium is introduced. All partners are asked to send the email address they are registered with on Facebook to Zsófia in order to be added as admin to the REMO page already established.
- § Also the design of the bilingual leaflets and posters is presented. Partners are asked for the translation into their language to allow the finishing of the dissemination materials. Afterwards, partners are responsible for the printing and distribution connected to the REMO dissemination activities.

11.00 Coffee break

11.30 WP 2 Evaluation and quality assurance strategy (Uwe, SystemCERT)

Presentation of the quality management attached (Annex 6)

- § Uwe gives an overview of the first evaluation for the REMO project done by the external evaluator. Summarised it can be said that good scores were achieved throughout all issues.
Concerning the quality management handbook that was sent out, Uwe states that no changes or adoptions were asked for by the feedback of partners.

12.00 WP 4 Exploitation and sustainability (Georg, Auxilium)

Presentation of the legal structure table attached (Annex 7)

- § Georg presents the table for a matrix to allow a comparison of legal structures for founding associations in all countries. This will provide a basis to find the best solution to found and establish the REMO network. There is no need for an international body; it is also possible to found REMO as a national legal body with partners from abroad.
- § Partners are asked to check their national laws and fill in the table until the end of June.

12.00 O3 / WP 7 Platform development (Zsófia and Enikő, Trebag)

Presentation of a first draft of the criteria catalogue (Annex 8), table for platform requirements (Annex 9) and flipcharts of discussion (Annex 10) attached

- § Zsófia presents the first considerations in respect to the criteria catalogue for the REMO online platform features. A lot of issues need to be taken into account in the development process and decisions need to be made.
- § A table containing points regarding the user and technical requirements as well as the content of the platform is distributed to partners as basis for small group discussions of two or three people each. Enikő gathers the feedback from partners on the paper for the further proceeding of the criteria catalogue. In plenum, the different user profiles are discussed with Enikő taking notes on flipcharts.
- § After considering the summary of the meeting discussion, a draft version of the criteria catalogue will be send out to partners who then will be asked for feedback.

12.30 Lunch

14.00 Next project steps (Auxilium)

- § After consideration, it is agreed that the **next meeting** will take place from Tuesday, the **17th** until Wednesday, the **18th of November 2015** in **Tolmezzo, Italy**.
- § Veronika summarises the upcoming tasks.

To do list until Tolmezzo meeting (11/2015)

WP1: Project Management		
What?	Who?	Deadline
Variance analysis III, IV	P1	30/06, 30/09
Distribution of financial and administrative documents etc.	P1	30/09
Internal progress reports (content development and financial report)	all partners	15/10
Progress report	P1	30/10

WP2: Quality Assurance		
What	Who	Deadline
Distribution of peer group evaluation form II	P2	12/05
Return of at least one evaluation form per organisation	all partners	20/05
Peer group evaluation report II	P2	22/06
Interim quality report	P2	30/09

WP3: Dissemination		
What?	Who?	Deadline
Translation of dissemination materials sent to P6 (leaflet, poster)	all partners	12/05
Dissemination materials available in printable version in all partner languages	P6	30/05
Magazine Article I	P6	31/07
Dissemination of research study results	all partners	31/07
Dissemination report	P6 and all partners	30/09
Newsletter II	P1 and all partners	30/09

WP4: Exploitation and sustainability		
What?	Who?	Deadline
Send out template for REMO network	P1	08/05
Send filled in table with national possibilities to establish REMO network to P1	all partners	30/06

WP5: Research Study		
What?	Who?	Deadline
Draft of final research report and executive summary	P1	22/05
Feedback of partners on draft version of research report and executive summary	all partners	29/05
O1 Final research report in English and executive summary in all partner languages	P1 and all partners	05/06

WP6: Process Description Development		
What?	Who?	Deadline
Send out gap analysis template of 10 process descriptions	P5	15/05
Performing of gap analysis template of 10 process descriptions	all partners	30/06
Finish 10 revised process descriptions	P5	31/07
Send out ISO principles template	P2	11/09
Performing of ISO principles analysis	all partners	16/10
Finish process descriptions according to ISO principles	P2	30/10
Adoption of process descriptions to EC/VET standards	P1	30/11

WP7: Platform development		
What?	Who?	Deadline
Summary of meeting discussion on platform	P4	05/06
Feedback of partners on first draft version of platform structure document	all partners	20/06
Draft of platform structure document	P4	31/07

15.00 **Coffee break**

15.30 **Official closing of the meeting**