

Mid-Term Managing Meeting

(MT2M) Brussels, 23 & 24 January 2014



Connecting cities
Building successes



Venue : Social Platform
Square de Meeûs, 18
B-1050 Brussels

List of participants:

Pat Kussé	City of Antwerp
Tereza Dostolova	City of Usti Nad Labem
Truus Van Noort	City of The Hague
Jop Munneke	“ “ “
Meelis Kond	City of Tallin
Matthias Marschall	City of Munich
Anna L. Eriksson	City of Stockholm
Eva-Britt Leander	“ “ “
Irena Dimitrova	City of Sofia
Mariya Goncheva	“ “ “
Pilar del Amo	City of Gijon
Ulf Hägglund	Lead Expert
Celia Pouget	City of Nantes (Financial Officer)
Jean-Jacques Derrien	“ “ “ (LP)

Thursday 23rd January : 01.30 - 06.00 pm

Welcoming and wishes for new year ;-) at 1.30p.m by JJ Derrien :

- Meeting will be from 2 to 6p.m the 23rd and from 9 to 1p.m the 24th
- Participants 1 person per city (maxi 2) with priority to local coordinator
- Type of meeting: technical meeting
- All the participants are surprised by the absence of Catania without any news before the meeting

socialplatform

The Platform of European Social NGOs

Short presentation by the Head of the Social Platform by Pierre Baussand, Director :

- Network of European of Networks
- 47 members
- Social inclusion, equality, poverty, social services, access to employment
- Rules on competition; economy governance

What are our goals during the Mid-Term review process?

- **To adapt the process management:**
 - Links between local and network levels
 - How do you organize links between the two levels?
 - What could be improved at the network level to help?
 - Management of ULSG
 - How do you think you will organize the production of your LAP
 - Use of Urbact LSG and LAP (and/or other) Tools
- **To prepare mid-term-review report**
 - A tool to be used as a process reflection
 - An assessment of Work Packages - Concretely WP1, 2, 3, 4
 - A way to collect agreement between partners for the next step
 - A reprogramming exercise

Thursday 23rd January/ 02.00 - 06.00 pm

SWOT-Analysis/ Discussion about overall strengths, weaknesses and proposals for improvement:

1.1 Project management/ Strengths, weaknesses and proposals for improvement under work package 1

- **What do you consider the main strengths of the (global/ local) network related to work package 1?**
 - Well coordinated project
 - Well-prepared meetings
 - Good communication; immediate feedback of the project leader
 - Project Platform: inspiration for the local coordinator for organizing the ulsg / activities
 - sharing of information (summary of meetings)
 - More generally: a good occasion of learning from others at the European level
- **What do you consider the main weaknesses of the network related to work package 1?**
 - Financial management : it needs time to be reimbursed
 - Too little knowledge of financial reporting (URBACT-Presage) in the beginning for some partners especially about categories of expenses
 - Collaboration on local level/ Local project groups <=> language barriers (no translation forth and back)
- **What could be done better and how?**
 - Constant progress reporting
 - Request should be sent as early as possible
 - Adjustments on the platform are always possible (send them to Pat Kusse from Antwerp)
 - Development of LAP should be focussed by the lead expert closely with lead partner (mails, visits, also during TM); it needs clear updated information from partners
 - Some Urbact rules could be more simple

1.2 Transnational exchange and learning/ Strengths, weaknesses and proposals for improvement under work package 2



- **What do you consider the main strengths of the network related to work package 2?**
 - Learning from other approaches (good practices)
 - Getting feedback from partners: we need critical friends analysis
 - Involvement of ULSG-members => interesting ULSG-meetings (spin-off)
 - Involvement of (local) political level
 - Better understanding of each other's, i.e. European challenges
 - Bilateral meetings matrix; sharing/ exchanging information
 - Recognition of „tiny“ good practices (support)

- **What do you consider the main weaknesses of the network related to work package 2?**
 - Almost no updates in real life (PM platform not used by everyone)
 - Maybe too many „academic“ presentations
 - Other approaches can not always be transferred directly (different cultures)
 - Not always easy to involve parents in TM
 - What could be done better and how?
 - More time needed to discuss internal issues (target-orientation); 2 hours on the first day; maybe one hour before/ after the meeting (evening before) Steering committees will be now a bit longer during TM (2 hours instead of 1) and in 2 parts (1 hour the first day or the evening before as we 'll try during next TM in Antwerp about sharing management organization at local level – difficulties –needs of help – global coherency / 1hour the second day about global management of the network)

1.3 Impact on local policies and practices/ Strengths, weaknesses and proposals for improvement under work package 3

- **What do you consider the main strengths of the network related to work package 3?**
 - Exchange of good practices => stronger network at the local level and a bigger involvement of stakeholders
 - Boost to local policy makers on the Prevent topic
 - Sustainability/ Perspective after the end of the project and expectations of policy makers
 - Very detailed discussions possible
 - Participative way of work in the ULSG. People feel free to discuss.
 - Very important role of coordinator
 - In some cases ULSG will probably “survive “ 2015
 - The great use of Summer University (8 prevent partners have participated) but unequal about NTS
- **What do you consider the main weaknesses of the network related to work package 3?**
 - Involvement of (local) politicians sometimes difficult (benefit for them is not always clear)
 - ULSG is not a „formal“ group
- **What could be done better and how?**

1.4 Communication and dissemination/ Strengths, weaknesses and proposals for improvement under work package 4

- **What do you consider the main strengths of the network related to work package 4?**
 - Dissemination of information within the networks of the ULSG members
- **What do you consider the main weaknesses of the network related to work package 4?**
 - Topic is too „optional“; there is no obligation to have a clear communication plan at local level
 - To reach parents is difficult <=> difference of “language” between professionals and parents
- **What could be done better and how?**
 - Decision approved: each partner must participate for updating the website: information (and a picture) that can be put on the website should be produced by all the partners throughout 2014 (budget for translation)
 - Newsletter: the format cannot be changed but we can use information coming from partners. So please do !
 - and send to Gijon and Nantes; feedback to Nantes concerning the content (format is fixed)
 - Make use of social networks (Facebook/ Twitter badge on website) could be interesting to reach new people but it needs a good daily follow up. We also have to ask if we use social medias because we really think it's useful or because we feel obliged.
 - Hiring a journalist who carries out an interview or something similar

Friday 24th of January/ 09.00 - 13.00 am

9.10.30am.: How to produce our LAP's

Some general information from JJD...



- Something specific that makes the difference, which takes into account the local environment to find relevant ideas but also including what you learnt from your network
- Not too formal, pragmatic
- Not too ambitious, not too vague
Use scheme and frames to design your LAP landscape
- The involvement and use of Structural indicators – what, how, when?

...who gives the floor to Ulf Hägglund for sharing some recommendations about logical framework methods:

Part 1: Ulf intro:



Thinking:

Each LAP will/should be a RESULT of a collaborative, holistic and maybe also an innovative process – but is not (never) a straight trip from A to B, more like a roller coaster loosing our hats from time to time...

Ulf is an expert in this and likes the new kind of stakeholder approach which could be called : out of the box thinking.

Normally we start with a plan. Now: we form a group first and come up with a plan after. It's another way of thinking and arranging things. It's ok to say that 'we don't know yet what we're doing'. It's a work-in-progress.

Urbact has an aim to be an innovative process. It's important to keep in mind that innovation happens outside of the project. Urbact is very interested in challenging structures. We need to investigate into complex systems that we have, and the struggles of cities to cope with complex situation. This puts pressure on us to challenge the current methods.

In relation with the stakeholder approach, it is difficult to reach these stakeholders. We don't include these people so often at home. From Urbact point of view, it's a minimum demand to include new actors and don't focus on the normal stakeholders.

Important is to find what is not working still. Where are the gaps? We have a wide range to work in. From early school-goers to those in their final years. We have many stages to fill in. All cities may have different stages where they focus on. We can complement each other on this. We should not all do the same. LAP is about adding on to each other.

LAP can also propose ideas for projects in the future.

LAP is about: reconnection with partners at home, as well as making new ones. Think about what kind of people are in your ULSG? What mandate do members have in your network. Can they implement the changes you propose?

Combine top-down with bottom-up approaches. Where both meet is the area we operate in. It's important to bring decision-makers to meetings: then they start carrying projects themselves.

Good idea of Pat Kusse: start thinking on how to carry on with the partnership of the ULSG after the project finishes. Link your projects to current policy. Incorporate the two. Think of this already, don't wait until the end of the programme.

ULSG is an engine, it has to be fed by *motivation*. This motivation comes with possibilities to implement the ideas in practice.



Implementing the LAP in reality:

The objective is that the ideas and projects that come out of the ULSG and are presented in the LAP are actually implemented. Prevent is about improving local policies.

In reality projects may be lost 'in time and space' and can be forgotten. Up to us to keep it alive. Our task is to inform our decision-makers and keep them excited. Tip: sent invitations, keep decision-makers actively informed.

Funding:

Many ideas we come up with, as long as they go in line with new things we would like to develop, we might need more resources. We must think about this from an early stage onwards in the programme. create closer connections between the city and the Managing Authorities. Reducing early school leaving is one of the most important goals in the 2020 strategy . Keep this in mind when applying for European funding.

Be realistic!

Be realistic and realize that you cannot change problems through just your project. Think about what can be realized in a short time through one project with one project manager.

Content of LAP:

Content depends on the composition of the ULSG. Some can be narrow and focused on a specific issue, others more broad. LAP, in reality maybe RAP: Regional Action Plan. It could be important to take regional structures in mind. We can think in different levels. Take regional structures in mind. If you know some ideas cannot work, change your strategy in time

> J.J Derrien gives some general information and more practical details

1. LAP has to be a very co-creative process! Biggest mistake would be to jump into solutions before focusing on problems. Don't leave the situational analysis too quickly is important. But, it's also nearly impossible to try to build a LAP without starting from a particular point. So you have to present a draft idea to the ULSG to start with.

It has to be...

- Something specific that makes the difference, which takes into account the local environment to find relevant ideas but also including what you learnt from your network
- Not too formal, pragmatic
- Not too ambitious, not too vague
- Use scheme and frames to design your LAP landscape
- The involvement and use of Structural indicators – what, how, when?

2. You are very free in the format. But: it has to be easy to read and not too long.

> JJD proposes also an example of format which will probably be the one for Nantes: (Maximum of 20 pages with some schemes and pictures)

- 1) not too ambitious, not too vague
- 2) not too formal: use a pragmatism presentation
- 3) Including propositions closed to the next future
- 4) Having something specific that makes the difference

Front page (1 page)

Local context (maxi 2 pages)

Focus on the LAP: (maxi 6 pages)

- Link with PREVENT
- Overall Aim of the LAP
- Specific aims
- Added value of the Local Action Plan
- Actions undertaken
- Funding

Actions: (maxi 8 pages)

Presented by sector or type of action with a date of start and end and some details on how to get it or at least to start the process of realization

Conclusion (maxi 1 page)

Contact details (maxi 1 page)

Last page (1 page)

Part 2: Round table – all cities share their ideas and thoughts on their LAP processes:

- **Usti:** Absenteeism...? NGO involved, Tereza in charge, will start now...
- **Tallinn:** some drafts and discussions going on... adding level of parental involvement to the assessment of head teachers...
- **Stockholm:** have the action plan in their heads... next phase to take these thoughts to the ULSG – and to policy makers...
- **Antwerp:** Have an idea of seven actions; LAP compiled as a booklet /?/ on parental involvement presented for teachers and parents... SI's as a check list for future projects/future strategies...
IDEA: a relay in partner cities on a "Day of the parents", where schools and parents meet in workshops, training, idea generation etc

- **The Hague:** Early 2014 The Hague started with its brainstorm sessions, which should form the base for its Local Action Plan. We split the brainstorm sessions into three meetings, and use the Urbact methodology. The first session consisted of the construction of a problem tree, while the next two will focus on the production of a solution tree and a strategy. The first meeting was a success. Under the guidance of Chantal Olfers, senior policy advisor for the Municipality of Rotterdam and involved in the Urbact project Creative SPiN, we brainstormed the tree together in two hours. Afterwards, ULSG-members were enthusiastic and motivated to continue the LAP-production process. One important question that a LSG-member asked, however, was how to incorporate best practices taken from future Bilateral Meetings into the brainstorm sessions and, most importantly, into the final Local Action Plan. This we will take into consideration. The Local Support Group will come together shortly after The Hague's bilateral exchange in Stockholm. We can use this ULSG-meeting in early May to combine our new expertise taken from Stockholm with the earlier results of the brainstorm sessions.

- **Munich:** have some ideas; building a platform for good practice in parental involvement is one, bringing policy makers closer to the project is another...

- **Sofia:** a plan closely connected to national educational doc's... First idea was to solve local problems... swot-analysis on local level... monitoring, indicators important issues... a plan with an open structure... teacher training, performed by parental organisations... family contest on innovative ideas on parental involvement... focus has shifted from involving parents to involving families...



- **Gijon:** haven't really started yet... collecting input so far... training sessions for ULSG is about to start now... have produced a guide on local good practice that makes it easy to "fill gaps" with GP's from other cities...

- **Nantes:** After having considered and reflected on the issue regarding parental implication in the prevention of early school leave (Local Support Group 1) and having listed and evaluated actions undertaken, or to be undertaken concerning parental implication in Nantes (Local Support Group 2). Some experiences were selected in Nantes (10) and in Europe (6) in order to feed the reflection on the Local Action Plan (Local Support Group 3). The fourth session aimed to enrich, finalize and collectively validate the shared diagnosis (European and Nantes experiences) as a basis for reflection around the definition of the Local Action Plan and also to submit a guideline for the year 2014 (define priorities/ collect / organize / produce).

In January 2014, Nantes shared diagnosis was published. Five local support group meetings are planned in 2014. The first one (24th of February will be a "one day session " to organize a deep co-productive process.

- **Catania:** not present

When will be a good time to present a draft LAP?

- TM in Antwerp – March 2014
- Ulf will distribute some "instructions"!

10.30-11 a.m: Some words about Dissemination Plan

Keep in mind :

Challenge for the people involved in the project is the process of making the results and deliverables of a project available to the stakeholders and to the wider audience. It has to leave the project-level and be soaked up by broader society.

With what can we reach who? Is a good question to ask in the ULSG. Think about stakeholders and your means. Keep changing this also. Maybe some people could be involved who were not involved initially.

- **Content/ What?**
 - « It's the process of making the results and deliverables of a project available to the stakeholders and to the wider audience...»
 - Dissemination is essential for take-up (transfer, absorption...), and take-up is crucial for the success of the project and for the sustainability of outputs in the long term (moving from a good result to an innovative measure)
- **Stakeholders/ Who?**
 - "...anyone who has an interest in the project and/or will be affected by its outcomes..."
 - "...a stakeholder analysis is an exercise in which stakeholders are identified, listed, and assessed in term of their interest in the project and importance for its success, dissemination and sustainability..."
 - Identifying policy/ decision makers who have the mandate to do changes; connection to political level/ policy/ decision makers
 - Sustainability/ Combination of top-down and bottom-up process
- **Purpose/ Why?**
 - *Raising awareness* – let others know what you are doing
 - *Informing* – educate the community
 - *Engaging* – get input/ feedback from the community
 - *Promoting* – 'sell' your experiences, outputs and results and sharing ideas (even if „solutions“ can't be found immediately)
 - *Making sustainable* – ensure that the results will be sustained after the project (avoid/ be aware of parallel structures)
 - Double loop learning
 - What do we learn from other cities' best practices?! (content-orientation)
 - How do we handle results?! (process-orientation)
- **Strategy/ Message?**
 - To whom – the audience
 - Why – the purpose
 - How – the method (discussion; maybe invitation of PR experts?!)
 - When – the timing (policy makers!)
- **Methods/ How?**
 - Publications
 - Conferences
 - Events Collaborative workshops
 - Websites
 - E-mails
 - Blogs, Twitter ...
- **Format/ How?**
 - Make the dissemination process visible in the ULSG
 - Dissemination plan



All the partners will have to fill the following matrix and send it to LP before next TM in Antwerp for being presented to the all group.

Dissemination level	Who	What	How	When
Local/ Regional				
National				
Transnational				

Organisation of events:

In 2014, we have to organise at least (or take part to) two local events to present PREVENT. For instance Nantes will do it during the first semester through the presentation at the end of February of the "nantaïse (local) charter for educational success. During the second semester Nantes will use the construction of a Plan for education on territories in the city all the French municipalities have to. Report on this will have to be done in the progress reports for the next periods. But it could be nice to put on website/newsletter too. New map on the platform.

a.m: TM 4 and 5 on Policy Recommendations – process map

- What do we consider speaking of policy recommendations?
- How to visualise The Prevent process and results to make "policy recommendations" a natural and validated "effect"?

The idea is to make use of the Structural Indicators (SI) framework as an innovative driver towards Policy recommendations on how to engage and motivate parents to become co-actors in the prevention of Early school leaving. First level input we will get from the answers and comments Prevent cities will give on the SI checklist – namely a number of core and additional structural indicators that could, if addressed in cities, have a direct impact on policy as well as on practice. Answers and comments will be analysed by the Prevent expert team and the analysis then will be used as an input to discuss and further develop activities and strategies related to the use of SI "thinking and acting" – or more concrete, how to combine elements of action (short term) with elements of strategy (long term) – focussing a structural level. Cities will then hopefully have new material and ideas to work with in their LAP process between TM4 and TM5, so that TM5 in Munich could be managed as a SI review meeting, ending with a workshop concluding best and most important SI Policy Recommendations. If this works, we will be able to give some hopefully innovative examples of "action" and thus, some validated recommendations for policy and/or systemic change. No doubt, if we will succeed, Structural Indicators thinking could make a substantive reform contribution on the way society and schools involve parents in the prevention of Early school leaving!

So, the steps to Policy recommendations using Structural Indicators approach, as a framework would, in rough, be the following:

1. Cities fill in and deliver their answers and discussions on SI questionnaire
2. Expert team analyse them and extract joint themes and issues as input to the Antwerp workshop programme
3. TM Antwerp:
 - a. cities share and discuss their SI experiences from working with the SI check-list
 - b. workshops on SI input from experts (learning and creative exercises)
4. TM Munich:
 - a. workshops and joint analysis
 - b. finalizing the recommendation

Transnational meeting Antwerp : Date 13./14. March 2014



- pre-meeting of steering-committee one hour on 12th March 2014 evening (precise time tbc)
- first ideas of draft LAP will be shared
- presentation of Dissemination Plan

Day 1// Study/ inspiration day about „parental involvement“

- Workshop
- Group discussion
- Lunch with schools
- Parents from language group will be there
- „Market“ with different activities
- Lecture „The teacher can make a difference“
- Specific programme; 14.30 pm, congress center

Day 2// t.b.c.

Transnational meeting Munich : Date 02./03.06.2014 (Monday/ Tuesday)

- 2 hours on the first day; maybe one hour before/ after the meeting (evening before)
- Meeting including politicians (preparation of a concrete statement); official invitation for Tuesday (03 June 2014); names of politicians from partner cities will be sent asap to Munich for sending an official invitation (beginning of April) with a copy of a first statement approved in The Hague.
- Communication strategy (involvement of local press/ radio/ television; PR sub-department)

PlESE note:

This report will be part of the Mid Term review we have to produce in April jointed with all the questionnaires filled by partners about Workpages and a short synthesis of our Mid-Term process.

Dovetail with Progress Reporting



Reporting Re-programme for improved results



After TM in The Hague last November with Truus, see you soon in March in Antwerp with Pat!

