Kick-Off meeting Value   Lisbon 26-28/02/2018

Content

Co-funded by the
Erasmus+ Programme
of the European Union

1. Introduction and presentation partners

See overall ppt presentation, presented By Sandra Van der Mespel (VBJK)

Objectives Kick-off Meeting

- Get to know each other and create a solid basis for cooperation between us.
- Provide information on content, operational and financial aspects of the project.
- Set the basis for WP 2 (desk research), WP 4 (pilots) and WP 7 (dissemination and exploitation strategy) .
- Discuss challenges in implementing the project.
- Get to know ECEC policy and practice in Lisbon/Portugal

ESE – IPSantarém (Portugal)

See ppt presentation by Maria João Cardona

- https://siese.ipsantarem.pt/ese/si_main
- University College: 5 schools – 800 students - near Lisbon
- Important project for us to be able to work with assistants from the perspective of diversity. Example: students that are working as assistants and are in qualifying trajectories. A special admission year. But they do the internship in another institution.
- In our University college we try to connect initial ànd in-service training.
- We were already involved in other European Projects such as Toddler Project (Lifelong Learning)

Educational Research Institute (ERI) (Ljubljana, Slovenia)
See ppt presentation by Mateja Režek

- http://www.pei.si/pei_english.aspx
- CoRe - case study[1] – inspiring example, yet not mainstream. How to support core practitioners to ensure that they see the importance of assistants?
- Involved in several KA3 erasmus+ projects (e.g. Intesys)
- We work with professional portfolio's
- We support professionals how to work with children and families, we do not work directly with children and families.

DPU / Denmarks institut for Pædagogik, Aarhus University (Denmark)

See ppt presentation by Bente Jensen

- Experience in research on quality in ECEC and developing related CPD trajectories
- University College (Bachelor degree for pedagogues) will be involved as well.

---

[1] Vonta, T. (2016). Early childhood education and care staff with different qualifications in professional development processes. In M. Vandenbroeck, M. Urban, & J. Peeters (Eds.), *Pathways to professionalism in early childhood education* (pp. 72-86). London: Routledge.

Co-funded by the
Erasmus+ Programme
of the European Union

- To create a top down and bottom up approach. Local needs are upfront, but we will set some lines: for example 1) strengths instead of deficiencies of children 2) active learning instead of passive receiving 3) individual versus collective learning
- In CPD/learning lab you need min. 2 years. One year is too short → something to discuss in this project
- Special issue in European Journal of Education (Innovative approaches to Continuous Professional Development in Early Childhood Education and Care. A European perspective) is interesting source to think about CPD → http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/ejed.2018.53.issue-1/issuetoc

VBJK, Centre for Innovation in the Early Years (Promoter Value, Belgium)

See ppt presentation by Katrien Van Laere

- https://vbjk.be/en
- remark Alexandra: we recognize the problems of diversity in the Portuguese ECEC workforce – inflow of professionals from diverse backgrounds is a huge challenge – qualification requirements and labour agreements can make it hard – similar to work with male ECEC workers
- remark Bente: In order to do policy advocacy, we should think about the difference between the mission statements of our organisations and how this is coherent or not with the mission of policy makers!

Aga Khan Foundation (Portugal)

See ppt presentation and movie by Alexandra Marques

- http://www.akdn.org/our-agencies/aga-khan-foundation
- 50 years ago, founded by Aga Khan: to stimulate economic development, social development and culture for all people, improve quality of life
- Urban community development is something new for AKF, before especially in rural community development in other countries.

2. Discussion shared framework and concepts – Part I

See preparatory Discussion Text Value and ppt presentation, presented by Katrien Van Laere (VBJK)

We discuss the first part 'The existence of ECEC assistants as a current problemacy' and the first part 'Invisible ECEC workers'

- When we talk about invisible ECEC workers, do we include family day carers / childminders as well? In the case of Portugal, this is a liberal profession without any supervision. Each 5 years they have 5 hours training. They are the most invisible when it comes to the ECEC workforce and this is an important issue for AKF.
    - In the original plan this was not included as it was written from the perspective of the problematic relationship of core practitioners and assistants in ECEC groups or preschool classes. In Belgium we work on CPD of family day carers as well, but in different projects than these projects

Co-funded by the
Erasmus+ Programme
of the European Union

- o Including family day carers, could be interesting in this project if they are included in a CPD path that is organised in a team of ECEC workers of a centre or preschool (like in France or Germany)
- In the case of Portugal, we do not have statistics or detailed studies, but we recognize the problems addressed in the text. There is a difference between the private and the public system however. In Portugal, assistants have a professional recognised status in agreement with the union: they need to have a vocational qualification on level 4 of the EQF. Yet there is the danger of deprofessionalisation as ECEC providers tend to hire cheaper non qualified assistants.
- A few years ago many people lost their jobs in Slovenia and recruiting teaching assistants was a mean to combat unemployment. The reputation, perception and qualification requirements lowered over the last years. Teachers themselves have negative ideas about assistant as they see their existence as a threat to their job.
- We should make a difference between how long assistants stay ultimately in the workforce. In the case of Denmark many students become an assistant as a kind of sabbatical year between compulsory and higher education. They will not stay in this position. In Slovenia on the other hand they tend to stay in that job position for many years.
- This discussion brings us to the question, who are we talking about when we talk about 'assistants'? (e.g. box on page 2 of the text). For example in assistants besides teaching assistants , the ECEC workforce encompasses Roma assistants and special needs assistants. *Who exactly is assisting who for what reason and from which vision on child development and pedagogical approach?* Important to include these questions in the desk research?

3. Working Plan of Value

See overall ppt presentation, presented By Sandra Van der Mespel (VBJK)

This project is a Key Action 3 project under Erasmus+, meaning that policy influence is main output!!!

This is a Forward-Looking Cooperation Project, meaning a bottom-up approach in terms of policy development and innovation.

Questions/Reflections

- "Led and implemented by key stakeholders" – who are stakeholders? → all the different kind of stakeholders you want to address – also assistants, children and families themselves.
- Do we need to evaluate the impact – innovation and cooperation also on policy makers? Yes, How do you translate your input into policy actions is an important issue in reporting for EACEA → we need a dissemination plan that is clearly goal oriented
- Call priority 4: focus solely on 'unqualified' assistants – so we need to take this into account – what to do with 'low qualified' assistants (e.g. in Slovenia or in Portugal they have EQF 4 level)
- Ending period is august 2020 – not the best period to finish a project. We can ask for an extension of two months but without budget
- We can make use of the intermediate evaluation data of the pilot schools in order to make the interim report for EACEA in April 2019
- You need to archive until 5 years after the project → VBJK, promoter needs to have copies of these documents

Co-funded by the
Erasmus+ Programme
of the European Union

See documents Work packages and timeline

- We work with monitoring reports each 6 months: partners report on content progress AND budget/administration! The first moment will be in June 2018.
- It is not included in the original project, but maybe we should organise a final meeting linked to a conference. We have to see what will be still possible in the budget.
- To gather extra data from Portugal – a questionnaire: proposal support for example from Nima Sharmahd who wrote the NESET II report.
- Discussion on dates TOT
- Everybody needs to organise a stakeholdersgroup in their own country.

4. Administrative and financial arrangements

See overall ppt presentation, presented By Sandra Van der Mespel (VBJK)

Risk assessment – other risks?

- Will they evaluate the attempts to influence policy or will they evaluate the actual policy impact? – Question to check with Eugenio
- Possible 1 month strike in Denmark?

Reporting to EACEA

- Three payment periods

See document Financial Rules and how to prove costs

- We decide to all use the same time template. – and we will share an example from another project.
- What is the place of activities in the time template? Question to check with Eugenio
- What do they mean by proving salary/payment? Question to check with Eugenio
- What about personal data protection?

5. Presentation ECEC system in Portugal

Movie Aga Khan Foundation

See ppt presentation by Alexandra Marques

- Split system: 0-3 years: Ministry of Social Security / 3-6 years: Ministry of education. That doesn't mean we don't have providers under Ministry of social security responsible for preschools. In future educational guidelines will be developed for crèche. The crèche is in the law recognised as an educational service with a pedagogical approach (not only care)
- No public service in 0-3 years – state funds private non-profit organisations and for profit organisations (Freedom of choice in education is written in the constitution).
    - o Non-profit organisations: income related (min. 7 euro's per month – max. 280 euro's per month)/ 5 hours of educative time is paid by the state.
    - o For-profit organisations: if they have agreement with education: parents can pay special fee, and ministry pays for educational hours. More high income families.
- Three types of services are important to ensure equity in society:
    1. Early intervention system (joined responsibility health ministry, education ministry and social security ministry / free service / national service)

Co-funded by the
Erasmus+ Programme
of the European Union

2. Inclusive education (ministry of education, for all education starting from 3 until 17/18 : special teachers who work on inclusive education, together with regular teachers/ there is a link between early intervention system and inclusive education! / more staff and less children, also assistants, not necessary qualified or with access to CPD)

3. National commission (rights and protection of children in more at risk situations)

➔ In 2011 Portugal had the best results in the PISA studies on 'equity and reducing inequality'. We started from being a emigrating country to a immigrated country. ECEC are first entry points for many families. 100% of the 3,4, 5 years old in advantaged areas attends ECEC.

➔ However, still problem of having a high retention rate at the age of 7 (already difficult for Portuguese speaking children, let alone children who do not speak Portuguese as their home language). So the transition to primary school/first grade is crucial as there is a gap between the pedagogical approaches between preschool and primary school education. Other gap is the transition from the 4th to the 5 grade (9-11 year) and the 6th to 7 th grade (at the age of 13/14 – a lot of students drop out: 50% have an 'African' migration background)

• To work in ECEC you need an upper secondary education degree. You can enter university or polytechnics. For those who left school earlier and who are younger than 23 years, they can do an exam. Educators/teachers have a masters degree. First they have bachelor's degree in basic education and they decide whether they want to work with young children until 6 years or with older children in primary education.

• The shift to master is a recent shift. In 2000 majority of educators had a bachelor (66,6%) phd (0,5 %), master (32,9%). The majority of assistants (96,2%) had a secondary level degree, yet not always finished. Many of the older assistants don't have 6th or 9nd grade because it was not compulsory or they dropped out school.

• With exception to the youngest age group, the qualification requirements of crèche and preschool are the same.

• The initial training of educators /teachers is not preparing them enough for the school as the curriculum tend to be too academic and not enough practice based. They invest more in theoretical exact sciences and didactics in the detriment of pedagogy (how do children think, learn, create,...), a whole school approach and a contextual vision on how to work with families and communities.

• No exact numbers this year, but the share between educators and assistants is approx. 50-50% in ECEC workforce: of educators and non teachers. Especially in the crèche you will find more assistants (two per group). The number of non-qualified assistants is higher than the specially qualified assistants on level 4 – EQF.

• Problem of providers who hire the non-qualified assistants as their recruitment is cheaper.

• In the AKF ECEC centres we had the situation in the beginning that non-qualified older assistants , but with 18-20 years experience were employed. Gradually more younger qualified assistants are getting in the ECEC centers. AKF chooses to invest in all assistants. The non-qualified assistants are also aware of their responsibilities. When they do not perform well according to in-service training and peer to peer learning requirements, we need to evaluate. Non-qualified assistants can undergo an accreditation process of acquired competences and then obtain a level 4 – EQF. Some assistants study for a higher teachers' degree but face the problem that they in reality will be paid as assistants.

6. Visit ECEC centre - Centro Infantil Olivais Sul

See presentation Joana Sousa (AKF) – Pedagogy-in-participation and Contextual Professional Learning

See document: 'Pedagogy-in participation: childhood association educational perspective'

- Private / Non-profit centre managed by Aga Khan Foundation for children from 0 to 6 years old
- In crèche: 1 educator and two assistants. In preschool: 1 educator and 1 assistant.
- Per day one educator in preschool and crèche are present early in the morning and late in the afternoon.
- 5 direct hours and 2 non direct hours for every teacher – its according to law. / assistants only 2 hours per month. → this difference is the challenge how to address this? / they use sleeping time of children to prepare or discuss. /
- Importance of participatory approach with children and families
- Pedagogical Documentation as crucial tool to make thinking and doing visible: creating evidence that is dynamic and that helps you to think and perform change.
- This documentation is then used by trainers to work with educators and assistants. What is your reality? We try to find purposes and focuses – e.g. the way environments can be organised influence children's learning.
- Staff have a professional portfolio to document their professional development.
- Contextual professional learning is including all stakeholders, including assistants: We do some training sessions specifically for assistants. We also train the educators how they can train the assistants.

7. Discussion shared framework and concepts – Part II

See preparatory Discussion Text Value and ppt presentation, presented by Katrien Van Laere (VBJK)

We restart discussing from the first part 'The existence of ECEC assistants as a current problemacy' and the second part 'Education and Care Divide'

Education and care divide?

- In Slovenia and Denmark both assistants and teachers/educators/pedagogues are involved in moments of eating, caring, toileting,... In Slovenia, you can see some nice practices in which they share and negotiate on the pedagogical approach. But if you check some other individual practices in Slovenia, you will see more a divide. e.g. assistants will prepare the place, cut the fruit, the assistants sits in the background in circle time,...
- In Belgium and Portugal we see often that assistants have a disciplinary role for example in circle time or outside playtime. In Belgium the teacher will have a coffee break during outside play time. In Portugal the educator has to stay with the assistant.
- Slovenia and Denmark are both integrated systems. Can we conclude that the care – education divide is more present in split systems?
- In Portugal it is more complex, it is not just linked to having a split system. Care was always part of education / pedagogy. Both educators and assistants do caring moments. The educational intentionality is different. Educators are the leaders of thinking about learning and the learning environment. Yet, there are some problems with a technical approach of 'caring moments' (e.g. changing diapers) or problematising 'potty training' more in preschool. There is also a big difference between private and public services.
- It requires observation and (self-)reflection on the way of how we are doing things. When teachers and assistants do different things, we need to understand why. It also involves how practitioners identify themselves.

Co-funded by the
Erasmus+ Programme
of the European Union

- In Denmark we start more from an educare perspective, although we have many discussions on learning and playing. It is more a tradition and culture to understand the educators/pedagogues role as a teacher who is fundamentally caring as well.
- In Portugal the professional identity of educators in ECEC is more linked with care, wellbeing than in primary school. → "We are educators, not teachers" There is a strong belief and identity in preschool pedagogues.

Invisible diversity?

- In Slovenia, many assistants do not have migration background with the exception of language and roma assistants.
- In Portugal you will find more diversity amongst ECEC staff in public schools and preschool education as they have a system of recruiting unemployed people.
- Assistants sometimes know more of the home languages of the families which is interesting in order to make ECEC more accessible. Yet, if these processes are not well-thought of and taking into account the often invisible position of assistants, you can create weird situations in which the assistant actually represents and confirms the disconnection between ECEC and families (e.g. example in Belgium of the Turkish speaking assistant in a preschool or the Arabic speaking cook in a childcare centre)
  - → although it is not the direct goal in the project, this dimension needs to be taken into account in the selection of the pilot schools

Everybody agrees with the second part of the text on how we would like to counter those three problems.

8. Planning TOT and Desk Research

TRAINING OF THE TRAINERS

The TOT will be organised in Ghent to make it easier for the Slovenian partners to come and attend.

The TOT will take place the **22nd until the 25th May in Ghent (4 days training)** – please take into account the Monday the 21st of May as travel day to Ghent.

Budget foreseen for travel and subsistence:
- DPU: 2000 EUR (based on 2 participants); remark; if needed, budget to be shared with university college)
- Aga Khan Foundation: 1000 EUR (based on 1 participant)
- ESEIPS: 1000 EUR (based on 1 participant)
- ERI: 2000 EUR (based on 2 participants)

Based on the discussion of the first day, a proposal is made to shift the timing and working plan a bit so it is more feasible and meaningful. Initially we wanted to have the desk research asap as this would serve as input for the TOT.

The **programme** of the TOT will exist out of three parts:

1. Each country presents their draft country report made from the desk research.
2. Each partner presents an inspiring method, project or ways of working that could help supporting the pilot schools in facilitating interdisciplinary learning in ECEC teams. (e.g. Portugal: Contextual Professional Learning / Denmark: VIDA project /...)
3. Discussion on the common principles of CPD paths to develop for the pilot schools in all the countries.

DESK RESEARCH GUIDELINES

See final part from the preparatory Discussion Text Value, ppt presentation and template, presented by Mateja Režek (ERI)

PROPOSAL GUIDELINES DESK RESEARCH
PART 1 – The Existence of ECEC assistants as a current problemacy in your country

- **Information on ECEC system**: split versus integrated system?– Please Check SEEPRO: http://www.seepro.eu/English/Home.htm
- Check and if needed update the data in NESETII report on the **position of assistants**: is this still applicable for your country?
  http://nesetweb.eu/wp-content/uploads/2016/10/AR1_2016.pdf
  o Except for Portugal we have separate guidelines in document
- Do you have articles or reports on the **risk of deprofessionalisation** when emphasizing the position of low or non qualified assistants?
- How is the state of affair of the **conceptual 'educare' approach** in your ECEC split or integrated system? Is it related to the debate of increasing schoolification of the Early Years? Any publications or reports?
- Can you document the problem of **lack of diversity in your ECEC workforce**? Any articles, reports? Check SEEPRO:
  http://www.seepro.eu/English/Home.htm

Remark: these questions of part 1 could also be discussed with the stakeholders in each country. They can help gathering this information and at the same time you are discussing content and constructing a shared vision with stakeholders.

Co-funded by the
Erasmus+ Programme
of the European Union

PROPOSAL GUIDELINES DESK RESEARCH

PART 2 - Finding sustainable solutions in your country beyond the individual responsibility of assistants

- We are looking for studies/research/grey literature/methods/inspiring practices developed in your country on **interdisciplinary learning in ECEC centres**, taking into account the different qualification levels (for examples how do assistants and teachers can collaborate so holistic development of child is at the centre and all professionals feel valued and recognised?)

- In case you do not find a lot in the ECEC field in your own country, please search for the following:

  o studies/research/grey literature/methods/inspiring practices developed in your country on **interdisciplinary learning in social/educational fields**, taking into account the different qualification levels of professionals (so search beyond the ECEC field if not enough data present in your country)

  o In case you heard of other **inspiring practices or methods in other countries** that you think might be meaningful for this project, please add this information too to the desk research.

- We are looking for studies/research/grey literature/methods/inspiring practices developed in your country on **facilitating the (ethnic-cultural and SES) diversity of staff members in relation to ECEC**

In order to document certain relevant projects, studies or methodologies more in depth, the template that Mateja has developed can be used for this. So the country reports exist out of fluent texts in English that give an answer to the questions above. When needed or relevant, you can use the template to describe more in depth.

➔ Consequently everybody works on the desk research within their own country and presents a draft on the TOT. **A draft text will be send to Mateja two weeks in advance of the TOT.**

➔ Everybody thinks what could be useful input in order to train the other countries in how to set up a CPD path that is based on interdisciplinary working of ECEC staff. This can be a methodology or a project. **Everybody writes a 1 page proposal on what they would like to present on the TOT by using Mateja's template and sends it to Sandra and Katrien (VBJK) by 16 April**.

➔ New exact dates and deadlines will be send out shortly by Sandra (TOT) and Mateja (Desk Research). A calendar with alerts for deadlines will be added to google drive

Co-funded by the
Erasmus+ Programme
of the European Union

9. Selection Pilot Schools and Evaluation

See text and ppt presentation by Bente Jensen (DPU)

EVALUATION

Proposal of doing a quantitative and qualitative evaluation → this could be good to influence the policy makers, to have subjective experiences and some facts and figures!

Aim of the evaluation of the pilots: having insight in

- professional 'identity' - professional 'self-efficacy' of educators and assistants
- Collaboration between assistants and core professionals
- A shared and integrated pedagogical approach (educare)

Discussion: how to operationalize 'professional identity'?
There is a discussion on the term 'self-efficacy' – It comes from a rather behaviorist approach, Bandura. One of the advantages is that for the self-efficacy, questionnaires and scientific scales exist.

We gather what we would like to know in the evaluation and Bente will check whether this concords with self-efficacy or another term
→ Importance of self-esteem, action, ownership, well-being, identity, human agency, personal influence
Remark: there should be a scale for well-being as well for adults.

Discussion: focus of the evaluation throughout the CPD path
Is it useful to already evaluate the impact of the CPD path on the 3 central aspects of the CPD path (professional identity, collaboration and educare approach) in the midterm (around Febr 2019) of the CPD path in the pilotschools?
→ this is not useful. It is better to make the midterm evaluation a process evaluation.
Conclusion: the evaluation of the pilots will consist of 3 phases:

- Making a baseline at the start of the CPD path. This can be part of the first meeting with the team of the pilotschool.
- Midterm: process evaluation
- End of the CPD path: process and impact evaluation (what was the impact of the CPD path on the 3 central aims of the CPD path?).

PILOT SCHOOLS

Do the criteria work?

- Diversity is better term than just ethnic diversity
- Every partner checks whether in the ECEC centres there are some basic structural conditions (leadership) and motivation, willingness to learn present. There must be growth within one year possible on the three dimensions: professional identity, collective work, educare → they need to make progress in these items. Each country can decide what works best whether you will take a 'starting' ECEC centre or a rather developed centre when it comes to interdisciplinary learning and collaboration.

Co-funded by the
Erasmus+ Programme
of the European Union

10. Dissemination and Exploitation Strategy

Ppt Presentation by Vera Agreja Barracho, Margarida Santos, Rui Gouveia (Aga Khan Foundation)

LOGO

- Logo presented in different variations
- What are core words you like to see represented? collaboration, different perspectives, meaning, no right answer, …
- Feedback:
  - Strong logo! Beautiful Style
  - Colors represent emotions / black/white is sometimes huge contrast with colors / colors work better on laptop than beamer
  - The idea of speech balloons is nice, avoid that they look like golf sticks, is it possible to cross over the dialogues which symbolizes that the different perspectives also change each other and can create something new?
- The meaning of logo also grows with the time
- Ensure that it can be combined with logo European Commission. In most cases we probably use the black/white variation in order to match it? Know that also the Erasmus+ logo can be used in Black/white

WEBSITE

- We have to buy a domain, proposal: www.value.eu
- Homepage can change over time. Three main blocks, one of the blocks will become 'News'. The importance of one powerfull photo that represents project. Logo's of partners will be too much on homepage, but added on partners' section.
- Possibility to have different languages for the whole website (not parts of website) – Dutch language should be Dutch flague, not Belgian flague. Unfortunately we will not be able to also translate it in French.
- Option in the foot area: log in password → to have a project page – we will use this as a final archive page for the project

For the project we need three ways of storing documents and working areas

1. Final archive of documents / output deliverables (website project page) / also accessible for European Commission
2. Easy usable and free working station with shared documents that can preferably synchronize documents from your own computer (e.g. google drive or other proposal of shared working space)
3. Immediate news and communication between partners (e.g. slack)

NEWSLETTER

- Everybody invites partners/stakeholders to sign up for the newsletter on the website. If we don't have enough subscribers, you forward the news letter again and ask them to subscribe
- The original letter will be in English and then it is quite easy to translate in your own language
- Discussion on frequency: short newsletter every three months with many strong images and short texts versus longer newsletter twice a year. → conclusion frequency news letter: three times a year.

Co-funded by the
Erasmus+ Programme
of the European Union

- Frequency depends on the goal of the newsletter: informing and keeping policy makers, initial training institutions, professionals, childcare associations, stakeholders, ... in the loop
- Is their costs foreseen for the translation per country? No, that is the responsibility of each partner. A news letter should not be long in text anyway. Mateja is a bit concerned on how they will manage the translation of the content. But if it is not translated in Slovenian, it will have less impact on the national stakeholders.
- The cut in translation costs in the initial proposal, was for the final publication for policy makers. The main document will be in English but fact sheets with the main information of the project results will be translated in other languages.
- If the news letter needs to contain many professional images, each partner organisation has to make sure they can do this.

SOCIAL MEDIA

- Facebook page of the project: once a week we need a post! Can also be a repost or posts to present the partners and schools involved in the project.
- Every partner organisation sends their news and info to AKF.
- Again, importance of high quality pictures!
- It would be good if there is a common bank with pictures that everybody can use. these pictures can also be used for the final publication.
- Later on in the project, we will also make use of twitter as this is the channel mostly used by policy makers and opinion makers.

➔ **Vera, Margarida and Rui Gouveia (Aga Khan Foundation) will write a note on how to communicate in the Value project.** Feedback will be asked in the month of March.
➔ **Every partner thinks about who can be the focal point in your organisation, a person who has 5% time to accompany the communication of the project** (e.g. sending and uploading news, do the translations,…).

11. Back to Monitoring, Evaluation and reporting

See overall ppt presentation, presented by Sandra Van der Mespel (VBJK)

- Do we also have to incorporate how to successfully bring the results to others? We can document our intentions, but documenting the result is more complicated and maybe even impossible within the scope of this project. We can ask partners/stakeholders how they will work with it and try to document this as concrete as possible.
- We need to find a way of documenting with respect for personal data ➔ important question needs to be addressed to Eugenio
- By the end of the year 2018 ➔ VBJK sends guidelines for the intermediate report to EACEA.

12.   Closing the meeting

Some impressions / feedback?

"It was very good to clarify the project. Although we face a lot of work, we are very motivated and happy to be involved."

"The Kick-off meeting is often one of the most difficult meetings. Now we have still doubts and problems to deal with, but in a positive way. I can already see the beginnings of a new project after this Value project…"

"Next time we should discuss also the difference between collaboration, cooperation and co-creation."

" I look forward to the next meeting. The practical organisation was splendid with thanks to AKF. The managing style of the meeting was good in terms of finding a balance between being precise/structured/clear and being flexible in terms of giving the floor to everybody to contribute and discuss"

"Besides discussing practical organisation and deadlines, it was good to start discussing a shared vision on the project"

" Thank you for preparing a meeting which requires resilience to facilitate without really knowing one another. Until now, VBJK as promoter worked quite alone on the project. Hopefully you as promoter feel more accompanied by the other partners now to work together on the project. This was a good start of the project"

" We look forward to see each other again. Continuous communication between the partners and promoter by email and skype will be very important in this project besides the face to face meetings"

13.Participants Meeting

Name	Partner organisation	e-mail
Mateja Režek	Educational Research Institut, Slovenia	mateja.rezek1@guest.arnes.si
Petra Zgonec	Educational Research Institut, Slovenia	petrazgonec@gmail.com
Sandra Van der Mespel	VBJK, Centre For Innovation in the Early Years, Belgium	Sandra.vandermespel@vbjk.be
Katrien Van Laere	VBJK, Centre For Innovation in the Early Years, Belgium	Katrien.vanlaere@vbjk.be
Bente Jensen	DPU, Denmark	bj@edu.au.dk
Alexandra Marques	Aga Khan Foundation, Portugal	alexandra.marques@akdn.org
Maria João Cardona	ESE-IPSantarém	mjoao.cardona@ese.ipsantarem.pt
Marta Uva	ESE-IPSantarém	
Inês Machado	Aga Khan Foundation, Portugal	
Andreia Lima	Aga Khan Foundation, Portugal	
Joana Sousa	Aga Khan Foundation, Portugal	joanacatarinasousa@gmail.com
Prity Ranchordas	Aga Khan Foundation, Portugal	
Vera Agreja Barracho	Aga Khan Foundation, Portugal	
Margarida Santos	Aga Khan Foundation, Portugal	
Rui Gouveia	Aga Khan Foundation, Portugal	