



**Active Inclusion Steering Group Meeting
11-12 September 2014
Vilnius, Lithuania**

Attendees:

Phil Taylor, UK, Project Director
Craig Georgiou, NOMS (Chair)
Asta Jurgute, ESFA Lithuania
Carlo Franco, Regione Piemonte
Chris Holmes, NOMS
Christian Rabergh, Swedish ESF Council
Dries Van Gool, ESF Agentschap
Gianluca Calzolari, ISFOL
Giovanna Mangano, ISFOL
Heather Law, Birmingham City Council
Heather Reid, NIACRO
Helena Eklund, Swedish ESF Council
Ioan Durnescu, University of Bucharest
John Noble, ESF Northern Ireland
Kirsty Jacobs, NOMS
Koen Detemmerman, ESF Agentschap
Renata Sartauskaite, ESFA Lithuania
Rhianon Williams, Ministry of Justice, Bremen
Rita Festi, Open Consortium
Ulrich Wolff, ESF Hamburg
Vivette Wadey, NOMS (Minutes)

Apologies:

Aggeliki Stabouli, EPANODOS

Introduction: Povilas Cesonis – ESFA Lithuania

Povilas Cesonis, the Director of ESFA Lithuania, gave a short presentation on the work done by ESFA Lithuania. He explained that 21 per cent of those aged 20 years and above are unemployed in Lithuania and he hoped to gain and share interventions for disadvantaged groups across Europe from the Active Inclusion Learning Network. Povilas hoped the steering group meeting would prove productive on both ESF and European platforms.

Item 1: Opening and Updates

Craig Georgiou opened the meeting by thanking the hosts ESFA Lithuania for the use of their meeting room and all the refreshments and lunch provided.

Kirsty Jacobs was thanked for her hard work on the Active Inclusion project over the past ten months by all the steering group members.



Craig reported that all of the project's deliverables were on time and that it was a testament to all that this had been achieved. The Platform 1 events were very well attended and he gave his thanks to those partners who hosted and facilitated these events.

The Platform 2 events are due to be held in Brussels on 13-14 November, Rome on 4-5 December and Bremen at the end of January 2015. It was advised that the event in Bremen would most likely take place in the last week of January. Dates on the Tuesday and Wednesday, or Wednesday and Thursday were preferred by the steering group.

It was agreed that a representative from the European Commission should be invited to at least one of the PL2 events. Craig Georgiou explained that he is hoping to arrange a mid-term meeting with the Desk Officer and would mention attendance of representatives from the European Commission at the PL2 events then.

Action – Rhianon Williams to provide the exact dates for the Bremen PL2 event as soon as possible.

It was agreed that another research meeting would be held in April 2015 in London, before the final conference, in order to provide an opportunity for any final adjustments to the final report. Craig explained that there should be money in the budget for this research meeting however he would need agreement from the desk officer via a change request.

The final conference will be held at the end of May 2015 and would be hosted by ISFOL, Italy. Thanks were given to ISFOL for hosting the final conference and providing translation which has helped to save the project money. This money has moved to the platform 2 events to assist them in providing translation if required.

The need for timesheets to be completed by partners was discussed with regard to match funding.

Action – CG to email individually those partners who need to complete and return timesheets.

Action – CG to confirm to Giovanna how many languages the final report will be translated into, and how many languages the final conference will be translated into.

Action – KJ to send out interim report from CESI to all partners

Action – KJ to invite representatives from the European Commission to attend the PL2 events.

Item 2: State of play of research – Ioan Durnescu (Powerpoint)

Ioan Durnescu discussed the interim final report to date and explained that it includes the outcomes from the PL1 events and interviews with experts and the final report

would also include the outcomes from the PL2 events. He explained the conclusions of this report would be used to develop the key messages for ESF.

Questions and suggestions discussed amongst the steering group members regarding the final report included:

- Some states have introduced new things and new policies even though they may not be new in other countries – this could be important to mention in the final report?
- Social innovation – format evaluation? Support from outside
- Should there be a section about evaluation and how it can be done? Re-evaluation? Are interventions successful because of good evaluation tools?
- The report should link to other programmes in the EC
- Should an interim report be submitted to EC? CG explained that he is trying to arrange meeting with the Desk Officer from the EC and would update her on the progress of the Network then, so an interim research report doesn't need to be submitted.
- ESF- social inclusion is 20% of their budget – how can this be linked into the report? For example, all best practice from the Active Inclusion Network is being built into Northern Ireland applications
- It would be useful to have 'index cards' for ESF MA's so they can easily see the key points when introducing policy/interventions regarding social inclusion in their regions. Index cards could be put on the website or a geographical map could be used to access information about the interventions.
- Could a glossary/terminology be included with the report and/or on the website?
- Annexes with information about the interventions – should information about the interventions be put just on the website, or should a 2 page document per intervention be included in the annex of the final report. A concern was raised that the interim final report is already very long, so introducing annexes would risk people not reading the report due to its length.
- Perhaps a DVD/USB could be produced to show best practices.
- Can we link examples into the investments priorities

Item 3: Platform 2 Meetings

The structure and format of the Platform 2 meetings were discussed. It was explained that each event, apart from Disaffected Youth event, will consist of two separate workshops which will combine two sub-themes. It was then confirmed that the PL2 events would be held on the following dates:

- Troubled Families on 13-14 November, Brussels
- Disaffected Youth on 4-5 December, Rome
- Marginalised in Communities (last week of January, exact date TBC), Bremen

Kirsty Jacobs explained that the number of experts invited per workshop will match the number of interventions that are presenting, for example if there are 7 interventions presenting in one workshop there will be 7 additional experts attending. The representatives from the interventions will then form part of the expert panel once they have presented their work.

It was highlighted that the period from November to March may be difficult to get representatives from ESF MAs to attend as this is a very busy period. It was agreed that partners from the project could attend the events as ESF experts, and this role would be prioritised over them facilitating at an event.

The agenda of the events were discussed and it was agreed that the presentations should be shortened to 10 minutes in length, as the most interesting content would most likely arise from the Q&A session. It was also discussed that the agendas should be amended so that the Q&A session for each intervention will follow directly after their presentation. Allowing longer for questions and answers after each presentation would also allow for any interpretation and run over in time.

Finally, it was agreed that the pre-event documentation should be more comprehensive and the interventions be required to provide more detail about their project so as to counterbalance the presentations being made shorter. The background information about the interventions will then be circulated to all of the experts in advance of the event in order to provide them with more background knowledge about the interventions.

Action – KJ to amend the PL2 event agendas and re-circulate to the steering group for approval.

Pre-event documentation

Papers 3E (the written overview of the intervention) and 3F (the intervention presentation template) were discussed in great detail.

There was a discussion about whether the surveys that the interventions have already completed should be sent to them again so that they can update and improve on the information already provided. Or, whether they should be required to fill out an additional written overview document, with additional questions about their intervention, to provide more detailed information.

It was agreed that the interventions would be asked to fill out an additional written overview form, in addition to their survey previously completed. It was discussed that it was important to ensure that the written overview document only included the questions that were identified by the experts, at the PL1 events, as needing to be put to the interventions. It was agreed that the experts would then identify the specific questions to be asked to each intervention after reading the written description that will be sent to them prior to the event. The steering group took a detailed look at each of the questions asked in the written overview document and proposed amendments were suggested. Kirsty agreed to check what questions were raised by the experts at the PL1 events and ensure these are included.

It was agreed that the presentation template needed to be shortened by reducing the number of points to cover, in order to reduce the length of the presentation to 10 minutes. The detailed information would instead be captured in the written overview document.

Action – KJ to re-write the written overview document and presentation template.

The documents that would be sent to the experts prior to the event were agreed to be the following:

- Systematic review and executive summary of the interim final report
- The intervention's original survey
- Intervention written overview
- Guidance document / delegate pack

It was agreed that the original survey; intervention written overview and the guidance document/delegate pack would be highlighted as essential reading. The systematic review and executive summary of the interim final report would be highlighted as being additional reading only.

The invitation to experts for the PL2 events (Paper 3C) was agreed by the steering group.

The proposed list of experts to be invited to the PL2 events (Paper 3D) was discussed. It was agreed that priority would be given to inviting those experts who have not previously attended an Active Inclusion event, but ensuring there is a good mix of nationalities represented at each event. Kirsty Jacobs advised that we wanted to have 2 representatives from ESF MAs per workshop and she hadn't yet received nominations of ESF MA representatives to invite. It was important she received this information as soon as possible as the Troubled Families event would be taking place in just 8 weeks so invites would need to be sent out very shortly. Those partners from ESF MAs agreed that they could attend the events as ESF experts, if required. ,

Action – Steering Group members to send Kirsty the name and contact details of representatives from ESF MAs to invite to the PL2 events as soon as possible.

Action –VW to produce guidance for the experts and presenters on how to fill in the written overview document and presentation template so as to make it clear what information we require them to provide – e.g. you provided the survey but experts have asked for more information / comprehensive.

Action – KJ to check the PL1 reports to ensure these questions are incorporated into the written overview document.

Item 4: Website

Vivette Wadey advised that it was likely the Active Inclusion Learning Network website would be produced in-house, as this would be the most cost-effective option.

Concerns were expressed about the longevity of the site and who would maintain it. It was highlighted that it would be important for the website to have a long hosting licence – ideally at least 5 years – as it would be important that the findings from the Network can be accessed in the future, even when the Network has ended.

The contents of the website was discussed and it was suggested that items to be included on the website could be: index cards which will provide a short overview of the key information for each sub-theme group; a geographical map possibly, case studies (anonymised) and a directory of all PL2 best practices.

It was confirmed that work will be undertaken to develop the logo and branding of the Active Inclusion Network. It was suggested that the colour purple should not be used in the branding.

Action – VW to look into the hosting costs and longevity of the website

End of Day 1

Day 2 – 12 September

Item 5: Review of Day 1

Craig Georgiou provided an overview of the discussion from the first day of the meeting. He highlighted that as a result of the savings identified in the budget it was agreed to hold another research meeting in April 2015, in London, to agree any final points prior to the final conference including the final report, subject to agreement.

All steering group members agreed that the interim final report from loan looks very good and comprehensive.

Item 6: Final Conference

Craig Georgiou informed the steering group that ISFOL have kindly agreed to host the final conference in Rome. The conference will take place at the end of May 2015, and Giovanna Mangano will identify an exact date and circulate this to the steering group in the next few weeks.

Action – GM to identify an exact date for the final conference and circulate this to the steering group.

The budget is for 70 people to attend the conference, however as attendees from ESF MAs can fund themselves, and with local attendees needing to be invited, it is likely that the total number of attendees could be nearer to 100 people.

The length of the conference was discussed and Craig Georgiou advised that the budget currently allows for two nights hotel accommodation to be paid per delegate, making the conference one and a half days in length. The steering group agreed to the conference being one and a half days long, with a marketplace and registration event taking place in the afternoon prior to the conference, to maximise the networking opportunities and amount of information to be provided at the conference.

The group had a roundtable discussion of what should be included in the conference, Suggestions included:

- Findings from the final report
- Key note speaker – invite Commissioner from the EC to do this
- Having a member of the EC on a panel as an expert
- Looking at a similar network, the inwork conference, for ideas on how the conference should be organised
- Showcase case studies from projects as best practice
- Use short films to make it interactive
- Gain input from those that we invite to attend

- Have roundtable discussions
- Include a plenary in the morning, with the policy context clearly set out, and make the rest of the conference interactive
- Networking is important
- Disseminate the results of the network
- Include information about each sub-theme
- Include panel sessions – open forum about results – experts / academics / policy
- The structure should flow – original structure / findings / future
- Academics to look at EC Policy with a critical eye and then discuss what was found
- Sustainability / can policy change?
- Include session on How ESF would adopt it? / the findings from the Network? Must make it clear how the findings and suggestions for the future link to their programme
- Include workshops/exhibitions to break up the day
- TV playing a DVD in the breakout area of different interventions
- Networking with evening meal
- Day 2 evening networking to cover those staying two nights because of flight availability
- Show the steering group a list of participants before inviting

The size of the conference was discussed and there being a cost involved with inviting more attendees due to the need to increase the catering.

Action – GM to find out the maximum number of people they could host and communicate this to the steering group

Sending a save the date letter to ESF MAs / EC might be a way of generating their interest and identifying how many would be willing to pay to attend.

ESF Partners could identify five ESF members to attend and maybe only two or three would attend from each country.

Action – All steering group members to provide an essential and desirable list of attendees for the final conference so that a database can be built up.

Item 7: Any Other Business

Phil Taylor thanked everyone for their input and expressed how everything is flowing along and it was a productive meeting.

All thanked Kirsty Jacobs for her work during the ten months in NOMS and confirmed that she would be invited to the final conference.

Thanks were given to our hosts ESFA Lithuania for providing the meeting room and excellent lunch.

End of meeting