

Course Compendium



Learning Outcome of Amateur Culture

This Course Compendium is part of the Grundtvig Multilateral development project entitled "LOAC - Learning Outcome of Amateur Culture", which a group of European organisations of amateur art and voluntary culture has completed in the period 2009 - 2011 with support from the European Commission's programme for lifelong learning.

The overall aim of the project has been to substantiate a humanistic learning perspective on amateur art and voluntary culture.

The aim of this Course Compendium is to present the programme, evaluations and recommendations of the pilot Grundtvig in-service Training Course and the pilot Grundtvig Workshop, which the project team completed 29 May - 3 June 2011 in Ljubljana, Slovenia with JSKD as host organisation.

We hope other actives with an interest in cross-border mobility in the area of amateur art and voluntary culture in the European civil society can benefit from the results of these pilot courses.

Course Compendium

Hans Jørgen Vodsgaard
Bente von Schindel



Learning Outcome of Amateur Culture

**Hans Jørgen Vodsgaard
and Bente von Schindel**

**Course Compendium on
Learning Outcome of Amateur Culture**

Interfolks Forlag 

Colophon

Course Compendium on Learning Outcome of Amateur Culture

© 2011, Hans Jørgen Vodsgaard, Bente von Schindel and the LOAC project consortium

All rights reserved. The book may be quoted with source reference.

Publisher: Interfolks Forlag

Cover: Signe Thur and Bente von Schindel

Layout: Signe Thur and Interfolks Forlag

Print: Huset, Aarhus

1st edition, 2011

ISBN 978-87-992776-4-3

The book can be purchased by contacting

Interfolks Forlag

Skovgade 25, DK-5500 Middelfart

(+45) 51 300 320 * info@interfolk.dk * www.interfolk.dk

This publication has been developed in the framework of the Grundtvig project:

LOAC – Learning Outcome of Amateur Culture (502283-LLP-1-DK-Grundtvig-GMP).

The website of the LOAC project: www.interfolk.dk/loac

The project has been funded with support from the European Commission.



Education and Culture DG

Lifelong Learning Programme

This publication reflects the views only of the authors, and the Commission cannot be held responsible for any use which may be made of the information contained therein.

Content

PREFACE	5
1. PRESENTATION OF THE PROJECT.....	7
1.1 THE PROJECT CONSORTIUM	7
1.2 OUTLINE OF THE PROJECT CONCEPT.....	8
2. THE PILOT GRUNDTVIG COURSE	10
2.1 COURSE PROVIDER.....	10
2.2 TARGET AUDIENCE	10
2.3 CONTENT OF THE COURSE	11
2.4 THE PROGRAMME DAY BY DAY	12
2.5 PRACTICAL INFORMATION	14
3. THE PILOT GRUNDTVIG WORKSHOP	15
3.1 COURSE PROVIDER.....	15
3.2 TARGET AUDIENCE	15
3.3 CONTENT OF THE WORKSHOP	16
3.4 THE PROGRAMME DAY BY DAY	17
3.5 PRACTICAL INFORMATION	19
4. EVALUATIONS	20
4.1 THE EVALUATION QUESTIONNAIRE	20
4.2 INTERVIEWS	42
4.3 EVALUATIONS AND AWARD CRITERIA	53
5. RECOMMENDATIONS	57
5.1 COMPARISON OF IST-COURSES AND WORKSHOPS.....	57
5.2 RECOMMENDATIONS IN GENERAL	62
5.3 THE GINGO POSITION	64
LINKS AND ANNEXES	71

Preface

This Course Compendium is part of the Grundtvig Multilateral development project entitled “LOAC – Learning Outcome of Amateur Culture”, which a group of European organisations of amateur art and voluntary culture has completed in the period 2009 - 2011. The partnership circle consisted of National Associations of Cultural Councils in Denmark; Republic of Slovenia Public Fund for Cultural Activities; Kunstfactor, Sectorinstituut Amateurkunst in Holland; and Interfolk, Institute for Civil Society from Denmark.

The overall aim of the project has been to substantiate a humanistic learning perspective on amateur art and voluntary culture. The aim of this Course Compendium is to present the programme, evaluations and recommendations of the pilot Grundtvig in-service Training Course and the pilot Grundtvig Workshop, which the project team completed 29 May - 3 June 2011 in Ljubljana, Slovenia with JSKD as host organisation.

Chapter 1 presents the project consortium and the project concept. Chapter 2 and 3 presents the pilot Grundtvig in-service training course and the pilot Grundtvig workshop with focus on the course providers, target groups, content of the courses, the programme day by day and practical information. Chapter 4 presents the evaluations including results of the questionnaire, interviews and a summary with reference to the award criteria of the two types of courses. Finally chapter 5 compares the two types of courses and presents recommendations for revisions of the next generation of Grundtvig in-service training course in the LLP programmes from 2013.

The pilot courses became an important step in the implementation of the project, and we wish to thank all the participants, who made this week a rewarding cross-border learning event for all of us. Finally, we wish to thank the EU Commission and its Executive Agency for Education, Audiovisual and Culture for the support that made it possible to arrange these pilot courses, and not least we must thank the project leaders and other active in the partnership circle for their tremendous work. We hope other actives with an interest in cross-border mobility in the area of amateur art and voluntary culture in the European civil society can benefit from the results of these pilot courses.

Hans Jørgen Vodsgaard
and Bente von Schindel
August 2011

1. Presentation of the project

LOAC – Learning Outcome of Amateur Culture is a Grundtvig Multilateral Development project, that took place from October 2009 to November 2011. The project has been funded by the European Commission in Brussels as part of the Lifelong Learning Programme.

1.1 The project consortium

The partnership circle of the project consists of the National Associations of Cultural Councils in Denmark; the Republic of Slovenia Public Fund for Cultural Activities; Kunstfactor, Sector Institute for Amateur Art from Holland; and Interfolk, Institute for Civil Society from Denmark.

National Associations of Cultural Councils in Denmark - see www.kulturellesamraad.dk

The National Association of the local cultural councils are the umbrella organizations for local associations within the area of culture and leisure-time activities. Local Cultural Councils exist in approximately 90 of Denmark's 98 municipalities. The main purpose of the national association of cultural councils is to inspire and develop the cultural area, and to influence, initiate, debate, exemplify etcetera in order to create the best possible conditions for all cultural learning activities. NACC is on a national basis working closely with the rest of the cultural voluntary associations.

Role in the project: Applicant organisation and project administrator.

Contact person: Bente von Schindel, General Secretary, MA (Nordic Literature and Rhetoric)
(+45) 29647040 * bs@kulturellesamraad.dk

Republic of Slovenia Public Fund for Cultural Activities - see www.jskd.si

JSKD is a national institution covering all branches of amateur culture and art: vocal and instrumental music, theatre and puppet, folklore, film and video, literature, fine arts, dance. JSKD main tasks are: Organization and offering of cultural events; Preparation of seminars, workshops, lectures, summer camps; Counselling, supporting, informing; Publication of periodicals and other publications; Joint financing of cultural programs.

JSKD headquarters in Ljubljana and fifty-nine branch offices all over Slovenia with about 100 employees (organizers, experts, and technicians) stimulate the development of Slovenian amateur art. JSKD organizes international, national and regional programmes of education, presentations and reviews of non-professional culture and art. JSKD is a member of European umbrella networks ECuCo and Amateo and international organisations of music, theatre, puppet theatre and folklore such as Europa Cantat, IFCM, CISM, AITA/IATA, CIOFF etc.

Role in the project: Project Member

Contact person: Marjeta Turk, Assistant Director for General Affairs
(+386) (1) 241 05 24 * marjeta.turk@jskd.si

Kunstfactor, Sectorinstituut Amateurkunst - see www.kunstfactor.nl

Kunstfactor is the national Dutch institute for the development and promotion of amateur arts. As such the centre has expertise in the fields of voluntary arts development, management and education as well as in that of arts education per se. Kunstfactor is responsible for various training and learning curricula, used inside and outside of educational centres, as well as for training modules

for volunteers who are active in the field of the amateur arts. Kunstfactor is constantly looking for ways in which cultural and artistic competences can be acquired and acknowledged. It is one of the founders and partners of the Standards and Accreditation Centre for Amateur Arts and Arts Education in the Netherlands.

Role in the project: Project Member

Contact person: Wies Rosenboom, Head of Office staff and Dance and Writing, MA Sc (Drs.)
(+31) (0)30 711 5140 * w.rosenboom@kunstfactor.nl

Interfolk, Institute for Civil Society - see www.interfolk.dk

Interfolk is an Institute for liberal education and voluntary associations. The objectives are to promote popular enlightenment and active citizenship in the context of liberal adult education, voluntary associations and cultural activities in the civic society. The activities may include research, surveys and development projects, seminars and debate, and other cultural activities in Danish, Nordic, European and broader international contexts.

Role in the project: Project coordinator

Contact person: Hans Jørgen Vodsgaard, Head of Institute, Ph.D. (History of Ideas)
(+45) 51 300 320 * hjv@interfolk.dk

1.2 Outline of the project concept

The idea has been to promote a humanistic learning perspective on amateur art and voluntary culture with the overall aim to make the learning quality and outcome more attractive and transparent for the actual and potential participants.

Background and need

The concept of learning and lifelong learning has in the last decade become a main concept in pedagogy and education in general and in liberal adult education and amateur culture in particular. Learning takes place both in formal learning from primary school to university and in the non-formal learning in the liberal adult education as well as informal learning in amateur art and voluntary cultural activities. However, the European main stream agenda for lifelong learning is dominated by a rather instrumental view on learning, which is blind for important learning qualities and goals in the liberal adult education and voluntary associations, especially of the unique qualities in the area of amateur art and voluntary culture.

It is the purpose of this Grundtvig multilateral Project to promote a humanistic learning methodology with the ability to incorporate the expressive and aesthetic qualities of the learning processes and to assess the learning dimension of personal formation.

The objectives

The first objective has been to complete a survey of learning qualities and outcome in voluntary cultural activities, including results of questionnaires and interviews with leaders, teachers and participants in the associations of the partnership circle.

The methodology of the survey has been formed by a humanistic learning theory, and the overall objective is to achieve new knowledge and reflexion of learning goals and learning valuation, which may qualify the methodology and praxis of validation of learning qualities and outcome. This methodology should furthermore form the guidelines for the online questionnaires in

the two types of validation tools, and the guidelines for the Compendium on Best Practice of learning activities.

The second objective was to develop two types of interrelated online tools for learning validation, one type for the learners' valuation of the personal learning outcome, and another for the learning providers' valuation of the organisational learning. The two types of tools can validate the same learning process from two different angles. The learners (students, participants, and other active) can validate their personal learning profile and outcome; the learning providers (leaders, teachers, facilitators, board members and other staff) can compare their learning objectives and priorities with the learners' actual outcome. This interrelated double tool will consist of a series of Danish, Dutch, Slovenian and English editions.

This documentation can be of personal value for the learners, and it can improve the work of the learning providers with monitoring, quality assurance and management of the learning activities in their organisation. These tools will validate the activities as learning activities and thereby bring new focus on amateur culture as an important area of learning. The validation data from the use of the two tools will be saved at a common database, and it means that the data can be used for research on several levels, from the classroom to the whole organisation, and from a group of local associations or a group of thematic associations, to a national and most important to a transnational European level. This network of national associations that uses the common transnational database can easily and by relative small costs be expanded with new umbrella associations from other European countries after the conclusion of the project.

The third objective was to publish three English project publications. The first is the Survey Report of validation of learning qualities and outcome in voluntary cultural amateur activities including results of questionnaires and interviews in the partnerships associations.

The second publication is the Anthology of Best Practise with focus on 1) the main aims of active citizenship, cultural cohesion, personal fulfilment and employ-ability, 2) a broader view on learning as composed of the three interrelated dimensions: competence, knowledge and personal formation, 3) social inclusion of people of all ages, including those with special needs and disadvantaged groups, 4) improving possibilities of transnational European activities as part of the ordinary activities of the cultural associations.

The third publication is the Compendium of European week courses regarding learning dimensions of amateur culture and validation of the learning outcome.

The fourth objective has been to complete two pilot week courses, respectively a Grundtvig in-service training course and a Grundtvig workshop in the spring 2011. An integrated part of the courses will be exchange of experiences regarding innovative products and best practise in different learning areas, including an introduction to the methodology and practical use of the personal and organisational valuation tool. The courses are first targeting teachers, tutors, facilitators and other pedagogical staff by offering a Grundtvig in-service training course, and secondly targeting board members, leaders and other active members by offering a Grundtvig workshop. The aim is after the conclusion of the project to initiate a transnational course programme for active in Europe's amateur art and voluntary cultural associations as part of the Grundtvig in-service training programme and the Grundtvig Workshop programme.

The fifth objective is to prepare and complete a comprehensive dissemination, exploitation and sustainable follow up of the results of project.

2. The pilot Grundtvig course

2.1 Course providers

The Pilot Grundtvig five-days in-service training course is part of the Grundtvig Multilateral Project 2009 – 2011 named “LOAC – Learning Outcome of Amateur Culture” managed by the following partnership circle:

National Association of Cultural Councils in Denmark (DK)

Republic of Slovenia Public Fund for Cultural Activities (SI)

Kunstfactor, Sector institute of Amateur culture (NL)

Interfolk, Institute for Civil Society (DK)

Course leaders are:

Marjeta Turk, Assistant Director for General Affairs, JSKD

Wies Rosenboom, Manager of Dance and Creative Writing, and Jan van den Eijnden, Senior Adviser, Kunstfactor

Bente Schindel, Secretary General, the National Association of Cultural Councils

Hans Jørgen Vodsgaard, Head of institute, Interfolk

The common website of this Grundtvig project including more course information has this web address: www.interfolk.dk/loac

2.2 Target Audience

The Target Groups

The target audience are active in amateur art and voluntary cultural associations working on a part-time or full-time basis, paid or voluntary, including

- Teachers, trainers, tutors, teacher trainers,
- Consultants, counsellors, career officers,
- Facilitators, coordinators and other pedagogical staff

Languages used for the training

The working language is English, and the course materials will be provided in English. The participants are expected to have good communicative skills in English. However, most participants are not native speakers of English and do not use complicated language.

Enrolment and number of participants envisaged

The three umbrella organizations from Denmark, Slovenia and Holland have each the responsibility to enrol 5 participants to the pilot course. The total number of participants will be 15.

NB: The other five-days pilot workshop primarily for board members and other will be completed at the same time and place, and some part of the programme will be common for both courses such as the general lectures, the one-day excursion, and other social and cultural activities.

2.3 Content of the course

Aim and objectives

The overall aim of the course is to promote the learning values and outcome of activities in amateur culture and voluntary cultural associations, and thereby improve the quality, attractiveness and accessibility of cultural activities. The training course will have four specific objectives:

- To present methods for assessment of the learning outcome of cultural activities based on the humanistic traditions of liberal adult education;
- To provide a double tool for assessment of the learners personal learning outcome and the learning providers organisational priorities of cultural activities by using a reference framework with focus on competences, knowledge and personal formation.
- To promote the best practise of learning in voluntary cultural activities with focus on personal fulfilment, social inclusion, cultural cohesion, and active citizenship.
- To improve the documentation and promoting of the values and goals of amateur culture and voluntary culture to main stakeholders.

Methodology

The course will be based on participatory and activity-based methods, and the intercultural learning about each other at the professional and the personal level will be a cross-curricular topic.

The course will focus on knowledge exchange and shared experiences. There will be a blend of lectures, trainers' presentations, plenum discussions, workshops, small group work, and individual learning. Short presentations on the topic prepared by participants themselves will be part of the course.

Sites visits to cultural activities in Ljubljana and other parts of Slovenia will help the participants to experience "best practice" within the areas of focus.

Preparation

The participants will latest 3 weeks before the course receive preparatory material for the different sessions, including a basic text on the course topic helping the participants to get acquainted with the relevant English vocabulary.

The participants will also be invited to prepare a short presentation of their cultural association with a focus on values and learning qualities and learning outcome.

Follow-up

The participants will complete an evaluation questionnaire at the end of the course about the hopes realized, the setting for the course, the programme of the course, the contents transferred etc. After the course the participants will receive a summary of the training course content, activities and results including a summary of the course evaluation. We will also encourage the participants to develop network and further transnational cooperation.

Certificate of Attendance

Participants will get a Certificate of Attendance stating the frame, content, method and the working hours of the course.

2.4 The programme day by day

Sunday, 29 May / day 1: Welcome and presentations

- 14.00 - 15.45: Arrival and accommodation at Hotel Emonec
- 16.00 - 16.45: Welcome and presentations of programme, participants and trainers
By Bente Schindel and Hans Jørgen Vodsgaard
- 16.45 - 17.15: Practical information and cultural visits and one-day excursion
By Marjeta Turk
- 17.30 - 18.00 Course presentation: Overview of objectives, methodologies, content
By Wies Rosenboom and Hans Jørgen Vodsgaard
- 18.00 - 19.00: Presentation round - organisation and position
By the participants
- 19.00 - 19.30: Free time
- 19.30 - 21.00: Dinner at Restaurant Abecedarium
- 21.00: Free time / Café visit, social gathering

Monday, 30 May / day 2: Tools for valuation of cultural learning

- 07.30 - 08.45: Breakfast at the hotel
- 09.00 - 10.15: Lecture & discussions: Learning outcome in voluntary culture
By Hans Jørgen Vodsgaard
- 10.15 - 10.45: Morning coffee break
- 10.45 - 12.00: Introduction and pair work with the personal valuation tools
Guidance by Wies Rosenboom and Hans Jørgen Vodsgaard
- 12.00 - 12.45: Lunch at Restaurant Hidden Corner
- 12.45 - 14.00: Free time
- 14.00 - 15.15: Introduction and group work with the organisational valuation tools
Guidance by Wies Rosenboom and Hans Jørgen Vodsgaard
- 15.15 - 15.45: Afternoon coffee break
- 15.45 - 17.00: Plenum discussions - the tools for learning validation
Moderator: Wies Rosenboom
- 17.00 - 18.00: Free time
- 18.00 - 19.30: Short study visit to the Cultural centre Pionirski dom
- 19.30 - 21.00: Dinner and boat trip in Ljubljana
- 21.00: Free time / social gathering

Tuesday, 31 May / day 3: Best practise of cultural learning

- 07.30 - 08.45: Breakfast at the hotel
- 09.00 - 10.15: Lecture & discussions: Best Practice of cultural learning
By Bente Schindel
- 10.15 - 10.45: Morning coffee break
- 10.45 - 12.00: Cases of Best Practise,
First example, By Lotte Volz; Second example, By Marjeta Turk

- 12.00 - 12.45: Lunch at Restaurant Hidden Corner
 12.45 - 14.00: Free time
 14.00 - 15.15: Workshops on Best practise
 Workshop I: Theatre - workshop leader: Urška Bittner
 Workshop II: Music - workshop leader: Lotte Volz
 Workshop III: Other arts and culture - workshop leader: Bente Schindel
 15.15 - 15.45: Afternoon coffee break
 15.45 - 17.00: Workshops present conclusions in plenum
 Moderator: Bente Schindel
 17.00 - 18.00: Free time
 18.00 - 19.00: Dinner in town, Restaurant Šestica
 20.00 – 22.00: Concert of the Brass Band Papirnice Vevče
 22.00: Free time / social gathering

Wednesday, 1 June / Day 4: One-day cultural excursion to Gorenjska region

Including coffee breaks, lunch, dinner and cultural visits. Organised by JSKD

- 07.30 - 08.45: Breakfast at the hotel
 09.00: Departure with bus
 18.30 - 21.00: Dinner in the town Radovljica, at Restaurant Lectar
 21.30: Return to the hotel in Ljubljana

Thursday, 2 June / day 5: The values of voluntary culture and how to promote it

- 07.30 - 08.45: Breakfast at the hotel
 09.00 - 10.15: Lecture & discussions: Why is amateur culture important, what is the outcome, and how should we promote it to main stakeholders?
 By Marjeta Turk JSKD and General Secretary of AMATEO; and Matjaž Šmalc, independent adviser for JSKD
 10.15 - 10.45: Morning coffee break
 10.45 - 12.00: Workshops on core values and promoting to actual and future active in amateur art and voluntary cultural activities
 Workshop I: Theatre - workshop leader: Marjeta Turk
 Workshop II: Music - workshop leader: Jan van den Eijnden
 Workshop III: Other arts and culture - workshop leader: Lotte Volz
 12.00 - 12.45: Lunch at Restaurant Hidden Corner
 12.45 - 14.00: Free time
 14.00 - 15.15: The workshops continue
 15.15 - 15.45: Afternoon coffee break
 15.45 - 17.00: Workshops continue, preparing presentations (including evaluation of the course and fill-out of short evaluation questionnaire) to Friday morning
 17.00 - 19.00: Free time
 19.00: Festive dinner with Slovenian folk music and dance at Restaurant Šestica

Friday, 3 June / day 6: Evaluation and dissemination

- 07.30 - 08.45: Breakfast at the hotel
- 09.00 - 10.30: Plenum for the two courses - reports from Thursday's six workshops
Moderator: Jan van den Eijnden
- 10.30 - 11.00: Morning coffee break
- 11.00 - 12.00: Evaluation: Reports from Thursday's six groups and plenum debate.
The short evaluation-questionnaire filled-out Thursday is collected for later analysis and feed back to the participants.
Moderator: Hans Jørgen Vodsgaard
- 12.00 - 12.45: Lunch in town
- 13.00 - 14.00: Course Certificate of attendance, Official Farewell
By the course leaders

2.5 Practical information

The pilot course is nearly free

The pilot course is part of the work programme of the Grundtvig multilateral project, and therefore the course is free, except for approx. 30 pct. of the travel costs.

The accommodation at a central hotel in Ljubljana, all the meals, the excursions and the course programme are covered of the EU grant. You only need to pay your own pocket money for the activities in the spare free time.

The accommodation and course venue

For accommodation we have book

Hotel Emonec,
Wolfova 12, Ljubljana
(+386) 1 200 15 20 * hotelemonec@siol.net
See www.hotel-emonec.com

For meals we use the following restaurants

Abecedarium Cafe - see www.abecedarium.si
Restaurant Hidden Corner - see www.restavracija-skritikot.si
Restaurant Sestica - see www.sestica.si
Restaurant Lectar (during the on-day excursion) - see www.lectar.com

The course venue will be in the centre of the city at

JSKD, Stephen 5, 1000 Ljubljana - see www.jskd.si

The one-day excursion to Gorenjska - see www.slovenia.info/?ctg_regije=21&lng=2

Information and map of Ljubljana - see www.visitljubljana.si

How to enrol

Each organisation that participates in this Grundtvig project will disseminate the pilot Grundtvig Course to their network. Interested participants must then contact their organisation and get a confirmation of participation. Each organisation then reports 5 participants to the course managers, who will send course material out at least 3 weeks before the start of the course.

3. The Pilot Grundtvig workshop

3.1 Course providers

The Pilot Grundtvig five-day workshop is part of the Grundtvig Multilateral Project 2009 – 2011 named “LOAC – Learning Outcome of Amateur Culture” managed by the following partnership circle:

National Association of Cultural Councils in Denmark (DK)

Republic of Slovenia Public Fund for Cultural Activities (SI)

Kunstfactor, Sector institute of Amateur culture (NL)

Interfolk, Institute for Civil Society (DK)

Course leaders are:

Marjeta Turk, Assistant Director for General Affairs, JSKD

Wies Rosenboom, Manager of Dance and Creative Writing, and Jan van den Eijnden, Senior Adviser, Kunstfactor

Bente Schindel, Secretary General, the National Association of Cultural Councils

Hans Jørgen Vodsgaard, Head of institute, Interfolk

3.2 Target Audience

The Target Groups

The target audience are active in amateur art and voluntary cultural associations working on a part-time or full-time basis, paid or voluntary, including

- Board members or other active with a organisational position
- Directors, principals, Inspectors, and managers
- Administrators, career officers, secretaries and other management staff in the organisation.

Languages used for the training

The working language is English, and the course materials will be provided in English.

Participants are expected to have good communicative skills in English. However, most participants are not native speakers of English and do not use complicated language.

Enrolment and number of participants envisaged

The three umbrella organizations from Denmark, Slovenia and Holland have each the responsibility to enrol 5 participants to the pilot workshop. The total number of participants will be 15.

NB: The other five-days pilot course primarily for teachers and other pedagogical staff with 15 participants will be completed at the same time and place, and some part of the programme will be common for both courses such as the general lectures, the one-day excursion, and other social and cultural activities.

3.3 Content of the workshop

Aim and objectives

The overall aim of the workshop is to promote the learning values and outcome of activities in amateur culture and voluntary cultural associations, and thereby improve the quality, attractiveness and accessibility of cultural activities. The pilot workshop will have four specific objectives:

- To present methods for assessment of the learning outcome of cultural activities based on the humanistic traditions of liberal adult education;
- To provide a double tool for assessment of the learners personal learning outcome and the learning providers organisational priorities of cultural activities by using a reference framework with focus on competences, knowledge and personal formation.
- To promote the best practise of learning in voluntary culture activities with focus on personal fulfilment, social inclusion, cultural cohesion, and active citizenship.
- To improve the documentation and promoting of the values and goals of amateur culture and voluntary culture to main stakeholders.

Methodology

The workshop will be based on participatory and activity-based methods, and the intercultural learning about each other at the professional and the personal level will be a cross-curricular topic. The workshop will focus on knowledge exchange and shared experiences. There will be a blend of lectures, trainers' presentations, plenum discussions, workshops, small group work, and individual learning. Short presentations on the topic prepared by participants themselves will be part of the course.

Sites visits to cultural activities in Ljubljana and other parts of Slovenia will help the participants to experience "best practice" within the areas of focus.

Preparation

The participants will latest 3 weeks before the workshop receive preparatory material for the different sessions, including a basic text on the course topic helping the participants to get acquainted with the relevant English vocabulary.

The participants will also be invited to prepare a short presentation of their cultural association with a focus on values and learning qualities and learning outcome.

Follow-up

The participants will complete an evaluation questionnaire at the end of the workshop about the hopes realized, the setting for the course, the programme of the course, the contents transferred etc. After the workshop the participants will receive a summary of the training course content, activities and results including a summary of the course evaluation. We will also encourage the participants to develop network and further transnational cooperation.

Certificate of Attendance

Participants will get a Certificate of Attendance stating the frame, content, method and the working hours of the workshop.

3.4 The programme day by day

Sunday, 29 May / day 1: Welcome and presentations

- 14.00 - 15.45: Arrival and accommodation at Hotel Emonec
- 16.00 - 16.45: Welcome and presentations of programme, participants and trainers
By Bente Schindel and Hans Jørgen Vodsgaard
- 16.45 - 17.15: Practical information and cultural visits and one-day excursion
By Marjeta Turk
- 17.30 - 18.00 Course presentation: Overview of objectives, methodologies, content
By Bente Schindel and Marjeta Turk
- 18.00 - 19.00: Presentation round - organisation and position
By the participants
- 19.00 - 19.30: Free time
- 19.30 - 21.00: Dinner at Restaurant Abecedarium
- 21.00: Free time / Café visit, social gathering

Monday, 30 May / day 2: Tools for valuation of cultural learning

- 07.30 - 08.45: Breakfast at the hotel
- 09.00 - 10.15: Lecture & discussions: Best Practice of cultural learning
By Bente Schindel
- 10.15 - 10.45: Morning coffee break
- 10.45 - 12.00: Cases of Best Practise,
First example, By Lotte Volz
Second example, By Marjeta Turk
- 12.00 - 12.45: Lunch at Restaurant Hidden Corner
- 12.45 - 14.00: Free time
- 14.00 - 15.15: Workshops on Best practise
Workshop I: Theatre - workshop leader: Urška Bittner
Workshop II: Music - workshop leader: Lotte Volz
Workshop III: Other arts and culture - workshop leader: Bente Schindel
- 15.15 - 15.45: Afternoon coffee break
- 15.45 - 17.00: Workshops present conclusions in plenum
Moderator: Bente Schindel
- 17.00 - 18.00: Free time
- 18.00 - 19.30: Short study visit to the Cultural centre Pionirski dom
- 19.30 - 21.00: Dinner and boat trip in Ljubljana
- 21.00: Free time / social gathering

Tuesday, 31 May / day 3: Best practise of cultural learning

- 07.30 - 08.45: Breakfast at the hotel
- 09.00 - 10.15: Lecture & discussions: Learning outcome in voluntary culture
By Hans Jørgen Vodsgaard

- 10.15 - 10.45: Morning coffee break
- 10.45 - 12.00: Introduction and pair work with the personal valuation tools
Guidance by Wies Rosenboom and Hans Jørgen Vodsgaard
- 12.00 - 12.45: Lunch at Restaurant Hidden Corner
- 12.45 - 14.00: Free time
- 14.00 - 15.15: Introduction and group work with the organisational valuation tools
Guidance by Wies Rosenboom and Hans Jørgen Vodsgaard
- 15.15 - 15.45: Afternoon coffee break
- 15.45 - 17.00: Plenum discussions - the tools for learning validation
Moderator: Wies Rosenboom
- 17.00 - 18.00: Free time
- 18.00 - 19.00: Dinner in town, Restaurant Šestica
- 20.00 - 22.00: Concert of the Brass Band Papirnice Vevče
- 22.00: Free time / social gathering

Wednesday, 1 June / Day 4: One-day cultural excursion to Gorenjska region

Including coffee breaks, lunch, dinner and cultural visits. Organised by JSKD

- 07.30 - 08.45: Breakfast at the hotel
- 09.00 : Departure with bus
- 18.30 - 21.00: Dinner in the town Radovljica, at Restaurant Lectar
- 21.30: Return to the hotel in Ljubljana

Thursday, 2 June / day 5: The values of voluntary culture and how to promote it

- 07.30 - 08.45: Breakfast at the hotel
- 09.00 - 10.15: Lecture & discussions: Why is amateur culture important, what is the outcome, and how should we promote it to main stakeholders?
By Marjeta Turk JSKD and General Secretary of AMATEO; and
Matjaž Šmalc, independent adviser for JSKD
- 10.15 - 10.45: Morning coffee break
- 10.45 - 12.00: Workshops on core values and promoting to the political decision-makers, opinion-formers and other multipliers
Workshop I: Theatre - workshop leader: Urška Bittner
Workshop II: Music - workshop leader: Bente Schindel
Workshop III: Other arts & culture - workshop leader: Hans J. Vodsgaard
- 12.00 - 12.45: Lunch at Restaurant Hidden Corner
- 12.45 - 14.00: Free time
- 14.00 - 15.15: The workshops continue
- 15.15 - 15.45: Afternoon coffee break
- 15.45 - 17.00: Workshops continue, preparing presentations (including evaluation of the course and fill-out of short evaluation questionnaire) to Friday morning
- 17.00 - 19.00: Free time
- 19.00: Festive dinner with Slovenian folk music and dance at Restaurant Šestica

Friday, 3 June / day 6: Evaluation and dissemination

- 07.30 - 08.45: Breakfast at the hotel
- 09.00 - 10.30: Plenum for the two courses - reports from Thursday's six workshops
Moderator: Jan van den Eijnden
- 10.30 - 11.00: Morning coffee break
- 11.00 - 12.00: Evaluation: Reports from Thursday's six groups and plenum debate.
The short evaluation-questionnaire filled-out Thursday is collected for later analysis and feed back to the participants.
Moderator: Hans Jørgen Vodsgaard
- 12.00 - 12.45: Lunch in town
- 13.00 - 14.00: Course Certificate of attendance, Official Farewell
By the course leaders

3.5 Practical information

The pilot workshop is nearly free

The pilot workshop is part of the work programme of the Grundtvig multilateral project, and therefore the workshop is free, except for approx. 30 pct. of the travel costs.

The accommodation at a central hotel in Ljubljana, all the meals, the excursions and the course programme are covered of the EU grant. You only need to pay your own pocket money for the activities in the spare free time.

The accommodation and course venue

For accommodation we have book

Hotel Emonec,
Wolfova 12, Ljubljana
(+386) 1 200 15 20 * hotelemonec@siol.net
See www.hotel-emonec.com

For meals we use the following restaurants

Abecedarium Cafe - see www.abecedarium.si
Restaurant Hidden Corner - see www.restavracija-skritikot.si
Restaurant Sestica - see www.sestica.si
Restaurant Lectar (during the on-day excursion) - see www.lectar.com

The course venue will be at JSKD in the centre of the city

Stephen 5, 1000 Ljubljana - see www.jskd.si

The one-day excursion to Gorenjska - see www.slovenia.info/?ctg_regije=21&lng=2

Information and map of Ljubljana - see www.visitljubljana.si

How to enrol

Each organisation that participates in this Grundtvig project will disseminate the pilot Grundtvig workshop to their network. Interested participants must then contact their organisation and get a confirmation of participation. Each organisation then reports 5 participants to the course managers, who will send course material out at least 3 weeks before the start of the workshop.

4. Evaluations

The evaluation of the pilot course and pilot workshop included

- A questionnaire for the participants, which they filled out at the end of the courses
- Succeeding interviews with three participants from each country. These nine interviews were conducted in July about one and a half months after the courses, and they included 5 participants from the pilot course and 4 participants from the pilot workshop.
- A succeeding evaluation by the project team at the fourth partner meeting in Ghent the 10 – 12 June 2011, it means a week after the courses.

We will in section 4.1 present the results of the evaluation questionnaire, including references to the conclusions from the evaluations at the partner meeting. In section 4.2 we present the interviews with a group of participants. In section 4.3 we will present our conclusions and perspectives of the evaluations, especially with reference to the award criteria of the Grundtvig programme for these two types of mobility activities.

4.1 The evaluation questionnaire

The methods of the evaluation questionnaire

The respondent groups

The number of participants in

- The pilot Grundtvig in-service training course was 17, with 6 from Slovenia, 6 from Nederland and 5 from Denmark.
- The pilot Grundtvig Workshop was 16, with 5 from Slovenia, 6 from Nederland and 5 from Denmark.

The number of participants, who filled out the evaluation questionnaire, was 30, with 15 from the pilot course and 15 from the pilot workshop. The evaluation by the two groups was anonymous, so we do not know the name, nationality or activity background of the respondents.

Processing

The evaluation questionnaire was designed to be self-explanatory. The questionnaire focuses on six main performance indicators and a seventh session on needs for improvements.

The questions for each session included first closed response categories in which the respondents must indicate the degree of value in a four point scale, and secondly three open questions about weaknesses, strengths and points to improve.

The data of the closed questions is processed by simple totals of responses within the different response categories. The results of these numerical values provide thus the quantitative documentation of the questionnaire. The answers to the open questions provide the qualitative documentation of the questionnaire.

Evaluation scale

The numerical values of the answers to the closed questions are derived from a four point scale, where the series of response categories for the six main performance indicators consisted of

- 1 = *poor/unsatisfactory* - major weaknesses
- 2 = *fair* - some important weaknesses
- 3 = *good* - strengths outweigh weaknesses
- 4 = *very good* - major strengths

The series of response categories for the seventh session on needs for improvements consisted of

- 1 = no need
- 2 = maybe
- 3 = yes, important
- 4 = yes, very important

NB: It means, the higher score, the higher discontent and needs for improvements.

With these scales, the respondents' assessments can be valued on a point-scale from 1 to 4. This type of conversion to average numerical values requires that the four response categories are approximately continuous.

The series of performance indicators

The evaluation focused on 6 main areas of performance, each with 4 indicators that are determined by typically 3 closed questions, where the answers must indicate a value on the four-point scale. Furthermore, each of the six main areas of performance is concluded with three open questions about 1-3 point of weaknesses, 1-3 point of strengths; and 1-3 points of improvements.

Finally a last seventh section included 14 questions about the need of improvement in relation to 14 main quality issues of the course or workshop.

The series of the six main performance indicators was the following:

1. Information, preparation and homework before the course
 - 1.1. Information about the course programme
 - 1.2. Enrolment and practical information
 - 1.3. Distributed course materials
 - 1.4. Homework
2. The design and content of the course
 - 2.1. Organisation of the course
 - 2.2. Clear objectives
 - 2.3. Content in general
 - 2.4. Appropriate balance of activities
3. Quality of the teaching
 - 3.1. The level of qualification
 - 3.2. The pedagogical approach
 - 3.3. A participatory didactic
 - 3.4. Overall rating
4. Course venue, materials and equipment
 - 4.1. Course venue
 - 4.2. AV equipment
 - 4.3. Course materials
 - 4.4. Overall course environment
5. Quality of the domestic arrangements
 - 5.1. The logistic frame
 - 5.2. Accommodation

- 5.3. Meals
- 5.4. The cultural and social programme
- 6. Quality of the transnational and intercultural dimension
 - 6.1. Intercultural qualities
 - 6.2. The language challenge
 - 6.3. Development of positive attitudes towards Europe
 - 6.4. Overall rating of the transnational and intercultural dimension

In the following sections we will present the participants' assessments of the performance indicators, first by a data table for the closed questions and secondly by their statements in the open questions on weaknesses, strengths and points of improvements.

First main indicator - Information, preparation and homework before the course

Table 1: Information, preparation and homework before the pilot courses						
Respondent Groups: Participants from the two pilot courses	N	Performance indicators of the offerings before the courses				
		1.1 Information about the course programme	1.2 Enrolment and practical information	1.3 Distributed course materials	1.4 Homework	Average
All	30	2,5	3,0	2,7	2,7	2,7
In-service training course	15	2,6	3,0	2,7	2,7	2,7
Workshop	15	2,5	3,1	2,7	2,8	2,8

Note: Valuated from an evaluation scale with the following values: 1 (poor – *unsatisfactory*, major weaknesses); 2 (*fair* - some important weaknesses); 3 (*good* - strengths outweigh weaknesses); 4 (*very good* - major strengths).
Each indicator, as for example 1.4 homework, is measured as an average of three sub-questions in the questionnaire.

Table 1 shows that the participants both at the course and the workshop gave the lowest score to “information before the course” with an average of 2.5, which is in the middle between “fair” and “good”. The highest score gets “Enrolment and practical information” with 3.0, which corresponds to “good”.

The participants of the workshop have a slightly higher valuation, and this is a general tendency. The reason may be that the participants at the course (mostly teachers) have higher expectations to the planning and teaching at an in-service training course than the participants at a workshop (mostly board members and leaders), where the dialogue, intercultural meeting, exchange of experiences and a participatory approach are in front.

Comments from participants at the pilot course

Here follows a representative selection of the comments from the participants at the pilot course to the first main performance indicator:

Weaknesses:

Some participants had experienced “no weaknesses”. However, a recurrent critique were that several participants received the course information and materials too late: “I received the papers too late”; “a bit too late”; “everybody should have the material before the course”; “too little time to prepare the homework”. Other mentioned that the problem more had been “my own lack of time before the course”.

Another point were the course materials with the compendium of best practise, the article on the learning methodology in the LOAC project, and the three questionnaires about the activities, best practise and core services of the participants cultural associations.

The article used a terminology and approach that were quite foreign and difficult for many participants, who had “some problems with the text: language used etc.”, and “the subject is so philosophical that it is hard to fill in all the questionnaires, if you do not have the right context, which i got during the lecture of Hans.” One mentioned that “Questionnaire 2 is very comprehensive and difficult to fill out completely. Some of the questions are not related to local voluntary cultural work (our situation/context)”.

A third point was that there beforehand was “too little information about the other partners” and the cultural situation in the countries of the other groups of participants.

Strengths:

Some praised the course materials on the course content, because “the text structure was very clear, and it was possible to have own input”: “The outline of the course was very clear”; “It is fine to have a best practise example prepared, so you can try the theory on these examples”. “Precise questions related to your field”. “Differentiated, learned, structured”.

Other mentioned that “the paper by Hans Vodsgaard is perfect and sufficient to cover the state of art in cultural arts arena”; “Introduction to the use of the tools, learning of the terminology”.

Some also mentioned that the practical information had “a good information level”. It gave “good information about the content and accommodation”.

Points to improve

First point was “to get the materials earlier” and “to get all the materials beforehand”; “Send all the materials and send it earlier”.

It would especially have made the homework easier: “At least 2 weeks for homework and clarifying that it is needed to do the homework. Not everybody had the same homework material.” It should have been clearer that all should have “filled out all the questionnaires before at home”,

Some lacked “more knowledge of the participants from the other countries”; and therefore a more precise homework with “individual presentations” of the cultural activities of the participants.

The practical information could have been better with “a clear list of course venue, phone numbers, info at hotel about the course; and a “list of all participants was needed” beforehand.

Comments from participants at the pilot workshop

Here follows a representative selection of the comments from the participants at the pilot workshop to the first main performance indicator:

Weaknesses:

A recurrent critique from this group of participants was also the late distribution of course materials: “Papers came relatively late”; “Some of the papers were sent very late”; “Lack of information before course”. “The homework was very late (one week is too short)”.

Another point relates to the homework: “It was not clear, if I should read the information at home. So, I was not familiar with Grundtvig.”.

A third point relates to the low preparation for the intercultural dimension of the workshop, as one stated: “Too little information about the other partners from Slovenia and Holland.”

Strengths:

Other participants had different experience. “The information itself was clear and complete as far as I can see”; “Good content, clear information”; “Practically all right”.

Some were happy for the course papers and guidelines for the homework: “The compendium was fine, the content of the homework was good”; “The Best practise publication gave me a good idea about this course and it was very nice to read”; “The LOAC Compendium of Best Practise gave a good basis to the course”. The questionnaires “was free for own interpretation”.

Points to improve

Some participants wished more homework. They wanted “more time”, “send the readers ear-

lier” as well as information that had been “more clear about the expectations to the participants. Maybe send out all the materials on one time”.

They were asked beforehand to fill out the Questionnaire 1 with presentations of their organisation and their own role and activity as well as Questionnaire 2 about their best cultural practise in a learning context. However, many also wanted, they could have worked beforehand with Questionnaire 3 about their mission and core services seen from the perspective of the learning views in LOAC: “Answer the questionnaire before arrival. Learning the terminology before arrival”. This opinion was contrary to the opinion of the course providers, who thought that these tasks were too difficult to manage before the introduction to the learning methodology at the workshop.

Furthermore, many participants wanted “more material about the partners and the history of the project” including “information about Grundtvig and his thoughts before the course”.

Partial conclusion on first indicator

The project team evaluated the pilot courses at the succeeding fourth partner meeting in Ghent, 10 – 12 June 2011. The conclusions in relation to the first performance indicator were that

- The course papers with practical information and course materials should have been released by all partners at least two weeks before start and not just one week before.
- The participants asked for more knowledge of the other participants and their organisation before the course. Their presentations in Questionnaire 1, which they send to the course leaders, could have been released to all participants before the course.

We can add that the problems with the late and unclear course information may indicate the challenges for a multinational course team to coordinate the information to a multinational group of participants. It proved to be more complicated than expected to secure efficient and coordinated information processes. A course coordinator can coordinate the works of the staff in his and hers organisation, but not necessarily the works of staff from other organisations, especially not organisations from another country and another sector.

Furthermore, the competence profile of the target groups and the succeeding selection of participants could have been more clear and coordinated. Some participants had the will and competence to complete a comprehensive homework, while others did not. This made it more difficult to state clear demands and expectations to the participants’ homework.

Finally, we underestimated the intercultural challenge or the need for information about the background and situation of the different national groups of participants. The questionnaire 1 had focus on this issue, but it should have been more elaborated in the guidelines for the homework and used more focused in the upstart of the course and workshop.

Second main indicator - the design and content of the course

Table 2: The design and content of the courses						
Respondent Groups: Participants from the two pilot courses	N	Performance indicators of the design and content of the courses				
		2.1 Organisation of the course	2.2 Clear Objectives	2.3 Content in general	2.4 Balance of activities	Average
All	30	2,9	2,8	3,0	3,4	3,0
In-service training course	15	2,9	2,8	2,9	3,3	3,0
Workshop	15	2,8	2,7	3,1	3,4	3,0

Note: Valuated from an evaluation scale with the following values: 1 (poor – *unsatisfactory*, major weaknesses); 2 (*fair* - some important weaknesses); 3 (*good* - strengths outweigh weaknesses); 4 (*very good* - major strengths).
Each indicator, as for example 2.2 clear objectives, is measured as an average of three sub-questions in the questionnaire.

Table 2 shows that the participants both at the course and the workshop gave the lowest score to 2.2: Clear objectives and 2.1: Organisation of the courses, with an average just below “good”. The highest score is assessed to 2.4: Balance of the activities with an average of 3.4, which is between “good” and “very good”.

The valuations of the two groups of participants are very similar; however the workshop group stated in average a higher value to point 2.3: The content in general.

It can be mentioned that the overall valuation of this second performance indicator is 3.0, which is slightly higher than the valuation of the first main performance indicator on the information before the courses (Cf. table 1, where the overall value were 2.7).

Comments from participants at the pilot course

Here follows a representative selection of the comments from the participants at the pilot course to the second main performance indicator:

Weaknesses:

Parts of 2.1: the organisation could be improved: “Address mentioned in the course papers was wrong. No clear communication of change of address. No emergency phone number mentioned in the course papers. No note on the door indicating another address.” Another participant mentioned: “Last-minute re-planning of activities and schedules created some confusion and uncertainty. The original plan and schedule for the course was only indicative.”

In relation to 2.2: Clear objectives it was mentioned: “I fail to see the evidence that the course achieved its objectives. We (the participants) provided a lot of input, but received little feedback on how this information can/will be structured and used. As a consequence it is difficult to assess whether the difficulty level was appropriate.”

In relation to point 2.3: The content in general could be improved. First by better preparation of the home-work: “We needed more time at home to do the Questionnaire”. Second by more clear focus in the some of the workshop sessions: “Content of workshops/workshop leaders. It should have been more focused on the content of the EU framework”. Third by having more time or a more conscious priority of the programme: “We could have used more time. Difficult Philosophical area”; “If we could stay just by the tool, we would have time enough, but we could not discuss

the tool without the importance of art education in general, and that was a very big subject”; “Maybe too *tense*”; “We needed an earlier presentation by Hans before best practise session”.

One mentioned in relation to the balance of activities: “I missed an icebreaking activity”.

Strengths:

Many were in general happy with the design and content: “It all worked well”; “Structure of the course was good”; “It was demanding, but maybe it is easier to work under pressure and get a result”; “Fine facilities, good organisation, the city”;

The objectives were clarified during the course: “The presentation and use of the tools, which gave better understanding of the objectives of the project.”; “The more the tools were explained, the better the understanding of course”.

The course content was inspiring: “All the discussions and insights in the different situations in the other countries made me very inspired to try to find ways to plant these thoughts into the heads of others”.

Other mentioned that “the mixture of activities was very appropriate. We all had a chance to meet and work with each other.”; “Good blend with social activities; the dining and lunching together with others.”

Points to improve:

Proposals for 2.1: organisation: “More equal preparation at home; all materials before start; clearer explanation/guideline for home work”. “More home work to get used to the “language and terms of the course”.

Proposals for 2.2: Clear objectives: “Clear goals for the workshop leaders, what information do we need, outline the presentation, so we all can work within the same context”.

Proposals for 2.3: Content in general: “More and timely feedback”: “More differentiation in work forms; more linking of different nationalities; more possibilities to present own organisations by posters etc and handouts.” Other mentioned that parts of the work could have been improved by a selection of participants with a more similar background: “More volunteers in participants group from Holland and Slovenia”.

Proposals for 2.4: The balance of activities: “I would have liked to see more amateur art galleries, or even professional art.”

Comments from participants at the pilot workshop

Here follows a representative selection of the comments from the participants at the pilot workshop to the second main performance indicator:

Weaknesses:

Parts of 2.1: the organisation could be improved: “Time management”; “The schedules were changed from the written programme”.

In relation to 2.2: Clear objectives: “I missed a specific focus in some workshops and some of the moderators didn’t have enough experience or capability in focussing the workshops”.

In relation to point 2.3: The content in general: “The Best Practise was not very relevant for the content. We could have spent more time on how to develop it further”. Other mentioned “the different levels people work and think”.

Strengths:

The content in general was assessed high: “The lectures were very informative. The programme was interesting, dynamical and multi levelled”. “The more the tools were explained, the better the understanding of course”. “Relevant content”.

Points to improve:

Proposals for 2.1: organisation: "Organisation and moderation of the programme can be more prepared and focussed."

Proposals for 2.3: Content in general: "The programme could have been more efficient. The main content could have been presented in one day and then more time on, how we could use it in several manners". "Choose the learners more specific in background".

Partial conclusion on second indicator

The project team evaluated the pilot courses at the succeeding fourth partner meeting in Ghent, 10 – 12 June 2011. The conclusion of the second performance indicator was that

- The organisation of the course schedule and workshops could be improved; the common information could be clearer, and changes of the time schedule of the one-day excursion and farewell party should have been avoided.

We can add that the objectives and content of the course as well as the workshop may have been too comprehensive. In fact it could have been divided on two or more week sessions, and for more differentiated target groups. It is especially the case for the in-service training course.

Third main indicator - quality of the teaching

Table 3: Quality of the teaching						
Respondent Groups: Participants from the two pilot courses	N	Performance indicators of the quality of the teaching				
		3.1 The level of qualification	3.2 The pedagogical approach	3.3 Participatory didactic	3.4 Overall rating of teaching	Average
All	30	3,3	3,1	3,2	3,0	3,2
In-service training course	15	3,3	3,1	3,2	3,0	3,1
Workshop	15	3,2	3,1	3,2	3,1	3,2

Note: Valuated from an evaluation scale with the following values: 1 (poor – *unsatisfactory*, major weaknesses); 2 (*fair* - some important weaknesses); 3 (*good* - strengths outweigh weaknesses); 4 (*very good* - major strengths).
Each indicator, for example 3.3 participatory didactic, is measured as an average of three sub-questions in the questionnaire.

Table 3 shows that the overall valuation of this third performance indicator is 3.2, which is higher than the valuation of the first and second main performance indicator, which were respectively 2.7 and 3.0 (Cf. table 1 and 2).

It is the qualification of teachers, which gets the highest average score for the two groups with 3.3, which is better than “good”, but less than “very good”.

The valuations of the two groups of participants are very similar; however the workshop group stated in average a higher value to point 3.4: Overall rating of teaching.

Comments from participants at the pilot course

Here follows a representative selection of the comments from the participants at the pilot course to the third main performance indicator:

Weaknesses:

It was mentioned in relation to the pedagogical approach: “Lectures were sometimes hard to follow. I missed some real life examples to make it understandable. I missed also comparing/ sharing the different working forms between the countries (as a starter)”. Another pointed on “Very big differences in the way instructors presented their material”.

In relation to the level of participatory didactic one mentioned: “I am not sure if and how participants' expectations have been taken into account. Ones again, I lacked feedback from the organisers on the information/work we provided.”

In the overall rating of the teaching we have several statements: “Some teachers showed some disadvantage/too critical thoughts about the course, not good for the group spirit”. “Sometimes there was some confusion about the concrete goals of some sessions. It looked not as all the workshop leaders had the same idea of these goals. They might have had a last check up together, before starting the workshops, or evaluate together between the workshops”. “Too much going to and from the sessions.”

Strengths:

The teachers approach and level of qualification were appreciated: “Very enthusiastic people

were performing the activities". "All workshop leaders were experienced and knew what they were talking about".

The overall ration of the teaching was positive: "Good message". "In the end I got a lot of ideas of how to do something with the theory and goals in my own organisation."

Points to improve:

Proposals for 3.2: The pedagogical approach: "Explain more about the whole project and the role of this course; explain why the course programme was made as it were". Another mentioned "Better and consistent planning; appropriate and timely information without confusing messages. Less crowded power-point slides and reading aloud from them".

Proposals for 3.3: Participatory didactic: "More leading of the discussions in the workshops to guide the discussions". I needed "use of more forms of teaching; and more involvement of the participants with homework where they present the history of amateur art in their organisation."

Proposals for 2.4: Overall rating of the teaching: "The teacher group should communicate more in advance about organising things". "Communication and cooperation between the leaders could be better".

Comments from participants at the pilot workshop

Here follows a representative selection of the comments from the participants at the pilot workshop to the third main performance indicator:

Weaknesses:

In relation to the teachers' level of qualifications: "Some of the teachers could motivate and explain very well and others not. They varied very much". "Some of the leaders were too busy doing other jobs. Some of the leaders were too nice, they sometimes lost focus and time, people were not stopped talking."

In relation to the pedagogical approach some mentioned: "On a didactical level there was not always enough ability or clearness about the purpose of the workshop".

Strengths:

In the overall rating of the teaching it was mentioned: "The content and knowledge on the subject was good and inspiring". "The questionnaires provide a basis to make your own answers".

Points to improve:

Proposals for 3.1: Level of qualification: "The instructors had not enough knowledge about other countries".

Proposals for 3.2: The pedagogical approach: "More leadership by the leaders. Or choose a participant in the group to lead the session, summarise after each session". "Teachers could be more conscious of how they present their story and organise their workshop structure."

Proposals for 3.3: Participatory didactic: "Sometimes there wasn't enough time for questions, which I think was a pity".

Proposal for 3.4: The overall teaching, which is directed at the participants' responsibilities: "If all the participants were present at all time, it would have made the course better".

Partial conclusion on third indicator

The project team evaluated the pilot courses at the succeeding fourth partner meeting in Ghent, 10 – 12 June 2011. The conclusion of the third performance indicator was that

- The group of course and workshop leaders should have planned and coordinated their tasks better before the start of the course.

We can add that the criterion for the selection of the workshop leaders and teachers was to secure the participation of the whole LOAC project team, because it should also be a learning process for the project consortium. This may not be the most relevant criteria.

Fourth main indicator - course venue, materials and equipment

Table 4: Course venue, materials and equipment						
Respondent Groups: Participants from the two pilot courses	N	Performance indicators of the course venue, materials and equipment				
		4.1 Course venue	4.2 AV and ICT equipment	4.3 Course materials	4.4 Overall course environment	Average
All	30	2,6	3,1	3,1	2,8	2,9
In-service training course	15	2,4	3,0	3,0	2,7	2,8
Workshop	15	2,7	3,2	3,2	2,8	3,0

Note: Valuated from an evaluation scale with the following values: 1 (poor – *unsatisfactory*, major weaknesses); 2 (*fair* - some important weaknesses); 3 (*good* - strengths outweigh weaknesses); 4 (*very good* - major strengths).
Each indicator, as for example 4.3 course materials, is measured as an average of three sub-questions in the questionnaire.

Table 4 shows that the overall valuation of this fourth performance indicator is 2.9, which is just below “good”. This average is higher than the valuation of the first main performance indicator of information before the course (2.7) and lower than the second main indicator of the design of the courses (3.0) and third main indicator of the quality of the teaching (3.2).

It is especially the course venue that gets the lowest score, and thereby reduces the average. The valuations of the two groups show that the participants at the workshop gave a higher score to all four sub-indicators. They were either more satisfied or less demanding than the participants at the training course.

Comments from participants at the pilot course

Here follows a representative selection of the comments from the participants at the pilot course to the fourth main performance indicator:

Weaknesses:

Many participants criticised the course venue: “The acoustics of the plenum room was not the best for learning”. “The plenum room was too small”. “The plenum room not equipped to large groups”. “The plenum room lacked tables. Some have to write in their lab”. “The plenum sessions were hard to understand because of the size and shape of the room. It was difficult to see the power-points”. “No elevator to the plenum room, a lack for elder people.” There was also some critique of the workshop rooms: “Some rooms were too small for too many people”.

There were also critical remarks on the course materials: “Hand outs from presentations have been promised to be send to the participants; they were not available on-line (or on paper) during the course”. “Address mentioned in course paper was wrong.”

Strengths:

Even though the plenum room and some workshop room had some disadvantages, the participants liked the place: “Good atmosphere in the building”.

The participants in general appreciated the course papers: “Interesting course material”. “I can definitely use the paper by Hans Vodsgaard in my practise”. “The power-points at the courses will be useful to get”.

Points to improve:

The proposals for improvements focus on the course venue: “Another plenum space”. “A more suitable plenum room; considerate that speakers and participants do not have the same mother language. Therefore acoustics must be perfect, possible by using microphones”. “Better writing facilities”.

Comments from participants at the pilot workshop

Here follows a representative selection of the comments from the participants at the pilot workshop to the fourth main performance indicator:

Weaknesses:

The workshop group also focuses on the course venue: “The plenum room needed more space”. “The plenum room was too small; some could not see the power points”. “The plenum room had bad acoustic”.

Strengths:

On the other hand the place also had its strengths: “Welcome and informal venue”. “Locations were close to each other and to everything in the city”. “Places were close to hotel and restaurants”.

Points to improve:

None to mention.

Partial conclusion on fourth indicator

The project team evaluated the pilot courses at the succeeding fourth partner meeting in Ghent, 10 – 12 June 2011. The conclusion of the fourth performance indicator was that

- The logistic between the hotel, meals and course venue was excellent, but the plenum room was too narrow and had a bad acoustic, the few times both groups were together (Sunday Evening and Friday morning).

However, the project team also agreed that the logistic frame of the courses with all facilities in the centre of Ljubljana was very attractive. The alternative had been to find course venues outside the city, and then the courses would have lost the charm and atmosphere and extra offerings for the domestic arrangements.

Fifth main indicator - quality of the domestic arrangements

Table 5: Quality of the domestic arrangements						
Respondent Groups: Participants from the two pilot courses	N	Performance indicators of quality of the domestic arrangements				
		5.1 The logistic frame	5.2 Accommodation	5.3 Meals	5.4 Cultural and social programme	Average
All	30	3,6	2,9	3,2	3,4	3,3
In-service training course	15	3,6	2,9	3,2	3,5	3,3
Workshop	15	3,5	2,8	3,2	3,4	3,2

Note: Valuated from an evaluation scale with the following values: 1 (poor – *unsatisfactory*, major weaknesses); 2 (*fair* - some important weaknesses); 3 (*good* - strengths outweigh weaknesses); 4 (*very good* - major strengths).
Each indicator, as for example 5.3 Meals, is measured as an average of three sub-questions in the evaluation questionnaire.

Table 5 shows that the overall valuation of this fifth main performance indicator is 3.3, which is better than “good” and less than “very good”. This average is the highest of all the six main performance indicators.

The highest score is given to the logistic frame with an average of 3.6; and to the cultural and social programme, with an average of 3.4; while the accommodation gets the lowest score with an average of 2.9.

It may be noticed that participants of the workshop value this main indicator slightly lower than the participants of the course. The reason may be that the course group as a whole was younger than the workshop group. It could be easier for the course group to walk around in the city between the hotel, course venue and restaurants, and especially the mountain walk during the one-day excursion was quite demanding.

Comments from participants at the pilot course

Here follows a representative selection of the comments from the participants at the pilot course to the fifth main performance indicator:

Weaknesses:

In relation to the meals some mentioned: “The acoustics at the Hidden Corner, lunch places and dinners were not conducive for conversations”. “Too noisy”. “Meals inside, when the weather was great outside”. In relation to the social and cultural programme some mentioned: “Lees free time than indicated”. “Change of schedule for excursion, too long day”, “No papers on the excursion programme”. “Excursions could have been to more important places.”

Strengths:

In relation to the logistic frame and accommodation many mentioned: “The location of everything in centre of Ljubljana was excellent, removing the need/time to commute”. “Logistic and accommodation”. “Central”. “I liked the hotel, also good with short distance to course venue and city centre”. “Every think was perfect”.

Points to improve:

In relation to places for meals: “Take acoustics into account for all venues”. “Meals outside”

Comments from participants at the pilot workshop

Here follows a representative selection of the comments from the participants at the pilot workshop to the fifth main performance indicator:

Weaknesses:

In relation to meals: “Almost too much food, 3 dishes for lunch and dinners”. In relation to the cultural programme: “The programme was very full”.

Strengths:

In relation to the cultural programme: “Very nice activities. Very well organised”. “The Slovenian leaders had made a great job organising the course. They took care of the guests, so we felt comfortable and had a good trip to Slovenia.”. “Very well organised, very convenient. Compliments.”.

Points to improve:

Very few complained, however some mentioned: “Maybe just a little bit less full programme”. “I would have liked just a bit more free time, somewhere.”

Partial conclusion on fifth indicator

The project team evaluated the pilot courses at the succeeding fourth partner meeting in Ghent, 10 – 12 June 2011. The conclusion of the fifth performance indicator was that

- The logistic between the hotel, meals and course venue was excellent, and the social frame and cultural offerings were excellent.

We can add that Ljubljana as a small capital offers a very attractive frame for courses, especially regarding the social and cultural offerings, and the possibilities of excursions are very fine. The only minus for courses with a European group of participants can be the quite few direct flights connections to Ljubljana from other parts of Europe.

Sixth main indicator - transnational and intercultural dimension

Table 6: Quality of the transnational and intercultural dimension						
Respondent Groups: Participants from the two pilot courses	N	Performance indicators of the transnational and intercultural dimension				
		6.1 Intercultural qualities	6.2 The language challenge	6.3 Development of positive attitudes towards Europe	6.4 The transnational and intercultural dimension	Average
All	30	3,3	3,2	3,2	3,1	3,2
In-service training course	15	3,3	3,2	3,2	3,2	3,2
Workshop	15	3,3	3,1	3,2	3,0	3,1

Note: Valuated from an evaluation scale with the following values: 1 (poor – *unsatisfactory*, major weaknesses); 2 (*fair* - some important weaknesses); 3 (*good* - strengths outweigh weaknesses); 4 (*very good* - major strengths).
Each indicator, for example 6.1 Intercultural qualities, is measured as an average of three sub-questions in the questionnaire.

Table 6 shows that the overall valuation of this sixth main performance indicator is 3.2, which is slightly better than “good”. This average is the second highest of all the six main performance indicators.

The valuations of the two groups of participants are very similar. Both groups value the intercultural qualities highest with 3.3, and they give the same value to the development of positive European attitudes. However, the workshop group stated in average a lower value to the language challenge, and properly therefore also to the overall rating in point 6.4. The reason could be that the workshop group with more elder people had not quite the same level of English skills.

It may be noticed that participants of the course as an overall average gave a slightly higher valuation than the participants of the workshop. It is only the case for this sixth main indicator and for the fifth main indicator of the domestic arrangements. It seems that the course group of more young people were a little more satisfied the work shop group with the intercultural dimension and the domestic arrangements, while they as participants at an in-service training course were less satisfied than the workshop group with the course preparation, design, teaching and course venue and equipment.

Comments from participants at the pilot course

Here follows a representative selection of the comments from the participants at the pilot course to the sixth main performance indicator:

Weaknesses:

In relation to the intercultural qualities some mentioned: “The instructors didn't have enough knowledge about other countries systems”, or “the instructors did not know the situation of amateur art in other countries”. In relation to the language challenge some mentioned: “Some people did not have enough English”

Strengths:

The intercultural dimension and European added value were highly appreciated: “The European dimension is perhaps the most interesting and valuable aspect of this course. Seeing how different similar amateur cultural issues are handled in different countries and they have overcome some

of our own obstacles was very important to me.” “EU dimension was very good, Good atmosphere in the group”. “Participants from 3 countries did make me more aware of our common European identity.”

Points to improve:

As mentioned before, the participants wished more time for intercultural exchange of experiences: “Start the course with information about amateur arts conditions in each country that participated”. “More lively work forms - more intercultural mixing”. “More time for discussions”.

Comments from participants at the pilot workshop

Here follows a representative selection of the comments from the participants at the pilot workshop to the sixth main performance indicator:

Weaknesses:

Again the participants mention the low level of knowledge of the state of art in other European countries: “No insight in the structures in the countries of other participants”.

Furthermore the teachers and workshop leaders could have been better to handle the language challenge: “Sometimes the workshops manage to overcome language challenge, and sometimes not.”

Strengths:

Anyhow, most participants agree with this statement: “Group discussions were very inspiring”.

Points to improve:

Again participants expressed a need for a better intercultural starting point: “Give the exchange of information about each other more focus. Have a starting point for exchange of such information”. “Start the course with information about amateur arts conditions in each country that participated”.

Partial conclusion on sixth indicator

The project team evaluated the pilot courses at the succeeding fourth partner meeting in Ghent, 10 – 12 June 2011. The conclusion of the fifth performance indicator was that

- The participants asked for more knowledge of the other participants and their organisation before the course. Their presentations in Questionnaire 1, which they send to the course leaders, could have been released to all participants before the course.

We can add that the intercultural and cross-border meetings of participants from different European countries proved to be a very if not the most important quality of the course as well as the workshop.

Proposals - how would you improve this course?

No.	Questions to the participants	The course	The workshop	Average
1	Provide better information before course	2,7	2,2	2,5
2	Clarify the course objectives.	2,5	2,2	2,3
3	Reduce content covered in course.	1,3	1,3	1,3
4	Update content covered in course	1,6	1,7	1,7
5	Improve the instructional methods.	1,9	1,8	1,9
6	Make course activities more stimulating	1,5	1,7	1,6
7	Improve course organization.	2,0	2,3	2,2
8	Make the course less difficult.	1,2	1,1	1,1
9	Slow down the pace of the course.	1,2	1,1	1,2
10	Improve the ICT-tools used in the course.	1,5	1,5	1,5
11	Improve the cultural visits	1,4	1,2	1,3
12	Improve the cultural excursion	1,2	1,2	1,2
13	Improve the frame of social gathering in the free time	1,3	1,3	1,3
14	Improve the used evaluation methods	1,8	1,6	1,7
	Average	1,65	1,59	1,63

Note: Valuated from a scale with the following values: 1 (No need); 2 (Maybe); 3 (Yes, important); 4 (Yes, very important).

Table 7 shows that the participants did not see much need for improvements. The overall average is 1.63, which is between “no need” and “maybe”. It may be reasonable to interpret this as an index of a high level of contentment.

It may be noticed that the course group as an average indicate a higher need for improvement (1.65) than the workshop group (1.59). The reason could be, as mentioned above in the presentation of the performance indicators, that the participants in the pilot in-service training course will have higher expectations to the quality of the homework, course design, teaching and facilities.

There are differences between the two groups, but the tendencies are the same. The questions with the highest overall score and thus areas most needed to improve are

- Provide better information before course (2.5)
- Clarify the course objectives (2.3)
- Improve course organization (2.2)
- Improve the instructional methods (1.9)
- Improve the used evaluation methods (1.7)

The questions with the lowest score and thus areas least needed to change are

- Make the course less difficult (1.1)
- Slow down the pace of the course (1.2)
- Improve the cultural visits (1.2)
- Improve the cultural visits (1.3)

- Improve the frame of social gathering in the free time (1.3)
- Reduce content covered in course (1.3)

The participants recommendations for improvements of the pilot course

What improvements would you recommend?

One point was: "Better planning and consistent execution of the time schedule of the course".

Another point was: "An intercultural evening with presentation of different activities (meals, songs, etc.). Each group might prepare a song for the whole group to learn and sing"

A third point was: "For cultural visits, not only folk culture",

What is least valuable about this course?

The main point relates to the course materials and pedagogical methods: "The Compendium and the lack of comprehensive and timely feedback on the sessions where we provided input (in the light of the methodology)".

Another point was: "The somehow passive way of teaching".

What is most valuable about this course?

One main point relates to the intercultural dimension: "International contacts. Sharing knowledge of same problems and cultural policy in our countries". "To get acquainted with other organisations and their way of doing things". "Learning about the different ways in which cultural activities and learning are handled, supported, and funded in different countries. Wouldn't it be nice to get this perspective from all member states".

Another main point relates to the course objective: "The humanistic message". "Starting to think about the (humanistic) value of art and culture again, and to discuss these thoughts with other passionate people".

A final recommendation: "Repeat the course with other participants throughout Europe, it is an important message."

Recommendations for improvements of the pilot workshop

What improvements would you recommend?

One point relates to the planning: "Before the course to have a didactic plan to be well prepared". "Only on the fourth day did I found information on a table. Please do it at the beginning of the course." Another point relates to the pedagogical approach: "All sessions should have a reporter to write all the good things". "More space for visions". "The tools were good, but improvement can make it even better." A third point was: "More intercultural activities". A fourth and noticeable point was: "Less comprehensive evaluation questionnaire". "This evaluation should be shorter".

What is least valuable about this course?

The main point was about the teaching: "Best practise plenum as it was now". "To work with two different tools; I think we could do with one, and have more time to think about strategies to implant the outcome in our societies."

What is most valuable about this course?

The main point relates to the course objective and learning methodology: "The importance of the subject". "The philosophical approach of the subject and the intensive discussion about it in the plenum group and workshops".

Recapitulation and conclusions on the evaluation questionnaire

Respondent Groups: Participants from the two pilot courses	N	Main performance indicators						
		1 Information before	2 Course design	3 Quality of teaching	4 Venue and equipment	5 Domestic arrangement	6 European added value	Aver- age
All	30	2,7	3,0	3,2	2,9	3,3	3,2	3,1
The Course	15	2,7	3,0	3,1	2,8	3,3	3,2	3,0
The Workshop	15	2,8	3,0	3,2	3,0	3,2	3,1	3,1

Note: Valuated from an evaluation scale with the following values: 1 (poor – *unsatisfactory*, major weaknesses); 2 (*fair* - some important weaknesses); 3 (*good* - strengths outweigh weaknesses); 4 (*very good* - major strengths).

Each main indicator is measured as an average of four sub-indicators, which each is determined by three sub-questions in the evaluation questionnaire.

Table 8 presents a summary of the evaluation of the six main performance indicators. The overall rating of the two groups is 3.1, which corresponds to “good”. The average of the course group is 3.0 and the average for the workshop group is slightly higher with 3.1.

It is point 5: The domestic arrangement that get the highest score with an average of 3.3. The contentment with “external” course factors such as the logistic frame, the accommodation, meals and cultural and social programme is very important. It creates a positive attitude in general and motivate to an engaged participation in the sessions of the course and workshop.

Point 6: The intercultural and European qualities get the second highest score with an average of 3.2, and it is noticeable, because the evaluations indicate that the participants missed more intercultural input in the preparation and the initial presentations and somehow also in the succeeding sessions as well as they missed more knowledge by the teachers and workshop leaders regarding amateur culture in the other countries and Europe in general. However, the possibility of cross-border meeting and exchange of experiences showed to be very important for the participants.

Point 5 and 6 indicate the importance of European mobility in the learning offerings. The possibility to have a social and cultural programme in another European main capital and country provides in itself an uplifting and motivating learning environment. Furthermore, the possibility to participate in a course or workshop with participants from other European countries that are active in the same area of interest provides new possibilities for exchange of experiences and mutual learning, which a national group of participants don’t ensure. It seems like the possibility of having a transcending learning environment in a cross-border and European context is enriching in itself and brings a higher openness and motivation for learning.

Point 2 and 3, the design of the course and the teaching also got a high overall score with respectively 3.0 and 3.2. Even though there were criticism of the course organisation and pedagogical approach, this did not overshadow that the course objectives and content of a humanistic learning agenda were seen as very important. Even though the pedagogical approach and didactical methods are important, the most important for a successful course still is that the course content meets an actual need of the participants.

Pont 4: The venue, equipment and materials got a lower overall score of 2.9. However, the use of these facilities was the condition with the given financial frame of the project budget, if we should have the pilot courses in Ljubljana. This gave some disadvantages, but overall it gave more advantages to use these facilities and their logistical frame for the accommodation and meals as the social and cultural programme.

Point 1: The information, preparation and homework got the lowest score with an overall average of 2.7. The preparation of the course team could surely have been better, but this weak preparation also indicates the difficulties, when a multinational course team must coordinate the information and enrolment of a multinational group of participants. It must be emphasised that these problems were related to the pilot status of the course and workshop, where the project team were organisers and the participants were recruited equally by the three national associations.

In a real situation the conditions of planning, information and enrolments will be very different for both a Grundtvig in-service training course and a Grundtvig workshop.

A training course must be planned a long time ahead, before it can be announced in the Comenius and Grundtvig Training Database. There is only one responsible course provider, which must get the approval from the national agency in the country, where the course provider is registered; and the participants must long time ahead get a pre-registration before applying for a personal grant at their national Agency. It means that even though the course leader(s), teachers and speakers can come from more countries and organisations, there will only be one responsible organisation as course provider and coordinator of the planning, enrolment and pre-information to the participants.

A Grundtvig workshop must also be planned in detail, before it can be announced in the Grundtvig Workshops Catalogue. There is only one responsible course provider, which must get the approval from the national agency and furthermore get the whole grant to cover all the costs of the course; and the participants must contact this course provider directly to register and get the costs covered. It means that even though the course team can come from more countries and organisations, there will only be one responsible organisation as course provider and coordinator of the planning, enrolment and pre-information to the participants.

Thereby the tasks of planning, enrolment, information and dialogue on homework will be easier to handle for a real Grundtvig workshop as well as a real Grundtvig in-service training course.

4.2 Interviews

This chapter includes three series of interviews with participants at the pilot course and pilot workshop in Ljubljana primo June 2011. The interviews were made in July one and half months after the completion of the courses. They were done by the project leaders from the National Associations of Cultural Councils in Denmark (KSD); the Republic of Slovenia Public Fund for Cultural Activities (JSKD); and Kunstfactor, Sectorinstituut Amateurkunst in Holland (Kunstfactor). Each of the three series of interviews includes three participants, a total of nine participants, with five from the pilot course and 4 from the pilot workshop.

Participants from the pilot Grundtvig in-service training course

<p>Interviewer: Project leader Bente von Schindel, General Secretary of the National Association of Cultural Councils in Denmark.</p> <p>Interviewee: Flemming Thøgersen, chairman of the liberal adult education association, NETOP-Hvidovre, Denmark.</p>	
Question	Answer
How do you evaluate the course here one and half month later?	In general very positive. The academic content was of a high quality and the tools demonstrated were useful and contained more elements than other tools I've seen. It was inconvenient to the professional discussion among participants that the criteria for selection of participants seem to be different from country to country.
How will you use the outcome in your own organisation in the future?	We are developing tools for evaluation learning in non formal adult education (also including cultural subjects), and there we will be able to use experiences from LOAC
Which pieces of advice do you have for improvement of the impact?	The material should be translated into several European languages.
What need do you see for future Grundtvig courses on the topic?	New courses with participants from several countries – not at least several northern European countries where there is a tradition of self-organization of amateur culture and voluntary associations. Volunteer leaders of smaller organizations have a great need for international experience
Would you recommend others to participate in such course in 2012?	Yes.
What have you learned from the course?	Amateur culture has a very wide distribution, but especially the smaller associations need to document the value of their work. Hence the need for tools for evaluation of the participants' yield and of associations effort.

What kind of support do you need from your organisation in order to use the results?	We do not need further assistance for our own organisation.
Which pieces of advice do you have as recommendation for the dissemination and exploitation activities in the autumn?	Selected participants could go on tour in one of the other countries participating and tell interested associations about their experiences using the tools. It would be nice to hear practical experiences from a similar association in another country.
Would you wish to participate in a Grundtvig course on the topic?	I would like to if there were participants from other European countries.
Other statements about the course?	None

Interviewer: Project leader Marjeta Turk, Deputy Director of Republic of Slovenia Public Fund for Cultural Activities.

Interviewee: Hermina Roposa, Slovenia.

Question	Answer
How do you evaluate the course?	The way of organization was O.K. 😊
How will you use the outcome in your own organisation in the future?	Outcome is very useful. Participants can exchange their opinion even after the end of the course.
Which pieces of advice do you have for improvement of the impact?	It was my first course – everything was very useful
What need do you see for future Grundtvig courses on the topic?	About organizing some learning event, and find ways of financing such event.
Would you recommend others to participate in such course in 2012?	Certainly.
What have you learned from the course?	I have learnt some new facts, new ways how to present our activity, how to involve more people, how to become more known in public.
What kind of support do you need from your organisation in order to use the results?	Location (room) for our activity and some money, too.
Which pieces of advice do you have for the dissemination and exploitation activities in the autumn?	Our activity plan is adjusted to autumn activity. Most holidays are over, more people are home – so it is the time to “employ” us and them. Just now, for example, we prepare a great exhibition about old crafts in our village; it will be opened all September.

Would you wish to participate in a Grundtvig course on the topic?	I would with pleasure ..., I hope so.
Other statements about the course?	I congratulate all holders of the course

Interviewer: Project leader Marjeta Turk, Deputy Director of Republic of Slovenia Public Fund for Cultural Activities.	
Interviewee: Miha Novak, Slovenia.	
Question	Answer
How do you evaluate the course?	The course was good, very invigorated, I learned a lot.
How will you use the outcome in your own organisation in the future?	First, the tool will be presented to decision makers in our organization and then be used in practice. The questions in the usability of the tool. What everybody that participants in the organization benefit from it; and how the organization can use the results for promotion of the activities of the organization.
Which pieces of advice do you have for improvement of the impact?	We have to see that there are many differences between the culture counters and organizations, and also between every participant in the organizations. The philosophy of the broader learning outcome is new, and therefore not known in Slovenia. BUT learning could be the common concept for what every organization is obliged to give to their participants.
What need do you see for future Grundtvig courses on the topic?	Expand.
Would you recommend others to participate in such a course in 2012?	Yes, to anyone; also to somebody, who are not active in amateur culture could benefit by participating.
What have you learned from the course?	That - despite culture differences the main problems of all organizations are the same. We have all the global challenge to find ways to live together..
What kind of support do you need from your organisation in order to use the results?	Just cooperation. No problems, at this point.
Which pieces of advice do you have as recommendation for the dissemination and exploitation activities in the autumn?	We have to find the appropriate form to implant the tool in the culture organization in Slovenia, so every participant will see the benefit from it. And we need to answer, why the organizations would need this tool?
Would you wish to participate in a	Yes of course.

Grundtvig course on the topic?	
Other statements about the course?	I hope that it will develop and be successful.

Interviewer: Project member Lotte Volz, adviser for Kunstfactor, Sectorinstituut Amateurkunst, Nederland.	
Interviewee: Hetty Floors, piano teacher at a Dutch music and arts schools and an active member of EPTA (European Piano Teachers Association).	
Question	Answer
How do you evaluate the course?	Positive.
How will you use the outcome in your own organisation in the future?	I have discussed my experiences during the LOAC-week with my employer, and we are very interested in continuation of the project.
Which pieces of advice do you have for improvement of the impact?	The start was a bit messy, especially referring to specific terms and differences in culture. It would have saved a lot of time to have a manual on paper with a summary of the educational systems and structure of amateur culture in our countries etc.
What need do you see for future Grundtvig courses on the topic?	To philosophize is fascinating and necessary, but for better understanding and clearness it is good to have a concrete synopsis.
Would you recommend others to participate in such course in 2012?	Yes. It is very informative and useful to exchange. It forms you. It will make you appreciate your own situation more.
What have you learned from the course?	That the matter is alive amongst me and my colleges. In my organisation steps will be taken to set up a follow-up system for pupils, where we will focus not only on the level of performance but also on the development of emotional, social, reflective skills and competences. It would be great if – on a larger scale and on a higher political level – people will get impregnated with the importance of cultural education and the impact it has on individuals and even society.
What kind of support do you need from your organisation in order to use the results?	Especially on technical and organizational level: how will it get embedded within an organisation? About that I am in consultation with my employers.
Which advice do you have for the dissemination and exploitation activities in the autumn?	Make a good translated and accessible questionnaire. Clarify the philosophic background, the origin and from that move to reality, practice.

Would you wish to participate in a Grundtvig course on the topic?	Willingly!
Other statements about the course?	Despite of the philosophical background, which certainly has to be told, make sure the transfer into practice will be as good as possible.

Interviewer: Project member Lotte Volz, adviser for Kunstfactor, Sectorinstituut Amateurkunst, Nederland.	
Interviewee: Peet van Duijnhoven, coordinator at VAK, Centre for arts education in the city of Delft, and has her own bureau (Horus) in art projects, concerning creative writing and theatre.	
Question	Answer
How do you evaluate the course?	<p>Very positive. To come together with people/colleagues from different cultures gave me a renewed view at the working field.</p> <p>To use Life Long Learning competencies in Art-and cultural education is a valuable addition to evaluate the work. Evaluation on different levels; with participants, students; within organisations and outwards as a political tool.</p>
How will you use the outcome in your own organisation in the future?	<p>Within our institution VAK (a provider of art education) we will organize a meeting for our teaching staff, to evaluate each section as a teacher; goals, priorities and how this all refers to the upcoming policy and the company plan of VAK. We haven't planned a date yet.</p> <p>On the 4th of October '11 we will organize a cultural market for teachers in secondary education. Cultural institutions will contrive projects with schools. Life Long Learning and skills will be integrated.</p> <p>From my own company (Horus Language and Theatre) I will start storytelling training with women of the World in Lelystad.</p> <p>I will use a selection of the online-questions for evaluating and reporting the subsidiser. And possibly I will also use the learning view of the Grundtvig course to apply for a grant to continue this project.</p>
Which pieces of advice do you have for improvement of the impact?	In advance we were asked to give information of our organisation and our own position. It would have helped a lot to use a power-point at the start of the week with this information. A moderator to lead the conversations, to summarize in English will help par-

	<p>participants understanding each other better. Good moderators will bridge level-differences and will simplify communication.</p>
<p>What need do you see for future Grundtvig courses on the topic?</p>	<p>In my opinion, the first announcement of the course didn't cover the subject and goals of the week. I thought the course was about naming and recognising personal development in a creative process. Also about learning how to disclose your students' learning goals. The teacher as a coach. This Grundtvig course mainly was about discussing and testing the online-evaluation tools.</p> <p>In preparing the Best Practices, we were encouraged to analyse the project of our choice and to name aim and objectives. That I found very valuable. These aspects could have been mentioned more specific in the presentations.</p>
<p>Would you recommend others to participate in such course in 2012?</p>	<p>Certainly. The intercultural group made it worth while. It tingles your own vision on your way of working with cultural education and voluntary arts by watching others working within their own possibilities. For example: I discovered, I hardly communicate with parents of the youngsters, I work with. In Denmark this would be unimaginable.</p>
<p>What have you learned from the course?</p>	<p>The presentations of Best Practices clarified to me even more that the power of our work is about working and moving with other people. Joy and satisfaction are more within the process, than we usually think. A final project, such as a Presentation, a Show, an Exhibition is something extra, but if the process was no good, participants will stay away next time.</p> <p>What also became especially clear to me is the fact that we will have to communicate the unique value of cultural education and voluntary art. Which is very obvious for us, but not for everyone. Within my work the communication with parents was a blind spot.</p> <p>Soon we will start an investigation on what appears to be left of art- and cultural education, if the Cultural Pass for youth (Governmental money) will stop. This time the parents of the youngsters will be questioned too.</p>
<p>What kind of support do you need from your organisation in order to use the results?</p>	<p>The VAK is experiencing a large reorganization at the moment and is preparing to be ready for privatization (it used to be municipal). When the moment is there, we will use LOAC/Grundtvig. On this moment I use elements of LOAC/Grundtvig in the Cultural Market.</p>

	For my own (privately held) organisation I can use it immediately: for preparation and evaluation. Grundtvig certainly is useful to clarify the importance of your work for individuals and society to politicians.
Which pieces of advice do you have as recommendation for the dissemination and exploitation activities in the autumn?	Whatever happens, I would certainly advise to approach volunteer organisations and community-art organisations. Also I'd make use of the possibilities for distribution through participants of LOAC. Let participants of LOAC who worked with the results present their work and show it on TV. Approach politicians.
Would you wish to participate in a Grundtvig course on the topic?	Certainly.
Other statements about the course?	I have been detailed enough yet.

Participants from the pilot Grundtvig workshop

<p>Interviewer: Project leader Bente von Schindel, General Secretary of the National Association of Cultural Councils in Denmark.</p> <p>Interviewee: Bodil Hejlsvig, member of the Cultural Council of Ringkøbing-Skjern municipality, Denmark.</p>	
Question	Answer
How do you evaluate the workshop?	Interesting and instructive.
How will you use the outcome in your own organisation in the future?	Try to figure out how we can measure the voluntary cultural work locally.
Which pieces of advice do you have for improvement of the impact?	Have a clear message.
What need do you see for future Grundtvig workshops on the topic?	Strong need for some sort of documentation of the cultural work - both professional and amateur cultural activities - to the policy makers to ensure the economy.
Would you recommend others to participate in such workshops in 2012?	Definitely. It was a great learning week - going through the tool, discussions and cultural experiences.
What have you learned from the workshop?	An increased awareness of the value of the voluntary cultural work and the possibilities to measure the benefits of volunteering.
What kind of support do you need from your organisation in order to use	Time to work with tools. Our local cultural council only has a few meetings a year.

the results?	
Which pieces of advice do you have as recommendation for the dissemination and exploitation activities in the autumn?	Spreading the message in the larger professional contexts and in public and the media.
Would you wish to participate in a Grundtvig workshop on the topic?	Preferably if it is an area, where I have something with which I can contribute.
Other statements about the workshop	Pros and cons of a group of participants with such different starting points - professional and volunteer board members.

<p>Interviewer: Project leader Bente von Schindel, General Secretary of the National Association of Cultural Councils in Denmark.</p> <p>Interviewee: Inger Bork-Larsen, member of the Cultural Council of Haderslev municipality, Denmark.</p>	
Question	Answer
How do you evaluate the workshop?	I learned a lot, especially about the enormous differences between support from the authorities in Slovenia, Holland and Denmark.
How will you use the outcome in your own organisation in the future?	I made a contact with a choir from Slovenia. Hopefully we can exchange further experiences.
Which pieces of advice do you have for improvement of the impact?	Making more use of IT.
What need do you see for future Grundtvig workshops on the topic?	It is important to learn – even from others within EU.
Would you recommend others to participate in such workshops in 2012?	Yes
What have you learned from the workshop?	That the volunteers have poor conditions in some countries within the EU.
What kind of support do you need from your organisation in order to use the results?	Interest in what I have learned in Slovenia.
Which pieces of advice do you have as recommendation for the dissemination and exploitation activities in the autumn?	That the participants will tell about the course and its content

Would you wish to participate in a Grundtvig workshop on the topic?	Yes
Other statements about the workshop?	My choir should have a description of the course and its content.

Interviewer: Project leader Marjeta Turk, Deputy Director of Republic of Slovenia Public Fund for Cultural Activities.	
Interviewee: Maja Papič, ZKD Ljubljana, Slovenia.	
Question	Answer
How do you evaluate the workshop?	Well organized, lecturers were well prepared, there were a lot of teamwork, which is very good and appropriate according to the topic of course
How will you use the outcome in your own organisation in the future?	I'm already using it☺ there will be documentary about amateur culture presented on the 11th Festival for the third life period and there will be round table discussion about voluntary work in culture. And I will try to organize more events for promoting amateur culture with an emphasis on humanistic learning perspective. (Importance of amateur culture for getting social, communicative, creative and other competences and positive and effective influence on lifelong learning.) Wider society and policy should be more informed about importance of amateur culture... I'm pissed off when somebody treats amateur culture less valuable than professional culture, especially in media.
Which pieces of advice do you have for improvement of the impact?	Participants involved in the workshop should represent outcome of amateur culture through public seminars, lectures, roundtables, maybe publishing brochure ... in their own country.
What need do you see for future Grundtvig workshops on the topic?	More countries to be involved in such courses. There are probably very different points of view on amateur culture among European nations.
Would you recommend others to participate in such workshops in 2012?	Yes.
What have you learned from the workshop?	There is a lot of amateur culture in each participating country, but I think that Slovenia has best organized network of it – JSKD – with all kind of support for culture associations. But the aim is the same – to spread the importance of influence of amateur culture on life-

	long learning.
What kind of support do you need from your organisation in order to use the results?	I don't know, maybe more people – volunteers – included in our projects, with fresh, innovative and creative ideas and of course more money for potential new projects.
Which pieces of advice do you have as recommendation for the dissemination and exploitation activities in the autumn?	Seminar about outcome of amateur culture in Ljubljana but I guess this is what the conference the 18 th of October is about?
Would you wish to participate in a Grundtvig workshop on the topic?	Yes.
Other statements about the workshop	/

Interviewer: Project member Lotte Volz, adviser for Kunstfactor, Sectorinstituut Amateurkunst, Nederland.

Interviewee: Hermy van Kempen, President of Palet, a Dutch association for amateur and professional visual artists in the city of Zwolle; amateur painter.

Question	Answer
How do you evaluate the workshop?	The course has been very valuable to me. It made me much more aware of the importance of active participation in the arts for the welfare of people.
How will you use the outcome in your own organisation in the future?	After the course I told my members in Palet about the importance of our work together. And even more important: What, with our affluence, could we contribute to our city society!?
Which pieces of advice do you have for improvement of the impact?	Initially starting doing things, even on a small scale. Awareness arises mainly from experience. Working out of experience makes the message well congruent as clear.
What need do you see for future Grundtvig workshops on the topic?	To be more clear in advance about what, why and wherefore.
Would you recommend others to participate in such workshop in 2012?	Certainly.

<p>What have you learned from the workshop?</p>	<p>To change politics and the economic world, we have to start with ourselves. First in our small circle of people and expand this. Bottom up!</p> <p>To take full advantage of our creativity. Resulting in having the supporting politicians and stakeholders we deserve.</p>
<p>What kind of support do you need from your organisation in order to use the results?</p>	<p>I would like to receive a Dutch translation as agreed in the last meeting.</p>
<p>Which pieces of advice do you have as recommendation for the dissemination and exploitation activities in the autumn?</p>	<p>Because our association Palet will move to another location mid-November, I will hardly have time left to work on the implementation of the LOAC/Grundtvig ideas. Afterwards I will surely proceed with it.</p>
<p>Would you wish to participate in a Grundtvig workshop on the topic?</p>	<p>Certainly</p>
<p>Other statements about the workshop</p>	<p>Again, to be more specific in advance about what, why and wherefore.</p> <p>It has been a special experience to talk and exchange enthusiastically and intensely about what is dear to our hearts, with participants of different arts, organizations and countries.</p>

4.3 Evaluations and award criteria

In this section we will relate the conclusions of the evaluations to the award criteria for the two types of Grundtvig mobility activities, the Grundtvig in-service training courses (IST-courses) and the Grundtvig Workshop.

The IST-course and the award criteria

It is the learners (potential participants) in the current programme for Grundtvig in-service training courses, who apply for a grant to their National Agency, and who afterwards sent an evaluation report to the same Agency.

It means the provider organisation does not send any evaluation to the national Agency, and there exists no procedure or standard template of course evaluation for the course provider. There is a lack of communication between the National Agencies and the In-service training providers in the programme structure. Apart from the course validation procedure before the announcement of the course in the Grundtvig course database there is hardly any information flow among these actors.

The following four award criteria¹ are the official criteria used for the quality assessment of the participants' evaluation report, which they must send to the national Agency after the end of the course. Anyhow, these quality criteria for the learners should also be relevant for the learning providers that must deliver a learning outcome for the participants.

Because of the lack of a standard evaluation form for the learning provider, we therefore have chosen to use these award criteria as a mean for our cross-evaluation of the pilot IST-course and the pilot Workshop.

Award criterion 1: European added value

The criterion is:

The training activity abroad will have a greater potential value than similar training in the applicant's home country and it is clearly demonstrated that the applicant will benefit from this experience in terms of personal and professional development.

The evaluation indicates that this criterion has been fulfilled in a "good" degree.

The benefits and importance of the intercultural and European dimension were clearly expressed by the participants. They gained new perspectives on their professional work by the exchange of experiences and the broader European outlook on the common professional challenges for the activities in the amateur culture.

However, the preparation of presentations by the participants of their national conditions could be improved as well as the teachers' homework on the conditions of amateur culture in other European countries and a broader European context could have been better. Therefore we only indicate the score to be "good" and not "very good".

Award criterion 2: Content and duration

The criterion is:

The programme for the mobility action is clear and reasonable; its duration is realistic and appropriate. The applicant provides a convincing explanation of his/her linguistic capacity to

¹ LLP Guide 2011, Part II b, Explanations by Action. Item 39: Grundtvig In-Service Training for Adult Education Staff (IST).

benefit from the training and of the preparatory activities that he/she intends to undertake to ensure the quality of the mobility.

The evaluation indicates that this criterion has been fulfilled in a “good” degree.

The pilot course had a very intensive programme, however the time schedule managed to be realistic and appropriate to fulfil the planned objectives. We had not screened the participants’ language capacity in English before the course or demanded special preparation. Some of the participants faced language difficulties, especially to speak and less with reading and understanding. However these minor problems were managed in the groups.

Award criterion 3: Impact and relevance

The criterion is:

There is a clear match between the training selected and the applicant's training needs. The training activity can be expected to have a positive impact on the professional development of the staff member concerned and on his/her institution/organisation.

The evaluation indicates that this criterion has been fulfilled in a “very good” degree.

The participants clearly stated that the training course fulfilled a need in their work in the amateur culture, both by providing a new conceptual frame and new methods for assessment of the learning outcome. The course objectives had a high relevance and the participants expected that it could have a strong impact on their future work as well as the development of their organisation. These expectations have been confirmed in the succeeding interviews and other contacts with the participants, among others in the national conferences in the autumn 2011, where the participants or other colleagues from their organisation had a high representation.

Award criterion 4: Dissemination of results

The criterion is:

The dissemination plan clearly demonstrates the applicant's intention to communicate the results of the foreseen training activity. The dissemination activities are relevant and well defined.

The evaluation indicates that this criterion has been fulfilled in a “good” degree.

The succeeding interviews and the feedback at the national conferences indicated that the participants in general had completed effective communication about the pilot course to their own organisations and related stakeholders. Furthermore several had started to use the tools in their professional activities.

The Workshop and the award criteria

It is the learning providers that must apply for a grant, which will relate both to the organisation of the Workshop itself and to the financing of the learners' participation, including their travel and subsistence. This application must be submitted to the National Agency and here assesses according to the award criteria defined in the action.²

The learning provider must latest two months after the workshop fill out a final report template and send it to the National Agency.³ This report includes a detailed evaluation of the course by the learning provider and annexes with course evaluations by each participant. The questions in the evaluation template for the learning provider relates to a high degree to the award criteria

² LLP Guide 2011, Part II b, Explanations by Action. Item 40: Grundtvig Workshop.

³ Lifelong Learning Programme Grundtvig. Final report form 2010 for Workshops (grant agreement period 1.9.2010 – 31.8.2011)

used in the assessment of the workshop application. These award criteria included four main areas.

Award criterion 1: Quality and relevance of the Workshop

The criteria are:

The Workshop's objectives are clear and realistic and the subject is relevant for a Grundtvig Workshop. The objectives are therefore relevant to the operational objectives of the Grundtvig programme.

The methodology is appropriate for achieving the objectives. The pedagogical and didactical approach is clearly described.

The Workshop will provide a stimulating learning experience and an added value in terms of learning opportunities, development of key competences, skills development, access to information, etc. for the participating learners, in particular those of disadvantaged groups.

The evaluation indicates that this criterion has been fulfilled in a “very good” degree.

The objectives could have been more clearly presented in the course papers; however they became clear for the participants in the start of the course. The subject was very relevant for this group of participants, who are active in the amateur culture or the voluntary cultural sector, and therefore had an interest in how to understand and describe the learning outcome in this area.

The pedagogical and didactical approach seemed to be appropriate to achieve the objectives of the workshop, according to the evaluations of the participants.

The workshop provided a very stimulating learning experience and the participants gained new views and methods to understand their own cultural activity and to describe the core services of the organisation they were active in.

Award criterion 2: Quality of the organisation of the project

The criteria are:

The tasks are clearly defined. The work programme is appropriate for organising a good quality Workshop within the time-frame envisaged.

The logistics of the Workshop are clear and appropriate to the target group (including as regards the arrangements for handling the travel and accommodation of participants and the hosting of participants with specific needs)

The possible need of cultural and/or linguistic preparation needs to be taken into account.

The evaluation indicates that this criterion has been fulfilled in a “good” degree.

The tasks for the participants were quite clearly defined before the course by sending out questionnaires and a background article.

The work programme was overall appropriate according to the evaluations by the participants.

We could have planned the cultural and linguistic preparation of the participants better by sending out the course papers earlier with more clear guidelines for the expected homework.

Award criterion 3: Impact and European added value

The criteria are:

The benefits of organising a European Workshop are clear and well defined. The results envisaged are relevant to the Grundtvig Programme and will have a demonstrable potential impact on the learning experience of the participants in the subject area concerned.

The European added value and possible additional benefits contributing to personal development and spin-offs are indicated.

The potential for repeating the Workshop in future (sustainability), if successful, is convincingly demonstrated.

The evaluation indicates that this criterion has been fulfilled in a “very good” degree.

The workshop demonstrated a clear European added value, especially because the participants shared a common interest in amateur culture and voluntary cultural work, which provided a solid base for exchange of cross-border experiences.

We see a clear potential for repeating a corresponding workshop. All participants expressed an interest to try it again, and they will also be fine ambassadors for recruiting new participants in their own organisations and network. The problem will not be to find participants for succeeding workshops, but rather that we need more workshops grants than possible to fulfil the needs in the international network, we already have developed.

Award criterion 4: Quality of the communication plan

The criteria are:

The communication plan for advertising and publicising the Workshop is well defined and ensures optimal use of European funds to organise and recruit participants.

The evaluation indicates that this criterion has been fulfilled in a “good” degree.

The workshop was a pilot activity, and the recruitment of participants was managed by the three national umbrella organisations, and the announcements were made through the organisations own contact network. Each organisation had a quota of five participants, and they had no problems with finding the needed numbers, even though the participants from Holland and Denmark in this pilot workshop should pay approx. 100 – 140 euro as a contribution to the travel costs, and the Slovenian participants should pay their own travel costs.

The strategy of advertising and publicising would be different in an ordinary Grundtvig workshop, because we should and would disseminate the offerings to networks and umbrella organisations from all the countries participating in the Lifelong learning programme. We here expect that the main problem will be that we must reject requests from many interested participants.

5. Recommendations

We see a clear need and a potential huge target group for Grundtvig in-service training courses as well as Grundtvig workshops in the European sector of amateur culture and voluntary cultural associations.

The main problem in our point of view will not be to find participants, but to get the needed grants to complete such mobility activities. However, the problems or challenges are different for the two types of activities. Especially the Grundtvig in-service training courses imply huge problems for the possible participants to get the needed grants and thereby derivative problems for the course providers to complete the announced courses.

The EU Commission is for the time being evaluating the current action of the Grundtvig in-service training in preparation for the next generation of the LLP programmes from 2013, and GINGO, the Grundtvig International Network of Course Organisers has also completed their own evaluation and published their own recommendations.⁴

In this section we will compare the actions of the Grundtvig IST-courses and the Grundtvig Workshop in relation to our LOAC courses. In the next section we will present our recommendation for possible LOAC-courses in relation to the current conditions of the two actions. In the third section we will discuss the recommendation of GINKO and conclude with our own recommendations for the revisions of the next generation of IST-courses.

5.1 Comparison of IST-courses and workshops

The conditions for providing Grundtvig Workshops and Grundtvig IST-courses differ. The conditions related to target groups, objectives and content, course frame and economy may seem quite different, but in reality they are overlapping. The main differences relate to the application procedure and management model.

Target groups

Workshops

Any adult person from European countries participating in the lifelong programme, whether or not they are already involved in adult learning, are eligible participants.

There are no prerequisites in order to participate, and early school leavers, socially vulnerable, seniors and those with little or no experience in engaging in educational contexts abroad have priority to participate. The adults are mainly people over 25 years, but some workshops are also open to younger adults.

Applications for Workshops relating to further vocational training, and in particular those addressing teachers, trainers, adult education staff as the main target group, will be declared ineligible.

IST courses

Teachers, supervisors, managers, administrative staff, and others with an active practice in adult learning from a European country participating in the Lifelong Learning Programme, are eligible participants.

⁴ Guy Tilkin: GINCO-Recommendations for the Grundtvig in-service training (IST) Course Action. a decentralised Grundtvig action. Input for the DG EAC public consultation for the next generation of programmes.

The training must relate to the participants' engagements in any part of the adult education sector (formal, non-formal or informal) on a part-time or full-time basis including volunteer staff as well as those who are formally employed. What matters is that your institution or association develops or provides general formal, non-formal or informal learning activities for adults, and you are involved in this work and have a need for further training to manage your paid or volunteer work in the institution or association.

Educators, counsellors, etc., of students in higher education that are not directed specifically at adult education (andragogik) are not eligible for a Grundtvig grant.

Differences

The target group of the Workshop is in reality the whole adult population in the member states of the LLL programme. The target group also includes persons, who are active or even employed in the adult education sector, as long as they are not the main target group.

The target group of the IST courses is seemingly more delimited, but in reality it is a very open group. It includes staff on a full-time and part-time, professionals as well as volunteers, and it even includes persons from other areas of work or unemployed, who can demonstrate a clear intention of working in adult education, and persons who have completed a qualification leading to a career in adult education and intend to start a career in adult education. In general, the target groups of the IST-courses can be participants at the workshops as long as they are not the main group, and most active in amateur culture and voluntary culture with a position of trust can also be participants in the IST-courses, including unpaid volunteers, who on a part-time basis improve the learning provisions of the organisation, such as board members, mentors, facilitators, etc.,

The borders between the two target groups are according to these definitions quite flexible. In reality many of the participants at the pilot IST-course could also be members of the workshop, and most participants of the pilot workshop could also be members of the IST-course.

Objectives and priorities

Workshops

The objective of this Action is to enable adult learners to participate in Workshops (learning events and seminars) taking place in another European country participating in the Lifelong Learning Programme. Grundtvig Workshops bring together individuals or small groups of learners from several countries for a multinational learning experience relevant for their personal development and learning needs, in which learners are also encouraged to share their competences and insights actively with others.

There are no European priorities for Grundtvig Workshops. However, Workshops may be organised on topics relevant to the Grundtvig Programme objectives.

IST courses

The objective of this Action is to improve the quality of learning provision in your institution or association by offering you in-service training courses in another European country participating in the Lifelong Learning Programme. The training course must be relevant to your daily practice as an adult learning provider, either in a formal, non-formal or informal learning context. The goal is that you, in addition to acquiring new skills, also will increase your understanding of lifelong learning in Europe and gain a European or international dimension in your daily work at home.

Applicants should consult the website of the National Agency in their country in order to ascertain any national priorities. European priority points will be awarded to applications for attending training events resulting from previous Socrates projects or Multilateral Projects and Networks in the Lifelong Learning Programme.

Differences

Both types of courses share the overall aim of promoting European cross-border value; furthermore both types of courses share the aim of promoting a relevant learning outcome. The difference of objectives may be that the IST courses only represent a subset of the possible objectives of the workshops. However, when the target groups are actives that provide learning in the huge sector of voluntary culture, this distinction of objectives become very fluent or flexible. In fact most objectives and priorities of both actions can be used in both types of courses.

Course frame

Workshops

The duration of the workshop must be from 5 to 10 days. Each Workshop will be composed of a minimum of 10 and a maximum of 20 learners. The group of participants must come from at least 3 different countries, and no more than 1/3 of the participants should originate from the same country. Nationals of the country where the Workshop takes place are eligible to participate in these Workshops but cannot be funded from Grundtvig and should not account for more than 1/3 of the total participants in the Workshop.

The workshop provider can apply one time a year to the deadline of 21 February, and the workshop can be completed from 1 September the same year to 31 August the next year. It is only possible to get support to one workshop per year. Adult learners can only seek to participate in one workshop and there must have gone at least 3 years before the same person can participate in another workshop.

IST courses

The duration of the in-service training course must minimum be 5 whole days and maximum 6 weeks. The group of participants must come from at least 3 different countries, and no more than 1/3 of the participants should originate from the same country. There are no demands on the number of participants, and it is possible to participate in a course in another country, where most of the participants are nationals.

The course provider can offer several courses in the same period, as long as they comply with the demands of the action, and there is no deadline for having the courses approved and announced in the Grundtvig course database. The adult learner can only possible to get a new grant for a new course after at least two years since the last course.

Differences

The duration of the workshop is 5 – 10 days, and for the IST-course 5 days to 6 weeks. However, most workshops and IST-courses are of financial reasons only 5-6 days, because the grants for the Workshop are a lump sum of 8.000 euro, and the IST-course has a max of 750 euro per participant (like 5 days of 150 euro).

The rules for the national composition of the group of participants are nearly the same. The workshop has a defined number of participants from 10 to 20, while the IST-course has no demands here.

Application procedure

Workshops

The Action is open to any institution or organisation, which is a legal entity and can demonstrate a capability to organise such a Workshop effectively. The Workshop provider applies their National Agency for a grant to organise a Workshop, and it must take place in that same country.

The Grundtvig workshop grant will relate both to the organisation of the Workshop itself and to the financing of the learners' participation, including their travel and subsistence. The Workshop organiser will organise the learner's stay and cover their travel and subsistence costs.

The workshop will be announced in the EU workshop Catalogue, and adult learners wishing to participate in a Workshop apply (either individually or in small groups) directly to the Workshop organiser, in accordance with the deadline specified by the organiser. The Workshop organiser will provide candidate learners with a learner application form. Local adult education organisations may assist learners in making their applications. The Workshop organiser selects the candidates according to the guidelines defined in its application to the NA.

IST courses

Institutions and organizations providing courses for adult educators are welcome to apply their National Agency for the inclusion of their course in the Grundtvig course database. It is imperative for the approval that the course is offered in accordance with the demands of the Action.

Persons wishing to participate in a course must first get a pre-registration from the course provider and then fill out the standard application form and send it to the National Agency of the country, where the applicant lives. The applicant can expect a response to the application 6 weeks after the application deadline. There are three yearly deadlines:

- 16 January 2012 for activities in the period 1 May 2012 to 30 April 2013
- 30 April 2012 for activities in the period 1 September 2012 to 30 April 2013
- 17 September 2012 for activities in the period 1 January 2013 to 30 April 2013

It is the learners, who must apply their National Agency for a personal grant after getting a pre-registration by the course provider. If the learners get a grant, they can then pay the fee to the course provider. This fee must cover the course fee as well as the subsistence costs. The participants will normally arrange their own travel and get the cost refunded later by the personal grant.

It means the course provider organisation does not get any grant from the National Agency (contrary to the workshop action), but only fees from possible participants. If there are too few participants, the course must be cancelled, because of financial and/or pedagogical reasons.

Differences

The workshop as well as the IST-course must be approved by the National Agency, and then they can be announced respectively in the European workshop catalogue or the Grundtvig database.

The major difference related to the application procedure. In the workshop model it is the learning provider organisation that applies their National Agency for the whole grant to the workshop. In the IST-model it are the individual participants, who must apply their national agencies for grants to the IST-course; and the participants can after approval then pay the course fee and accommodation costs to the course provider.

The application procedure of the workshop model is a lot easier to plan and manage for the provider organisation than the IST-model. When the workshop has been approved and granted by the National Agency, it will normally be completed (very few granted workshops are cancelled). The approval of the IST-course is contrary no guarantee for its success, because it depends on the sum of approved grants to the group of interested participants.

Economy

Workshops

The workshop organiser (and not the participants) will receive the grant from the National Agency in the country of the organising organisation, which is also the country where the Work-

shop is held. This grant will relate both to the organisation of the Workshop itself and to the financing of the learners' participation, including their travel and subsistence.

Approved workshops will receive a fixed contribution of 8,000 euro to the preparation, information and recruitment of participants and the implementation of the planned workshop program. In addition, the organiser receives a fixed contribution to cover the foreign participants' travel, accommodation and meals of 150 euro per person per course-day.

In particularly justified cases, it is possible to seek extra grants to the participants' linguistic, educational and cultural preparation prior to the workshop. This grant is a lump sum of typically max 200 euro per person, but in special cases it can be up to 500 euro.

IST courses

It is the participants (and not the course organiser), who apply their National Agency, and who in case of approval get the grant from their National Agency.

The maximum individual grant is 2000 euro €, regardless of course duration. The funding is based on budgeted expenditures for travel, accommodation, course fee and possible linguistic preparation. The calculation uses the following guidelines:

- Travel costs are covered up to 100% of the transport from home to the course place abroad, if economy class tickets are used. Maximum grants for travel is € 500.
- Subsistence costs for food and lodging in the first seven days are calculated on the basis of fair pricing of 150 per day in all European Programme Countries, except for Bulgaria, Lithuania, Romania and Turkey, where the pricing per day is only 120 euro.
- The course fee can be up to 150 € per day per person. The grant for course fees per person may not exceed 750 euro. It means with 10 participants a possible course fee of 7.500 euro, and with 20 participants a possible course fee of 15.000 euro.
- Participants cannot get a grant for salary coverage of a temp worker or loss of own earnings.

Differences

The IST-course may seem to have a better financial frame, especially when the number of participants is higher than 12-15. However, the IST-courses have a lot higher risk of cancellation, and thereby the costs and work of preparation and management has been wasted. Furthermore, the IST-course will as a tendency be planned with a higher quality of content and thereby costs, which is difficult to reduce (for example number of teachers, planned excursions, etc.), even when the final number of participants is lower than estimated.

The overall challenge for the IST-course is not be to get the course approved by the National Agency and announced in the Grundtvig course database, but rather thereafter to get enough participants to avoid course cancellations with losses or completion with few participants and thus a poor economy.

5.2 Recommendations in general

Overall rating of the two types of mobility activity

The two Grundtvig mobility actions for respectively workshops and in-service training courses have each their advantages and disadvantages, seen from the perspective as learning provider in the field of amateur culture and voluntary cultural associations.

Each action meets a clear need in relation to target groups, learning objectives, course frame and pedagogical approach. On paper the economy can also be fine for both actions; however the application procedure and grant conditions for the IST-courses imply some serious problems both in relation to cross-border networking and pedagogical implementation as well as management and economy. Because the IST-course provider

- Faces a long and complicated application procedure, where the results often first are known very late in the process from announcement to completion;
- Has no control over the granting and thereby enrolment of the groups of participants;
- Has no possibility of developing cross-border collaboration with other related European organisation about offering courses to staff in the common network;
- Faces a high risk of cancellation and thereby no refunding of the initial costs and works of planning, announcing and administration of the course.

The overall problem with the current IST-action is the high level of cancellations, which make it very questionable for the learning providers to use resources on this action of mobility.

The level of cancellations of IST-courses

It has not been possible for us to find official statistic from EACEA on the level of cancellations of IST-courses, however GINGO, the Grundtvig International Network of Course Organisers has published an evaluation of the current IST-action with recommendations for the next generation of the LLP programmes from 2013.⁵

Here we can read that United Kingdom, Germany and Italy in 2009 represented 44.6 pct. of the announced courses and 51.8 pct. of the sessions (a series of the same course) in the Grundtvig database. The numbers were for UK 136 courses and 780 sessions, Italy 126 courses and 338 sessions, Germany 112 courses and 118 sessions. It means a total of 374 courses correspond to 44,6 pct and 1236 sessions correspond to 51,8 pct. of the total number in the Grundtvig database. The total numbers of sessions (single courses) then are 2386.

Furthermore the GINGO report mentions that there were issued 2400 individual grants in 2009. It means an average of one grant per announced session.

If the average number of participants per completed course is 15, it can be possible to complete a total of 160 IST-courses (2400 grants) in the 31 European programme countries. However the Grundtvig database included approx. 2400 single courses for a period of one and half year, or for one year approx. 1600. It means only about 10 pct. of the announced courses can expect to be completed or differently said, 90 pct. of the announced courses are cancelled.

This is a huge problem for the potential participants as well as the course providers. The learners have a high risk of doing a lot of work with pre-registration and application without getting any grant and even if they get a grant the risk of late cancellation is still high. They must up to

⁵ Guy Tilkin: GINCO-Recommendations for the Grundtvig in-service training (IST) Course Action. a decentralised Grundtvig action. Input for the DG EAC public consultation for the next generation of programmes.

one year ahead find a possible course, get a pre-registration, and send an application to their national Agency before one of the three yearly deadlines, then wait 6 weeks on an answer and then again wait on the final confirmation from the course provider, which will come late and with a high probability of a cancellation.

The course provider must first plan the course in detail and apply for its approval by the National Agency to be announced in the Grundtvig Database. Then the provider must make own dissemination work and manage information and pre-registration for the possible participants, and again wait on their possible grant and succeeding contact, and often they don't hear more from the pre-registered participants. Finally the most probable result will be cancellation and extra work and possible extra costs for cancellation of teachers, course venue, etc. In some cases the provider will try to complete the course with a low number of participants, even though it can be both pedagogical and economic problematic.

An additional problem with this application procedure is also the lack of possibilities to develop and use a European network for recruiting participants, because the partners in the network cannot send participants or just guarantee their possible contacts that they can participate, but only guarantee a lot of extra work with a high risk of failure. The conditions undermine thus cross-border cooperation on providing a common course programme.

The advantages of the Workshop model

The workshop model does not imply such problems neither for the participants nor the workshop provider.

The participants do not need to make a comprehensive application to their National Agency for one of the three yearly deadlines, often a long time before course start. They can have a shorter planning horizon and they only need to contact and apply the course provider, and often they can plan to be a small group from their organisation, who go together. Finally, the risk of cancellation is very low, so the planning for the participants and their organisation is easier.

The workshop provider needs to prepare a detailed planning of the programme and to make a more comprehensive application to the National Agency. The main risk related to the possible rejection of this application, but if it is granted, the rest of the course management will gain a higher quality. The risk of cancellation is low; the provider can make a focussed dissemination plan and use the international network to find participants; the provider have full control of the application procedures; and the preparation and completion can be planned better.

The applications procedures and management model of the workshop action is therefore in our point of view better than the IST-course model, and we will recommend that this model will be used in the next generation of Grundtvig in-service training course in the LLP programmes from 2013.

5.3 The GINGO position

GINGO, the Grundtvig International Network of Course Organisers recommends a continued use of the current IST-model with some minor changes. Their argumentation for this conclusion is in our point of view weak and without solid grounding. We will in this last section therefore look closer on their argumentation.

GINGO completed in 2010 an evaluation survey that included a statistical analysis of the Grundtvig Database, an on-line questionnaire with a representative group of European course providers, interviews and a workshop at the annual GINGO conference in October 2010. GINGO recognises that this evaluation indicates several shortcomings in the current IST-action.

GINGOs recommendations were clustered in the following areas:

1. Communication flow among the IST Grundtvig Action stakeholders
2. The current course offer
3. The IST cycle management
 - 3.1. Validation and registration of IST courses
 - 3.2. Participant's grant application procedure
 - 3.3. Evaluation and follow-up of the IST courses
4. The future management mode of the IST Action in the next generation of programmes

Item 1: Communication flow among IST Grundtvig Action stakeholders

Message:

There is a lack of communication between the National Agencies and the in-service training providers in the programme structure. Apart from the course validation procedure there is hardly any information flow among these actors.

Recommendation 1:

Better structured and more regular communication flow between the NAs - responsible for the IST Grundtvig action - and the course organisers should be introduced. This should be seen as a fundamental strategy to increase the efficiency of this Action.

Comments from the LOAC team:

The identified problem will be solved by the use of the Workshop model, which includes a high communication between the National Agency and the course providers.

Item 2: The current course offer – an area for improvement

Message 1: Concentration of the offer

The polarity of the offer is extreme: 3 countries (GB, DE and IT) provide 44,58% of the courses and 51,8% of the sessions. 9 countries provide less than 5% of the IST course offer (BG, LT, LV, SI, EL, RO, IS, PT, TR) and 15 countries provide less than 8% of the sessions.

Message 2: The success rate of the registered course sessions

The number of grants is about 1 grant per course session. It means with an average of 20 participants per completed course, only 5 pct. of the announced courses will be completed.

Message 3: The course cancellation problem

As a consequence organisers find it extremely difficult to attract a sufficient number of course participants to run the course. (..) This means that especially the courses created in the light of the

priorities of the programme are cancelled and are not repeated because of organisers' lack of faith in the present system.

Message 4: "Unfair competition"

A certain degree of "unfair competition" has been identified between European courses developed by Grundtvig project teams on the one hand (because of higher organisational costs and more complicated logistics) and standard national (often language) courses which have been opened to participants from other countries.

Recommendation 2:

Specific incentives and promotional approaches should be sought to enlarge the IST course provision, particularly in those countries that up to the present are not very active in the action.

Recommendation 3:

Clear preference in the new generation of programmes should be given to courses which have been developed by Grundtvig projects. If nationally developed courses are „Europeanized“ and seek entry into the course database, they need to undergo a much stricter validation process than the courses developed by Grundtvig projects. The former will have to prove in detail that they meet European criteria (transnational trainer team, working language, intercultural competence).

Recommendation 4:

(..) More concretely, the number of sessions of the same course eligible for Grundtvig support within one year should be limited to 2 (two), to avoid extremely large numbers of repetitive sessions which obscure the overview of the complete course offer and make it difficult to fill courses with a sufficient number of participants.

Comments from the LOAC team:

We don't think extra promotional approaches will solve the basic problems, and courses developed in a Grundtvig project have already today a priority. The identified problems will on the contrary be solved by using the workshop model with a max of one grant per organisation per year in combination with national course quotes of the total IST-Grant. Furthermore, the possibility of using mobility grants to fill out extra seat in national courses would disappear.

Item 3: The IST cycle management

Messages 3.1 Course validation and registration

- There is considerable concern among course organisers about the quality and redundancy of courses currently available in the data base. (..)
- An accurate validation of IST courses, following clear quality standards as well as eligibility criteria for themes and activities (such as the extent of cultural offer that a training programme should have) applied similarly by all national agencies is crucial for the well-functioning of the IST offer provided at EU level.
- Some National Agencies have expressed a certain difficulty to accurately judge the quality of the training offer on the basis of the current description form.

The relevance of the validated Grundtvig courses should be better in line with the needs and aims of adult education and the Grundtvig programme. The eligibility criteria for course validation are very differently applied from National agency to National Agency.

Recommendation 5:

In addition to the existing formal validation procedure by the National Agencies, quality criteria

should be introduced as well. Courses which meet high standards should be given priority in the grant selection procedure. Of course, the underlying set of quality criteria would need to be published and guidance how to implement them should be offered. Feedback from participants and proof of quality could be added to the description of following courses in the database.

Recommendation 6:

The general standards of validation of the courses should be revised, including the eligibility criteria for the themes and activities. The NAs should apply these criteria in a stricter way; the EU should monitor the course validation process by the NAs in a stricter way.

Comments from the LOAC team:

The identified problems will in principle be solved by using the workshop model, which includes a common application template with clear eligibility and award criteria including monitoring by EACEA of the national Agencies.

Message 3.1.1: The data base as a promotion tool

While in general, the promotion instrument of a Grundtvig/Comenius course database is appreciated by the course organisers, it is felt that the database needs technical improvement, a higher visibility and combination with other central promotion tools.

Recommendation 7:

The user-friendliness of the existing course database should be improved by

- > reducing the number of courses offered (cf. recommendation above)
- > removing finished courses from the database
- > refining the search functions
- > allowing for better and more attractive course descriptions
- > improving its visual appeal

Moreover, the visibility of the database should be increased by linking it to relevant adult education websites and placing it at a much easier to find position on the European website.

Comments from the LOAC team:

Improved user-friendliness is fine, also when the workshop model is used. However, the problem is not a lack of potential participants, but a lack of grants. With the workshop model the high risk of cancellations disappears, and it improves the possibilities for using the cross-border network of related organisations for dissemination. Furthermore, the question of reducing the number of courses in the database will follow from the use of the workshop model.

3.2 Grant application procedure for IST courses

Messages:

- There is (..) much discontent about the grant application and approval system, which is considered to be complicated and inadequate. Course organisers receive a number of 'pre-registration requests' but remain in the dark as to the rest of the procedure. (..) How can a course organiser prepare, make reservations and plan under these circumstances?
- Course organisers also complain about the late notice of (dis)approval of grant applications. Rejected applicants do not bother any more to answer mails from the organiser and even approved applicants tend to forget they have to confirm their participation. This means organisers remain uncertain until very late before the course starts about the final number of participants, whether the course will have enough participants at all, or has to be cancelled.
- Course organisers also indicate problems with the inflexible system of three deadlines per year for grant applications.

- The application procedure appears to be so complicated that course organisers are often asked to provide guidance through the application procedure to their potential participants. This is even more resource-intensive, as priorities apparently differ from one country to another. This guidance should be delivered by the NAs.

Recommendation 8:

The application procedure for grant applications needs to be simplified. The programme needs to ensure that the application procedure and communication between NAs and course organisers are improved in a way which allows the latter to have certainty about the number of participants well in advance of the starting date of the course.

Comments from the LOAC team:

The recommendations do not solve these identified problems. However, they would all be solved by the workshop model.

3.3. Evaluation and follow-up of the IST course

Evaluation and monitoring of IST training courses, is not an activity of this current programme.

- IST training courses are not required to submit any evaluation form to the NA of the country where they take place. Random monitoring of IST courses does not exist either. As a result, the only evidence that NA have about the quality of the courses taking place in a member state is the evaluation form that the grantee has submitted to the NA in its country of origin.
- A problem arises when a participant attending an IST in another member state, complains to his/her own member state about the quality of the training event. There is lack of evidence of the quality of the implementation of the programme in a course. NAs of the sending or the host country do not have enough information to respond adequately, or to take adequate action in relation to an IST course that possibly should not be included in the catalogue in the future.

Recommendation 9:

To introduce a self-evaluation system for the IST courses implemented, to be submitted by the training provider to the National Agency of their country, after the course has been delivered. A standard template should be designed and made available to all IST courses providers whose course has been validated in the data base.

Reports of IST-participants of the various countries should be passed on to the validating NA so that examples of good practice can be identified and courses of a lesser quality can be monitored. An internet-based course evaluation system for participants to fill in after the course could support this process.

Comments from the LOAC team:

These recommendations do not solve the identified problems, but rather creates extra bureaucracy. The simple solution of the problems is to use the workshop model.

Item 4: The future management model of IST provision

Message 1: Preliminary discussions about the most adequate management model for IST provision in the next generation of programmes have already been raised.

The options being the i) status quo, where Grundtvig grants are selected and awarded by NAs of the participant beneficiary country, ii) the recently introduced Grundtvig workshop model, where the course provider is responsible for the whole organisation of the course, the finances and for the selection of the applicants.

The GINCO network of course organisers is clearly favourable to maintain the status quo. Following is the rationale behind the GINCO position:

The Workshop model PROs

The selected course organisers would have guaranteed direct funding and complete and direct control on recruitment of participants. Reduced administrative workload for NAs. NAs would have to select and validate a limited number of courses and have more time for monitoring and/or quality control of these courses.

Comments from the LOAC team:

These PROs are correct, but there is another important advantage, namely the benefits for the participants both in the application phase and especially by minimising the risks of course cancellation. The participants are the end users of the action, and their benefits should have top priority.

The Workshop model CONS

1. The course organisers' application form and the course selection & validation process will be a lot more complicated. Competition between course organisers will move to the application stage. NAs will have to organise a more complex and thorough selection system for courses. This competition will be a hard one since there will be less courses (see below).

LOAC comment: The workshop procedure is not that complicated, and better to have the competition in the start phase to minimise unnecessary later management.

2. The course organisers will have to do the full administration of a high number of applicants and select the participants. The criteria to select the participants will have to be identified. Will this be done by the Commission? Can the national priorities of the applicants' countries be taken into account by the course organisers? It will be very difficult for the course organisers to gather and check all requested details, e.g. eligibility check of an applicant or organisation in the non-formal adult education sector.

LOAC comment: The criteria for selection are identified in the workshop application. Why should it be more difficult to check an applicant than in the current IST-system.

3. The WS model offers NAs hardly any control on participants' profiles, repetitive applications, eligibility of participants and organisations. Extra control systems for the NAs will have to be introduced and implemented. Course organisers run a high financial risk in case they do not implement the complicated participants' eligibility rules correctly.

LOAC comment: A control system against repetitive applicants must be implemented; however it is already the case in the workshop model. This financial risk is small compared to the financial loss with current probably cancellation.

4. On the one hand NAs will set up an assessment and selection system for courses in their own country for the benefit of participants from abroad. On the other hand there is no guarantee whatsoever for NAs that their own nationals can participate in a course they need most.

LOAC comment: Participants are not from "abroad", but citizens of the Union. The workshop model could be revised, so is possible for a course provider as in the current IST-action to arrange courses in other countries and still apply to the National Agency.

5. Will participants from peripheral countries (high travel costs) still have a chance in the WS system?

LOAC comment: The use of the workshop application procedure can be combined with revised economic conditions, so the participants travel costs is separated from costs of accommodations as in the current IST action. No problem.

6. If guaranteed funding is provided for course organisers on the basis of an average of e.g. 20 participants per course, the total number of approved courses (based on the total number of grants) is very limited (120 courses in 2009 for 2400 issued grants).

LOAC comment: Just use an average of 15 participants. Again, the use of the workshop application procedure can be revised and combined with part of the current IST economic frame.

7. In case the number of courses approved in a country is based on the number of grants that country has, small countries will only have 3 – 5 courses. Course organisers will also not be able to establish the sustainability of their courses since this depends each year on the assessment of their NA. Long-term planning will become extremely difficult.

LOAC comment: Strange argument. Today many countries do not complete IST courses at all or very few, but of course, the three main course providing countries: UK, Germany and Italy will get a lesser share, which is only fair and most needed. Furthermore, the problem with the IST model is exactly that it undermines the possibility of long term planning.

8. In this system national courses, run from different sources and attracting only a few Grundtvig participants have no place.

LOAC comment: Hopefully not, this sort of courses is against the whole idea of multilateral mobility.

Recommendation 10:

GINCO does not recommend the introduction of the “Workshop” management model for the IST training courses in the next generation of programmes. A National Agency based selection system of grant applicants is still the preferred option, provided that the suggested recommendations to the programme indicated in this paper are further investigated and implemented.

LOAC comment: Considering the problems identified, this recommendation seems inconsequent. An adapted workshop model could in a clearly higher degree solve most of the identified problems, compared to the recommended adjustments of the current IST-model.

The main challenge for an adapted workshop model will be to adopt the quote of courses for each NA, or to find the basis of distribution of IST courses for each member state in the LLL Programme. Here we will propose to follow the basis of distributions of seats in the European Council as first priority, or the Parliament as a second priority.

Such a list of distribution is presented in the table on the next page, where we calculate with a total of 160 courses per year with an average of 15 participants.

Basis of distribution: IST courses 2013 - 2018						
Countries	The Parliament: Period 2009-2014			The Council: 1 January 2007		
	Seats	Pct.	Number of courses	Seats	Pct.	Number of courses
Germany	99	13,5%	21,5	29	8,4%	13,4
France	72	9,8%	15,7	29	8,4%	13,4
UK	72	9,8%	15,7	29	8,4%	13,4
Italy	72	9,8%	15,7	29	8,4%	13,4
Spain	50	6,8%	10,9	27	7,8%	12,5
Poland	50	6,8%	10,9	27	7,8%	12,5
Romania	33	4,5%	7,2	14	4,1%	6,5
Nederland	25	3,4%	5,4	13	3,8%	6,0
Greece	22	3,0%	4,8	12	3,5%	5,6
Belgium	22	3,0%	4,8	12	3,5%	5,6
Portugal	22	3,0%	4,8	12	3,5%	5,6
Hungary	22	3,0%	4,8	12	3,5%	5,6
Czech Republic	22	3,0%	4,8	12	3,5%	5,6
Sweden	18	2,4%	3,9	10	2,9%	4,6
Austria	17	2,3%	3,7	10	2,9%	4,6
Bulgaria	17	2,3%	3,7	10	2,9%	4,6
Slovakia	13	1,8%	2,8	7	2,0%	3,2
Denmark	13	1,8%	2,8	7	2,0%	3,2
Finland	13	1,8%	2,8	7	2,0%	3,2
Ireland	12	1,6%	2,6	7	2,0%	3,2
Lithuania	12	1,6%	2,6	7	2,0%	3,2
Latvia	8	1,1%	1,7	4	1,2%	1,9
Slovenia	7	1,0%	1,5	4	1,2%	1,9
Estonia	6	0,8%	1,3	4	1,2%	1,9
Cypres	6	0,8%	1,3	4	1,2%	1,9
Luxembourg	6	0,8%	1,3	4	1,2%	1,9
Malta	5	0,7%	1,1	3	0,9%	1,4
Total	736	100,0%	160	345	100,0%	160

Note: Some Candidate Countries which are part of the LLL-programme should also be part of this basis of distribution. We calculate with an unchanged budget, and this could imply 2400 grants, corresponding to 160 courses with an average of 15 participants.

Links and annexes

Links

The course material included

Course programme: In-service training course

Course programme: Workshop

Q1 questionnaire

Q2 questionnaire

Q3 questionnaire

The Compendium on Best practise by Bente von Schindel

Background article: The Learning view in the LOAC project by Hans Jørgen Vodsgaard

Power points by Hans Jørgen Vodsgaard

Power points by Marjeta Turk

These materials can be seen and downloaded at the website of the LOAC Project:

www.interfolk.dk/loac

The online tools for validation of the learning outcome can be seen and tried at the website:

<http://grundtvig.netschooltools.com>

Annexes

LOAC - Template, course evaluation

Course Evaluation

The evaluation is focussed on the following performance indicators

1. Information, preparation and homework before the course	2
1.1 Information about the course programme	2
1.2 Enrolment and practical information	2
1.3 Distributed course materials	2
1.4 Homework	2
2. The design and content of the course	3
2.1 Organisation of the course	3
2.2 Clear objectives	3
2.3 Content in general	3
2.4 Appropriate balance of activities	3
3. Quality of the teaching	4
3.1 The level of qualification	4
3.2 The pedagogical approach	4
3.3 A participatory didactic	4
3.4 Overall rating	4
4. Course venue, materials and equipment	5
4.1 Course venue	5
4.2 AV equipment	5
4.3 Course materials	5
4.4 Overall course environment	5
5. Quality of the domestic arrangements	6
5.1 The logistic frame	6
5.2 Accommodation	6
5.3 Meals	6
5.4 The cultural and social programme	6
6. Quality of the transnational and intercultural dimension	7
6.1 Intercultural qualities	7
6.2 The language challenge	7
6.3 Development of positive attitudes towards Europe	7
6.4 Overall rating of the transnational course	7
7. How would you improve this course?	8

Evaluation scale

- 1 = *poor/unsatisfactory* - major weaknesses
- 2 = *fair* - some important weaknesses
- 3 = *good* - strengths outweigh weaknesses
- 4 = *very good* - major strengths

1. Information, preparation and homework before the course	1	2	3	4
1.1 Information about the course programme	poor	fair	good	very good
I was well informed about the objectives of this course.				
I was well informed about the content of this course.				
I was aware of the prerequisites for this course.				
1.2 Enrolment and practical information	poor	fair	good	very good
The procedure of enrolment was clear and effective				
Appropriate prior travel and accommodation information issued to participants				
Appropriate prior information on other practical questions issued to participants				
1.3 Distributed course materials	poor	fair	good	very good
I received the course materials in good time before the course				
I had the ability to read the course materials before the course				
How are the quality and use of the received course materials				
1.4 Homework	poor	fair	good	very good
Appropriate prior information on expected homework before the course				
The expected homework was appropriate				
I had the ability and commitment to fulfil the expected homework				
Possible comments to the information and homework before the course				
Mention 1-3 points of weaknesses:				
Mention 1-3 points of strengths:				
Mention 1-3 points that can improve the information and homework:				

2. The design and content of the course	1	2	3	4
2.1 Organisation of the course	poor	fair	good	very good
Evidence of a clear planning of the course programme				
Evidence of a clear planning of enrolment and practical guidance				
Appropriate selection of participants				
2.2 Clear objectives	poor	fair	good	very good
The objectives of the course are clear to me.				
Appropriate content, clearly related to the aims and objectives of the course				
Evidence that the course achieved its objectives				
2.3 Content in general	poor	fair	good	very good
Were the topics covered in sufficient detail?				
How easy was it to understand the content?				
Evidence that the difficulty level of this course is appropriate.				
2.4 Appropriate balance of activities	poor	fair	good	very good
Appropriate blend of speaks, workshops, tests, peer work and plenum				
Relevant mixture of icebreaking activities, didactic sessions, workshops, social activities, cultural excursions, and free time				
Realistic timescales: The pace of this course is appropriate				
Possible comments to the design and content of the course				
Mention 1-3 points of weaknesses:				
Mention 1-3 points of strengths:				
Mention 1-3 points that can improve the design and content of the course:				

3. Quality of the teaching	1	2	3	4
3.1 The level of qualification	poor	fair	good	very good
How well prepared were the trainers and leaders				
Trainers and leaders have the appropriate subject competence and knowledge				
Trainers and leaders communicated well with the necessary language skills				
3.2 The pedagogical approach	poor	fair	good	very good
Instructors' presentation abilities including to provide real world experience?				
Instructors' ability to listen and respond appropriately to questions?				
The activities in this course gave me sufficient practice and feedback.				
3.3 A participatory didactic	poor	fair	good	very good
Evidence that participants could contribute with their own expertise				
Evidence of participants sharing roles and responsibilities during the course				
Evidence that expectations of participants have been taken into account				
3.4 Overall rating	poor	fair	good	very good
How were the flow/structure of practical information to the participants				
The course activities stimulated my learning.				
Your overall rating of trainers and leaders?				
Possible comments to the teaching				
Mention 1-3 points of weaknesses:				
Mention 1-3 points of strengths:				
Mention 1-3 points that can improve the teaching at the course:				

4. Course venue, materials and equipment	1	2	3	4
4.1 Course venue	poor	fair	good	very good
Was the plenum room comfortable and conducive to learning?				
Were the classrooms comfortable and conducive to learning?				
Were the workshop rooms comfortable and conducive to learning?				
4.2 AV equipment	poor	fair	good	very good
Was the standard of the equipment satisfactory?				
Were the ICT-tools sufficient and suitability to the planned sessions?				
How was the support and assistance for the use of the ICT-tools?				
4.3 Course materials	poor	fair	good	very good
How well did the course materials follow the course?				
How were the relevance and quality of materials issued during the event				
Will it have a potential use for me as future reference material				
4.4 Overall course environment	poor	fair	good	very good
Were the standard of the training facilities as you expected?				
How suitability is the training facility for a week course?				
Overall rating of the training facilities (course venue)?				
Possible comments to the course facilities:				
Mention 1-3 points of weaknesses:				
Mention 1-3 points of strengths:				
Mention 1-3 points that can improve the course facilities:				

5. Quality of the domestic arrangements	1	2	3	4
5.1 The logistic frame	poor	fair	good	very good
How is the logistic quality with different places for hotel, meals and course				
What quality do the logistic conditions have for free time and social activities				
How is the quality of a course situated in the centre of Ljubljana				
5.2 Accommodation	poor	fair	good	very good
How is the quality of the hotel room				
How is the quality of the breakfast				
What are your overall rating of the hotel				
5.3 Meals	poor	fair	good	very good
How is the quality of having the lunch at the Hidden Corner?				
How is the quality of having dinners at different places during the course?				
How are the service and conditions for the coffee breaks at the course venue?				
5.4 The cultural and social programme	poor	fair	good	very good
How were the possibilities for cafe visits/social gatherings in the free time?				
How was the Boat trip Monday evening?				
How was the concert of the Brass Band Tuesday evening?				
How was the one-day excursion Wednesday?				
Possible comments to the domestic arrangements				
Mention 1-3 points of weaknesses:				
Mention 1-3 points of strengths:				
Mention 1-3 points that can improve the design of the course:				

6. Quality of the transnational and intercultural dimension	1	2	3	4
6.1 Intercultural qualities	poor	fair	good	very good
Quality of having a group of instructors from different sectors and countries.				
Intercultural quality of having a group of participants from different countries.				
Quality of having participants from different generations and cultural sectors.				
6.2 The language challenge	poor	fair	good	very good
Our workshops manage the language challenge and worked well together.				
Evidence of strategies for overcoming language difficulties for the participants				
I felt encouraged by my group members to engage in the discussions				
6.3 Development of positive attitudes towards Europe	poor	fair	good	very good
Opportunities to share information about own countries and education systems				
The extent and quality of the European dimension				
Development of positive attitudes towards transnational European activities				
6.4 Overall rating of the transnational and intercultural dimension	poor	fair	good	very good
This course lived up to my expectations.				
Was the content suited to your requirements?				
Would you recommend this course to others?				
How satisfied are you with the overall experience of the course				
Possible comments to the trans-national quality				
Mention 1-3 points of weaknesses:				
Mention 1-3 points of strengths:				
Mention 1-3 points that can improve the design of the course:				

7. How would you improve this course?	No need	Maybe	Yes, important	Yes, very important
Provide better information before course				
Clarify the course objectives.				
Reduce content covered in course.				
Update content covered in course				
Improve the instructional methods.				
Make course activities more stimulating				
Improve course organization.				
Make the course less difficult.				
Slow down the pace of the course.				
Improve the ICT-tools used in the course.				
Improve the cultural visits				
Improve the cultural excursion				
Improve the frame of social gathering in the free time				
Improve the used evaluation methods				
What will you recommend?				
What other improvements would you recommend in this course? Mention 1-3 points				
What is least valuable about this course? Mention 1-3 points				
What is most valuable about this course? Mention 1-3 points.				