RWL Final Partner Meeting

9th November 2014

Present: Ziva(SL) Zsuzsa(Hun) Tom (UK) Richard(UK) Angelika(Ger) Daniela (It) Irena(CR) Thorsten (Ger) Sam (UK)

The agenda for the meeting was informal and agreed at the start of the meeting.

1. Reflections on the Project

The team spent the morning reflecting on the project, guided by the questions:
- What has changed for me?
- What has influenced me?
- Where will I go next?
- Where will we go next?

The partners felt unable to share definite answers to these questions at this time, preferring to reflect further and have some time to consolidate their views on the RWL model without taking any decisions on the future at the present moment. Partners felt that the conference was 'a great success, very positive, inspiring and a fantastic outcome.' Some people felt they would have preferred to know more in advance about the conference planning; this issue was not explored further.

2. Working Groups

Each WG reported on their work and any tasks remaining.

a. WG1

There is still work to complete as follows:
- Contact case study providers to ask if they wish to edit their case study based on assessment by WG1 members.
- Publish the WG1 assessment of the case studies if the providers provide agreement. If permission is not provided the assessments will only appear in the Confidential part of the final report for the EU.
- Complete the criteria and indicators.
- Write guideline text for using the criteria and indicators, and recommendations.

Actions:
- CoCo's to get permissions from case study providers to place their case studies on the website; this is for all 24 case studies not just the final six (by end of November 2014).
- CoCo's and WG1 to check if providers of the six reviewed case studies wish to make further changes (by end of January 2015).
- WG1 to complete all tasks outlined above by end Jan 2015.
- Angelika to provide case study assessments to WG3.

b. WG2

Work has been completed. It was questioned whether the mind maps would have a 'solutions tree' added. This was not the intention of the WG and this will be made clear on the website.

Actions:
- Sam to add text to website to explain the mind maps and the lack of a solutions tree (by end November 2014) <mark>DONE</mark>

c. WG3

WG3 work is mostly complete. Based on WG1 recommendations, the case studies can be edited for the website.

Actions:
- Send any edited case studies to Richard for the website (by end January 2015).
- CoCo's to ask for permission to publish all case studies on the website (by end November 2014).
- Richard to publish all case studies on website provided permission has been granted.
- Richard to add the MeMo's document onto the website.

   d. WG4

No work remaining.

   e. Core Group

No work remaining.

3. **Website**

We spent a considerable time discussing the website. The site was independently proof read. Richard has edited the site to make the language more consistent and correct obvious grammatical errors. The proof reader commented that there are large amounts of repetition in the site, some of which has been removed by Richard.

The main area of discussion was the RWL model page. This currently has three layers of information:
- The model itself.
- The pop-ups.
- The light boxes.

Currently the information at each level is inconsistent leading to repetition of information in some cases and too much information in others. It was agreed that the RWL model page needs to be simpler: the light boxes will be removed and the pop-up text edited to 50-100 words.

Actions: (all by 10th November)
- Richard: Ensure light-boxes are removed.
- WG Leaders: To email Richard changes to the main finger web-pages. To be completed at CH (understanding finger done)
- CoCo's: Email Richard with a request for Umbraco password if you need it
- Richard to set-up translation fields in new website, and resend website manual to partners.

4. **Translations and Poster**

We had a long conversation about translations and the challenges each partner faced with a limited budget. The amount allocated for translation at the beginning of the project will not be sufficient for all partners. Each partner needs to decide how much needs to be translated to ensure non-English speakers in their country can understand the results of the project, and justify their decisions for the final project report to the EU. Richard calculates this at about 55 pages based on all the RWL Model and Resources pages and downloads.

Given the limited budget, Richard will explore if additional monies can be found from within other areas of the budget. This will depend on the cost for printing the poster. A file containing the poster text to be translate will be sent around. Each country to find a quote from a local printer for 500 or 1000 copies and send to Richard. Costs incurred so far are £1250 (design work), £792 to print 2000 copies in English; about €2600. German version to be about €500 for 1000 copies.

Actions:
- Richard create a translation folder in Huddle to include all text to be translated (by 10th November 2014). DONE
- CoCo's to provide estimates of translation cost (send to Richard by 15th December 2014).

- CoCo's to send Richard quotes for poster printing – 500/1000 copies (send to Richard by end November 2014).
- Richard to send poster specification and UK files (by 10th November 2014). <mark>DONE</mark>
- Richard to send translated poster text to designer to complete each language version.

5. Conference Report

We discussed what should be included into the conference report and agreed the following:

- Keynotes speakers presentations and notes.
- One page review of each workshop (see Tom's email for example of format).
- Reflections on the RWL model.
- VDO reflections on the RWL model.
- Details of share zone activities.

Actions:
- CoCo's to arrange one page summary from workshop providers (by 15th December 2015).
- Richard to compile conference report.

6. Dissemination, Exploitation and Evaluation

There were some concerns expressed about the provision of information for dissemination and exploitation. Partners need to complete the dissemination and exploitation table that has been provided, and give evidence. The Monitoring and Evaluation Framework document provides details of information to collect and target numbers for evaluating impact of the project.

We clarified what we meant by 'engaging with decision makers': talking with and encouraging decision makers to use the results of RWL in their work. We have no control over the impact but can encourage decision makers to make use of the RWL results.

Actions:
- CoCo's: To complete Excel table with events for D&E. Number the evidence that you submit with each event, in terms of files to support the events. Janet will need to see which piece of evidence for each event. Evidence can be things such as participants lists, reports on line, photo's, session lists which include the event, session plan, sign in sheets, screen shot of web-site, write-ups in magazines, twitter feeds, survey monkeys, facebook pages (by end February 2015).
- Richard to send copy of questions UK team are using for evaluation (by end November 2014). <mark>DONE</mark>

7. Final Report for EU

We went through the final report sections and discussed what should be included.

Project Objectives:

Restating what is in the proposal.

Project Approach:

Working Groups, core groups etc. Do we want something evaluative in terms of how the project changed the way we work or its significant in terms in the outcomes of the project. The core group was a positive change to the way of working, so we should mention this. Methodologies, surveys that had an impact on the projects.

Outcomes and Results:

Reasons for achievement and barriers in the outcomes and outputs. This is tangible things and intangible things. What influenced the project outcomes and outputs? Big outcomes beyond what we had to do, e.g. the hand model.

- ACTION: CoCo's - Questions and reflections to Working groups: Richard will send this to CoCo's so that they can contact and get some feedback. 12th Nov 14 <mark>DONE</mark>
- ACTION: CoCo's feedback to Richard – End Jan 2015: Whats happening in your organisation, has anything significant happened through-out the life-time of the project that are evidence of the project having an impact and also what has happen for the individuals involved in the working groups, as above point.

Management Aspects included in the confidential report:

Changing members of the working groups, clarity in certain aspects of the management of the project.

Partnerships:

Describe the advantages of a multi-country partnerships.

Plans for the future:

Continuity of the project. There is a need for time to consolidate and think about using the RWL model in a deeper way in a national aspect. Talked about the possibility of bringing that experience back together in a conference in a years time. If we want funding for further projects, we need to know if it works in each country before we look at developing it further. We had no recipe for a future project at the moment. And to just leave the door open for a future project. Looking at developing new partnerships within countries, leaving this before the network takes another step.

Actions:
- Richard to send partners final reporting template (by end November 2014)
- All partners to complete and send evidence to Richard (by end February 2014)

8. Summary Table of Actions:

Date for completion	Action	Who
10th Nov 14	Email changes to the main finger web pages	WG Leaders
12th Nov 14	Email questions to CoCo's about reflections about outcomes and results	Richard
12th Nov 14	Website translations on Huddle	Richard
30th Nov 14	Richard will send poster text to all CoCo's. CoCo's need to translate this and get back to Richard as soon as possible so that you can get printed.	Richard / CoCo's
30th Nov 14	Get a quote locally printing 500 or 1000 copies of the poster to Richard.	CoCo
31st Nov 14	Sam to add text to website to explain the mind maps and the lack of a solutions tree	Sam
31st Nov 14	Angelika to provide case study assessments to WG3.	Angelika
31st Nov 14	CoCo's to get permissions from case study providers to place their case studies on the website; this is for all 24 case studies not just the final six	CoCo
31st Nov 14	Send final report template to partners	Richard
15th Dec 14	Add MeMo's to experience section of website	Richard
15th Dec 14	Ask providers of workshops to write a one page summary	CoCo
15th Dec 14	Get an estimate for translating all conference case studies and the web-site, or whatever you would like to translate from the Huddle folder that Richard has made.	CoCo
15th Dec 14	Send one page summary of conference workshops to Richard	CoCo
31st Jan 15	WG1 to have completed all tasks	WG1
31st Jan 15	Case study re-writes if people want to. CoCo's to ask providers if they are happy with the write up and get permission to publish on website. Send case studies to Richard.	CoCo
31st Jan 15	Report back to Richard about what is happening in your organisation, has anything significant happened through-out the life-time of the project that are evidence of the project having an impact and also what has happened for the individuals in working groups.	CoCos
28th Feb 15	To complete Excel table with dissemination and exploration events	CoCo's
28th Feb 15	Final report and evidence sent to Richard	CoCo's

Other actions:
- Richard: Ensure light-boxes are removed.
- CoCo's: Email Richard with a request for Umbraco password if you need it
- Richard to set-up translation fields in new website, and resend website manual to partners.
- Richard to send poster specification and UK files (by 10th November 2014).
- Richard to send translated poster text to designer to complete each language version.
- Richard to compile conference report.
- Richard to send copy of questions UK team are using for evaluation (by end November 2014).
- CoCo's - Questions and reflections to Working groups: Richard will send this to CoCo's so that they can contact and get some feedback (12th Nov 14).
- CoCo's feedback to Richard – End Jan 2015: Whats happening in your organisation, has anything significant happened through-out the life-time of the project that are evidence of the project having an impact and also what has happen for the individuals involved in the working groups, as above point.