Organiser **Coordinator**

Competence Coach
Leonardo Transfer of Innovation

Programme

Competence Coach **Steering group meeting**	in Rome, Italy Meeting of project managers of all partners The aim of the steering group meetings is - to solve management and financial problems, - to review work packages and planning of working plan until next meeting, - to monitor project process, - to exchange ideas with decision-makers.
Date	26th – 29th May 2010
Organiser	Ms. Federica D´Armini Viale Iale Bruno Buozzi 47 00197 Rome Italy Tel.: 0039 06 57 30 51 51 Fax: 0039 06 57 47 834 Email: f.darmini@trustonline.org
Contact person	Ms. Federica D´Armini Mobile: *+39 334 24 91 076*
Accommodation (see your confirmations)	"Domus Sessoriana"- address: P.zza Santa Croce in Gerusalemme, 10, 00185 Rome www.domussessoriana.it

Wednesday, May 26th , 2010		Arrival of participants at Rome
	20.30/ 21.00	informal meeting at the Hotel, dinner together
Thursday, May 27th, 2010	9.30	Federica D´Armini/ Ulrike Santos: Welcome, introduction Opening of work
	09.45 - 10.15	Plenary session of opening ttg team training GmbH: status quo of our project Since the last SGM in Athens a lot of things happened (definitions, template for curriculum, first ideas for composition of the modules). Modules should have been completed until December 31st 2010. The schedule for the translation of the modules was extended to January 31st 2010. According to the activity plan all partners had time for the piloting of the modules until end of March. The SGM in Rome had to be postponed due to force majeure (volcanic eruption in Iceland made flights impossible). At the meeting, the most important tasks will be: - discuss content of all modules - discuss financial items

- new activity plan for the remaining month of the project

10.15 – 10.45	**Susanne Weber/ f-bb: presentation of internal interim report** Susanne Weber presented the conclusion of internal data f-bb collected. 5 from 8 partners responded to her request and filled in the questionnaire. The main results are **WP 1** The general result is quite positive. The goals and results are clear and the aims are shared. Every partner knows what his role is and has a direct interest in the completion of the WP. But there are some doubts concerning the completion of the project. The problems that where mentioned from the partners refer mainly to the delays and as causes a weak management and an unclearness concerning the contents were specified. In comparison to the first evaluation report the results are a little bit worse in regard to the delays. **WP 2** is about the quality management which means the internal and the external evaluation. Everything is totally clear in this WP. For WP 3, the dissemination activities, the general evaluation is quite positive except for the last question. Some partners feel only partly or slightly feasible to complete this WP. The delay was mentioned again, another partner notes that the posters are still missing. One partner hopes that there will be more dissemination activities when the course is completed. In accordance with the proposal, the expected results for this WP are: Project flyers, posters, articles, national transfer workshops, participation of lead partner on European conferences for dissemination activities. The **WP** "Needs analysis" was evaluated positive. This WP is already completed, it was conducted by IEKEP. The **WP** "Learning from experience" was evaluated positive. This WP is already completed; TRUST was responsible for this WP. For **WP 6**, the development of the modules, the results are as follows: The goal, the activities and results are quite clear for the partners. All partners that answered to the questionnaire share the aim of the WP. The role and activities for each partner are quite clear. Every partner has a direct interest in the training course, but there are some problems with the completion of the WP. Again, the delays are mentioned and it seems that still the contents of the modules are not clear for every partner. In comparison to the first evaluation, this WP was evaluated better from the partners but there still exists some unclearness. The content of **WP 7** applies to the long-term effect of the training course. The training courses at national level take place after the completion of the curriculum and as well after the project has finished. The evaluation is positive for the goal, the activities and the results of this WP. The aim is shared by the partners. One partner has only a slight interest in this WP. When it comes to the completion of the WP, the problem is the same as mentioned above, namely the delay. Three partners are concerned about the national certification of the training course. For one partner the cooperation with other VETI is a problem. It also seems that there is uncertainness about the commitment of all partners to the transfer of the training course. Compared to the first evaluation, the results are almost the same except for question 4: For you/your organisation is clear your specific activity and role for reaching the goal? The results are better here. For **WP 8** the coordinator is responsible.

	SWOT Analysis: There are mainly two weak points related to the project: one is the lack of time, the other is the missing knowledge about coaching and its theoretical background. One partner mentioned that it will become difficult to implement coaching as a service. The project is threat by delay which can lead to financial consequences. Other threats are a not shared aim, the national certification and the lack of adequate human resources. But the strong points persist as the strong partnership, the real interest in the project and the usefulness of the project outcomes. The training course is a real opportunity for some of the partners' regions. Recommendations: In order to handle the delay and improve the management regular telephone conferences via Skype could be a solution in order to control the status of every partner. As some partners mentioned uncertainness about their background of coaching, a possibility could be – if there is budget – to have the modules checked by some experts. **Juliane Stierle/ EU- Concilia: presentation of the external interim report** Juliane Stierle had prepared a PowerPoint presentation, the main results are: The status quo of the achievements: - Most results are ready: Website, Symposium, Needs analysis etc. - Missing: first external evaluation report, piloting of course The internal project process - After slow beginning the project is picking up speed - Difficulties and confusions in the beginning - Delays and confusions in the past but now positive attitude The satisfaction and needs of the partners: - Satisfaction rated „sufficient" or„satisfactory" - Improvements in the last month are seen - Communication rated „good" - Frequency of communication can be improved The quality of the consortium: - Balance of European regions, – Balance of expertise - Good experiences in: Competence assessment, Diversity management - Fewer experiences in: Coaching, Vocational guiding Conclusion and prospects • Partners are able and willing to reach all set goals • Products up to now are of good quality • Basis for high-quality curriculum is lied • Revised activity plan is in action • Needs for improvement: strong leading hand is needed, rising communication (e.g. Skype), deadlines must be held
10.45 - 11.15	Coffee break
11.15 – 13.00	interviews of all partners (approx. 30 min), Juliane Stierle Discussion of training course modules and handbook COMPETENCE COACH Not all partners did the piloting of all modules before the SGM. All present partners (Simon Hughes from Yale College could not join the new date because of other obligations) were asked to give

		feedback to each module, the material etc. by Ulrike Santos. Here the summary: 1.Coaching - ttg and Telsiai Training Center Feedback to module 1: - ok all in all, maybe a little bit too long at least for experienced trainers - nothing has to be changed
	13.00 - 14.00	Lunch break
	14.00 - 16.30	2. Competence Assessment – fbb Feedback to module 2: - partners like the content, CV and competence card are included because of TOI; Susanne Weber will add Europass- CV to the module 3. Change Management – Trust Feedback to module 3: - many good material; nothing has to be changed concerning the content; proposal: put some material, theory etc. as appendix (decision about it after all pilotings) 4. Guidance of groups at risk of social exclusion – Athena Feedback to module 4: - a lot of exercises, not all were tested, partners like that they can choose; nothing has to be changed concerning the content; proposal: some material, theory etc. as appendix (decision about it after all pilotings) 5. ICT based guidance for groups at risks of social exclusion - IEKEP and Yale College Module 5 Handbook must be extended; missing: definition of guidance (→ worksheet 1.1), definition of ICT- based guidance (worksheet 2.1) case studies as examples for worksheet 3.1, , examples for a) "similarities and differences between ICT- based and traditional guidance" (worksheet 2.2) and b) when ICT- based guidance is more appropriate and where are its limitation (worksheet 3.1) Unfortunately Yale College couldn't join the SGM, so there could be no discussion about the part handbook of module 5 with Simon Hughes; questions of project partners to Yale´s task could not be solved in Rome but had to be postponed.
	18.00	sightseeing
	20.00	meeting at Spanish stairs, dinner
Friday, May 28t^{h}, 2010	9.00 – 11.30	5. ICT based guidance for groups at risks of social exclusion - IEKEP and Yale College *(continued)* 6. Intercultural Counselling – IDF Module 6 -simplify the material to get a basic approach to the topic; revise/ work on the curriculum and handbook as announced at SGM in

		Rome; proposal: use the more advanced material for the appendix now new composition- Noel Cardi and Christophe Verbizier introduced the new abstract: two parts, group work, etc. supported by two PowerPoint presentations. The adapted module will be ready until the new deadline (June 15th, 2010).
	in between	Coffee break
	11.30 – 12.30	group interview, discussion (Juliane Stierle)
	12.30 – 14.00	Lunch break
	14.00 – 15.45	Budget/ financial problems and questions Questions from Telsiai Training Center, Trust, IEKEP, and others were discussed and solved.
	15.45 - 16.15	Coffee break
	16.15 – 17.30	Working plan/ tasks of each partner until the next meeting in Telsiai. Lithuania (July 2010) Ulrike Santos had prepared a paper with was presented via beamer at the end of the meeting, every partner received a copy. **Tasks until next meeting:** Completing all modules of training course until June 15th 2010 – **f-bb; IEKEP & Yale, IDF** Piloting of **all** modules of training course from June 16th to July 9th 2010– **all partners** Proposal for handbook layout until June 15th – **ttg** Feedback to layout until June 18th – **all partners** use the final format (layout) for the national handbook and send it to ttg until July 14th – **all partners** for Federica D´Armini´s request send all financial documents (covering the period up to May 31th 2010) to team training until Friday, June 5th 2010 – **all partners** send status report (period January to March 2010) to ttg – **partners affected** if possible: send articles etc. about CC to ttg **– all partners** preparation for first run of training course **– all partners**
	20.00	Dinner
Saturday, May 29th, 2010		Departure of participants