



## WP6 – Test Seminar Results – HEC-ULg

---

### Test seminar description and participants

#### **Aim**

The three areas of assessment, as specified in the project proposal, were:

- To validate the quality and relevance of these training modules tailored to the specifics of each country. (does it address needs & level of SE managers in your country)
- To improve the modules and transfer process.
- To assess the integration of this module into existing qualifying training programmes (fit with existing trainings –gaps in provision)

Our aim in these test seminars is more centred on assessing the general tools and the design/adaptation process, as opposed to evaluating the “product” or training that results.

#### **Date**

20<sup>th</sup> of September 2012

#### **Location**

Liège

#### **Participants<sup>1</sup>**

<b>Trainers</b>	Benjamin Huybrechts, Center for Social Economy, HEC-ULg
	Michel Boving, CESSOC & Consultant indépendant
	Sybille Mertens, Centre d'Economie Sociale, HEC-ULg & Helmo-ESAS & UNIPSO
	Michel Marée, Centre d'Economie Sociale, HEC-ULg, ESAS
	Arnaud Henry, Institut Cardijn <sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Two more documents are available: a document signed by the participants (scanned document) and a list with updated information about the participants.

<sup>2</sup>Arnaud Henry forgot to sign the document.



<b>Practitioners</b>	Marie-Céline Jamoye, Atout EI
	Frédérique Debaar, Théâtres et publics asbl
<b>Trainers &amp; practitioners<sup>3</sup></b>	Eric Dewaele, Belgian Fair Trade Federation (as practitioners) & ESAS & Consultant indépendant pour la CRB-CFr (as trainers)
	David Gabriel, Autre Terre & Helmo-ESAS
	Julie Rijpens, Centre d'Economie Sociale, HEC-ULg & SAW-B (as trainers) & Asmaé (as practitioners)

## Organization

The period of separate discussions has been quite short, because the participants preferred to have large exchanges on those topics. The participants have been able to respond to others' point of view. The interaction between the various members allows the stimulation of their reflection.

## Results of the test seminar

### **The three tools developed through the Ariadne Project**

#### Competence model

Both trainers and practitioners felt this was a great tool but in different ways.

- The trainers explained the tool was interesting to make their training as close as possible to the needs of the practitioners. By that, they underlined the need to know the target group of the training<sup>4</sup>, which is sometimes quite difficult. Indeed, the trainers do not always know in advance the exact level of knowledge and skills of the people who participate to their training. Moreover, they emphasized the fact that the list of competences was quite big and that it was not possible to transfer, to teach all those competences in one training, even if it is a long one.

<sup>3</sup> Those participants are together active on the field in a social enterprise and involved in a teaching activity on social enterprises or social entrepreneurship.

<sup>4</sup> To be linked with the 8 variables (number 3 : target)



- The practitioners outlined the fact that the competence model allows each practitioner to evaluate its own strengths and weaknesses. They also claimed that the competence model need to be adaptive because each situation, each social enterprise, each function is different and demands different competences. For example, some social enterprises put more focus on the democratic governance while others don't.

Both trainers and practitioners felt the competence model was a little bit too much focused on the “legal” aspects. They felt there was missing something about the global stakes addressed by a social enterprise, about its “raison d’être”. A dynamic presentation of the competence model is appreciated.

*In response specifically to the questions in the focus group methodology:*

1. Is this framework relevant to addressing needs of SE managers in your country?  
Yes for both trainers and practitioners.
2. Is this framework relevant to addressing level of SE managers in your country?  
Yes for both trainers and practitioners.
3. Is this framework reasonably comprehensive or are there significant gaps?  
The competence model is comprehensive for both trainers and practitioners and no really significant gap has been identified even if improvements are always possible.
4. Do you have any suggestions for improvements?  
See above on the global stakes addressed by a social enterprise, its “raison d’être”. Because of the potential of self evaluation of the competence model for any practitioner, it should be largely diffused.

### Country specificities chart

The country specificities chart has been evaluated as a very useful tool.

- It appeared to the trainers as a sort of common background that any trainers, teaching on social enterprises in Belgium, should have in mind. That list of points about the European dimension has been identified as a really good way to make the trainers ask themselves the good questions to be sure they have the necessary knowledge. It allows the trainers to integrate the European dimensions in their trainings.
- For the practitioners, having that European view is important to know in which context their social enterprise operates and to know the eventual possibilities of



development. It will make the practitioners aware that they are part of something bigger and that they can integrate their project in the European stakes.

*In response specifically to the questions in the focus group methodology:*

1. Is the Chart useful and relevant for developing a course for SE managers in your country?

Yes, absolutely for both trainers and practitioners but the trainers have had an especially positive reaction to that tool.

2. Is the classification of topics useful and relevant?

Yes for both trainers and practitioners. They underlined that it covers all the main topics about the important European dimensions.

### General training framework

Both trainers and practitioners felt that something was missing about the limits of the actual economic system and the financial capitalism<sup>5</sup>. Because of the societal goal of a social enterprise, bringing an ethical perspective to that training and linking the training with more global stakes is important. “Why do we talk about social enterprises?” is thus a necessary introduction, even in a short way. The European perspective has been particularly appreciated by both practitioners and trainers. The trainers and practitioners defended also the importance of the sharing of experiences, difficulties, good practices, and so on. Linking the practices of the practitioners to the meaning of those practices appeared to both trainers and practitioners as a good way to make visible the principles of social enterprises, while starting from the field.

- The trainers underlined the fact that the European dimension is currently missing in the Belgian trainings on social enterprises. The trainers emphasized that, in three days, it seems hard to give the practitioners concrete tools on the technical aspect of management. In that format (three days), the training can raise awareness about social enterprises but seems too short to concretise the theory in the use of tools. Exemplifying but above all, giving to the practitioners useful tools seems to be always challenging for the trainers. If there were more time, visiting some social enterprises

---

<sup>5</sup> To be linked with the improvements suggested on the competence model about the « raison d'être » of the social enterprises



would be a great way to render more concrete the training. Another way would be to start from the existing definition of social enterprise and to see, in a real organization, how the different elements of the definition are lived. In order to make the training about social enterprises interesting, it is crucial to make the link between social enterprises and the global move through transition in the entire society. It also seemed important to differentiate the different forms of social enterprises and especially, to underline the difference between nonprofits and social enterprises present on the market. Indeed, those different organizations face different challenges and functioning.

- The practitioners explained that they like to feel that they are not alone, that they have, in some ways, a common background, and that they live similar experiences (feeling of being “on the same boat”).

*In response specifically to the questions in the focus group methodology:*

1. Are these areas of curriculum relevant to addressing needs of SE managers in your country?

Yes, for both trainers and practitioners.

2. Are these areas of curriculum relevant to addressing level of SE managers in your country?

Yes for both trainers and practitioners. The practitioners and trainers have agreed to say that, in a caricatured way, there are two kinds of people attending that sort of training: the ones who have the “social” competences (people especially sensitive to the values of the organization) and the others who have the “management” skills (people which are more oriented on the management of the organization). The first group need to learn about management competences (often more technical) and the second group need to learn about social competences (about the social economy, its history and evolutions, its societal roles, etc.)<sup>6</sup>.

3. Is this reasonably comprehensive or are there significant gaps?

Yes for both trainers and practitioners. Few little gaps have been identified, as mentioned above.

4. Do you have any suggestions for improvements?

See above about the limits of the actual economic system notably.

---

<sup>6</sup> The same comment is done for the target variable (number 3).



5. How do both elements fit with existing training provision; i.e. Can you identify any gaps in provision that this might help to fill?

Practitioners and trainers felt that those kinds of trainings already exist in Belgium but that they could be improved, notably, by including the European dimension and by using the competence model.

### **The design methodology (8 variables)**

For both trainers and practitioners, those eight variables appeared as really useful to construct a training. The variables appeared to the trainers as a good way to evaluate the trainings they are already giving. It allows the trainer to ask himself the important questions in order to improve the training.

1. Existing training context

Both trainers and practitioners agreed to say that it is important “not to reinvent to wheel” and to consider what already exists.

2. Teaching corps

The trainers have presented the interest of being two trainers in one unique training. It allows the students to gather different points of view. Some debates can even be organized. They all underlined the importance of having trainers that know very well the field, its various realities. Being connected to the reality is crucial. That’s why lots of trainers are also implied in the field.

3. Target

Both trainers and practitioners agreed to say that the target group was an especially important variable as long as the training will be thought very differently according to the target group. Even if the training is addressed to students, it will not be the same approach for the first grade that for a master degree student. When the target is not homogeneous, it seemed difficult to answer the various expectations. Practitioners and trainers have agreed to say that, in a caricatured way, there are two kinds of people attending that kind of training: the ones who have the “social” competences and the others who have the “management” skills. The first group need to learn about management competences (often more technical) and the second group need to learn



about social competences (about the social economy, its history and evolutions, its societal roles, etc.). This appeared as a good starting point to identify the target group.

#### 4. Country oriented context

Both trainers and practitioners agreed to say that the training should mainly be country-oriented. But they also strongly underlined the interest of having a European dimension.

#### 5. Priority competences

Both trainers and practitioners explained being able to identify the priority competences was really important but still hard to achieve. The trainers explained their difficulty to identify the level of knowledge or the exact expectations of the public before the training. Moreover, they often face a public with different levels, different motivations and expectations. Even if that variety is often considered as a strength (allowing exchanges and so on), it stays challenging for the trainers. This point is, for practitioners, a really important one because it often allows answering their expectations.

#### 6. European dimension

Having a European dimension has been identified by trainers and practitioners as one of the main insights of the proposed training, even if it seems sometimes difficult to make it sufficiently concrete or to link that with their everyday constraints or concerns.

#### 7. Format and 8. Teaching method

Both trainers and practitioners agreed to say that the format and the teaching method are important and have to be suitable to different elements: the various constraints of the public (how much time can the practitioners liberate in their agenda?), the content of the training (certain content can be done online, others can't<sup>7</sup>), the goal of the training (if one of the goal is to network, the online training is not suitable), etc. They still emphasized the need to have strong insight on concrete examples and on the

---

<sup>7</sup> For example, developing some know-how or behaviours seems really difficult online.



concretization of the theoretical elements. The practitioners also underlined that networking is really important for them, such as underlined above.

### **Developments of Shared resources discussion**

Unfortunately, we really haven't had time to discuss that point.



Education and Culture DG

### **Lifelong Learning Programme**

Ce projet a été financé avec le soutien de la Commission européenne.  
Cette publication [communication] n'engage que son auteur et la Commission n'est pas responsable de l'usage qui pourrait être fait des informations qui y sont contenues.

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

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