

**MINUTES FROM
IV MEETING of Leonardo da Vinci innovation transfer project "Sustainability and social responsibility through learning in SME",
No. LLP-LDV-TOI-2008-LT-0021
18-19.03.10, Barslelona, Spain**

18th of March, 2010

Partners represented:

Name, surname	Organization	Country
Aušra Rūtelionė	KTU, Economics and management faculty	Lithuania
Rūta Čiutienė	KTU, Economics and management faculty	Lithuania
Žaneta Piligrimienė	KTU, Economics and management faculty	Lithuania
Grazyna Swiatowy	Wroclaw University of Economics	Poland
Anna Sliwa	Wroclaw University of Economics	Poland
Fernando Leon	Pau Casals Institution	Spain
Jose Gonzalez	Pau Casals Institution	Spain
Elina Gaile Sarkane	Riga Technical University, Faculty of Engineering Economics	Latvia
Natalija Lace	Riga Technical University, Faculty of Engineering Economics	Latvia
Alina Costache	Fiatest SRL	Romania
Margarita Kyprianou	European University Cyprus	Cyprus
Vanda Viera	Cecoa	Portugal
Alexander Krauss	ISOB	Germany
Alexi Alexov	NAMSB	Bulgaria

There were 14 participants *at the first day* of the fourth meeting of the project "Sustainability and social responsibility through learning in SME".

The meeting on 18th of March has started at 9:00 a.m. The hosting organization EUC representatives have welcomed all partners in Barselona. The agenda of the meeting has presented

Then A. Rūtelionė has introduced the progress of the project. It has been indicated that all activities have done on time and as have been estimated in the evaluation guidelines created by internal evaluator ISOB.

Then project coordinator has presented the situation on interim report evaluation. She has confirmed that the report has approved and according it, the good management of the project led to implementation of activities foreseen respecting the timetable, proper involvement of all project partners, and active dissemination of the project. No significant weaknesses are observed at this stage. Still there are several points where the more attention have been presented and discussed among partners:

- According interim report evaluation, the contents is missing in the summary report, therefore it is not very user friendly in terms of finding of information needed and different formats of national reports makes it difficult to compare provided on different countries. *Thus the Internal evaluator has confirmed that Information collected was evaluated as relevant and urgent.*
- 80 % of respondents in Lithuania were from one city of Kaunas, there although they represented different types of organizations, representation of country did not assured- *Partners have discussed this issue and have decided that nothing was promised in AF concerning methodology of RA Nothing was promised in AF concerning methodology of RA Part aim was to recruit members of AB and testing companies. This is not a check and control approach but a community building and cooperation approach*
- The agency has also asked how results of researches in every country have been used in methodology preparation. It has been indicated that therefore the basic content is limited by products transferred but to be adapted and valorized. RA aim was to validate approach of original content in new countries as well as reflect the actual economic situation. RA (requirement analysis) concluded the necessity of focus on learning as a internal dimension as well as focus on general systematic of the management. The concept was not translated

but localized, i.e. facilitators are required to take regional circumstances into account. Also the national RA is a part of the innovation.

- Guided project self- evaluation research design indicate the need of collecting of workshops and informal conversation with target groups and stakeholders (data, place, main talking points; arguments/questions/perspectives, conclusions); however no such information has submitted with the report. It *has decided to strengthen this point and fill main meeting talking points with target groups and include the column that partners could write in main talking points with every organization and persons contacted, consulted.*
- Also the forming of AB in partner countries is not sufficiently recorded *so it has decided to select all possible evidence, i.e. meetings minutes, contracts with them (if they have been reimbursed), give them to fill peer review questionnaires, etc. Also it is important to have all information on how every AB member has contributed to the project.*
- Involvement of unions, chamber, etc. as social partners *should be strengthened.*

Then the project finance manager has presented the feedback from the financial report (interim):

- Declared expenditures exceed 70% of the pre-financing paid.
- The interim report has approved on the 25-02-2010.
- The request for payments from partners have to be sent to project manager scanned and also and provide the original by post.
- NA requested staff costs payment evidences. All partners must send transference bank evidences.
- It must be explained also the exchange rate. All documents should be clear and well explain.
- The number of full days must be declared to the report, information on calculation on daily or subsistence rates have to be provided by partners;
- Local travelling by taxi should be covered by subsistence, not travel costs.

The ineligible costs have been presented and it has evaluated what documents are needed and missed for interim report and will be needed to present for the final report.

The internal evaluator has reflected on quality assurance and evaluation of the project. He has indicated that from the perspective of quality evaluation, comparable format in the requirement analysis – if we have time it can be improved. Also he has discussed about evaluation questionnaires-physical and internet version. Hardcopies will be need for the NA. Paper version will be requested by the Promoter. Online version will be requested for quality evaluation (ISOB). Every partner (or facilitator, manager) has to fill questionnaires online, and then print them as the hardcopy will be needed for the final report.

Regarding number of questionnaires: peer review: 10 peer facilitators. Regarding testing in SME: facilitators (it depends how many facilitators have worked with 5 SME) and 5 managers (5 SME). Peer facilitators, in the questionnaires the name is there. We do not need to collect signatures when the questionnaires are identified. The really important point is the description of the field cases in questionnaires. The peer facilitators must be done as soon as possible.

- To fill in the survey "Socialsme Fieldtest Survey for Facilitators" (who have done the testing in companies) go to the web address: <http://www.isob-regensburg.net/survey/index.php?sid=48765&lang=en>
- We want to collect feedback also from the managers of companies involved: For Managers: "Socialsme Managers Feedback Survey" <http://www.isob-regensburg.net/survey/index.php?sid=99756&lang=en>
- The third questionnaire is for peer facilitators and consultants who did not work with the workshop concept but have reviewed it and are prepared to give us feedback on their assessment. The questionnaire can be accessed at: <http://www.isob-regensburg.net/survey/index.php?sid=38724&lang=en>

After the coffee break, every partner has presented results from the testing- SOCIALSME testing

KTU: methodology will need a clear structure. Better to define CSR as an internal dimension since the 1st workshop. It's not correct to address only the internal dimension, said some facilitators. It's consistent to have material from all the other dimensions as social, economic and environmental dimension.

Its not clear the results of the second seminar. The facilitator must to force the learning approach. Suggestion to add the information regarding the training needs analyses. The workplace learning is a social responsibility activity. The indicators of BSC and they miss the relation between indicators.

The results from the testing phase of 5 SME companies from LT has been presented. According them, planning of learning implementation must be clarified and overview of workplace learning is not an operation prescription. The project is about strategy building and to give the ideas of the options. Supported by the process. Planning to know what to do...

NASMB. Alexi Alexov has presented testing SME in Bulgaria. 1st SME: 10 persons involved. Accounting services. Training continuously all the time. There is a plan for training investment. Second company: 20 employees. 3rd SME: transportation sector. 4th SME: personal development. 5th SME: alcoholic sector.

EUC - University of Cyprus: Margarita has presented consultants who will work in the project. Strong points were presented as well as the points of improvement: more simplified theory, ability to customise the materials according to each SME conditions. According Cyprus partner, the material is more related to the lifelong concept. *Advantages:* In general the Advisory Board was positive about the training material; well presented and assertive; the 'cyclical' approach gives important feedback; feedback given by facilitators to companies and well-structured agenda of each workshop; a very useful tool which helps SMEs to set up a strategic and long-term planning on training. *Points for improvement:* simplicity – reduce theory. Make sure that time allocated for each workshop is realistic and can be followed closely; we need more of a 360° type feedback by all people involved (facilitators and managers) in order to 'build' a learning environment; take the learning product shorter, more concentrated to practical issues and emphasise key points; ability to customize material according to each particular SME's needs.

Some remarks for the peer facilitators, according to Alexander, the comments are legitimise but there was a small unfair since they seems to don't understand the project goal. It is not a comprehensive book for workplace learning but strategy building. The materials are targeted to facilitators and not a requirement from the managers. The approach its appreciative inquired approach, the person and personality of the facilitators is very important. The manual provides suggestions to «move on». They should select the materials and adapt the methodology according to the company needs.

Pau Casals: Fernando Leon has presented consultants from SME and companies: Cidadi, 9 employees. AEMUSMI, 5 employees. Duro Sanchi, 7 employees. Ferrer Servicios Medicos, 4 employees. *Advantages of the methodology:* general overview of the process; instructions for facilitators; information on concepts used; worksheets; activities Instructions; best practice cases. *Points for improvements:* Time - materials: it is difficult to use them in 3 hours with some companies; It is difficult to understand templates and information regarding Stakeholders; some templates could be filled with real cases.

Points of improvement from ISOB perspective: reflection sheets must helps on the aspects. Always adapt to the speed and cultural organization values. Benefits of social responsibility: difficult to calculate the return on investment. Difficult com evaluate in Euros. Facilitators profile was conceive in Resyfac.

Wroclaw University: Anna Sliwa brief presentation of the companies and facilitators. According her, it was very difficult to select companies. PL companies are not interesting in training because they think they know a lot. Examples of good practices are coming from big companies and some think about the concept of ethical business and not training employees. Some miss the hard components as finances, market, etc.

Concerning the BSC is not adapt to SME but use other tools as strategic instruments. It quite is demanding from companies. Use only in complex processes and related to controlling.

Suggestions: 1 no changes; 2 and 3 more tools; 4 – personal policy and 5 and 6 there should be more working out of the strategy.

Fiatest: Romanian partner has organized focus groups with 6 organizations and 5 managers. Consultancy companies will be involved. List of consultants was presented. According results of testing from Romania, strong points from different worksheets. Still there are several improvement points: expected results of the organizing company (overview). Great value but do not cover all dimensions as the external variables. Also there is a need of general aspects regarding CSR from all the perspectives, checklist of all materials. The good visualization of all materials has emphasized.

RTU: Latvian partner has talked about separate workshops. W1 – getting knowledge about CSR and to discuss problems. Time for making preparation and implementing the process. Understand the methodology and the business. W2 – understand the methodology, some recommendations: difficult to evaluation the BSC. To divide this into 2 parts. W3 – clear and sufficient. Manual do not provide the clear formulation of execution sequence. W4 – the tools are ok, the process was interesting for facilitators and company managers. Needs for training analysis are appropriate. Training needs analysis is a lot of work.

CECOA: Portuguese partner has presented facilitators, then the timetable of testing in SME. Basing on feedback of testing in Portuguese SME , The methodology was design in the context of multidisciplinary team of consultants (corporate social responsibility, training experts), practical tools were very well integrated with the theoretical framework, basic information about the theme – social responsibly – are relevant, in particular, from the internal dimension perspective. Weaknesses were

eralted with layout: must be improved. It was considered the major limitation. It was not perceived as intuitive and/or user friendly. From a theoretical approach, the Portuguese Social responsibility Norm (2008) must be mentioned, at least, it was suggested the introduction of some annexes (stakeholders involvement). Proper PT examples must be integrated as well. SME mostly know that they will win with the process: the dialogue with internal and external elements and the creation of a customized action plan.

The explanation on how to contact with SME. We decided to develop a letter of intent with clear point of "What the SMEs will win? What consultants will win? What the project will win?"

Time-intensive process if all workshops would be fulfilled according to the methodology. At this point, we decided to combine the application of some workshops (3, 4 and 5). Selection of some tools with emphasis on the vision and mission (if companies do that have it), BSC indicators and active action plan and well less focus on the training activities (training needs assessment).

Conclusions from all partners about testing results:

- Very interesting materials. Quality of facilitators and the quality of the guidelines are topics for another project.
- Those points are interesting but from several projects: facilitation, methodology of implementation, CSR dimensions....
- The manual brings more structure and more awareness about CSR, relation from the stakeholders.
- Additional materials will be need but considering the budget those are good products. For example, made links to other products and projects.
- For further development is clear: strategy building for environment protection. The Portuguese are in the process of developing a customised process, using the material but also reformulating.
- At the end, there is a Portuguese version with good tools with reflection of SME experience and expertise.
- Almost every partner's referred improvements on workshop number 2. What direction do we have to go? Looking of stakeholders and see other priorities than learning.
- Improvement of the manual layout. Open system with additional materials?
- Demands for facilitators: introductions to the materials.
- Several remarks what companies must know after testing. Methodology to think about this problems and building a strategy about that.
- Improvements. Workplace learning like an internal dimension of CSR.

Then development of innovation: presentation, discussions has followed. Project manager has presented working version of methodology in www.socialsme.org

Innovation Website: the introduction has to be prepared (By ISOB). After introduction we will go to general set up; in the general overview, include information from facilitation and appreciative inquiry approach.

Point of the website must be improved and the *conception of the CD:* discussion about intro (still in question); news, project events, survey questionnaires, individuals in the project, newsletters should be removed in CD version. The design, possible view of CD cover has approved too.

Then the further WP: organisation of Work, tasks, Partner Meetings etc., has been presented and discussed. It has been decided on these deadlines:

WP4. Testing of innovation

Activity	Responsible	Deadlines
Testing of innovation in SME, invoking consultants (5 SME each partner)	All IA partners	1st of November, 2009 – 30th of April, 2010
Peer review of innovation (5-10 training provider, university, etc. depending on partner context) give feedback to material)	All IA partners	1st of November, 2009 – 30th of April, 2010
Fill questionnaires in www and collect other evidence docs	All IA partners	Till 30th of April, 2010
Report of testing the innovation and evaluation results	ISOB	Till 15th of May, 2010
Adjustment of innovation in English version and send to partners	ISOB	15th of May, 2010
Adjustment of innovation in other partners languages	All IA partners	31st of May, 2010

Testing documents that obligatory:

- Feedback questionnaires for facilitators and managers
- List of participants from every company (with signs)
- Feedback Q from peer review
- Pictures from workshops
- Info about facilitators and SMEs

Development of innovation

Activity	Rsp	Deadlines
Translation for package in www and CD (info about cons, sme, etc.)	All IA partners	Till end of May, 10
Creation of innovation design, style, content managing and send to partners for comments	KTU	31st of May, 10
Review of innovation by partners and comments send to KTU	All	7th of June, 2010
Final version of innovation creation and integration into CD	KTU	31th of July, 2010 - 1ST of July
CD sending to partners	KTU	7th of July
Dissemination seminars (min one per country, min 20 participants)	All IA partners	15st of July- 20th of September

Regarding CD:

Number of CD to every partner- 150, In total: 1200

Write in PS the post address till 1st of April, 2010, select info to whom, where, when and how many CD have been sent, distributed (if you will send them, ask for feedback)

It has also discussed what should be done during next period in order to disseminate and valorisate the innovation in the best way.

- Integrate **some representatives of unions as social partner** representatives in the dissemination efforts:
 - o Links of project www in websites
 - o Information or articles in newsletters
- According to **AF advisory boards** members are external evaluators of project product in all phases of the project.
 - o Try to select all possible evidence, i.e. meetings minutes, contracts with them (if they have been reimbursed)
 - o Give them to fill peer review questionnaires
- **Meetings with AB:** minutes, photos, list of participants, filled questionnaires
- **Participation in events** (evidence: exact name of conference, seminar, other event (possible evidence documents, etc. information about conference (agenda, info from www), photos, list of participants (or how many participants have participated in event), presentations)
- Information about the innovation in **business media**- one article or/and advert / invitation about dissemination seminar/conference per partner
- Attendance of **conferences** related with CSR, strategic management, life long learning etc. in every IA country
- Include the innovation in **studies** (EUC, KTU, WUE, RTU) – evidence-
 - o Module card
 - o Program of study of the module
 - o Prescription of the school director, that the methodology has implemented in the study program, i.e. in practice classes of the subject "....."
 - o Presentation in course, lectures (evidence: minutes of discussions, focus groups, etc., course work)
 - o Including the methodology as the literature source in module card
- **Leaflets** (photos)- places where leaflets have been distributed, in premises of associations, partners, exhibitions, etc.
- **Responses** on RA, newsletters, leaflets, innovation from target groups (select e-mails from SME consultants, AB)
- Present project and product in **other meetings of other projects**

Dissemination seminar: min 1 per partner. Documents needed to present for the final report:

- Present aims, duration and target group of the seminar (i.e. invitation): could be in business press, national press, also send by post, e-mail
- Present dissemination seminar plan (agenda)
- Present the material of dissemination seminar (slides, etc.)
- Present the list of participants with signs
- Filled survey questionnaires (??)
- Certificates for participants (not obligatory)
- Participants: min 20 persons
- Photos

Newsletter 3. It has decided to produce the newsletter 3 till 15th of April. Content will be: Information about Barcelona meeting; Information about testing: SME participated, feedback, process; information events, conferences in other countries; news in the topic in partner countries. Partners have to send info for newsletter till 10th of April. Also it has decided to take interview from target group representatives and put that into newsletter.

Then the statistics of www.socialsme.org has been presented. From content management system statistics: 2646 Visits from 47 countries, ~ 6, 62 visits per day according to google statistics. It has discussed how increase the attendance of www.

Contracts of agreements on copy rights have distributed and asked to sign, stamp and send one version to coordinator. It has decided that all partners can and should change the materials according to their needs.

Also info on tested SME and facilitators have to be sent till 1st of April, 2010.

The first day has finished on 5:00 p.m. as planned.

19th of March, 2010

Partners represented:

Name, surname	Organization	Country
Aušra Rūtelionė	KTU, Economics and management faculty	Lithuania
Rūta Čiutienė	KTU, Economics and management faculty	Lithuania
Žaneta Piligrimienė	KTU, Economics and management faculty	Lithuania
Grazyna Swiatowy	Wroclaw University of Economics	Poland
Anna Sliwa	Wroclaw University of Economics	Poland
Fernando Leon	Pau Casals Institution	Spain
Jose Gonzalez	Pau Casals Institution	Spain
Elina Gaile Sarkane	Riga Technical University, Faculty of Engineering Economics	Latvia
Natalija Lace	Riga Technical University, Faculty of Engineering Economics	Latvia
Alina Costache	Fiatest SRL	Romania
Margarita Kyprianou	European University Cyprus	Cyprus
Vanda Viera	Cecoa	Portugal
Alexander Krauss	ISOB	Germany
Alexi Alexov	NAMSB	Bulgaria

There were 14 participants *at the second day* of the fourth meeting of the project "Sustainability and social responsibility through learning in SME". It has started at 9:30 a.m.

After the welcome and reminder of the day agenda all partners have discussed regarding decisions of the first day.

Dissemination of innovation: every partner presents exact list of dissemination activities from 10 10 2010 – 30 09 2010 in ppt format- 15 min each. Presentations are included in partners' space in project www.

Then final report questions have discussed. Ruta Ciutiene has presented requirements for **finance** report. She has emphasized to take more attention on current exchanges rates, all should obey same rule which indicates the conversation rate, number of full days, calculation of daily or subsistence rates – compulsory. Also it is important to fulfil financial tables for all the period of project duration.

Then project manager has indicated that every partner should follow self evaluation design made by internal evaluator and select info continually, all partners should fill contact records and don't forget to include main talking points, minutes from contacts with persons and organizations contacted and consulted. All these info has to be presented in one file and sent for the final report.

After the final reflections and tasks assigned, the meeting of the second day has finished as planned, i.e. 2:00 p.m.