IHOD

PROJECT MANAGEMENT MEETINGS WITH 8 PARTNERS
VALENCIA 27/03 to 29/03/19

Focus as per Agenda

Analysis of Meetings

1. Project Descriptor explained and it was clear there was a lack of familiarity with the details

2. The new governance structure was explained and very well received and understood by all and seen as an improvement in communication and governance structure.

3. The role of the Work Package (WP) leaders was seen as a great source of communication to enable all to be more responsive.

4. Local Operational Committees (LOC) described in detail and each partner has similar structures in place, however there is a new awareness of the need for a chair person for LOC and the more formal record keeping of the activities of the group.

5. Agreed to Steering Group meeting at the end of June in Moscow. Membership agreed to be senior people.

   A synopsis of the Project Descriptor was discussed with everybody and all are now aware of WP, outputs, deadline dates and progress. This was very welcome by all.

6. The 3 year planner was discussed in detail, some changes suggested and to be agreed by concerned parties (all to be informed). e. g:

- Visit to Uzbekistan is now happening the week of 17th June and 24th June from Dublin or available EU partner
- Vladivostok requested a delay from June 3rd to June 10th, Italy visiting
- Kazan requested to delay Italy visiting from June 15th to June 22nd
- Spain requested a change in visiting Tomsk but Tomsk-unable to accommodate
- Vladivostok requested a delay in Lithuania's visit by 1 week from Sept 2 3rd to Sept 30th

7. It was highlighted that the needs of each partner is now what drives the teaching and learning activities for capacity building and enhancement. Each partner will be asked to identify their learning needs and send to the WP leader. Therefore each partner will assess their own needs for EU support for the project and, where possible, this will be provided by the visiting EU personnel. It is likely that this content will be related to the educational strategies for the delivery and assessment of the programme.

8. The curriculum document was well received and agreement was reached in that every partner will review all modules using track changes and send back to Mary Casey. It is accepted that the standard will have to be within a 1 page module template. A reading list will have to be provided by each partner once the final module descriptor is agreed. Oversight of the content will be provided by experts in the relevant areas from the EU partners.

9. It is clearly understood that output 2.3, students visit, will be based on the curriculum content.

10. All 8 partners are keen to implement at least 1 or 2 modules from the programme, by integrating them with their existing Masters programme.
11. It is unlikely that the programme will be implemented in its entirety in any of the partners.

10. Partners are very clear regarding the benefits of the programme to the students and they now have a better understanding of what students can learn and how they can benefit for the masters programme.
11. Agreed that the website for IHOD will be completed and active within the next 8 to 10 days. Each partner can then populate their own individual websites thereafter.

13. Dissemination of the project will be undertaken at local events (conferences) in each partner and other opportunities.

14. 3 Year planner discussed in detail with all partner and this is now to be read in conjunction with the project descriptor and the governance structure document.

15. There continues to be issues regarding banking arrangements. Partners advised to outline the challenges in detail, clearly stating the steps taken to try address the issue and email same to Mary who will contact the EU person. The steering committee needs to be made aware of these issues.

16. The EU monitoring guidelines were discussed in detail to enable the partners to be adequately prepared for potential visits.

17. To improve communication, agreed to make available all minutes of all meetings across all levels of all partners on the website.

18. Equipment: originally all agreed 5 purchase Tele-conferencing equipment. Now Kazan is not sure. Bukhara and Tashkent want teleconferencing equipment. Tomsk is looking at equipment to help with providing distance learning. Vietnam wants teleconferencing equipment as do Vladivostok. Tomsk to send price range to Mary as soon as possible
19. Agreed items for circulation:
    (a) Record from these management meetings with all partners.
    (b) Outline of governance structure document which also has a synopsis of all WP, outputs and deadline dates. As The EU requires circulation of their report on the Monitoring experience of Uzbekistan - Mary will do same and to indicate how the issues raised are addressed. It is therefore more of a progress report.
    (d) An updated 3 year planner.
    (e) An outline of the requirements for EU monitoring to assist partners in understanding what is required.

    (f)Word version of the curriculum document.

20. Agreed that a standard evaluation format for each activity would be developed and circulated 4 same 4 be completed by those providing the activity and submit a synopsis report by the relevant WP leader.
21. It was noted that some attendees were tired from the long tourney - it is important to ensure more participant-led activities are included in these teaching and learning opportunities,
22. Noted that the planned visit of the local hospital was very relevant in terms of telecare and "hospital in the home" care which is relevant to management of chronic illness.

23. An unexpected valuable spin arose from the hospital visit in the form of a research collaboration opportunity between practitioners in this hospital and the partner HEIs.

24. Agreed that all minutes from the partner LOC meetings, the minutes from WP leaders' meetings, the minutes from the project team and steering group meetings would all be available on the website - considerations given to confidentiality: these may have to be password protected.

25. Project Team meetings will need to be more regularly scheduled for once a month to the foreseeable future. Each partner will be given a Teleconference code in order to link in. It was suggested that the chairperson of the LOC may be the most appropriate person to participate. However this may not always be possible and due to different time zones it may also be complicated. To facilitate participation, a list of dates for these project meetings will be circulated and partners can either link in to teleconference call or use 'WhatsApp', send a request to the appropriate manager about their particular item for discussion. After the meeting, the WP leader can give a response via email or phone call. The partner can then check minutes of the project team meeting to see what was the outcome of its discussion at the meeting.

26. An evaluation of the value of these management meetings suggested that they were very worthwhile, informative and motivating for the partners.