

GfNA-II-C-GRU-workshops-grant agreement – Annex II - final report - version December 2012



LIFELONG LEARNING PROGRAMME GRUNDTVIG

Final report form 2013 Call for Workshops (grant agreement period 1.9.2013 – 31.8.2014)

Please send this report to your National Agency, duly completed and signed by **31 October 2014 at the latest**. This report is considered as your request for payment of the balance of the grant.

ECORYS UK Ltd | 92-93 Edward Street | Birmingham | B1 2RA | United Kingdom

The questions in **part A** concern the **Workshop as a whole**. **Part B** concerns the individual **participants** and **part C** is your **Declaration of expenditures**. The **Annex** is an individual evaluation form to be filled in by each participant in the Workshop.

GENERAL INFORMATION

Grant agreement number	2013-1-GB2-GRU13-11216 (Internal Reference No. 2013-10)
Title of the Workshop	Workshop Title: Promoting Employability Through Specific Literacies
Acronym (if applicable)	PETSL
Name of your institution / organisation	University of Greenwich
Dates and venue of the workshop	March 09 to March 16 2013



INSTITUTION/ORGANISATION DATA

Please fill in this page if data has changed since application.

Full Legal Name	[In national language and characters]		
	[In Latin characters - where originals are not in Latin characters]		
Type of Organisation	[Table C – Type of organisation]		
Legal Status	<input type="checkbox"/> Private	<input type="checkbox"/> Public	Size
Commercial Orientation	<input type="checkbox"/> Profit	<input type="checkbox"/> Non profit	
Address	Street – Number		
Postcode		City	Region
Country		Scope	[Table D – Geographical Scope]
Organisation's national ID (if applicable)			
Organisation's website (if applicable)		Organisation's e-mail (if applicable)	

CONTACT PERSON

Title		First name	
Family name			
Department			
Position			
Work Address	Street – Number (if different from above)		
Postcode		City	
Country			
Telephone 1		Telephone 2	
Mobile		Fax	
E-mail address			



PART A (THE WORKSHOP)

1. WORKSHOP CONTENT

Workshop summary: please give a brief updated description (max 250 words) of the Workshop carried out; please note that this description may be used for publication. Elements of interest include duration of the Workshop, number of participants, aspects of literacy covered, types of activity, key outcomes etc.

The workshop is anchored to the central principle of developing specific literacies in order to enhance the employability of adult learners. The workshop is located in the context of current debates around the suitability of young people and adult in the areas of literacy and literacy for mainstream employment roles. There were 20 delegates from across eight European countries and other delegates from the UK. The seminar series lasted 6 days while there were two days of socialising, arrival and departures. The workshop was structured in a way that allowed presenters/ session leaders to have an initial input which was usually followed by a hands-on session and rounded up with a question and answer session. The scene for the workshop was set by an input on the nature, structure, rationales and underpinning principles of specific literacies. Subsequent seminars focused on various specific literacies that have been developed and how these have been delivered in country and industry-specific contexts and the extent to which they have been effective. Amongst the specific literacies that were explored during the workshop were the nature of information literacy in the context of the library and how learners can be helped to acquire this specific literacy, the exploration of information literacy focused on how learners can be taught to identify, locate and access information that is useful for their employment prospect and for operating within society in general, literacies for the Trowel Occupations, literacy for entrepreneurship, academic literacy, accreditation of previous learning and transformational literacy.

2. WORKSHOP OBJECTIVES AND RESULTS

2.1 Workshop objectives

To what extent were Workshop objectives as indicated in the application form achieved?

(Circle the appropriate number below. Please note that 1= not at all or only to a very small extent achieved; 5= totally or to very large extent achieved)

1 2 3 4 5



In case you circled 1 or 2, please explain which aims were not achieved and for what reasons:

--

2.2. Workshop programme

Did you implement the daily plan according to what was foreseen in the application form?

- Yes**
- No

If not, please explain why.

Please provide **detailed** information on the programme you implemented:

Day	Date	Programme of activity
Arrival (If different from day 1)		
1	09/03/14	Welcome/lodging and social
2	10/03/14	Workshops on 1. Literacy for Specific Purposes. 2. Developing a literacy for the Trowel Industry: Illustrating Literacy for Specific Purposes. 3. Adult Literacy Learning in France. 4. Accrediting literacy for specific purposes
3	11/03/14	Workshop (1) Learning from Exemplars of good practice in information literacy. Workshop (2). Information literacy (Library and employability) Workshop (3) Transformational Literacy and employability
4	12/03/14	Workshop (1) The embedded nature of Information Literacy (IT focus) Workshop 2) Fostering literacy development, balancing state demands, workplace and learner motivation (The Dutch experience)
5	13/03/14	Workshop (1) Employability needs and Literacy problems. Workshop (2). Literacy problems in employability and solution and approaches in France
6	14/03/14	Workshop (1) Literacy and entrepreneurship Workshop (2) Training literacy trainers for Engineering Literacy
7	15/03/14	Workshop 1. Academic literacy and employability. Workshop (2) What next?; Developing ECALRAP. Some departures
8	16/03/14	Final departure
9		
10		
Departure If different from last day of workshop		



2.3. Workshop impact

What impact did the Workshop have on the participants?

- **increased skills in teaching adults with literacy problems**
- **possibility to learn in a foreign language; increased language skills**
- increased skills in using ICT to teach adults with literacy problems
- **introduction to new teaching methods and materials**
- increased motivation
- **increased self-confidence**
- **increased knowledge about the literacy problem in the host country and other participants' countries**
- other impact, please specify:

Please describe any impact you have noted, on your organisation and/or on the local community:

1. Graduate students in my school, who attended the workshops are looking to extend their research interest into the area of literacy for specific purposes.

2.4. Dissemination and use of results

How have you informed staff and teachers in your own institution/organisation, other institutions/organisations, local, regional or national authorities of the results of your Workshop?

Members of the university were informed of the workshop through the PR newsletter prior to its commencement. As a result, many students and tutors attended some of the sessions. The final outcomes would also be communicated through the same source. Furthermore, a dedicated website (www.ecalrap.org) has been created as one of the outputs of the conference. This website will be a repository to all the resources used at the conference and will be accessible to the public. Finally, a special issue of a journal, IJMCS, will be publishing papers to be developed by all workshop leaders from different countries and will be made accessible through the open access route.

How do you think that the results and possible products of your Workshop could be used by others?

1. Teaching resources could be developed from the sample of templates which can be accessed via the website
2. The presentations could be used/ refereed to by teachers, particularly teacher trainers in the field of literacy.



3. A collaborative project could emerge from the partnership developed from the workshop



3. WORKSHOP MANAGEMENT

3.1. Practical arrangements

Please describe practical arrangements put in place (incl. board and lodging).

Accommodation had already been booked ahead of the workshop. The accommodation was specifically chosen because of its proximity to the university and social tourist locations in the Greenwich area of London. Three student ambassadors were recruited to support and provide guidance when needed. Prior to the commencement of the workshop, information about places and activities of interest to tourists was sent to all participants. Each participant was invited to provide information regarding their dietary needs. This was to ensure that the communal meal (lunch) adequately caters for each delegate's needs. Delegates were given the choice to dine at many of the restaurants available in the area. A social gathering/dinner was arranged to welcome the delegates and another was arranged to send them off. Based on this, all board and lodging requirements of delegates had been catered for before their arrival and they were, therefore, able to settle in comfortably.

3.2. Recruitment of participants

Please indicate how you implemented your communication plan and the process for selecting participants, and what the results were (e.g. whether you had any difficulties in recruiting participants or whether the Workshop was oversubscribed and how you managed that, etc...)

Please indicate the total number of applications you received?

At the planning stage of the programme, we had structured a staged periodic communication strategy which requires us to communicate with all relevant stakeholders from time to time to keep them abreast of developments. Of particular importance was the need to ensure that applicants were aware of the stage of recruitment to the workshop. Frequent communication was also made with the country leaders with whom relationships had already been established.

All applicants who approached us either through ECORYS/Grundtvig's websites were sent an application form which we designed. A requirement of the form was for every applicant to provide the reason for wanting to attend the workshop. This was also sent to individual leaders in four countries, France, Spain, The Netherlands and Bulgaria, with whom we had already established a relationship at the application process. The leaders further helped in putting the information into the public domain in their countries.

As a result, there was a significant response to the invitation to attend with 32 applications received at the time the final shortlist was made. Subsequently, an additional 5 applications was received, but this were not considered, as offers had already been made and accepted.

Given that the workshop was over subscribed, the choice of participants was informed by the relevance of their current work and the reasons they offered for wanting to attend. Applicants who were not offered places were formally written to with explanations on why



they were not offered. The explanation highlighted the issue of relevance and the number of applications from which we had to select.

3.3. Recognition of learning outcomes

What recognition of learning outcomes did you provide participants with?

- 1. Each delegate was given a University designed certificate signed by a Deputy Pro-vice chancellor**
- 2. A second recognition of learning outcomes was integrated into delegates' reflection through the feedback process. In the application form, each delegate was asked to identify the learning they hoped to take away from the workshop. The feedback form follows this up by asking each delegate to confirm which learning they felt they had achieved. Through this, a process of self-validation/confirmation of learning was put in place.**



3.4. Evaluation and monitoring

Please indicate how you monitored and evaluated the implementation and impact of the Workshop

- 1. Evaluation was carried out on a daily basis through post-presentation discussion. Delegates were invited to confirm whether they enjoyed the sessions and if they gained from it. In addition, delegates were asked about their comfort and needs to see if they were being met.**
- 2. A post workshop meeting was held and delegates were invited to discuss the workshop in terms of its benefit and in terms of what should happen subsequently.**
- 3. A feedback form was despatched electronically to all delegates asking them to confirm if their expectations were met.**

What were the main conclusions and consequences of the monitoring and evaluation?

- 1. Delegates felt they had benefitted immensely from attending the workshop**
- 2. Delegates valued the preparation, accommodation, hospitality and the opportunity they had to establish contact with colleagues**
- 3. Delegates want a congress of practitioners and researchers to be one of the outputs of the workshop and this was established**
- 4. Delegates felt that their aims were achieved.**

3.5. Sustainability

Do you foresee follow-up activities of the Workshop?

- 1. A congress of Applied Literacy Research and Practice was established which will look to continue to collaborate. All participants are members of this congress and will continue to interact through the on-line facility provided by the website (www.ecalrap.org)**
- 2. Materials from delegates will be deposited and made available through the website, hence sharing of good practice will continue**
- 3. Some institutions in the group are already collaborating on a further project under the K2 action of Erasmus+.**
- 4. It looks certain that different forms of collaborative partnerships would emerge as a follow-up to the workshop.**



3.6. Problems/obstacles encountered

What problems/obstacles did you encounter during the implementation of the Workshop and how were they solved?

- Late grant agreement / payment
- High administrative workload
- Communication problems
- Lacking support within participating institution/organisation
- Organisational problems within the institution/organisation
- Language problems
- Lack of funds
- **Other problems, please specify:**

Please comment:

The occasional problem of having to purchase tickets twice for two delegates because of problems with names and for another delegate because of visa problems.

3.7. Suggestions/recommendations

Please provide any further comments and suggestions; your recommendations are important.



Education and Culture DG

Lifelong Learning Programme

**GRUNDTVIG
WORKSHOPS**