



Programme d'éducation
et de formation
tout au long de la vie



«Project Reference: 538785-LLP-1-2013-1-FR-LEONARDO-LMP»
This project has been funded with support from the Lifelong Learning
Programme - Leonardo da Vinci sub-programme



Lifelong
Learning
Programme

Sagiter – Agroecological knowledge and territorial ingenuity

Intermediate evaluation - 2
SAGITER project
November 2013 – May 2015

Anne MONEYRON
1st June 2015

QUALITATIVE AND QUANTITATIVE REVIEW OF INTER-SEMINAR EXCHANGE

Review tables from **extracts** of minutes from meetings of the two Groups:

Follow up Committee and Scientific and Technical Committee

Partners (cf. SAGITER site)

France

- SupAgro Florac: Institute for agro-environment education
- Fumeterre: consultancy, expertise, monitoring and engineering in agroecology
- Knowledge and Discovery: acquiring agroecological knowledge
- Cfppa du Merle: shepherding and animal production school
- Geysler: analysis of relations between territories - natural resources - local communities.

Germany

- Working group for regional studies, department of Geography, University of Marburg (DE): Environmental, social and economic issues

Spain

- Federation of agrarian schools in Galicia (Es): professional training

Belgium

- Vlaamse Landmaatschappij (B) land development and rural development agency of the Flemish government

Slovenia

- Chamber of agriculture and forestry in Slovenia

Hungary

- Szent Istvan University in Godolo (Hu), training experts in agriculture and foodstuffs

Romania

- USAMV at Cluj Napoka (Ro), environmental management in rural areas

THE 1ST FOLLOW UP COMMITTEE (nov2013) became the "STEERING COMMITTEE"(Feb.2014)

1st Group: Steering committee (Nov.2013) then Follow up Committee (Feb.2014) – <i>i.e. 11 meetings between February 2014 and April 2015</i>		
Contributors to this group according to the document distribution list on 2014-09 Is there a new one? 18 pers.	Germany / Marburg University: Nicolai Dellmann (r1.2.4.5.6.7.8.9.=8) – Markus Hassler (r=0) Belgium / Vlaamse Landmaatschappij : Sylvie Fosselle (r1.2.4.7.9.10.11=7) Spain / Escuelas Familiares Agrarias de Galicia : Rosa Leis (r1.4.6.8.9.11=6) Romania / Universitatea de Științe Agricole și Medicină Veterinară, Bucurest: Avram Fitiu (r0) Slovenia / Chamber of agriculture and forestry in Slovenia Aleš Tolar (r1.3.4.=3) Hungary / Szent Istvan University, Gödöllő : Itsvan Feher (r6.10.=2) France / Association Fumeterre : Hélène Hollard (r1.2.3.6.7.8.10.11=8) – Bénigne Joliet (r1.3.=2) France/ Association Savoir Faire et Découverte : Arnaud Trollé (r1.3.=2) France / SupAgro Florac, agro-environment education institute: Marie-Laure Girault (r1to11) – Bruno Righetti (for info ?) – Cathy Azema (r) – Loïc Braïda (r3.4.11) – Aurélié Javelle (r) – Lydia Bourdreux (r1.) – Michel Vidal (r1.2.) – Guy Lévêque (r1.3.4.5.6.7.) – Thierry Dupleube (for info ?)	
Add from message addresses 20 pers.?	France / Geyser: abs distribution and participants lists? France / le Merle absent from distribution list? Romania / Universitatea de Științe Agricole și Medicină Veterinară, Cluj Napoca: Mignon Sandor (r1.3.5.9.=4) Slovenia / Chamber of agriculture and forestry in Slovenia: Janko Rode (r4.5.6.9.=4)	
When	with whom
26 February 2014 (r1)	12 participants 6 countries: Germany, Belgium, Spain, Romania, Slovenia, France	<i>Nicolai Dellmann ; Sylvie Fosselle ; Rosa Leis ; Mignon Sandor ; Aleš Tolar ; Hélène Hollard ; Bénigne Joliet ; Arnaud Trollé ; Marie-Laure Girault ; Lydia Bourdreux ; Michel Vidal ; Guy Lévêque</i>
Agenda * Who participates in the Follow up Committee * Draw up a progress report for each country (composition of local groups, interview schedule, survey...) Decisions / memos * This committee will be called COMITE de SUIVI or FOLLOW-UP COMMITTEE. Marie-Laure will set up a Google so that each country can provide: the contact person for the project who participates in the follow up committee and the person responsible for the administrative follow up. A regular period is planned for the Follow up committee to meet: every 4th Tuesday of the month or every 6 weeks on a Thursday, for example. * Establishment of a working group "Analysis of methods of transmission of Agroecological Knowledge": Marie-Laure has added the contact persons and administrative contacts to the table as well as the volunteer experts from partner countries. To enable each participant to present their work, materials and tools, a special folder will be created in the Dropbox. On the Wiki, we will post a summary file presenting the use of the tools. These files, with a shared format, will enable us to compare certain elements of the methods proposed. The working group "Analysis on the methods of transmission of Agroecological Knowledge" will also present a model for these files. Comments AM Effectively, who participates in the Follow up Committee and who receives the Reports? The collective and "distance" method of construction and shared knowledge does not seem to be working as expected.		
22 April 2014 (r2)	5 participants 3 countries: Germany, Belgium, France	<i>Nicolai Dellmann ; Sylvie Fosselle ; Marie-Laure Girault ; Michel Vidal ; Hélène Hollard</i>
Agenda * Preparation of the Marburg Seminar and creation of a summary file for members of the follow up committee (contact person per country) Decisions / memos * Working group "Analysis of methods of transmission of Agroecological Knowledge": We have spent a long of time completing the table sent by Marie-Laure and the group has not yet met. It would appear difficult to do so before the seminar. How can we make progress? Comments AM The question of supports and their comprehension and work to be carried out: the level of motivation of the participants for the project. What is a research-action? Use of distance collaborative tools?		
3 June 2014 (r3)	8 participants 3 countries: Romania, Slovenia, France	<i>Mignon Sandor ; Aleš Tolar ; Hélène Hollard ; Bénigne Joliet ; Arnaud Trollé ; Marie-Laure Girault ; Loïc Braïda ; Guy Lévêque</i>
Agenda * Feedback to our local partners of exchange from the Marburg seminar * Actions taken since the Marburg seminar * Discussion on the validation of the file-tool layout * Reminders relative to commitments made at the seminar Decisions / notes * None of the countries present at the meeting has yet had time to prepare feedback from the seminar to the local partner. This must be done quickly. Comments AM * The notion and dynamics of contribution and identification of local groups remains unclear with regards to project presentations: who are they? Are they really 'groups'? What real interaction is there between partners and local groups in a SAGITER research-action? * Partners demand "methodology"... the answer is in the form of tools? Is the difference between the demand and the need duly analysed? When? How?		
2 September 2014 (r4)	8 participants 5 countries: Germany, Belgium, Spain, Slovenia, France	<i>Nicolai Dellmann ; Sylvie Fosselle ; Rosa Lei ; Aleš Tolar ; Janko Rode ; Marie-Laure Girault ; Loïc Braïda ; Guy Lévêque</i>
Agenda * Feedback from the latest exchanges: what happened at the last meetings (follow up committee and the Survey Methods working group) in June and July?		

<p>* Organisation of the seminar in Slovenia: location, access, programme.</p> <p>Decisions / notes</p> <p>* Since May the Survey Methods working group has met every 2 weeks. It has produced a methodology memo for the framework of the surveys, based on the exchanges at the seminars, plus two types of tools. All these documents are both on the Sagiter website on the "Tools" page and in the Dropbox under "Shared tools".</p> <p>* Proposal for a part of the seminar to be devoted to "project accelerators". The principal is that a partner presents their situation or any problems encountered and the participants ask comprehension questions, then, in small groups, the participants put forward solutions or paths for progress, without the partner intervening. Finally, feedback from each small group is organised. This method is detailed on the Coop-tic site. Marie-Laure will lead this sequence which has the advantage of contributing elements that may boost the project presented by the partner. It is important to define who wishes to submit a project, before the seminar. The schedule is to spend one hour on each project, meaning 2 or 3 can be studied.</p> <p>Comments AM</p> <p>These tools are interesting summary files, there are many of them but they come mainly from SupAgro Florac (possibly due to the high number of participants there) although they are not always very operational and adaptable to the partners' different publics and cultures. How can one facilitate the action and research dynamic?</p>		
7 October 2014 (r5)	4 participants 3 countries: Germany, Romania, France	Nicolaï Dellmann ; Mignon Sandor ; Marie-Laure Girault ; Guy Lévêque
<p>Agenda</p> <p>* Validation of the minutes of the previous meeting: 5 minutes, Marie-Laure</p> <p>* Feedback from the Survey Methods group's previous meetings: 10 minutes</p> <p>Organisation of a seminar in Slovenia</p> <p>Decisions / notes</p> <p>Some elements:</p> <p>* Defining the objectives for each sequence: see the definitive programme.</p> <p>Finally we have reasoned in terms of objectives per day and not sequence.</p> <p>Presentation of the actions of each partner and note any difficulties or positive elements for communication to each partner country to prepare a project accelerator, using the procedure put forward by Marie-Laure.</p> <p>- The intermediate report needs to be prepared for early 2015.</p> <p>* Proposal: Rename the "Survey Methods" working group given that the title is too limiting. For example, it could be called "Research Group" or "Scientific Committee" or "Research Committee".</p> <p>Comments AM</p> <p>We repeat the same things... true delegation to a different country for each seminar: is this possible? The host country is in charge of logistics, another country leads the proceedings and Florac covers the reports, reviews and feedback?</p>		
4 November 2014 (r6)	7 participants 5 countries: Germany, Slovenia, Spain, Hungary, France	Nicolaï Dellmann ; Janko Rode ; Marie-Laure Girault ; Rosa Leis ; Istvan Feher ; Hélène Hollard ; Guy Lévêque via the pad
<p>Decisions / notes</p> <p>* The 'analysis is a subject for the Follow up Committee and the Scientific and Technical Committee.</p> <p>* Working on the training path depends on the success of the field work. This requires a directive line for data collection. How should this be used for the training? We need training objectives in order to set up the course, to know which elements should be highlighted during the analysis. The elements collected are a means for an objective.</p> <p>* The training base is shared by everyone. Each party then adapts the material. This depends on the target group of the training course: secondary education, adults (consultants, farmers...). Trainers and teachers are the main public for the training material. The trainers, in turn, have different target levels to take into consideration.</p> <p>* Each party can reflect on its basic training structure. With regards to agroecology, do we work on a set of values? With a horizontal system? From the land through to transformation...? Depending on the choices made, more or less information is required.</p> <p>* Each party works on the objectives of the training path and, where possible, the materials and we will review this during the Follow up Committee meeting. We will present the results in Cluj. Notably regarding the manner we collect information in the field for the training material.</p> <p>Comments AM</p> <p>The analysis is a subject for the Follow up Committee and the Scientific and Technical Committee. YES! But what does each group actually do?</p>		
13 January 2015 (r7)	7 participants 5 countries: Germany, Belgium, Spain, Hungary, France	Nicolaï Dellmann ; Marie-Laure Girault ; Rosa Leis ; Sylvie Fosselle ; Hélène Hollard ; Guy Lévêque via the pad ; Istvan Feher before the meeting by telephone with Marie-Laure.
<p>Agenda</p> <p>1. Reminders: next meeting, photos for the web site, slides from Ljubljana, conditions for participating in the train the trainer session in France.</p> <p>3. Feedback to local groups further to the previous seminar: has this been done by everyone?</p> <p>4. Sagiter web site: What phase is this at?</p> <p>5. Exchange on our conception of agroecology from items defined in Florac.</p> <p>Decisions / notes</p> <p>Hélène: autonomy is positioned at different levels (energy, seed...) and we need to work towards autonomy (star diagram by Hélène annexed to the minutes of the meeting). A desire to shake up the system is important.</p> <p>Nicolaï: The minimum requirement is motivation. This is like a scale because autonomy is hard to achieve in the field. This is agroecology because there is an ideal autonomy but our vision must also offer a slightly off-beat system.</p> <p>Rosa: For example, in our case when we speak of "forgotten or almost" practices, it is impossible that the farmers are autonomous. This requires education, testing. I agree that we can say that it is down to a person's motivation that practices are agroecological rather than targeting 100% autonomy.</p> <p>Sylvie: To move ahead on the project I don't think it is necessary to speak yet again about our concept of agroecology. In Flanders, farmers rely on Europe, on subsidies. In agroecology or not, farmers want to leave this system. Access to the land, this too is autonomy. Farmers cannot freely decide what they want to do with their land.</p> <p>Reply from Hélène: this is not reviewing the agroecology issue, it means having more tools for each item.</p> <p>This point will be looked at during the Scientific and Technical Committee meeting on Thursday.</p> <p>Comments AM</p> <p>This is not reviewing the agroecology issue, it means having more tools for each item. This point will be looked at during the Scientific and Technical Committee meeting on Thursday. Refer to the issue of doubling up of questions between the two working groups.</p>		

3 February 2015 (r8)	4 participants 3 countries: Germany, Spain, France	Nicolaï Dellmann ; Marie-Laure Girault ; H��������� ; Rosa Leis
Decisions / notes meeting put back to 17 Feb Comments AM		
17 February 2015 (r9)	6 participants 6 countries: Germany, Belgium, Spain, Romania, Slovenia, France	Rosa Leis ; Sylvie Fosselle ; Marie-Laure Girault ; Nicolaï Dellmann ; Mignon Sandor ; Janko Rode
Agenda 1. Information: date of the next meeting, dates for the next seminar in Romania. 2. Draft objectives and content for the Romania seminar. 3. Participation in the training test in France: Who? Decisions / notes It is important to address the methods. Some were under development, being tested. Present the methods used, with positive aspects, difficulties encountered... in order to work on these using, for example, the project accelerator method. In Spain, the method has been tested and more practices have been collected. The film is interesting because many farmers or artisans search for information on YouTube. In Belgium, the team has also considered using video. What do we need to consider in order to film correctly? We require both technical and tuition training. The persons filmed give information in a random order. How can the different sections be brought together. We also need to review the method which simply lets people speak, this is interesting. Is it up to them? Audio-visual skills workshop: participation of the SAF or Romania team? • We must speak about dissemination and distribution already in order to develop a strategy. We now need to feed the site. Even if there is a language barrier, there will be videos in English and photos. • Discussion on the results from the Scientific and Technical Committee. It would be a good thing to develop together because we have different methods, but how can we consolidate our methods. • Analysis of the training course to be held in May in France. Move ahead on the all aspects at the same time: analysis, method, training... Training test in France - 26-29 May 2015 In addition to the French trainers, Remy Bacher, vegetable producer, will participate in the training course. Two colleagues from Rosa (one who speaks some French and the other some English) will be present and maybe a colleague of Sylvie's. Sylvie has placed information on the web site about an agro-ecological group in Belgium (Brussels University). Take care with the different languages on the course, be organised for this. Farmers also have their own language which is not always understandable, the same goes for us too. Comments AM Test training in May: who is coming, who came? Wide difference between participants and their expectations: are there SAGITER partners? Contributions and their content: Who are the leaders and what are the objectives? Is it a working meeting and/or a training course: take care not to mix roles and functions because the resulting actions may create divergence between partners and lead to an excess in the number of tools.		
3 March 2015 (r10)	4 participants 3 countries: Belgium, Hungary, France	H��������� ; Sylvie Fosselle ; Marie-Laure Girault ; Istvan Feher
Agenda 1. Intermediate report: deadline, organisation. 2. Organisation of the seminar in Romania: which workshops? What priorities? What objectives for each workshop? Audio-visual, visits to farms, programme, leadership. Decisions / notes The intermediate report is to be presented from 31 May and submitted in mid-July. It is important to have all the required elements by the end of June. With regards to distribution of the Sagiter results, this needs to be anticipated. We can begin to address this during the Romania seminar. But the agenda of subjects is already very busy. This should therefore be held over for the autumn 2015 seminar. Possible channels: articles, radio, television and also trainers. Make progress on the training path: to be carried out in parallel to the analysis of the SupAgro training course in May on environmental aspects and teaching related to agroecological knowledge. The duration of the module also depends on the target public. * Make progress on the training path: to be carried out in parallel to the analysis of the SupAgro training course in May on environmental aspects and teaching related to agroecological knowledge. * For the 4 participants at this meeting, the 'remainder of the Sagiter team, it would be good to have a SAGITER main objective which is the same for all and then secondary objectives specific to each partner in relation to the target public for the training course. • Test course in May 2015, SupAgro: - Itsvan can come and his travelling expenses will be covered if he gives a lecture or a course. Marie-Laure will refer on this to her colleagues in Florac. Itsvan requires a letter of invitation. - For the Belgian participation, Sylvie would like to come but given that she has already participated in the conference last summer in Florac, she is liaising with other members of the team to see who will come. She will get back to us shortly. • It could be interesting to carry out a survey amongst trainers and teachers with regards to agroecology given that they are all now supposed to address this theme with their trainees or apprentices (memo from the Ministry of Agriculture). This would help us to adapt the total duration of the training path in relation to each theme, target public, etc. Comments AM develop a core curriculum for SAGITER with special elements.... / per target public / per country Did the 4 Sagiter members appoint themselves: what were the contributions to the working groups: what efficacy?		
7 April 2015 (r11)	5 participants 3 countries: Belgium, Spain, France	Sylvie Fosselle ; Rosa Leis ; H��������� ; Marie-Laure Girault – Loic Braida
Agenda Only one meeting to go before Cluj!! * Preparation of the Cluj seminar: Decisions / notes Discussion on the proposed programme • The definition of the main objective of the training path should respond to the partners' questions. • It is becoming urgent to think about developing the training path... At the Cluj seminar!! Sagiter provides for an evolution of this path, with a retro-planning schedule showing that the evaluation should take place in autumn 2015 and spring 2016... This means that the training path should be tested between the Cluj		

and the following seminars (autumn 2015). However, the summer period is not necessarily the best time for this... **in what way?**

- Working on the key objective of the training path will enable us to feed the development of the research-action and its hypotheses. **To date, you have not really formalised this research-action all together since the project was initiated.** This work was started by the methodology memo put forward by Marie-Laure and reviewed by Jean-Luc and Michel in 2014. **This memo could have been attached to the present report... 2014 was a long time ago...** We could envisage analysing the objectives and hypotheses at the same time. On the basis of our exchanges, it would appear that now is the right time.
 - Contribution of the Scientific and Technical Committee: Marie-Laure and Rosa don't see what the committee can propose given that it has not been very active Ljubljana seminar. At the next committee meeting we have to address: How to stimulate participation and commitment for group work between seminars: Speaking time for each participant? The partners present at the meeting propose that this question be raised in Cluj.
 - There should be closer management of the project (Rosa): to give progress reports and direction. This is possibly clear for the French because the project was designed there and there are many French partners.
 - We do not rely enough on documents produced together.
 - We need a project management technique that enables each party to express themselves. For at least one hour.
 - That the management is carried out by someone who is not often present. Ask Anne? **Anne could have but... what about travelling expenses and last minute requests... the coherence? Mid-path evaluation of the trainer for research-action? Monitoring?**
 - There are several productions by partners but a gap between production and data analysis. A view of the work carried out in France would help! The analysis work represents a difficulty. For this, we need an objective. **NO...too different**
 - We hesitate because we don't know how to start. We develop 'as we go'. Research-action is not part of everyone's culture.
 - There is an element of stress due to passing time but the elements are widely dispersed and we are committed to a transnational production.
 - **We don't have the recipe to promote participation from everyone but it is important to take time to discuss this because we may be heading towards a problem;** collaborative work is a great strength but causes problems too.
 - This is a project which requires production **We must all work together and we must ensure that the objectives become clear for everyone.** We are beginning to become a little lost.
 - We need to make a review, understand any points which are blocking progress and put forward corrective actions. With the language barrier **we need to spend time on written elements before oral exchange in groups.**
 - The theme could be: **How to encourage participation and commitment in group work? Or, what are the difficulties you encounter with regards to your participation?**
 - We could also review the project proposed to the agency with a presentation based on the present level of progress.
 - The sticking points are part of the project development process. There are always such moments, followed by a clearer phase... The sticking points are a natural part of the process. A very positive point is that the partners have produced a great deal of work!
 - Is there a need for a field survey? We are not fully convinced. We could test the video tool with a farmer one evening? Be present sufficiently early in order to be able to maximise the time available. The workshop on video use must be held before this meeting.
 - Meal at the farm and meeting with the farmers: find a video to present to the farmers and ask their opinion, while filming them, to add elements to our work on methodology. Who can lead this? Loïc can provide a video and work upstream with Marie-Laure. Arnaud Trollé could take on part of the workshop on the use of video or photos. Check with him to see what is needed.
- Work on the link between the hypothesis of research-action and consolidation of our methods. This is a way of forming a contract on what is required.

Comments AM

I leave these thoughts as they are because it would seem that you have found your own solutions...

Cluj programme: a critical analysis of the video would be more appropriate than a technical workshop: how should the video be chosen from the elements already available? This is your job. Arnaud works mainly with "non-farmers and non-locals", this is different. Where is the limit/boundary with the project?

? May 2015 (12) ?

?

Comments AM: was this meeting scheduled? Did it take place?

THE 2ND STUDY GROUP (Feb 2014) BECAME THE SCIENTIFIC AND TECHNICAL COMMITTEE" (Nov 2014)

2nd Group: Survey method (Feb.2014) then Scientific and Technical Committee (Nov.2014) – i.e. 11 meetings between May 2014 and May 2015		
<p>The group according to the document distribution list on 2014-09</p> <p>17 persons.</p>	<p>Germany / Marburg University: Nicolai Dellmann (r1.2.4.7.8.9.10.=7) Markus Hassler (r0)</p> <p>Belgium / Vlaamse Landmaatschappij : Sylvie Fosselle (r11=1)</p> <p>Spain / Escuelas Familiares Agrarias de Galicia : Rosa Leis (r1.2.4.5.6.11=6) José Gil (r0)</p> <p>Romania / Universitatea de Științe Agricole și Medicină Veterinară, Cluj Napoca: Mignon Sandor (r1.2.4.6.9.10.=5)</p> <p>Slovenia / Chamber of agriculture and forestry in Slovenia Janko Rode (r5.8.=2)</p> <p>Hungary / Szent Istvan University, Gödöllő : Judit Kovic (r2.3.5.8.9.10.=6) Katalin Kujani (r0)</p> <p>Belgium /</p> <p>France / Association Fumeterre: Hélène Hollard (r11=1) Bénigne Joliet (r0)</p> <p>France/ Association Savoir Faire et Découverte: Arnaud Trollé (r0)</p> <p>France / Geyser: Jean-Luc Campagne (r6.8.=2)</p> <p>France / SupAgro Florac, agro-environment education institute: Marie-Laure Girault (r1to11) Loïc Braïda (r1.2.4.6.7.8.11) Aurélie Javelle (r1.7.) Michel Vidal (r1.3.) Guy Lévêque (r1.5.)</p>	
<p>???</p>	<p>France / Le Merle absent from distribution list? What is Geneviève doing for the project with the money from the EU? She is collecting credit notes while this is not the key objective... what about the "transmission" of the project to Le Merle? Who is going to take over, the two girls are about to retire... if they haven't already.</p> <p>France/ knowledge and discovery: what participation in the collective work/investment? He is developing his contacts / marketing with money from Europe: this is a research-action not a development action!</p>	
<p>When</p>	<p>with whom</p>	<p>...</p>
<p>28 May 2014 (r1)</p>	<p>8 participants 4 countries: Romania, Germany, Spain, France</p>	<p>Present: Mignon, Nicolai, Rosa, Aurélie, Loïc, Michel, Guy, Marie-Laure.</p>
<p>Decisions / notes</p> <p>Marie-Laure proposes a general framework for surveys (conditions, context) and to review our tools. Between the two meetings we can draw up documents to present and share these tools.</p> <p>3 questions are raised:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - How to motivate farmers to take part in the surveys? - What is the general framework for the surveys? - What methodology do we have? <p>Rosa presents the method used in Spain for their work on hops.</p> <p>Exchange on the format of tool description files so that these can be shared: Guy wants a succinct summary file of our tools. What type of file do we need to describe and share our tools? We do not need a protocol that is too restrictive. We should start from the file proposals put forward by Guy: objectives, context of use, procedure, interests and limits, results obtained, link between methods.</p> <p>* Everyone agrees to a meeting every 2 weeks. Marie-Laure set up a poll to see what day of the week and time suits everyone best.</p> <p>Comments AM</p> <p>From Rosa's work: not to isolate persons from other groups and/or cultures and their environment and time frames... compare to link with questions from Belgium?</p> <p>The question of the "collective" aspect for working towards agroecology and the terroir?</p> <p>The method must be easy to understand. This must be simple and open and structured. And also easily adaptable to each national/regional context.</p>		
<p>19 June 2014 (r2)</p>	<p>6 participants 3 countries: Romania, Germany, Spain, Hungary, France</p>	<p>Present: Mignon, Nicolai, Rosa, Judit, Loïc, Marie-Laure</p> <p>Excused: Jean-Luc, Lydia, Michel, Aurélie.</p>
<p>Agenda</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 2. Review on the commitments made at the previous group meeting. 3. Final validation of file templates proposed by Guy. 3. Review of the feedback on Marie-Laure's proposal for a methodology memo: everyone reads the document, comments, puts forward additions or changes. 4. Distribution of tasks between group members. <p>Decisions / notes</p> <p>On the survey method itself:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - For the Sagiter project we need to talk about methods of transmission. This is not therefore just collection of knowledge. However, as an initial phase, it is important to have validated a common framework on what agroecological knowledge is considered to be, within the methodology proposal. This should possibly be completed by a typology of agroecological knowledge, if the one put forward by Guy meets with approval. <p>Distribution of tasks between group members.</p> <p>For the next meeting on 3rd July 2014: from all the questions or items listed in the methodology memo, everyone can plan forward and draw up a questionnaire for the different categories of persons: farmers, consultants, apprentices, students, teachers, consumers... Should each questionnaire be developed on the basis of everyone's own context, concerns, motivations?</p> <p>The participants are free to choose: Loïc: a farming consultant and for farming technician; Nicolai: a farmer (active, retired) and a consumer; Judit: an apprentice; a professional trainee and a student; Rosa: a technical trainer and a local authority. Sandor is already working with farmers and students. He will share the documents he has drawn up; Michel will write up two files, one on life experience, the other on an explanatory interview.</p> <p>Comments AM</p>		
<p>July 2014 (r3)</p>	<p>3 participants 2 countries: Hungary, France</p>	<p>Present: Judit, Marie-Laure, Michel.</p>
<p>Decisions / notes</p> <p>In the end the July meeting did not take place due to lack of participants. Michel, Judit and Marie-Laure met by Hangout and discussed the survey project from Hungary and Judit's questionnaire. We did not write up the minutes because the exchange was too specific.</p> <p>Comments AM</p> <p>It would appear that it is not only farmers who are difficult to get hold of.</p> <p>What about this work and its English-French translation?</p>		

4 September 2014 (r4)	5 participants 4 countries: Spain, Romania, Germany, France	Present: Marie-Laure, Loïc, Sandor, Rosa, Nicolai. Excused: Judit, Jean-Luc, Michel, Aurélie.
Agenda 2. Report on the exchange between the Follow up Committee on Tuesday on the organisation of the Slovenia seminar 3. Review of the group members' work since the last meeting 4. Continuing the work: how to move forward? Distribution of tasks between group members. Decisions / notes Michel, Judit and Marie-Laure met by Hangout and discussed the survey project from Hungary and Judit's questionnaire. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Questions from Mignon: Should the same tools be applied in every country for the surveys? <i>Replies:</i> Some tools are maybe not usable in other regions, countries or sectors. We aim to develop innovation, we are developing our work, tools and methods. Mignon aims at 15 interviews with farmers from different sectors. They first of all visited some farmers with regards to general aspects (projects...). There is a lot of subsistence farming in Romania, they will also be interviewed. Rosa is working with a group comprised of different actors: farmers, consultants, cooperatives...all involved in the transmission of knowledge. They carried out their research through trainers, given that this is important for them. She reviewed the proceedings with the younger subjects, who understand the procedure. The older populations are less aware and ready than was initially thought. They use different collection tools because the subjects are different the collection tool must be duly adapted to the public. They also collected old films. Mignon questioned the group members about fair income, one of the 12 items for defining agroecological knowledge that we share during the Florac seminar. What is a fair income? We must be attentive to income because this is an important factor in the communication and promotion of agroecological practices. Comments AM		
10 October 2014 (r5)	5 participants 4 countries: Slovenia, Spain, Hungary, France	Present: Marie-Laure, Rosa, Janko, Judit, Guy. Excused: Nicolai, Aurélie, Loïc.
Decisions / notes * Marie-Laure individually reminded each member who had committed to produce a file or a method or a questionnaire by e-mail. Guy reminded them that everyone had to place their files on-line. This is better because several members' Dropbox is full. * Work for the Slovenia seminar: presentation of tools and methods Comments AM		
6 November 2014 (r6)	6 participants 3 countries: Spain, Romania, France	Present: Rosa, Mignon, Marie-Laure, Loïc, Michel, Jean-Luc.
Decisions / notes Most of us had not made progress since the seminar because there was a lack of time. * However, Mignon prepared an article after the seminar and translated the Sagiter site's home page in Romania, as did Rosa. SupAgro Florac organised an internal meeting to talk about the seminar. Given the diversity and complexity of the data, the type of data collected (due to the diversity of data collection tools), it was very difficult to imagine a shared analysis tool. We would certainly lose a lot of information. The best is to share the key concepts defined during the project opening seminar. Before analysing the data, we need to answer the question: what are we looking for? If we agree on a general basis with these items, we can still maintain certain diverging points. We need to go further with or definition. We need to be clearer. Using the 12 word/items will enable each participant to plan ahead and sort their data within this conceptual framework. There would then be a discussion based on the key concepts, differences between use, collection methods and the related analyses. * Marie-Laure raised the question of technical problems and the quality of our discussions on themes due to technical and language differences.... There is a certain level of difficulty with regards to interaction. * Mignon proposes preparing documents upstream in order save time and become more efficient. Mignon's proposal was to make the most of this procedure to define what agroecology is for the project partners. * Michel suggested that we extend the analysis to transmission / training within this framework. Comments AM Choice of the name of the group... not what it will be doing with regards to research-action... the transfer of collection/survey to the Scientific Committee? : What change in position does this entail?		
15 January 2015 (r7)	4 participants 2 countries: Germany, France	Present: Nicolai, Marie-Laure, Aurélie, Loïc. Excused: ...
Decisions / notes Given the low number of persons present, the meeting was postponed to 22 January at 16h00 (next week) with the same wide reaching agenda which should enable us to exchange on the work to be achieved before the Romania seminar. Comments AM		
22 January 2015 (r8)	6 participants 3 countries: Slovenia, Hungary, Germany, France	Present: Janko, Judit, Nicolai, Jean-Luc, Marie-Laure, Loïc. Excused: Michel, Aurélie, Rosa.
Agenda . Each participant's progress. . What work for the Scientific and Technical Committee before the Romania seminar? Decisions / notes In France we held a local partnership meeting on 18 December. We have shared the level of progress of our information collection campaigns, their sectors (olives, dry walls, vegetable transformation...) and worked on the objectives and conditions for a train the trainer session to be held in May 2015. For the moment we only have hypotheses though (cf. below). Next time we meet (two days in March) we will have a more analytical point of view which can be shared. The course will be in French but we will present the feedback from this at the Romania seminar. Hypothesis for the training objectives: methodological capacity to accompany data collection, construction and generation of agroecological knowledge (<i>skills</i>), capacity to promote the learning of integrated knowledge (with consideration of motivation, ethics, desire, senses, experience) (<i>knowledge</i>), promoting the tuition transition through a new didactic and pedagogical coherence, capacity to describe and analyse knowledge and practices of a professional situation through an agroecological chart (map). : the 3 skills, we are still there!!! map: this is often referred to, what is it? Where are we at exactly?		

<p>We need to work on an ideal training course or how to adapt it to different situations (for example: the land and humanism course and training trainers at the Agricultural Lycée).</p> <p>... an ideal situation does not exist given that you have used the hypothesis of <i>enaction</i> (F.Varela) related to the issue of transmission and learning of agroecological knowledge!</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sandor asked whether we had been able to discuss the issue of autonomy with regards to agroecology. No, because at the last meeting everyone appeared to agree that we had laid the main foundations and this would risk repetition of such. Not so sure • The third point on our agenda was not addressed due to lack of time and language and technical difficulties in communication. <p>Comments AM</p> <p>Feedback from partners concern the CS as much as the CST: it is no longer uniquely a question of data and the method of processing this: the research method is analysed as a group: what are the objectives and endpoints of this? May be a cause for lack of interest in the meeting. You speak about motivation in the persons you meet and wish to train: but what about your own motivation and your methods? Why is it that action is taken in a 'crisis' situation (and through research and not trial and error, i.e. going beyond your fears and uncertainties and taking a more long term view?)? The absence of partners during the discussion phase affects the content and working methods...issue reminders of the research-action method.</p> <p>Do the files enable deployment of actions and change?</p> <p>Partners are doing their own thing without using the research-action process: what will they produce in terms of 'validated' scientific knowledge in terms of education and training science. (e.g. Geyser, le Merle, SF& Découverte, Fumeterre when we read the slide presentation for the seminars, it is always the same thing???)</p>		
26 February 2015 (r9)	4 participants 4 countries: Hungary, Germany, Romania, France	Present: Judit, Nicolai, Mignon, Marie-Laure. Excused: Jean-Luc, Michel, Loic, Rosa.
<p>Decisions / notes</p> <p>Hypotheses for the training course in France</p> <p>MOOC: the course can accept unlimited numbers of participants.</p> <p>Open, the course is open to all web users, without distinction of origin, level of studies or other criteria.</p> <p>Online, the course can be followed on line: lessons, activities, study work, exams, etc. Even if presence based modules or physical supports (e.g. books) can be proposed in parallel to the lessons, they are not essential for following the course.</p> <p>Course, this is a series of lessons with training objectives and one or several training paths for participants, not simply resources placed on line.</p> <p>Comments AM</p> <p><i>A large portion of the reports are not given outside the pad notes, there is a mix of 'franglais' texts: who consults these documents outside the meetings? Shouldn't there be a research-action-training road map?</i></p>		
26 March 2015 (r10)	4 participants 3 countries: Hungary, Germany, Romania, France	Present: Marie-Laure, Nicolai, Judit, Mignon Excused: Jean-Luc, Michel, Loic, Rosa.
<p>Agenda</p> <p>2. What work for the Scientific and Technical Committee between the Ljubljana and Cluj seminars?</p> <p>3. Discussion on hypotheses for the training course in France</p> <p>4. Proposal from Mignon: talk a little more about what we are doing for the next seminar.</p> <p>Decisions / notes</p> <p>Each country wants to see this work translated and distributed to the partners. Marie-Laure thinks that it is preferable to work individually to preserve creativity and inventiveness, free of any third party constraints. We can begin to share our work at the Romania seminar.</p> <p>It is good to have tools. It is interesting to see how France has moved forward. If the French group has worked on elements, these should be used by everyone to stimulate progress. Marie-Laure stated that the training path worked on in France is adapted to our context (political, social, educational...) and to our public (teachers in secondary level agricultural schools). This may not be adapted for other partners. Moreover, each word has been weighed up and debated internally. These debates are essential.</p> <p>Rosa: We have objectives with regards to data collection in order to create teaching content which can be used in training courses in our centres and be shared by other institutions. We are still on the first phase of data collection and experimentation. We simply want to have the basic points to help us analyse the best practices.</p> <p>If these are approved by us, Marie-Laure will translate the training course outline along with the objectives for the modules and will send them in English and French to all the partners. Each partner can then decide whether to use them before moving forward on this theme.</p> <p>Comments AM</p>		
7 April 2015 (r11)	5 participants 3 countries: Spain, Belgium, France	Present: Rosa, Sylvie, Marie-Laure, Loic, Hélène.
<p>Agenda</p> <p>Decisions / notes</p> <p>Comments AM</p>		
21 May 2015 (r12)	?	?

The two groups totalled 23/24 meeting via *Hangout* with related minutes in one year, mainly led by Marie-Laure Girault. The reports were written in French by MLG and translated by Nicolai.

Several general questions/remarks:

- 1- Little practical return and deployment amongst the different partners, raising the question of the utility of spending so much energy: - *Objective/goal incorrectly defined?* ; - *Group work and function not well defined from the outset?* ; *Not concrete enough / or too rigid?* - *Were the minutes read by participants and non-participants?*
- 2 – The number of participants and the regularity of their participation, as seen on the tables, not from a control point of view but to raise questions: - Concentration of the research action onto just a few persons? ; - Little "diversity" of input, which is the very reason for a Research-Action?
- 3 – CS and CST (Scientific and Technical Committee): Who does what? Local groups: who, to what and what to do with the results?

