

ANNEXES
INCLUSION
REPORTING TEMPLATE – WORK PACKAGES
NUMBER AND NAME OF WORK PACKAGE:

Guidelines/Master plan and institutional mechanisms for inclusive practice & social dimension strategies (WP2)

REPORT PROVIDED BY: UoR London

SHORT SUMMARY OF WORK PACKAGE AS IN PROJECT PROPOSAL

State the main outputs and activities as per Logframe

ACTIVITY	DELIVERABLE/OUTPUT
2.2.1. Development of national guidelines with an emphasis on the HE role	National / regional guidelines to be presented at Government level by each country (Armenia & Bosnia)
2.1.1. Two day workshop on master plan and institutional mechanisms development	Workshop in Leuven with all partners attending
2.3.1. Study visits to twinning partners in EU	2 weeks of study visits – Armenian partners to Roehampton; Bosnian partners to Leuven
2.3.2. Master plan for each PCU on implementation of social dimension strategies	Successful design and delivery of institutional master plans at each of the 4 partner country universities

COMMENTS ON TIMELINE IN REFERENCE TO PROPOSAL *(are activities/outputs delayed and if so – why?)*

Activities/outputs in line with established workplan

Activity	Timeline
2.2.1. Development of national guidelines with an emphasis on the HE role	Spring 2017-summer 2017. DONE
2.1.1. Two day workshop on master plan and institutional mechanisms development	November 2017 DONE
2.3.1. Study visits to twinning partners in EU	March 2018 DONE
2.3.2. Master plan for each PCU on implementation of social dimension strategies	Various dates, 2018 DONE

GENERAL COMMENTS ON WORK PACKAGE IMPLEMENTATION *(describe challenges and opportunities/success stories encountered in WP implementation, success in meeting major milestones...etc)*

In general, we were very pleased with the end results, although some partners required extensive support to achieve their goals. It took quite a long time for everyone to fully understand the project's definition of 'Inclusion' and for this to be accepted at an institutional level.

We were very pleased that both countries were able to kickstart major discussions at a national / regional level, and feel that the INCLUSION project has given participants a clear voice to discuss social dimension issues.

GENERAL COMMENTS ON INDIVIDUAL ACTIVITIY

Activity No and title	2.2.1. Development of national guidelines with an emphasis on the HE role
Description of implementation process	UoR worked closely with UCLL to encourage each country to design draft and then publish national guidelines.
Challenges and opportunities/success stories	Some adjustments had to be made to recognise that Bosnian partners were only able to complete this task at a regional level, rather than nationally, due to the political situation. In both countries, there was an extensive consultation process with various levels of Government committees and panels, but we were very pleased with the end results.
Deviation from the original plan (why?)	<p>This activity took place AFTER 2.3.2, as we did not feel that participants would have been ready for national discussions before they had a good understanding of good practice in their own settings.</p> <p>Additional time was needed by some partners to incorporate governmental committee / panel dates</p>

Activity No and title	2.1.1. Two day workshop on master plan and institutional mechanisms development
Description of implementation process	This event took place in Leuven in November 2017, rather than in London, due to building works on the Roehampton campus. Participation and engagement was good, with all partners in attendance. The workshop was modelled on good inclusive practice, with a wide variety of activities and tasks being included for demonstration purposes.
Challenges and opportunities/success stories	At this early stage of the project, we had to work hard to ensure that all partners and organisations were fully on board, and that they needed to recognise the workloads involved.
Deviation from the original plan (why?)	Only the change in venue, and a slightly later date for the event.

Activity No and title	2.3.1. Study visits to twinning partners in EU
Description of implementation process	These took place in March 2018, with Armenian colleagues travelling to London, and Bosnian partners travelling to London.
Challenges and opportunities/success stories	The outcomes were good, with many positive ideas being shared amongst participants. Videos were made to capture the 2 weeks of study visits, to share with colleagues in the home institutions.
Deviation from the original plan (why?)	There was a delay with the arrival of the Armenian colleagues, due to unforeseeable visa issues. This meant that one member of faculty joined us in the original week, and the rest of the party arrived 2 weeks later. This caused some timetabling / operational issues, as the main party arrived in the Easter vacation when there were very few students / faculty on campus. It is really important for any future projects that visa issues are carefully considered, with sufficient time being allocated for applications to be processed.

Activity No and title	2.3.2. Master plan for each PCU on implementation of social dimension strategies
Description of implementation process	Roehampton worked closely with all partners over several months, reviewing draft versions and offering feedback.
Challenges and opportunities/success stories	Extensive use of the project's Moodle site was effectively used by some partners, so that institutions could share best practice and design plans that would suit their own institutional needs and priorities.
Deviation from the original plan (why?)	This activity took place BEFORE 2.2.1, so that participants could have a much clearer understanding of their own situations before having any discussions at a national, more public level.

ANY OTHER COMMENT:

n/a

The following section is to be filled in by person providing feedback to WP reporting template

FEEDBACK BY:
COMMENTS ON THE REPORT/IMPLEMENTATION OF WP: