



	REPORT SHEET ON PILOT ACTIVITIES
FIELD THEME	
Talking about talking about social exclusion	
PLACE, DATE, TIME OF SESSION	
Gdynia, UM WIS: 21.11.2014, 17:00 – 19:00	
TARGET GROUP, NUMBER OF PARTICIPANTS	
Adult trainers - 7 participants external, 2 internal	
OBJECTIVE OF THE SESSION (WHAT DID WE WANT TO ACHIEVE)	
(1) Testing out good practices; (2) Train trainers	
METHODS USED (ILLUSTRATE WITH IMAGES WHEN POSSIBLE)	
Tat good practice; Who are you until now good practice; C2C good practice.	
REACTIONS - OBSERVATIONS - EVALUATIONS: WHAT ADVANTAGES AND RISKS OF THE METHOD HAVE WE FOUND?	
<p>The meeting had a completely unexpected flow. Whereas FCP and EF always meticulously plan timeframes for each element (good practice) in a meeting, this time the planning went overboard. The reason for this being the unexpected presence of a university staff member who had taken it upon himself to evaluate us. He interrupted the first good practice (Who are you) and demanded to know the theoretical underpinnings. At first the instructors refused but then gave him a summary of the underlying theory. When that also did not satisfy him and he wanted to continue his intervention it was decided to have a break.</p> <p>In the break the academic acknowledged that he felt insecure about participating in the good practice because he did not feel in control. He was then presented with the option to leave and let the others experience the good practices or experience alongside with the other</p>	



participants leaving his questions for later. He decided on the latter. It then occurred that two of the other participants who were adult trainers in training had invited him. Instead of teaming up with him they rather were looking for excuses for his behavior – something which the academic experienced as condescending.

The Who are you good practice had an interesting outcome. The participants did build on the mold of the first participant – the academic – but greatly enriched this mold.

The Tat good practice provided a vent for emotions that had been cropped up. There was a lively discussion about the sentences – but no disagreement. The participants drafted their own versions of the sentences.

The C2C good practice brought the biggest surprise. Whereas three pairs had a wonderful, delicate, intimate dialogue, three pairs had not. Twice the participant asking the questions switched into being a kind of TV journalist doing an interview. Once a participant – who was a student of the academic while being paired up with the academic – could not overcome the hierarchy between them and stayed in a facilitating role only.

It became clear that professional communication tricks/ skills and hierarchical relations between the participants beyond the good practice were negative factors for engaging in the good practice.

At the end of the meeting the academic said that while he had felt like a laboratory rat in the beginning, he now felt so much less and was happy that he had been there.

His students – after the meeting – became friends with the instructors on Facebook, at their request.

ANY FURTHER OBSERVATIONS