

---

## LEONARDO DA VINCI PARTNERSHIPS

---

---

---

---

### PROGRESS REPORT

---

---

#### For Partnerships approved in 2012

---

---

---

Please send this progress report to your National Agency, duly completed and signed, by **30.06.2013** as requested in Article 7 (Monitoring, Evaluation and Control) of your Grant Agreement. The report will be used by your National Agency for monitoring purposes.

#### 1. General information:

Grant Agreement Reference No.: 2012-1-DE2-LEO04-11659-1

Partnership title: Teaching Permaculture in Europe: Sustainable Ways of Sharing Knowledge

Partner countries: Britain, Netherlands, Spain, Denmark, Sweden, Bulgaria, Ireland, Portugal, Slovenia, France, Finland

Your institution is: †A partner

Name of your institution:

Address:

Telephone:

Name of contact person:

Telephone:

E-mail:

## 2. Partnership content

### 2.1. Please describe briefly the Partnership activities undertaken and the results achieved so far:

The Partnership consists of 12 funded partners and several guest participants, which have met 4 times so far (August 2012, Germany; October 2012, Slovenia; March 2013, Portugal; May 2013, UK). At each meeting had between 45 and 50 participants, with about 1/3 newcomers and trainees at each meeting.

The Partners collaboratively designed a working structure that allows to share tasks within the Partnership and rotate the preparation of meetings around small groups.

Each meeting has a focus on one of the objectives of the Partnership, well as allowing time to exchange about the other objectives. So far, partners have focused on the following objectives:

- To form a network of European teachers (1st meeting, Germany strengthened and diversified at subsequent meetings)
- To learn from other organisations' experience (2nd meeting, Slovenia)
- To exchange about different curricula and course formats (3rd meeting Portugal)
- To supporting teachers in practising teaching methods and in enhancing their teaching quality (4th meeting, England)
- To enabling teachers to visit permaculture projects and see practical solutions in other countries and climatic conditions (each meeting)
- To promote cultural exchange, diversity and inclusion within permaculture network (each meeting)

The remaining objective is:

- To create a handbook with methods and curricula, PDF brochure about organisational structures, a booklet about best practices and a website which displays the results.

This will be the focus topic of the next meeting in Spain. We expect the format and media used to convey the information to change, but the details are yet to be specified. However, the partnership website has been established (see below).

#### ***Concrete results have been:***

##### **Escherode Germany, August 1-7, 2012:**

1. We spread information about the Partnership to newcomers and on the newly established website: <http://permateachers.eu>
2. We presented partner organisations to each other,
3. We implemented a structure of organisation (based on the "Viable

Systems Model” by Stafford Beer) for the Partnership,

4. We worked out more details of the work-programme for the 2 years,
5. We formed teams for the different tasks and functions of the Partnership,
6. We met at a permaculture site as a practical example.
7. A short slideshow of the meeting was produced:  
[https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=qMAbqS1IM\\_I](https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=qMAbqS1IM_I)

#### **Trenta, Slovenia, October 21st to 25th, 2012:**

1. We gathered questionnaires on educational structures from: Denmark, England, France, Germany, Ireland, Netherlands, Portugal, Italy, Austria, Croatia, Czech Republic, Slovakia, the Canary Islands,
2. We made SWOC-analysis (Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities, Constraints - and Solutions) of different educational structures,
3. We looked at “lessons learned” from this meeting and made a design how to better organise the next meeting,
4. We visited a permaculture farm and a bee keepers’ museum.

#### **Vale da Lama, Portugal, March 25th to 30th, 2013:**

1. We collected various course curricula, different formats of courses, session plans and an overview of the content that most teachers teach,
2. We worked on the clarification of the structure of the Partnership so that it is more easily accessible for newcomers,
3. We decided to focus on *the a* WIKI (wiki.permateachers.eu) as the main place where the outcomes of the Partnership will be published and started to work out templates to upload information,
4. We stayed on the site of a permaculture project and got involved in practical work here, and visited 2 more permaculture projects on the last day of the meeting,
5. Video interviews of attendees at this meeting was produced:  
<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=HP9CDfzPeXo>

#### **Leeds, England, May 27th to June 1st, 2013:**

1. We organized a Creative Teaching Methods training course as an option before the actual meeting in Leeds,
2. We exchanged about Pedagogy, methods, stories of success and failure and apprenticeships in teaching,
3. We had a talk by Jon Walker, consultant, on the Viable Systems Model, to further improve our working structure,
4. We saw presentations about various Permaculture projects in Leeds, visited a local sustainable & affordable housing project, a nearby permaculture farm and community garden.
5. We worked with Open Space Technology to enable as many people as possible to participate in exchange of information, knowledge and learning processes,
6. We did a World Café Method to collect wishes, ideas and visions for

the continuation and development of this project beyond July 2014 and created a group to work out details,

7. We started to fill the WIKI with content and results.

## **2.2. What problems/obstacles, have you met in the implementation of the Partnership, if any? How have these problems been solved?**

Managing the diversity of perspectives within the project has brought a number of challenges.

A major challenge has been balancing the desire to widen participation to include as many people as possible (which supports the objective of forming a network of teachers) with the practical need to maintain continuity within the project to deliver the other objectives. In particular during the 3rd meeting, we observed that newcomers to the project had high expectations and felt frustrated by certain aspects of the way the project was run and details of the programme (specifically they wanted more focus on content and less on discussing details of “how to manage the Partnership”); meanwhile “old timers” who had been involved in the project from the beginning felt that their contribution to the project had not been recognised or honoured.

We have responded to this by conducting more thorough inductions for newcomers to the project at the beginning of meetings and by splitting groups so that people with different levels of information can participate without frustration. Also, the participants from each country made efforts to brief new attendees prior to the meetings.

Another challenge that we have faced has been how to enable some degree of participation for unfunded partners: those organisations that contributed to writing the application, but did not receive the funding from their national agency (Italy and Latvia), or potential partners that failed to engage in time to be included in the bid process (e.g. Permacult organisations in Czech Republic, Croatia, Austria, Belgium, Switzerland, Ukraine etc). We decided to facilitate unfunded partners’ participation by reducing their event fee and inviting partner organisations to make donations to subsidise them.

A major challenge has been (and remains to be) for the participants to stay in touch in between meetings, especially in the working groups, as they have been formed by interest rather than proximity of participants to each other. Using the Internet to collaborate with a multi-lingual group spread out over several time zones and countries is one of the major learning experiences! The partners try to move towards getting the work done between the meetings themselves, plus there is usually time allocated to the question of “how will we stay in touch and work together until the next meeting”. The solution for that issue was the decision made for all to have regular Skype meetings using Team viewer and start adding (again on a regular basis) their input to the WIKI.

Last but not least it turns out that the funded partners seem to have communicated enough during the application period and before the start of the project about how certain outcomes were going to be financed. Due to this, the partners have made budget-plans which do not allow for printing all of the material that has been planned. Although there was awareness of the “Accompanying Measures”, the partners did not have the resources to apply for this funding. The solution for now is to focus on online publication of the results and the various products that have been planned on a WIKI-platform.

### 2.3. Mobility activities

**Minimum number of mobilities planned** (*please tick as appropriate*)

4      8      12      24

**reduced number of mobilities** \_\_\_\_

### 2.4 Mobilities carried out between 1.08.2012 and 30.6.2013 (add rows if necessary)

**Mobility description**

**Nr of participating staff<sup>1</sup>**      **Nr of participating trainees**

Germany, August 1st to 7th 2012; Preparatory-meeting: Getting to know each other more closely, defining work and social structure of meeting, outline of next mobility meeting in October

Slovenia, October 21st to 25th, 2012; Presentation and discussion of educational structures, systems and processes; preparing exchange agreements; discussion of curricula at next mobility meeting

Portugal, March 25th to 30th, 2013; Exchange and recording of curriculum of Permaculture Design Courses and other course formats

UK, May 27th to June 1st, 2013; Pedagogy, methods, stories of success and failure, apprenticeships; Masterclasses, skill sharing, holistic learning (including)

**Total number of mobilities**

### 2.5 Number of mobilities to be carried out by 31.7.2014

### 3. Grantholder's declaration to be signed by the person legally authorised to sign on behalf of

---

<sup>1</sup> Including - in the case of mobility involving persons with special needs - accompanying persons

your institution/organisation and by the Partnership contact person in your institution/organisation:

"We, the undersigned, certify that the informat  
contained in this Progress Report is correct t  
the best of our knowledge".

Date:

Date:

Place:

Place:

Name and position of the contact person:

Name and position of the Head of  
institution/organisation:

Signature of the contact person:

Signature of the Head of institution/organisation:

Stamp of the institution/organisation (if applicable)

\*\*\*\*\*