

## Minutes 5<sup>th</sup> transnational meeting in Amsterdam Wednesday the 22<sup>nd</sup> of May 2019

This last transnational meeting of the project is hosted by the City of Amsterdam in cooperation with the City of Rotterdam.

### Wednesday the 22<sup>nd</sup> Program

*Location: Level 11, next to Central Station Amsterdam, Stationsplein 51-53, 1012 AB Amsterdam*

12:00 - 13:00 Welcome and lunch in Level11

13:00 - 13:30 Closing and follow-up of the project  
Odette Spee, Esther Captain

13:30 - 13:45 Continuation of the Citynetwork?  
Serv Vinders, Yvette Vervoort

*Short break: tea and coffee*

14:00 - 14:30 The Dutch ECEC system  
Mariet Yedema, municipality of Amsterdam

14:30 - 15:00 ECEC in Rotterdam  
Petra de Hoog, municipality of Rotterdam

*Short break: tea and coffee*

15.15 - 16:15 Evaluation of the project in smaller groups  
3 groups guided by Serv Vinders, Mariet Yedema, Yvette Vervoort

Evaluation on 3 levels

1. Personal level: What is your most impressive experience during these 3 years?
2. Professional level: What is your most impressive experience?
3. Level of your organization: Which experience will/can/would you use in your own organization?

16.30 - 18.00 Drinks in Tolhuistuin, Tolhuisweg 3, 1031 CL Amsterdam

18:00 - Dinner in Tolhuistuin

### Notes on Wednesday the 22<sup>nd</sup>

#### **Follow-up:**

In 2020 Llubljana will apply for a grant focusing on the development of teachers on an international level. There is a need for job shadowing and practitioners want to apply for grants to facilitate international job shadowing for child care institutions.

### **Continuation of the project:**

Different municipalities divided about formal continuation. Some say formal continuation is necessary because on a political and European level exchange and collaboration is necessary. Those who cannot formally participate, it has to do with lack of time or lack of goals.

Serv will contact the different members of the city network and request their interests and what they prefer the next coming days.

If it can be combined with student and practitioner exchanges, it might be feasible.

### **Presentation Dutch Childcare system with a special focus on Amsterdam.**

### **Presentation on Preschool in Rotterdam.**

### **Evaluation of the project:**

How difficult it was to approach inclusion and come up with a common definition, but all approaches and definitions seemed to have passed during the three years, and it's become clear social inclusion is a journey and not a destination :)

### **Evaluation Research Group**

#### **1. what can you use:**

Report on the definition of inclusion. The satisfaction with the report wasn't high at first. But during the project it became clear we really processed and worked through the different approaches and definitions of what social inclusion is. For PACT.

Nuance: it was not so much about how you see inclusion, but what the current policy is.

There was both a review and a country-report. It was a good starting point. Originally we thought we must learn what social inclusion is. And what we did we brought together different concepts of inclusion per country, and in that sense it stayed on a certain abstract level. And because it didn't end in one definition, it makes one aware it is something of a journey, not a given.

Internal reflection: The project described inclusion in certain ways, making it hard to bring it to other possible partners, because it was somewhat predefined, making it scary if it was possible to develop during the project. Can we actually develop and discuss together. It is a lesson learned, because it seems like it scared people away. A more open approach to explore it, would be valuable to add in the future.

It has become clear that there is still not a common definition or understanding of what inclusion is. To some it seems contradictory when one talks about limits to inclusion. Inclusion cannot be a concept where limits are a part of.

The problem of finding a common definition had a lot to do with the complex structure within the project group and the various countries and actors.

For the city network it was good opportunity to network and collaborate on an international level and explore what inclusion really means on the level of a city, linked to politics.

It would have been valuable to work more on the policy aspect, output 5.

From a research project (Ljubljana), it would have been valuable to have more opportunity to work closer with practitioners. Funding is just so determining. For the future: to connect an in-house project with a larger international project, to arrange the funding and connect these two levels. It's complex, but it would be valuable.

The work done necessary for the projects is often done during meetings but it's really necessary to do it in between the meetings.

Further collaboration is desired because it simply takes time to learn to collaborate so internationally.

**2. and 3. Professional and Personal:**

On a professional level: during a field visit, how pedagogues welcomed the children, as opposed to how Dutch parents bring their children to day care. The parents here come in and stay with the children quite long, and in DK the parents drop them off and from there the pedagogue takes over, who is viewed as an expert on their children.

Professionally: the comparative experience. In relation to working on projects, the field visits, the institutions and organizations. The comparative, also helping in the approaches to solving problems. Seeing how other countries and organizations go about it, and how in one country the same problem is approached and tried to solve in the same way for ten years.

On a personal and professional level: being challenged to review your own convictions about ideals and concepts and approaches to inclusion. New perspectives really refresh.

Valuable to work with students during the exchanges.