**WP4 DISCUSSION SESSION**

**Bristol, April 11th**

Attended by: Sandrine Gallois (UOC, WP4), Rachel Mason (SMS, WP2), Oriol Marimón (TBVT, WP2), Bérénice Collet (TRACES), Eric Jensen (UoW, WP4) and María Heras (UAB, WP4).

**Agenda**

1. **Clarification of task 4.2 and calendar**

Update of the development of task 4.2 Online interaction (UoW) in UK and France, in which there have been concerns.

In UK, Eric will implement the Contingency plan this year, previously agreed with SMS, through interviews to selected students on May 19th. He will conduct a “small” ethnography.

Eric provides clarification about the timeline for social-media data collection and analysis:

* April 2017 – Review online data; confirm whether further data collection is needed
* May 2017 – Interviews in UK
* June 2017 -

In France, no real interaction with ECRs through online platforms. Bérenice comments that they posted some videos and some content in Facebook, but it was hard to engage students, students have not used the Fb. Sandrine corroborates from her observations.

It seems that the main problem is that they do not use that platform. Bérénice comments that students wanted to use Snapchat, but the content disappears**. Eric checks whether data from this platform can be collected and analysed and it is feasible**.

Eric shows concern about not fostering online interaction in the case studies. Oriol highlights that WP2 commitment is to explore this interaction and that this is what they are doing. **Eric asks for letter from the UK school stating that online interaction is not possible**, in order to have an official document.

Bérénice suggests that the low engagement of ECRs might have affected as well the low interaction. The reshaping of the process might contribute to enhance this online interaction, although they cannot know it now.

Eric comments that if data collected through online interaction in France is not enough, he might need to do supplementary data collection, like in the UK (mitigation strategy: face-to-face interviews). **Eric will check the available data in Facebook and then, make a decision**.

**María asks Eric to be updated about the development of task 4.2** so that UAB coordination is aware of its implementation in the different case studies and also to avoid overlapping with tasks 4.3 and 4.4., implemented by UAB and UOC.

1. **Informed consents**

WP4 needs to check that informed consents (IC) have been collected by WP2 in order to conduct the data analysis.

We agree that **case-study coordinators in each country will scan the IC gathered and upload them in the intranet. They will also produce a summary document** with the names of the students and whether an IC has been collected.

* **María will check the location of the IC folder in the intranet and will send indications about it 🡪 DONE.** Intranet 🡪 Folder “Work-packages”🡪 WP7 🡪 Informed Consents

In UK, the IC from the control group was not properly gathered (signatures from students and not from teachers). Rachel suggests using the generic informed consent from the school. **Rachel will check with Leanne and contact the teacher** 🡪 **DONE.** There is no generic form in FFH and also the project officer did not approve this option, so Rachel will ask again for the IC for the control students.

1. **Formative Evaluation**

WP4 would like to better integrate students’ formative evaluation within the design of WP2 activities and explore synergies.

María shares the design of a pilot self-reflection activity in one school of the PERFORM schools in Barcelona. During this activity, students were asked why they thought PERFORM was being developed and discussed in small groups about their perceived goals of the project. They shared through post-its in the blackboard their small group discussions and their perceived goals were then compared to PERFORM’s goals (WP2 workshop goals). Afterwards, students were asked to which extent they thought these goals had been achieved in their school and they responded through a traffic-lights activity (red (not achieved), yellow, green (achieved)) and their responses were briefly discussed.

There is a good reception from the case study coordinators. Rachel (SMS) suggests that this activity could be proposed in the other case studies too, as an extra session, instead of adding more activities within the workshop sessions. Bérénice (TRACES) agrees.

**We agree that we will explore this possibility**, so that we can design a formative evaluation activity that is integrated in the workshops and is meaningful for their process. **WP2 and WP4 will be in touch for this during the re-design process.**