

Stakeholder consultation: criteria and indicators of a quality framework for Learning Regions

Germany

Lernende Regionen Deutschland e.V.

Dr. Jutta Thinesse-Demel

Disclaimer: This project is funded with support from the European Commission. This communication reflects the views only of the authors, and the Commission cannot be held responsible for any use which may be made of the information contained therein.

APPLYING QUALITY ASSURANCE CRITERIA: CONSULTATION WITH NETWORKS - LRD			
	Quality Indicators: What you might look for to establish this is being done effectively and appropriately?	Methods and Approaches to Measuring Quality: How you might go about getting information or feedback on these issues:	Constraints: What difficulties you foresee in collecting this information/feedback:
Partnership:			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Common vision, mission, aims objectives identified and understood; 	Application had to be written, concepts developed as a precondition to get approved	Written applications with milestones, work-packages and curricula of included persons	Sometimes visions and missions were not understood when projects have started
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Targets specified 	All types of learners on all levels	Targets were identified after roundtables with relevant local players	Lack of employers of companies mostly
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Principles and protocols to govern ongoing collaboration developed and understood; 	Every LR had an initiation-process (“kick-off”) where the whole mission was visualised, developed and understood	Monthly jour-fixe for all leaders of the project + sub-projects with protocols of the results	Relevant organisations on place felt sometimes excluded because all LR started with a specifically defined partnership which couldn’t include all interested parties and organisations
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Partnership is ‘deep’ (not just one person if representative); 	The LR consist of 2-4 people running the LR and sub-projects embedded with same number of people working there	Reports have been made up also by the sub-projects	Sometimes cooperation was loosely developed which led to disparate results and didn’t strengthen the LR
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ BUT also ‘deep’ if personal – bring all experience, not just some 	In most of the cases skilled and experienced people were responsible	Additional methods were used to identify all experience existing in the LR (e.g.	Sometimes too much adult education

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Individual partner can communicate back to their partnership organisation (non-conflictual) ○ Partnership is proactive (participative not representative); ○ Engagement is voluntary, not enforced ○ Partnership is valued (time is paid for) ○ Partners show leadership; ○ Basis of partnership can be reviewed (changing to suit needs and challenges as they arise); 	<p>for LR</p> <p>Many pilots were running with the clear option to enhance communication of individual partners</p> <p>Every partnership had to apply and was approved in a high-ranking selection-process; therefore every LR was representative</p> <p>Engagement was paid and therefore a pre-condition</p> <p>Partnership was paid ...</p> <p>The LR and sub-projects were mainly running by professionals skilled in leadership</p> <p>Review belonged to the projects; feedbacks have always to be given</p>	<p>pedagogic games)</p> <p>All pilots work with methods and approaches suitable to the development of contents (e.g. through questionnaires, interviews where individual partners but also users could communicate back)</p> <p>The application had to be made up in a professional way</p> <p>Also the subcontracts needed a professional written concept</p> <p>Reshape had to be undertaken in the interim- and final reports – and should lead to adopt partnership to the actual situation which was not always the case</p>	<p>There was a danger that partners were developing their projects in an independent way not so embedded into the whole context as planned</p> <p>... but not always valued</p> <p>Changes which came perhaps to the fore couldn't be made up because the projects had to stick on the approval by the federal ministry</p> <p>In a way it was "cherry-picking" by bringing forward the most relevant and successful pilots</p>
--	--	---	---

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Partners are kept motivated – ensuring network agenda matches partner expectations – is value-added (but not cherry-picking); ‘what’s in it for us?’ ○ Consistency – language, concepts clearly understood to facilitate partnership (common sense) ○ Coverage: all necessary partners are involved to address needs ○ Partners clear of their own role (responsibilities) and the connections they need to make ○ Flexibility: partnership arrangements are not too rigid as to impede responsiveness ○ Trust and openness amongst partners exist (even within competitive conditions) ○ There is Ownership: autonomy as well as sense of responsibility 	<p>Motivation was directly orientated on one side to the financial support and on the other hand to success of the pilots</p> <p>All concepts had to be developed, evaluated and most of them were proved after at least 2-years-time by the dlr</p> <p>Building-up networks was one of the first tasks to be fulfilled</p> <p>In general the overall mission of whole project was known to all partners</p> <p>Partnerships arrangements were fixed by contracts</p> <p>Fixed employment leads to seeking for people to whom it could be trusted</p> <p>LR were defined as clear ownership-systems</p>	<p>No approaches have been made up which kept partners motivated</p> <p>Evaluation-processes had to be undertaken – mostly done by two external evaluation-groups; very rarely and not in a written way this evaluation was done by the LR themselves</p> <p>Needs-analysis was undertaken by many of the LR – but not by all; there was no unique scheme</p> <p>In that respect no methods were used as far as I know</p> <p>New partners brought in new methods which might have no direct link to the former methodology</p> <p>Questions around copy-right of products aroused by the pilots came up in the end of</p>	<p>Sometimes too much emphasis was given to the consistency which leads to a lack of creative new ways</p> <p>Sometimes it turns out that slight changes of the firstly defined roles would have been good</p> <p>New partners popping into the projects brought in new ideas and might have changed sometimes the main purpose</p> <p>Like in a normal organisation there was also competition included which could lead to distrust</p> <p>Sometimes ownership was taken too personal and project.-leaders felt like</p>
---	---	--	--



Education and Culture DG

Lifelong Learning Programme

R3L+ Quality Framework For Learning Regions
504475-LLP-1-2009-1-DE-GRUNDTVIG-GMP

		the 2 periods (after 5 years and 8 years); agreed schemes of quality and approaches to measuring quality were missing	owning their own "company"
--	--	---	----------------------------

	Quality Indicators: What you might look for to establish this is being done effectively and appropriately?	Methods and Approaches to Measuring Quality: How you might go about getting information or feedback on these issues:	Constraints: What difficulties you foresee in collecting this information/feedback:
<p>Participation: Involving the wider public or community</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Network is known and understood by general public ○ Clear measures to involve those most distant from learning opportunities ○ People have a chance to express their needs ○ People are involved in decision-making (governance) ○ People are involved in review ○ People are actively supported (and opportunities created) to express needs, be involved in decision-making and review 	<p>Wider public was involved – but not everybody living in the regions was aware of the LR</p> <p>Wider public knew the network ...</p> <p>Blended-learning modules were developed and tested</p> <p>Vertically and horizontally mixed roundtables speak for individual users</p> <p>LR in Germany try to attract people but didn't involve them directly</p> <p>In big events (e.g. Learning Festivals) short reviews were made</p> <p>In pilots feed-back was asked for</p>	<p>Marketing was included (info to media, leaflets, posters, brochures)</p> <p>Approaches to measuring quality of advertisements were not indicated and undertaken</p> <p>These modules were evaluated</p> <p>There was no method foreseen</p> <p>No methods foreseen</p> <p>Review mostly done in simple feed-back-schemes or verbally</p> <p>Feed-back-papers</p>	<p>In general most of the LR couldn't find the real key to inform the whole community</p> <p>... but didn't understand a long time what LR is about</p> <p>there are severe concerns of sustainability of blended-learning-programmes</p> <p>people were normally not represented in the roundtable to express their needs</p> <p>no governance included in the German LR</p> <p>no measurable quality indicators</p> <p>people were not directly involved in decision-making processes or reviews</p>

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Language, materials, resources, published materials are clearly understood in everyday life: not just at overall network level, but also in constituent activities and programmes ○ Understanding of learning needs to be universally relevant and meaningful to all life-styles 	<p>There is a quite good amount of materials published – but not only clearly understood and included into the institutional activities</p> <p>This is completely unrealistic and would cut flexibility and innovation</p>	<p>All kinds of methods have been used; there is no set of approved schemes for methodology</p>	<p>not all institutions included the results into their constituent activities and programmes</p>
---	--	---	---

	Quality Indicators: What you might look for to establish this is being done effectively and appropriately?	Methods and Approaches to Measuring Quality: How you might go about getting information or feedback on these issues:	Constraints: What difficulties you foresee in collecting this information/feedback:
<p>Progress and Renewal: The capacity to continuously understand results, reasons; and the capacity to use this understanding to influence ongoing planning</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Partners ‘internalise’ evaluation and review (identifying benefits and not just an imposition) ○ Evaluation and review (quality) are prioritised – seen as a core activity and not just an add-on ○ Resources are allocated (not just finance but human responsibility) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Methods and mechanisms should not be cumbersome or divert from the main purpose of the network. ○ Means of measuring must be appropriate in context of learning region (not just quantitative; and also longer-term) 	<p>For the different reports evaluation was compulsory – focussed on benefits</p> <p>Evaluation and quality review was always undertaken at the end</p> <p>With finances human responsibility for fulfilment was embedded</p> <p>That is so evident and has therefore not to be mentioned</p> <p>Instruments for measuring were developed and can be looked up in the existing reports</p>	<p>Different types of methods were used</p> <p>Different evaluation-methods were used – also from the external side (2 expensively paid organisations!)</p> <p>Methods for evaluation were directly allocated to finance</p> <p>Different methods have been used – there was no clearly indicated scheme</p>	<p>Sometimes it was unclear which benefits was to be addressed to</p> <p>It was not seen as a core-activity</p> <p>The distinction between finance and human responsibility was not always clearly made up</p> <p>Methods and quality assurance was not always adequate; everybody used the methods known to him</p>

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Results and findings must be able to be widely understood ○ Must be macro as well as micro picture (product as well as process) ○ Flexibility of partners to share information (not defensive) ○ Flexibility and openness of partners to accept results (failures as well as successes) and act on results – open to change ○ Benefits identified are broad-based (not just education-linked) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Benefits are demonstrated and communicated ○ Results and learning is used to influence policy (not just practice) Unintended as well as planned outcomes are documented and shared 	<p>That was a precondition by the dlr</p> <p>Dlr was interested in the process- and product-description – both has been fulfilled</p> <p>The LR built up roundtables and subgroups just in case there were necessary to develop a pilot</p> <p>A project is per definitionem an open process, and therefore openness was indicated</p> <p>Of course – the German LR had to produce broad-based benefits</p> <p>In a lot of publications</p> <p>Of course the results influenced policy in the Länder a different way – in some very successfully</p>	<p>Methods had to be clear</p> <p>The reports had to be written alongside a clearly defined scheme – methods used were therefore very transparent</p> <p>Methods were used alongside the necessity of the pilots</p> <p>No clear methods has been used</p> <p>No clear methods has been used</p> <p>Any kind of publications inclusively websites and media</p> <p>Conferences, access to new regional calls, part of the educational policy of some Länder</p>	<p>Dlr measured success and sought for failures – therefore the LR tried to avoid to open up failures; the defined any step as “necessary for the development”</p> <p>Sometimes benefits were too broadly described and therefore too general</p> <p>Too many publications in the website of dlr</p> <p>Disadvantage: education is in the responsibility of the Länder; finally no possibility to spread the results on a national base</p>
--	--	---	---