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

Hungary

University of Pecs

Dr. Balázs Németh

APPLYING QUALITY ASSURANCE CRITERIA: GUIDE TO CONSULTATION WITH NETWORKS (MACRO LEVEL)			
Partnership:	**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:
o Common vision, mission, aims and objectives identified and understood o Targets specified	Mapping expectations, visions and strategic development plans of the partners in **Learning City-Region Forum** Founding document of Pécs learning City-Region Forum expressing joint agreements Agreement to be elaborated into concrete projects	Analysis of documents implying identified collaborative frames, measures, tools, etc. A series of discussions/workshops of group members/stakeholders/ partners	a.) too complicated and contradictory materials/thick and boring (only rhetoric!) strategy documents b.) Lack of appropriate representation/the appointment of the delegate/ his-her power partner influencing goals
o Principles and protocols to govern ongoing collaboration developed and understood	Partnership agreements elaborated and signed by all members of the partnership Level of trust/honesty/credibility	Chart of organisational duties and responsibilities open dialogues and reflections/professional integrity at meetings	a.) personal conmmitment deformed by institutional position/power
o Partnership is 'deep' (not just one person if representative) o BUT also 'deep' if personal – bring all experience, not just some	It is a primary/achievable issue at macro level format	-	-
o Individual partner can communicate back to their partnership organisation (non-conflictual)	Forms of communication require ongoing feedbacks from partners	Management to plan events/meetings channelling feedback upon the quality/effectiveness of collaboration	disbelief upon the role/impact of feedback
o Partnership is proactive (participative not representative)	Number of bottom-up initiatives from partners Forms and frequency of spreading relevant information to partners	joint projects/initiatives joint project planning project outputs project meetings uploading relevant	a.) the culture of learnt passivity b.) fears of politically-driven interest and abuse of power

	The level/intensity of participation number of new partners	materials to website	
o Engagement is voluntary, not enforced	initial engagement has to be constantly reinforced and not lost	appearance level particip. level level of generating projects time and skills input	a.) distrust in partners' hidden motives b.) lots of other engagements and workloads
o Partnership is valued (time is paid for)	Formal commitment made through agreements of collaboration Resources allocated to the partnership (human, physical, financial, time etc.)	Scrutiny of contributions of partners (human resources, infrastructures, financial input)	a.) Lack of proper management skills of partners/ too authoritative style of leadership b.) partners in the micro-format are too big to consider the Forum as significant enough c.) the overall participation is not compulsory in legal terms/ In case of efficiency partners may opt out
o Partners show leadership	Balanced/democratic deliberative leadership	ongoing partnership without conflicts upon the issue of domination	Some smaller partners consider bigger ones may dominate leadership
o Basis of partnership can be reviewed (changing to suit needs and challenges as they arise)	The capacity of renewal and adaptation to new claims/challenges	Ongoing consideration of revision initiatives/ proposals for flexible paths of actions.	a.) low flexibility b.) no recognition of the benefits of change
o Partners are kept motivated – ensuring network agenda matches partner expectations – is value-added (but not cherry-picking); 'what's in it for us?'	Ownership / securing mutual gain Common ratio of benefits/responsibilities	Satisfaction surveys/feedbacks informal interviews	a.) egoistic attitudes arising b.) undervalued personal commitment/ contribution
o Consistency – language, concepts clearly understood to facilitate partnership (common sense)	open forms/spaces for dialogue Trying to understand/listen different logics and reasoning (ethical principal!)	Satisfaction surveys/feedbacks informal interviews	a.) clashes of different realms (political, human, financial, etc.)

o Coverage: all necessary partners are involved to address needs	not that relevant	-	-
o Partners clear of their own role (responsibilities) and the connections they need to make	Systematic information given to all participants, in advance, related to the activities, outcomes and impact foreseen Formal participation agreements mutually developed and assumed	Monitoring the degree of involvement (generating initiatives and implementation of agreed projects) Regular checks of products quality and contributors division of tasks	a.) low level of commitment b.) low level of co-operative behaviour
o Flexibility: partnership arrangements are not too rigid as to impede responsiveness	*See above at Renewal of partnerships!*	-	-
o Trust and openness amongst partners exist (even within competitive conditions)	Transparent decision-making process All decisions are discussed among partners Approving rules upon the use and channelling of confidential information	Lack of complaints/conflicts formalised rules	High number of partners, diverse type of organisations, insufficient time for interactions peer to peer
o There is Ownership: autonomy as well as sense of responsibility	Autonomy within the partnership is to allow initiatives under shared principles Individual, specific roles are assigned to each member of the network	Monitoring the non-active partners/Interviewing them upon the reason. Number of initiatives	a.) free-ride behaviour b.) misunderstanding of autonomy and responsibility c.) dominance-patterns

Participation:	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:
o Involving the wider public or community	Reaching out and involvement of different target groups	website/database open to the public – interactive usage Frequency of visits to website/database Growth of number of learners and contributions Raising attention: campaigns, media-appearance	a.) lack of resources b.) lack of practical ideas
o Network is known and understood by general public	public visibility – creating different publics and spaces/initiatives	information surveys/ image-surveys upon learning city-region partnership and project-outcomes/innovations	a.) non-attentive media b.) lack of real achievements
o Clear measures to involve those most distant from learning opportunities	not relevant right now!	-	-
o People have a chance to express their needs	open dialogue	collecting/performing various needs analyses for further report website open for public discourse/chatboard Analysis of the diagnosis-part of development strategies/plans of partners Future-scenario forecasting and plannig	a.) lack of resources
o People are involved in decision-making (governance)	not relevant right now!	-	-
o People are involved in review	not relevant right now!	-	-
o People are actively supported (and	creating and fitting open spaces/dialogue	number of opportunities	a.) lack of interest b.) not appropriate

opportunities created) to express needs, be involved in decision-making and review			cultural context/ lack of democratic actions
o Language, materials, resources, published materials are clearly understood in everyday life: not just at overall network level, but also in constituent activities and programmes	not using alienating codes/commonly understood language – user-friendly environment	events website public campaigns publications/newsletter	lack of translation-capacity and will
o Understanding of learning needs to be universally relevant and meaningful to all life-styles	not relevant right now!	-	-

Progress and Renewal	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:
o The capacity to continuously understand results, reasons; and the capacity to use this understanding to influence ongoing planning	Creating ongoing reflection	Regular monitoring and assessment of network results (ex-ante, ad-hoc, interim and ex-post) Impact assessment and feasibility studies	a.) resistance to reflection and change
o Partners 'internalise' evaluation and review (identifying benefits and not just an imposition)	promotion/triggering self-evaluation	self-evaluation, questionnaire	a.) Lack of motivation
o Evaluation and review (quality) are prioritised – seen as a core activity and not just an add-on	Not on the agenda	-	-
o Resources are allocated (not just finance but human responsibility)	Securing adequate human and financial resources	Resource analysis versus planned goals Resources offered in kind Percentage of budget allocated for the	Difficulty of getting funds Limited possibilities to apply for funding Lack of resources for

		collaborative partnership from the budget of the partner	a management group
o Methods and mechanisms should not be cumbersome or divert from the main purpose of the network.	Purposeful, sound methods and operational mechanisms	length of the formal agreement disturbances in the oily functioning	exaggerated paperwork, demanding "proofs" and records of managerial activities, over-bureaucratization
o Means of measuring must be appropriate in context of learning region (not just quantitative; and also longer-term)	Creating the experience of good and efficient practice and contribution to public good. Designing soft indicators	Asking feedback the feeling-good factor and perceived transformations	The culture excessive quantitative data
o Results and findings must be able to be widely understood	Designing presentations in different frames/ and ways of thought targeting different publics	Analysis of the style of publications, different modes of communication targeted to the main user groups	Dominance of the political "speak" Lack of sensitiveness to class-specific or life-style based cultures
o Must be macro as well as micro picture (product as well as process)	achievements in the product /process/professional practice-field/ policy level	Analysis of achieved recognition/status Evaluative surveys of citizens, user groups Peer reviews on collective competences Document analysis of media coverage Number of new services/products/policies contributed to Feelings of pride	Lack of identifying the real key players affecting the domains the partnership works
o Flexibility of partners to share information (not defensive)	Trustful relations, seeing the value-addedness of sharing insights and giving information	contributions to online databases smaller networks created within the hub	Ego-centered strategies Fear of exploitation

	Structures to support learning from others Create learning teams/ learning cultures		
o Flexibility and openness of partners to accept results (failures as well as successes) and act on results – open to change	Thinking in developmental way Developing a change culture	Emergence of Change agents, shakers and shapers	Opting out having experienced failures
o Benefits identified are broad-based (not just education-linked)	Identification of positive benefits in different contexts	Meet the researcher / Meet the specialist/ Meet the learners etc.- type of events giving evidence	Narrow-mindedness, sectorial interests only
o Benefits are demonstrated and communicated	Identifying benefits of co-creation and collaborative learning	transdisciplinary research : research papers professional literature using old and new media to disseminate to the wider public	
o Results and learning is used to influence policy (not just practice)	Creating channels of influencing policy levels (at different levels) Collective efficiency creating a Voice	Involvement in public debates Consultative process with policy actors : - invitations as experts by policy makers - recommendation offered -invitation of policy-makers	Limited level of deliberative and rational decision-making in the political sphere; slim chance for structural dialogues with the political leadership
o Unintended as well as planned outcomes are documented and shared	setting up a website/database Publicity policy Openness for research and peer review	Professional framework	

APPLYING QUALITY ASSURANCE CRITERIA: GUIDE TO CONSULTATION WITH NETWORKS (MICRO LEVEL)			
Partnership:	**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:
o Common vision, mission, aims and objectives identified and understood o Targets specified	Mapping expectations, visions and strategic development plans of the partners Informal joint agreements on shared agendas and goals Agreement to be elaborated into concrete projects	A series of discussions/workshops of group members /stakeholders/ partners	c.) face to face meetings are needed for exploration: leisure time - travel location-problems may arise
o Principles and protocols to govern ongoing collaboration developed and understood	Partnership agreements elaborated and signed by all members of the partnership Clear-cut organisational duties and responsibilities: in loosely structured role-set Win-win principle Equity in partnership Level of trust/honesty/credibility /personal committedness	Climate of open dialogues and reflections at meetings Balanced speaking rights at meetings Participative management technigues observation	a., personal conmmitment deformed by institutional position/power Political polarization/camps in the present social context b. dominant personality characters
o Partnership is 'deep' (not just one person if representative) o BUT also 'deep' if personal – bring all experience, not just some	Personal involvement-based collaborative learning Respect for the assets the partners have, valueing differences	collaborative skills demonstrated in round-table discussions not blaming others	- free rider mentality, seeking for individual ends

	Inclusionary culture		
o Individual partner can communicate back to their partnership organisation (non-conflictual)	not relevant	-not relevant	-not relevant
o Partnership is proactive (participative not representative)	Generating common project ideas, initiatives Collaborative planning The level/intensity of participation Team building Possessing the right of inviting new partners Identifying learning needs embedded in the shared activity	Project generation workshops Number of bottom-up initiatives from partners Forms and frequency of spreading relevant information to partners suggesting themes for project meetings Asking help from partners/ forms of mutual activities uploading relevant materials to website	c.) lack of trust d.) fears of politically-driven interest and abuse of power
o Engagement is voluntary, not enforced	initial engagement has to be constantly reinforced and not lost	appearance level particip. level level of generating projects time and skills input altruistic deeds showing engagement level	c.) distrust in partners' hidden motives d.) lots of other engagements and workloads
o Partnership is valued (time is paid for)	Private resources allocated to the partnership (human, physical, financial, time etc.)	Scrutiny of contributions of partners (human resources, infrastructures, financial input)	d.) Lack of proper management skills of partners
o Partners show leadership	Balanced/democratic deliberative leadership longterm goals/ constant improvement	ongoing partnership without conflicts upon the issue of domination	Some partners consider others may dominate partnership or may exploit if for their sake
o Basis of partnership can be reviewed	The capacity of renewal and adaptation to new	Ongoing consideration of revision initiatives/	c.) low flexibility d.) no recognition of

(changing to suit needs and challenges as they arise)	claims/challenges	proposals for flexible paths of actions.	the benefits of change
o Partners are kept motivated – ensuring network agenda matches partner expectations – is value-added (but not cherry-picking); 'what's in it for us?'	Ownership / securing mutual gains Common ratio of benefits/responsibilities Building confidence	Satisfaction surveys/feedbacks informal interviews	c.) egoistic attitudes arising d.) undervalued personal commitment/ contribution
o Consistency – language, concepts clearly understood to facilitate partnership (common sense)	open forms/spaces for dialogue Trying to understand/listen to different logics and reasoning (ethical principle!)	Satisfaction surveys/feedbacks informal interviews shared vocabulary and interpretative frameworks	b.) clashes of different realms (political, human, financial, etc.)
o Coverage: all necessary partners are involved to address needs	see above: Equity principle	Peer exchanges	Rigidity, lack of anticipation of new directions
o Partners clear of their own role (responsibilities) and the connections they need to make	Systematic information given to all participants, in advance, related to the activities, outcomes and impact foreseen	Monitoring the degree of involvement (generating initiatives and implementation of agreed projects) Regular checks of products quality and contributors division of tasks	c.) low level of commitment d.) low level of co-operative behaviour e.) negligence
o Flexibility: partnership arrangements are not too rigid as to impede responsiveness	*See above at Renewal of partnerships!*	-	-
o Trust and openness amongst partners exist (even within competitive conditions)	Transparent decision-making process All decisions are discussed among partners Approving rules upon the use and channelling of confidential information	Lack of complaints/conflicts formalised or unwritten but habitualised rules	diverse settings and passions/ desires insufficient time /energy/ knowledge, skills/ will for interactions peer to peer

o There is Ownership: autonomy as well as sense of responsibility	Autonomy within the partnership is to allow initiatives under shared principles Individual, specific roles are assigned to each member of the network based on proactivity	Monitoring the non-active partners/Interviewing them upon the reason. Number of initiatives	d.) free-ride behaviour e.) misunderstanding of autonomy and responsibility f.) dominance-patterns

Participation:	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:
o Involving the wider public or community	Reaching out and involvement of different target groups (new partners, volunteers, visitors)	website/database open to the public to explore and learn Frequency of visits to website/database Growth of number of visitors and contributions Generating profits and benefits /recognition Raising attention: campaigns, media-appearance	c.) lack of resources d.) lack of practical ideas
o Network is known and understood by general public	public visibility – creating different publics and spaces/initiatives	information surveys/ image-surveys upon partnership and project-outcomes/innovations reaching the right scale to arouse attention	c.) non-attentive media d.) lack of real achievements
o Clear measures to involve those most distant from learning opportunities	not relevant	-	-
o People have a chance to express their needs	open dialogue with potential user groups	collecting/performing various need- analyses for further improvement website open for public discourse/chatboard/ comments/blogs Analysis of the diagnosis-part of development strategies/plans of institutions and authorities at the domain. Future-scenario forecasting and comm	b.) lack of resources to create interest

		planning	
o People are involved in decision-making (governance)	Not relevant	-	-
o People are involved in review	not relevant right now!	-	-
o People are actively supported (and opportunities created) to express needs, be involved in decision-making and review	creating and fitting open spaces/dialogue/public debates / contexts where partners and people are feeling more and more empowered	number of opportunities created and offered by the partnership	c.) lack of interest d.) not appropriate cultural context/ lack of democratic actions and debates e.) c, fear of empowerment of people
o Language, materials, resources, published materials are clearly understood in everyday life: not just at overall network level, but also in constituent activities and programmes	not using alienating codes/commonly understood language – user-friendly environment	events website public campaigns publications/newsletter forms for increasing public access	lack of translation-capacity and will
o Understanding of learning needs to be universally relevant and meaningful to all life-styles	not relevant right now!	-	-

Progress and Renewal	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:
o The capacity to continuously understand results, reasons; and the capacity to use this understanding to influence ongoing planning	Creating ongoing reflection, stimulating questioning and new insights	Regular monitoring and assessment of network results (ex-ante, ad-hoc, interim and ex-post) Impact assessment and feasibility	b.) resistance to reflection and change c.) self-assuredness

		studies	
o Partners 'internalise' evaluation and review (identifying benefits and not just an imposition)	promotion/triggering self-evaluation	self-evaluation, questionnaire, guide Lessons learned-sessions	b.) Lack of motivation
o Evaluation and review (quality) are prioritised – seen as a core activity and not just an add-on	Not on the agenda	-	-
o Resources are allocated (not just finance but human responsibility)	Securing adequate human and financial resources	Resource analysis versus planned goals Resources offered in kind Financial resources	Difficulty of getting funding Limited possibilities to apply for funding Lack of resources for a stable (full-time or part-time)management group
o Methods and mechanisms should not be cumbersome or divert from the main purpose of the network.	Purposeful, sound methods and operational mechanisms	number and types of disturbances in the oily functioning dropped outs	exaggerated paperwork, demanding "proofs" and records of managerial activities, over-bureaucratization
o Means of measuring must be appropriate in context of learning region (not just quantitative; and also longer-term)	Creating the experience of good and efficient practice and contribution to public good. Designing soft indicators	Asking feedback the feeling-good factor and perceived transformations	The culture excessive quantitative data
o Results and findings must be able to be widely understood	Designing presentations in different frames/ and ways of thought targeting different publics	Analysis of the style of publications, different modes of communication targeted to the main user groups	Dominance of the political "speak" Lack of sensitiveness to class-specific or life-style based cultures
o Must be macro as well as micro picture (product as well as process)	achievements in the product /process/professional practice-field/ policy level	Analysis of achieved recognition/status Evaluative surveys of citizens, user groups	Lack of identifying the real key players affecting the domains the partnership works

		Peer reviews on collective competences Document analysis of mediacoverage Number of new services/products/polici es contributed to Feelings of pride	
o Flexibility of partners to share information (not defensive)	Trustful relations, seeing the value-addedness of sharing insights and giving information Structures to support learning from others Create learning teams/ learning cultures	contributions to online databases smaller networks created within the hub	Ego-centered strategies Fear of exploitation
o Flexibility and openness of partners to accept results (failures as well as successes) and act on results – open to change	Thinking in developmental way Developing a change culture	Emergence of Change agents, shakers and shapers	Opting out having experienced failures
o Benefits identified are broad-based (not just education-linked)	Identification of positive benefits in different contexts	Meet the researcher / Meet the specialist/ Meet the learners etc.- type of events giving evidence	Narrow-mindedness, sectorial interests only
o Benefits are demonstrated and communicated	Identifying benefits of co-creation and collaborative learning	transdisciplinary research : research papers professional literature using old and new media to disseminate to the wider public	
o Results and learning is used to influence policy (not just practice)	Creating channels of influencing policy levels (at different levels)	Involvement in public debates	Limited level of deliberative and rational decision-making in the

	Collective efficiency creating a Voice	Consultative process with policy actors : - invitations as experts by policy makers - recommendation offered -invitation of policy-makers	political sphere; slim chance for structural dialogues with the political leadership at different level
o Unintended as well as planned outcomes are documented and shared	setting up a website/database /records Publicity policy, dissemination policy Openness for research and peer review	Analysis of documentation, research results attendance at civic workshops/ conferences	Without stable management roles, documentation can be not systematic.