

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

## **Romania**

ODIP

Dr. Magda Balica, Dr. Ciprian Fartusnic, Dr. Mihaela Jigau, Dr. Irina Horga

*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

<b>Partnership:</b>	<b>Quality Indicators:</b> What you might look for to establish this is being done effectively and appropriately?	<b>Methods and Approaches to Measuring Quality:</b> How you might go about getting information or feedback on these issues:	<b>Constraints:</b> What difficulties you foresee in collecting this information/feedback:
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Common vision, mission, aims and objectives identified and understood</li> <li>○ Targets specified</li> </ul>	<p>Common strategic documents discussed and elaborated</p> <p>All stakeholders involved in the regular meetings agreed within the network</p> <p>Incentives for coordination promoted</p>	<p>Feed-back face to face (i.e. semi-structured interviews)</p> <p>On-line consultation</p> <p>Ad-hoc discussions</p>	<p>High turnover in participation, lack of appropriate representation, high diversity of organisations included in the partnership</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Principles and protocols to govern ongoing collaboration developed and understood</li> </ul>	<p>Partnership agreements elaborated and signed by all members of the partnership</p>	<p>Analysis of partnership agreement content</p> <p>Interviews with partners representatives</p>	<p>The informal agreement not captured by the official document of partnership</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Partnership is ‘deep’ (not just one person if representative)</li> <li>○ BUT also ‘deep’ if personal – bring all experience, not just some</li> </ul>	<p>Topic not included in the quality agenda</p>	<p>-</p>	<p>-</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Individual partner can communicate back to their partnership organisation (non-conflictual)</li> </ul>	<p>Communication channels, in place protocols and monitoring activities initiated</p> <p>Specific roles assigned to partners</p> <p>External monitoring/audit initiatives</p>	<p>Regular meetings (including online) offering space for feedback on communication</p> <p>Surveys investigating cases of communication failures</p> <p>Persons assigned with this role reporting on this issue</p>	<p>Hierarchical structure of the partnership</p> <p>Time constraints</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Partnership is proactive (participative not representative)</li> </ul>	<p>Systematic information given to all participants, in advance, related to the activities, outcomes and impact foreseen</p>	<p>Monitoring the degree of involvement in the process</p> <p>Assigning facilitator roles</p>	<p>It is a reality, as one of the highest challenge of the partnership: ALWAYS are organisations only represented.</p>

	Regular checks of products quality and contributors division of tasks	Developing specific incentives (i.e. management and administration responsibilities rotated)	Lack of appropriate representation, high diversity of organisations included in the partnership
○ Engagement is voluntary, not enforced	<i>See point above</i>	-	-
○ Partnership is valued (time is paid for)	Formal commitment made through agreements of collaboration  Resources allocated to the partnership (human, physical, financial, time etc.)	Monitoring the degree of agreements signed  Monitoring the resources allocated to the partnership  Analysis of free riding behaviours and investigating reasons	Lack of proper understanding of overall objectives of the partnership  Lack of appropriate skills in the area of the partnership in the case of some representatives  Lack of appropriate managerial initiatives and a too authoritative style of leadership
○ Partners show leadership	Not included in the quality agenda	-	-
○ Basis of partnership can be reviewed (changing to suit needs and challenges as they arise)	A specific procedure for revision of partnership (to be clarified WHAT: type of organisations, objectives, strategies etc.)	Analysis of number of revision initiatives in a given period of time  Investigation of specific complains	Opposition to change, lack of understanding the benefits or the risk of status quo
○ Partners are kept motivated – ensuring network agenda matches partner expectations – is value-added (but not cherry-picking); ‘what’s in it for us?’	Regular discussion on the short-term and long-term objectives  Discussion of interim evaluation results and fine-tuning intervention needs	Motivation surveys regularly applied  Investigation of specific complains	Win-win situations not formulated from the perspective of each network member  Lack of flexibility in discussing the network agenda
○ Consistency – language, concepts clearly understood to facilitate partnership (common sense)	Open space for debate  Learning opportunities created for all network members	Regular surveys including topics related to consistency  Case analysis  Specific training	Lack of feed-back from organisations facing difficulties in understanding the language/concepts used by the network (various reasons)

		programs	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Coverage: all necessary partners are involved to address needs</li> </ul>	<p>Objectives of the network are properly defined, concrete results are expected and organisational roles are identified</p>	<p>All partners are consulted regarding the need of additional partners</p> <p>Cases in which specific roles are failing to be reached are investigated</p>	<p>Some objectives and organisational roles are poorly defined</p> <p>Lack of incentives for participation in the network</p> <p>Lack of appropriate resources</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Partners clear of their own role (responsibilities) and the connections they need to make</li> </ul>	<p>Systematic information given to all participants, in advance, related to the activities, outcomes and impact foreseen</p> <p>Formal participation agreements mutually developed and assumed</p> <p>Regular checks of products quality and contributors division of tasks</p>	<p>Monitoring the degree of involvement in the process</p> <p>Assigning facilitator roles</p>	<p>Low degree of commitment.</p> <p>Lack of appropriate representation, high diversity of organisations included in the partnership</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Flexibility: partnership arrangements are not too rigid as to impede responsiveness</li> </ul>	<p><i>See basis of partnership can be reviewed</i></p>	-	-
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Trust and openness amongst partners exist (even within competitive conditions)</li> </ul>	<p>Open space for debate/arguing is created</p> <p>Transparent decision-making process</p> <p>All decisions are discussed among partners</p>	<p>Individual feedback/justification is asked to partners in the decision-making process</p>	<p>Management of the network is avoiding any constructive debate/criticism</p> <p>Double standards policies are adopted</p> <p>High number of partners, diverse type of organisations, insufficient time for interactions peer to peer</p>

<p>○ There is Ownership: autonomy as well as sense of responsibility</p>	<p>Rotating management and administrative roles among partners</p> <p>Procedures to allow specific initiatives/innovations to be shared with the other members of the network</p> <p>Individual, specific roles are assigned to each member of the network</p>	<p>Questionnaires for assessment of cases of complaints</p> <p>Surveys among network partners (satisfaction surveys)</p> <p>Interviews with representatives of organisations that were not active in a specific period of time</p>	<p>Management of the network is not participative</p> <p>Some organisations are stealing the network agenda</p> <p>Free ride behaviour of some network organisations, taking the benefits but not assuming costs/responsibility</p>
--	--	--	---

<b>Participation:</b>	<b>Quality Indicators:</b> What you might look for to establish this is being done effectively and appropriately?	<b>Methods and Approaches to Measuring Quality:</b> How you might go about getting information or feedback on these issues:	<b>Constraints:</b> What difficulties you foresee in collecting this information/feedback :
○ Involving the wider public or community	<i>See point below</i>	-	-
○ Network is known and understood by general public	Formal commitment made through agreements of collaboration is promoted within the community  Resources allocated to the partnership (human, physical, financial, time etc.) are presented to the general public	Monitoring the degree of knowledge of the agreements  Monitoring the degree of knowledge on the amount and type of resources allocated to the partnership	Lack of proper understanding of overall objectives of the partnership  Lack of appropriate skills in the area of the partnership in the case of some representatives  Lack of appropriate managerial initiatives and a too authoritative style of leadership
○ Clear measures to involve those most distant from learning opportunities	Not included in the quality agenda	-	-
○ People have a chance to express their needs	Defining in detail communication channels, protocols and monitoring activities	Regular meetings (including online) offering space for feedback on communication  Surveys investigating cases of communication failures  Persons assigned with this role reporting on this issue	Hierarchical structure of the partnership  Time constraints
○ People are involved in decision-making (governance)	Not included in the quality agenda	-	-
○ People are involved in review	Not included in the quality agenda	-	-
○ People are actively supported (and opportunities created) to express needs, be	Open space for debate  Learning	Regular surveys including topics related to consistency	Lack of feed-back from organisations facing difficulties in understanding the

involved in decision-making and review	opportunities created for all network members	Case analysis	language/concepts used by the network
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Language, materials, resources, published materials are clearly understood in everyday life: not just at overall network level, but also in constituent activities and programmes</li> </ul>	<p>Objectives of the network are properly defined, concrete results are expected and organisational roles are identified</p> <p>Specific strategic documents are “translated” into general public information campaigns language</p>	<p>All partners are consulted regarding the need of additional partners</p> <p>Cases in which specific roles are failing to be reached are investigated</p>	<p>Some objectives and organisational roles are poorly defined</p> <p>Lack of incentives for participation in the network</p> <p>Lack of appropriate resources</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Understanding of learning needs to be universally relevant and meaningful to all lifestyles</li> </ul>	Not included in the quality agenda	-	-

<b>Progress and Renewal</b>	<b>Quality Indicators:</b> What you might look for to establish this is being done effectively and appropriately?	<b>Methods and Approaches to Measuring Quality:</b> How you might go about getting information or feedback on these issues:	<b>Constraints:</b> What difficulties you foresee in collecting this information/feedback:
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The capacity to continuously understand results, reasons; and the capacity to use this understanding to influence ongoing planning</li> </ul>	<p>Regular monitoring and assessment of network results (ex-ante, ad-hoc, interim and ex-post)</p> <p>Impact assessment and feasibility studies</p>	...	Lack of appropriate competences and resources
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Partners ‘internalise’ evaluation and review (identifying benefits and not just an imposition)</li> </ul>	Not included in the quality agenda	-	-
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evaluation and review (quality) are prioritised – seen as a core activity and not just an add-on</li> </ul>	...	...	...
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Resources are allocated</li> </ul>	...	...	...

(not just finance but human responsibility)			
○ Methods and mechanisms should not be cumbersome or divert from the main purpose of the network.	Not included in the quality agenda	-	-
○ Means of measuring must be appropriate in context of learning region (not just quantitative; and also longer-term)	...	...	...
○ Results and findings must be able to be widely understood	Not included in the quality agenda	-	-
○ Must be macro as well as micro picture (product as well as process)	Not included in the quality agenda	-	-
○ 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)	Not included in the quality agenda	-	-
○ Benefits are demonstrated and communicated	Organisation of seminars and other information events	...	...
○ Results and learning is used to influence policy (not just practice)	Not included in the quality agenda	-	-
○ Unintended as well as planned outcomes are documented and shared	Information kits sent prior to each meeting (including online meetings)  Newsletters open to contributors from all the partnership organisations  Ad-hoc dissemination activities based on	Regular reports produced by a knowledge management expert  Analysis of complaints from partners	Lack of resources  Use of documentation channels that are not appropriate/sufficiently used by some of the partners  Lack of initiatives at management level for creating incentives in the case



	specific information needs		of unintended outcomes
--	-------------------------------	--	---------------------------