



# Observatory PASCAL

*Place Management, Social Capital and Learning Regions*

---

## **PASCAL UNIVERSITIES REGIONAL ENGAGEMENT PROJECT (PURE)**

### **PURE Briefing Paper No. 8A**

***This Briefing Paper updates and takes the place of BP8 issued in early January.  
There is now no further need to read BP8.***

### **Visits of Consultative Development Groups (CDGs): March - May 2009**

#### **Notes of guidance for Coordinating Lead Reviewers (CLRs) and Regional Steering Group Link Partners**

This briefing note guides the hosts and the visiting teams in preparing and carrying out review visits in March-May 2009 for a synthesis report to the PURE Workshop in Vancouver on Thursday 21 May. Relevant key points from earlier (BPs) are brought forward as an Annex.

**RSG and CDG members should read though the earlier BPs in full.**

#### **1. Terms and Abbreviations**

Some of the terms used as PURE developed have altered. We will now use the following terms, and where appropriate abbreviations, for clarity and to be consistent.

**Briefing Paper - (BP)**  
**Regional Coordinating Group - (RCG)**  
**Link Partner - (LP)**  
**Consultative Development Group - (CDG)**  
**Coordinating Lead Reviewer - (CLR)**  
**Regional Profile - (RP)**  
**Regional Briefing Paper - (RBP)**  
**First Regional Visit Report - (RVR1)**

#### **2. Preparing for the Visit**

- The **Regional Coordinating Group (RCG)** should be in place from January 2009 and convene to plan and review the region's participation and its intended gains.
- The **Link Partner (LP)** should lead and guide the work of the RCG.
- The **Regional Profile (RP)** should be prepared and mounted on the Pascal PURE Website by mid-January.
- A **short Regional Briefing Paper (RBP)** should be prepared in two parts by the LP, working with the RCG and referring to the earlier RP. The RBP should be sent to the Glasgow Office, to Chris Duke ([PUREadmin@educ.gla.ac.uk](mailto:PUREadmin@educ.gla.ac.uk)), and to all members of the CDG, **at least two weeks before** the visit is due (earlier would be better to help the CDG's preparation). **The template for the RBP is available below as the final part of this document.** No other template documentation will be required.
- A **schedule of visit meetings** giving participants, times and places should be agreed and available at least two weeks before the visit begins (see below for further advice on planning the schedule).

- The LP is responsible for making all **local arrangements**, including local hotel bookings, and transport within the region. CDG members will pay their own hotel and other personal expenses, which will be refunded by the PURE office.

## 3. Planning and Managing the CDG Visit

### 3.1 Overall Planning

- It is the responsibility of the **Link Partner (LP)** to propose a programme of meetings and visits. These will set out who the CDG will meet, when and where. Link Partners should liaise with the RSG in the region, and with the Glasgow PURE office and the CLR in together preparing for the visit. A schedule of meetings should be agreed that will allow CDG and region to engage in well-informed, open and constructive discussions about higher education and the development aspirations of the region.
- **An agreed final schedule must be available at least two weeks prior to the start of the visit.**
- In arranging meetings the LP should keep in focus what the region considers to be its central aspirations, issues and concerns. **Focus and quality of meetings will be more important than sheer volume of coverage.**
- Despite tight scheduling it is important to allow enough time to explore issues in depth. A little time should be allowed between successive meetings, to avoid overrunning, and forcing those arriving for the next meeting to wait.
- Planning the meetings schedule should have in mind what the CDG can do after the visit:
  - (a) To report back and share this work with the full PURE meeting in May 2009.
  - (b) To help the region take forward its self-study in order to get practical improvements as well as better understanding.

### 3.2 Other key points for the LP in preparing the CDG schedule

- It is important to **involve as wide a range of stakeholders in the region as possible in the meetings**. Consideration of overall purposes and the 'big picture' of global and local changes affecting regional development should precede discussion of more detailed matters.
- The visit should start with an initial welcome and briefing for the CDG by the LP.
- **A joint meeting involving all HEIs, regional authorities and other stakeholders in the region should be arranged** as an opening formal session.
- This meeting should serve as a reciprocal briefing and review session. It should be introduced by the local host (LP) and then chaired by the CLR. **This pattern should where practicable be adopted as the norm for all meetings.**
- The initial meeting will include a brief sketch of the PURE project and the place of the review visit in this, leading to the May PURE meeting in Vancouver, and including an introduction to the benchmarking tools. It will be followed by an open question and answer discussion period. The relevance of the current global financial and economic crisis may be considered.
- Those meeting the CDG at each meeting will normally be expected to make a brief presentation about their engagement work, especially their **main relevant purposes and priorities, obstacles they encounter and how they hope to overcome them, and hopes from PURE involvement**. This will provide a basis for questions and interactive discussion for the remainder of each session.

- Given the limited time, the LP must decide where to hold meetings. **Local travel should be restricted to important on-site visits** thought necessary to gain a good understanding of the region, institutions or issues. When the CDG goes out to such meetings they should normally include a range of people for whom participation is relevant and convenient. A 'home base' with a working office will help the CDG. Regional partners should where possible come to this venue to meet the CDG.
- Ideally the LP (or an alternate) will accompany the CDG for all meetings and make introductions. It is often helpful for meetings with one stakeholder to be open to participants from other stakeholder interests, helping mutual understanding and partnership within the region. Ideally the whole review visit will provide a kind of rolling dialogue between the CDG and different regional groups and interests.
- It might be thought necessary to split the CDG into two pairs to fit in essential visits. In general however **it is much better for the full CDG team to share all visits, meetings and experiences**. This enables them to debrief and share impressions as they go along. It generally proves more efficient than holding separate meetings.
- The CDG needs some free, unscheduled time alone during the visit (in practice probably in the evening) to reflect and share impressions as it goes along.
- The final period of the visit should begin with a private meeting of the CDG on its own, followed by a 'debriefing and wash-up' session with the RCG.

### 3.3 Logistics and Administration

- All administrative and logistical matters will be handled or in liaison with the Glasgow PURE regional office. The Glasgow office will liaise with each region and each CDG on matters of travel, accommodation etc.
- Travel to the region will be arranged by the Glasgow office direct with CDG members.
- Local travel within the region is the responsibility of the LP consulting within the RCG.
- The LP is asked to arrange convenient and inexpensive accommodation, and generally act as host and guide to the RCG so that it can concentrate on the review visit.
- CDG members will pay their own expenses for meals and accommodation as they go along and be recompensed by the PURE office.

### 3.4 Consultative Development Group Preparation

- The CLRs leading the CDGs should contact other team members and the region's link person (LP) after reading this BP8A and consult about the review visit.
- In particular they should be consulted by the LP and the PURE office about a suitable schedule of meetings for the visit.
- CDG members are asked to look at PURE Briefing Papers 1-7, seeking clarification if needed from Mike Osborne or Chris Duke. They may wish to consult earlier reports, available electronically from the Pascal offices, of OECD regional self-reviews and reviews (2004-07) especially if the region was directly involved (those long reports differ very much from the brief PURE reports arising from the CDG visits).
- Liaising through CLRs, CDGs should study: the initial **Regional Profile (RP)**; the **Regional Briefing Paper (RBP)**; the **draft benchmarking tools**; and any other materials made available about the region.

- The CDG may identify further information needs. They can ask for this, either before or during the visit. The CDG needs to be able to enter into well-informed and relevant questioning and discussion with the Regional Steering Group and with different partners and interests in the region.
- Practical preparations for CDG members will be arranged by the Glasgow Pascal PURE office, including travel to and from the region, accommodation, and remuneration of expenses (see 3.3).

## 3.5 Benchmarking tools

- PURE HQ has undertaken to provide, by the time of the CDG review visits, **two draft benchmarking tools** for discussion and for progressive use and possible revision throughout the project.
- The draft HEI benchmarking tool is being sent out together with this BP8A in early February. The draft Regions benchmarking tool will follow with the review schedule ten days before the visit itself.
- The LP is responsible for distributing the HEI benchmarking tool to all relevant institutions. (In the case of regions with many 'colleges' such as TAFE community and FE colleges, the region may by agreement ask a small sample of these to undertake the benchmarking work in an HE-focused way.
- It is expected that the benchmarking tools will feature in the review visit discussions, helping the review visits and especially the regions to work out what is needed and facilitate the setting of priorities. This will assist regions in forming interest clusters according to their priority needs.
- The ongoing use of the tools can serve to measure and monitor progress in support of action. They may become a lasting benefit for assisting regions and HEIs in making progress on a shared development agenda.
- The project may make clearer what kinds of quantitative measures are useful, and other ways in which progress and benefit can be monitored and reported.
- Many CDGs will include a member from another PURE region. These in particular may look for points of common interest that could assist benchmark planning, as well as sub-group clustering.

## 3.6 After the Visit - RVR1 and region work plan

### 3.6.1 The Regional Visit Report (RVR1)

- In light of the visit, and by reference to other RVP1s as these appear, the LP and RCG should discuss special interest **partnerships and possible sub-group clusters**, to be formed or confirmed at the Vancouver Workshop.
- RVRs should be **brief and concise**, setting out the region's circumstances, needs and priorities, and its ambitions for engagement and regional development.
- RVRs should include the main **challenges and barriers** identified during the CDG visit.
- RVRs should explain so far as possible the region's chosen **work programme** within PURE. They may foreshadow Action Plans to be developed later in the project.
- Examples of good practice identified within the region should be listed here. They may be written up for a PURE Good Practice Manual later (see 1.6 of RVP).
- Regions and their needs are diverse. Therefore no template is offered for the RVR1s, but is expected that they will **reflect the points set out in Part 2 of the RBP**. Further guidance may be provided later, in light of the first RVR1s to be prepared.



# Observatory PASCAL

*Place Management, Social Capital and Learning Regions*

---

- This will enable the project-wide PURE review meeting in Vancouver on May 21 2009 to share and focus all PURE project work, identifying prominent shared areas for special attention and cluster activity, over the next twelve months. Several sub-groups **or special interest clusters**, to be facilitated and coordinated by John Tibbitt, will be created within PURE as a result.
- It is the **responsibility of the CLR** to see that RVR1 is provided to the Glasgow office and the project Director in good time. Its production is the shared responsibility of the full CDG. The CDG should agree at the end of the CDG visit who drafts which sections.
- Brief RVRs should be **sent by the CLR within two weeks of completion of the CDG visit** to the Glasgow office (and to Chris Duke). A copy will then be sent to the LC, inviting correction of any factual error, and any other comment felt to be appropriate.

## 3.6.2 Region Work Plan for mid '08 – mid'09

**After the visit of the CDG** the region should review its purposes in relation to taking part in PURE. It should prepare a note about a **project Work Plan** for the 12 months following the Vancouver Conference, if possible to be sent to the Glasgow office for pre-circulation before the Vancouver meeting, or at least to be available in Vancouver.

**Note: Regional Advisory Network (RAN).**

**All LPs and CLRs are automatically members of the PURE Regional Advisory Network (RAN), and are invited to comment on any aspect of the work of PURE, either to the Glasgow Office and to Chris Duke as the Academic Coordinator, and / or to the full RAN.**

## 4. Annex: aide-memoire Extracts from earlier Briefing Papers

Brought together to remind you of PURE's rationale and approach

### 4.1 From BP1

The core questions to be addressed are essentially policy driven. They are:

- Within universities, how is the 'third mission' (i.e. engagements with community and society beyond teaching and research) being developed and implemented?
- In what ways is the globalisation of the economy changing regional economic, social, environmental and cultural policies? What are the implications for university regional engagement activities?
- What role is national and regional policy on the third mission of universities playing in overcoming barriers to university regional engagement activities?
- To what extent and in what ways are national and regional policies on sustainable development, the implementation of lifelong learning, and on innovation and research policy having an impact on university regional engagement activities?
- To what extent and in what ways is regional (and national) governance and administrative behaviour having an impact on university regional engagement activities?

These questions will be addressed in such a way as to allow both regions and universities to:

- work in clusters with other regions which have similar circumstances and share similar specific interests;

# Observatory PASCAL

*Place Management, Social Capital and Learning Regions*

---

- identify barriers to successful partnership and the best means to overcome them;
- benchmark their activities and performance with other regions;
- provide tested metrics and templates for impact evaluation, including the 'softer' social, cultural and sustainability dimensions of engagement.

## Expectations and Obligations of participating regions

In contracting to participate in PURE, each participating region will be expected to: nominate a regional organiser and project contact point(s):

- develop local arrangements for liaison between participating HEIs and regional authorities;
- participate in agreed arrangements for baseline data analysis using the agreed PURE template;
- identify topics of particular priority interest for study in the region;
- participate in, and provide data for, PURE project workshops to address the core elements of PURE;
- participate in 'cluster' workshops to share knowledge and experience with other regions with similar topic interests;
- Provide feedback to the PURE team from draft interim and final reports to the region and the overall synthesis report.

## 4.2 From BP2

### Lessons from OECD 14-regions project for PURE?

- The identification and involvement of an appropriate regional entity with commitment to offset a too HE-centred and driven approach.
- Great flexibility and eclecticism in defining criteria for participation and in responding to diversity of situations in agreeing on partner participation.
- Encourage local dialogue and cost-sharing as part of the process of developing local engagement as well as to make the cost manageable for smaller and poorer regions .
- Encourage the recognition and active contribution of in-region expertise eg. in regional studies, especially within any HEI involved in the project.

## 4.3 From BP6

### The central purpose of PURE

is to improve what happens in the region, and to work for the continuation and sustainability of good practices. **It is action-oriented.** At the same time, it is essential to know the situation, and to be able to use existing and new data effectively to inform good practice.

Regions therefore need to assemble what is already known, and to have a basis for monitoring changes, and evaluating what works. The PURE project requires regions first to prepare snapshot profiles to inform other regions, and then to identify and make available statistical and qualitative data relevant to regional development, and the work and management of HE institutions.

It is essential to be able to learn from past and present experience, and to be able to make best use of data available from all sources to inform regional governance and the management of productive partnership.

It is also important to be able to assess progress, and to continue to learn and improve from understanding what is working and what is not. We also need to be able to account for the effort and resources used when higher education institutions engage with the development of their regions.



# Observatory PASCAL

*Place Management, Social Capital and Learning Regions*

---

## 4.4 From BP7

The intention of the CDG review visits conducted during this period is to inform the CDG, and to enable better understanding all round, so that participation in PURE can be of the greatest possible benefit to the region. The idea is not to impress, but to explain, analyse and problematise. The more open and non-defensive the meetings, the more valuable the visit and its aftermath will be.

Much may be learned within the region in the process of preparing for the visit, defining problems and sharing understanding about ambitions and difficulties. So far as possible the visit should be planned so as to allow the region to identify what it is going to do subsequently, in order to make progress in problem-solving and improved productive partnership.

The meeting and visits during this first CDG review visit should cover the central purposes of the region's PURE involvement, and what it hopes to achieve from its participation in PURE. Overall the visit should identify the main obstacles and barriers to be overcome, and the strategy for tackling these through development and partnership work over the coming months.

No standard template is required for the review visits beyond the Regional Briefing Paper. The idea is to allow each region to focus on its priority needs, according to its unique circumstances. The visit may however lead to some redefinition, or extended definition, of these needs.

## 5. Regional Briefing Paper (RBP)

**Note or bullet form documentation will be more useful than extensive description. In preparing the RBP do not duplicate what is in the RP. Simply add material and further analysis that will help the RSG and the CDG to share a well informed agenda. The CDG will have the RP and use the two documents together.**

### 5.1 Part 1

- a) Clarify what is meant by **the region** in this project e.g. historical and cultural, long-term administrative and legal, or specially created for a particular development purpose. Comment on the advantages and difficulties of the nature and understanding of the region involved. [One general benefit from the PURE project should be to gain a better understanding of what kind of region is effective for what purposes.]
- b) Set out briefly the **key characteristics** of the region in terms of geography, economy, demography, social structure, trends and changes, as these affect PURE and the development agenda.
- c) Identify and draw together a reference list of the main **data sources** available on the socio-economic, environmental, etc. condition of the region, and recent trends.
- d) Summarise any existing efforts to **monitor and benchmark** progress against purposes and targets.
- e) Please comment on any interest in and pressure for the **measurement of quality and outcomes**, including value for money auditing, that you are aware of in the region.
- f) [It is hoped that the project will assist an understanding of what kinds of indicators and quantitative measures of regional development and the contribution of HEIs to this work and are useful.]
- g) List the **main existing forms of collaboration** between **HEIs and the region**. You may need to consider the region as a single administrative entity, but also note and include more localized and specialized significant HEI partnerships with other stakeholders - public, private, and NGO or third sector.



# Observatory PASCAL

*Place Management, Social Capital and Learning Regions*

---

- h) If there are any examples of **good practice** in HEI-regional engagement that you think of special interest, perhaps for inclusion later in a PURE Good Practice Manual, please make a note of them to call to the attention of the CDG.

## 5.2 Part 2

### 5.2.1 What are:

- a) the main **problems and challenges**
- b) the main **development aspirations**

that are shared by stakeholders in the region?

Please consider the **full spectrum of civil, economic, social, cultural, and environmental factors, including issues of sustainability**, where these apply.

In particular, **what impact is the current global financial and economic crisis – and the global environmental crisis (global warming etc) - having on your thinking and long-term planning as a region and different stakeholders?** What has really altered (or is changing) in your policy planning since one year ago?

### 5.2.2 What are the **main changes that are looked for** in taking part in PURE?

- a) For the **region as a whole**, and for particular communities and interests within it?
- b) Within and on the part of **higher education institutions** i.e. sought by the HEIs themselves, and looked for by other stakeholders from HEIs?
- c) In terms of how **regional and local government** are managed?
- d) In terms of the role and policies of **central government**?

### 5.2.3 What **key issues do you wish to discuss** with the CDG when it visits your region?

*Chris Duke 4 2 09*