

STAFF TRAINING WEEK: DOCUMENTATION

DAY 1

Mapping expectations of participants May 9th

- Networking
- New ideas
- Vienna
- Translating theory into practice
- Exchange of good practices
- Discovering projects which are working → impact
- Comparing universities' practice
- Career counselling
- Framework of USR
- Financial issues and USR

Mapping expectations of participants May 9th

- What are your expectations for this week?
 - Share knowledge
 - Brainstorming about USR
 - New ideas for applications
 - Practical ideas of implementing USR
- What do you expect to learn?
 - To hear as much as possible about USR
 - To upgrade my knowledge
 - How USR is understood in different universities
- Which expectations do you have towards networking with others?
 - Opportunities for new partnerships
 - Intercultural experiences
- If you were able to take one thing home on Friday, what would that be? (idea, souvenir, contact, topic, paper...)
 - Ideas
 - Contacts
 - USR strategy and policy
 - How to develop USR policies for my university
 - Feedback on UNIBIBILITY products so far produced
 - How to overcome challenges in implementation

DAY 2

Official Welcome and Presentations May 10th



Overview of presentation material:

- Presentation by National Agency for Erasmus+
- Presentation of the UNIBILITY Project
- Presentation of the EU-USR Project
- Presentation of the Rationale for USR
- Presentation of USR-Practices

Parallel Workshops and country-specific exchange

Workshop results were not documented, but were meant for individual exchange only.



DAY 3

Key Note “Indicators to measure social responsibility” May 11th See separate presentation of Attila Pausits

Discussion points Key Note Attila Pausits May 11th

- Competition within universities → cross-cutting issues and links
- Third mission → should it not strengthen diversity?
- Are young universities more open to third mission? (labelling/positioning)
- “third mission” sector – how beneficial is this name? It will always be the “third” one...
- Rankings and indicators – usefulness?
- Why “recovery” of the social contract? → this might lead to proactive behavior of rectors; changing role of universities in society; positioning universities and universities of applied sciences; management of waiting might be broken;
- Voice of the EU towards USR? → we react to national realities
- Which incentives are there for USR for the rectorate?
 - we have to say: voluntariness of USR for the rector
 - structure versus people
 - contributing to the profile of the university
 - contraindicating the lambing effect
 - “Braveheart”

Talking Practice Session May 11th

- Solidarity Foundation
- DCU in the Community
- Psychological Counselling
- Mentoring Programme
- Community Garden
- President’s Award
- UANEEN Project
- Polifest



Action Planning Parallel Workshops 1-6

Workshop results were presented on Day 4 of the training.

DAY 4

Key Note “How to report and document social responsibility in universities” May 12th

See separate presentation of Jordi Miret

Discussion points Key Note Jordi Miret May 12th

- How many universities use GRI?
- US Standard: Carnegie Foundation for Community Engagement, for more information, see:
http://nerche.org/images/stories/projects/Carnegie/2015/2015_first-time_framework.pdf
- Adaptation of indicators for higher education
- How do you report on negative issues?
- Is there annual reporting in Spain?
- Understanding of indicators
- GRI was designed for the private sector
- Why GRI?
 - Widely used in Spain due to comparability issues
 - AA 1000
 - High acceptance

Parallel Workshop Results May 12th

Workshop 1 Vision/Mission for USR (Maria)

- The workshop started with what USR is not (Museums, Apple Days)
- Key benefit of USR is to make visible many (valuable) activities
- However, there is also danger and concern of bureaucracy, administration and higher effort in accounting in quantitative terms
- Importance of communication
 - Internal: important signal sent out by the website
 - External
- Motivation to engage with USR
 - Status (recognition)
 - Promotion
 - Profile (i.e. DCU President’s Award)
- Process: building on strengths, making visible existing work
- Issues
 - Danger of current “fad”
 - Resources and revenue streams (no extras for USR)



- Research
- Teaching
- USR
- Competing pressures
 - Individual staff
 - Middle management (deans etc.)

Workshop 2 Involving Stakeholders in USR (Steve, Dario)

- Different universities have different structures and different stakeholders and needs (different level of engagement in USR) as well as different institutional frameworks
- Also, stakeholders can be differentiated along departments, faculties, projects or the whole university.
- Categorizing stakeholders:

boards
 administration
 researchers
 NGOs industry
 media
 faculties
 students
 municipality
 society
 teachers
 businesses

Categories	Detailed Stakeholder Analysis
Power (level of impact)	
Orientation (internal/external)	
Formalization (formal/informal)	
Collaboration (connectivity)	
Needs and expectations	

Workshop 3 Barriers to USR (Fernanda)

- Barriers
 - Financial barriers
 - Lack of knowledge about the subject
 - Prejudice
 - USR is not a priority because they are mainly interested in research and technological performance
 - Lack of trust between universities and companies
- Solutions
 - To convince universities to be pioneers in this field
 - Include USR as a priority in the university’s budget (projects or own funds)
 - Overcoming prejudice by information and dissemination
 - Bring together CSR and USR / university staff
 - Create technological events including the concept of USR
 - Involve students
 - Promote dialogue

- Change agents
 - Rectorate
 - Researchers and teaches
 - Students
 - Politicians and decision makers
 - NGOs, national and international
 - Trade unions



Workshop 4 Implementing USR (Petja)

The objective of the workshop was to collect driving forces for USR and to discuss the USR criteria we used in UNIBILITY but also which are available outside the project.

- **How far is your home university with implementing USR? (between 1 and 10)?**
 - Slovenia: in the beginning. Staff was unaware about all the activities we are already doing in USR. We evaluated our knowledge about USR on level 4.
 - Level 4 – not on the strategy or framework level yet, but have been identifying good practice examples and we found quite some of them in our own university. So, we have the plan to expand our vision and add the manifesto of USR to our strategy and implementation.
 - Romania: in the beginning, do not have a USR framework yet. They are facilitating students to the labour market. They had a discussion to promote the idea of creating the USR framework. It is the rector's decision - USR related activities are identified within the faculty, and this could be a good start.
 - Level 4 – without a strategy, but are doing steps towards it. They are identifying already existing practices and make them visual.
 - Spain: already on the level of reporting on social responsibility. Jordi has been preparing these reports for 6 years now, but the USR strategy exists even longer. However, USR is a process, you have to go overcome barriers, to rearrange the strategies if something is not working properly. Reporting makes you capable of changing the strategies and reconsidering the vision on USR.
 - Level 9 – already doing the annual reports, have implemented strategies but are open to improvements.
 - Each country should take a look at their own strong points and grow from there. Universities are diverse, and to overcome the diversity we should adapt local community needs first and follow for development of common USR criteria.
- **When you think of USR, what is the most important thing when it comes to a successful implementation? Name one.**
 - **NEEDS:** You have to identify the needs of the local environment and communities, so you can take steps in the implementation process.
 - **UNIVERSITY PRIORITIES:** Every university has their own visions and therefore implementation success is based on the rector. The motivation for change is a huge factor – if there is no willingness from high-level personnel, then we will face only barriers.
 - **OPEN-MINDED HIGH LEVELS PERSONNEL:** Open-mindedness and the will to give something back to the community of high-level staff – if you have the

- support from the rector, then you have a strong hope for success. However, in our opinion it is still a process from bottom to the top, and we should make steps towards changing this.
- It should be a win-win situation.
 - We have to make university staff understand that USR is not an activity that brings nothing to the university.
 - The university should be open towards the local community, especially since we are providing the future brains of the country and the community.
 - One of the answers would be to be brave and to speak out about our project and our findings and make some suggestions and recommendation to come up with a common vision towards USR, even on descriptive level if not on indicative level.
 - It is a process and it should be dispersed amongst all staff members. There should be different people and different departments involved into discussions in the field of USR. There should be some continuation in the process – if we change visions every 4 years, then it is difficult to implement something on the longer run.
- **In terms of importance for implementation, which of these factors would you rate as important for successful USR implementation?**
 - Personal factors of the people involved: knowledge, beliefs, skills, education and training, experience, cultural norms and practices, social status, cognitive or physical abilities, gender, age ...
 - Environmental factors at the university: social support, available resources and services, barriers (including financial, physical, and communication), social approval, policies, environmental hazards, living conditions, poverty ...

Personal factors of involved people	Environmental factors at the university
Beliefs	Available resources and services
Leadership – leaders have visions and could gather people and it is easier to convince others.	Collective mentality of people – people are self-oriented, and it is important to make steps towards open-minded society.
Values – if you are humane and socially aware and oriented towards others, then you will act the same at your workplace.	Social approval – everybody agrees on importance of the USR.
Tolerance – it is hard to accept differences and changes.	Social support as linked with social approval.
Knowledge and skills	Policies – government policies, municipal policies, university policies.

Not to be ignorant towards society

The more barriers there are, the harder it is to implement changes.

Workshop 5 Arguing for USR → Workshop did not take place

Workshop 6 Reporting on USR (Jordi)

WS6 USR-Reporting

- Responsible Management Reporting - DCU
 - example according to Gaspar
- Global Compact
- PRIME Network - - - - - → 1. Purpose, 2. Values, 3. Method
- Global Reporting Initiative (58 indicators) → 4. Research, 5. Partnership, 6. Dialogue
- Applying Reporting Standards across Catalan universities → comparison
- Standards for companies, public admin., HE ⇒ needs adaptation
 - ↳ make no sense "i.e. human rights in Europe", "supply chain"
 - ↳ product = knowledge
- Accreditation systems for universities
- General reporting: no. of students, publications...
 - ↳ does not always show social impact
- Process of data collection ← faculty database
 - * tables from faculty data
 - * university registration system
 - * statistics office
 - * contact app. 30 units
 - * send indicators ⇒ faculties report back
 - * identify people/units for each indicator:
 - "bothering people"...
 - different degree of detail...
 - keeping deadlines...
- static indicators
 - no changes from one year to the other
- reporting about previous activities and not future
 - data-driven format
 - narrative format

WS6

- 3 languages
- summary
- UB Report - app. 100 pages +
 - ↳ index of indicators
- Economy of the Common Good - Reporting
 - ↳ indicators + points ⇒ situation analysis
- Effect of the report:
 - confidential or public? → transparency
 - email + upload
 - announce the report
 - no approval/signature by dean/rector
 - approval by Committee (of different stakeholders)
 - presentation of the report → minor adaptations
 - dissemination via website (more marketing is necessary!)
 - reporting units as islands
- PRIME network reports in EN + native language
- hardest parts: staying polite, motivating people, slow processes
- One year process:
 - 01 ask for info
 - 02 1st round
 - 03 2nd round
 - 04 call people
 - 05 write report
 - 06 ask again
 - 07 translation of report
 - 08 approval
 - 09 presentation of report
 - 10 publish
 - 11
 - 12
- recommendations:
 - ↳ organise a strict schedule for collecting data with tables and details
 - ↳ set it up as a project
 - ↳ set up a communication process internally
 - ↳ schedule meetings with higher management/senior staff in time
 - ↳ secure relevance of the report ⇒ attitudes

Field Trips May 12th

Field Trip 1 uniclub plus

Feedback from participants of this field trip:

- Meeting the coordinator and manager of the refugee project
- 2 days for refugees, workshops, learning German, app. 40 refugees there
- Introduction of all participants
- Small groups of 4, asking questions
- Different stakeholders, also the rector and Center for Teaching and Learning, get didactic experience for future teachers
- Win-win situation: intercultural knowledge, credits
- Place: 2 floor apartment in a normal house
- Relationship to Romania existed; knowledge in Syrian refugees
- Freedom of expression and feelings
- Expectation: unaccompanied teenager refugees, importance of getting in contact with other teenagers, objective: youth center, bringing teenagers together who are here only with their family and don't know any other teenagers
- Financing of the project by city funds and EU funds
- Logo of the university has a detrimental impact for external funding



Field Trip 2 uniMind workshop

Feedback from participants of this field trip:

- Connecting health issues to business issues
- Introduction of all participants
- Presentation of health competence models
- Interactive workshop setting was helpful for discussions

DAY 5

Final Plenary Session – Conclusions May 13th

- RO: very useful training week for the concept of USR, we did not know that we were doing USR
- IE: connections were made, reporting was very useful, Jordi will be bothered ☺
- Material: Presentations, references to further material, flipcharts of the workshops, pictures
- Attila's Keynote: continuing education, social dimension, technology transfer (3 criteria) – UNIBILITY (5 criteria) → matrix of criteria
- Continue to communicate via facebook (Petja)
- Organised well – great field trips

Evaluation Session May 13th

- **What did I learn?**
 - all expectations were fulfilled or succeeded
 - good for a framework for USR
 - thinking about the own university structure
 - good interactive approach, workshops, small groups
 - on personal level: intercultural communication, different countries
 - various knowledgeable people here; relaxed way; exchange of information, talking about practices from others, new ideas for a project
 - learn from each other
 - more aware of barriers and challenges and counter-strategies, nice overview of presentations and data, new body of knowledge
 - community involvement is not just nice to do; embedded into a strategy; interested in the reporting process
 - good presentation from Attila, most useful was Jordi's presentation, toolkit most useful document to bring back
 - most useful were the practical aspects of the programme
- **How has my scale changed? (knowledge of USR) 1-10**
 - 3→4, 4→5, 3→6, 2→6, 5→6, 2→5
 - Reassessment of own knowledge
- **Recommendations for future events**
 - name badges would have been good !!
 - more practical examples would have been good;
 - distribute a copy of the toolkit
 - Preparation with Reader and Toolkit before the training would have been nice („blind“)
 - Get a participant list and a description of each person
 - Presentation of each institution would have been useful

Preview to UNIBILITY Summer School in Barcelona

- Accreditation from UB, incentive for people to participate
- Budget constraints: 275 € per flight + 55 € per day
- Who makes the reservations for hotel/hostel? (project partner or students themselves), app. 35 € per night = cheapest option
- 7-8 students per country
- Book as soon as possible! Keep all receipts!
- Which students are you choosing? List of participants (June 6)
- Minimum of 6 hours a day – programme
- MAX: 48 students; a staff member accompanying the students
- Status:
 - RO: selection process
 - SI: 4-5 students chosen, active
 - IE: students work during summer, 3 paths of finding students, ie. Social entrepreneurship, intergenerational learning
 - AT: 4-5 students in community project
 - ES: rector of studies will decide
- Emphasis on service learning
- 1 service learning project until December 2016 (IO 5)
- Documentation required (i.e. light portfolio)
- Peers until December = project partner
- Selection of 2-3 students
- Template: description of the project, 4-5 questions, pictures, leave space for creativity!! ... → Fernanda
- No evening programme – freedom for students !!
- Hoping for dissemination among students, instructions E+ and participation, clean students ☺