



**caENTI**  
Coordination action of the  
European Network of Territorial Intelligence

[www.territorial-intelligence.eu/caenti/](http://www.territorial-intelligence.eu/caenti/)

**Report on evaluation of the Quality Letter  
UNISA team conclusions**

**Deliverable N° 46**

Natale AMMATURO and UNISA team  
University of Salerno

**December 2007**

## ***Summary***

### ***1 – DESCRIPTION OF THE VALIDATION PROCESS AND DESCRIPTION OF THE PARTICIPANTS***

*1.1 Determine the most suitable (for this discussion) territorial actors from those that in general collaborate and work with the University of Salerno group (the reasons behind the choices are explained below).*

*1.2 Distributing copies of the quality letter and jointly establishing the most suitable manner in which to begin the discussion:*

*1.3 Determining results and conclusions*

### ***2 – DELIBERATIONS RESULTS***

### ***3 – APPLICABILITY OF THE QUALITY LETTER TO THE EXPERIENCES WHICH ARE DESCRIBED BY UNISA IN HER ACTION-RESEARCH EXPERIENCES CATALOGUE***

## ***1 - DESCRIPTION OF THE VALIDATION PROCESS AND DESCRIPTION OF THE PARTICIPANTS***

The adopted methodology to start up the validation process of the quality letter consisted of various phases, as listed below in chronological order:

### ***1.1 Determine the most suitable (for this discussion) territorial actors from those that in general collaborate and work with the University of Salerno group (the reasons behind the choices are explained below).***

There were 2 territorial actors involved in the process of discussion surrounding the quality letter:

- the Piano di Zona S1
- the town of Laviano

The Piano di Zona is the most significant element of innovation from social politics within the last ten years in Italy, introduced by the act of 328/2000. This act aspires for change, for the construction of future settings based on a three-way integration affective between various local communities, socialsanitary and an integration between institutional and social activities that represent the community. In our case, the Piano di Zona is that of the S1 area of the province of Salerno, called the Agro Nocerino-Sarnese (Piano di Zona S1). This territorial area has undergone a very different development to that of all other areas in the Campania region, and Italy as a whole, becoming, as such, an example to be followed.

Since 1996, with the founding of the Territorial Pact, this area became part of the European Union's pilot project intended for some Italian and European territories falling under Objective 1 areas. But what makes this event extraordinary and altogether innovative is that, following a proposal put forward by the Caritas Diocesana, a "social protocol" was linked to this event, giving a fundamental role to recognizing and emphasizing the value of human and social capital in the promoting strategies of local development, from the bottom up. The main aim in the signing of this agreement was to see to it that all institutions and social parties of the territory traced out a course of action and governance of the territory with a broad vision, that went beyond the administrative limits of individual towns, and thereby uniting solidarity and development with a mindset to overcoming the state centralism and attributing new forms of power to local governments. More specifically, this process of innovation was the result of the collaboration and collective work of administrators, social and medical workers, and the third sector, in the combined effort of identifying the collective needs, determining the priorities and the relative action of intervention.

The Piano di Zona S1, as a whole, has long been considered an Italian best practice in the field of applying a planned course of action within the social politics sector and in local development (this being the main reason it was chosen for the discussion of the quality letter), succeeding in convincing the administrators of the need to secure a governance and an integrated management of the territory without damaging the autonomy of individual towns, but rather underlining their specific value.

The town of Laviano is a small town within the province of Salerno, wedged in between the territories of Basilicata and Irpinia. Today the town holds a population of 1528 people (744 males and 784 females) distributed between 578 family units, in an area equal to 56,56 km<sup>2</sup>. The 1950s saw the first migrant influxes. The catastrophic earthquake of 23 November 1980 that completely destroyed the area and took an enormous number of human life, a fifth of the entire population, added to an already difficult situation. The earthquake not only destroyed houses and human lives, but also contributed to the destruction of the community's identity, which had already been greatly threatened by the wave of emigration. Over twenty years on from the earthquake, this 'loss' still seems to permeate the lives of the people; a 'fracture' was created that still today has not healed. Despite this, the community has not given up and is trying to re-establish a new identity, putting main emphasis on the large number of young born and raised after the earthquake: in fact the years between 1981 and 1983 have the highest number of registered births for the whole of the twenty years of 1971-1990. However, we cannot overlook crucial elements of the attempt to revive the community: firstly, the continued emigration that brings a loss of population, and secondly, the decreasing number of births.

The decision to involve the town of Laviano in the discussion of the quality letter is mostly down to the fact that this territory is trying to promote actions of territorial development, and whose course of action closely follows that which is outlined in all CAENTI documents: the development, in fact, of a territorial system manifests itself in various forms, as there are diverse ways of production and a variety of inter-relations between businesses. The subjective tendencies of the local actors, the social and economical environment and every territorial sphere is characterized by an internal working plan that is based on history, social and cultural phenomenon, and the geomorphologic plan of the territory.

### ***1.2 Distributing copies of the quality letter and jointly establishing the most suitable manner in which to begin the discussion***

Together with the 2 established groups, the form of the discussion deemed most suitable is decided, in particular, it is decided the meeting should follow a seminar style in order to outline, in general terms, the philosophy of CAENTI and that of the letter. Some time is then left to enable the territorial actors to interact with the each other, with those closest to them, for general interests or for work purposes.

### ***1.3 The discussion begins, determining results and conclusions***

Four discussion groups were created on the most important points of the quality letter outlined by the elected people.

## **2. Deliberations Results**

### *2.1 The roles of the territory: some critical aspects*

Emerging strongly from the discussion was that the roles of the territory had not been clearly defined, above all in relation to the rights/duties of citizens, in the relationship between the centre and the suburbs and other social aspects.

These ambiguities are above all down to the lack of clarity in the Italian language between government activities and governance, as is seen in Great Britain. Nevertheless, all participants agree that the term *governance* effectively indicates the passage from a form of planning based largely on hierarchical type models and a direction of *policy making*, to an alternative form of planning based on the principles of subsidy and the cooperation between public and private.

The first summing up of the debate defined *governance* as the sum of many ways in which individuals and public and private institutions deal with their common problems; the actors described it as a continuous process, through which differing or conflicting interests can be resolved through cooperative action.

A second summary presented *governance* as a form of *partnership* between the public administration and social subjects who have the right to demand greater fairness in social conditions, as well as the right to be listened to.

A substantial amount of time was given to this part of the discussion, but in the end an agreement was reached, taken from the letter itself, that «territorial governance presents the challenge of seeing that “territorial engineering” (coordination of plans, programs and projects in the territory) takes advantage of and effectively stimulates the “organizational capacity of the whole of the social organization” in order to manage to provide appropriate answers to the democratically expressed needs of the citizens».

### *2.2 The pillars: some observations on deontology*

With regards to the four established pillars, the objectives and mean, no specific observations were brought up, apart from point 3.b “Deontology and autonomy of participants”. The idea of compiling a document containing the principles of *deontology* that would be accepted by all participants raised some uncertainty, considering that all researchers and social actors themselves already worked following the general principles of deontology and with respect to the rights of others.

In conclusion, the discussion raises the need for further reflection regarding an ethical protocol, that should not appear as a collection of preset rules but, and this being in line with the perspectives of WP5, rather as a set of guidelines and general orientation, that considers the evident multidisciplinary characteristics of the actors involved.

### *2.3 The grill: the expressed proposals*

With regard to the proposals of the ‘grill’, few observations emerged; the compilation carried out by the group of work presents itself as rather exhaustive with respect to the underlined sections, nonetheless the expressed proposals that could be taken into consideration are outlined below (they are indicated by the number of the objective):

1.b.1) the makeup of the final action-research group must descend from an open climate and mutual trust between the various actors involved;

1.b.2) topics addressed must take into account the responsibility of each participating actor and the responsibility of the interests they represent;

2.a.1) participants and actors have analyzed and agree on the synthesis of the document;

2.a.2) the final action-research group is made up of actors and participants from different sectors and disciplines;

2.b.3) to build a system of communication capable of representing to all involved actors, in a complete and coherent manner, both the philosophy of the process of development and the active contents;

4.a) the groups must write out *reports* to be used as instruments in implementing the consensus of the social actors, through a process of negotiation, that outlines the goal and provides a transparent account of advantages and disadvantages.

For the points already mentioned, none have been eliminated, in fact for some points, a full level of agreement cannot be reached.

#### *2.4 The state of correspondence between the letter and the various realities: the discussion*

In the end, both groups were asked if the quality letter as a whole could be considered a valid tool to use as a guide for all action-research processes. The aim of the discussion was to study the state of correspondence between the letter and the various realities where action-research is applied as a tool able to influence the social structure of a territory and the actions carried out on it.

Within the discussion groups they searched to compare the pillar, objectives and mean already incorporated in the letter, with the realities that relate to the participants of the groups; in other words, they attempted to re-read the indicated items together with the actors of the territories, on the basis of a possible positive or negative agreement, reiterating that the actors (researchers and social parties) are not only the tools through which this 'integrated system of action' can be realized, but they are above all the main protagonists of the planning and realization of the action itself, and in more general terms, the promoters and upholders of the general change in culture of the territory.

#### *2.5 The validation*

Both the participants of the Piano di Zona S1 and the town of Laviano, have validated the quality letter, supporting what it represents; a suitable instrument that is to become a 'guide' in action-research processes, in so far as emphasizing the crucial points within the process (from start to finish), and implicitly proposing possible solutions to problems that arise during the various phases of the process.

## 2.6 *Some Italian skepticisms*

There is some skepticism that the letter will remain a tool for exclusive use by members of CAENTI, and that in the future, such a tool will not become shared knowledge among the various territories (national and international), however this reaction is primarily the result of a deep-rooted Italian culture.

## **3. *Applicability of the quality letter to the experiences which are described by UNISA in her action-research experiences***

**Actors' anonymity, transparency** of research goals, and **autonomy of actors** are addressed to people, trying to avoid the political system influence, also if it is considered possible the political use of the results, but not a political control on methodology, path and results.

In general, the team has an ethical action at least in an implicit way, which affects all research elements; in particular methodology and employed results **transfer and diffusion systems**.

In all the experiences described, the issue of the possible political exploitation of this research project is present since the beginning of the experience.

The researches-action developed are focuses on

- taking into account the changes in the social, economic and cultural scenarios,
- adopting a different planning idea, because of they are developed in european regions considered non-favourite.

Developped researches exepriences intend to draw up and propose an operational model based on the logic of integration and sustainable measures following an approach that is consistent with new methodologies for integrated action plans. It can be said that practically all our research projects are carried out with this approach, although not always with the sought results and with the required participation level. As regards the elements that give quality to a research-action, we keep on following an analytical list.

*Transformation*: it is a principle in all the represented experiences, because their aim consists of fostering the transformer role that research can performed on social reality.

*Multidimensionality*: our experiences focussing research object using a multidimensional and multisectorial approach.

*Partnership*: also it is very difficult, the attempt of the three projects is to foster and involve territorial partnerships in the research-action processes. We are looking to realize this aspect also through assuring that territorial actors' participation (those who are directly confronted with territorial problems) is carried out in an effective way. In particular the researches "Young people and cultural consumption goods" and "Bring up, teach, integrate and promote".

All the projects are aimed to obtain a more evolutionary knowledge in order to generate sustainable territorial development dynamics. In particular the research "Territorial intelligence and sustainable development: analysis of a territory, the opportunities and the constraints".

As regards *transparency* our researches have some difficulties for that concerning politics one and facilitating and democratizing the processes of decisions making, otherwise transparency and spreading up of knowledge is warranted, on the one hand by academic system and on the other side by involved actors.

These researches are formed in the institutional area, so they require a hard research work of *co-responsibility* aimed to give equally responsibility for the process evolution both the component “action” and the component “research”.

For the reasons before, only the research “Intelligence, territoriality and sustainable development: analysis of a territory, the opportunities and the constraints” improving the capacity of the territorial system to look for solutions to the future problems keeping in mind their past experience.