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Overview

1. The State of Victoria started negotiations with the OECD at the end of 2008. Victoria joined the second round of the OECD Reviews officially in March 2009, and commenced active participation in June 2009, with the aim of receiving a report from the OECD evaluators in December 2009. It is acknowledged that the Review process in Victoria will be fast paced but it is considered that the timing will best complement a range of policy considerations underway by government at this time.

2. Victoria has three strong policy interests which support this review. Firstly, it is committed to supporting initiatives that encourage innovation as a tool for economic development, in particular the contribution of research in science and technology. Secondly, it has a strong regional development policy agenda and is currently undertaking a major strategic planning initiative to promote growth and sustainability in provincial communities. Thirdly, the government recently launched a new skills policy initiative and is developing a Tertiary Education Plan or roadmap for the future.

Progress in putting the review machinery in place

3. The Victorian project is governed by a Steering Committee of government officials from the Department of Innovation, Industry and Regional Development, representing Skills Victoria, International, Regional Development and Policy. It is chaired by the head of the Policy Coordination Division (PCD). This group meets approximately monthly, but also provides advice to the Regional Coordinator and Project Team out of session as required.

4. The project team comprises officers from the PCD and officers from other areas as required. The Regional Coordinator was appointed in June, and reports to the Chair of the Steering Committee on a regular basis. A Reference Group has been convened and has met for the first time in August. It comprises representatives from the universities, the Technical and Further Education sector, business associations, the Australian Economic Development Agency and other government agencies.

Progress in drafting the regional self-evaluation report

5. All publicly funded higher education institutions have been invited to participate in the review. The majority has responded favourably, has attended an information session and endeavoured to complete the first draft of the self-evaluation. At this stage there are 18 HEIs in the review representing 75% of the publicly funded HEIs in the State.

Progress in partnership building

6. It is too early to comment on progress in partnership building. HEIs are under considerable pressure to review their policies and practices as a result of major changes proposed by the national government for the university sector as well as changes to the technical and further education sector proposed by the Victoria Government last year. Both governments plan to implement changes in 2010. Engagement activities are regarded as important requirements for better meeting skills needs.

Major achievements and major concerns

7. By September, it is expected that a substantial amount of material will have been collated on the current activities undertaken by the HEIs in Victoria. As well, continuing dialogue will be occurring on the
benefits and issues of community engagement, or third stream activities, and their impact on both economic and social development, and the prosperity of the HEIs themselves.

8. Concerns at this stage relate to how the review can assist in assessing the value of “third stream” activities, particularly where they may be seen to be intangible. For example, institutions participate to varying degrees in community engagement and development. The resourcing of these activities can be problematic as there is no specific funding stream that acknowledges these activities. Institutions develop their own initiatives and occasionally receive specialist grants to this end. If we wish to increase engagement activities in pursuit of economic and social development, we may need to better articulate the return on investment.

9. Another concern relates to the apparent conflict of policy drivers around collaboration and competition, and how individual institutions and government can best respond. In Victoria, there have been recent major reviews of higher education to set directions for the future. It has been suggested that while there are policies to encourage collaboration and partnerships, institutions are increasingly operating in a competitive environment (for students and staff) and this environment may be detrimental to more openness and sharing of market intelligence. These drivers will impact on the way institutions collaborate with stakeholders, particularly within the local region.

10. A further concern relates to different expectations of stakeholders in provincial or isolated locations compared to stakeholders in metropolitan Melbourne. Provincial institutions may tend to be more engaged in non teaching and learning activities than their metropolitan counterparts. This becomes more complex where a Melbourne metropolitan institution has provincial campuses and resources are constrained. What are the appropriate policy and resourcing responses for different locational campuses?

11. Within the teaching and learning environment, there are issues around the changing expectations of the community concerning lifelong learning. This suggests that individuals and employers may seek re-skilling at various periods throughout their lifetime, (which may not relate to a new qualification) yet the there are questions as to the capacity of higher education institutions to respond to these needs, especially where the traditional systems are around the linear model of qualification upgrades.
Progress in putting the review machinery in place
12. The Federal University of Parana opened the negotiations with the OECD on joining the second round of reviews in November 2009. Northern part of Parana had been involved in the first round of reviews in 2005-06. The practical arrangements in the State of Parana started in December 2008. Around March 2009, key partners in the region and regional steering committee (RSC) were identified and the regional co-ordinator and the project team appointed. On 4 April a launch workshop was organised in Curitiba with the active collaboration from the RSC. It has representatives from eight organizations, including two federal universities (UFPR and UTFPR i.e. technical university of Parana); the federal organization for research (CNPq); two business sector organisations (FIEP and SEBRAE-PR); the local government of key city Curitiba (Agencia Curitiba) and the State Government (SETI).

Progress in drafting the regional Self-evaluation report
13. A survey has been sent to the six main universities in the state of Parana. Two of them are federal universities, three belong to the state of Parana (the other two were included in the first regional review) and one is a private university (catholic). The responses from the HEIs were delayed due to vacation period and misunderstandings and it took five months to get the response from them. Currently, a synthesis of the surveys and the first draft of the report are being prepared. The interviews with the main stakeholders have also started.

Progress in partnership building
14. Partnership building is delicate by nature. After the leadership of an organisation has become convinced of the importance of the project, the decision to join the review will follow quickly. However, each organisation has its own procedures which may delay concrete action. This has been case particularly with the private sector organisations.

15. The partnership building takes place at two levels: Firstly, there are efforts to guarantee ownership among the eight organisations of the steering committee. This involves gaining support from the operational level. At the same time, the aim is to engage new stakeholders to support the project. It has been a continuous process which will hopefully gain momentum during the round of interviews.

Major achievements and major concerns
16. The concerns are in general related to some characteristics of Brazilian organisations: inadequate planning, delays and bureaucracy. Another challenge is the fact that apart from economists the OECD is not well known in Brazil among university leaders or high level administrators. A key concern is the lacking evidence base (information and statistics) on HEIs. One major achievements of the project has been to make HEIs aware about the importance of more robust evidence and data.
CHILE, BÍO BÍO REGION

By Martin ZILIC
August 2009

Progress in putting the review machinery in place
17. The negotiations between the OECD and the Bío Bío Region started in May 2008 and the region joined the OECD reviews officially in September 2008. The regional Task Force to carry out the Self-Evaluation process was established in October. A Directive Committee and an Executive Committee were appointed with representatives from major regional stakeholders. The Executive Committee in charge of the daily work related to the review met on a weekly basis. Dr. Martin Zilic was appointed as a Regional Coordinator and he was also the chair of the Regional Steering Committee.

Progress in drafting the regional self-evaluation report
18. The task of drafting of the Self-Evaluation Report was outsourced to a consulting group made up of academic experts from three leading universities in the region in October 2008. Funding for the Self-evaluation phase study was received from two different sources: The Regional Agency for Innovation and Productive Development and the Regional Government. The Self-Evaluation Report was carried out between December 2008 and June 2009.

- January – Initial Facilitated Workshop
- January-May – Data collection: surveys, interviews, communications, secondary sources
- April – Second Facilitator Workshop
- May – Third Facilitator Workshop
- May-July – Drafting of the Self-Evaluation Report
- July – OECD team Pre-visit
- 3 August -- Final SER sent to the OECD
- 15-22 August -- OECD/World Bank review visit

Progress in partnership building
19. The Self-evaluation process has allowed the HEIs to inform stakeholders and make them aware of the obstacles for mobilising HEIs for regional development and about the possible pathways that the region could follow. The review process has brought together a group of stakeholders from different areas who are interested in the review process and the results obtained and could play a key role in future partnership building initiatives. The process has already brought together three universities to collaborate in clinical medicine. This has high potential for positive impact on regional development.

Major achievements and major concerns
20. A key obstacle during the self-evaluation process was the lack of collaborative efforts among HEIs due to the diverse interests of the various HEIs and the fact that they perceive themselves as competitors in many areas. In addition, while the process has improved the relations between most HEIs, the engagement from the private sector remains a challenge.
GERMANY, CITY OF BERLIN
ISRAEL, GALILEE REGION

By John E. GOLUB
August 2009

**Progress in putting the review machinery in place**

21. The Galilee region joined the project officially in May 2007. Setting the review machinery has taken some time. John E. Golub joined as regional co-ordinator in April 2009. In addition, the Council for Higher Education provides clerical support. Also, there are regular meetings with Mr. Steven Stav and Ms. Galit Eizman of the Council.

22. The region has approached a number of potential steering committee members and has recently received confirmation that Mr. Silvan Shalom, Deputy Prime Minister and Minister for Development of the Negev and Galilee, will serve as steering committee chairman. Mr. Shalom is the most senior national stakeholder and his participation is an important accomplishment. The region has also approached a second minister: Prof. Avishai Braverman, Minister for Minority Affairs. Initial indication is that Prof. Braverman will serve on the committee. With these anchor appointments settled, appointment letters to steering committee members will be shortly issued.

**Progress in drafting the regional self-evaluation report**

23. There are 17 HEIs in the project region. The region has received written input in some form from 10 of them. There is a great deal of information related to chapters I and II. There is also information, sometimes anecdotal, regarding chapters III, IV, and V. Chapters VI and VII are in their early phases.

24. The OECD pre-visit has been scheduled for September and the review visit for November 2009.

**Progress in partnership building**

25. The Galilee has begun to build a partnership between the Council of Higher Education, the Galilee Development Authority, and the Ministry for Minority Affairs. This alignment is an important accomplishment since the Authority is tasked with implementation of initiatives bearing on the region while the Council's mission relates to higher education nationally.

26. On 3 September 2009, there was a first meeting at the Director General level including representatives from the Council, the Authority, the Ministry for the Development of Negev/Galilee, and the Ministry for Minority Affairs, i.e., the top national level stakeholders.

**Major achievements and major concerns**

27. Major achievements have been (1) to meet with all HEIs and receive written input from many of them; (2) to identify steering committee members and recruit two anchor members including the chair; (3) to forge a relationship between the Council for Higher Education and the two relevant ministries.

28. Major concerns include the lack of one-on-one conversation with OECD representatives to clarify goals and expected results or to discuss best practices. This may result to a gap in perceptions and expectations. Another concern is the lack of response from certain HEIs. This is a secondary concern since the response received should suffice to characterize the region.
ITALY, REGION OF LOMBARDY

By Paolo TRIVELLATO
September 2009

**Progress in putting the review machinery in place**

29. Negotiations between the region and the OECD started in May 2008. A year later, on May 2009 the Lombardy Regional Council, on behalf of the universities located in the region, agreed to join the second round of the OECD Review and appointed the Lombardy Regional Institute for Research (IReR) to carry on the process, under the directorship of Prof. Alberto Brugnoli. Following a three months period devoted to contacts with Lombardy Higher Education Institutions, all twelve Universities agreed to take part in the Review. On 13 July 2009 the steering committee gathered at IReR headquarters in Milan. In that occasion the president and the vice-president were elected.

**Progress in drafting the regional Self-evaluation report**

30. As to the self evaluation process, the following steps were agreed upon:

- Drawing of a position paper for each chapter of the self evaluation report (July to October 2009)
- Discussion and validation of the position papers within the Steering Committee (October 2009)
- First draft of the self evaluation report (November 2009)
- Validation of the first draft by the steering committee and preliminary conclusions (December 2009)
- Second draft to be submitted to the OECD pre-visit reviewers (January 2010)
- Final self evaluation report (February 2010)

31. The position papers will be written mainly by researchers belonging to IReR under the supervision of the representatives of HEIs; external researchers will be involved according to the suggestions of the members of the steering committee.

**Progress in partnership building**

32. Together with academics, several representatives of post secondary institutions (7), industrial associations (4) and trade unions associations (3) have been invited to join the steering committee. Three heads of department in the economics and education fields of Lombardy Government are full members.

**Major achievements and major concerns**

33. The region is still at the very beginning of the process, but can count as a first achievement the fact that all the HEIs (public and private, large and small) have accepted to join the review process. Considering that the accountability culture and the benchmarking practices are not common in the Italian Higher Education system, this wide participation can be accounted as a promising start. There are no major concerns about the review. One question mark is the extent to which the conclusions and suggestions will affect the policies at the regional level and in individual HEIs. This point seems particularly important, as the performance evaluation criteria have an increasingly strong weight at the national level.
By Morshidi SIRAT  
August 2009

**Progress in putting the review machinery in place**

34. Negotiations between the OECD and the Universiti Sains Malaysia (USM) began in spring 2008. Penang under the leadership of USM joined the reviews officially in May 2009. The Regional Co-ordinator was nominated in February 2009. The region is now in the process of finalising the composition of the Regional Steering Committee. RSC members would like to know the exact times when they need to be available. The Global Higher Education Forum in Malaysia in December 2009 will provide a good time to assemble the RSC members for the pre-visit.

**Progress in drafting the regional self-evaluation report**

35. The draft self-evaluation report is complete and going through a rigorous editing for language.

**Progress in partnership building**

36. Being a member of the Penang Tertiary Education Sub Committee, the Regional Co-ordinator has been able to organise meetings with the Penang private HE providers. Other authors of the SER belong to various organisations in Penang and have been involved in partnership and community engagement projects.

**Major achievements and major concerns**

37. The process has helped to build a comprehensive picture of the role of HEIs in the Penang Region. The role of Universiti Sains Malaysia as the only major HEI in the region has become obvious. With USM as Malaysia's APEX University this role is increasingly dominant at regional, national and international levels. One major concern is the rapid decline of private education in the region and the fact that their role is slowly becoming irrelevant for the social and economic base of the region.

38. One major challenge has been to engage the private sector stakeholders in the review process. In addition, the local government, mainly concerned about political survival, has demonstrated low level of commitment in so far as higher education is concerned. It sees higher education as a federal concern which has little to do with state or local authorities. During the time the SER was prepared, the state was occupied by a land acquisition problem and issues connected with higher education seemed trivial to them. The decline of the private education sector in Penang has a lot to do with the lack of strategic direction and support from the state.

39. One major problem when preparing the self-evaluation report has been the lack of data on some aspects of the Penang region's economy.
MEXICO, STATE OF SONORA

By José Manuel OCHOA
September 2009

Progress in putting the review machinery in place
40. The Sonora’s Institute of Technology (ITSON) expressed interest in the OECD reviews in 2006. In July 2009, the State of Sonora, México, with the leadership of ITSON, took a step forward and initiated the efforts toward a regional review which will lead to develop a stronger connection between HEI’s main activities and the state’s social, economic, environmental and cultural issues. After several meetings held by the State of Sonora’s Commission for Higher Education Planning (COEPES), a Regional Steering Committee was established to reach an adequate representativeness, plurality and achievement of desired goals. This Committee is composed by the presidents of HEIs in the state, the state’s Ministry of Education, Sonora’s Educatice Evaluation Institute, the National Council for Science and Technology, Sonora’s Institute for Culture and representatives from other social and business organizations. Professor José M. Ochoa from ITSON was appointed as regional co-ordinator to coordinate the efforts.

Progress in drafting the regional Self-evaluation report
41. A team composed by 9 academics with different backgrounds and trainings was carefully selected to draft a first version of the self-evaluation report. This team has made considerable efforts in researching, selecting and systematising information and data. After a month of hard work, version 1.1 of the report has been made public. The challenge is now to improve it working with other HEIs and main stakeholders in the State, either by collaborative work, quantitative and qualitative data collection, and highlighting particular views of every sector and region within the state.

Progress in partnership building
Gaining interest and respect from other HEIs is a key challenge. Fortunately, all HEIs have showed strong commitment and collaboration in order to achieve results and mutual benefits.

Major achievements and major concerns
A major achievement has been securing the support from the National Council for Science and Technology, the Ministry of Education, and the Ministry of Economy to develop this project.

42. The mains challenges include:

• developing a strong methodology for the self-evaluation report data collection
• creating a genuine collaborative project with the participation of every sector in the State
• using innovative technologies and techniques to ensure participation from every region and from every stakeholder
• creating a sense of authorship and ownership, and a sense that every sector, region, and key participants’ ideas are included.
MEXICO, STATE OF VERACRUZ

By Ángel Antonio FERNANDEZ
September 2009

Progress in putting the review machinery in place
43. Veracruz joined the reviews officially in July 2008. The co-ordination is under the responsibility of the Veracruz University (UV). The project team is formed by members of the UV, staff from the ministries of Economic Development and Education, representatives from private and public HEIs and a member of the entrepreneurial sector. The Regional Steering Committee has representatives from different departments of the UV (Regional coordinator), the Secretary of Economic and Harbor Development, the State Council of Science and Technology, the Secretary of Education of Veracruz, from the business sector and the social sector. The OECD pre-visit took place in Veracruz late August (23-25 August 2009). Meetings were organised with members from the RSC and the project team to discuss the contributions to the self evaluation report.

Progress in drafting the regional Self-evaluation report
44. The final contributions were received during the pre-visit meeting.

Progress in partnership building
45. During the OECD pre-visit, the opportunity to collaborate between federal technological institutes and the state government was made clear. Meetings were scheduled to discuss an agenda. Within the UV, the pre-visit has also helped different departments to get closer and establish tighter links. Daily urgencies mask the need for longer range agreements and the monitoring and evaluation of institutional policies and work procedures.

Major achievements and major concerns
46. All but one higher education institution, governmental agencies, and private and social sectors have agreed to participate in the project. There has been a special commitment from the Secretary of Education of Veracruz to participate closely with the UV. Seven delegates from Veracruz are attending the Paris roundtable meeting.

47. There is at the moment interest in the issues of the review, but achieving concrete results remains a challenge. Politics at both HEIs and the region have an impact on the process. There has been delay in achieving the responses to the questionnaires as HEIs have limited time and human resources for this type of exercise in addition to their everyday responsibilities. Institutional operational structures are often weak and it has been difficult to identify people to do the actual work. The review has pushed the HEIs to begin an integrated analysis, but there is possibility that this will not lead to further collaboration.
NETHERLANDS, CITY-REGION OF AMSTERDAM
NETHERLANDS, CITY-REGION OF ROTTERDAM

By Monique DE KNEGT
August 2009

Progress in putting the review machinery in place

48. The first contact between Rotterdam and the OECD was made in March 2008. In May the Economic Development Board Rotterdam (EDBR) was invited to lead Rotterdam’s participation in the review. The HEIs - which participate in the EDBR - recognised the Board as the logical platform to conduct the review. Rotterdam joined the review officially in December 2008.

49. In autumn 2008 the EDBR established the Working group – completed with the director Economy of the municipality - as the Regional Steering Committee (RSC). The secretary of the RSC also acts as the Regional Co-ordinator. The make-up of the RSC guarantees the commitment of HEIs and the regional community. The four HEIs and the municipality each took an equal share in financing the review project, which was estimated to be equivalent of two man-years of work.

50. In January 2009 the RSC appointed the review’s project leader and subsequently approved the project plan for the review, which had been drafted by the Regional Co-ordinator and the project leader. In addition, the RSC established a Core Team, which is composed of staff members of the five shareholders. Chair of the Core Team is the Regional Co-ordinator. This Core Team is the link pin between the RSC and the working groups, which will conduct the SWOT analyses for the various chapters of the self evaluation report. Each Core Team member presides over a working group. Each working group has participants from each of the shareholders, completed by stakeholders involved in the issues under review.

Progress in drafting the regional Self-evaluation report

51. The project leader drafted the chapters on the region and the higher education system.

52. The RSC established four working groups, each with their own theme, corresponding with chapters 3-6 of the self-evaluation: Regional innovation, Human capital development, Social impact and sustainability and Regional co-operation.

53. The working groups have been free to choose their method of working, but are accountable for the analysis and the SWOT of their respective theme/chapter. The methods have been selected according to the themes, and may include desk research, interviews, workshops, working visits, benchmarking and group discussions.

54. A kick off meeting took place on March 30. This meeting was attended by the RSC, the Core Team, the four working groups and a number of stakeholders. Main goals were:

- to encourage further team building: experience the process of partnership building by meeting shareholders and stakeholders

---

1 The EDBR is an independent platform formed by over thirty opinion leaders from the business community and the educational, scientific and cultural sectors in Rotterdam. The EDBR advises the Municipal Executive on matters of economic development and policy. It has a Working Group on the relation between higher education and urban economic development.
- to jointly set the agenda for the review’s goals, results and content and ensure performance commitment of all participants
- to give the working groups a set of keynote themes, which are regionally specific for Rotterdam to use as basic principles for the SWOT’s for the review’s issues

55. The Core Team developed the outcomes of the kick off meeting, the regional keynote themes and a SWOT-avant-la-lettre into a framework for the self-evaluation, which addresses the most urgent policy issues of the region.

56. Subsequently the Core Team gave the working groups their ‘homework’. Within the regional framework, the working groups will answer the questions outlined in the OECD Guidelines in a first draft of the chapter they are responsible for. Each chapter concludes with a draft SWOT analysis. The first draft will be approved by the Core Team for editing by the project leader. The RSC will approve the edited draft and the SWOT analyses as the input for a concluding conference. This conference, to which the EDBR, the RSC, the Core Team, the four working groups and the external stakeholders are invited, will take place on 21 September. The proceedings of this conference will be used to draft chapter 7. The OECD pre-visit team is invited to attend (part of) this conference in order to get a feel of the themes, discussions, involvement, strategies and actions.

Progress in partnership building

57. Rotterdam has great potential to develop its knowledge economy with two universities of applied sciences and two strongly complementary, internationally renowned research intensive universities. This potential is not yet fully used for the benefit of the business and public community in the city and region, nor is its economic spin offs focussed on the region. OECD review is helpful as Rotterdam needs to move from fragmented academically oriented analysis, memorandums of understanding, letters of intent and so on, towards a joint strategy followed by concrete and helpful action points.

58. Policy focus should lay on enhancing co-operation, not only between the HEIs and the region, but also between the HEIs themselves. Therefore, first goal of the review process is to determine on which policy themes the HEI’s, government and business community should build their partnerships. Secondly, by jointly exploring the strengths and weaknesses of our present actions regarding those themes, we aim to identify opportunities for co-operation and spin out. And thirdly, we aim to decide for a number of short term actions on the most urgent issues, while at the same time set the conditions for sustainable ‘triple-helix-partnerships’.

59. The RSC decided to use the self-evaluation process to build on mutual understanding and co-operation on issues of regional development, as well as a tool to ensure broad support for its outcomes and actions. Therefore the project plan of the Rotterdam review provides maximum stakeholder involvement by combining the research activities and partnership building in a co-production process.

Major achievements and major concerns

60. The key asset for managing partnership building and stakeholder is time, time, time. It is important to let people take time build mutual understanding and trust. The time which is lost in the beginning, is gained in the next steps because participants have already begun to understand and appreciate each other’s motives and goals. At the start there is limited understanding of the scope of the efforts that the review process will take. The internal workload (even having outsourced the self-evaluation) is usually underestimated. It may be easy to convince the board that (the financial equivalent of) a couple of man-years for the project, but it takes a considerable effort and time to actually free sufficient (and high level) capacity from the participating departments and organisations to build a sustaining co-operation.
SPAIN, AUTONOMOUS REGION OF ANDALUSIA

By Eulalia PETIT DE GABRIEL
August 2009

Progress in putting the review machinery in place
61. First contacts between the region and the OECD were made in June 2008. The fulltime Regional Co-ordinator was appointed mid-February 2009 and is supported by two staff members. Regional Co-ordinator visited all 10 universities in April to meet the University Governing Boards to enhance the transparency and ownership of the review process. The Regional Steering Committee (RSC) has been established with strong representation from the regional government (Ministry of Innovation, Science and Enterprise; Ministry of Education; and Ministry of Economy and Finance) and the National Ministry of Education. In addition, the RSC has representation of the ten Andalusian universities (Vice-presidents for Planning and/or QA), Students Council of Andalusia and the Forum of the Social Councils of Andalusian Public Universities. Nine other regional stakeholders from public, private and mixed bodies have also been nominated, hence increasing the total number of RSC members to 30. The first meeting was held on 15 April and the next one is scheduled for September. HIEDRA, an interactive web platform, has been created to facilitate discussion between the stakeholders. The working group has produced two questionnaires to collect information. Universities have been requested to respond to a long version of 100 questions, while other stakeholders have received a shorter version with focus on the role of universities in regional development.

Progress in drafting the regional self-evaluation report
62. Between mid-May and mid-July, the drafting of the common chapters (mainly Chapter 1 and 2) was concluded and pertinent data selection was identified. During this period, a meeting in the OECD was held on 28 May 2009 together with Catalonia. After 15 July, a 2-month period was designed as next step, during which the stakeholders contributions are to be analyzed and reviewed, resulting in a draft report being produced by 30 September. The final draft report should be presented to the Steering Committee by mid October and a final draft report will be completed on the last week of October. Parallel to the confidence building process on the report contents, report will be translated into English to be sent to the OECD on 31 October 2009.

Progress in partnership building
63. Partnership building process, i.e. enhanced interaction between university representatives and regional stakeholders, has been identified as a key issue. The OECD review process is used as a tool to evaluate the outcomes of the initiatives and work carried out during the past five years when HE in Andalusia has been under the Ministry of Innovation, Science and Enterprise. A OECD-LEED (Local Economic and Employment Development) Review will complement the IMHE Review process.

Major achievements and major concerns
64. Despite the change in the Spanish Government, in the autonomous Region of Andalusia, higher education remains to be the responsibility of the Regional Ministry of Innovation, Science and Enterprise as has been the case since 2004. The OECD review continues to enjoy full support from the regional government which has encouraged the engagement of universities in the partnership building process.
SPAIN, AUTONOMOUS REGION OF CATALONIA

By Josep VILALTA and Martí PARELLADA
September 2009

Progress in putting the review machinery in place
65. The first contacts with Catalonia and the OECD were made in April 2008. The region joins official about a year later in spring 2009. The OECD Review in Catalonia is hosted by four institutions: the City Council of Barcelona, the Fundación CYD, the Catalan Association for Public Universities (ACUP) and the Strategic Metropolitan Plan of Barcelona, each with representation also in the Regional Steering Committee (RSC) which has also been strengthened with members from the universities (e.g. the biggest private university), representatives from business and industry and from the national and regional ministries of education. The first meeting of the RSC was held on 14 July 2009. The process is led by two Regional Co-ordinators from the ACUP (Josep Vilalta) and Fundación CYD (Marti Parellada) who hold this role in addition to their other activities.

Progress in drafting the regional Self-evaluation report
66. ACUP’s ongoing research (since Nov 2008) on the contribution of the public universities to the social and economic progress of Catalonia will serve as a basis of the Regional Self-evaluation Report required by the OECD. It is expected that the draft self-evaluation report will be ready by the end of December 2009. Catalonia is currently working on the chapters on Contribution of research to regional innovation (III), Contribution of teaching & learning to labour market and skills (IV) and Contribution to social, cultural and environmental development (V). In this last case the focus is particularly on social and cultural development. The contribution of research to regional innovation (chapter III) analyses both the scientific production of universities and the channels of knowledge transfer.

Progress in partnership building
67. The process has contributed to opening a dialogue and cooperation arena between different public and private stakeholders of Catalonia. As an example, an agreement has been signed specifically for the OECD Review in Higher Education in Regional and City Development, between representatives of the Catalan public and private universities, of the City Council of Barcelona, the Strategic Metropolitan Plan of Barcelona, the 22@ technological district and representatives of the business and industry sectors (Science and Knowledge Foundation). This agreement specifies the members of the Steering Committee (see above) and at the same time designates the coordination tasks, among other legal technicalities.
UNITED STATES, SOUTHERN ARIZONA

By Francisco MARMOLEJO
September 2009

Progress in putting the review machinery in place
68. Initial contacts between the University of Arizona and the OECD were made in spring 2007 but the region, under the leadership of the University, joined the review officially in July 2009. The support team for the project in Southern Arizona was put in place in spring 2009. This includes Mr. Francisco Marmolejo as Regional Co-ordinator and Mr. John Paul Jones as Technical Co-ordinator. A group of representatives from different sectors was invited to participate in the Regional Steering Committee. In general, responses were positive. The Steering Committee began its work officially in late spring 2009.

Progress in drafting the regional Self-evaluation report
69. The Self-Evaluation Report has been drafted. A first revised version has been submitted to the OECD. The development of the Self-Evaluation Report was coordinated by John Paul Jones, and included an active participation from a team of graduate students from the University of Arizona. The document has been send to members of the Regional Steering Committee for their review and suggested changes.

Progress in partnership building
70. The establishment of the Regional Steering Committee and the process in the drafting of the Self Evaluation Report were two useful tools in building a partnership with the relevant stakeholders in the region. The OECD pre-visit in August 2009 was a good opportunity to make aware key individuals in the region about the importance of the study. So far, all institutions have been willing to collaborate with the project, and recognize the need to continuing and strengthening partnerships with other local institutions. In addition, the financial support provided by Lumina Foundation for Education has been an important factor in making institutions willing to further learn about mechanisms to collaborate and to seek support from external sources.

Major achievements and major concerns
71. Being able to draft the Self-Evaluation Report in such a short period of time has been a major accomplishment. Also, having students directly involved in the process of conducting research and writing pieces of the Self Evaluation Report has been an important accomplishment that students highly value.

72. A concern that most probably is common to other regions, is that some stakeholders have not dedicated enough time to fully understand what is the scope and both opportunities and limitations of the project. Review Visit is scheduled for 4-9 October 2009.
UNITED STATES-MEXICO, PASO DEL NORTE REGION

By Lisa COLQUITT-MUNOZ
August 2009

Progress in putting the review machinery in place

73. The first contact between the region and the OECD were made in September 2008. The decision to join the OECD review was made by the Paso del Norte Group in October 2008.

74. The self-evaluation process was initiated in earnest by the members of the Paso del Norte region in March 2009. The early coordination and organizing was done by the Paso del Norte Group and Lisa Colquitt-Munoz serving as Regional Coordinator. Eleven HEIs were identified and approached to participate in the self study. A series of meetings were held in each of the three communities of the region to explain the process and the work that it would entail. Meetings with the leadership of the HEIs assured commitment to the endeavour.

75. The Regional Steering Committee was formed in April 2009 comprised of a representative from the Academic, Business and NGO sectors from Ciudad Juarez, Chihuahua; El Paso,Texas and Las Cruces, New Mexico. The workgroup was formed from representatives of the HEIs to compile and review the information on a regular basis. On average the RSC meets monthly and the work group meets bi-monthly.

Progress in drafting the regional Self-evaluation report

76. Of the eleven HEIs contacted to participate, seven are actively involved in the Self-evaluation report. The other three HEIs continue to contribute on a limited basis due to scarce personnel or time constraints. Chapters I-7 have been completed in their draft form and are currently in the editing stages. Chapters I-VI were done by each of the HEIs independently and then submitted to the regional coordinator. The answers were combined and edited then reviewed by the workgroup and regional stakeholders committee for comments and further input. Chapter VII was done at a group meeting at which representatives from the HEIs assisted to discuss lessons learned and how to move forward with suggested outcomes and proposed strategies. Numerous revisions are expected as the document is reviewed by the workgroup and the RSC for content, gaps in information as well as for clarity and consistency.

Progress in partnership building

77. The HEIs that have participated in the self-evaluation have noted great progress in furthering awareness and communication among the institutions and their leadership. The regular meetings between colleagues have led to a deeper understanding of the great assets that the various HEIs have developed as well as the myriad of partnerships and projects they are involved in. As segmented as the region is the study has unveiled that co-operation among the HEIs is occurring albeit on an informal basis. Among the most prominent examples of this cooperation are the articulation agreements that exist among some of the HEIs to transfer credits and waive out-of state tuition requirements for students from the region. A number of examples of shared research and study opportunities were identified as a result of existing relationships among the faculty within the participating HEIs.

78. Discussions with the region’s economic development agencies and other private and public sector partners as a result of the self-evaluation process have also resulted in a greater understanding of the role of the region’s HEIs and the resources that they have. As information from the self-evaluation is disseminated among the region’s strategic partners in the coming months, the team from the Paso del Norte Region sees these links as vital to implementing those outcomes and opportunities identified in the report.
Major achievements and major concerns

79. Completion of a draft of the self-evaluation report that included responses from HEIs from two countries and three states with different systems, languages and governing structures with some semblance of cohesion was a major achievement. Another major achievement was the commitment to the project that was expressed by the leadership and faculty at the participating HEIs. Because of the geographic dynamics of the region a considerable amount of time and personnel resources went into attending numerous meetings that entailed travelling across international and state boundaries. This process revealed the fact that the needs of the students and the communities being served by the HEIs were not so different after all. It also showed that however daunting collaboration might seem it is possible in many instances.

80. Many of the impediments to serving the students needs and furthering regional cooperation identified by the HEIs demand a community based solution. An example of this the need for students to have bilingual and bicultural guidance in order to address bi-national accreditation and course transfer policies. The importance of early childhood education and the alignment of K-20 educational strategies is a critical factor in determining long-term success. If the region is to realize a transformational change, this self-evaluation has to serve as a platform for a regional evaluation to include other strategic partners. This along with the development of a framework for regional collaboration among the HEIs that allows for continuity over a long period of time was identified as a major concern furthering these initial efforts.
81. The regions were invited to suggest ideas on how to improve the review process and give comments for the forthcoming third round of reviews.

**Ideas on how to improve the review process**

- Regular and direct communication by OECD personnel with the regional coordinator including one-on-one conference calls at monthly intervals to discuss best practices; and share experiences from other regions.

- Mentor from a previous round to speak to the regional coordinator early in the process, answer any questions and provide some guidance in getting started, in understanding organisational requirements, e.g. scheduling a realistic timeframe for completing the evaluation.

- An initial OECD visit to motivate the steering committee and to present the goals; Meeting with stakeholders at the beginning of the process to motivate and empower them.

- Brochure to be distributed at the onset of the process to help the regional coordinator convey the importance of the evaluation and buy-in from HIEs and stakeholders

- Collection of various methodological approaches to the review; More detailed – but open options between different models - to facilitate time-planning at the beginning of the process

- Closer relationship between regions taking part in the reviews, either through web 2.0 community or meetings once every three months in participating regions

- More simple guidelines, including also measures of impact.

- Longer time-lines

- Free IMHE membership for a HEI when the region joins the review process

**Ideas on how to maintain the growing network of HEIs and regions**

- Keep the process alive, create a formal forum and obtain support from the media; Provide a mechanism by which to share success stories and best practices as regions began to model changes in operation and seek out policy changes; Maintain the OECD website as a resource for HEIs and regional coordinators; Explore the use of a networking site such as Linkedin to serve as a forum for discussion and future collaboration;

- Actively stimulate and moderate the community by regular open communication;

- Nominate a dedicated resource person at the OECD who reaches out by phone to each region monthly, and serves as information bridge between regions;
- Benchmark the process with at least two regions which are strongly related;

- Convene regions within one country to take part in a meeting facilitated by the Ministry of Education with presentations from the OECD experts or representatives from regions that have gone through the review to disseminate the programme and to shed light on its benefits for the regions;

- Follow up the regions that have already gone through the reviews to highlight the real impact of the process;

- Request the HEIs to set five year goals to improve monitoring the results and accountability;

- Use the project as a basis to develop networking task forces to address specific problems;

- Organize meetings with stakeholders prior to the formal presentation of the review results to the decision-makers in order to agree on specific commitments.

**Ideas for the forthcoming 3rd round of reviews**

- Use veterans of the 1st and 2nd rounds as paid consultants e.g. through a mentorship programme whereby each participating region is paired with a mentor who previously participated in a review;

- Invite cities and regions already connected in various networks (sister cities, partner cities, port city associations, green city associations, climate initiative cities etc) or with communal interests. This would facilitate decision-making in the cities and regions to join as well as comparability;

- Continue to incorporate lessons learned from the previous rounds and continue to maintain a process or format by which to share information among past and future participants;

- Twin the new regions with an already evaluated region, to share experiences, concerns and ideas;

- Give more accurate advice on how to develop the process at regional level either from the OECD or either from any other reviewed region;

- Have feedback about the previous reviews. What happened in the regions participants after 2 or 3 years? Do people still remember the project?

- Integrate and promote best practices of successful projects of the 1st and 2nd rounds;

- Involve participants of the 2nd round as advisors to the 3rd round and organize a general meeting.
ANNEXE 2: PROGRESS IN REGIONS
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Regional Co-ordinator</th>
<th>RSC</th>
<th>SER draft</th>
<th>Final SER</th>
<th>OECD pre-visit</th>
<th>OECD review visit</th>
<th>Challenges</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AUSTRALIA Victoria</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>2-3 Sept. 2009</td>
<td>6-12 Dec. 2009</td>
<td>- Time constraints</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GERMANY Berlin</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>25-26 June 2009</td>
<td>13-18 Sept. 2009</td>
<td>- Engaging the private sector</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ITALY Lombardy</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>- Engaging the private sector and local government</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MALAYSIA Penang</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>17-18 Dec. 2009</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>- Lack of data on regional economy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEXICO Sonora</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>- Engagement from the private sector</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NETHERLANDS Rotterdam</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>21-22 Sept. 2009</td>
<td>8-13 Nov. 2009</td>
<td>- Geographical dispersal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPAIN Andalusia</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10-11 Nov. 2009</td>
<td>24-31 Jan. 2010</td>
<td>- Partnership building</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPAIN Catalonia</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12-13 Nov. 2009</td>
<td>28-6 March 2009</td>
<td>- Challenges linked to cross border collaboration</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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