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• Project features and methodology
• Drivers behind engagement between HEIs and regions
• Barriers to regional engagement
  1. national policy
  2. regional governance
  3. finance
  4. institutional
• Overcoming the barriers: a case study
Objectives of OECD Programme

• Response to multiplicity of initiatives across OECD to mobilise HEIs in support of regional development (HEIs + region)
• Synthesise experience into coherent body of policy and practise to guide HEIs and regional and national governments
• Provide opportunity for dialogue between stakeholders and help with clarification of roles and responsibilities (i.e. assist with capacity building in each country/region)
Distinctive Features

• Cross OECD Directorates (EDU/GOV)
• Diversity of audiences: HEIs, regional authorities, business and community groups, national governments
• Formative (c.f. summative) evaluations
• Expanding international networks of HEIs and regional partners
Participants

- 14 regions across 12 countries including one cross border region, hundreds of HEIs, and regional and national stakeholders from the private, public and the 3rd sector.

  - Denmark (Jutland-Funen)
  - Finland (Jyvaskyla region)
  - England (the North East)
  - Spain (two regions: Valencia and the Canary Islands)
  - Sweden (Varmland)
  - The Netherlands (Twente)
  - Norway (Mid-Norwegian Region)
  - Australia (Sunshine-Fraser Coast)
  - Korea (Busan)
  - Mexico (Neuvo Leon)
  - Denmark-Sweden (The Oresund region)
  - Canada (Atlantic Canada)
  - Brazil (North Parana)
Variety of Regions Opting In

- Administrative regions: varying degree of identity/cohesion
- Variety of population sizes and numbers of HEIs
- Metropolitan $\leftrightarrow$ rural
- Central $\leftrightarrow$ peripheral
- Devolved $\leftrightarrow$ centralised governance
- Dynamic $\leftrightarrow$ declining
Variety of HEIs/HE Systems

- Binary/unitary systems
- Institutional autonomy
- Internal governance / management
- Research – teaching / vocational orientation
- Public and private
Methodology

- Common framework for regional self-evaluation developed by OECD task group
- Self evaluation report by regional consortium using OECD guidelines
- Site visit by international peer review team (HEI, Regional, National Experts)
- Peer Review Team review team report and response from the region
- Analysis and synthesis by OECD task group drawing upon regional case studies and commissioned review of literature
- Production and dissemination of synthesis report
University/region value added

T = Teaching
R = Research
S = Service to the community
S = Skills
I = Innovation
C = Culture and community

Value added university management processes
Value added regional management processes
University/region dynamic interface
National policies impacting on university / regional relations

Key:
- S & T: Science and Technology
- TDP: Territorial Development
- HE: Higher Education
- LM: Labour Market
- Indust: Industry policy

Local & Regional Agencies
Reflections on Evaluation Process

- Extent of stakeholder engagement
- Ownership of self evaluation
- Embeddedness in stakeholders
- Maturity of partnerships
- Moving from unconnected projects to HE/regional development system
- Maintaining momentum
- Developing regional capacity and influencing national policy
Regional Drivers

• Post WW2 emphasis on reducing centre/periphery disparities: nationalisation of HE
• 1970s structural adjustment problems in core cities: end of redistributive regional policy
• 1980s emergence of innovation orientated regional policy (innovative milieu: industrial clusters: learning regions)
• 1990s threats and opportunities of globalisation
• Current perspective: widening range of immobile supply side influences where HE has role (tacit knowledge, skills, cultural and social inclusion)
HE Drivers

• Heightened regional expectation of third “public interest” role of HEIs
• New teaching orientated HEIs to meet local as well as national skill needs
• Global competition facing research intensive HEIs – search for local externalities
• Declining public funding – entrepreneurial universities engaged in economic development
• Blurring of the boundary between HEIs
Regions and HE: A Synthesis

- HEIs discovering regions and regions discovering HEIs
- Conjoint interest in tying down the global in the local via engagement of HEIs in economic, social, cultural and environmental development
- HEIs as place makers, attracting and retaining creative people
- But HE not a magic bullet
The regionally engaged multi-modal and multi-scalar university
(after Arbo and Benneworth)
Barriers (1): National Systems of HE/S&T Policy

• Lack of a territorial dimension to HE policy
• HE meeting national/international research and education aspirations
• Uncoordinated HE, S&T and territorial policy at national level
• HEIs reinforcing hierarchies of regions
• Neglect of the role of teaching and learning in knowledge transfer and human capital development
• Barriers between levels in HE (e.g. vocational and non-vocational HEIs)
The human resource upgrading process
(after Arbo and Benneworth)
### Academic Leadership: Managing the Tensions
*(after Vestergaard)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>HE – rationality</th>
<th>S&amp;T – rationality</th>
<th>Synthesis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ideal of government</td>
<td>At-a-distance</td>
<td>Close interaction</td>
<td>Close interaction – but ‘distantiated’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distribution of tasks</td>
<td>R&amp;T: U</td>
<td>R&amp;T: U</td>
<td>R&amp;T: Researchers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>E&amp;C: Other actors</td>
<td>E&amp;C: U</td>
<td>E&amp;C: Students and PS partners (on-campus)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conception of object to be</td>
<td>Guardian of truth,</td>
<td>Innovation factory,</td>
<td>Innovation cradle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>governed</td>
<td>independent</td>
<td>key agent in the IS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conception of the subjects</td>
<td>Independent researchers</td>
<td>Responsive researchers</td>
<td>Guardians of truth and innovation facilitators –</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to be governed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>never entrepreneurs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Barriers (2): Regional Structures and Governance

• HE not domain of local government
• Fragmented local governments
• Limited regional level powers/authority
• Intra regional competition and urban/rural tensions
• Absence of strong private sector R&D base
• Inchoate SME populations
Barriers (3): Finance

• Third role legislation but not part of core funding
• Teaching funding related to student numbers/graduate output – poorly connected to regional needs
• Research not fully costed – no headroom for investment in translational research capacity
• Intra regional competition for consultancy / CPD
• Short term project based funding from variety of non HE sources (nb EU)
• Metrics – outcomes in non HE domains (e.g. job generation)
Barriers (4): HEI Governance, Leadership and Management

- Limited institutional autonomy to respond to regional opportunities
- No control over key place creating assets (estates)
- Weak internal management in old research intensive HEIs
- Unrelated drivers for T, R and O
- Partnership working confined to senior management and / or isolated entrepreneurial academics
- Intermediate organisations (e.g. science parks, centres for continuing education) detached from academic heartland
Jyväskylä in its National and Regional Context

• Prosperous city region compared with the rest of Central Finland
• 60% of population of Central Finland live in the city region
• Small city by international standards
• Jyväskylä unemployment above the national average, 30% long term
• Low productivity within existing business base, predominantly SMEs and low investment in R&D
• Higher education supports 1 in 3 of working population of Jyväskylä
• Without investment in Higher Education structural adjustment problems would have been worse
Jyväskylä University

• Long established multi-faculty University but without Engineering or Medicine
• 35% of budget earned for non-teaching activities (19% from EU structural funds)
• National/international orientation with 75% of student applicants from outside Central Finland
• Two thirds of graduates gain employment outside Central Finland
• Central Finland 5% of population but University has 11% of students graduating with Masters (2\textsuperscript{nd} ranking in Finland)
Jyväskylä Polytechnic

- New teaching institution with 7 schools including engineering, social care, tourism and education
- 11% of budget earned for non-teaching activities (72% from structural funds)
- 34% of students from Central Finland
- 60% of graduates employed in Central Finland
- Mission to serve Central Finland
Jyväskylä: Wellness Technology and Ageing

- Basic research funded by the Academy of Finland in the Faculty of Sport and Health Sciences of the University.
- Establishment of an independent foundation with a strong representation from civil society (including the voluntary and community sector) to underpin the development of systems and services to support active ageing (Gerocentre).
- Translation of the research into products using the Wellness Dream Lab coordinated by the Polytechnic and supported by EU funding from the Regional Council.
- Driving the social innovation necessary to facilitate the uptake of technology through practice based polytechnic applied research in hospitals and community services.
- Practitioner training undertaken in the Polytechnic and the flow of practitioners into the research programmes in the University to undertake higher degrees.
- A Human Technology Forum where actors in the system meet and exchange knowledge and experience.
- A building (Viveca) owned and managed by the Science Park where selected parts of the above chain can operate, including spin out companies.
Science Parks in 1980 - 2000 and CoE concept

- in 1980’s
  - University
  - Company
- in early 1990’s
  - Universities
  - Science Park
  - Companies
- in late 1990’s and 2000’s
  - Universities
  - Polytechnics
  - Centre of Expertise Programme
  - Science Park
  - Companies
Partners at regional level
Integrating Science Parks into HEIs

• The development of a common innovation strategy
• Agreements between the parties concerning codes of practice to guide action and purchases during the process of innovation from ideas to commercial products/service
• Consideration of commercial applications in the planning of new R&D projects and business possibilities during their execution
• Provision of pre-incubator facilities and services for students and academic staff
• Licensing via specialist service provider (*reach out*)
• Identification of business sources to contribute to HEI programmes and projects (*reach in*)
Obstacles to More Effective Regional Engagement by HEIs

• National innovation system with three separate pillars and no territorial dimension (except Centres of Expertise linked to local science parks)
• Current funding model for HE – no full economic costing for research and 3rd strand activities
• No mandate for Regional Councils to engage in development of regional strategies for higher education
• Overly rigid demarcation boundaries between Universities and Polytechnics and limited capacity for joint working
• Limited autonomy of Universities and related underdeveloped management capacity to build entrepreneurial institutions linking the global and the local
Overcoming Obstacles at the National Level

- Unequivocal regional development role for Regional Councils and universities as well as polytechnics
- A single Higher Education and Regional Development Fund (capital and revenue)
- Competitive bidding led by universities and polytechnics and other regional stakeholders (Municipalities, Regional Councils, Science Parks, Chambers of Commerce etc)
- 5 year programme and selection from a range of activities (translational research, knowledge transfer, skills development, community/cultural development)
- Clear mechanism for programme management, monitoring and evaluation of impact.
Overcoming Obstacles at the HEI Level

- More joint working building upon and supplementing current ad hoc collaboration
- Shared one stop shop for business support
- Review of educational pathways from the region into and through HEIs and into the local labour market
- Joint academic planning unit supporting the work of the Steering Committee
- Integration of Open University and Continuing Education into regional engagement strategy
- Strengthen management of regional engagement within the University – disseminating good practice throughout the academic heartland
- Baseline studies and ongoing impact assessment of regional engagement by both the HEIs in partnership with the regional stakeholders.
Next Steps

• Key leadership role of the Steering Committee
• Endorsement of the Committee’s role by the City, the Region and Central Government
• Development of a single overarching vision linking global role of higher education and research to the development of Jyväskylä and Central Finland
• Continuing of the learning process initiated through the OECD review (e.g. response to recommendations)
Building Regional Higher Education AND Development Systems

• Challenges of accountability
• Evaluating conjoint impacts (HEIs on regions and regions on HEIs)
• Co-ordinating policy at the national level
• Towards an expanding international learning network