CASE STUDIES IN REGIONAL ENGAGEMENT BETWEEN POST-SECONDARY EDUCATION AND BUSINESS

INTRODUCTION
The contributions to this edition of B-HERT NEWS are all concerned with the way the university interacts with its local and regional community for mutual benefit. The considerable recent growth in this new agenda for universities and communities, both in Australia and internationally, is evident from the articles.

There are four articles describing the situation in overseas countries. Dr Barbara Holland, Director of the National Service Learning Clearinghouse and Executive Editor of the Coalition of Urban and Metropolitan Universities Journal in the USA discusses the growing role of community engagement in US higher education. In particular, Barbara, a regular visitor to Australia, distinguishes between the scholarship of teaching and learning and the scholarship of engagement as being an integrated underpinning to the discovery agenda of many faculties today in the USA. This has been particularly the case among the other than elite and mature universities, fuelled in part by new accountability requirements associated with funding programs.

From South Africa, Josef Lazarus, General Manager of the Community Higher Education Service Partnerships (CHESP) highlights recent policy initiatives designed to boost higher education engagement with the community following a 1997 White Paper on the Transformation of Higher Education. The article also raises a number of key challenges to community development in South Africa in this engagement agenda, including university culture, expertise and resourcing.

An example of the way universities and regions are working together in the UK is provided by Professor John Goddard. John is the Deputy Vice-Chancellor and professor of regional development at the University of Newcastle-upon-Tyne, a university that has had a long and active involvement in working closely with the communities of North East England. John describes what the University of Newcastle is doing in partnership with North East regional bodies using third stream funding from HEFCE to facilitate technology transfer.

Dr Kiyong Bung, a consultant to the OECD, describes recent policy changes in Korea designed to strengthen connections between regions and universities located outside of the main capital region to achieve balanced National development. The New University for Regional Innovation (NURI) programme is designed to enhance regional competitiveness through innovation through partnerships with universities, business and other regional stakeholder groups.

Staying with the international theme, Dr Steve Garlick describes a new multi-country project launched by the OECD in January to evaluate the contribution of higher education institutions to regional development. Steve is part of the OECD working group and part of the OECD international peer review team for the project. The project will run for two years and involves 12 countries and their regions and universities.

In Australia, a second article by Steve Garlick provides an overview of the regionalization of university education over the past decade and how the practice of community engagement by universities in this environment can be a strategic tool for viability and competitiveness.
Three articles are provided that describe developments from the individual university level, including through case study examples of specific initiatives. Professor Paul Thomas, Vice-Chancellor of the University of the Sunshine Coast since its inception in 1996, talks about his commitment for his university to be strongly oriented towards having an engagement relationship with the Sunshine Coast regional community. Paul uses the evolution of the Sippy Downs Knowledge Precinct at the University as an on-the-ground demonstration of this. The Precinct comprises the Sippy Downs township and a Technology Park. The Technology Park is evolving with an Innovation Centre having been opened in January 2002 and an Accelerator as the next stage of development.

Anne Langworthy, Director of the Centre for Regional Development at Swinburne University’s Lillydale campus, describes what initiatives the Campus has been undertaking with the municipalities in the Outer East of Melbourne to identify future directions and pursue new opportunities for sustainable community development. Anne stresses that such engagement initiatives, built around a whole-of-university and whole-of-university approach take many years of constant attention before they begin to deliver meaningful outcomes of benefit to all partners.

Dr Helen Sheil, from the Centre for Rural Communities at Monash University’s Churchill Campus, highlights initiatives that have been put in place to strengthen small rural communities in the Gippsland region of Victoria through the University. In particular has been the development of tools to foster community dialogue, and an accredited Graduate Certificate program that provides access for regional workers to the resources, skills and knowledge of a major University to facilitate the beginning of new ventures.

Finally, Alice Story, Executive Assistant of the Australian Universities Community Engagement Alliance (AUCEA) discusses the formation and initiatives of this new network organisation with its main objective being as a national forum for the discussion and development of university-community engagement, encouraging collaboration, innovation, the exchange of knowledge and the scholarship of engagement.

THE GROWING ROLE OF COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT IN US HIGHER EDUCATION

Dr BARBARA A. HOLLAND PHD
Director, National Service Learning Clearinghouse and Executive Editor, Coalition of Urban and Metropolitan Universities Journal, USA

This call to reconsider what it means to be a scholar resonated strongly with many academic leaders across the nation and tapped into a well of concern and frustration about the growing disconnect between academia and the social, economic, political and cultural realities of the nation.

Sometimes a critically important conversation is energized by a single, compelling work of literature that can focus public attention on a growing, but diffuse and difficult issue. So it was when Ernest Boyer, President of the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching published Scholarship Reconsidered: Priorities of the Professoriate in 1990. He asserted that a core crisis of the US higher education sector was the “tired old teaching versus research debate” and argued that traditional conceptions of scholarly work were outmoded and only served to limit our nation’s intellectual capacity, undermined public support for higher education’s role in society, and failed to meet the learning needs of students. He proposed a new view of scholarship that would “recognize the full range of faculty talent and the great diversity of functions higher education must perform.” Technology, globalization, and diffusion of knowledge persuaded him that the silos of teaching, research and service must be reframed as interactive modes of discovery, integration, teaching and engagement.

This call to reconsider what it means to be a scholar resonated strongly with many academic leaders across the nation and tapped into a well of concern and
frustration about the growing disconnect between academia and the social, economic, political and cultural realities of the nation. Throughout the 1980s, higher education was not seen as a relevant resource for addressing critical public issues, and was criticized by business, media and policy leaders as rather self-indulgent, over-priced, and out-of-date. As a consequence many U.S. scholars, public and private funding organizations, and policy leaders became actively involved in extensive exploration of the nature of faculty work and how it must be designed to align with knowledge needs and practices of the 21st century. Conferences, summit meetings, national study panels, and multi-institutional grants to support experimental change initiatives led to numerous policy reports, essays, books, even new journals and new affiliate organizations – all calling for new conceptions of scholarly work and academic culture. In particular, these efforts generated two new fields of scholarly study and practice that now complement the scholarship of discovery: the scholarship of teaching and learning, and the scholarship of engagement.

Today, many faculty and institutions are adopting a conception of scholarship as a highly integrated agenda of discovery, learning and engagement. Yet, these ideas also remain controversial even in the institutions most advanced in their transformation to new modes of scholarship. My specific purpose here is to briefly summarize some key points regarding the current views of the scholarship of engagement in the U.S.; lessons learned about sustaining, evaluating and rewarding engaged scholarship; and important challenges that remain. The observations shared in this article are derived from my own opportunities to serve in nationwide roles as a federal program administrator supporting and assessing engagement programs, and as a researcher studying engagement and consequential changes in higher education.

Institutional and faculty interest in engagement has grown dramatically during the last 15 years. Campus Compact, a membership organization of presidents who commit their campuses to engagement agendas for students and faculty, has grown from a few to nearly 1,000 institutions of all types. Federal agencies created grant programs specifically aimed at supporting community-campus partnerships related to economic and community development endeavors. Private foundations, industry and donors invested hundreds of millions in single and multi-institutional demonstration projects to involve faculty and students in community problem-solving work, to create endowed professorships, centers or institutes dedicated to critical public issues. National panels convened by some of the largest higher education affiliate groups, such as the National Association of State Universities and Land Grant Colleges (NASULGC) and the American Association of State Colleges and Universities (AASCU) have conducted national studies of institutional commitment to engagement and produced ground-breaking reports that guide further institutional change. Many institutions, including major research universities, have revised promotion and tenure guidelines to ensure recognition for community-based research and learning. Refereed articles derived from community-based scholarship have appeared in more than 60 diverse academic journals across the disciplines. National awards for faculty achievement in engagement have been in place for more than five years. Perhaps most importantly, in neighborhoods and communities across the US, faculty and students are contributing to better outcomes and conditions related to such areas as school performance, youth development, healthy children, services for the aged, urban environment, rural job development, housing quality, and many other public issues.

The expansion of engagement programs has been facilitated by considerable attention to the production of research on the practices and techniques of engaged teaching, learning and discovery. Scholars from fields as diverse as education, psychology, history, art, sociology, political science, biology and others have conducted studies on engagement and its impacts on student learning and development, on faculty productivity, on institutional mission and organization, and on community capacity. From this growing body of literature we have developed a growing consensus around core principles, definitions and practices related to the design, methods, and conduct of engaged scholarship and community partnerships.

What have we learned from this research and documentation? Terminology and definitions have been clarified. In the US we talk about several forms: civic engagement (the involvement of students in activities that promote civic responsibility); engaged teaching and learning (the use of active pedagogies that engage students in learning), and community engagement (the involvement of faculty in community-based scholarly work). The scholarship of engagement encompasses all these forms. That said, at individual institutions, local history and context may introduce important variations in this general definition of engagement. Through engaged forms of teaching and research, faculty connect their academic expertise to public purposes as a way of fulfilling the core mission of the academic institution. Engagement is a specific conception of faculty work that connects intellectual assets to public issues in ways that enhance both academic work and community capacity. Much as academia has always articulated its economic impact on communities, now we are articulating our intellectual impact as an asset for community-building and improvement through knowledge-based partnerships.

We have learned that engagement is not a new view of “service” nor is it extra or additive work for faculty. Rather, it is a mode for discovery and learning that enriches all scholarly work by creating a direct connection to alternate sources of knowledge and information and to potential application toward public purposes. Not surprisingly, engaged scholarship is often interdisciplinary and leads to new research and curricular directions for institutions.
Models for recognizing and rewarding engaged scholarship have emerged. A National Review Board and Clearinghouse for the Scholarship of Engagement (founded by the Kellogg Foundation) serves as a resource for faculty mentoring, external peer review, consultation with campus committees, and workshops on documentation strategies (www.scholarshipofengagement.org). Most institutional models for rewarding engaged scholarship are based on new conceptions of common standards of quality for all scholarly work. For example, in “Scholarship Assessed” Charles Glassick and colleagues argue that all forms of scholarship can be judged by the same criteria because all good scholarly work will have the following features in evidence:

- Clear goals
- Adequate knowledge, literature and preparation
- Appropriate methods
- Replicability
- Breaks new ground; creative and innovative
- Significant results
- Effective dissemination
- Reflective critique by peers and practitioners

Models similar to this are increasingly used at institutions seeking to reward new views of scholarly work as more integrative, diverse, and reflective of mission.

The literature has also revealed advanced understanding about the critical role of community partnerships, and models for developing effective and sustainable campus-community relationships that ensure reciprocity. Other areas of research have revealed much about faculty motivations and effective modes of faculty development; and the importance of creating supportive infrastructure and engaged curricula for students. These elements are essential to institutionalization of engagement.

Much has been revealed about the scholarship of engagement, but it does remain controversial in some academic settings. This is not really surprising. First of all, higher education is not an industry comfortable with change, innovation, or risk-taking choices. Faculty may ask: if a new mode of scholarship is embraced, will traditional forms be discounted? No, the growing integration of scholarship calls for recognizing a wider array of scholarly modes, not a more narrow set. Will everyone have to become an engaged scholar? No, new views of scholarly work acknowledge, more than in the past, that faculty members have diverse talents and interests that should be encouraged and rewarded. Will we be able to grow our research funding and academic reputation by pursuing an engagement agenda? Yes, if it is well integrated with other modes of research and quality teaching.

For many major universities, the traditional modes of scholarship have led to financial success and intellectual prestige...what would motivate them to discard tradition for new, complex modes of work that involves potentially messy interactions with communities? Therefore it is not surprising that the greatest interest in community engagement has sprung up among institutions other than the most mature, elite universities. Engagement has been a major force for institutional differentiation in the US and has helped many colleges and universities with relatively generic missions and curricula find a stronger focus and energizing sense of commitment by focusing their scholarly agenda, at least in part, on state and regional issues of importance. This may be a good thing if it helps higher education be more diverse and responsive to societal information needs while maintaining standards of academic quality.

Recently, important changes in systems of institutional accountability are creating greater interest in the scholarship of engagement (and the scholarship of teaching and learning). Indicators of engagement are being incorporated into the regional accreditation agency standards and will be part of institutional self-studies and accreditation site visits. Prominent federal research agencies such as NIH and NSF have begun to include elements of engagement in major funding programs. The US News & World Report’s College Rankings now includes a ranking of institutions most respected for their commitment to community-based learning for students. And perhaps, most compelling to our nation’s colleges and universities, those who manage the Carnegie Classification System are considering major changes. For many years Carnegie has categorized institutions according to program mix and degree production (associate, baccalaureate, master, doctoral level degrees) and level of research funding. Recently, Carnegie launched a pilot project to test measures that would introduce indicators of commitment to community engagement in future classification schemes. This and other pending reforms to institutional recognition schemes will be important incentives for each institution to explore the role of engagement in their own community context and campus mission.

I hope that this comparative case will provide some useful ideas that may guide further exploration of the role of engagement in Australian higher education, just as we hope to continue to learn from your experience and that of others. While we have learned much and produced a useful body of research and literature on engagement practices and impacts on students, communities, institutions and faculty, much remains to be discovered through further study and experience. As in past centuries, when new methods of research spread around the world through academic dissemination, so can we see today the impact of global exploration of the role of higher education in community and nation building through engaged scholarship.


COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT IN SOUTH AFRICAN HIGHER EDUCATION

JOSEF LAZARUS
CHESP Project Manager
JET Education Services
PO Box 355
Muizenberg 7950
South Africa

Following the first democratic elections in South Africa (S.A.), the White Paper on the Transformation of Higher Education (1997) laid the foundations for making community engagement an integral part of S.A. HE. It calls on institutions to ‘demonstrate social responsibility,... and their commitment to the common good by making available expertise and infrastructure for community service programmes’. It states that one of the goals of HE is ‘to promote and develop social responsibility and awareness among students of the role of HE in social and economic development through community service programmes’. It showed receptiveness to ‘the growing interest in community service programmes for students’ and gave in principle support to ‘feasibility studies and pilot programmes which explore the potential of community service in higher education.’ Since the release of the White Paper there have been numerous national policy initiatives aimed at integrating community engagement as a core function of S.A. HE.

NATIONAL COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT INITIATIVES

In December 2000, the Department of Education (DoE) commissioned the development of a policy framework for community engagement in HE. The policy, currently in draft form, was informed by research data generated through more than 200 pilot academic programmes, including 39 different academic disciplines across 8 S.A. universities and interviews with numerous HE stakeholders including Vice-Chancellors, DoE officials and student bodies. In early 2000, the South African Qualifications Authority (SAQA) formed a Task Group to explore the role of community engagement in HE. The Task Group commissioned a Discussion Document in May 2000. The purpose of the document was: (i) to stimulate debate about community engagement in S.A. HE; (ii) to inform the development of a conceptual framework for this debate; (iii) to put community engagement more firmly on the agenda of HE policy and legislative initiatives; (iv) to identify key issues in terms of the implementation of community engagement; and (v) to make recommendations for taking forward the issue of community engagement in S.A. HE.

The Founding Document (2001) of the Higher Education Quality Committee (HEQC) of the Council on Higher Education (CHE) identified academically-based community service as a key area for the accreditation and quality assurance (QA) of HE along with teaching and research. During 2003 the HEQC generated comprehensive criteria for the QA of service-learning at an institutional and programmatic level. These serve as useful implementation guidelines for the final HEQC criteria published in April 2004. The HEQC audit criteria call on HEIs to have ‘quality related arrangements for community engagement which are formalised and integrated with those for teaching and learning and are adequately resourced and monitored’. In order to meet this criterion, examples of what might be expected include:

- Policies and procedures for the quality management of community engagement.
- Integration of policies and procedures for community engagement with those for teaching and learning and research, where appropriate.
- Adequate resources allocated to facilitate quality delivery in community engagement.
- Regular review of the effectiveness of quality related arrangements for community engagement.

In July 2000, the Minister of Education chaired a meeting of university Vice-Chancellors, DoE officials, members of the CHE and the South African Universities Vice-Chancellors Association (SAUVCA) to explore the role of community engagement in S.A. HE. The following key issues emerged:

- Purpose of higher education: Concern was expressed about the overemphasis on ‘education for the market place’ and the need for this to be balanced with ‘education for good citizenship’. It was suggested that universities should revive the notion of civic responsibility through their teaching, research and service programmes.
- Compliance or serious engagement: It was suggested that community engagement should not be optional in S.A. universities. Institutions should be encouraged and supported to take seriously their responsibility to inculcate the notion of citizenship in students through integrating community engagement into mainstream academic programmes.
- Add-on or integrated approach: It was agreed that community engagement should not be an ‘add on’ or purely philanthropic exercise. It should be an integral part of the mainstream teaching and research business of every university.
- Faculty roles and rewards: The dominant paradigm of scholarship focuses on and rewards teaching and research. It was agreed that community engagement should be promoted as a scholarly activity and should be rewarded as such.
- Resources: Given the current resource constraints experienced by most S.A. universities it was recommended that consideration be given to the allocation of national resources towards a
reconstruction and development agenda within HE. These resources should encourage and support the development of academic programmes that engage in the reconstruction and development of poor communities through teaching, research and service.

- The role of national HE stakeholders: Although government should not necessarily drive the role of universities in reconstruction and development, government should provide the necessary encouragement, support and direction.
- Leadership support: For the community engagement agenda to take effect, it would need the vocal, visible and tangible support of the top leadership within S.A. universities.
- Institutional audits: All universities should be encouraged to do an audit of existing community engagement activities linked to their institution. This audit would contribute towards a national audit on community engagement in S.A. HE.

During the past few years, numerous universities made significant progress with integrating academic service-learning into the mainstream academy. Key activities have included: conducting institution-wide audits on community engagement; developing institution-wide policies on community engagement; allocation of resources and enabling mechanisms to support community engagement; and developing academic programmes that include community engagement.

**Higher Education Institution Initiatives**

During the past few years, numerous universities made significant progress with integrating academic service-learning into the mainstream academy. Key activities have included: conducting institution-wide audits on community engagement; developing institution-wide policies on community engagement; allocation of resources and enabling mechanisms to support community engagement; and developing academic programmes that include community engagement.

Numerous universities have conducted an audit on their community engagement initiatives while others are in the process of doing so. Generally, the results of these audits show that most HEIs have a wide range of community engagement initiatives, although these are often not integrated with curricula, tend to be ad-hoc and driven essentially by interested and innovative academics and/or students.

Several universities have developed institution-wide policies, guidelines and strategies for community engagement. Generally these policies include issues such as: a rationale for community engagement and service-learning; a definition of the HEI’s interpretation of community engagement and service-learning; objectives to be achieved through the policy; mechanisms for implementing the policy; staff promotion and rewards pertaining to community engagement; organisational structures and staffing required for implementation; risk management in terms of student placements; and the allocation of resources towards implementation.

Most institutions that have made significant progress in terms of community engagement have dedicated resources (i.e. physical space; finances; human resources) towards the implementation of their community engagement policy and strategy. Several institutions have established an enabling mechanism such as a central office of community engagement and service-learning. In most cases, the office falls under the auspices of the Deputy Vice-Chancellor Academic. The primary functions of these structures are to represent the community engagement agenda at appropriate institutional committees (e.g. academic planning, teaching and learning, research); to facilitate engagement between neighbouring communities, service agencies and the HEI; and to support academic staff with the conceptualisation and implementation of academic programmes that embrace service-learning.

Between 2000 and 2004 the Joint Education Trust (JET) supported the development of approximately 200 accredited academic programmes including 39 different academic disciplines across nine university campuses involving more than 6 000 students ranging from first year to masters level. All programmes were designed to embrace the principles and practice of service-learning. An extensive monitoring and evaluation of these programmes identified the following factors determining success or failure. In the conceptualisation phase, the critical factors are: the extent to which the course addresses a need perceived as important by the recipient community; the extent to which the course is designed collaboratively with the recipient community and participating service agency; and the initial feasibility analysis in terms of finances, logistics and readiness of community members and service providers to participate. In the implementation phase, critical factors include: student readiness and preparation; appropriate placement of students; preparation of community for service-learning intervention; alignment of student capabilities and community needs; proper logistical and resource-planning and allocation; integration of theory of the discipline and the service provided by students; and structured time for critical reflection on both theory and practice.

**Key Challenges to Community Engagement**

Despite the achievements by numerous S.A. universities many have not yet embraced community engagement as a core academic function and are unlikely to do so without the necessary policy imperatives, support and direction. There can be little doubt that the pending DoE policy framework on community engagement will provide the necessary impetus and direction to take community engagement to scale in S.A. HE.
The prevailing perception that community engagement is an add-on, nice-to-have, and philanthropic activity, remains one of the key challenges to its integration as a core academic function. Increasingly, scholars who engage their teaching and research practices with community, are encouraged and enthused by the insights and richness this adds to their scholarly endeavours.

Many universities may require external assistance to embrace community engagement as a core academic function. The knowledge, skills and experience required to conceptualise and implement community engagement are different to those required to drive other processes within the institution.

Many universities may require external assistance to embrace community engagement as a core academic function. The knowledge, skills and experience required to conceptualise and implement community engagement are different to those required to drive other processes within the institution. It is anticipated that the expertise and materials developed by universities that have made significant progress will benefit others as they endeavour to advance their community engagement agenda.

Unlike most other academic endeavours, universities cannot ‘go-it-alone’ when it comes to community engagement. Community engagement implies and necessitates ‘engagement’ with recipient communities, local authorities and service agencies. If the traditional ‘boundaries’ of the academy are not challenged and stretched through community engagement, it may be a sign of insufficient engagement. Increasingly, engaged institutions are confronted with decisions they may not have encountered before. Examples include: whether to appoint community leaders and service providers who contribute to student learning and research as adjunct faculty; and whether to provide participating community leaders, local authorities and service agencies access to campus facilities, such as the library. The reconstruction and development mandate of South African local government facilitates partnerships between universities and local government to implement local and regional social and economic development plans. The potential knowledge contribution universities could make towards the implementation of these plans is enormous. Conversely, universities will benefit from having a local community context for integrating teaching and research programmes with local development priorities and having access to a wider pool of resources.

CONCLUSION

Although national policy initiatives in terms of community engagement are still in process, they have flagged the importance of community engagement and encouraged feasibility studies and pilot programmes which explore the potential of community service in HE. Spurred by these initiatives, their own conviction, and assistance from agencies such as JET, numerous HEIs have developed, monitored and evaluated a range of pilot programmes identifying the potential of community engagement as a core academic function.

As a result of this work, universities have at their disposal: research instruments to conduct audits of their community engagement initiatives; examples of institution-wide policies and strategies for community engagement; guidelines for good practice of community engagement through service-learning; instruments to measure good practice at an institutional, faculty, departmental and course level; and a wide range of exemplar service-learning case studies in a variety of academic disciplines.

Having described some of the achievements made in terms of community engagement in S.A. HE after ten years of democracy it must be emphasised that these achievements are relatively small in scale in relation to the overall task of mainstreaming community engagement as a core academic function. Even within those institutions that have made significant progress, the adoption of community engagement is a slow, time-consuming and often painful – if liberating – process, as community engagement infuses new energy and insights into teaching and research.

1 White Paper 1997: Sections 1.2, 1.28 and 2.36.
3 See JET-CHESP website (www.chesp.org.za), Service-learning, Quality Assurance.
4 CHE/HEQC 2004: 19.
5 See JET-CHESP website (www.chesp.org.za), Advocacy, Policy – for a full report on this meeting.
6 See JET-CHESP website (www.chesp.org.za), Research, Community Engagement Audits.
7 See JET-CHESP website (www.chesp.org.za), Advocacy, HEIs – for examples of HEI policies and strategies.
8 See JET-CHESP website (www.chesp.org.za), Service-learning – for range of courses.
9 See JET-CHESP website (www.chesp.org.za), Monitoring and Evaluation – for results of the JET-CHESP monitoring and evaluation of service-learning courses.
11 See JET-CHESP website (www.chesp.org.za)
BUSINESS, HIGHER EDUCATION AND REGIONAL DEVELOPMENT: NORTH EAST OF ENGLAND PERSPECTIVE

BACKGROUND:
The Higher Education Funding Council for England (HEFCE) currently provides a small funding stream to support third strand activities, currently labelled the Higher Education Innovation Fund under which funds are awarded to individual institutions on a competitive basis. The UK Treasury commissioned a major review of Business – University Collaboration (the Lambert Review) and recommended, inter alia, the following:

“third stream funding should be substantial, permanent and allocated in a way that enables universities to make long term plans for these activities”

“third stream funding support regional shared services in technology transfer”

“increase in the level of proof of concept funding”

“give Regional Development Agencies targets that promote business – university collaboration”

“create a significant new stream of business relevant research funding”

This last recommendation is particularly significant as third stream funding is dwarfed by funding provided to support research excellence determined by peer review through the national Research Assessment Exercise (RAE). This funding is heavily concentrated in London and the South East region with four institutions (Oxford, Cambridge, Imperial College London and University College London) receiving one third of the funding from this source. Other funding, for example for research infrastructure and from the research councils, parallels these allocations. The allocation of funding however does not recognise that universities in the peripheral regions face a greater challenge in knowledge exploitation than those in the South of the country, and nor does it recognise that universities have a role in tackling problems of uneven development.

In contrast to the area of higher education, the UK does have a regional policy sponsored by the industry and territorial ministries. Regional Development Agencies are funded differentially to recognise regional disparities. In response to a Treasury review of these disparities the agencies responsible for the three Northern Regions have launched an initiative entitled “The Northern Way” in which the universities are playing a leading role through their regional associations. As an initial contribution to the Northern Way agenda, the three Northern higher education associations identified eighteen proposals for consideration as a potential pan regional initiative.

Three main areas have now been prioritised where additional resources would have most significant impact on Northern economic development – the Northern Science Initiative, Centres of Professional excellence, and Higher Level Skills Enhancement. How this collaborative initiative will pan out in the higher education policy environment which foster competition between institutions regardless of their locations, remains an open question.

NEWCASTLE UNIVERSITY
Newcastle University is a research intensive multi-faculty university with a medical school and located in the peripheral and less prosperous north east region of England. It has its roots in the local economy but has successfully become a national and global institution. It is now seeking to re-engage with the city and the region. Restructuring designed to raise its competitive position globally has had a strong local component. A revised mission statement is to be “A world class research led educational institution playing a leading role in the economic, social and cultural development of the North East of England”. A significant restructuring of the university faculties and departments has taken place to introduce greater clarity in the academic management hierarchy and to ensure an ability to respond corporately to the needs of business and the community.

A significant restructuring of the university faculties and departments has taken place to introduce greater clarity in the academic management hierarchy and to ensure an ability to respond corporately to the needs of business and the community.

1. Enhancing devolved business development to embed third strand activity in three new faculties.
2. Enhancing the commercialisation of intellectual property through specialist advice.
3. Developing consultancy, commercial services and continuing professional development.
4. Building collaborative links in technology transfer with other universities in the region.
5. Creating enterprising staff and students by developments within the curriculum and work with alumni

One of the faculties, Science, Agriculture and Engineering has undertaken a mapping of its research strength into the five Centres of Excellence in knowledge exploitation established by the Regional Development Agency as part of its Regional Economic Strategy. These centres aim to link actual and potential strengths in the regional economy with the research base and embrace:

- Digital technology and media
- New and renewable energy
- Process industries
- Nanotechnology, photonics and micro systems
- Life sciences

The faculty’s research strategy is to ensure a coherent programme of long term R&D on major themes that will fill the pipeline of knowledge exploitation into the future. A further key strategy is bringing interaction with business onto the university campus. This is well exemplified by the Institute of Nanoscale Science and Technology (INSAT) and its commercial arm (INEX). The key elements in the INEX strategy are:

- Providing external users from industry, academia and government with access to a dedicated bio-hybrid and micro-nanofabrication facility (cf. ‘embedded teams’)
- Employing a dedicated team drawn from industry to run and manage the facility
- Mapping INSAT capabilities with industrial needs
- Providing continual professional development courses (from short two-day highly specialised programmes to longer courses)
- Setting up a one-stop shop for licensing and investment opportunities
- Acting as a focal point for academic staff to exploit their investigations and developments

In reviewing the university’s strategy and comparing it with a more conventional science park in Copenhagen (Symbion), it was concluded:

> Here the vision is not to transfer certain research results with particular commercial potential from the university to the regional economy, rather it is to make the university itself an active player in the regional economy, in other words to place the university ‘at the heart of the regional economy’.

A fundamental difference between this and the traditional model is that the latter is tailored to help commercialise research, whereas the Newcastle model seeks to build an institution that is capable of producing commercialisable research. The traditional model is tailored to help new entrepreneurs commercialise research-based technologies, while the Newcastle model seeks to make entrepreneurs of students and commercialisable technologies of research.

However this agenda is not without its problems. For example, the Centres for Excellence supported by the RDA have their own targets and run the risk of a problem identified by the OECD in its 2002 review of the UK Science and Technology Base namely:

> “A relatively large infrastructure of intermediate organisations has developed in response to successive initiatives … the issue at stake is whether excessive emphasis on specialist transfer agencies could monopolise knowledge flows and act as a barrier to the creation of a positive knowledge culture diffused throughout the industry – science nexus. In other words, is there a risk of consigning industry science relations to peripheral units”.

OECD UK Science and Technology Review 2002

One of the most successful schemes for technology transfer in the UK has been the Teaching Company Scheme under which postgraduate students work 50/50 between the university and the partner company. Many universities have work placement schemes as part of their teaching programmes and many run modules to develop enterprise skills.

CONCLUSION

This discussion has concentrated on knowledge exploitation from scientific research and have said little about the role of teaching and the contribution of the social sciences and humanities. One of the most successful schemes for technology transfer in the UK has been the Teaching Company Scheme under which postgraduate students work 50/50 between the university and the partner company. Many universities have work placement schemes as part of their teaching programmes and many run modules to develop enterprise skills. Some have developed student volunteering programmes to support the community and voluntary sector. And last but not least many play an active role in the local arts and cultural arena, ensuring the universities contribute to the creation of vibrant places that attract and retain innovative people.

The very breadth of this agenda makes it a challenging one for university managers and external funders. It crosses the functional portfolios of vice chancellors and interacts with the concerns of a wide range of external stakeholders. Many of the areas have no obvious performance metrics nor is the impact of external engagement on the bottom line of the university accounts obvious in the short run. But if in the long run universities are to continue to act as key institutions in civil society their managers must come to grips with the need to actively engage with the economic, social and cultural development agendas of their communities.
1. RAPID ECONOMIC GROWTH AND CONCENTRATION OF POPULATION AND ECONOMIC ACTIVITIES IN THE CAPITAL REGION

For the past four decades, Korea has experienced remarkable economic growth. GNP per capita has increased to US$10,013 in 2002 from US$83 in 1960 and total exports have risen 11.1 percent per annum during the period of 1977–2002. However, the concentration of population and economic activities in the Capital Region (Seoul, Incheon and the surrounding Gyeonggi Province) has been one of the most dominant spatial patterns in the process of rapid industrialization and urbanization, resulting in increasing regional inequalities within Korea.

Since the inception of President Roh’s administration in February 2003, the government has given much higher priority to achieving balanced regional development by introducing a new policy framework that comprises regional governance, the regional innovation system, and partnerships between key relevant actors. This policy direction was further reinforced by promulgating the Special Law on Balanced National Development in January 2004, the first legislation dealing with more balanced regional development in a comprehensive way ever enacted in Korea.

2. THE SPECIAL ACT ON THE BALANCED NATIONAL DEVELOPMENT

Establishment of a mid-term plan for the balanced national development plan at a national and a regional level

The Special Law on Balanced National Development requires a Balanced National Development Plan (BNDP) to be implemented every five years based on the Regional Innovation Enhancement Plan prepared by Seoul Metropolitan Government, six Metropolitan Cities, and nine provincial governments. The national goal and strategies of balanced regional development are thus supposed to be synthesized into the BNDP. The plan must include a broad coverage of regional development policies. To name a few: the goal of balanced regional development; the stimulation of regional innovation systems and strategic industrial clusters; the fostering of university R&D capabilities in each region; the promotion of lagging regions; the relocation of public offices; and the raising of investment funds. The first BNDP was formulated in 2004 through inter-ministerial coordination and with close consultation with local governments.

Another important clause in the law is concerned with the establishment of a permanent body for not only carrying out intensified horizontal and vertical coordination, but also maintaining a long-term consistency in policy decision and budget allocation.

Establishment of the Presidential Committee for Nationally Balanced Development (PCNBD)

Another important clause in the law is concerned with the establishment of a permanent body for not only carrying out intensified horizontal and vertical coordination, but also maintaining a long-term consistency in policy decision and budget allocation. A single and permanent organization, the Presidential Committee on Balanced National Development established by the presidential decree in April 2003, will coordinate policies and prepare strategic decisions on balanced regional development. The Committee is directly responsible to the President. The Committee is thus expected to motivate relevant ministries, local authorities and all stakeholders involving firms, universities, research institutions and NGOs, and to provide opportunities to improve cross-sectoral communications.

Creation of the Special Account on Balanced National Development

The law also authorizes the central government to create the Special Account on Balanced National Development. This account is mainly intended to support both regional innovation and regional development priority projects. The special account, amounting to approximately US$4billion, is likely to help stimulate more balanced regional development by allocating the funds among localities more objectively and transparently.

The relocation of Public Offices & A New administrative capital plan

With respect to the relocation of public offices, the government since its inception has pushed to move public institutions in Seoul and its surrounding areas to other regions. The institutions to be relocated include state-run agencies, research institutions and public corporations. A new administrative capital plan was also planned as one of the highest priorities of the current administration, however the initial plan has implementation difficulties because of the Constitutional Court’s decision against the plan. The Court gave a decision in late 2004 that the plan violates the current Constitution; therefore, the
Constitution should be revised in due course in order for the government to be able to move the Capital outside Seoul, the present Capital of Korea.

In short, all these policies are strongly expected to disperse the over-crowded population and the dominated economic activities from the Capital Region, and thereby facilitate more balanced regional development, which can lead to social and spatial justice.

In short, all these policies are strongly expected to disperse the over-crowded population and the dominated economic activities from the Capital Region, and thereby facilitate more balanced regional development, which can lead to social and spatial justice.

3. NEW UNIVERSITY FOR REGIONAL INNOVATION (NURI) PROJECT

Overview
Under this policy context, after a long period of preparation, the Ministry of Education & Human Resources Development (MOE hereafter) launched the New University for Regional Innovation (NURI) Project in January 2004. The Project is part of national activities to contribute to nationally balanced development and will continue for five years from 2004 through 2008. The core concept of the NURI project is to establish regional innovation systems to enhance the economic competitiveness of the region where HEIs are expected to play a pivotal role. Since the idea was originally initiated as a follow-up measure of implementing the Presidential pledge on “balanced regional development”, only local HEIs, outside the Capital region, are entitled to apply for the NURI fund. Those local HEIs applying for the fund should form a consortium with other key players in a region such as other regional HEIs, local governments, industries and NGOs. As of January 2005, 112 NURI project proposals were selected through a competitive bidding process.

Structure of the NURI Project
All HEIs wanting to join the Project should form a consortium with other key players in a region such as other HEIs, local governments, industries and NGOs. The Project consists of three different types classified largely by individual project cost. Ceiling of individual project cost given to each type are about US$ 4.5, 2.8 and 1 million, respectively. Out of the total Project fund, fifty percent will be allocated to large projects, thirty percent to medium projects and twenty percent to small projects.

Only HEIs located outside the Capital region can be the beneficiaries of the NURI funds. Three Provinces, out of sixteen Provinces in Korea, located in the Capital region including Seoul, Inchon and Kyunggi Province are therefore excluded in the Project. All Provinces are required to organize their own Regional Innovation committee. A committee consists of members from HEIs, government, industries and NGOs in the local area. The committee is responsible for reviewing each project proposal by local HEIs and advising the MOE. The MOE is in charge of managing the whole process of the Project including the selection of proposals, organization of an evaluation committee, allocation of funds, and monitoring and evaluation. Important decisions made by MOE on the Project are supported by two special committees. One is the Committee for Human Resources Development responsible for coordination of HRD activities initiated by central government. The other is the Presidential Committee for Nationally Balanced Development. Its roles in the Project are to observe the performance of the Project and to make recommendations for its development.

Evaluation and Monitoring
HEIs whose proposals are finally adopted by MOE are able to receive MOE funding continuously for five years, on the condition that they pass annual and interim evaluation. Three ways of managing quality and performance are introduced in the Project: consulting, annual evaluation, and interim evaluation. Purposes of consulting are to find problems and obstacles in project implementation and to provide participating institutions with technical assistance.
ENGAGING THE UNIVERSITY AND THE REGIONAL COMMUNITY: A STRATEGY FOR COMPETITIVENESS, VIABILITY, AND EQUITY

1. INTRODUCTION:
There are now more than 160 university campuses in Australia and many more university teaching and learning access centres. About one-third of these campuses are located in non-metropolitan areas. Much of this rapid regionalisation of universities has come about over the past two decades on the back of efficiency and equity policy arguments that were false and there is now a need for new strategies that better connect these universities with the regional communities in which they deliver their services.

This connection between space and the higher education system, and the increasing need for new ways to boost competitiveness, enhance institutional viability, and reduce inequity within and between metropolitan and non-metropolitan areas has led to a growth in interest in forming meaningful and mutual partnerships between universities and the regional communities in which they have an interest in. Spurred on by the recognised benefits of knowledge creation and distribution in a global environment of rapid change, institutional managers, regional community practitioners and leaders, researchers, educators and policy developers have over the last seven or eight years been facilitating the formation of new partnerships built around location. It is not a ‘third way’ or ‘add-on’ in the way that some universities have previously seen their community service obligations as additional to teaching and research – it connotes the academy and regional society as a whole. For universities, it is a way of designing and delivering their teaching, learning and research that has relevance to the communities in which they reside. For communities, it is seeing how their active and creative human capital can be put to enterprising and productive purposes right across the economic, social, cultural and environmental spectrum.

For the university, regional community engagement represents an additional strategy by which they can draw on a much wider range of regional attributes (human capital, infrastructure, leadership, social capital, etc) in pursuing their viability options. For the regional community trying to remain competitive and viable in an increasingly idea-dependent world, it provides a much underutilised asset that is right on their doorstep. For government, trying to maintain a viable and accessible higher education system as well as some balance in the way the spatial economy develops, facilitating such engagement arrangements between HEI’s and their regional communities must make just good sense.

The location arguments underlying these decisions follow the embedded institutionalist views that suggest that the mere presence of competitive firms, efficiently running infrastructure and institutions, technology diffusion programs and other government program intervention can be enough to stimulate a region’s growth and competitiveness. This simple view of regional growth and competitiveness also underscores the competitive behaviour of firms and institutions in a global capitalist system.

The alternate view, and the one subscribed to here, is that regions are much more than simple scaled down versions of the national economy and more than a simple amalgam of a few behaviour-less competitive firms and institutions. Regional viability is a function of the full range of a community’s endogenous cultural, economic, social, human and natural attributes. A region’s resources of human capital (creative and enterprising skills and knowledge) are mostly important – and this is core business for universities.

Based on the simple structural view of regional growth, many Vice-Chancellors often quote excessive regional economic multiplier figures to support their case that their university is a valuable part of the regions growth and competitiveness. These multipliers of course do not see the university as a knowledge creator and distributor, but simply a supplier of public infrastructure in the same way that a correctional centre, hospital, utility supplier, etc would perform this role.

There has also been a view that the location of a campus in a regional area would lead to an
agglomeration of knowledge dependent business around it, along the lines of the science and technology parks at Silicon Valley, Cambridge, Boston’s Route 128, and other popular examples. This country has been littered by failed attempts in this area. Generally as thinly disguised real estate ventures, particularly in non-metropolitan areas, these initiatives have ignored (and in some cases knowingly done so) the research which identifies the way spatial flows of technology occur.

It could be argued, as a worst case situation, that the university that does not relate to the full range of attributes of its community in meaningful knowledge ways through its teaching, learning and research programs, could in fact be a net drain on the local region – not a booster. The disengaged university campus may be the very worst economic driver for a regional community. The university that encourages local students to up-skill and move to another region, by running programs with no local relevance, undertakes research for other regions, rather than addressing local issues, and does not attract cutting-edge knowledge workers may argue it contributes to national benefits but it causes knowledge outflow from the region it is in.

The second myth underlying the simple regionalisation of campuses over the past two decades in this country has resulted from a view that historically low higher education participation rates in non-metropolitan and peri-urban areas could be turned around by enhancing the proximity of the campus to students in these areas. There has been considerable research by DEST and others over recent years that have shown that, by itself, university campus proximity is not a booster of higher education participation. Policies that do not cause universities to go beyond a ‘just being there’ approach to their location will not achieve their objective of building the viability of the university through its location. It is also unlikely they will have any positive impact on the viability of the community in which the campus is located.

What is needed from universities, communities and governments is much more than simple regionalisation – a much stronger connection between the attributes of the universities and the places they are located in is required.

3. BUILDING UNIVERSITY-REGIONAL ENGAGEMENT

At the regional scale, universities can enhance the viability of the communities in which they are located through their teaching and learning, research, and leadership in various ways. They can:

- Tailor and target teaching and learning programs to areas of identified regional skill need and build-in course elements so as to facilitate an enterprising culture among those undertaking the learning. There are a number of universities that now tailor their programs to the specific institutional and corporate needs of the region. There are few programs in universities however that aim to facilitate the enterprising abilities of graduates and undergraduates, to enable them to apply their ideas in the local region to bring about change.

- Design undergraduate access requirements that equate with the region’s socio-economic circumstances. There are a number of examples of universities where this already occurs.

- Design courses that are delivered in a flexible way so as to respond to the changing demographic and other circumstances of the region.

- Introduce initiatives such as business incubators, practicums, scholarships, awareness raising programs, and other means to maximise undergraduate attendance and graduate retention in the region.

- Targeted local research in partnership with local community groups.

- The university may contribute social capital in the community through its leadership and strategic focus, its marketing and promotion, and infrastructure provision. In a few cases this contribution goes beyond simple civic capital into enterprising action to get things done locally.

4. THE ENGAGEMENT MODEL

As the figure below shows, the challenge for university management in being fully responsive to the labour market, innovation, social, cultural and environmental requirements of the local region is to integrate, tailor and target its teaching, research, infrastructure and community activities. For the regional community, the challenge is to recognise and value the potential significance of their human capital, and the creative and enterprising outcomes it can bring through knowledge and learning, and to work in partnership with the university in a way that can bring mutual benefit.

5. GROWTH IN REGIONAL ENGAGEMENT

There is certainly much more interest in building university and community partnerships today then there were six or eight years ago. A number of universities have changed their strategic plans and missions to reflect the need to strengthen these connections. Some universities have appointed senior people to take on responsibility for building these relationships. There are now many more case study examples of ‘good practice’ engagement occurring across a spectrum of social, cultural and environmental dimensions. Conferences such as the Insideout conference in Queensland held every two years, the annual regional engagement forum organised by the newly formed Australian Universities Community Engagement Alliance (AUCEA) of networked universities show an increasing interest in this area.

Just this year alone there are at least four major conferences in Australia on community engagement that involve the role of universities. The United Nations and the Queensland Government have partnered in running a conference on Engaging Communities in August in Brisbane (www.engagingcommunities2005); the Australian Universities Quality Agency has a theme for its annual Forum in Sydney in July this year of Engaging Communities (www.auqa.edu.au/auqa/2005); the AUCEA conference in Melbourne in July is entitled Universities and Communities: Learning and Engaging through Sustainable Partnership (www.uws.edu.au/aucea/conf05); and the biennial Insideout Conference on community
engagement will again be held this year at the University of Queensland.

In January this year, the OECD launched its international project \textit{Supporting the Contribution of Higher Education Institutions to Regional Development} (see later article), involving regions and their universities in 12 countries, and finally the Business and Higher Education Roundtable has undertaken a series of roundtable discussions in regions throughout Australia. These can be seen on the B-HERT web site \url{www.bhert.edu.au}

6. BENEFITS FOR THE UNIVERSITY

Returns to the university from its connection with its community can include focussing research and teaching around regional characteristics and regional partners, gaining access to local students, economies of scale through resource sharing, access to regional social capital and knowledge resources, and informing strategic planning and implementation practices. Regional partnerships in many ways have to be easier for the university than the partnerships they develop that are geographically and culturally distant.

7. BENEFITS FOR THE COMMUNITY

Regional communities have not as yet fully realised the importance of building knowledge and learning connections for their viability. Few specifically refer to it in their strategic plans and few have undertaken knowledge audits in their communities. Some regional communities rank highly in terms of their human capital attributes, but rate lowly in terms of their ability to turn these attributes into socio-economic benefits for their community.

A community’s connections with its university can assist with skill development, business development, urban and rural planning, cultural expansion, the provision of health, social and environmental services, and the provision of community leadership. It can play a role in finding solutions to today’s problems, and it can assist in mapping what the future could be.

Importantly for the regional community is the need to build an enterprising culture. University education can play a valuable role in fostering this enterprising culture through their learning and research programs.
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\textbf{Figure 1: Value adding through the university/region interface}

\begin{itemize}
\item \textbf{T} = teaching & access to regional
\item \textbf{R} = research specialisation & training
\item \textbf{I} = Infrastructure & resource efficiency
\item \textbf{S} = Community service & access to social capital
\item Value added university management
\item Value added regional management
\item University/region interface
\end{itemize}

\textbf{Source:} Adapted from OECD. 1999. \textit{The Response of Higher Education Institutions to Regional Needs.}
SUPPORTING THE CONTRIBUTION OF HIGHER EDUCATIONS TO REGIONAL DEVELOPMENT: THE OECD PROGRAM ON INSTITUTIONAL MANAGEMENT IN HIGHER EDUCATION (IMHE)

1. BACKGROUND
In January this year the OECD Program on Institutional Management in Higher Education (IMHE), in association with the Higher Education Funding Council for England (HEFCE), launched a new international project aimed at strengthening the competitiveness and viability of regions and the higher education institutions that are engaged with them. The project follows up a 1999 OECD/IMHE project report: Response of HEIs to Regional Needs.

The project will evaluate the current contribution of HEIs to regional development; assist institutions, government and communities with dialogue to identify initiatives and build partnerships in regions to enhance this agenda; lay the foundations for an international network for supporting ongoing discussion over the long term; and offer a methodology for monitoring & international benchmarking for improvement.

2. EVALUATION METHODOLOGY
The project involves a number of iterations of regional self-evaluation & international peer review. Each region forms its own broadly-based regional steering committee comprising regional, HEI and government and other stakeholder interests. A regional coordinator is appointed to liaise between the region, HEIs, the Steering Committee and the OECD Secretariat and to organize events locally. Through dialogue, information collection and agreement, a self-evaluation is undertaken of the way the relationship between the region and the HEIs is contributing to competitive outcomes for the region and viability returns for the institutions. Policy perspectives are also important in the evaluation. Once the draft self-evaluation report is completed at the regional level, an OECD peer review team will visit the region, the HEIs, and national and state governments to also evaluate the relationships and policies and provide feedback on the self-evaluation report to the region. A national workshop will enable broader views to form part of the evaluation exercise and a final self-evaluation report to be completed.

When evaluation reports for all participating regions and their HEIs are complete an international comparison and calibration is carried out and key themes drawn out to assist regions, HEIs and governments. An important element of the project is the building of long standing network relationships between the participating regions where there can be exchange of information, sharing of understandings and experiences and programs of continuous improvement.

3. PARTICIPATION
Participation by regions and universities in the project was limited to nationally recognised administrative regions where there has been an interest and practice in HEIs and the regional community working together to enhance regional competitiveness and institutional viability. Only one region and its HEIs in each country is participating in the project as the table below shows.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LARGE REGION (COUNTRY)</th>
<th>SMALL REGION (COUNTRY)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jutland-Funen (Denmark)</td>
<td>Varmland (Sweden)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oresund (Denmark/ Sweden)</td>
<td>Jyväskylä (Finland)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comunidad Valenciana (Spain)</td>
<td>Mid-Norwegian Region (Trøndelag, and Trondheim) (Norway)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Busan (Sth Korea)</td>
<td>Twente (Netherlands)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North East England (UK)</td>
<td>Canary Islands (Spain)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nurvo Leon (Mexico)</td>
<td>Sunshine Coast (Australia)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. TIMETABLE
The project was launched in Paris in January 2005 and is due for completion in December 2006. The self-evaluation process will occur from February through to September and the peer review process from June through to December 2005. The region’s response to the peer review process and refinements to the Self-evaluation report will occur in the first half of 2006 and the international comparisons and final international conference will be held in the latter half of 2006.
INTRODUCTION

In a paper for B-HERT in July 2003 (B-HERT News, Issue 17), I described a sea change in the way that universities generally had engaged with the communities they serve. There was a shift in the 90’s in approach from ‘outreach’, which I described as ‘a benevolent dictatorship in which the university decides what the community needs and gives it to them’, to engagement, where universities work in partnership to value add in social, economic and cultural development initiatives. Since then, partnership initiatives led by or involving the University of the Sunshine Coast have grown both in scope and in pace, and have given life and flavour to a conceptual framework involving:

- integrating teaching, research and service
- recognising diverse faculty interests and valuing/fostering multi disciplinary approaches and
- giving scholarly work a public purpose.

But this is not to say that actively pursuing engagement is without its difficulties and tensions. Indeed, one of the most critical of these is the tension between the increasing emphasis on short time horizons inherent in the rapidly changing environment in which the University operates, and the much longer time horizons required to develop the kinds of relationships and partnerships that yield significant benefits for the community and the region.

In this paper, I’d like to use a single example – the development of the Sippy Downs Knowledge Precinct – to illustrate this point.

SIPPY DOWNS AS A ‘KNOWLEDGE HUB’ FOR THE SUNSHINE COAST

In the recent draft South East Queensland Regional Plan, Sippy Downs (where the University is headquartered) is identified as a Knowledge Hub, with the expectation that it will evolve into a Major or Principal Activity Centre by 2026.

According to the Plan:

*These Centres provide the focus for major emerging communities, comprising the primary focus of regionally significant urban growth. They are planned to evolve to provide key sub regional or district concentrations of administrative, business, retail, cultural and entertainment activity. They are also the preferred locations for major health, education and public transport services. (Qld Govt 2004, 37)*

To give some perspective on how far Sippy Downs has come, I’ll diverge to briefly outline its history.

Sippy Downs was part of the Moolooloo Plains pastoral run leased by John Westaway & Sons in the 1860s. The run extended from the Maroochy River to the Mooloolah River and was bordered by a coastal strip on the east.

In 1870, all runs ceased and land became available for selection or lease. What is now Sippy Downs was noted as an open plain of wallum country, treeless, swampy plain, sandy soil with numerous holes, and considered unsuitable for agricultural or grazing purposes. As a result, it was designated a ‘Remnant Block’.

The block was surveyed in 1938, and occupied as a perpetual lease selection until 1957, when the lease was forfeited. It was incorporated with other blocks to make it more viable and in 1964 Alfred Grant Cattle Corporation was granted a special lease on the land for cattle fattening and breeding. This company went into liquidation in 1979 and in 1987 the Queensland Industrial Development Corporation became the owner and acted as the Bank for the Crown.

The Sippy Downs Development Control Plan and Urban Design Master Plan envisaged Sippy Downs as an integrated knowledge community, and a regional hub for the knowledge based economy on the Sunshine Coast.

It’s last use prior to rezoning in 1993 to allow the creation of the University, was as a cane field.

When the University took possession of its Stage I buildings on the Sippy Downs site on 15 December 1995, one of the main concerns about the site was that the University be seen as part of the community rather than standing apart from it. In addition to the on site issues this created, the issue of complementary development on the boundaries of the University was also critical.

Following planning seminars sponsored by local councils, the Minister for Local Government invited stakeholders to participate in the preparation of a Development Control Plan (DCP) for Sippy Downs, including the University precinct.

The Sippy Downs Development Control Plan and Urban Design Master Plan envisaged Sippy Downs as an integrated knowledge community, and a regional hub for the knowledge based economy on the Sunshine Coast. To capture the essence of this vision, the parties characterise developments in and around Sippy Downs as a ‘Knowledge Precinct’.

The Knowledge Precinct therefore comprises both physical developments (eg the Sippy Downs Township, a Technology Park, etc), and knowledge based developments such as collaborative ventures delivered by education service providers and generated from the shared Sippy Downs site.
One of the central developments, which has both physical and knowledge based elements, is the Technology Park project, which was conceived with three implementation phases:

1. The Innovation Centre: A small business incubator located at the entrance to the University
2. The Accelerator: A next stage development designed to accommodate graduates of the incubator program, compatible high tech businesses and service firms and
3. The Technology Park itself.

Phase 1 of the project – the Innovation Centre – was launched in January 2002, and was recognised in the following year as ‘Australia’s Regional Incubator of the Year’ by AusIndustry and the Australian and New Zealand Association of Business Incubators.

Supported by all three tiers of government and by the business community of the Sunshine Coast and, increasingly, Brisbane, the Innovation Centre has attracted and selected twelve high potential companies – from over 1500 inquiries and applications – across a range of industry sectors, including software development, electronics, multimedia and video production, technical documentation, and neuraceuticals. The businesses currently based at the incubator employ around 60 people, with 43 in full time jobs.

Already, the incubator is ahead of schedule to fill its remaining space, and it is anticipated that the Centre will be at full capacity before the end of this year.

This rapid growth has meant that planning for Phase 2 – the Accelerator – has had to be brought forward.

...it will allow for high growth, high tech businesses to be nurtured and retained within the region, providing next stage space for graduates of the Innovation Centre’s incubation program, and allowing for compatible high tech businesses and service firms to collocate.

The Accelerator will support businesses through their early stages of growth and development and, with a flow through of growing businesses, it is estimated that at least 500 jobs will be created in the initial 10 year period.

Importantly, it will allow for high growth, high tech businesses to be nurtured and retained within the region, providing next stage space for graduates of the Innovation Centre’s incubation program, and allowing for compatible high tech businesses and service firms to collocate.

A business case has already been developed for the Accelerator, which will be built on University land, in close proximity to both the Sippy Downs Township and the University.

The final phase in the Technology Park Project – the development of the Park itself – was given a major boost when, in 2004, a parcel of land was identified and earmarked by the Queensland Government to provide the initial footprint for the Park.

The Park will provide a pathway through which graduating and high growth companies from the Innovation Centre and the Accelerator can be retained within the region. It will also focus on attracting complementary established companies, as well as service providers.

The aim of this three phase project can be expressed in three words – jobs, jobs, jobs! More specifically, it seeks to catalyse the generation of high value, knowledge based jobs and sustainable economic development on the Sunshine Coast.

In the University’s mission, we don’t just talk about engagement. What we actually say is that we will act as a major catalyst of regional development, including economic development. This implies, and I can confirm, that the University often has to ‘take the bit between its teeth’ and take a leading role. In this case, we took the initiative by establishing the Innovation Centre (which is wholly owned by the University), providing the land and developing the business case for the Accelerator, and taking a lead role in discussions on the Technology Park.

Having said that, however, the Commonwealth Government, Queensland Government, Maroochy Shire Council, and the Sunshine Coast business community have been with us all the way. Without their direct support and expertise, the Technology Park project would never have gotten off the ground.

Activity surrounding the development of the Sippy Downs Township has also gathered momentum over the past year. Ownership of privately held land surrounding the site has consolidated, and ongoing and fruitful discussions are continuing with a view to retaining the conceptualisation of the township as one complementary to the knowledge based developments taking place all around it.

As one might expect, the University has taken a strong role in bringing together the parties – Maroochy Shire Council, various Queensland Government Departments, private developers and other community groups – not only to address planning issues, but also to ensure that essential infrastructure (eg transport, ICT) is in place to best serve the needs of those living and working in the Knowledge Precinct.
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IMPLEMENTING REGIONAL COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT: THE CASE OF SWINBURNE UNIVERSITY, LILYDALE

ANNE LANGWORTHY
Director,
Centre for Regional Development
Swinburne University of Technology, Lilydale

1. THE LOCAL SITUATION
The Act of Parliament that established Swinburne as a university specifically outlined a regional role for the campus at Lilydale. Thus in the eight years that the campus has been operating the concept of serving the region has been in the forefront of campus activity. During the past three years much work has been done to understand the role the university plays regionally and to make some assessment of the impact that it is having on the region. Competition for Government funding is making it clear that engagement with the regional community is imperative for not only success but survival.

Outer urban in nature, the region does face the challenge of losing its knowledge workers. Unlike other outer Melbourne urban areas, the outer east is bound by the green wedge and expects negligible growth. Nonetheless, it has a significant population of over 330,000 – homogenous, ageing and with pockets of socio-economic disadvantage. During the intercensal period, 1996–2001, there was a slight increase in residents with Bachelor degree or higher but the number of residents with higher education qualifications is still below Eastern Melbourne, Melbourne and Victoria on average. Residents tend to travel out of the region for work and regional graduate employment rates are low. Retention is an issue for secondary schools. More students apply for than are offered tertiary positions and fewer students take up these tertiary positions. Youth workforce participation in higher education.

2. PERCEPTIONS AND EXPECTATIONS
Business:
Businesses representatives commented that much regional employment did not require tertiary qualifications. The exception was accountancy businesses which noted that the complexity of modern legislation and the business environment meant that a degree is now a necessity. Accountancy businesses stressed the value of Industry based Learning (IBL). Although the value of development and training was acknowledged, credentials were not necessarily seen as important; cultural change needs to occur for the community to embrace education. It was felt that universities needed to be more accessible, that perceived barriers need to be removed and a long-term strategy developed with the aim of developing a sense that the community “owns” the university.

Local Government CEOs:
Local government is concerned about trades, industry leadership, availability of courses desired by local students, mature aged students, changes in the workforce, business training for the 45 plus “at risk” group, the economy of the region and upskilling of the workforce. It was noted that it was difficult to quantify the value of lifelong learning and the need for ongoing personal development. The concept of collaboration between the three Councils ( ) and the idea of the university providing educational opportunities to staff was discussed in addition to the university facilitating regional collaboration around strategic projects. Leadership and strategic direction in terms of regional development was seen as desirable. Collaborative projects with the three local governments in the Outer East have demonstrated the power of the university facilitative/independent broker role.

Community Houses:
Community houses are providing education for young people disaffected by school – some are entering into VCAL and collaboration with schools. The number of home-schooled students in the region was noted. Although the traditional community house preserve of mature-age education and re-entry into study is still dominant, it was noted that young people and employed people upskilling are significant participants. The issue of cost of education was discussed and it was felt that cost was a significant disincentive to regional participation in higher education.

Principals:
Issues of student engagement and aspirations are as much a concern to secondary school staff as university staff and thus the idea of closer collaboration was very appealing to principals. Seven local schools are collaborating in a leading schools initiative and have welcomed Swinburne as a partner. In addition to the research component to the new initiative, the university has funded a regional study into student aspiration and enterprise in the region. Additional opportunities for this collaboration include cross-fertilisation with university subjects taught at night in schools; involving business to clarify skills needed; promotion of extension studies; hosting a dinner for VCE teachers and first year lecturers; a teacher professional development program; linking VCAL to a foundation year; and career teacher education.
The township and wider community:
Sociology and Statistical Research Methods undergraduate students interviewed local township businesses in 2003 and local Australian Retired Pensioners Association and Rotary members in 2004. The aim of the research/interviews was to collect information about community perceptions regarding the role and function of the University within the local community.

Interviewees were able to identify a number of significant areas of change in the community since the campus was built in 1996 (for example, an increase in the amount of people and traffic in the local area; an increase in property values; an increase in the number of residential properties; an increase in the number of young people and Asian students in the area; an increase in the amount of student accommodation; an increase in business activity; more businesses in the areas; and an increase in the number of entertainment venues). However, they were unsure about just how much the university had contributed to this change. Whilst there was a general perception that the presence of the University in Lilydale is positive because it has provided increased educational prospects for local students and has indirectly caused an increase in local business activity generally, opinions seemed to be based on generic expectations rather than an actual knowledge of what the University offers or in fact achieves.

The students:
The University campus serves a significant number of regional students, although the percentage of students coming from the region has declined as overall student numbers have risen.

An examination of regional VTAC preferences showed that 35% of eligible 2002 school VCE graduates were enrolled in higher education in 2003. Those who entered employment after VCE tended to be engaged in low-level and often part-time work.

Swinburne does enrol the most university participants from the local region and offers courses that meet local demand (In order of preference: Business [1], Social and Behavioural Science [5], Computing [6], Multimedia [7], Media [8], but not Education [2] Nursing [3] and Arts [4]). The relationship of student demand to regional need and the role of these courses in developing a sustainable regional community are yet to be fully explored.

A total 136 student survey/interviews were conducted in 2002 and 2003 as part of a research project designed to explore current student perspectives of their university studies in relation to other priorities in their lives. The final phase of this project will be undertaken in second semester 2005 and will add to the quantity and depth of the data collected. In addition to information about student use of services and student perceptions of life on campus, the following initial observations have been noted at this stage of this study.

• Most of the students interviewed (84.5%) were 25 years of age or younger; were studying full time (86%) most of the students interviewed were single and had no children (84.6%); were living with their parents (73.3%); had computers at home (98.5%); and travelled to University by car (80.9%) with a travel time ranging between 15 – 44 minutes.
• The majority of students interviewed (61%) did not have parents who attended University and 52.8% of students did not have an older sibling who had attended University.
• Most full-time students worked and considered this a normal part of life. Whilst the maximum numbers of hours worked was 42.5, the average number of hours spent working was 14.5 hours; greater than the average number hours (10.9) spent studying. The impact of part-time work was most felt around assessment time.
• Most students chose the campus because of the location (close to home), the campus (small, new, friendly, close to nature), their ENTER score, or the courses offered.
• Students list priorities in life as study, family, work/career, socialising/friends.
• Students list barriers to study as work, socialising/friends, motivation, family, tiredness.

3. LESSONS LEARNED
Regional engagement initiatives have characterized campus activity since establishment. The partnership with the Shire of Yarra Ranges has been a focal point since 1999 both with the Town and Gown lecture series and with a number of regional projects and associations. Marketing strategies have been largely targeted to the region with the current marketing plan identifying priority schools and specific discipline based strategies in the areas of sociology and technology. The Centre for Regional Development has undertaken a range of regionally significant projects over recent years. However, many of these activities could be seen as peripheral to the development of engagement activities in the mainstream curriculum.

Apart from work related subjects or placements and some research activity which have traditionally involved partnerships outside the university, embedding engagement in the core business of the university is challenging. The workload model currently being developed at Lilydale seeks to acknowledge the work associated with community engagement where previously academics have not been rewarded or recognized for their efforts in this area. To balance structural constraints, most university staff members are committed citizens themselves so the merit of engagement is readily apparent. Helping staff to understand regional needs, mapping participation and making some assessment of the regional contribution of the university helps to build the case for making the connections. Supporting staff with establishing and maintaining the relationships is essential. Once this is done, the Swinburne experience shows that the biggest incentive is in the teaching and learning outcomes. Real projects and applied learning brings a richer and more rewarding student experience. It is also believed, but not substantiated by research as yet, that better academic results are an outcome.

It is clear that relationship building takes time. It is eight years since the campus was established, the partnership with the Shire celebrates its sixth anniversary this year and other relationships have years of experience. It is only now that crucial issues of regional sustainability are beginning to be addressed in any depth. It is only now that members of the community and community organizations approach the university with ideas about collaboration. It is only now that the university can begin to address a deeper understanding of the dynamic of engagement and begin to articulate objectives and measures in a meaningful way.
1. INTRODUCTION
The dream of having a Centre where rural communities are the primary focus of activity, and where resourcing, research and learning bought together interested people from regional educational institutions across Gippsland in Victoria came to fruition as the Centre for Rural Communities Inc. at Monash University Churchill Campus in 1995.

The teapot logo for the Centre, on a round table with hands reaching out, symbolises a place where rural people gather round and are welcome and their issues treated seriously and has been welcomed by rural people who understand the important inclusion of local knowledge.

The Centre’s inception was at a time when rural voices were largely absent from public debate and in the absence of a rural policy the alliance with regional educational institutions provided an important link for rural people. Since this time the Centre has produced a study circle kit, Building Rural Futures through Co-operation (Sheil 1997) and a professional development manual, Growing and Learning in Rural Communities (Sheil 2000) promoting a model of Collaborative Engagement from within rural communities.

A critical step in making this work available has been through the alliance with Monash University and its the accreditation of a Graduate Certificate in Regional Community Development, designed by the Centre for Rural Communities Inc. with funding from the Commonwealth Government through the Regional Solutions program in 2001.

The Graduate Certificate is a one year part-time program that provides access for regional workers to the resources, skills and knowledge of a major University, integrating current issues with theoretical knowledge. The cross-sectoral nature of the course reflects the need for an integrated approach to regional development and participants come from diverse backgrounds that include natural resource management, all levels of government, health, housing, enterprise development, art, tourism and recreation as well as Indigenous, women’s and community based organizations.

During the program workers make the transition to become educators by establishing study circles or projects in their community or workplace. The requirement that participants immediately put their intellectual knowledge into practice not only reinforces the relevance of this approach but ensures that local people own and guide projects and future planning. This secondary stage is accredited by TAFE providing access to library facilities and recognition of learning to community members.

The program has now been offered from Monash University’s Gippsland Campus for two years. In 2003 there were 15 participants and in 2004 there were 30 participants, and the partnership between Monash and the Centre has gained recognition by business, government and community organizations with growing sponsorship of workers into the course. East Gippsland Shire Council sponsored ten rural facilitators to participate in the Graduate Certificate and the course was offered from the East Gippsland Institute of TAFE’s Forest Industry Centre to facilitate access for these participants. Latrobe City Council sponsored seven Township Facilitators in the program. All parties are pleased with the outcomes and actively participate in showcasing the work at regional and national conferences.

A key factor in the course is engagement with local knowledge in a collaborative manner. For communities to move forward together, the establishment of study circles within communities facilitates people learning to work, plan and agree on future directions. This step enables local people to establish sound foundations and is an affordable and resourced option supported by a growing group of skilled facilitators.

In 2003–2004 study circles were facilitated by participants in 30 communities across Gippsland involving around 300 people. Benefits include the increased capability of local people as they use these skills in community associations, arts councils, childcare centres, community banks, festival committees, housing groups on Co-operative Boards for health and housing, community newspapers, youth groups, on sporting associations, Catchment Management Authorities, Landcare and indigenous and women’s organizations.

In beginning new ventures, communities are no longer isolated and a regional university campus is well placed to resource common initiatives across communities. A good example is the proliferation of rural community newspapers that inspired a Community Newspaper Conference attracting 80 participants keen to share their experiences and learn together. An outcome is a working party to look at the benefits of establishing an association for community newspapers.

The presence of skilled researchers and facilitators able
to incorporate local knowledge into planning and policy is welcomed by regional organizations (external consultancies are frequently expensive and fail to meet expectations). There is also evidence that relationships between communities and organizations with rural and regional responsibilities improve as local people have the space and time to plan together prior to negotiating future directions with organisations. These communities no longer feel invisible and are actively involved in strategic planning.

In October 2004 A Regional Affair, the story so far, conference and dvd, provided an opportunity to showcase the work of past and present students along with people from the study circles. The venue – the Living Resource Centre of East Gippsland’s Forest Industry that teaches conservation management, timber industry harvesting, value adding in wood design and the establishment of related business incubators on the one site set the scene. David Stone the manager welcomed people to Forestech acknowledging the foresight of those that sought integration of conservation and employment issues as a key to regional development ten years previously (www.egtafe.vic.edu.au).

Dr. Deborah Rose’s keynote address ‘Love and Reconciliation in the Forest’ (Rose 2004) shared stories of a dairy farmer from Southern New South Wales as he spoke of his relationship with the land on which he and his family had lived for generations. In different ways these people challenge us not to predetermine outcomes of engagement with rural people, a theme reinforced throughout the presentations by regional workers and community members as they spoke of the impact of this model of engagement for their communities. University staff, funding bodies and departmental agencies participated in a closing panel speaking of opportunities and constraints of community engagement from their perspectives.

A highlight of the event was the launching of tea-shirts featuring ‘driving the rural conspiracy’ to promote consideration of a rural policy in Australia similar to that in the European Union. Again the teapot is featured acknowledging the importance of people from within each community meeting and conspiring – breathing life into – vibrant futures for their communities, not in isolation but in partnership with other rural communities, urban communities, government, industry and of course educational institutions (Sher & Sher 1994).

The Victorian Universities Regional Research Network (VURRN) is co-operating with Monash University to roll-out the Graduate Certificate to other regional universities beginning with RMIT’s Centre for Regional and Rural Development in Hamilton in 2005. Funding is currently being sought to extend this one year Graduate Certificate to a Graduate Diploma incorporating subjects on community business and governance as well as accessible triple bottom line indicators to provide relevant feedback for community organizations as they increasingly take on ownership of ventures from within communities. Continuing access to resources and knowledge within regional university campuses will provide a key link in this process.

The issue of University engagement with the community is prominent on the agendas of both national and international forums of higher education. Increasingly, universities are playing an integral role in their regions, contributing to the sustainability, wellbeing and economic vitality of their communities while becoming catalysts for positive change and development.

Recognition of the role of higher education institutions in social, economic and cultural development led to the formation of the Australian Universities Community Engagement Alliance (AUCEA) in July 2003. Professor Janice Reid AM, Vice Chancellor of the University of Western Sydney (UWS) has been a driving force in this initiative providing ongoing support and funding. Throughout its formalisation process AUCEA is guided by a Steering Committee comprising of representatives from 10 Australian Universities with the mission of the AUCEA being to ‘promote direct and mutually beneficial interaction between universities and communities that is essential for the development and application of knowledge and the shaping of our future citizens.’

The AUCEA Steering Committee includes representation from the following universities:

- University of Western Sydney – Chair
- James Cook University
- Swinburne University of Technology
- Queensland University of Technology
- University of Ballarat
- La Trobe University
- Charles Sturt University
- Curtin University of Technology
- Australian Catholic University

Since July 2003, the AUCEA has grown into a network with representation currently from 30 Australian universities committed to university-community engagement. The principals and practices of AUCEA focus on scholarly practice and community driven engagement that has reciprocity and mutual benefit as an
outcome predicated on the exchange of knowledge achieved by:
- raising awareness and disseminating best practice in university-community engagement;
- facilitating collaborative research in university-community engagement between AUCEA members and their communities;
- promoting the integration of engagement into the curriculum and the student experience;
- promoting the recognition of the scholarship of engagement as a valid pedagogy;
- collaboratively developing resources that support university-community engagement.

More recently, AUCEA has been successful in securing funding from the Australian Government’s Higher Education Innovation Programme (HEIP) for 2005-2006 to formally establish the Alliance as the leading inclusive national forum for the discussion and development of university-community engagement. The formalisation of the Alliance will provide the mechanism to maximise opportunity, to build capacity, expertise, productive collaboration, quality partnerships and shared vision between universities and their communities with respect to community engagement. The Alliance aims to be a self-sustaining national association by 2007 through the commitment from all Australian Universities.

AUCEA strives to be “the leading inclusive national forum for the discussion and development of university-community engagement, encouraging collaboration, innovation, the exchange of knowledge and the scholarship of engagement”. The Alliance will create the opportunity for peer and community discussion and engagement including the promotion of social, environmental, economic and cultural development of communities across Australia. This will be achieved by showcasing examples of good practice and theory through AUCEA’s annual National Conference, Workshop Program, National Benchmarking Program and Visiting Scholars Program.

In line with AUCEA’s vision, the Alliance will maintain and enhance the quality of higher education by developing an Expert Advisory Panel in university-community engagement. The Panel members will be peer selected based on their expert and professional experience in community engagement and higher education. The primary role of the Panel will be to provide a credible resource for valued comment on ideas, theories, research, working papers and grant proposals pertaining to community engagement and higher education. The Panel members will further act as referees for academics and others seeking to advance through the scholarship of community engagement. Ongoing critical dialogue between the members of AUCEA together with the publication of Occasional Papers and Refereed Conference Proceedings will ensure that rigorous discussion regarding the innovation of university and community engagement and its contribution to the quality of higher education is deepened and maintained.

The AUCEA Visiting Scholars Program is a result of collaboration between institutions whereby one institution is willing to share their particular national and international contacts through a broader network of programs and events. This Program will enable AUCEA to build on the existing commitment to collaboration to develop other relevant engagement endeavours. There is currently a proposal on the Steering Committee’s agenda to utilise AUCEA members to benchmark university-community engagement on a national scale and several proposals for research collaboration are in formation stage but dependent on the Alliance being adequately funded and formalised.

Another area for collaboration is in holding the AUCEA annual National Conference and Workshop Program. One of the AUCEA objectives is to foster the sharing of information and to develop the networking for community engagement, particularly within the community. The AUCEA annual National Conference and Workshop Program will enable a network of national and international universities, government and community organisations to meet and create an opportunity to showcase best practice examples and theories of university-community engagement with international and national experts in the field. The Conferences and Workshops will be held at venues nationally and enhance the sharing of information on a regional, national and international scale. Participation and presentations from community organisations and individuals will be encouraged within these Conferences and Workshop Programs.

Participation of 30 Australian universities committed to university-community engagement at the 2004 AUCEA National Conference held at Charles Sturt University at Bathurst demonstrates both the relevance and timeliness of AUCEA. This Conference celebrated and explored the issues and initiatives concerning regional and rural communities in Australia and overseas.

One of the 2004 Conference delegates said “We made great strides in developing a real sense of community across the community engagement groupings in all of our universities. This Conference has further stimulated discussion about the importance of university community engagement on a national scale.”

To further address the issues surrounding university community engagement, the 2nd annual AUCEA National Conference will focus on “Universities and Communities: Learning and Engaging through Sustainable Partnership”. The 2005 Conference will be held at Victoria University’s Flinders Street Campus, Melbourne on the evening of Wednesday 20 July to Friday 22 July 2005. The Conference Programme is designed to stimulate dialogue and encourage the development and maintenance of productive and sustainable partnerships between universities and communities.

Keynote speakers, peer-reviewed presentations, interactive workshops and panel discussions will be focusing on a range of issues relating to community engagement, including promoting the social, environmental, economic and cultural development of communities through partnership across Australia. The 2005 Conference Programme is available at [http://www.uws.edu.au/aucea/conf05](http://www.uws.edu.au/aucea/conf05).

The 2005 Conference will create a central national forum to exchange knowledge and an opportunity for universities, government representatives and community members to share experiences, gain knowledge and generate new ideas for sustaining partnerships between universities and communities for the future of Australia. AUCEA enables Australian Universities to both share and create knowledge about community engagement. Ultimately the process, which is developing trust between universities, will create an effective centre for dialogue and research into university community engagement and place the scholarship of engagement on the national agenda.
B-HERT’S – REGIONAL ENGAGEMENT PROGRAM

B-HERT has focused on Regional Engagement as an important issue and to date has conducted six very successful one-day fora, which have attracted over 700 local business people and post-compulsory education providers.

- 31st July 2003 at Shepparton co-hosted with the Greater Shepparton City Council. Hon John Brumby, Treasurer and Minister for State and Regional Development presented a paper.
- 24th September 2003 at Parramatta co-hosted by the University of Western Sydney. The Chancellor (John Phillips) and Vice-Chancellor (Prof. Janice Reid) both participated. Hon David Campbell, Minister for Regional Development, for the Illawarra, and for Small Business participated and the forum was sponsored by the NSW Dept. for State and Regional Development and Lend Lease Corporation.
- 23rd April 2004 at the University of the Sunshine Coast at Mooloolaba co-hosted by the university and sponsored by the Queensland Dept. for State Development and Innovation. Mrs Linda Lavarch MP, Parliamentary Secretary to the Queensland Minister for State Development and Innovation, gave the Keynote Address.
- 13th July 2004 at the University of Newcastle co-hosted by the university and sponsored by the NSW Dept. of State and Regional Development, Gloucester Coal and Minerals Council NSW. Senator John Tierney and Bryce Gaudry MP, Parliamentary Secretary for Education, Training and Aboriginal Affairs, and Member for Newcastle, delivered addresses.
- 8th September 2004 at Bendigo co-hosted by La Trobe University in conjunction with the City of Greater Bendigo, Bendigo Bank, the Central Victorian Business Network and the Victorian Government, Department of Education and Training. Keynote addresses were given by the Hon. John Brumby, Treasurer & Minister for Innovation, Industry & Regional Development and the Hon. Jacinta Allan, Minister for Education Services, and Member for Bendigo East and Professor Michael Osborne, Vice-Chancellor of La Trobe. More than 170 participated and a number of follow-up initiatives were identified.
- 3rd March 2005 in Albury-Wodonga co-hosted by Charles Sturt University in conjunction with Albury Wodonga Business and the New South Wales Department of State and Regional Development. Bryce Gaudry MP, Parliamentary Secretary for Education, Training and Aboriginal Affairs and Professor Ian Goulter, Vice-Chancellor, Charles Sturt University, delivered addresses.

Further activities being planned over coming months are –
- Whyalla with the University of South Australia on 7th June 2005.
- Mackay campus of Central Queensland University.
- Perth with Murdoch University.
- Port Macquarie with Southern Cross and Hastings Council.

These fora are useful to the ongoing development of linkages between regional business/industry and post-compulsory education. Such linkages will invariably lead to appropriate skill enhancement of regional youth, greater entrepreneurial endeavour, accelerated commercial awareness and increased economic activity in the regions.

The following paper by David Ensor vividly illustrates the benefits flowing from the Forum held in Bendigo only six months ago.

Ashley Goldsworthy
Executive Director
B-HERT

NETWORKING, GROWTH & REGIONAL FORUMS

DAVID ENSOR
Director – Engagement and Enterprise
La Trobe University, Bendigo
d.ensor@latrobe.edu.au

OVERVIEW
La Trobe University Bendigo Campus contributes to sustainable regional growth through, for example, the development of economic modeling data and the development and support of key networks. The strategic development of the regional economy will create enhanced opportunities for scholarship, commercial income and graduate employment. The BHERT Regional Forum was instrumental in consolidating these key partnerships.

INTRODUCTION
A university’s community engagement should directly serve scholarship objectives and the genuine commitment of the university to actively growing its region.

The community engagement and commercial income generation activities at La Trobe University’s Bendigo
The BHERT Regional Forum in Bendigo was therefore structured across these core business and resource functions to provide an opportunity to assess the status of partnerships and identify key opportunities through presentations from partners and review of case studies. Through the networks represented at the Forum, we are supporting and encouraging key community activities that will contribute to local growth and are likely to result in higher level demand for university research and teaching, and appropriate Bendigo employment opportunities for graduates. The BHERT/La Trobe University Regional Forum provided a valuable opportunity to consolidate these partnerships.

La Trobe University was, for example a co-founder of the Community Foundation of Bendigo and Central Victoria, which is hoped to aggregate philanthropic activity in the region. The North Central Greenhouse Gas Alliance, EducationBendigo, Chamber of Commerce, Primary Care Partnership, NGO Alliance, IT Alliance, BendigoPlus are networks that have formed to address particular challenges and opportunities in Bendigo. The University is an active member of these networks, and attempts to identify key regional initiatives that will advance their respective agendas, integrate students into participant organisations, and develop critical mass to create opportunity to frame important research and teaching opportunities.

An underlying principle of the engagement has been to nurture partnerships to jointly develop, identify and implement projects and programs that will use university scholarship and infrastructure to add value to community programs and that contribute to community sustainability. The programs should also add value to core university activity and involve creating, sharing, applying and preserving knowledge for our communities (of place and of interest).

It becomes difficult to separate the concepts of engagement and commercial income development. As engagement activity becomes integrated across most areas of activity, additional income to the University will result from many planned shared objectives. For example, a local foundry encountered an issue of critical commercial value. The University is currently assisting a local foundry develop a technical and commercial solution that aligns with an academic’s research interest, and which is being considered for further development as a funded Linkage Grant.

We have been actively committed to growing our region as part of community engagement activity. Partnerships with key stakeholder groups will indirectly contribute to sustainable growth of our region. These partnerships and regional growth will provide:

- opportunities to enrich academic study and increased opportunities to contribute to scholarship though collaborative research;
- increased student/graduate employment opportunities;
- work placements, for example through the BendigoStudent program;
- better integration of our communities into the knowledge economy;
– co-development of campus infrastructure – for example co-development of laboratories with industry partners; and,
– co-development of infrastructure – for example co-development of Central Victorian Innovation Park with City of Greater Bendigo, Bendigo Bank and Victorian State Government.

Put simply, many of our collaborative programs have been either demand-driven (based on community need that is matched to academic expertise), such as the development of a local government sponsored Linkage project relating to the aging population and academic expertise in statistics, or supply-driven (based on academic activity that is matched to community need), as in the case of the development of economic modeling software that is based on academic economic modeling expertise, and matched to the data needs of local governments.

For countries in the centre of the world economy, knowledge has become perhaps the most important factor determining the standard of living – more than land, than tools, than labour. Some Australian regional economies have been described as “quarry economies” – economies from which raw materials and produce are extracted for subsequent value-adding elsewhere. The sustainable growth of these economies is vital for their survival in a global economy, and La Trobe University is an important partner to its communities in central Victoria facing these opportunities.

VALUE ADDING
Regional economies, for example, face the challenge of increasing the value and margin of the initial individual raw products. There is an opportunity to value-add to raw products to ensure farmers’ and regional communities’ sustainability in a global marketplace where raw product prices are not likely to rise to match production costs.

One example of this aggregated supply and value-adding is SunRice, operating out of Deniliquin, New South Wales, where 2,000 ricegrower members have pooled their product in a shared value-adding chain. This is today the largest rice mill facility in the Southern Hemisphere with annual sales of close on $750m and over 1000 employees.

IMPORT-REPLACEMENT AND EXPORTING
Put simply, there are also opportunities to grow a regional economy through: Buying and selling locally, by plugging economic leakages through import replacement (we have estimated the import-replacement opportunity in Bendigo to be $315.4 million, including a $33 million import-replacement opportunity in the business and professional services sector alone); and, selling our goods/services to the world through active exporting.

THE REMPLAN JOURNEY
To illustrate this engagement and the importance of networks, I elaborate on one key program using expertise in economic modeling data and developed an application in the form of modeling software (REPLAN) to:

– contribute to the economic understanding of sustainable growth of our regions;
– provide opportunities to advance the academic research associated with economic modeling; and,
– commercialise an application of intellectual property to supplement university income-streams.

The academic outcomes formed the foundations of engagement. By highlighting this journey as a theme at the BHERT/La Trobe University Regional Forum, we were able to consolidate its place in one engagement strategy, and identify new opportunities.

In order to use an academic outcome (REPLAN) to support the outcome of supporting regional growth, we focused on the development of value-adding and import replacement/export strategies.

By making this modeled economic data meaningfully available to the community, we have supported the identification and development of import-replacement and value-adding programs, and led the development of many opportunities to develop research programs.

But, again, is this provision of data enough to help in the development of our region? In the context of a commitment to grow a sustainable regional economy, we chose to take this modeling activity to another level, underpinned by the belief that a passionate, connected and informed business community could use the data to achieve community outcomes.

The REMPLAN journey has, for example, been a blend of a useful application of academic research that has generated income for the university and opportunity for further academic research, with an active commitment to help leverage business growth of an economy through the development and support of networks.

Its success has relied on the willingness of an academic staff member, Ian Pinge, to stretch a research interest in input-output modeling to develop a product that has contributed to many levels of community activity, has withstood peer review and contributed to the field of regional economics.

Many regional business communities have needed a culture of deep collaboration to flourish in the global economy, and La Trobe University co-founded the Central Victorian Business Network (CVBN). In its second year, the CVBN has approx 300 active participating businesses, and also supports the 250 strong (and two month old) Young Professionals Network.

CENTRAL VICTORIAN BUSINESS NETWORK – A VEHICLE FOR BUSINESS COLLABORATION
The Central Victorian Business Network hopes to achieve a vision of enhancing the economic development, growth and sustainability of central Victoria; and enhancing central Victoria as the place to be for business innovation, attracting new businesses and growing existing businesses.

A key focus has been to support business networking:
– A Business and Professional Services Group has developed with City of Greater Bendigo Council support to address the $33 million professional services import-replacement opportunity from the Bendigo economy.
– The Bendigo Manufacturing Group has used data
to support a 30 year industrial land strategy, development of an integrated food precinct and gap analysis to identify the opportunities of developing additional businesses.

- Developed an Exporters Group.
- Developed a value-adding olive sector through facilitating partnerships with equipment manufacturers.

Some of the strategies being advocated and supported through the networks include:

**Aggregation of demand** for sectors (eg business and professional services) and place in such areas as: Banking (eg. Bendigo Bank Community Bank) and Telecommunications (eg Bendigo Community Telco).

Other opportunities such as energy, insurance, superannuation, aged care, transport and supply of infrastructure & equipment are also under consideration.

**Aggregation of supply** for sectors such as: Grains (local niche flour production – Production, standards, supply chain, marketing); Olives (production, standards, supply chain, marketing); Tourism (trails, brand, marketing); and, Services (shared service provision).

**COMMONWEALTH YOUTH GAMES – BENDIGO 2004**

Support for the Commonwealth Youth Games resulted from a partnership between the City of Greater Bendigo, Commonwealth Games Association and Victorian State Government. La Trobe University hosted the Games Village for over one thousand athletes and officials and provided opportunities for physiotherapy and podiatry students and staff to work alongside professionals in the support of elite international athletes.

This partnership, leveraged off the creative use of La Trobe University’s campus facilities has, amongst other things: Contributed over $9 million to the Bendigo community; developed student and staff placement opportunities and consolidated and developed professional relationships in these academic fields; developed a close and integrated relationship with a key local government that is being used as a basis for further collaboration; and, firmly positioned the University as a key partner in an event of which the community is significantly proud.

**CONCLUSION**

Not all research and teaching is, or should be, relevant to regional engagement objectives. The challenge is matching community need, academic expertise and curriculum relevance to develop community engagement activity that achieves mutual objectives.

Research, teaching and infrastructure have formed the basis of many community engagement activities at La Trobe University’s Bendigo Campus, and relationships have been extended to identify opportunities to support University activity and actively support regional through strategic partnerships.

In the context of relatively small communities, networks have been important in providing a critical mass that provides opportunity to advance a quality research and teaching profile, while enabling us to actively contribute to our regions’ growth in a global economy.
The Construction and Property Services Industry Skills Council covers businesses that develop, construct, manage, maintain and sell properties. It’s a long list...everyone from builders, to real estate agents, security professionals, pest managers and cleaners. The sector focuses on Australia’s physical assets, but one of its first actions will target what most of us don’t see – the highly technical spatial data used to map our physical infrastructure.

**ELECTROCOMMS AND ENERGY UTILITIES**
The multi-billion dollar electrical and energy industries employ almost half-a-million Australians and have highly specific training needs. The ElectroComms and EnergyUtilities Industry Skills Council will boost skills development in electro technology, lifts, communications, gas, and the electricity generation, transmission and distribution sectors. Addressing skills shortages at trade and post-trade technical levels is the most urgent area of business for the council. These skills shortages are limiting the industries’ ability to respond to expansion.

**GOVERNMENT AND COMMUNITY SAFETY**
The Government and Community Safety Industry Skills Council covers the skill needs of public sector and emergency services employees around the country – including corrections, local government, defence, police and fire personnel. These are among the biggest employers in the country, providing for the nation’s public safety and social infrastructure. The Government Industry Skills Council will identify common competencies across sectors and also develop pathways or credit/transfer arrangements into higher education.

**INNOVATION AND BUSINESS**
Innovation has long been essential to the survival of any business, but until now business and creative skills have not been brought together in one body in Australia. The Innovation and Business Industry Skills Council covers the full range of business skills, from core and specialist financial and business services including management, through to telecommunications, information technology and printing. The council also represents the more creative fields of music, film and television, visual arts and design.

First order of business for the council will be developing an integrated competency framework for the innovation and business sectors that supports innovation and creativity across the full spectrum of business skills.

**MANUFACTURING**
The Manufacturing Industry Skills Council covers an enormous range of manufacturing sectors, including metal and engineering; aeroskills; chemical, hydrocarbons and oil refining; plastics and rubber and cable making, manufactured mineral products; furnishing; and textiles, clothing and footwear.

Top of the agenda is the extension of the innovative Competitive Manufacturing Initiative, which focuses on competencies for leading edge skills used to drive new technologies and practices in supply chains across the entire manufacturing sector.

**RESOURCES AND INFRASTRUCTURE**
The Resources and Infrastructure Industry Skills Council covers the extractive, metalliferous, coal, drilling and civil construction industries. As the first industry skills council formed, it is strongly connected to enterprises in the industry and is targeting changing skills needs and future workforce requirements. A key priority in 2004 is implementation of the industry wide ‘Attract, train and retain’ strategy.

As the first industry skills council formed, it is strongly connected to enterprises in the industry and is targeting changing skills needs and future workforce requirements.

**SERVICES**
Services Industries Skills Australia (SISA) is the trading name for the skills council representing the fast growing and highly diverse services industry. With forecast job growth of around 5.8 per cent over the next five years, the services industry is well and truly booming. SISA covers 640,000 businesses, with more than three million employees, across sectors including retail and wholesale, sport and recreation, tourism, hospitality, hairdressing, beauty therapy, and funeral services. A priority for SISA is rationalising the Training Packages across its sectors.

**TRANSPORT AND LOGISTICS**
Transport and Distribution Training Australia is the industry voice for the road, rail, maritime, aviation, warehousing and logistic sectors. The council aims to enhance the long-term employability of individuals in the industry, maximise access and equity in training opportunities and increase industry’s ownership and investment in training. Major priorities for 2004-2005 include implementation of a national strategy for technology training, establishment of a registered training organisation professional development network and development of a skills development portal.
Applications were sought earlier last year and were judged by an experienced panel of judges comprising:

- Professor Leon Mann, Professorial Fellow, School of Behavioural Science, University of Melbourne (Chairman)
- Dr Annabelle Duncan, Chief of Division, Molecular Science, CSIRO
- Dr Bob Frater AO, Vice-President – Innovation, ResMed Ltd
- Ms Lesley Johnson, Director of Strategic Initiatives, Australian National Training Authority
- Mr Peter Laver AM, Chairman, Australian Building Codes Board
- Associate Professor Jane Munro, Head of College & CEO, International House, University of Melbourne
- Dr Peter Scaife, Director, Centre for Sustainable Technology, The University of Newcastle

B-HERT wishes to acknowledge the generous support of the following organisations:

---

**Criteria for Assessment**

1. Innovation
2. Strength of Relationship
3. Outreach Inclusion
4. National Benefits
5. Cultural Impact

The Hon Peter McGauran MP, Minister for Citizenship and Multicultural Affairs, presented the Awards at a gala dinner at the Shangri-la Hotel in Sydney on Thursday, 18 November 2004.
Best Research & Development Collaboration

All winners are pictured with the Hon Peter McGauran MP, Minister for Citizenship and Multicultural Affairs and Rob Stewart, President, B-HERT.

**Winner:** Monash University and Norwood Abbey Ltd

**Title:** Rebuilding Immunity for Better Health

The thymus is the engine room of the immune system, being the exclusive site of production of T cells. It severely atrophies from puberty such that by the mid-20’s, it functions at less than 10% of its youthful maximum. Research has shown that sex steroids are a major inhibitor of the function of the thymus.

Our studies have shown that temporary inhibition of sex steroids using an analogue of Luteinizing Hormone Releasing Hormone (an existing treatment for hormone responsive cancers) causes restoration of the thymus in animal models; and in human clinical studies we have good evidence for renewed thymic function. This program is focussed on rejuvenating the immune system for treatment of cancer, infectious diseases, autoimmune conditions, transplantation and other areas of immune deficiency.

**Honourable Mention:**

Australian Catholic University, Dept of Education & Training (Victoria), Catholic Education Office (Melbourne) and Association of Independent Schools Victoria.

**Title:** Early Numeracy Research Project (ENRP)

The ENRP enhanced teacher capacity to deliver improved learning outcomes in numeracy for children in the first three years of schooling. The cross-sectoral project involved 35 ‘trial schools’ and 35 carefully-matched “reference schools” throughout Victoria, 353 teachers and over 11,000 students. Key features included:

- A research-based framework of “growth points” in young childrens’ mathematical learning
- A one-to-one, forty minute, task-based mathematics assessment interview for use by teachers
- A multi-level professional development program for teachers, coordinators and principals
- Detailed case studies of effective numeracy teachers and schools
- An intervention program for students having difficulty in mathematics in the early years

Related projects have been implemented subsequently in nine other countries.

Brisbane Airport Corporation (BAC) and Queensland University of Technology (QUT)

**Title:** Brisbane Airport Corporation/Queensland University of Technology Collaborative Partnership

The BAC/QUT collaborative partnership seeks to implement world best practice to transform Brisbane Airport to an Airport City. It is based on a shared vision of mutual benefits to ensure a whole of organisation involvement for excellence in the management of a modern international airport through robust scientific enquiry and academic rigour. For BAC to achieve its vision of the best Airport City in the world and as a model for other international airports, it needs to develop best practice management based on extensive research. It is not feasible for a business organisation to undertake research in the diversity of disciplines relevant to the operation of an international airport and the building of an Airport City. Consequently, QUT is effectively the R&D Arm of BAC. In turn, for QUT, Brisbane Airport is the ‘living laboratory’ where it can strengthen its leadership position in the delivery of multidisciplinary real world research outcomes, which are of relevance to society.
Winner: School of Agricultural Science (University of Tasmania), Tasmanian Alkaloids Pty Ltd, Botanical Resources Australia, Australian Hop Marketers, Simplot Australia Pty Ltd Serve-Ag Pty Ltd, Impact Fertilisers Pty Ltd, Essential Oils of Tasmania Pty Ltd and State Dept of Primary Industries, Water and Environment

Title: Science Lectureship Initiative: Partnerships in Tasmanian Primary Industry Science Education (HEIP)

Nine local primary industries combined forces with the School of Agricultural Science, to address the shortage of tertiary educated science graduates seeking work in primary industry, as well as promoting in schools, the value of and excitement of careers in primary industries. This was achieved by developing two programs, one to increase student awareness of the available science careers in primary industry (Education Program), the other program to deliver tertiary modules relating to the needs of current staff in industry (Industry – AgPD Program).

As a result of this collaboration between industries, educators and the University, the project has caused a significant and positive attitudinal change in teachers and students towards potential career options in primary industries and has also greatly contributed to the further education of primary industry field staff.

Honourable Mention:

Musculoskeletal Research Unit (La Trobe University), Access for All Abilities (Ballarat Regional Area: Pinarc Support Services), Cardiopulmonary Research Unit (Alfred Hospital), Ascot Vale Sport & Fitness Centre, Association for Children with a Disability, Australian Barbell Co., School of Human Movement & Sport Sciences (University of Ballarat), Physiotherapy Dept (Box Hill Hospital), Cerebral Palsy Support Network, Council on the Ageing, Multiple Sclerosis Society Vic., One80 (Belgravia Leisure) Fitness Club, Royal Children’s Hospital Vic., Scope (Vic) Inc., Victorian Sport & Recreation Assoc of Persons with an Intellectual Disability Inc (Vicsrapid), Washington University (St Louis, USA), Wodonga Regional Health Service and Womensport & Recreation Victoria Inc.

Title: Physical Activity for People with Disabilities

This program generates health, social and economic benefits for Australia by increasing the uptake and maintenance of physical activity as a healthy life-style choice for people with disabilities. It is widely recognised that participation in regular physical exercise regimes such as strength and aerobic training programs can have health and social benefits for individuals as well as economic benefits for society. Research has shown that this is also true for people with disabilities. Despite this, people with disabilities remain more sedentary than the rest of the community. This innovative network of projects provides a best practice model of focused and ongoing collaborations that draw together the different perspectives and skills of clinical researchers, business people, service providers and local communities to develop, disseminate and promote evidence based and feasible strategies to increase and maintain physical activity for people with a range of different disabilities.
Winner: CRC for Polymers, Olex Australia Pty Ltd, Monash University, University of NSW, RMIT University, CSIRO Manufacturing Infrastructure & Technology and DSTO

Title: Ceramicifying Polymers

Olex, a participant in the CRC for Polymers identified a need for a plastic material that could transform in a fire into a ceramic, and hence provide a radical new solution to the requirements of the fire performance cable market. Fire performance cables are specified to enable emergency services to continue operation in a fire, in order to save lives. Working in collaboration with the research partners listed, Olex developed and, in July 2003, launched Pyrolex™ Ceramifiable® cables which has been an instant success. Already over 12 major public buildings have used this cabling and Olex forecast resultant sales of $75 million and 20 new jobs over the next 5 years. Additionally, global licences are being negotiated and a spin-off company has been formed to explore markets outside cables (such as building panels, door seals, roof tiles). Compared to existing solutions, the resultant technology performs better, is faster and cheaper to produce and easier to install. A true “world first”, replacing 20 year old technology.

Honourable Mention:

Monash University, Griffith University, CSIRO Land and Water, The University of Melbourne, Melbourne Water, Brisbane City Council, NSW Environment Protection Authority, Victorian Environment Protection Authority, Ecological Engineering Pty Ltd, WBM Oceanics Pty Ltd, Sinclair Knight Merz and EarthTech Pty Ltd

Title: Fast Tracking Advances in Urban Stormwater Management

Stormwater pollution represents the biggest threat to waterways in urban areas. The ability to tackle this problem has been limited by an inability to predict the (a) quality of water emanating from urban catchments, and (b) performance of alternative strategies to reduce pollutant loads. CRC researchers and industry developed a ‘vision’ for a software tool that would give the water industry (local and state agencies, consultants) a user-friendly system for designing “best practice” stormwater management systems to protect the environment. Development and testing of the new software, along with collection of the vast amount of data necessary to underpin it, was undertaken as a complete partnership, resulting in a tool which is both scientifically rigorous and focussed on the needs of industry. The product is now widely used throughout Australia, giving agencies much greater confidence, and a ‘common language’ on which to base stormwater management decisions.
**Best International Collaboration – Research & Development or Education & Training**

**Winner:** University of Newcastle, Novo Nordisk Education Foundation (India) and Novo Nordisk India Pte Ltd  
**Title:** Diabetes Care Program  
There are approximately 31.6 million diabetics in India but only a limited number of trained medical practitioners to manage the disease. Access to postgraduate medical education in diabetes for primary care physicians, who treat the majority of diabetic patients in India, is also limited. A collaboration between the pharmaceutical company Novo Nordisk India Pte Ltd and the University of Newcastle has produced an accessible postgraduate degree in Diabetes Care that commences as a non-award certificate course in India and concludes by distance learning in Newcastle. Key achievements of the program are the training of 593 doctors in diabetes care at certificate level and 124 doctors at Graduate Diploma/Masters level, the development of innovative learning materials suitable for use in other countries, the training of Indian clinicians in problem-based and self-directed learning methods, the strengthening of relationships between Novo Nordisk and medical practitioners in India and the establishment of fee paying degrees in Diabetes Care at the University of Newcastle.

**Best Collaboration with a Regional Focus**

**Winner:** Victoria University and the Murray Valley Training Co Ltd  
**Title:** The Swan Hill-Horn of Africa Employment Relocation Community Building Program  
The project aims to relocate members of the Horn of Africa community (HA), who are 70% unemployed in the Cities of Marlborough/Dandenong, to the job rich regions of Loddon, Mallee, and Murray for long-term settlement in a planned and strategic way. This is done by the Murray Mallee Training Company (MMTC) in partnership with Victoria University which in turn has a partnership with the Horn of African Communities Network (HACN). This project is based on specific job projects for the Swan Hill area, with 24 HACN members already in employment. The project is also designed to build community and community capacity of both the Horn of African and Swan Hill communities. Strategically utilising the dual-sectors of the University, and drawing on its interdisciplinary expertise, the project involves a six-stage program coordinated between the partners. It aims to attract external funding with $300,000 obtained to date. The projects reflect Victoria University’s community engagement with its region.

**Honourable Mention:**

Australian Sheep Industry CRC, Australian Wool Innovation, University of New England, NSW TAFE, Department of Agriculture, WA and University of Tasmania  
**Title:** National Program of Sheep and Wool Education  
Market failure in sheep and wool education has been widely recognised by industry stakeholders. AWI and the Sheep Education Program staff have been closely collaborating to improve the expertise and skills of the sheep industry workforce to assist the industry develop to its full potential. Collaboration has occurred in the development of complementary organisation strategic plans for education and training, co-management of scholarship programs and Education Advisory Committees and co-funding of projects. Schools projects emphasise opportunities for ‘high-tech’ careers. VET and undergraduate programs provide national support and resource material for lecturers, teachers and trainers to ensure that students have access to current information presented in an interesting way. School students and university undergraduates have access to scholarships and professional development at undergraduate, honours and postgraduate levels.

---

Note your diary – applications for next year’s Awards for Outstanding Achievement in Collaboration in Research & Development and Education & Training and Best Entrepreneurial Educator of the Year will be called in May 2005.
Purpose
To recognise the importance of education in the process of developing and nurturing entrepreneurs; and to showcase best practice in entrepreneurial education.

Criteria for Assessment
1. Effective involvement of industry in the design, implementation and evaluation of entrepreneurial educational activities.
2. Encouragement of students in the practice of entrepreneurship.
3. Is the educator’s work a model for others?
4. Demonstrable outcomes of the educator’s work – development by students of new products, processes or services.
5. Has the educator’s work made a difference to the attitudes, self esteem, behaviour, life chances, values and employment outcomes of their students?

The winner of the 2004 BestEntrepreneurial Educator of the Year:
Professor Kevin Hindle
Professor of Entrepreneurship,
Australian Graduate School of Entrepreneurship
Swinburne University of Technology

Professor Kevin Hindle is Professor of Entrepreneurship at the Australian Graduate School of Entrepreneurship, Swinburne University of Technology. He is a researcher, educator and management consultant, whose variety of expertise and interests embrace many aspects of managing in conditions of uncertainty. His research, teaching, managerial and consulting work focuses on entrepreneurial business planning but includes: investment evaluation (especially in the field of venture capital), market and financial modelling, change management, organisational design, corporate strategy and management training. Applying leading-edge research to practical problems, he has initiated and developed new ventures and worked for organisations large and small, public and private, Australian and international.

As a long-serving educator, Professor Hindle has developed and taught marketing, finance, organisational behavioural and entrepreneurship curricula for a range of award and executive development programs in Europe, Asia and America as well as Australasia. He has taught in the Helsinki School of Economics and Business Administration’s executive MBA program. He has held visiting professorships in entrepreneurship at Baylor University (Texas), at INSEAD (Fontainebleau, France), the University of St Gallen (Switzerland) and was the inaugural visiting professor at the First Nations University of Canada (Regina, Saskatchewan). He is co-author of two textbooks on entrepreneurship. In 2004 he won the Academy of Management Entrepreneurship Division and McGraw Hill Innovation in Entrepreneurship Pedagogy Award. This is the highest honour for entrepreneurship education in the United States. Professor Hindle is the first non-American ever to win it. As a researcher, he has authored over 50 peer-reviewed publications in a range of respected international journals and conference proceedings. He is Australian Project Director of the Global Entrepreneurship Monitor (GEM), the world’s largest entrepreneurship research initiative. He has a strong network of collaborations and personal friendships among leading entrepreneurship scholars and practitioners throughout the world and has a track record of substantial fundraising for entrepreneurship research. His current teaching, research investigations and PhD supervisions are dominated by four fundamental questions: (1) How do you measure the value of an innovation process? (2) What factors influence and explain the decision to invest in a new venture? (3) What distinguishes Indigenous entrepreneurship from ‘mainstream’ entrepreneurship? (4) How do you teach entrepreneurship?

Professor Hindle has consulted on entrepreneurship policy to both State and Federal governments and several international universities, government organisations and corporations. He is a ministerially appointed foundation member of Australia’s National Innovation Awareness Council. The unifying theme of all his work is to develop and execute constructive, internationally relevant research whose findings can be used to enhance the teaching and development of ethical entrepreneurs in Australia and the world.

Note your diary – applications for this year’s Award for Best Entrepreneurial Educator will be called in May 2005.
DIRECTORS REGISTER
B-HERT LAUNCHES ONLINE DIRECTORS REGISTER FOR ACADEMICS, RESEARCHERS, ENGINEERS AND ICT PROFESSIONALS

In the Jan 2005 issue of Company Director, the official journal of the Australian Institute of Company Directors, in an article on Corporate Governance, the comment was made, ‘We need to widen the pool of directors….. to include women, government, academics, HR people, industrial relations, communications and IT.’

This view reinforces the recent initiative of B-HERT to launch the B-HERT Directors Register.

Companies are constantly seeking to widen their pool of non-executive directors, to diversify the collective talent around the board table, and to go outside the normal pool of likely candidates. It is frequently remarked that there is a shortage of quality directors in Australia.

Companies could gain valuable expertise by tapping into the university and research sectors.

There is probably not a single university governing body in Australia which does not include at least one business person. Generally there will be several. Conversely, there are very few corporate boards which include academics, scientists, or researchers.

Many companies, at board level, could profit from having a greater understanding of the true potential of the latest developments in science or technology.

It has become evident in recent times that most companies do not understand or appreciate the competitive value of their intellectual property. There are a couple of outstanding examples in Australia of companies who do realise and are devoting considerable resources to effectively exploiting their IP.

B-HERT has established a register for those from universities and research organizations (CSIRO, DSTO, ANSTO, and medical research institutes) who are interested in becoming non-executive directors on company boards. Companies will be able to access this register and follow-up with individuals whom they see as potentially suitable. We have procedures to protect the privacy of those who put their names on the register.

For those employed by B-HERT Members, for an annual fee of $50 plus GST, interested persons can register their profile, including details of current and past experience, with B-HERT. For those employed by organizations who are not members of B-HERT, the annual fee is $75 (plus GST).

The Register is an Internet based service which gives individuals complete control over their profile. Profiles can be updated at any time by accessing the register using individual passwords. Registrants can also easily remove their profile from the Register.

This is a new initiative by B-HERT. Visit www.bhert.com
As a unique group of leaders in Australian business, professional firms, higher education and research organisations, the Business/Higher Education Round Table (B-HERT) sees as part of its responsibility the need to articulate its views on matters of importance germane to its Mission. From time to time B-HERT issues Papers in this context – copies of which are available from the B-HERT Secretariat at a cost of $7.90 (GST incl.) per copy.

B-HERT Paper No. 8 (July 2004) – THE FACTS: Higher Education in Australia
A compendium of statistics on higher education. The purpose of the report is to present some key relevant perspectives, statistics, trends and comparative data. The accurate and broad-based content of the report should help those in the higher education sector gain an informed view. ($17.95 per copy)

B-HERT Paper No. 7 (February 2003) – The Knowledge-Based Economy: Some Facts and Figures
An update to B-HERT Paper No. 4 which provides some useful and interesting comparative data on Australia’s relative global position within the context of the knowledge-based economy.

Leading Edge – Australian Public Sector Research (November 2003)
This publication seeks to showcase our developing research excellence, and widen the opportunities available to many of the researchers, their universities and agencies which supported this research, and to the nation. ($15.95 per copy)

B-HERT Paper No. 6 (February 2003) – Research Issues for the Service Sector, particularly for Community Service Professions and Export Services
This paper attempts to define the service sector, particularly on two important areas, the community services sector and the export industries sector.

Position Paper No. 10 (September 2002) – The Importance of the Social Sciences to Government
Social policy is concerned with a range of human needs and the social institutions created to meet these needs. The social sciences cover a wide array of complex issues and disciplines. Government activities are now centrally related to social policy and the boundaries between social, economic and science policy are blurred. Commonwealth Government expenditure on social security and welfare, health and education amounts to some 65% of total expenditure and indicates the importance and persuasiveness of social policies. The social sciences and policies are important in ensuring the maintenance and functioning of a stable society by attempting to provide a more equitable distribution of wealth and income and ensuring an understanding of governance and institutions of civil society. Universities play a key role in providing social science courses which educate graduates in a philosophy, knowledge and the new developments of social science. The enables government agencies to access skilled social scientists who are capable of developing and implementing new social science policies appropriate to meet the needs of an ever changing world.

Position Paper No. 9 (August 2002) – Enhancing the Learning and Employability of Graduates: The Role of Generic Skills
In an era when various new kinds of partnerships and relationships are developing between industry and higher education, and between the different sectors in education, a paper on generic skills is timely. This paper outlines the nature and scope of generic skills before discussing the reasons why they have become a focus of policy interest. The benefits of paying attention to generic skills for learning and employability purposes are considered in relation to relevant research findings. The holism, contextuality and relational level of generic skills as well as the links to lifelong learning are highlighted. Examples of the incorporation of generic skills into higher education structures and courses are also described.

There is also discussion of ways to close the ‘employability’ gap.

The paper then suggests a learning framework for generic skills at different levels.

Finally the paper makes some recommendations in respect of further work that would be valuable in pursuit of the agenda to enhance the learning capability of employability of graduates.

B-HERT News
| No. 22 | July 2005 | The Humanities and Business |
| No. 21 | March 2005 | Case Studies in Regional Engagement between Post-Secondary Education and Business |
| No. 20 | July 2004 | The Changing Education Needs for the Professions |
| No. 19 | March 2004 | The Challenge of the Private Providers |
| No. 18 | November 2003 | Improving Teaching and Learning in Universities |
| No. 17 | July 2003 | Regional Provision of Higher Education |
| No. 16 | April 2003 | Developing Generic Skills: Examples of Best Practice |
| No. 15 | November 2002 | Productivity in the Higher Education Sector: What Does it Mean? |
| No. 14 | July 2002 | Excellence in Collaborative R&D |
| No. 13 | March 2002 | Vocational Education and Training (VET) |
| No. 12 | October 2001 | The Need for a Stronger Entrepreneurial Culture in Australia |
| No. 11 | July 2001 | The Knowledge Economy & Knowledge Management |
| No. 10 | March 2001 | Business, Ethics, Values and Education |
| No. 9 | November 2000 | The Triple Bottom Line: Shareholders, Society, Sustainability |
| No. 8 | July 2000 | Populate or Stagnate: Australia 2050 |
| No. 7 | March 2000 | The Business of Education for Business |
| No. 6 | October 1999 | Lifelong Learning in the New Millennium |
| No. 5 | July 1999 | Australia – The Information Economy |
| No. 4 | March 1999 | Leadership |
| No. 3 | October 1998 | Innovation |
| No. 2 | June 1998 | Science Education and Science Research in Australia |
| No. 1 | March 1998 | Inaugural Issue |
“And the Winner of the 2004 Students in Free Enterprise World Cup is... Australia!” These words were immediately drowned by more than ten minutes of sustained applause from the 800-strong audience, drawn from 37 countries, who were gathered in the Grand Ballroom of the Princess Sophia Hotel in Barcelona on 24 September 2004.

What had seemed an impossible dream, that a team from any country other than the United States, could ever win the SIFE World Cup, was a reality and it had been done by a team of students from Curtin University of Technology, representing all the SIFE teams in Australia. This achievement is all the more remarkable when it is remembered that the program, established in the USA in 1975, was only introduced to Australia in 2000 with participation by four universities but had grown to over 30 in the past year. It shows yet again that young Australians can compete at the highest levels and succeed and also shows that SIFE in Australia is ‘world’s best practice’.

SIFE’s mission, as members will recall, is to challenge university students to make a difference in their own lives by developing their leadership, teamwork and communication skills. They are encouraged to do this through learning, practicing and teaching the principles of free enterprise so as to empower others in their communities and enhance their economic prospects.

Curtin’s SIFE team were judged to be the most innovative, creative and effective by the very practical results of their projects which, over a three year period had created 105 new business ventures employing 175 individuals in new jobs and achieving a turnover in 2003/4 of $8.5 million.

University and corporate members of B-HERT who are not already involved in SIFE are strongly encouraged to contact the CEO of SIFE Australia, John Thornton, on 0417 811877 or by email to john.thornton@sifeaustralia.org.au for more information on opportunities provided by the program.
CONFERENCES

POST-COMPULSORY EDUCATION: BRIDGING THE GAP SYMPOSIUM
Keynote Speakers include:
The Hon. Gary Hardgrave MP, Minister for Vocational Education & Training
The Hon. Lynne Kosky MP, Minister for Education & Training (Victoria)
When: Wednesday 18 May 2005
Where: RMIT Storey Hall, Melbourne CBD
Cost: $429.00 incl GST (refreshments and lunch included)
Programme and registration details are available at www.bhert.com

EMERGING SKILLS SUMMIT
A one day summit on the type of employment skills that may be needed in the years 2020 and beyond.
Recently there has been considerable discussion about the growing problem of skill shortages. Such shortages cover an array of industry sectors. However, what is not being discussed is the type of skills the Australian workforce will need in the coming decades and the education and training which will be needed to support those needs.

Australia is increasingly a knowledge-based economy. Sectors such as elaborately transformed manufacturing, ICT, engineering, the sciences and the professions will be the enablers in our pursuit of a high performing knowledge-based economy.

Issues to be considered at the Emerging Skills Summit will include:
• What skills gaps exists today in Australia and how are they being rectified?
• How are the Higher Education and Vocational Education & Training sectors positioning themselves to meet future shifts in skill requirements?
• How can business and industry communicate to education providers what their market needs are?
• Should Creativity be a recognised discipline much the same as Knowledge Management now is?
• How do you build a demand driven culture where organisations are constantly seeking change rather than waiting to have change forced upon them?
• How will the ageing of the Australian workforce be addressed and what are the implications for lifelong learning?
• Is the trend towards generic degrees coupled with vocational skills, or double degrees the right option?
• How do we predict future skills trends especially for future business leaders and those wishing to embark on a career incorporating innovation, entrepreneurship and business development?

The summit will be an opportunity to canvass the opinions, thoughts and ideas of senior representatives from a number of areas of expertise. We hope that the outcome will be some concrete proposals for implementation by the various stakeholders.
When: 2nd half 2005
Where: Sydney CBD
Cost: $tba (refreshments and lunch included)
Programme and registration details will be available at www.bhert.com once a date is confirmed.

REGIONAL ENGAGEMENT FORUMS
COLLABORATIVE ENGAGEMENT – SOUTH AUSTRALIA
Co-host: University of South Australia
Keynote Speakers invited include:
The Hon. Karlene Maywald, MP, Minister for Regional Development, Small Business (SA)
The Hon. Stephanie Key, MP, Minister for Employment, Training & Further Education (SA)
When: Tuesday 07 June 2005
Where: Whyalla, SA
Cost: $tba (refreshments and lunch included)
Programme and registration details will be available at www.bhert.com

Other forums to be announced include Perth WA, Port Macquarie NSW, Central Victoria and South East Queensland.
Programme and registration details will be available at www.bhert.com once details are confirmed.
The Business/Higher Education Round Table has three outstanding publications highlighting what's going on, where the opportunities are and where Australia stands.

THE FACTS is a compendium of higher education information gathered from a variety of sources. The accurate and broad-based content of the report should help those in the higher education sector gain an informed view. $17.95 incl. gst

KNOWLEDGE-BASED ECONOMY: Some Facts & Figures highlights where Australia stands on the world stage in a number of critical industry indicators. $7.90 incl. gst. For example, how do we rate on Investment in Knowledge, R&D Intensity, R&D Expenditure as a % of GDP, Biotechnology R&D, ICT Development and Venture Capital Investment.

LEADING EDGE is a collection of brief vignettes which highlight the research excellence that places Australia amongst the best in the world. $15.95 incl. gst. As Brendan Nelson, Minister for Education, Science and Training says in his foreword – 'It is research and innovation that will drive us confidently into the knowledge society of the 21st Century'.

YES, I WISH TO ORDER ______ COPY/COPIES OF ‘THE FACTS’ at $17.95 per copy (GST incl.)

YES, I WISH TO ORDER ______ COPY/COPIES OF ‘THE KNOWLEDGE-BASED ECONOMY’ at $7.90 per copy (GST incl.)

YES, I WISH TO ORDER ______ COPY/COPIES OF ‘LEADING EDGE’ at $15.95 per copy (GST incl.)

YES, I WISH TO ORDER ______ SET/SETS OF ‘ALL THREE PUBLICATIONS’ at $39.00 per set (GST incl.)

☐ Cheque payable to: Business/Higher Education Round Table
   ABN 80 050 207 942
   24 Brunswick Street, Fitzroy Vic 3065
   Ph: +61 3 9419 8068
   Fax: +61 3 9419 8276
   Email: bhert@bhert.com

☐ Please charge my credit card – Type: ☐ Visa ☐ Mastercard ☐ AMEX

Card #: ...........................................................................................................Card Expiry Date: ....................................................

Signature: ..........................................................Full Name: ..........................................................

Position: ..........................................................Organisation: ..........................................................

Address: ....................................................................................................................Postcode: .................

Ph: ..................................................................Fax: ...........................................E-mail: ..........................................................
The purpose of the Business/Higher Education Round Table (B-HERT) is to pursue initiatives that will advance the goals and improve the performance of both business and higher education for the benefit of Australian society. B-HERT is the only body where leaders of Australia’s business, research, professional and academic communities come together to address important issues of common concern, to improve the interaction between Australian business and higher education institutions, and to help guide the future directions of higher education. In pursuing this mission BHERT aims to influence public opinion and government policy on selected issues of importance.

Mission Statement

B-HERT believes that a prerequisite for a more prosperous and equitable society in Australia is a more highly-educated community. In material terms it fosters economic growth and improved living standards – through improved productivity and competitiveness with other countries. In terms of equity, individual Australians should have the opportunity to realise their full social, cultural, political and economic potential.

Membership of B-HERT comprises Australian universities, corporations, professional associations, the major public research organisations (Commonwealth Scientific and Industrial Research Organisation and Australian Nuclear Science and Technology Organisation and the Australian National Training Authority. B-HERT pursues a number of activities through its Working Groups and active alliances with relevant organisations both domestically and internationally. It publishes a regular newsletter (B-HERT NEWS), reporting on its activities and current issues of concern relevant to its Mission.
IF YOU WISH TO ADVERTISE IN THIS SPACE PLEASE CONTACT THE B-HERT SECRETARIAT FOR DETAILS ON +61 3 9419 8068 or anne@bhert.com