Observatory PASCAL

Place Management, Social Capital and Learning Regions

2nd PURE CDG Regional Visit Report (RVR 2)

MELBOURNE, AUSTRALIA

28th – 3rd March, 2010

Pascal Consultative Development Group:

Janelle Allinson   University of Tasmania
Chris Duke   Academic Director PURE
Glen Postle   University of Southern Queensland
Chris Shepherd   Vice Chair PASCAL

Summary of Main Recommendations and Key Observations

(i) National Policy

The policy and resource environment for TAFE and HE is changing significantly, with university compacting and a new competitive methodology for TAFE

Federal government continues to sponsor competition. Policy objectives are disabled by mixed messages.

Requirements and reward systems align poorly with federal policy intentions for higher participation by low-SES groups and greater HE-industry collaboration.

Federal policy for an SES premium to raise low SES participation in different locations requires detailed and careful attention.

Tertiary education supports the social and economic development of an active coherent and diverse multicultural society, while equipping employers and workers with the knowledge and skills to innovate and compete.

Unitary and competitive league tables of university performance should be approached cautiously; they tend to undermine regional development and engagement in favour of research publishable in prestigious journals.

Support for a few world-class research universities could strip out pockets of research excellence important to a region from smaller and 'regional' universities. Each HEI should where possible have relevant centres of excellence which make it a magnet for students, not a fall-back in lieu of a prestigious city university.

Federal government should stimulate third mission engagement (compare HEIF in the UK) so that HEIs prioritise it alongside traditional research and scholarship, for the sake of HE as well as for regional development, notwithstanding the recommendation of the Bradley Review (2009).

(ii) At State level - Melbourne and Victoria

Changed TAFE funding may reduce the contribution of public sector TAFE to local economies and their skill requirements, and to the equity agenda.

Melbourne is the hub of SE Australia. The City of Melbourne, metro-Melbourne and the State of Victoria are inescapably interdependent.

▪ All levels of government should plan accordingly.

There are several correct answers to the question 'what is the region?' There are at least four concentric 'regions' from City to State. Each is important for different purposes. Also important are local regions and sub-regions.

▪ HEIs should relate confidently to their chosen regions, sectors and interest groups.

Melbourne is blessed with rich social and cultural capital.

▪ It should use this to work across silos and sectors, learning through the process.
▪ The City through OKC should nurture a broad-based Melbourne and Victorian 'tertiary education learning community', collaborate with others and support diverse institutional strategies. These should be monitored individually and systemically, with continuing adaptation.
▪ OKC should make every effort to bring TAFE fully into its remit. It should accelerate learning, City and State-wide, about collaboration that supports progression to meet SES participation targets, enhance the skills base for City and State prosperity and equip the City and State to innovate effectively.

Models linking and articulating between VET-TAFE and higher education are evolving and diverse. This is a focus of State policy attention.

▪ Melbourne should be treated as a living laboratory and monitored, with applied research guiding development and adoption of best practice.
▪ The City and State should sustain vigorous dialogue with federal government to ensure that new funding arrangements do not inflict serious harm.

The Office for Knowledge Capital (OKC) has an important role in nurturing collaboration and relating higher education and VET to the needs of greater Melbourne and the region; it is yielding good value and evolving as a model relevant to other regions in Australia and beyond.

Victorian universities appear to be diversifying more confidently, with signs of new and confident leadership enabling pursuit of different and complementary missions.
This bodes well for their capacity to develop in complementary directions and reduce wasteful competition.

There is a weak tradition of sustained partnership between HEIs and their regions and communities, although good examples can be found. There is as yet little evidence of significant results from collaboration between the universities.

▪ Sustained effort is needed to realise the potential. This applies especially to collaboration with the private sector.
▪ OKC should initiate and monitor partnership projects that will achieve results in priority areas: Innovation Systems, Green Jobs and Skills, Social Inclusion and Active Citizenship, Creative Industries, and provision for Rural Regional areas. Initiatives should be co-owned by participating institutions, and the results shared State-wide.

Areas of innovation and sustainability across the emerging green skills and jobs arena, and practical ways of enhancing social inclusion and active citizenship, are of keen interest to other PURE regions.

Melbourne and Victoria can gain and contribute from international networking and knowledge exchange in higher education.

- Melbourne should continue participating in developmental benchmarking and applied studies of effective engagement. Several PURE metropolitan regions have interests similar to Melbourne's, such as Antwerp in Flanders, Glasgow, Helsinki, and London (Thames Gateway). Melbourne should develop a special network relationship with these regions, for mutual advantage.
- Melbourne's examples of good practice should be shared internationally.

Many plans for partnership are at an early planning stage and should be monitored.

- The City of Melbourne should continue to develop its leading role among the local authorities in the greater metropolitan area, and work with other regional metropolitan local authorities for locality-up metro-region-wide strategies.
- Fora and consultations should bring State Departments involved in economic and social development together with a wider stakeholder community including private sector representatives and their peak leadership bodies.
- The City of Melbourne with OKC, the Committee for Melbourne and others should monitor the outcomes of different approaches and opportunities for restricted and open policy discourse, from invitational policy round tables to social networking that allows wide public participation.

Changes since the First CDG Visit in March 2009

(i)   The Economic Environment

As the Region's mid-project review noted, the impact of the global financial crisis on the overall Victorian economy 'was moderate, reflecting the overall resilience of the Australian economy with Victoria being one of the stronger economies due to economic growth around innovation and knowledge intensive industries, and the overall healthy level of business as well as public sector investment'.

On the other hand the other longer-term global crisis to do with global warming has had a major impact. following the disastrous February 2009 bushfires: 'the subsequent Royal Commission has increased community awareness of the risk of adverse outcomes associated with catastrophic weather conditions influenced by climate change, and the need for adaptation and mitigation at both a community and individual level'.

The CDG was also advised that the Melbourne City Council elected in late 2008 had 'a strong focus on economic and business development, especially through a new Enterprise Melbourne agency and a knowledge city strategy as part of the City's implementation of the broad Future Melbourne strategy developed in 2008'.

(ii)   The National and Regional Policy Environment

Two significant reports commissioned by the federal government are relevant: the Cutler Review and the Bradley Review in 2008. In his review Cutler reiterated the importance of Australian universities in the national (and regional) innovation systems. Cutler identified that some of the drivers for change include a shift to networks of open innovation, and the rise of user-generated and demand-drive searches for applicable knowledge systems and solutions. These shifts have particular implications for universities.

Equally, the Bradley Review of Higher Education will shape the future direction for tertiary education. In response to Bradley the government has announced future structural reforms for the higher

education sector which focus on a student-centred, demand-driven system overseen by a national regulatory and quality agency. Bradley highlighted the need for a national tertiary system with clear pathways, articulation and connectivity between the university and VET sectors. Alongside a call for greater accessibility and participation targets, the Bradley Review also addressed the sector's longstanding concerns in regard to serious shortfalls in research funding for the indirect costs of research.

The new approach to 'compacting' between universities and federal government which followed Denise Bradley's review is also being worked through. There were hopes that the Bradley review would recommend some kind of funding to support the development of third mission engagement work. Apparently hampered by lack of agreement as to just what was meant by engagement and what was required, the report did not go beyond words of commendation.

Meanwhile, targeted funding to raise the participation rate of low SES communities in higher education is proving problematic to implement. Regional universities not surprisingly expect the extra funds to come to them, but the patchwork of different universities' ancillary campuses across the State requires consideration. There is also criticism that regional loadings are restricted to raising the age participation rate (APR), whereas economic, social and cultural impact are also important, involving partnership with the community. As Gavin Moodie of RMIT put it 'there are many other reasons to provide higher education in regional and rural areas – one is decentralisation so that Australia's entire higher education provision in not only in metropolitan areas'. This is not irrelevant to this report, since the Melbourne region extends in some senses to the borders of the State and beyond (see below).

While the CDG visit was taking place, Denise Bradley praised a federal website initiative called My University, which is intended to provide better information in an open competitive system. The policy-led competitive character of Australian HE gave the CDG cause to ask whether national and international league table ranking is seriously threatening and already undermining regional engagement, especially by the more research-led institutions. OKC has coined the term 'coopetition' in an attempt to capture the need to work cooperatively in a competitive environment. The CDG asks how far keenly sponsored competition in federal policy impairs efforts to create a powerful knowledge-driven innovative system involving all HEIs at State and City levels.

Turning to TAFE, concern about declining funding and unmet demand is exacerbated by a new funding methodology that is causing still more serious concern. This was clearly articulated to the CDG on its visit to VU and Ballarat, as to what provision will remain affordable, and what TAFE courses important to the local economy and especially to the SME sector might be lost. In general there remains a sense that all of tertiary education still suffers under-funding relative to the wealth of the nation and using OECD comparators.

At State level the report of the panel chaired by Professor Kwong Lee Dow (Report advising on the development of the Victorian Tertiary Education Plan, 2010) was finalised for release as the 2nd CDG visit took place (see below). This useful and comprehensive report is clear that it is not for the State to run tertiary education, but to support and help guide change that is seen as being in the public interest.

(iii)   Melbourne within the PURE project – other Comparable Regions

Much has been achieved since the first PURE team visited Melbourne in March 2009. The CDG encountered energy and a spirit of relative optimism about what was happening and could be achieved in 2010, as opportunities identified in 2009 were realised. The work of the Melbourne Project Steering Group was brought to a focus with a large full-day seminar opened by the State Minister for Skills and Workplace Participation Education in December 2009. This received and discussed interim reports on projects commissioned in the three priority areas of Regional Innovation Systems (RIS), Social Inclusion and Active Citizenship (SIAC) and Green Jobs and Skills (GJS). The studies have since been

revised and are being shared internationally via the PURE website. They are seen as the basis for demonstration projects in the current year. Each is commented on further and briefly below.

Victoria took part in the OECD Review of Higher Education Institutions in Regional Development. Victoria prepared a weighty self-evaluation review prior to the visit of the OECD Review Team in December 2009. The OECD report is not expected until mid-2010. Preliminary findings presented in a feedback session on 11 December suggest that the issues, as well as the region covered, unsurprisingly resemble those in the PURE project. The final OECD advice should be looked at in the context of the region's ongoing work within PURE. The Report by the Kwong Lee Dow panel recognizes this alignment on page 51, recommending that the implementation of the 'OECD advice for cities and regions' be aligned with the PURE project (see reference to demonstration projects above).

Whereas there is a doubtless irresolvable debate as to whether the federal-State system serves 21st century Australia well, it happens that Melbourne-centred Victoria is a natural and quite 'organic' region. This enhances a case for the State to play a more vigorous leadership role in developing and shaping a well articulated tertiary system for sustainable knowledge society, in this sense perhaps going beyond the advice of the Kwong Lee Dow report (see below) in system planning.

Melbourne's activity in 2009 with an enlarged Steering Group and a clear Action Plan has made it a leader among the initial PURE regions. In particular its work with a first iteration of benchmarking both by HEIs and in the Region was written up and shared throughout PURE by means of a Briefing Paper (BP 16 November 2009). Melbourne's experience was of value for other regions in the PURE international workshop in February 2010, including its matrix approach to simplifying the work of analysis. Melbourne has established itself as a leader in learning city-region planning and development, making more rapid progress than many of the other early-starting PURE regions and consequently also gaining much from international exchange.

The Region and the Office of Knowledge Capital (OKC)

Regions and Sub-Regions

The meaning of region has been a source of ambiguity for Melbourne and Victoria. There is no one answer that serves well for all purposes. Melbourne is among the world's most liveable, culturally wealthy and creative cities. It is the hub of a region of SE Australia extending beyond the State borders. In practice the PURE remit with (the City of) Melbourne and the OECD State review refer to the same issues and the same region and sub-regions.

There are at least four concentric 'regions': from the City of Melbourne through the 31 local authority areas of metro-Melbourne to the wider commuting region and out to the whole State. Each of these is real and important for different purposes. The CDG visited Geelong in 2009 and Ballarat in 2010. Some quite remote rural parts of the State are directly served by the regional campuses of city-based universities – Melbourne and Monash, La Trobe and RMIT, as well as Ballarat and Deakin with their non-metropolitan HQs. Also important are the local regions and sub-regions served by different universities and TAFE institutes, and by their respective satellite campuses.

HEIs should identify their respective areas of geographical as well as subject interest, and relate confidently to their chosen regions, sectors and interest groups.

The Capacity and Potential for Cooperation

Melbourne is projected to grow significantly, presenting planning challenges and problems for all levels of government, as well as opportunities for greater wealth and capacity to thrive in the global economic context. Every tertiary institution will be affected in some way. The State as a Region led by the City needs the

combined and harmonised efforts of its whole tertiary sector to meet present and future needs for sustainable innovation, human resource development, and social inclusion.

The CDG found evidence of purposeful leadership in different universities for quite diverse missions. A stronger sense was gained even than twelve months earlier of institutional leaders adopting purposeful different yet generally complementary missions. Monash for example, vigorously entrepreneurial as a global institution, is developing close partnerships across the huge and fast-growing stretch of south-east Melbourne, with access- and SME-oriented campuses as well as its impressive hi-tech R&D. Five years on, Melbourne has reaffirmed the third mission intention written into its previous strategic plan. This balances local community-based work with major big-budget partnerships across all three sectors, government, private and NGO.

Several universities are collaborating to extend articulation and HE opportunities across the ever-extending and relatively disadvantaged regions of northern and western Melbourne, while Ballarat and La Trobe, for example, resolutely maintain small outreach campuses and partnerships that short-run rationalisation would possibly condemn. All this has the potential to ease the chronic competitiveness of Australian higher education in Victoria. Yet much remains to be done. OKC during its short existence has fostered dialogue and built common activities, but jealousies, suspicions and separatist tendencies remain strong in the culture, both between HEIs and among different public and private sector interests jostling to speak as and for Melbourne.

All parties need to strive for a more collaborative culture, seeking synergies and complementarities of effort where all can win. It is important for Melbourne to have a mechanism such as OKC which is explicitly supported by and speaks with disinterest for all the universities and for TAFE, as well as with and for the City, the greater metropolitan area, State government and the private sector. It should serve as a neutral forum and brokerage, where needs can be identified and met in the most rational, economical and effective way. It is early days, but the record so far suggests that OKC is a model in which Melbourne can reasonably take pride. It rates well by international standards, and is of interest in a number of places overseas.

A difficulty building regional partnership and development in a fiercely competitive local, national and international environment is vulnerability to the accidents of change. A few key leaders can leave and the drive may be lost. It is important to embed a culture of collaboration, by formal as well as informal means. If this is institutionally and culturally embedded the departure of a chief executive from the City, a key State department, or a university should not result in mission shift away from engagement between higher education, City and State. We have reported gains from the recent accession of new heads in several universities. By the same token the gains are at risk if another new head can easily revert to competitive isolationism.

Priorities for Action in the Region using PURE

The PURE Steering Group commissioned pilot studies in three of the priority areas identified by regions for the whole Project (see above). The Regional Innovation Systems and Social Inclusion themes form the basis of demonstration projects to be proposed to state and federal governments from April 2010.We now report briefly on all three of these.

Regional Innovation Systems

Within the knowledge economy the need to be innovative, and the need to generate the next good idea to stay competitive, are paramount. Thus ensuring that mechanisms and systems are in place to enable and facilitate innovation is important. An added difficulty in supporting innovation is creating 'innovation systems' or milieu that enables a myriad of informal or serendipitous as well as formal interactions – because innovation often occurs 'on the margins'. Knowledge and learning sit at the heart of innovation, and universities as critical repositories of knowledge are key components of innovation systems. However, and

this may be a challenge for universities, effective innovation systems rely on networks and relationships to drive responsive, flexible demand-driven solutions. Furthermore, place-based knowledge, often locality or regionally based and unique because it is of a particular place and tacit, is also integral to regional innovation systems, because innovation is fostered by distinctive place-based knowledge systems and social networks. This being the case, and given the role of the knowledge economy in the State of Victoria, it is important to evaluate the role of the Victorian universities as core components of the regional innovation system and innovation catalysts.

The intersection of key attributes of place (region) - complex systems, locality- specific knowledge and multiple institutions - with core attributes of the university - learning/ knowledge, research and community engagement - provides the basis for a regional innovations systems framework. Within this framework it is possible to frame questions which provide insight as to how universities in Victoria have contributed to and catalysed the region's innovation system.

- **Capacity to rethink and reframe knowledge**

  Universities are specialised in learning, knowledge creation and knowledge management. They play a critical role in knowledge transfer and are thus ideally suited to building capabilities across the region. Overall, the positioning of the 8 universities means that the metropolitan area of Melbourne is well covered, albeit there is a gap or corridor to the North-West. The South-East corridor stands out, and the roles of Melbourne and Monash are significant. Monash's distributive model along the transport corridor serves that part of the region well. Victoria University in the West, and La Trobe and RMIT in the North-West, are currently grappling with the tension of access and costs. Current housing and residential development along this corridor will place further demands on the system. To this end the inward reach of Ballarat– well versed in regional engagement – towards Melbourne provides an additional opportunity.

  Monash's role in the Innovation Precinct, Victoria University's linkages with business especially engineering in the western industrial areas of Melbourne and Ballarat's efforts to build an innovation precinct demonstrate examples of universities seeking to develop distinctive approaches to knowledge generation and learning which are characteristic of regional innovation systems.

  However, beyond the confines of the outer metropolitan area and the Bendigo/ Ballarat Corridor, universities in Victoria continue to struggle with the dilemmas of delivery into rural and regional Victoria. What the CDG did observe however was a concerted effort by several of these universities to broker knowledge, learning and research within and across their localities and regions (note La Trobe and Ballarat). La Trobe, for example, has developed a number of approaches in reframing/ rethinking curriculum, for example where learning is co-developed with relevant groups such as indigenous health workers. Ballarat has purchased a rural property to provide outreach opportunities for learning and has taken a regional specific approach to some courses and applied research.

- **Mobilising university social infrastructure and relational assets**

  A university positions itself to gain access to, and engage with, a range of knowledge sets by multiplying and strengthening relationships with individuals, communities, business and institutions across the regional landscape. As part of emerging diversification across the Victorian universities, the CDG observed good examples of the ways in which universities are creating and building distinctive relational assets. Outstanding examples include Deakin University's relationship with the Ford Motor Company, and Victoria University's linkages across a diverse range of SMEs across the western Melbourne industrial region. It has been particularly interesting to note the initiatives now put in place by Monash to re-engage with the eastern industrial heartland of Clayton and its environs, creating and building a distinctive precinct which not only taps into the big players such as the synchrotron but also explicitly acknowledges the need to bring locally based suppliers in the value chain into the regional innovation system.

▪ **Utilising university institutional structures**

University campuses are ideally suited to play an intermediary regional-development role, given that they have well established systems and processes for quality and delivery. The question is how flexible are these arrangements, and can they accommodate new opportunities? Clearly RMIT and Victoria University as dual sector universities, and Deakin with its highly effective distance learning models, also demonstrate quality effective flexible learning structures needed to grow workforce productivity and the entrepreneurial imagination.

The panel also observed that the flexible co-location of high school, TAFE and university on the Berwick campus of Monash was illustrative of the kinds of institutional flexibility needed in effective regional innovation systems. Also illustrative of this approach is the work of Chisholm TAFE in seeking to ensure that apprentices and trade students graduate not only with their trade skills but also with business and entrepreneurial skills.

▪ **Connecting and leveraging place attributes**

Place and regional assets will be increasingly important as a way for universities in Victoria to generate unique value-add for each institution with a concomitant value- add in the effectiveness of the regional innovation system.

The position of Melbourne and Monash as leaders in medical research and biotechnology and regenerative medicine, along with the emerging areas of material science and nanotechnology, reflects in no small way effective collaboration between Victorian State policies and investment and local governments' willingness to ensure that planning and development precincts align. Equally, other universities such as RMIT and its creative links with design, creative industries and social inclusion and Deakin with an explicit focus on regional commitment and applied research, demonstrate the value-add attained from leveraging place attributes.

Leveraging place attributes is giving each Victorian university a distinctiveness which generates its own demand. It adds to the diversity and opportunity of choice across the region (in itself a creative edge). The interaction of these differences increases the opportunities for serendipitous exchange of informal knowledge - interaction highly characteristic of effective regional innovation systems. The CDG argues that the efforts to value and grow distinctiveness should be prompted and supported by the Office of Knowledge Capital and by relevant state and federal government policies.
Green Skills and Jobs

The green agenda in Melbourne is broad and largely fragmented. The HEIs have a significant role to play within the Region both in advising policy-makers in State and Federal Government and at the same time using their research capability to explore new ways for effective solutions and interventions to support and advise industry in their planning for the future. However, the coordination within and between HEIs which this needs is not currently apparent.

The VET-TAFE sector will have a significant role to play in skills development, particularly where they is the need to challenge existing behaviour and practice. There is always the risk that skills lag behind demand. Close cooperation between HEI, TAFE, industry and policy makers is therefore essential; it must be robust and consistent.

The green agenda is common to all Regions in the world, and the PURE network offers a good opportunity to develop a best practice approach to policy issues, products, techniques and skills. The green agenda is already of great importance to the other metropolitan regions in the PURE network. It should be one of the foci for future joint collaboration. A good example of a coordinated approach already exists in another PURE region, at the Thames Gateway Institute for Sustainability in the UK.

Social Inclusion

It was stated in the first CDG report that Victoria's socio-economic profile, history, identity and values could arguably `be linked to a more mature and balanced view of development than the narrowly econometric'. The first CDG was not able to examine these different substantive aspects in any systematic way. The second visit offered the CDG opportunities to consider how the Region is balancing the economic with social inclusion, equity and diversity agendas. There is considerable evidence to suggest that the policy focus on improving social and community well-being is linked primarily to changing community economic circumstances. Much of the education and training activity concerns improving and widening access and pathways for the disadvantaged and marginalised. This is closely linked with the overall aim for the region to grow, and supporting the potential in the Region for economic benefit. The major thrust of social inclusion is aimed at treating or processing various groups so that they have an equal opportunity to contribute to and benefit from the economic growth of the Region.

Some outstandingly innovative programs across the Region are involved in improving education and training opportunities for the disadvantaged, disenfranchised or marginalised, for example Monash Clayton and Berwick regional engagement with TAFE and high schools, Victoria University industry engagement programs, and the La Trobe/RMIT/Victoria University/University of Melbourne 'Learning Beyond School' project.

There is however little apparent activity in the Region aimed at diminishing the prevalence of social problems or understanding their origin or cause. One example in the Region which tackles this is the Hume Global Learning Village. While understanding that economic and social issues are inextricably linked, this community concept includes a charter which aims 'to promote respect for every citizen, encourage participation and strengthen community well-being and reduce the causes of disadvantage'.

There is increasing evidence to suggest a decline of community spirit and a rise of anti-social behaviour. Recent examples of apparently racist attacks in Melbourne indicate that the Region is not without its social problems. Many of the partners in this PURE project subscribe to the view that the main focus of governments in the Region is on providing opportunities for everyone to better their own position, and that this should be modified in favour of a better and more socially inclusive society. The Hume Global Learning Village maintains that while individual prosperity is important there is a need to shift attention from just economic growth, to include ways of improving the social well-being of society as a whole.

Other Issues

Benchmarking of Higher Education Institutions and the Region

Benchmarking is an important part of the PURE methodology. Melbourne's leading work in using the HEI benchmarking tool and in pioneering the Region tool has proved of wide interest. In 2010 the Region intends a second iteration of both tools, allowing refinement of use and the beginnings of longitudinal monitoring to track and guide progress over time. It is recommended that efforts be made this year to bring together the results from HEIs and the region, with a view to acting on the data. Institutions should be able to identify needs and gaps in provision which provide business opportunities meeting State and City needs.

The Kwong Lee Dow report and TAFE in Victoria

At the time of the 2nd CDG visit, Professor Kwong Lee Dow's report commissioned by the State to review the tertiary education sector was released. The CDG met the Chair and discussed his findings. The report recommends the vigorous development of the TAFE sector and better articulation across all parts of a more integrative tertiary education system. It stops short of recommending State intervention to shape and steer the system, believing that 'the Victorian Government should not seek to restructure the higher education sector in Victoria' but should 'encourage, facilitate and support developments in the public sector that

emerge from the sector itself – not impose them'. The advice to promote and support but not to direct change in the public interest strengthens the need for a facilitative mechanism such as the OKC to nurture a spirit of collaborative innovation leading to such developments.

Victoria has a strong TAFE system, currently much concerned about the new funding methodology. Its relationship with higher education varies and is changing. The State is unique in having four dual sector institutions catering for both TAFE and higher education students. Many forms of articulation are being employed or trialled. There is interest in the dual sector institutions in other regions abroad, where efforts are also being made to explore how to develop a more encompassing tertiary system with multi-directional flows and ease of progression; one of the PURE cluster interests is in Tertiary Systems. The CDG would encourage the Region, especially in the wake of the recent report, actively to innovate with modes of articulation and progression, and to share this work internationally.

The Governance of Melbourne and Planning across all Levels of Government

Like many other of Australia's and the world's great cities, Melbourne lacks a unitary metropolitan-wide regional authority. This pushes the City of Melbourne, as the leading local authority, and the State as the overarching larger-region jurisdiction, into planning for Melbourne, for effective engagement between Region and HEIs as for other purposes. Many of the big issues to do with the sustainable development and planning of a large and fast-growing city-region require educational institution partnership. Different universities have different senses of 'their region' in a geographical sense. Often collaboration is required among HEIs for effective educational partnership across the spectrum of teaching (human resource development) and research and innovation, as well as other kinds of engagement.

Close cooperation between the different local authorities across metro-Melbourne and with the other regionally grouped authorities across the State is required, both systemically and on a local institution-by-institution basis. The States' sensitive involvement is essential: respecting local diversity, balancing the more remote rural with metropolitan needs, and influencing and managing the impact of federal government policy. To succeed and to gain most benefit from tertiary education, private and third sector (NGO) interests and representative bodies must also be
involved. The CDG found evidence of much energy among such bodies, for example the Committee for Melbourne and BHERT as well as industry representative associations and the community NGO sector. Cooperation and liaison in the public interest, respecting sub-regions and different interests and engaging HE appropriately, will remain a work in progress. A deeply embedded competitive ethos appears to make full collaboration elusive.

Industry and Higher Education

The need to build trust and confidence through the experience of working together to mutual advantage is most evident in terms of university-industry collaboration, although there are also excellent examples of fruitful recent partnership. However there continues to be a need for better penetration of the SME community, where new techniques to build effective networks are still required.

There also remains the issue of future-proofing from the RVR1 in respect of the changes in the current economy and its future direction. Programmes in the universities and TAFEs appear to be developed in isolation without the knowledge of future trends being fully embedded. The role of government is important here. The Kwong Lee Dow Report highlights this, as referred to earlier. Outcomes form the PURE project, especially the demonstration projects referred to earlier, can assist government in this process.

Examples of Good Practice

The CDG encountered many examples of good practice that would be of interest and utility to other learning cities and regions. On its first visit the CDG tentatively identified several possible examples including:

- The alliance between Victoria University and AFL Western Bulldogs
- Deakin's work with Geelong and the rural Warnambool region

Other possibilities drawn from the Region's original briefing and from CDG observation include:

- The participation of RMIT, Swinburne, Monash and Melbourne in Design Victoria
- The recent response to the Victorian bushfires, albeit by individual universities rather than in a coordinated manner
- Monash University's participation in the South East Melbourne Innovation Precinct, along with CSIRO and Swinburne University selectively
- The University of Melbourne's 3rd mission commitment and its Carlton community partnership.
- Developments in the northern suburbs industry belt involving several universities
- and specifically the Hume Global Learning Village and its multiversity aspirations
- The Australian Catholic University's social partnership with the Fitzroy community
- The University of Ballarat's strong regional government approach on multiple fronts especially with local government.

It would be impertinent for the CDG on the basis of its reading and brief visits to pretend to judge with authority which are the best examples for the Melbourne region. Instead it encourages the Region to use the template Wiki approach on the Pascal PURE Website to identify and present examples that it considers most suitable.

In Conclusion

The CDG concluded its second visit to the Melbourne region heartened by the energy and 'can-do' spirit everywhere in evidence; but very aware also of significant difficulties confronting the region. The region's reservoirs of cultural and social capital need conserving, replenishing, and using wisely and well, as much as do its water storage reservoirs. Melbourne is as alert as is anywhere to the impending disaster awaiting the ecosystem if things do not change, as its 'green skills and jobs' priority reflects. It is also conscious of its standing as a most liveable 'Florida' city; and of the need to be a knowledge society as well as a knowledge economy, concerned with wellbeing as well as GDP.

In terms of the engagement of higher and tertiary education with the region, awareness and discourse are well advanced. Some albeit fragile conventions and arrangements are growing up, notable among them OKC: for systematic and automatic consultation; for engagement in designing curriculum; for undertaking research; and for allocating resources and energies. Too much depends on a small number of charismatic and long-sighted individuals; but there is strength in the many local and sub-regional community endeavours which characterise an active participatory democracy.

Compared with most PURE regions, Melbourne started with a firm and clear sense of direction. Working from a firmer foundation, it has made strong progress in fifteen months, setting and working to its chosen agenda. Two years is barely time to more than start a journey into systematic engagement. In Melbourne's case it already had a map and was charting the direction which it continues to take. Some regions will be pleased enough if after two years they have found a basis for collaboration and located the starting point. The challenge for Melbourne, beyond what is contained above, will be to sustain energy and purpose well beyond 2010. The growing PURE network should provide one valuable means to support this.

Observatory PASCAL

Place Management, Social Capital and Learning Regions

Names of those Consulted during CDG 2 – Order of Meetings:

1. **La Trobe University**

   - Dr Kerry Ferguson, Pro Vice Chancellor, Equity and Student Services
   - Dr Andrew Harvey, Director, Regional Operations

2. **RMIT University**

   - Dr Leonie Wheeler, Program Director, Northern Partnerships Unit

3. **City of Hume**

   - Frank Maguire, Hume Global Learning Village
   - George Osborne, Manager Learning Community
   - Dr Alistair Lewis, Victoria University

4. **Victorian Government**

   - Steve Herbert, Parliamentary Secretary
   - Matthew Harris, Manager, Higher Education, Skills Victoria
   - Prof Kwong Lee Dow, Chair, Tertiary Education Review Panel

5. **Industry Group**

   - Megan Lilly, Australian Industry Group
   - Sharon Winocur, Business Higher Education Roundtable
   - Matthew Gould, Victorian Employers Chamber of Commerce and Industry
   - Patrick Coleman, Business Council of Australia
   - Darryl Wilson, Wyndham City Council

6. **City of Melbourne**

   - Geoff Lawler, Director City Planning and Infrastructure
   - Jane Sharwood, Manager Business and International
   - David Mayes, Manager Strategic Planning
   - Alex Fearnside, Manager Sustainability
   - Austin Ley, Manager City Research
   - Cherry Grimwade, Community Services

7. **Committee for Melbourne**

   - Susan Vale, Policy Director
   - Amelia Jalland, Policy Officer

8. **Monash University and SE Melbourne community (Monash unless otherwise noted)**

   - Assoc Prof Joanne Etheridge, Director Monash Centre for Electron Microscopy
   - Silvio Tiziani, Manager Australian Regenerative Medicine Institute
   - David Buckingham, Office of Vice Chancellor
   - Jane McLoughlin, Office of Vice Chancellor
   - Jane Holt, Director Planning and Support, Office of DVC-Research
   - Assoc Prof Abid Khan, Director Institute for Nanosciences, Materials and Manufacture

- Sarah Newton, Director Industry Engagement
- Rahda Thomas, Manager Partnerships and Development
- Prof Adam Shoemaker, DVC-Education
- Phillip Steele, Pro Vice Chancellor, Campus Co-ordination
- Virginia Simmons, CEO, Chisholm TAFE
- Roger Page, Principal, Nossal High School
- David Wilkinson, Economic Development Manager, City of Casey
- Anne Peek, CEO Dandenong Casey General Practice Association
- Assoc Prof Lionel Frost, Department of Economics
- Lindsay Smith, Deputy Head, Berwick School of IT
- Erik Elmund, Head of School, Communications and Social Sciences
- Katherine Lock, Campus Manager Berwick
- Pat O'Connell, Frankston Mornington Local Learning & Employment Network
- Tony Sheet, Monash Peninsula Campus Community Advisory Council
- Assoc Prof Barbara Clarke, Faculty of Education
- Prof Louise Farnworth, Head Department of Occupational Therapy

9. DIIRD/SEMIP

- Peter Chaffey, Economic Development Coordinator, City of Knox
- Ron Chiggino, Economic Development Manager, City of Greater Dandenong
- Paula Brennan, Industry Development Coordinator, City of Greater Dandenong
- Trevor Ray, Department of Industry Innovation and Regional Development (DIIRD)
- Leanne Boulton, Project Manager, South East Melbourne Innovation Precinct (SEMIP)

10. Victoria University

- Barbara McLure, Industry Engagement Coordinator
- Neville Penney, Industry Liaison Manger
- Sharon Orbell, Assistant Director Engagement and Partnerships

11. University of Ballarat

- Prof Terry Lloyd, Deputy Vice Chancellor
- Prof Frank Stagnitti, Pro Vice Chancellor, Research
- Wayne Hurst, Major Projects Manager
- Doug Sarah, Chairman Destination Ballarat Advisory Board
- Mal Vallance, Business Development Director Technology Park
- Barry Wright, Manufacturing Services Head
- Kath White, Applied Sciences Head
- Clare Rasmussen

ANNEX

Full list of those whom the CDG met during the visit to the Melbourne region:

PURE Steering Group - March 25

- Dr Marj Horne, Australian Catholic University.
- Prof Hal Swerissen, La Trobe University.
- Jane McLouighlin, Monash University.
- Bronwyn Jones, University of Melbourne.
- Anne Badenhorst, Swinburne University.
- Prof Peter Creamer, Victoria University.
- Elly Hutton, Department of Innovation, Industry and Regional Development DIIRD.

City of Melbourne - March 25

- Geoff Lawler, Director Sustainability and Regulatory Services.
- Jane Sharwood, Manager International and Business.
- Michael Anderson.
- Dale Bowerman.
- Anne Malloch.

South East Melbourne Innovation Precinct - March 25

- Jane Niall, Deputy Secretary, DIIRD.
- Elly Hutton, DIIRD.
- Faye Burton, Project Manager.
- Prof Rod Hill, Pro Vice Chancellor, Monash University.
- Jane McLaughlin, Monash University.
- Greg Redden, CSIRO.
- Damien Thomas, CSIRO.
- Clive Davenport, CSIRO.
- Prof Errol Harvey, CEO, MiniFAB.
- Jeff McAlpine, Monash City Council.
- Suzanne Ferguson, City of Kingston.
- Paula Brennan, City of Greater Dandenong.
- Peter Chaffey, City of Knox.
- Rod Nelson, Enterprise Connect.

Deakin University, Geelong - March 26

- Prof Sue Kilpatrick, Pro Vice-Chancellor.
- Graeme Dennehy, Chief Operating Officer.
- Kirsten Kilpatrick, Senior Project Officer.
- Michael Betts, Managing Director, Betts Williams Group.
- Andrew Scott, CEO, G21 Geelong Regional Alliance.
- Lawrie Miller, Executive Director, Geelong Chamber of Commerce.
- Helene Bender, Director, Allabout Tours and Travel.
- Ed Coppe, Principal, Strategic Investment Management.
- Michael Dowling, Dowling Corporate Consulting (and Deakin University Council).
- Keith Jackson, Regional Director, Department of Planning and Community Development.

Victoria University, Footscray - March 26

- Prof Peter Creamer, Pro Vice-Chancellor.
- Steve Pereira, Sponsorship Manager.
- Western Bulldogs Australian Football Club.

University of Melbourne, Parkville - March 26

- Helen Hayes, Director, Knowledge Transfer and Partnerships Office.
- Bronwyn Jones.

Minister for Regional and Rural Development, Skills and Workforce Participation - March 26

- The Hon Jacinta Allan, MP.
- Brendan Sheehan, Director, Skills Victoria DIIRD.
- Chris Gartner, Adviser.

Australian Catholic University, Fitzroy - March 26

- Prof Gabrielle McMullen, Deputy Vice Chancellor.
- Prof Chris Sheargold, Associate Vice Chancellor.
- Dr Marj Horne.
- Mary Campbell.

Australian Industry Group - March 27

- Megan Lilly, Director, Education and Training.

Victorian Government Panel - March 27

- Jane Niall, DIIRD
- Justin Hanney, Chief Executive, Regional Development Victoria.
- Lynne Williams, Deputy Secretary, DIIRD.
- Fiona Williams, Executive Director, Department of Sustainability and Environment.
- Michael Kane, Executive Director, Department of Premier and Cabinet.
- Edmund Misson, General Manager, Department of Primary Industries.
- Deborah Peterson, Deputy Secretary, Department of Primary Industries.
- Diane Sydenham, DIIRD.
- Pin Ng, Senior Policy Adviser, DIIRD.
- Elly Hutton, DIIRD.
- Brendan Sheehan, Director, Skills Victoria.
- Justin Bannikoff, DIIRD.
- Peter Allen, Under Secretary, Department of Human Services.