



United Nations  
Educational, Scientific and  
Cultural Organization

Organisation  
des Nations Unies  
pour l'éducation,  
la science et la culture

Organización  
de las Naciones Unidas  
para la Educación,  
la Ciencia y la Cultura

Организация  
Объединенных Наций по  
вопросам образования,  
науки и культуры

منظمة الأمم المتحدة  
للتربية والعلم والثقافة

联合国教育、  
科学及文化组织

**IOS/EVS/PI/42/REV**

**Original: English**

**Internal Oversight Service**

**Evaluation Section**

## **Evaluation of the UNESCO-CEPES**

Peter Maassen and Agnete Vabø

With Contributions from Ossi V. Lindqvist

NIFU STEP Studies in Innovation, Research and Education

*March 2006*

The designations employed and the presentation of material throughout this document do not imply the expression of any opinion whatsoever on the part of UNESCO concerning the legal status of any country, territory, city or area of its authorities, or concerning its frontiers or boundaries.

# Contents

<b>Executive Summary .....</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>Introduction.....</b>	<b>13</b>
1.1 Background.....	13
1.2 Evaluative Purpose .....	13
1.3 Evaluation Design and Methods.....	14
1.3.1 Document review .....	14
1.3.2 Field work .....	14
1.3.3 Interviews .....	15
1.3.4 E-mail survey .....	15
1.3.5 Self-evaluation .....	15
1.3.6 Methodological challenges.....	15
1.4 The history of UNESCO-CEPES .....	16
1.4.1 The role of CEPES after the Cold War .....	17
1.4.2 The role of CEPES in the Bologna Process .....	18
1.4.3 The role of CEPES in UNESCO .....	19
<b>2 The Relevance of CEPES' activities to UNESCO programmes.....</b>	<b>21</b>
2.1 Background reflections .....	21
2.2 Alignment with UNESCO's strategies and goals .....	23
2.3 The relevance of CEPES for various actors and regional levels .....	26
2.3.1 The relevance of CEPES for the UNESCO Education Secretariat and the Higher Education Division .....	26
2.3.2 Relevance for Romania .....	27
2.3.3 Relevance for Region (South East Europe).....	27
2.3.4 Relevance for Europe as a whole .....	27
2.3.5 Relevance for higher education beyond Europe.....	28
2.4 Comparative advantage.....	28
2.5 Can CEPES services be provided more effectively and efficiently?.....	29
2.6 The location of CEPES .....	30
2.7 The Library and Documentation Unit.....	31
2.8 Adoption of management tools.....	32
<b>3 The results of CEPES activities .....</b>	<b>33</b>
3.1 Achievement of UNESCO's expected outcomes .....	33
3.2 Achievement of CEPES organizational objectives.....	35
3.2.1 Higher Education Developments and their Relevance for EFA.....	36
3.2.2 Networks and Capacity Building in the Age of Globalization and Knowledge-Based Societies .....	36
3.3 Effectiveness of tools.....	37
3.4 Clearing house .....	39

3.4.1 UNESCO-CEPES Publications .....	39
3.4.2 The quarterly journal .....	39
3.4.3 The Centre's website .....	40
3.5 Higher education, global developments, CEPES and EFA .....	41
<b>4 Quality of coordination and interaction .....</b>	<b>42</b>
4.1 Effectiveness of coordination and interaction .....	42
4.1.1 Coordination and interaction with Headquarters .....	42
4.1.2 Coordination and interaction with field offices, regional offices and national commissions .....	44
4.1.3 Quality of coordination and interaction with <i>member states</i> .....	45
4.1.4 Quality of partnerships .....	46
<b>5 Financial and organizational management .....</b>	<b>48</b>
5.1 Centre status of CEPES .....	48
5.2 Funding pattern mechanism .....	48
5.3 Staffing and organizational management .....	51
5.3.1 The Director .....	52
5.3.2 The role of the advisory board .....	52
5.3.3 Staffing and Human Resource Management .....	53
5.3.4 Management and coordination of programme activities .....	54
<b>6 Recommendations .....</b>	<b>56</b>
6.1 Continuation of CEPES .....	56
6.2 Status of CEPES .....	56
6.3 Clarification of mutual expectations and roles .....	58
6.4 Future role of UNESCO-CEPES .....	58
6.5 The internal organisation .....	59
6.6 Publication policy .....	59
<b>Appendix 1 Terms of reference .....</b>	<b>60</b>
<b>Appendix 2 Interviews and Informants .....</b>	<b>62</b>
<b>Appendix 3 CEPES: List of publications 2000 – 2005 .....</b>	<b>64</b>
<b>Appendix 4 Higher education and global developments .....</b>	<b>66</b>
<b>Appendix 5 CEPES PROJECTS 2000 - 2005 .....</b>	<b>70</b>

# Foreword

The present report is an evaluation of the UNESCO European Centre for Higher Education, UNESCO-CEPES, in Bucharest, commissioned by UNESCO Internal Oversight Services (IOS) as part of its general review of its education institutes and centres.

The evaluation has been undertaken by Peter Maassen, Professor at Faculty of Education, University of Oslo/Senior Researcher at the Norwegian Institute for Studies in Research and Education - Centre for Innovation Studies (NIFU STEP) and Agnete Vabø, Senior Researcher at NIFU STEP in Oslo, Norway. Professor Ossi Lindqvist, Chair of the Finnish Higher Education Evaluation Council, has also contributed to the evaluation.

Oslo, 1 March 2006

Petter Aasen  
Director NIFU STEP

Bjørn Stensaker  
Programme Director

# Executive Summary

## ***Background***

UNESCO has six Institutes classified as ‘Category I’ and two Centres in the field of education, which are expected to contribute to the objectives and priorities of UNESCO’s education programme through offering services and technical assistance to Member States, partners, and to the network of UNESCO field offices.

Since 1972, The European Centre for Higher Education, UNESCO-CEPES, has existed in Bucharest. It was established to promote co-operation in higher education among Member States of the Europe Region. Its formal geographical scope of action reflects the UNESCO definition of the Europe region that includes North America and Israel. However, the current activities of the Centre are first and foremost focused on higher education in Central and Eastern Europe. The director of CEPES also serves as the representative of UNESCO in Romania.

UNESCO has commissioned this evaluation of CEPES as part of its broader review of education institutes and centres in the context of UNESCO’s overall decentralization strategy. The purpose of this evaluation is to inform UNESCO entities and units, as well as Member States and cooperation partners, on the relevance of CEPES activities to UNESCO’s priorities, the results achieved by CEPES, the quality of coordination and interaction between UNESCO entities and partners, and the effectiveness of its financial and organizational management. In addition, the evaluation intends to give feedback directly to the centre.

The evaluation is based on interviews undertaken during field visits to UNESCO Headquarters (HQ) in Paris and CEPES in Bucharest. In the latter case, interviews were also conducted with several stakeholders representing various levels in the Romanian system of research and higher education. In addition, various stakeholders in Europe have been interviewed. Several documents and publications relating to the activities of CEPES and the education sector of UNESCO have been examined.

## ***Major findings***

### ***Relevance of CEPES activities to UNESCO***

Since 2000 CEPES has focused its activities on the following three priority areas:

1. higher education policy and reforms;
2. higher education developments and their relevance for EFA and sustainable development;
3. networks and capacity building in the context of globalisation and knowledge-based societies.

The first finding is the significant symbolic importance of CEPES for UNESCO's status and visibility in South East Europe, and the continued support for and belief in UNESCO's relevance. It can be argued that without CEPES' presence, the overall trust of the main actors involved in the role of UNESCO in the further development of (higher) education in the region would be considerably smaller.

Being a UNESCO Centre that is located in Europe and focused on higher education, CEPES has limited direct relevance for UNESCO's efforts to realize the EFA goals. However, UNESCO also wants to address higher education (see C/4 document). Three outcomes, all related to enhancing quality, are expected when it comes to UNESCO's activities in the area of higher education, i.e. developing policy guidelines for enhancing the quality of higher education and teacher education systems; strengthening institutional capacity in higher education in the areas of institutional autonomy and academic freedom; facilitating the mobility of students and teachers. Concerning CEPES contributions to achieving these outcomes the following can be concluded.

First, a number of CEPES's projects and meetings are designed to contribute to the development of policy recommendations. CEPES has been particularly active in supporting the efforts of various governments in Eastern Europe to develop national systems of quality assurance in higher education. The Glossary of Terms in Quality Assurance and Accreditation has been used by national authorities in the region in the development of quality assurance systems and higher education policies.

Second, as part of the follow-up work of the Lisbon Recognition Convention, the Centre has been actively involved in efforts to promote academic mobility through developing methodologies that would facilitate academic credit assessment and recognition.

Third, it does have an input into strengthening capacities at the institutional level, but not in the first place in the areas of academic freedom and institutional autonomy. Therefore we conclude that there is a direct alignment of CEPES to UNESCO programmes in the area of higher education, even though the main strand of the activities of CEPES lies outside the priority areas of UNESCO.

CEPES is the only field unit of UNESCO in the area of higher education in Europe. Its main comparative advantage is that it is well connected – mainly through its director – to the mainstream of higher education expertise and experience in the first place in Europe, but also in North America and Japan, and other parts of the world. In addition, there is no other UNESCO field unit that is so well connected in the area of higher education to other supra national and intergovernmental agencies, such as the European Commission, the Council of Europe, and the OECD, as CEPES.

There is no direct relevance of the current EFA goals for European education. Consequently, the contributions of CEPES to achieving the EFA goals are rather

small. However, UNESCO could consider adapting the EFA goals to European realities and needs in education, e.g. in Europe EFA could refer to Higher Education for All as well as to promoting access to higher education for immigrant/ethnic minorities and other traditionally underrepresented groups.

There are strong arguments not to relocate CEPES within Europe. Nonetheless, if CEPES is to remain in the same location, the operational, financial and personnel basis of the centre need to be reformed if UNESCO wants CEPES to become a unit of interest and relevance to European higher education as a whole.

The question concerning the appropriate mission and organisational basis of CEPES has been on the agenda since the political changes in Central and Eastern Europe at the beginning of the 1990s. However, UNESCO HQ has never explicitly addressed the issue of the consequences of these changes for the status and mission of CEPES. The uncertainties have been severely deepened by the continuous indecision about the status of CEPES, i.e. Centre or Institute. Therefore, this report strongly urges UNESCO HQ to finally address the question of the role and place of CEPES in UNESCO.

#### *Results, quality, and the effectiveness of tools*

CEPES has undertaken a range of projects in the period 2000-2005, mainly in South East and East Europe. These projects can be related to the three priority areas of CEPES, the first of which concerns '*Higher education policy and reforms*'. The EC funded project on the regional university network on governance and management of higher education in South East Europe (2002-2004) is a good example of a project intended to support national higher education reforms.

The second major priority theme of CEPES concerns '*Higher Education Developments and their Relevance for Education for All (EFA) and Sustainable Development*'. Even though higher education is not in the very core of the EFA strategy, EFA still has implications in the area of higher education policies, the ethical values, and especially teacher education.

Related to this priority area, CEPES has undertaken five projects, dealing with teacher education in Europe and its national models, with ethical and moral dimensions in education, and especially, what is currently important, with the issue of the vocational content in mass higher education. And not the least important is the Project on 'First Place of Employment', which is directing attention to very critical issues in the Europe region, that of employment and career development of young scientists, and also the entire higher education staff.

The third main priority theme addresses *'Networks and Capacity Building in the Age of Globalisation and Knowledge-Based Societies'*. It includes eight projects that deal with, e.g. the impact of globalisation; cross-border or transnational education; entrepreneurial universities; brain drain and brain gain; and the concept of the bilingual university.

In order to support higher education reform and development in the Europe Region, CEPES has undertaken activities in areas such as the elaboration and implementation of higher education policy, legislative reform, academic quality assurance and accreditation, institutional ranking and its methodologies, the recognition of academic qualifications, brain drain and the intellectual labour market, new approaches to governance and institutional management, university autonomy and academic freedom, the status of teachers and their training, university-industry relations in the context of the knowledge society, the use of ICT including on-line courses, and transnational education (TNE).

The core of these CEPES activities consists of the identification of a relevant theme, the invitation of experts to address the theme, the organisation of a seminar where the experts meet with policy makers and other representatives from the higher education practice in the institution(s), country or region in question, and the production of a publication that consists of the papers written by the experts plus the conclusions of the seminar. Consequently, a relatively large part of the CEPES activities can be interpreted as networking, and capacity-building, with substantive inputs mainly from people from outside CEPES, and outside the core region of CEPES (South East Europe). By utilizing a large network of practitioners, university staff and consultants mainly from outside the region, CEPES is able to organize a level of activities that is much larger than the size of the Centre itself should indicate. This is an effective tool for contributing to the reform and renewal of higher education in the countries in question.

The main task of CEPES staff is therefore not to undertake research itself, but to contribute to the successful and effective organisation of the seminars and publications. As such and in line with the original decision of UNESCO in the early 1970s with respect to the establishment of CEPES, the Centre is not a research institute, but a policy-oriented expertise unit of UNESCO. The question should be addressed whether the original mission of CEPES still fits the current expectations with respect to the Centre.

To assess the actual impact of the CEPES activities in practice goes beyond the current evaluation. To get a valid indication of the impact of CEPES a large-scale study would be necessary. This evaluation did not allow for such a study to be undertaken.



Interviews with stakeholders of the Centre indicate that the role of CEPES as UNESCO clearing house (referred to by some as a broker role) in capacity building, networking and publications is differently appreciated. The interviewees from the South East Europe region appreciated very much the ‘broker’ role of CEPES and the contributions CEPES is making through this tool to the reform and renewal of higher education in the region. Others were more sceptical and indicated that they would prefer a larger variation of activities including more studies undertaken by the staff of the Centre itself.

Clearinghouse services are to some extent effective, but can be improved. A more strategic and structured use of *Higher Education in Europe* is particularly advisable. Currently the journal does not have many subscribers (159). User studies of the journal, as well as the other publications of the Centre and its website are very much in need in order to make its clearinghouse and information dissemination functions more effective.

Finally, we want to refer to a recent initiative in the area of higher education, i.e. the UNESCO Forum on Higher Education, Research and Knowledge, to illustrate the challenges UNESCO faces in integrating CEPES effectively in its education strategies. This intersectoral initiative, with a specific focus on developing countries, was in the C/5 document referred to as a flagship activity, and was at least initially expected to play an important role in UNESCO’s strategies with respect to higher education in the coming period. Independent of the eventual implementation of this initiative, it is striking that the evaluators have found no signs of any direct involvement of CEPES in the initial set up and operationalization of this activity. Obviously CEPES cannot be blamed for this, but, again, it is an example of the challenge UNESCO faces in finding an effective way to involve CEPES in UNESCO initiatives with respect to higher education, since practically all new higher education initiatives are focused on higher education in developing countries within the larger framework of the EFA strategy. CEPES, being a UNESCO higher education centre in Europe, with an expertise in areas such as higher education governance and policy, quality (assessment) of higher education, and doctoral level education, apparently does not fit very well into this main UNESCO focus. But if CEPES does not fit well in the EFA/developing countries focus of UNESCO in the area of education, what role does UNESCO expect of CEPES?

### ***Staffing and organizational management***

Some interviewees indicated that CEPES would be more effectively managed if it had a less hierarchical leadership approach. In addition, the centre operates in a top-heavy

way in the sense that practically all external activities are undertaken by the director and deputy director.

Currently, CEPES does not have programme areas to which staff are attached, or other structural possibilities for staff members to specialize and to develop a career within a certain thematic area. The involvement of regular staff in the activities of CEPES seems to be based more on the demands of externally financed opportunities than internal competencies and interests. As a result of their UNESCO programme assistant status, the salaries of the Romanian staff members of CEPES are higher than practically all public officials in Romania. This fact should not necessarily indicate that all staff members are completely satisfied with their job and their current career opportunities. It is obvious that the overall UNESCO personnel guidelines and procedures imply all kinds of limitations for a centre such as CEPES. Nonetheless, as indicated to part of the outside world CEPES seems to be hierarchically led and top-heavy.

In addition, there is a need to revise staff structures at CEPES. The centre would need to strengthen its expertise basis by recruiting more international staff holding doctoral degrees and having research and/or policy experience. We realize that the current financial situation of CEPES makes this practically difficult if not impossible, but the consequences seriously affect CEPES future in Europe. In relation to that, CEPES needs to develop more diversity regarding the social capital of the staff, with respect to national background, professional experiences and networks. It needs to become more international and professional in its organisational structure and management orientation. Such aspects of the future role of CEPES should also be considered in light of the forthcoming retirement of Director.

### ***Key recommendations***

1. The Centre has to become better integrated into the UNESCO educational programmes. UNESCO HQ should find a more effective way to involve CEPES explicitly in its main strategies with respect to higher education.
2. CEPES is a regional UNESCO Centre in Europe. However, as a European Centre there is currently limited relevance and limited impact of its activities outside its immediate surrounding region in South East Europe. If CEPES is to remain in the same location, a number of operational, financial and personnel management issues of CEPES need to be seriously addressed.
3. If UNESCO wants to enhance CEPES as one of its units we strongly recommend giving CEPES the status of Institute. CEPES will not be able to operate effectively on a European higher education market if it has to continue

as a centre. In addition, if UNESCO is interested in giving a global priority to higher education, it may wish to consider promoting joint delivery of policy advice and programmes between CEPES and other institutes. Promoting stronger institutional alliances can be recommended as an option.

4. If UNESCO is deciding to change the status of CEPES into a UNESCO Institute, there is a need to introduce a new strategy, to be implemented over a two-year period, covering processes on the geographical coverage of CEPES activities, actions, recruitment, integration, different steering tools (e.g. new incentive structure). The role of the governing board must be reconsidered as well as a strategy for better integration and attainment of synergy effects of the activities carried out by different UNESCO institutes and centres.
5. There is a need for more internationally qualified and experienced staff at CEPES. The centre should aim to strengthen its intellectual capital by recruiting more international staff holding doctoral degrees and having research experience.

# Introduction

## 1.1 Background

UNESCO has established six Institutes and two Centres in the field of education, which are intended to serve in their field of specialisation as think-tanks and international focal points for the provision of information and expertise to member states, working towards improved education outcomes in collaboration with partners in member states and the network of UNESCO field offices. The institutes are expected to operate with intellectual and functional autonomy from UNESCO Headquarters, while at the same time being strongly guided by the priorities set out in UNESCO's education programme. In the context of its reform process, UNESCO has initiated a review of its education institutes and centres, with the aim of considering the continued operation of and support to each institute or centre against alternative modalities of providing equivalent or better programme support for UNESCO activities. This evaluation of the European Centre for Higher Education, UNESCO-CEPES in Bucharest, is part of that review. The evaluation is organized by UNESCO HQ, IOS. The evaluation mandate is given in the terms of references for the evaluation.

## 1.2 Evaluative Purpose

The purpose of this evaluation is to inform relevant entities and units including: UNESCO Task Force on Category I UNESCO Institutes and Centres; UNESCO Task Force on Decentralization; Education Sector of UNESCO; Member States of UNESCO; and CEPES's cooperation partners, regarding the following points:

- Relevance of CEPES activities to UNESCO's programme priorities in the field of higher education.
- Results achieved by CEPES in the area of higher education in Europe, and its contribution to UNESCO's efforts in achieving respective EFA goals.
- Quality of coordination and interaction between UNESCO Headquarters, other Institutes, Field Offices, and CEPES with regard to planning and implementation of programmes.
- Funding patterns, mechanisms and their risks for sustained institutional capacity, viability and sustainability, organizational structure, and quality of

organizational management and programme implementation systems adopted by CEPES.<sup>1</sup>

### **1.3 Evaluation Design and Methods**

We have applied a variety of approaches to inform ourselves on CEPES and how the Centre functions in relation to its mandate:

- Review of relevant documents, publications, statistics and websites.
- Field work in UNESCO headquarters in Paris and CEPES in Bucharest.
- Interviews and meetings with UNESCO HQ staff, CEPES staff and various stakeholders.
- E-mail survey among UNESCO Field and Regional Offices.

#### **1.3.1 Document review**

The evaluation team has examined a large number of documents and publications relating to the activities of CEPES. The relevance of CEPES activities has been assessed in the framework of the overall policies and programme priorities of UNESCO. The main documents examined in this concerned the *1998 UNESCO World Conference on Higher Education*, while also the UNESCO's *Medium-Term Strategy 2002-2007* and UNESCO's *Programme and Budget (C/5)* provided general guidelines. In addition, CEPES produced a number of documents including "A synthetic presentation of UNESCO-CEPES projects implemented during the period 2000 – 2005" (see Appendix 3), that were used in the evaluation.

#### **1.3.2 Field work**

The evaluation team undertook fieldwork in Paris and Bucharest.

##### *Field work at UNESCO Headquarters, 17 - 19 October 2005*

This visit was organised to inform the evaluation team on the purpose of the evaluation, to provide information on UNESCO and its relationship to its education institutes and centres, and to conduct interviews with staff at the HQ.

##### *Field work at UNESCO-CEPES, 14 - 17 November 2005*

During our field visit to CEPES, Bucharest, Romania, we conducted several interviews with members of staff as well as with various Romanian stakeholders. Files of archives containing internal documents, correspondence and financial data as well as CEPES publications and journal were presented for our disposal.

---

<sup>1</sup> For a more detailed presentation of the scope of the evaluation, see **appendix 1**.

### **1.3.3 Interviews**

We have conducted more than 30 interviews in person or by phone, as well as some group interviews. The selection of informants at HQ was organised by UNESCO IOS. Informants among members of the CEPES advisory board and various stakeholders we interviewed were selected from a list provided to us by UNESCO IOS. Informants selected for interviews during our field work in Bucharest were partly identified by ourselves, partly suggested by CEPES, which also organised the practicalities of the Bucharest field work in an excellent manner, including meeting facilities and telephone interviews with Romanian stakeholders living in other parts of Romania.

### **1.3.4 E-mail survey**

The E-mail survey among UNESCO Field and Regional Offices was conducted by Martin Jenkins Associates, Wellington, New Zealand, covering all four UNESCO Institutes and Centres which were evaluated in this phase (UIE, IIEP, IBE and CEPES). Since the response rate generally was low, and since most of the UNESCO field offices are located in regions not particularly relevant for the activities of CEPES, the information gained by the survey was of limited use for the evaluation of this particular UNESCO Centre.

### **1.3.5 Self-evaluation**

CEPES provided the evaluation team with a background document for the evaluation; “A Synthetic Presentation of UNESCO-CEPES Projects Implemented during the period 2000-2005” (See appendix 5). This document presents the CEPES projects implemented during the period 2000 - 2005, the perceived results of these projects as well as the participants. The document was not requested by us. However, it was detailed and precise and very useful in order to get an overview of the activities of the centre.

### **1.3.6 Methodological challenges**

UNESCO is a political organization with many agendas, procedural and other internal practices that are not always clear to the outside world. In line with this, while there is broad agreement that UNESCO and its education centres and institutes have an important (global) role to play in education, the interpretation of this role varies a lot among the many stakeholders of UNESCO. That implied for this evaluation, for example, that it was practically impossible to get a hold of a set of explicit expectations with respect to CEPES’ activities as part of UNESCO’s strategies and goals in the field of higher education. For reasons not clear to us CEPES is not explicitly included in the official educational documents (plans, programmes, budgets such as C/4 and C/5) and strategies of UNESCO. In other words, we could not

undertake a straightforward goal achievement evaluation of CEPES, because UNESCO does not have any explicit goals with respect to CEPES. Instead we could only use CEPES' own objectives for measuring goal achievement, without it being made clear to us how these objectives related to (implicit) UNESCO expectations with respect to CEPES.

In addition, the logistics of the evaluation formed a challenge, since in the short time frame for the evaluation, and with the limited budget available, it was difficult to get a hold of some of the main actors of relevance. Some of the stakeholders never responded to our emails, and did not return our phone calls. The time frame and budget of the evaluation also implied that it was in practice impossible to examine the actual *effects* of CEPES activities. For that an empirical study in the countries in question would have been necessary. In this evaluation we could not go beyond asking the available stakeholders for their impressions of the effects of CEPES activities. As could be expected, we received mixed answers to the questions concerning the effects of CEPES activities.

Despite these challenges we feel that the report gives a valid insight into a number of relevant aspects, including the strengths and weaknesses of the way in which CEPES operates, the problems it encounters in communicating with HQ, the challenges the geographical location and specific history have posed for CEPES in the period in question (2000-2005), as well as in the coming period, and the importance of CEPES for its own region (i.e. the Eastern European countries that are not – yet – a member of the EU, with the exception of Belarus). All these and other aspects should make it possible for UNESCO to answer the question whether there is a future for CEPES in the UNESCO family.

## **1.4 The history of UNESCO-CEPES**

It was a 'window of opportunities' in the then political climate of Europe that led to the establishment of UNESCO-CEPES in 1972 in Bucharest, Romania. This establishment is the outcome of a series of UNESCO actions and decisions, aimed at creating a centre that could address the joint problems that, despite the political and ideological divide, characterized higher education in both Western and Eastern Europe at that time. The formal objectives and functions of the Centre, as formally confirmed by the Second Conference of Ministers of Education in 1973, refer to CEPES being a regional field unit of UNESCO, established to promote cooperation, to disseminate information, and to study innovative trends in higher education, with particular reference to mobility of teachers, researchers and students in the European region. It was expected to act as the host institution for the promotion of collaboration in European higher education and for the promotion of research. These tasks and

organizational limitations provided the framework for CEPES mission as ‘bridge’ between Eastern and Western European higher education during the first two decades of its operations. While CEPES was set up as a European Centre for Higher Education, its formal geographical scope of action, however, reflects the UNESCO definition of the Europe region that includes North America (*i.e.*, the USA and Canada), and Israel.

In 1970 the government of Romania invited UNESCO to set up the Centre in Bucharest. The offer was accepted in principle, but depended on the outcome of negotiations concerning the legal basis and the conditions under which the Centre would be housed and would operate. These conditions were spelled out in an *Accord de siège* signed on 12 June 1972 and in an Annex to this *Accord* signed on 21 September 1972.

In its first 20 years of existence UNESCO-CEPES functioned as the only intergovernmental body for higher education covering the whole of Europe. It was as such an important channel of European cooperation in higher education between East and West within the limitations of the complex ideological, political, economic and social circumstances under which it had to operate, which included the internal political situation and material conditions in communist Romania.

#### **1.4.1 The role of CEPES after the Cold War**

The first major shift of CEPES mission came with the end of the Cold War and the end of the ideological and political divide between the two parts of Europe. The then mission of the Centre of the promotion of East-West co-operation in higher education became less relevant in the rapidly changing realities in Europe at the beginning of the 1990s. The need for interregional co-operation in the Europe Region changed, and the Centre had to find new roles and tasks.

In light of this search the DG of UNESCO was invited by the UNESCO Executive Board to consult with European countries and institutions about the future of UNESCO-CEPES. He commissioned in 1992 an Advisory Committee to assess the programme, facilities and potential of CEPES, and to negotiate with the EC, the Council of Europe, and the OECD about the future of the centre. Aim was to see if it was possible to involve these European supra-national and intergovernmental agencies more directly in the governance and funding of CEPES.

The Committee concluded that the transformation of CEPES into an inter-organizational centre was not feasible. At best what CEPES could hope for was closer collaboration with certain units in the EC, with the Council of Europe, and with the OECD. As a consequence CEPES continued as a UNESCO centre, without a formal involvement of any of the three contacted agencies in its organization, governance and



funding. However, at a later stage the three agencies agreed to have a representative participate in the CEPES Advisory Board as observer.

An important aspect concerning the role and purpose of CEPES the Committee pointed to in its report is that these can only be understood within the purpose and mission of UNESCO as a whole in the field of higher education and research.

Therefore it pleaded for a recall of the role and purpose of UNESCO.

The interviews undertaken by the Committee at OECD, Council of Europe and the EC also clearly showed the ambiguities, in the sense that the interviewees often did not know whether they should contact CEPES or UNESCO Headquarters. The following quote from the Committee's report clearly refers to a major challenge for UNESCO and CEPES at that time (1992) in their efforts to find a new role for the Centre:

“The problem of the autonomy of CEPES as a decentralized centre for the European region must in any case be defined so as to avoid misunderstandings, sources of frustration, possibly even conflicts which could be avoided. In our opinion this matter must be resolved. Equal attention requires a matter of more clear hierarchical as well as institutional relationship between CEPES and Headquarters in Paris”.<sup>2</sup>

These two dimensions pointed to in 1992 have played a major role in the functioning of CEPES until today. While formally a UNESCO Centre the cooperation of CEPES with European supra-national and intergovernmental agencies has increased in many ways throughout the 1990s and the beginning of the new century, while at the same time the ambiguities and lack of clarity characterizing the role of CEPES and its relationship with Headquarters after the political changes in Central and Eastern Europe, were not handled in 1992, nor have they been handled since, and if anything, have only intensified over the last 15 years.

To illustrate the nature of the first of these two dimensions we can point to the involvement of CEPES in the Bologna Process. The second dimension is visible in the mandate for this evaluation of UNESCO, where the only explicitly substantive indicator to be used is the contribution of CEPES to achieving the EFA goals, while no reference at all is made to the role of CEPES in the follow up of the UNESCO World Conference on Higher Education (Paris 1998), the important role of CEPES in the development and implementation of the so-called Lisbon Recognition Convention, or the role CEPES plays in promoting quality assessment in higher education.

#### **1.4.2 The role of CEPES in the Bologna Process**

As indicated above, CEPES has become involved directly in the Bologna Process.

---

<sup>2</sup> Quote from: J. Thorens and G. Leibbrandt (1992) *The Renewal and Reinforcement of Unesco's European Centre for Higher Education (CEPES) – The report to the Director-General of UNESCO*, Paris: UNESCO, p. 7.

This process started in 1998 and has been further elaborated in the summit meetings of Ministers of Education in Prague, Berlin and Bergen, the last one in 2005. The Bologna Process itself is a means of renewing the higher education structures in European countries with the overall aim of making European higher education more attractive internationally, and finally, creating the European Higher Education Area (EHEA) by the year 2010. The number of Bologna signatory countries is now 45, which means that the process includes several countries also from outside the European Union (EU). Especially for the current candidate countries to the EU, including Bulgaria, Croatia, and Romania, the Bologna Process itself is an important means of bridge building and national development in the higher education sector. Given this important role and effect of the Bologna Process in South Eastern Europe, it is of great relevance that UNESCO-CEPES has a consultative status of the Bologna Follow-Up Group (BFUG), and is active in contributing to several of its actions.

The major aims of the Bologna Process concern the enhancement of the mobility of students and staff, the introduction of a new and comparable degree structure, and the creation of European wide standards for quality and quality assurance in higher education. Evaluation and accreditation processes in higher education are becoming common (and actually ‘required’) in all Bologna countries, though several countries especially in Eastern Europe still need outside assistance in developing their own evaluation practices and in establishing their own evaluation/accreditation agencies. Consequently, the CEPES Bologna agenda is thus mostly concentrated on problems specific to Eastern and South-East Europe, especially in relation to the attainment of the goals of the Bologna Process.

#### **1.4.3 The role of CEPES in UNESCO**

With respect to CEPES role in and relationship with UNESCO, an important year was 1984, when UNESCO-CEPES became the Secretariat of the UNESCO Regional Committee for the Application of the Convention on the Recognition of Studies, Diplomas, and Degrees Concerning Higher Education in the States Belonging to the Europe Region. This responsibility led the Centre into such varied areas as the diversification of higher education; assessment, evaluation, and accreditation; creation of the ENICs (European Network of National Information Centres on Academic Recognition and Mobility); the reform of higher education; higher education governance; and the responsibility for the European follow-up to the UNESCO World Conference on Higher Education.

In 1984, CEPES was assigned responsibility for the UNESCO European Diploma Convention. Up until the political changes at the end of the 1980s in Eastern Europe, the role of CEPES as the Secretariat of this Regional Committee was to deal with problems in annual meetings and to increase the number of signatory countries. Just

before the political changes, UNESCO had begun to broker a possible merger of the UNESCO Convention and the so-called Prague Convention of 1975, on the Mutual Recognition of Secondary and Specialized Secondary School-Leaving Certificates of Higher Education Diplomas with several other conventions including those of the Council of Europe.

The result of numerous efforts, including those of CEPES, eventually led to the diplomatic conference held in Lisbon, Portugal, in April 1997 where the joint Council of Europe/UNESCO Convention on the Recognition of Qualifications Concerning Higher Education in the European Region – the so-called Lisbon Recognition Convention – was adopted.

The work accomplished in the area of recognition, evaluation, and accreditation has provided the foundation for CEPES focus on such policy issues as transnational education (TNE).

By this point (1997), the original activity of CEPES as Secretariat of the European Regional Convention had resulted in a variety of activities, and these, in turn, led to a growing number of publications. Increasingly, and particularly after a new Director, Ms. Lesley Wilson, who had previously directed the TEMPUS Secretariat in Brussels, had been appointed as Director of UNESCO-CEPES (1996), the Centre got involved in European Union projects directed at the reform of higher education in Eastern and Central Europe.

In 2002, UNESCO-CEPES celebrated its 30<sup>th</sup> Anniversary. As part of the celebration a conference was organized on: “Higher Education in the Twenty-First Century: its role and contribution to our common advancement”. This conference brought together high-level governmental officials in charge of higher education and top-level leaders of international and national academic institutions and organizations.

Finally, a major issue in CEPES recent history has been its formal status as a UNESCO centre. As indicated above, already in 1992 the tension between the formal status of CEPES as a UNESCO centre and its programmatic autonomy in practice was referred to as a major problem. The Advisory Board has recommended at various occasions since 1998 that UNESCO should give CEPES the status of Institute, but despite some signals from the UNESCO Executive Board that it was willing to consider following the recommendation, until now the formal status of CEPES has not changed, and will not change until at least 2007. This continuous ‘in-between status’ forms an important contextual element in this evaluation of the Centre.

## **2 The Relevance of CEPES' activities to UNESCO programmes**

The evaluation team was asked to assess the following aspects with respect to the relevance of CEPES activities for UNESCO's programmes:

- Determine whether CEPES programmes are in clear and explicit alignment with UNESCO's strategies and goals in the field of higher education, as defined in Medium Term Strategy (C/4).
- Identify the comparative advantage of CEPES among other UNESCO Institutes and Centres in the context of decentralisation and assess the ways in which CEPES plays a complimentary role to other Institutes, especially with respect to IESALC.
- Analyse whether the same kind of services, with equal or better quality, can be provided in a more efficient way, by alternative programme delivery mechanisms or different institutional arrangements.
- Examine whether CEPES is located in the most rational and strategic place in the context of decentralization.
- Determine to what extent CEPES has adopted UNESCO's results-based programming and management (RBM) and tools used for RBM, such as SISTER and FABS.

### **2.1 Background reflections**

According to the report "A synthetic presentation of UNESCO-CEPES projects implemented during the period 2000-2005" (see appendix 5), CEPES has focused its programmes since 2000 on the following three priority areas:

- 1) Higher Education Policy and Reforms.
- 2) Higher Education Developments and their Relevance for EFA and Sustainable Development.
- 3) Networks and Capacity building in the Context of Globalization and Knowledge-based Societies.

In assessing the relevance and quality of the activities undertaken under these three headings it is of importance to take the overall situation in the environment where CEPES is active into account.

These environmental factors in CEPES core region (South East Europe) included the fast expanding student population since the changes in the early 1990s, which also created a situation where demand for higher education far outstripped the supply. The mismatch concerned not only the student numbers as such, but also the nature of the academic fields in which they enrolled. Some 'modern' disciplines, such as business administration, that were not taught in the 'old' system suddenly met a high demand, because the labour market of the 'new', democratic societies demanded skills and competences in the areas covered by hitherto lacking fields and disciplines. Similarly, demand for new language skills, especially English, surged. The mismatch between educational choices of students and labour market demands also resulted in a considerable brain drain out of the South East European countries.

The 'old', public higher education institutions apparently were rather slow to change and adapt themselves to meet the new demands, or their institutional structures simply prevented it. This created space for private higher education institutions. But this 'dual' system in higher education also created new needs to update and develop the national legal basis of both public and private higher education institutions. Part of the challenge, for instance, was the recognition of public as well as private academic degrees both at the national as well as international levels.

The new private institutions of higher education also came into competition with the public universities with respect to attracting competent teaching staff. At the same time, the salary levels at the 'old' universities were not always market-competitive, which complicated the situation, and created a kind of 'black market' for jobs or even for double-jobs for competent staff. This has led to visible and invisible corruption within the higher education sector. However, the double-job situation has also helped the experienced staff to remain active in their field.

The financial basis of many a university has been shaky in the new situation, which has had the unwelcome outcome that replacement of the old staff is difficult, simply because the starting salaries for young scientists remained low, and special requirements for supporting the career of scientific staff have been neglected. This also called for renewal of the internal and academic structures of the universities, simply in order to meet the new market demands and to upgrade them to meet the national and international challenges at large. In this transition period from old to new political realities it was clear that the private money and private institutions were there to stay in most Central and eastern European countries.

On top of all of this comes the European *Bologna Process* that was started in 1998 and has been further clarified in the summit meetings of Ministers of Education in Prague, Berlin and Bergen. The Bologna Process is expected to deal with the

enhancement of the mobility of students and staff, new and comparable degree structure, and creation of European wide standards for quality and quality assurance in higher education. Evaluation and accreditation processes in higher education are becoming common (and actually ‘required’) in all Bologna countries, though several countries especially in Eastern Europe still need outside assistance in developing their own evaluation practices and in establishing their own evaluation/accreditation agencies.

This is the overall environment where CEPES is and has been working, during the period 2000-2005 which is now being evaluated. The European context of higher education institutions is rapidly changing, and the Bologna Process itself does not have a closed end state but is continually developing. Also, the European higher education institutions are facing problems and challenges that are outside the Bologna Process proper – e.g. growing competition for European students with US and Australian universities – but which in the future need appropriate attention.

At the same time, players in the higher education field are changing, and it is necessary also for CEPES to sharpen its vision if it wants to develop and maintain its own particular niche, not necessarily alone but in dynamic collaboration with other organizations and agencies in the higher education arena. Also, the regional coverage of its activities may need at least partial re-orientation under the current circumstances, even on relatively short-term.

## **2.2 Alignment with UNESCO’s strategies and goals**

When assessing the relevance of CEPES for UNESCO’s strategies and goals as defined in the Medium Term Strategy document 2002-2007 (31 C/4) the strategic priority attached to Education for All (EFA) by UNESCO comes very clearly to the fore. As indicated in the C/4 document (p. 15): *‘UNESCO is placing the outcomes and priorities of Dakar at the heart of its work during 2002-2007. The realization of the six goals of the Dakar Framework for Action will be the overriding priority for UNESCO’s education strategy’*. Obviously, CEPES, being a Centre that is located in Europe and focused on higher education, has very little direct relevance for UNESCO’s efforts to realize the EFA goals.

However, as is indicated in the C/4 document, UNESCO also wants to address other educational concerns and responsibilities, including higher education. The main role of higher education expected by UNESCO is in the area of the renewal of education systems. From this perspective assisting the member states in enhancing the quality of higher education and teacher-education systems is regarded as an activity that UNESCO wants to implement in the C/4 period (2002-2007). Three outcomes, all

related to enhancing quality, are expected when it comes to UNESCO's activities in the area of higher education, i.e. first the development of policy guidelines for enhancing the quality of higher education and teacher education systems; second the strengthening of institutional capacity in higher education in the areas of institutional autonomy and academic freedom; third facilitating the mobility of students and teachers.

Given that no other expected outcomes in the area of higher education are mentioned in the C/4 document, with respect to all three the contribution of CEPES in achieving them can be assessed as the main perspective from which to get an impression of the relevance of CEPES activities for UNESCO.

First, CEPES has been actively supporting the efforts of various governments in Eastern Europe (for example, Bulgaria, Estonia, Poland, Romania, Russian Federation, Turkey, Ukraine, and Czech Republic) to develop national systems of quality assurance in higher education. While it does not develop policy guidelines itself, a number of CEPES projects and meetings are designed to contribute to the development of policy recommendations. In this sense, its work, e.g. the Glossary of Terms in Quality Assurance and Accreditation, has been used by national authorities in the development of quality assurance systems and higher education policies.

Second, CEPES does not facilitate academic mobility of students and staff directly. As part of the follow-up work of the Lisbon Recognition Convention, however, the Centre has been actively involved in efforts to promote academic mobility through developing methodologies that would facilitate academic credit assessment and recognition. Third, it does have an input into strengthening capacities at the institutional level, but not in the first place in the areas of academic freedom and institutional autonomy. Therefore we conclude that there is a direct alignment of CEPES to UNESCO programmes in the area of higher education, even though the main strand of the activities of CEPES lies somewhat outside the priority areas of UNESCO.

What are these main activities of the Centre? How relevant are they for UNESCO and other stakeholders? Why is the main focus of CEPES programmatic activities somewhat outside the UNESCO's strategies and goals in the field of higher education?

In order to address these questions we want to point to a number of aspects that was referred to by the stakeholders and users interviewed in this evaluation.

a) This includes in the first place the different needs of the relative mature higher education and teacher-education systems in UNESCO's European region, compared to most other regions.

b) In the second place in the European context there is a number of other supra-national and intergovernmental agencies active in the area of higher education that have overlapping roles with UNESCO in the enhancement of the quality of higher education and teacher education. For example, stimulating student and staff mobility is since the end of the 1980s an important activity of the European Commission, implemented very successfully through its Erasmus/Socrates programmes.

c) In the third place an important aspect of CEPES role in European higher education concerns in practice its role as ‘broker’ between Western European expertise and experience, and Eastern European needs for an input into national and institutional efforts to strengthen capacity in a number of areas, including quality assessment, and institutional leadership and management competencies and skills.

d) In the fourth place it is of importance to point to the unique history of the Centre. Set up in 1972, its original aim was to bridge the political, economic and academic differences that existed at that time between the higher education systems and institutions of Western and Eastern Europe. While this ‘bridge function’ has become less important as a result of the political changes in Eastern Europe at the end of the 1980s/beginning of the 1990s, it still plays a role in the judgements made by many of the interviewees in this evaluation of the current relevance of CEPES. Therefore, we will take it into account, even though our evaluation is covering the period 2000-2005.

e) In the fifth place the geographical location in Bucharest (in the close vicinity of the Romanian Ministry of Education) should play a role in judging its relevance for national and regional stakeholders and other actors. Despite the growing importance of electronic communications and internet, the location of the centre in South Eastern Europe has an effect on its organisation, staff composition, set of activities, etc.

f) Finally, we have to take into account the formal status of CEPES as an education centre of UNESCO and the large level of functional autonomy the centre has in practice. Many of the interviewees in this evaluation indicated that in their view CEPES is in a transition period ‘from centre to institute’ which has important consequences for assessing its relevance.

In order to do justice to these aspects, we feel that we cannot limit the assessment of the relevance of CEPES to its relevance for UNESCO. On the basis of the interviews and the analyses of documents, the Centre’s relevance for a number of additional actors and regional levels has been added that will be presented in the next section.



## **2.3 The relevance of CEPES for various actors and regional levels**

We will start with discussing the relevance of CEPES for UNESCO, after which we will reflect on the Centre's relevance for Romania, the South Eastern European region, Europe as a whole, and the world 'beyond Europe'. When we talk about the CEPES region, we refer mainly to those East European countries, including The Balkans, not members of EU yet, with the exception of Belarus.

### **2.3.1 The relevance of CEPES for the UNESCO Education Secretariat and the Higher Education Division**

As indicated above our overall first impression is that while CEPES is aligned to UNESCO's strategies and goals with respect to higher education, its main direct relevance in practice is currently larger for other actors than for UNESCO. CEPES had formerly an important role in bridging East and West European higher education, but politically this role is no longer relevant for UNESCO. It is obvious that an increasing involvement of UNESCO in developing countries, and a rather limited focus on higher education, have consequences for CEPES' relevance for UNESCO.

As has been emphasized by many interviewees this is an unfortunate development from the perspective of the growing attention for higher education in Europe as well as in the rest of the world, including the developing countries. Given the nature of this 'global momentum' for higher education it was argued by most interviewees that UNESCO's education policies could have more overall foci than EFA, and that it could include, for example, higher education and its role in national development, as well as promoting the access to higher education of non-traditional student groups. From that perspective it can be concluded that the only potentially global higher education expertise unit that is part of UNESCO is CEPES. However, given its limited mission and capacity at the moment, and given UNESCO relative invisibility in the global higher education developments, CEPES is neither capable nor expected to adapt its activities in order to become more directly relevant for UNESCO also outside Europe.

However, we want to nuance this overall impression of rather limited direct relevance somewhat by pointing to two aspects of CEPES' functioning that are examples of more direct relevance of the Centre to UNESCO. First the role of CEPES, together with the Council of Europe, in development of the Lisbon Recognition Convention. This Convention forms an important step in the joint enhancement of the quality of higher education of the involved countries.

Second, the symbolic relevance of CEPES for UNESCO's status and visibility in South East Europe, and for the continued support for and belief in UNESCO's

importance is clearly very large. It can be argued that without CEPES' presence the overall trust of the main actors involved in the role of UNESCO in the further development of (higher) education in the region would be considerably smaller.

### **2.3.2 Relevance for Romania**

CEPES continuous importance for Romanian higher education is emphasized by all stakeholders that were consulted, and can also be illustrated by the large number of requests for support from the Romanian Ministry of Education towards CEPES. It is clear that in many respects Romanian higher education has profited very much over the last 10 to 15 years from the presence of CEPES. The Centre has had an input in a large number of policy processes; it provided the authorities with expertise input into these processes, while also its publications and its library/documentation centre have been widely used in Romanian higher education. Examples are: CEPES involvement in the introduction of a new higher education law in 1999, and the contributions of CEPES to the development of new study structures and a quality assurance system. As such CEPES functions as a policy expertise centre for the Romanian government; as an expertise centre for the supporting the improvement of the funding and organization of Romanian research; and as a 'broker' by providing higher education in Romania with new ideas and conceptualizations originating mostly from Western Europe on a more or less continuous basis.

### **2.3.3 Relevance for Region (South East Europe)**

The relevance of CEPES for the countries in South East Europe is large. As such it is comparable to the relevance of the Centre for Romania, but on a less continuous basis. The input of CEPES into the regional reform and higher education policies is taking place more on a thematic/project basis. This has, amongst other things, to do with the political instability of the region, and the limited capacity of CEPES. The former implies that in the countries in the region regularly new governments, and therefore new Ministers of (Higher) Education are installed which makes a continuous involvement of CEPES in the higher education developments of the countries in question impossible. Still, there are indications that the region has and is profiting a lot from CEPES presence and activities. This refers especially to the national Ministries of Education, and to a lesser extent to the higher education institutions in the region. The stakeholders we consulted clearly pointed to this role of the centre: in their view the activities of CEPES are of relevance for the region and satisfy an important need.

### **2.3.4 Relevance for Europe as a whole**

CEPES direct relevance for European higher education beyond its nearest region is limited. This implies, for example, that CEPES does not contribute to national reforms

of higher education in Western Europe, or to the strengthening of institutional capacity beyond its 'own' region. It does have indirect relevance in its role as a clearinghouse or 'broker', connecting Western European experiences and expertise with Eastern Europe reform efforts. It has to be pointed to that this role is somewhat fragmented, and generally goes in one direction, but it is beyond doubt that CEPES as a clearinghouse contributes to the current higher education debates in Europe.

Given the complexity and intensity of the current debates and change processes, it is clear that no organisation or agency can contribute to all these debates in a relevant way and that also goes for CEPES. But its role in the BFUG; the representation of the EC, the Council of Europe and the OECD in the Advisory Board; and the involvement of many academics in CEPES seminars and conferences show that CEPES is well-connected in Europe, even though that connection is in practice fully determined by the Centre's Director and Deputy Director's networks and contacts.

### **2.3.5 Relevance for higher education beyond Europe**

UNESCO's Europe region includes North America and Israel. The involvement of CEPES in the higher education systems of these countries is not very intense and in general limited to the Centre's Director. Outside UNESCO's Europe region CEPES seems to be well-connected to Japan and the Central Asian countries, with incidental involvements in other countries, e.g. in Africa. However, in this case these connections are limited to the Director, and are in some respects personal instead of institutional.

## **2.4 Comparative advantage**

CEPES is the only field unit of UNESCO in the area of higher education in Europe. Its main comparative advantage is that it is well-connected to the mainstream of higher education expertise and experience in the first place in Europe, but also in North America and Japan. In addition, there is no other field unit of UNESCO that is so well-connected in the area of higher education to other supra-national and intergovernmental agencies, such as the European Commission, the Council of Europe, and the OECD, as CEPES.

Being a sole player also implies that there is hardly any overlap between CEPES and other UNESCO institutes and centres. Consequently, there is hardly any potential at the moment for collaboration with other centres/institutes.

However, there is an overlap between CEPES and other non-UNESCO European agencies and units. It is of great importance for CEPES to identify its specific niche in the European context. Given that many countries in its current main region, South

East Europe, will most likely become a member of the EU in the coming years, the current role of CEPES in the reform and renewal of these countries' higher education systems, will become less obvious.

In this CEPES faces an important dilemma. If it adapts its mission and activities in line with European developments, it will most likely become less relevant for UNESCO. However, if it adapts its mission in order to become more relevant to UNESCO, it will most likely become less relevant in its European context.

## **2.5 Can CEPES services be provided more effectively and efficiently?**

This question includes three different aspects. First, whether there are alternative mechanisms for delivery within CEPES; second, whether these services can be more efficiently delivered by other institutional arrangements; and third, whether other institutions than UNESCO can provide the same services.

Concerning the first aspect, we have not been able to conduct any strict cost/benefit analysis to assess the efficiency of CEPES activities. To do that, it would have been necessary to conduct a thorough analysis of all activities and their impact. However, in general CEPES is very active and plays an important role, especially in its 'own' region, considering its small size and limited budget. For this to be achieved it has to use its contacts, partners and networks intensively in its operations.

The second aspect is rather hypothetical. This would imply that UNESCO would be willing to consider using the services of non-UNESCO centres, institutes and other organisations in Europe. We find that highly unlikely in the current circumstances.

Concerning the third aspect within the wider European context CEPES is facing heavy competition from other organizations, such as the OECD, the European University Association (EUA), and higher education expertise institutes, including the Center for Higher Education Policy Studies (CHEPS), University of Twente, the Netherlands; NIFU STEP, Oslo, Norway; and the *Wissenschaftliches Zentrum für Berufs- und Hochschulforschung*, University of Kassel, Germany. In addition, in the political arena the European Commission, and the European Council are much more directly involved with European higher education in general than UNESCO and CEPES. Given this situation it is clear that the services provided by CEPES can be (and are) provided more effectively in most European higher education systems by these other organizations than by CEPES. As a consequence, if CEPES wants to provide services to other higher education systems than those in South Eastern Europe, it has to cooperate with one of the other organisations mentioned.

Only with respect to the immediate region of CEPES, i.e. in the South Eastern European countries not yet a member of the EU with the exception of Belarus, it can be argued that no other organization can provide the higher education services provided by CEPES more effectively and efficiently than the centre itself. However, it can be expected that the situation will change once a number of the countries in South Eastern, to start with Bulgaria and Romania, become a member of the European Union.

Overall it can be concluded that at the moment the services provided by CEPES in its own region cannot be provided by other organizations more effectively and efficiently than by CEPES. In the other regions of Europe CEPES cannot provide the same services on its own. If CEPES wants to become a UNESCO clearinghouse of potential relevance and interest for all European higher education systems it has to drastically change its operational, financial and personnel basis. In addition, in order to be attractive to all European higher education systems it has to find its own niche, in the sense of areas of expertise. At the moment the services provided by CEPES are substantively rather fragmented, i.e. they are driven by perceived needs and not by specific internal CEPES expertise.

## **2.6 The location of CEPES**

Given its mission and the UNESCO region it is serving, CEPES has to be located in Europe. If CEPES is expected to be an effective European-wide Centre the current location has disadvantages. Therefore it could be claimed that the Centre should be located in a more central position in Europe, rather than in Romania. For example, recruiting and sustaining qualified international staff is more difficult in Romania than in Western European countries.

However, the current location has great symbolic value for Romania and the region of South East Europe. In addition, in this region the need for the services from UNESCO-CEPES is at the moment larger than in other regions of Europe. Furthermore, the use of modern technology makes geographical localisation less important than before.

As far as the evaluation team knows, there are no offers of other countries to host CEPES. In addition, the Romanian government has no intention to end its support for the current location. In a written statement by the Romanian Ministry of Education given to the evaluation team during the field visit in November 2005, it is stated that

*The Romanian Ministry of Education and Research has many reasons to argue that the organisational basis of CEPES should not be changed.*

All in all there are strong arguments not to relocate CEPES within Europe.

Nonetheless, if CEPES is to be continued at the same location the Centre has to become better integrated into the UNESCO educational programmes; the staff has to be internationalized; the organisational and funding bases for the Centre have to be changed; the programmatic activities of the Centre have to become more focused, less fragmented and of greater relevance for UNESCO HQ, as well as all member states of the wider UNESCO Europe region; a better balance has to be found between the external demands for CEPES activities and the internal capacities and areas of specialisation and interest of the staff; and the management style should become more open and transparent, and less hierarchical.

To illustrate the need for change, at the moment CEPES hardly plays a role with respect to achieving the EFA goals. Obviously, the EFA goals as such are of less direct value in UNESCO Europe region than in the developing countries. However, it might be expected of both CEPES and UNESCO HQ that more serious attempts are undertaken to adapt the EFA goals also to European needs, of which the most important is the need to increase access to higher education for immigrant/ethnic minorities and other traditionally underrepresented groups.

A final aspect concerning location is the issue of the European location per se. If UNESCO HQ feels that there are no convincing arguments to include European needs with respect to higher education in its educational strategies, a relocation of the Centre to Africa might be considered. There is a great need for a strong UNESCO higher education and teacher education unit in Africa from the perspective of the importance of higher education and teacher education for EFA, and from the importance to support the reform and renewal of higher education systems in Africa (see appendix 4).

## **2.7 The Library and Documentation Unit**

The CEPES Library and Documentation Unit is relevant to UNESCO's programme activities in the area of higher education. It is not relevant for UNESCO's efforts in achieving EFA goals since the Library is specialized in topics related to higher education and does not contain all UNESCO materials. It is used by researchers, students, academic university staff, employees of governmental and non-governmental organizations, etc., from many different countries, for updating themselves on higher education literature.

## **2.8 Adoption of management tools**

CEPES is fully accredited in FABS, and the Centre is using this tool for its administration. This is the result of the fact that CEPES implemented more than 80% of the audit recommendations made as part of the Audit in 2005 (see Audit Report of CEPES Bucharest, August 2005).

According to the CEPES administrative officer SISTER is not being used yet, because it does not function for field offices in terms of connectivity. If CEPES is to use SISTER additional staff might be needed to handle all the tools adequately.

The evaluation team got the impression that the administrative officer of CEPES is very competent. As a result, despite the lack of financial administrative capacity other than this officer, the financial administration of CEPES is handled in a very professional way, despite the detailed administrative requirements with respect to a UNESCO centre. The handling of the financial administration could be done much more efficiently if CEPES would get the institute status.

### 3 The results of CEPES activities

Concerning the results achieved by CEPES the evaluation team was asked to consider the following issues:

- Assess to what extent CEPES has achieved its organizational objectives, as evidenced by the achievement of the expected outcomes set out in UNESCO's *Programme and Budget (C/5)* and CEPES medium-term Plan 2002-2007.
- Examine whether the tools used by CEPES, such as networking, human resource development, knowledge sharing & clearing house services and promoting partnership, are effective in attaining above-mentioned organizational objectives.
- Assess to what extent CEPES' programmes and activities in the area of higher education in Europe contribute to UNESCO in achieving respective EFA goals, both directly and indirectly.
- Assess whether the results achieved by CEPES have reinforced UNESCO's overall decentralization strategy by providing a better and more timely response to the needs of Member States.

#### 3.1 Achievement of UNESCO's expected outcomes

The evaluation team confronted an important methodological challenge in trying to assess the extent to which CEPES has achieved the expected outcomes presented in UNESCO's *Programme and Budget (C/5)*, since the text of the *C/5* document only contained one indirect reference to CEPES:

*"Given the growing recognition of the role played by effective higher education systems in supporting progress towards EFA goals, UNESCO will give a new thrust to the strengthening of sustainable national higher education systems with a developmental perspective. Particular focus will be given to building and strengthening capacities at the national level, in close cooperation with UNESCO's field network and the education institutes and centres, including CEPES"*  
(33 *C/5* p.52).

From this perspective CEPES activities have contributed to UNESCO achieving its objectives, given the important involvement of CEPES in higher education reforms in a number of countries in its region, including Romania, Ukraine, and Croatia.



In the presentation of UNESCO's three main lines of action with respect to higher education, i.e. 1) Advancing policy options for higher education; 2) Promoting inter-university solidarity for development; and 3) Promoting the use of information and communication technologies in education; no reference is made to CEPES, while CEPES as a Centre does not have a separate section in the C/5 document describing its programme for the coming period. This contrary to, for example, IESALC that as a consequence of its Institute status has its programme included in the C/5 document.

In addition, a recent initiative in the area of higher education presented in the C/5 document, i.e. the UNESCO Forum on Higher Education, Research and Knowledge, can be referred to as an example of the challenges UNESCO faces in integrating CEPES effectively in its education strategies, as well as the difficulties the evaluators faced in assessing the level of goal achievement realized by CEPES.

This intersectoral initiative, with a specific focus on developing countries, was at least initially expected to play an important role in UNESCO's strategies with respect to higher education in the coming period. While it may not have developed in the way initially expected, it is striking that the evaluators have found no signs of any direct involvement of CEPES in the initial set up and operationalization of this activity.

Obviously CEPES cannot be blamed for this, but, again, it is an example of the challenge UNESCO faces in finding an effective way to involve CEPES in UNESCO initiatives with respect to higher education, since practically all new higher education initiatives are focused on higher education in developing countries within the larger framework of the EFA strategy. CEPES, being a UNESCO higher education centre in Europe, with an expertise in areas such as higher education governance and policy, quality (assessment) of higher education, and doctoral level education, apparently does not fit very well into this main UNESCO focus.

According to the Director of CEPES a detailed proposal for CEPES programmatic activities for the coming years has been sent to Headquarters as an input into the C/5 document. However, the proposal was not incorporated directly or indirectly in the C/5 document. While the evaluation team could not verify the reasons for this, fact is that the C/5 document provides us with few direct guidelines for a goal achievement analysis of CEPES.

The three main lines of action mentioned above are a logical continuation of the three main expected outcomes in the area of higher education as presented in the C/4 document and discussed above in the section on relevance. The same can be mentioned here that was mentioned above, i.e. CEPES activities contribute to the achievement of the expected results in UNESCO's three main lines of action with respect to higher education, but the main activities of CEPES seem to be focused on

other themes. Again, this is a result of a number of specific aspects related to CEPES' embeddedness in its European context.

Overall we can conclude that CEPES has contributed to the achievement of expected outcomes set out in UNESCO's C/5 document. However, it is difficult to make a more precise assessment of the nature of the contributions as a result of the lack of a clear and transparent insight into the expectations of UNESCO concerning CEPES contributions to the achievement of UNESCO's expected outcomes. Here the evaluation team recommends that UNESCO makes its expectations with respect to CEPES more explicit in a form that will allow for more effective future evaluations of the level of goal achievement by CEPES.

### **3.2 Achievement of CEPES organizational objectives**

As indicated above CEPES has produced a background document in which it presents its major projects conducted in the period 2000-2005. This document has been used by the evaluation team for assessing the extent to which CEPES has achieved its own objectives.

In terms of project numbers and coverage, the first priority area, 'Higher Education Policy and Reforms', is the most prominent one among the CEPES activities. The list describes 14 different projects, spanning the period of 2000-2005.

Under this title, CEPES has had numerous activities, many of which can be seen conforming to the overall UNESCO priorities and targets. The EC/UNESCO Project on the regional university network on *governance and management of higher education in South East Europe* (2002-2004) is a good example of this. The main target was integration of the countries of South East Europe (SEE) involved in the project into the EHEA, with several policy recommendations, network building, establishment of UNESCO Chairs, support towards new structures for financial management, university autonomy and accountability, with stronger links also to the civil society and local economy. Also, information and capacity building on *quality assurance, credit transfer systems, and new curriculum development* were involved. The Project also produced several papers and books by CEPES.

A kind of permanent work plan within CEPES has been capacity building and promotion of *academic mobility*, which was the follow-up of the Council of Europe/UNESCO Lisbon Recognition Convention. It has produced, amongst other things, several 'Codes of Good Practices', recommendations and other documents.

Another important project worth mentioning is the one on *doctoral degrees and*

*qualifications* (2003-2004). It was a critical ‘meta-analysis’ of doctoral studies in Europe and the USA, by pointing out also the challenges and policy implementations. One should note that especially after the Berlin summit meeting of the Bologna Process in 2003, doctoral level studies are being more closely incorporated into the new Bologna degree structure.

CEPES has been working on the development of *strategic indicators ‘for monitoring higher education in the 21<sup>st</sup> century’*, e.g. in relation to institutional and programme accreditation, or in relation to ranking and league tables. This is a topic that is taken up by CEPES in the framework of its role in the follow up of the World Conference on Higher Education. In this it works closely together with other organizations, such as the German Center for Higher Education Development (CHE). This is an area that receives a lot of attention internationally, but it is not uncontroversial given the large number of methodological problems attached to the use of indicators and the production of ranking tables in higher education.

In addition, CEPES has organised projects and seminars covering individual countries, such as Russia, Romania, Ukraine, former Yugoslavian countries, etc., which generally have contributed positively to the implementation of national reforms with respect to higher education. The special problems related to the *private higher education sector in Europe* have also been addressed.

### **3.2.1 Higher Education Developments and their Relevance for EFA**

The second major priority theme of CEPES concerns ‘*Higher Education Developments and their Relevance for Education for All (EFA) and Sustainable Development*’. Even though higher education is not in the very core of the EFA strategy, EFA still has implications in the area of higher education policies, the ethical values, and especially teacher education.

Within this priority area CEPES reports to have undertaken five projects, dealing with *teacher education in Europe and its national models*, with *ethical and moral dimensions in education*, and especially, what is currently important, with the issue of the *vocational content in mass higher education*. Another project is the one on ‘*First Place of Employment*’, which is directing attention to a very critical issue in the present European area, that is the employment and career development of young scientists, and also the entire higher education staff.

### **3.2.2 Networks and Capacity Building in the Age of Globalization and Knowledge-Based Societies**

The third main priority theme addresses ‘*Networks and Capacity Building in the Age of Globalization and Knowledge-Based Societies*’. Included are all in all eight

projects that deal with, e.g. the impact of globalization; ***cross-border or transnational education; entrepreneurial universities; brain drain and brain gain; and the concept of the bilingual university.***

*All the above projects are all well within the UNESCO priorities and targets, and generally CEPES has been able to put together an impressive array of projects, seminars, publications, networks of UNESCO Chairs, etc. But from the perspective of UNESCO's education strategies clearly some of the priorities and projects presented in CEPES' report are more important than others, partly because some other national and international organizations are already covering those issues more thoroughly and with far better resources. Consolidation of the use of CEPES resources and action targets seems thus a proper strategic development.*

In order to support higher education reform and development in the Europe Region (with particular emphasis on Central and Eastern Europe), CEPES has undertaken activities in areas such as:

- The elaboration and implementation of higher education policy.
- Legislative reform, academic quality assurance and accreditation.
- Institutional ranking and its methodologies.
- The recognition of academic qualifications.
- Brain drain and the intellectual labour market.
- New approaches to governance and institutional management.
- University autonomy and academic freedom.
- The status of teachers and their training.
- University-industry relations in the context of the knowledge society.
- The use of ICT including on-line courses.
- Transnational education (TNE).

Many of the informants consulted in this evaluation praised CEPES for contributing to useful capacity building in the region in question on such relevant topics. Judging from the informants, that often mentioned the usefulness of the publications of CEPES and judging from the amount of human resources invested in relation to publications- and information at CEPES, it seems like the publications- and the information strategy of the centre is essential for assessing the results achieved.

### **3.3 Effectiveness of tools**

CEPES undertakes a range of activities mainly in South East and East Europe. The core of most of these activities consists of the identification of a relevant theme or

policy problem, the invitation of experts to address the theme, the organisation of a seminar or conference where the experts meet with policy makers and other representatives from the higher education practice in the institution(s), country or region in question, and the production of a publication that consists of the papers written by the experts plus the conclusions of the seminar/conference. Consequently, a relatively large part of the CEPES activities can be interpreted as networking, and capacity-building, with substantive inputs mainly from people from outside CEPES, and outside the core region of CEPES (South East Europe). By utilising a large network of practitioners, university staff and consultants mainly from outside the region, CEPES is able to organize a level of activities which is much larger than the size of the Centre itself should indicate. This is an effective tool for contributing to the reform and renewal of higher education in the countries in question.

The main task of CEPES staff is therefore not to undertake research itself, but to contribute to the successful and effective organisation of the seminars/conferences and publications. As such and in line with the original decision of UNESCO in the early 1970s with respect to the establishment of CEPES, the Centre is not a research institute, but a policy oriented expertise unit of UNESCO.

Interviews with stakeholders and users of the Centre indicate that the current focus on CEPES clearinghouse or ‘broker’ role in capacity-building, networking and publications in terms of nature and volume of work and allocation of resources is differently appreciated. The interviewees from the South East Europe region appreciated very much the ‘broker’ role of CEPES and the contributions CEPES is making through this tool to the reform and renewal of higher education in the region. Others were more sceptical and indicated that they would prefer a larger variation of activities, including more studies undertaken by the staff of the Centre itself.

Given CEPES possible future status as institute an examination of UNESCO’s institute policy as formulated by the Executive Board (Document 162 EX/18, paragraph 19) is of relevance here. Such an examination reveals that the potential function as “think-tanks” is strongly emphasized for institutes. The institutes should contribute to the conceptualization, design and formulation of UNESCO’s programmes, they should serve as laboratories of ideas as well as centres of excellence and experimentation, they should function as clearing houses and reference centres, and they should mobilize, in an innovative setting, a critical mass of specialized expertise and skills. Here we can refer to the reflection made above concerning the lack of direct initial involvement of CEPES in the UNESCO’s flagship initiative with respect to higher education as an example of the mismatch between UNESCO’s current use of CEPES and UNESCO’s Institute policy.

### **3.4 Clearing house**

The CEPES Library and Documentation Unit provides library and documentation services for internal and external users. It offers reading room services, general and specialized bibliographies and provides other regular information services. The Library holds over 6,000 books, 143 serial titles, and 2112 documents that, in particular, cover the major questions of higher education and related domains. As discussed above, the clearing house services are effective but can be improved; from that perspective a users-study of the CEPES publications can be recommended.

#### **3.4.1 UNESCO-CEPES Publications**

UNESCO-CEPES publishes a quarterly journal (*Higher Education in Europe*) and four series of publications, i.e. *Monographs on Higher Education*; *Papers on Higher Education*; *Studies on Higher Education*; and *Studies on Science and Culture*. The latter publishes the findings of research undertaken by UNESCO Chairs collaborating with UNESCO-CEPES. Since 2000 in total 26 titles have been published in the four series, of which 21 were covering a higher education topic (a list of the CEPES publications 2000-2005 is given in appendix 2)

CEPES regularly organizes seminars, workshops and conferences on higher education topics, intended to promote the sharing of knowledge and ideas between academics and policy-makers in the field. The Centre disseminates the outcomes of such events through its publications (in one of the series or the journal) and website.

All CEPES publications are made available free of charge, in electronic format, within six months following their publication in print. This does not include the English version of the journal *Higher Education in Europe*.

The publications are relevant for the higher education developments in the South East European region. This was confirmed in the interviews with the users of the books, and stakeholders, particularly those from the region. However, given their specific nature, not all publications are of direct relevance to UNESCO's work in the area of higher education.

#### **3.4.2 The quarterly journal**

The quarterly journal *Higher Education in Europe* is edited by the Centre and published by Routledge. The editorial policy of the journal can be summarized as follows: 'The journal deals with major issues and trends in contemporary higher education. It presents information, interpretations, and critical views about current developments in the field, aiming at fostering the interaction of research and higher education policy and practice. While focusing primarily on higher education in

Europe and North America, the quarterly frequently features contributions from other regions of the world as well.’

An analysis of the issues 2002-2005 reveals that the major part of the articles addresses themes that are related to the activities of CEPES, but are not necessarily related to the three priority areas of UNESCO with respect to higher education for the period under review, i.e. support quality enhancement, facilitate student mobility, and strengthening institutional capacity. In the past the journal has gone through a number of crises, but the Centre has managed to publish it almost continuously since 1975. One of the coming numbers is dedicated to the theme *Higher Education and Education for All* (with Georges Haddad as guest editor). This indicates the efforts made by the editors of the journal to link it to UNESCO’s educational programmes.

Overall the journal gives the impression of being somewhere in between a peer-reviewed academic journal and a collection of policy oriented opinion papers. According to the users of the journal many of the more academic articles are of rather high quality and in most cases relevant for an academic audience. The users of the policy oriented articles are very positive about the articles’ relevance, and indicated in the interviews that these articles are used in the higher education policy making practice in a number of countries in the region. What is striking is that this information on users was gathered by the evaluation team. The editorial staff of the journal does not have any information on the actual use or appreciation by the subscribers/readers of the journal. The same is true with respect to the four publication series.

The two faces the journal shows, might be one of the reasons why it has only 159 subscribers. Even though it is very likely that each copy is read by more than one reader, still this number seems to be rather low compared to the investments in staff and money necessary for publishing four numbers per year. While the promotion of the journal has already been discussed with the publisher, who produced as a consequence promotional materials, which is currently being used accordingly, we recommend that CEPES itself should also actively try to promote the journal under a wider audience. In addition, we want to recommend that this promotion campaign will be based, amongst other things, on a study of the current use of the journal by its subscribers and readers.

### **3.4.3 The Centre’s website**

The Centre’s website is of growing importance in the communication with its users. In a report produced by the CEPES Senior Informatics Assistant it is indicated that the number of visitors to the CEPES website in 2005 has more than doubled compared to 2002. Of importance here is that especially the ‘visits’ to pdf-files has grown.

Whether this implies that more pdf-files are downloaded is not known. Also in this case no attempt has been made until now to do a user study among the visitors of the website.

### **3.5 Higher education, global developments, CEPES and EFA**

There are important contradictions between the location and aims of CEPES, and the main educational policy focus (EFA) and geographical aims of UNESCO Headquarters. CEPES is located in Europe, and it has a higher education focus. The UNESCO Education Secretariat on the other hand is focusing mainly on Education for All (EFA), and has consequently been focusing mainly on the world's developing countries thereby reducing its financial budget available for activities in Europe. In addition it implies also that higher education until recently (the flagship initiative!) has been a sector whose relevance is seen in the first place from the contributions it makes to EFA. In a separate Appendix (nr. 4) of this report, a reflection is presented on the importance of higher education for national development. This text must be seen as an attempt to support the suggestions made by many of consulted experts and stakeholders concerning a stronger position of higher education in UNESCO's education strategies, and not in the first place from the EFA perspective.



## 4 Quality of coordination and interaction

The evaluation team was asked to examine two specific aspects of the relationship between CEPES and UNESCO Headquarters and other relevant agencies:

- a) Assess the effectiveness of coordination and interaction with UNESCO Headquarters (notably with the Division of Higher Education), the other Institutes and Field Offices in order to analyse whether they play complementary and/or overlapping roles.
- b) Assess the quality of partnerships with other entities including partner agencies, other UN agencies, bilateral and multilateral development agencies.

### 4.1 Effectiveness of coordination and interaction

Given its mission, we would expect to find that CEPES has a high degree of interaction and exhibit coordination with:

- UNESCO Headquarters (HQ), and more specifically with the Higher Education Division within the Education Department (Ed).

Given the specific field of CEPES, we do not expect a high degree of interaction with other UNESCO institutes or centres. However, to some extent CEPES could benefit from interaction with the IIEP and IBE, certainly in relation to the internal capacity building of the centres and institutes (e.g. sharing knowledge and exchange ideas within certain areas and topics such as quality in higher education).

We would furthermore expect CEPES to have close relations with and to serve the needs of

- Member States, especially in South East Europe
- Relevant Non-Governmental Organisations operating in the field of non-formal education and literacy

#### 4.1.1 Coordination and interaction with Headquarters

Even though quality of coordination and interaction among human beings always is a question of the culture and people – particular features of UNESCO as an organization as well as of the formal organizational model of UNESCO are decisive for understanding the nature of the interaction between a centre such as CEPES and UNESCO Headquarters. The institutes and centers represent the core of the expertise

within UNESCO. In order to function effectively both type of units, including the centres, need a minimum level of functional autonomy.

UNESCO is a world wide organization having to coordinate its activities with more than 150 member states. Like most working areas of UNESCO, the activities of the educational sector are characterized by diffuse goals and unclear criteria for goal attainment. One consequence is that the relationship between Headquarters and CEPES is loosely coupled. This problem was pointed to already by the committee set up in 1992 to address the consequences of the new socio-political context of CEPES. Most informants working at Headquarters claimed that there were tendencies of mismatch between the activities of CEPES and the goals of the Educational sector of UNESCO. In addition, the coupling was loose due to a lack of systems for reporting of the activities and the resources of the centers. However, informants at Headquarters also claimed that there was a lack of intellectual leadership among them, capable of creating a better integration between UNESCO central and its institutes and centers.

Many interviewees both from inside and outside CEPES have indicated that the interaction between CEPES and UNESCO HQ is mainly a one-way street with a limited direct input from UNESCO HQ in CEPES' agenda and activities. For example, in the C/5 document CEPES is mentioned only once.

However, as indicated by the Centre's director, there has been a formal reporting process and interaction between CEPES and UNESCO. For the programme related matters, CEPES has two lines of accountability: one to the ADG Education and one to the Governing Board. And it also reports to BFC on all non-programme related matters. There were a visit of the Director-General to CEPES in September 2003, participation of the ADG for Education in the 7th Session of the Advisory Board (May 2004), participation of Directors of the Division of Higher Education in the session of the CEPES Advisory Board, and visit of a number of members of this division in meetings organized by CEPES. There is a regular reporting made in the context of reporting to the Director General at the Executive Board and the General Conference, mission partners and so on.

When asked directly CEPES staff indicated that in practice each of them has only been in serious contact with one staff member at HQ, and in all cases it was the same person. Other staff of HQ were either described as lacking relevant knowledge in higher education, lacking interest in CEPES or being never available. Regardless of whether this impression is correct or not, it presents an image of a HQ that is very difficult to contact from the operational level of CEPES, and no matter what the underlying reasons are for this image, this creates a problem when it comes to having an effective and smooth interaction between CEPES and HQ.

A possible solution might be to select two (or more) staff members of HQ as contact persons for CEPES. This would improve the communication considerably and would increase the trust of CEPES staff in HQ.

Also when operating in the field CEPES seldom interacts directly with HQ. Since CEPES staff size is small, and since most ‘academic’ staff are Romanian programme assistants, CEPES invites in general experts from other parts of Europe (or elsewhere), implying that the possibilities for direct interaction between HQ and CEPES staff in CEPES activities (mainly seminars/conferences) is consequently small. This ‘outsourcing’ on CEPES side, however necessary in itself it is, may contribute to lack of communication and a limited flow of information.

#### **4.1.2 Coordination and interaction with field offices, regional offices and national commissions**

In addition to its main activities as the European Centre for Higher Education, CEPES also represents UNESCO in Romania. The Director of CEPES functions as the UNESCO Representative to Romania and, as such, participates regularly in the UN Agency Country Team meetings organized by the UN Resident Co-ordinator in Romania, as well as in other events relevant to the mission and activities of UNESCO in Romania.

During the 1998-2003 period, CEPES actively participated both in the elaboration of the *Common Country Assessment (CCA)* document (serving as the coordinator of the chapter on Education) and in all the activities undertaken in the framework of the United Nations Development Assistance Framework (UNDAF) exercise, being responsible mainly for areas of education and culture, particularly participating in the UN Thematic Group on “Gender and Education”. CEPES also supported the elaboration and publication of the *National Report on Education for All Romania, 1999*.

Five years later, in 2003, the UN system released the second generation of CCA for Romania. The UNDAF was finalised in December 2003 and along with the CCA, were released in January 2004. CEPES contributed to the processes of producing this common instrument of the UN system in Romania, being particularly involved in the elaboration of the chapter dealing with education and in gender mainstreaming the whole document (as coordinator of the special UN Working Group on Gender).

Other than we can refer to the regular contact of CEPES with the German National UNESCO Commission through its chairperson Professor Klaus Hüfner, who is also the chairperson of the CEPES Advisory Board.

#### **4.1.3 Quality of coordination and interaction with *member states***

The quality of interaction of CEPES with member states in the region (South East Europe) is excellent. However, whilst the best cases build on relatively stable relations of networks and contacts, in some cases it is difficult for CEPES to maintain a continuous and stable relationship with national governments, amongst other things, due to rapid shifts of governments. In addition to the governments, CEPES also maintains good connections to the leadership at many universities in these countries.

As already pointed out in this evaluation, the activities of CEPES are first and foremost relevant for Romania and other South-East European countries. Informants from these countries were also particularly pleased with the services provided by CEPES, not at least in relation to the current processes of reforming and renewing higher education. CEPES took part in actions also believed to be important for creating stabilization in the region (management of universities/governance, funding of universities/ entrepreneurship, Bologna process, ranking, multilingual universities in Europe, ethical dimension in higher education). In addition to these contributions of the Centre our informants also emphasized CEPES role as provider of information and advice, that organized different types of training for regional higher education actors, and arranged relevant conferences and meetings. These activities were said to be organized very effectively by CEPES. They create platforms for actors in the region to collaborate. Despite the turbulent relations between different groups in these regions, it was said that CEPES managed to “keep everything together” - “bridging us to shared values”. It was also said that CEPES was able to promote new ideas and conceptualize processes of change, thereby stimulating higher education policy work in general, such as the writing of strategic documents and the development of new university legislations. CEPES was said to be a “friendly framework”, “idealistic” able at maintaining diplomacy and fast response.

Even though our informants from Western Europe acknowledged many of the activities of CEPES, in contrast to the informants from South-Eastern Europe, they stressed the questions whether in the long run CEPES could viably continue to play a role as a regional centre. A number of the informants pointed to the coming EU membership of Romania and other countries in the region. This was expected to lead to some kind of support for higher education reform the countries in the region will receive from the EC. What will under these new circumstances be the role of CEPES as a UNESCO Centre? Can CEPES find a new role for itself once there is less need for its role in the support of higher education reform in the region? These and other related questions will CEPES and UNESCO confront in the coming five to ten years.

#### **4.1.4 Quality of partnerships**

Partnerships and network cooperation in Europe is essential for the way in which CEPES operates. CEPES collaborates closely with agencies such as IAU, OECD, the Council of Europe, EUA, and the European Commission. The latter four are also sending observers to the biennial Advisory Board meetings of CEPES. In addition, CEPES is a member of the Bologna Follow-Up Group (BFUG).

CEPES hardly has any working relationships with other agencies of the United Nations system. Most other agencies CEPES works with are European. This is another indication of the well-connectedness of CEPES in the European higher education arena, and the limited integration of CEPES in the UNESCO structure. This is also illustrated by the survey among Field and Regional Offices (see table 1). Most other offices are not aware of the activities of CEPES, even though we must add here of course, that the survey neither shows a high level of interaction between the other offices. The figures show, for example, that IESALC's activities are only moderately better known than CEPES activities.

*Table 1: Awareness of CEPES activities among field offices*

N.B: Question addressed: How aware are you of CEPES activities?  
(58 percent response rate)

	<b>Very aware</b>	<b>Moderately aware</b>	<b>Not aware</b>	<b>Not Applicable</b>	<b>Response Total</b>
Research	4% (1)	24% (6)	<b>68% (17)</b>	4% (1)	<b>25</b>
Training	8% (2)	8% (2)	<b>75% (18)</b>	8% (2)	<b>24</b>
Technical assistance to Member States	4% (1)	17% (4)	<b>75% (18)</b>	4% (1)	<b>24</b>
Seminars and Conferences	12% (3)	8% (2)	<b>75% (18)</b>	4% (1)	<b>24</b>
Standard setting activities	12% (3)	12% (3)	<b>72% (18)</b>	4% (1)	<b>25</b>
Facilitation of international cooperation	4% (1)	12% (3)	<b>71% (17)</b>	12% (3)	<b>24</b>
<b>Total Respondents</b>					<b>31</b>
(skipped this question)					<b>9</b>

## **5 Financial and organizational management**

The evaluation team was asked to focus on four aspects of CEPES' funding pattern and organisational management:

- a) Analyse the funding patterns, mechanisms and their risks for sustained institutional capacity, viability and sustainability.
- b) Assess the process by which extra-budgetary resources (including cash, cost sharing and in-kind contributions) are sought and obtained and to what extent the extra-budgetary funding is aligned to the strategic objectives of UNESCO.
- c) Evaluate the management of inputs to deliver expected outcomes, bearing in mind available resources (a key question to be answered is whether the activities undertaken could be delivered in a more efficient way).
- d) Examine the quality of organizational management and the impact of the extent of functional autonomy provided.

### **5.1 Centre status of CEPES**

The centre status forms a problem for CEPES when it comes to its financial management and financial income. In a region (Europe) where more and more of the available funds for higher education activities are distributed in a competitive way on a project market, the centre status of CEPES implies that it cannot compete on an equal basis and in an effective way with its competitors for these funds. Amongst other things, the centre status implies that CEPES cannot administer its own finances, but has to do it through HQ's financial administration. The Centre has asked for a special account, but the request has until now been denied. This implies, for example, that the Centre's financial administrator has to rely on HQ for handling specific administrative demands from the EC concerning the EC project CEPES was involved in. This administrative inefficiency has a negative effect on the attractiveness of CEPES as a contractor in the competitive higher education project market in Europe.

### **5.2 Funding pattern mechanism**

The location of CEPES in Romania implies that it cannot expect the level of funding from the national government as other UNESCO units (for example, UIE) have received. Nonetheless, despite its relatively limited funds provides the Romanian government CEPES annually with \$30,000.

In the biennium 2002-2003 CEPES' basic allocations covered 100% of its expenses. These include the programmatic allocations (or additional appropriations) from UNESCO for agreed upon projects, the allocation from UNESCO concerning the running costs of CEPES (in the administrative system referred to as BUC = Bucharest), and the annual government contribution from Romania. As an example concerning the first allocation, CEPES run a project with Budget code 11223117, entitled Publications on new demands. In 2002 \$6,597.96 and in 2003 \$7,956.15 (in total \$14,554.11) was allocated by UNESCO to CEPES for this project. The expenses of CEPES concerning this project were in 2002 \$6,597.96 and in 2003 \$7,956.15 (in total \$14,554.11).

With respect to the years 2004-2005 the financial administration shows a small surplus resulting of CEPES spending for almost all agreed upon projects in 2005 less than the amount allocated to CEPES for the project. In most projects the amount not spent was very small. The total amount not yet spent at the moment of the evaluation (November 2005) was \$30,888.55.

Because of this we will present only the income side of the budget of CEPES of the last two bienniums (table 2). Please note that the figures refer to the allocations for a two-year period, implying that CEPES total basic programmatic allocation in 2002/03 was on average slightly more than \$100,000 per year. The allocation for the running costs of CEPES increased by more than 17% from almost \$132,500 to \$155,000.

The extra-budgetary activities included in table 2 refer to all extra-budgetary income of CEPES in the period in question, i.e. income for smaller as well as income from larger projects. The smaller external projects concern contributions from e.g. the DAAD, the Elias Foundation, ISSC, and Kulturkontakt Austria. With respect to these small projects there was no information available on how the money was spent other than that income and expenses covered each other for 100%.

As an example of a large extra-budgetary project CEPES was responsible for we can refer to a project on Governance and Management of Higher Education funded by the European Commission with a budget of more than \$500,000 (2002-2004). Other large extra-budgetary projects were a project on strategic indicators for higher education (2001-2003), funded by the Japanese Funds in Trust for Promotion of International Cooperation and Mutual Understanding with budget of \$200,000; and two EC/Phare projects (2001/03) with a total budget of over \$650,000.

With respect to expenses, the EC project on Governance and Management of Higher Education (with a total budget of \$504,797.57) shows, for example, the following types of expenditure:



1. Project personnel	
Consultants	\$ 73,650.97
Mission costs	\$ 85,786.42
Total	\$159,436.99
2. Sub-contracts	\$112,331.80
3. Trainings and seminars	\$217,028.78
4. Miscellaneous	\$ 16,000.00
Total	\$504,797.57

*Table 2: CEPES Income in US \$<sup>3</sup>*

<b>1. Income</b>	2002/03 Years	2004/05 Years
<b>UNESCO</b>		
Running costs CEPES Bucharest	132,467.26	155,000.00
Additional appropriations	208,993.72	310,080.00
<b>ROMANIA</b>		
Government of Romania	45,713.80	63,509.00
<b>Extra-budgetary activities</b>	598,341.60	147,706.85
<b>OTHER INCOME<sup>4</sup></b>	p.m.	p.m.
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>985,516.38</b>	<b>676,295.85</b>

<sup>3</sup> This table includes the figures provided to us by CEPES. These are the figures that are included in the FABS system. A word of caution concerning these figures is necessary because they do not include the staff costs (salaries).

<sup>4</sup> As a consequence of CEPES' status as a Centre all external (=other) income has been administered directly by UNESCO Headquarters.

Given its relatively low level of basic investments in CEPES, UNESCO gets ‘value for its dollars’ in the sense that CEPES manages to produce a lot of for UNESCO relevant outcomes for the relatively small amount invested in CEPES.

### **5.3 Staffing and organizational management**

At the moment of the evaluation CEPES had 22 staff members, the overwhelming majority of which were recruited locally, and one vacancy (see table 3). Presently, only two of the staff members of CEPES are non-Romanian.

The general impression from our visits is that given the circumstances in which it has to operate, i.e. as a centre with limited resources and a mainly Romanian staff, CEPES staff members are performing very well. The Director is very well-connected and has a high professional status internationally, the Deputy Director is regarded as one of the most important experts on higher education governance and management in the region, while the programme assistants are highly competent and in general very experienced in their area. They are supported by a dedicated and committed administrative and support staff, who all are very loyal to CEPES and UNESCO. The third programme specialist (in addition to Director and Deputy Director) is relatively new in his job, but gives the impression of a very competent publication specialist who when given the right stimulation and support, has the potential of developing into a very valuable senior staff member of CEPES. The staff members are highly committed to CEPES and their work, as well as to the Director of the Centre.

Nonetheless, some external interviewees pointed to the personnel management approach of CEPES and suggested that this approach resembles more an old-fashioned, micromanagement style than the management practice one would expect to find in a modern expertise centre. Here we realize that part of the observations might have to do with cultural differences between West and East Europe. Nonetheless, also our observation is that the personnel management approach of the Center seems to be more hierarchical than what one might expect of a Centre as CEPES.

CEPES does not have programme areas to which staff are attached, or other structural possibilities for Romanian staff members to specialize and develop a career within a certain thematic area. Involvement of Romanian staff in the activities of CEPES seems to be based more on the demands of externally financed opportunities than internal competencies and interests. This is obviously a characteristic that CEPES shares with other centres that are earning a large part of their income on a fluctuating market. However, the fact that as a result of their UNESCO programme assistant status, the salaries of the Romanian staff members of CEPES are higher than practically all public officials in Romania should not necessarily be an argument for expecting that therefore all staff members should be satisfied with their job and their

current career opportunities. It is obvious that the overall UNESCO personnel guidelines and procedures imply all kinds of limitations for a Centre such as CEPES. Nonetheless, to part of the outside world CEPES seems like a centre consisting of two senior staff members with many international contacts and a large support staff.

If UNESCO decides to continue the UNESCO status of CEPES and if it decides to give the institute status to CEPES it will be of profit to both CEPES and UNESCO if the staff of CEPES becomes more international, and more directly involved not only in the implementation but also in the planning of activities. In addition, UNESCO should consider how to stimulate the careers from a professional point of view of local staff such as the programme assistants at CEPES. Here we would like to recommend to UNESCO, also from the perspective of the coming retirement of the current director CEPES, to start reconsidering the current personnel structure of CEPES as soon as possible.

### **5.3.1 The Director**

The financial and organizational management of the Centre is the responsibility of the Director, supported by administrative staff, programme specialists, and programme assistants. The Director (since September 1999) holds a PhD in educational administration from the State University of New York at Buffalo, and prior to his appointment, he was Chief of Section for Higher education Policy and Reform in UNESCO headquarters in Paris. The Director has an excellent knowledge of the field as well as of CEPES where he began his career in the 1970s.

When requested, the interviewees all appreciated the Director's professionalism, his impressive international networks, his political skills, and his competences in positioning CEPES prominently in the European higher education landscape. However, some external informants were somewhat sceptical about the management style of the Director, in the sense that they felt that it is too hierarchical and does not allow enough space for the CEPES local staff to further develop their career in the Centre and in the fields and areas of specialization CEPES is covering.

### **5.3.2 The role of the advisory board**

Since CEPES is still a Centre its activities are monitored by an Advisory Board, and not by a Governing Board. This Advisory Board consists of eight members of which four are appointed by the Director-General of UNESCO and four are designated by international organizations at the invitation of the director-general. In addition the Board has currently four observers representing the Council of Europe, the European Commission, the OECD, and the European University Association (EUA). The Advisory Board also serves as the Regional Follow-up Committee for the Europe Region of the UNESCO World Conference on Higher Education. The Advisory

Board meets every second year, and as the name indicates, its main role is to advise the Director, amongst other things, with respect to the future orientation of the CEPES programme. The Board evaluates implemented activities and plans of activities to be undertaken in the ongoing biennium and recommendations formulated by the Advisory Board after each session. The last meeting of the Advisory Board was 7/8 May 2004.

The influence of the Advisory Board is on paper limited. It can meet only once every two years, it can only advise, and formally it does not get any insight into the financial situation of CEPES. However, in practice (at least some of the members of) the Advisory Board is more powerful. Because of the relative lack of clear steering of CEPES by UNESCO, the Advisory Board has the opportunity through its recommendations to the Director on the future programme of CEPES to influence the direction in which CEPES is going rather considerably. Here we want to point to the information we received from the Chairman of the Board saying that he contacts the Director of CEPES at least twice a month to discuss 'CEPES matters'. The other Board members have less regular contacts with the Director outside the Board meetings, but many of them meet the Director on occasion, for example, during CEPES seminars or conferences.

Concerning the composition of the Board it is clear that the members are expected to be prominent (political) actors that are well-known in the UNESCO structures. However, some interviewees suggested that it would be better for CEPES if the Advisory Board could include some members with a more 'academic' (substantive) knowledge of the field. The main argument for this was that in the current composition the members represent more or less the same networks and bring in homogeneous knowledge, information, and views.

### **5.3.3 Staffing and Human Resource Management**

The Administration officer of CEPES is responsible for handling the financial administration of the Centre within the framework and guidelines provided by UNESCO. This implies that the Centre itself is not autonomous in handling its financial affairs. The Centre has a Library and Documentation Unit with four staff members. Their activities are coordinated by one of the programme specialists under the final responsibility of the Director. The activities of this unit and the relevance of its services have been described and discussed above.

The Centre has been able to bring together an exceptional number of outside experts to work for its projects; this working strategy may give it desired flexibility of action, but at the same time, this might come at the expense of continuity of CEPES activities and its own organizational expertise and capacity building as was indicated above.

*Table 3: Staff overview CEPES Nov 2003*

<b>Director</b>	1
Deputy Director/Programme Specialist	1
Programme Specialist	1
Programme Assistant	3
Programme Clerk	1
<b>Administration and support staff</b>	
Administrative officer	1
Senior Informatics Assistant	1
<b>Secretaries</b>	4
<b>Publications and Information Unit</b>	
Publications Assistant	1
Editing Clerk	1
Library Clerk	1
Library/Information Assistant	1
Maintenance Technician	1
Watchman	1
Driver	1
Manuel Worker/Cleaner	2
<b>Total</b>	<b>22</b>

#### **5.3.4 Management and coordination of programme activities**

Overall the management and organisation of CEPES seem to be functioning satisfactorily within the operational frameworks for a Centre provided by UNESCO. However, the managerial and organisational situation of CEPES can be described as being in a “transition mode” since it is for almost ten years on the way from being a Centre to being an Institute. Due to the need to bring in external funds, his capacity as programme specialist, and in his function as UNESCO representative to Romania, the Director has allocated a large part of his time and efforts to external activities and he has been frequently on travel. The frequent absence of the Director from the Centre affects, amongst other things, his capabilities to fully inform the staff on all activities going on and his possibilities to involve the staff more fully into the external CEPES activities.

In addition, CEPES activities are not organised on a programmatic basis. There are a number of priority areas, but given the large number of themes covered by the CEPES projects of the last five years the CEPES activities give an impression of

programmatic fragmentation. In the current staff situation it will be difficult to address this problem adequately. However, if the future staff situation would allow it might be advisable to introduce a set of programme clusters in CEPES each with its own programme coordinator. If this were to be realised the role of programme coordinator has to be clearly described, including his/her relationship to the Director.

## **6 Recommendations**

### **Recommendations to UNESCO and CEPES**

#### **6.1 Continuation of CEPES**

1. CEPES is a regional UNESCO Centre in Europe. However, as a European Centre there is currently limited relevance and limited impact of its activities outside its immediate surrounding region in South East Europe. If CEPES is to be continued at the same location the Centre has to:
  - Become better integrated into the UNESCO educational programmes.
  - Internationalize its staff.
  - Change its organisational and funding basis. This should be based on a clear commitment of the European member states of UNESCO to UNESCO and CEPES.
  - Change its programmatic activities so that they become more focused, less fragmented and of greater relevance for UNESCO HQ as well as all member states of the wider UNESCO Europe region.
  - Find a better balance between the external demands for CEPES activities and the internal capacities and areas of specialisation and interest of the staff.
  - Adapt its management style in the sense that it should become more open and transparent, and less hierarchical.

#### **6.2 Status of CEPES**

2. If UNESCO wants CEPES to continue as a UNESCO unit it should take a final decision concerning the status of CEPES. The current position of CEPES ‘in-between’ a Centre and an Institute position is very ineffective and the uncertainty with respect to the status of CEPES (“will it become an institute or not?”) has lasted far too long. In case UNESCO wants to continue with CEPES as one of its units we strongly recommend giving CEPES the status of Institute.
3. If UNESCO is deciding to change the status of CEPES into a UNESCO Institute, there is a need to introduce a new strategy. In that case we recommend UNESCO HQ, in line with recommendation 2, to implement over a two-year period a stepwise strategy involving the following processes.

- The **geographical coverage** of CEPES activities should be reassessed and clarified. It should be made clear what it means that CEPES should cover the entire Europe region, and not just part of it.
- **Actions:** Despite the symbolic value given to and appreciation of CEPES in the South Eastern Europe, the renewal of European higher education (including the Bologna Process) is entering a new phase at the latest after 2010 with serious consequences for CEPES. In addition, as a consequence of the inclusion of countries such as Romania and Bulgaria in the EU, the direct involvement of the EU in the renewal of higher education in the new member states will increase. Furthermore, CEPES is facing competition from other organizations, such as the EUA and OECD. Against this backdrop, CEPES needs to find its own niche and adapt its activities accordingly within the framework of the new strategies with respect to higher education of UNESCO. This is also in line with CEPES need to develop solid research qualifications in a few areas.
- **Recruitment:** UNESCPO-CEPES should also improve the diversity of the social capital of the staff, with respect to national background, age, gender, professional experiences and networks.
- **Integration:** UNESCO HQ needs to develop a strategy to improve the integration between CEPES, the other institutes and centres, field offices and the UNESCO HQ.
- **Incentive:** Although performance based funding is difficult to implement in an international organisation like UNESCO (e.g. since the different member states have different cost levels), in order to achieve their main goals UNESCO needs to develop incentives; steering tools with the possibilities of rewarding both at individual and institutional level. The use of such incentives does not necessarily need to have financially implications (e.g. fresh resources, new positions, grants), since academics are more in favour of attractive working conditions- and tasks.
- **The (new) governing board** must have a more active role and influence in the strategic steering of the institute. One should avoid recruiting members from the same networks, with similar backgrounds, etcetera, to the new governing board. By providing the governing board with some financial steering possibilities of the strategic activities of the institute, UNESCO will most likely benefit from a more active intellectual leadership from the members of the governing board.
- Depending on the costs of transaction, a strategy for better integration and attainment of synergy effects of the activities of the different UNESCO institutes and centres may involve short term exchange of staff. However, such collaboration can also be attained by using less costly incentives, e.g.



inter-institutional collaboration as a criterion for funding of research projects.

### **6.3 Clarification of mutual expectations and roles**

4. Actions should be taken to improve the interaction between UNESCO HQ and CEPES to enhance the volume and quality of services from CEPES to UNESCO. The Higher Education Division should initiate meetings with the Centre to clarify roles and responsibilities. This would allow for a better clarification of UNESCO's expectations and CEPES responsibilities. In addition, it can be recommended that HQ should select (at least) two of its staff members as contact persons for CEPES in order to improve the level and quality of communication.

### **6.4 Future role of UNESCO-CEPES**

5. The current focus on and interpretation of EFA are in some respects barriers to UNESCO developing a more effective and relevant higher education strategy. It can be recommended that in the coming 12 months UNESCO develops a plan of action to improve the connection between higher education and EFA in the following areas:
  - In UNESCO's Europe region EFA should refer to Higher Education for All. This implies that there is a need for UNESCO, for example, to promote access to higher education for immigrant/ethnic minorities and other traditionally underrepresented groups.
  - In developing countries there is the need for UNESCO to develop a more integrated and close link between EFA and higher education programme of UNESCO, and the policies of national governments and multilateral and bilateral donors that invest in higher education in developing countries.
6. CEPES should try to strengthen its empirically based knowledge foundation in a limited number of areas, e.g. quality assessment/accreditation of higher education; governance and management; and ICT and higher education. Its efforts to build up a statistical data-basis on higher education in its region is laudable. This effort could be extended to the other areas mentioned. For that, CEPES should undertake more self-initiated studies.

## **6.5 The internal organisation**

7. There is a need for more internationally qualified and experienced research staff at CEPES. The centre should aim to strengthening the intellectual capital by recruiting more international staff holding doctoral degrees and having research experience.

## **6.6 Publication policy**

8. Clearing house services are relatively effective, but can be improved. A more strategic and structured use of the journal *Higher Education in Europe* is particularly advisable. The number of subscribers needs to be increased (from the current 159) and user studies of the journal, the other publications of the Center, as well as the website need to be conducted.
9. CEPES could increase its visibility in Europe by increasing its number of publications. This could be done in a number of ways, for example, by stimulating the own staff to develop more publications such as the Glossary of Basic Terms and Definitions with respect to Quality Assessment and Accreditation; and by inviting guest authors and editors to publish in a new series to be distributed to a wide audience called e.g. CEPES Higher Education, Research and Knowledge.

## Appendix 1 Terms of reference

This evaluation covers the period between 2000 and 2005 (the last three biennium of UNESCO).

In order to meet the purpose of the evaluation described above, the following evaluation parameters shall be considered in the process of designing a detailed analytical framework and developing appropriate performance indicators:

### *(b) Relevance of its activities to UNESCO's programmes*

- Determine whether CEPES's programmes are in clear and explicit alignment with the UNESCO's strategies and goals in the field of higher education, as defined in *Medium Term Strategy (C/4)*;
- Identify the comparative advantage of CEPES among other UNESCO Institutes and Centres in the context of decentralisation and assess the ways in which CEPES plays a complimentary role to other Institutes, especially with IESALC;
- Analyse whether the same kind of services, with equal or better quality, can be provided in a more efficient way, by alternative programme delivery mechanisms or different institutional arrangements;
- Examine whether CEPES are located in the most rational and strategic place in the context of decentralization; and
- Determine to what extent CEPES has adopted UNESCO's results-based programming and management (RBM) and tools used for RBM such as SISTER and FABS.

### *(c) Results achieved*

- Assess to what extent CEPES has achieved its organizational objectives, as evidenced by the achievement of the expected outcomes set out in UNESCO's *Programme and Budget (C/5)* and CEPES medium-term Plan 2002-2007;
- Examine whether the tools used by CEPES, such as networking, human resource development, knowledge sharing & clearing house services and promoting partnership, are effective in attaining above-mentioned organizational objectives;

- Assess to what extent CEPES's programmes and activities in the area of higher education in Europe contributes to UNESCO in achieving respective EFA goals, both directly and indirectly; and
- Assess whether the results achieved by CEPES have reinforced UNESCO's overall decentralization strategy by providing a better and more timely response to the needs of Member States.

*(d) Quality of coordination and interaction with relevant entities*

- Assess the effectiveness of coordination and interaction with UNESCO Headquarters (notably with the Divisions of the Higher Education), the other Institutes and Field Offices in order to analyse whether they play complementary and/or overlapping roles; and
- Assess the quality of partnerships with other entities including partner agencies, other UN agencies, bilateral and multilateral development agencies.

*(e) Funding pattern and quality of organizational management*

- Analyse the funding patterns, mechanisms and their risks for sustained institutional capacity, viability and sustainability.
- Assess the process by which extra-budgetary resources (including cash, cost sharing and in-kind contributions) are sought and obtained and to what extent the extra-budgetary funding is aligned to the strategic objectives of UNESCO.
- Evaluate the management of inputs to deliver expected outcomes, bearing in mind available resources (a key question to be answered is whether the activities undertaken could be delivered in a more efficient way).
- Examine the quality of organizational management and the impact of the extent of functional autonomy provided.

## **Appendix 2 Interviews and Informants**

### **Officials of UNESCO Headquarters**

Alexandre Sannikov, Regional Education Adviser for Europe, Executive Office, Education Sector

Hans d'Orville, Director, Bureau of Strategic Planning

Qian Tang, Deputy Assistant Director-General, Education Sector

Peter Smith, Assistant Director-General, Education Sector

Stamenka Uvalic-Trumbic, Chief of Section, Section for Reform, Innovation and Quality Assurance, Division of Higher Education

Ruiz Molero, Chief of Section, Europe and North America Section, Division of Relations with Member States, Sector for External Relations and Cooperation

Mr. Asghar Mir Husain, Director, Division of Educational Policies and Strategies, Education Sector

Mr. Etienne Clément, Deputy Director, Bureau of Field Coordination

### **CEPES, Director and staff**

Jan Sadlak, Director

Lazar Vlasceanu, Programme Specialist and Deputy Director

Peter J. Wells, Programme Specialist

Laura Roxana Grünberg, Programme Assistant

Venera Ionita, Programme Assistant

Corneliu Dragomir, Senior Informatics Assistant

Marilena Filip, Library/information Assistant

Dan Parlea, Publications Assistant

Alexandrina Cucoanes, Administrative officer

### **Stakeholders based in Romania**

Mircea Miclea, former Romanian Minister of Education and Research

Victor Sahini, ELIAS Foundation of the Romanian Academy

Prof. Işan, Director General for International relations and European Integration, Ministry of Education and Research

Prof. Ioan Dumitrache, President of the National Council for Scientific Research in Higher Education

Prof. Radu Damian, President of the National Council for Financing of Higher Education, Vice-Chairman of the Council of Europe Committee for Research and Higher Education

Prof. Adrian Miroiu, Dean of the Faculty of Political Sciences; former State Secretary for Higher Education

Prof. Andrei Marga, President of the Academic Council, former Minister of Education, and Member of the CEPES Advisory Board.

**Other informants**

Per Nyborg, Former Chair of the Bologna Secretariat

Sjur Bergan, Head, Higher Education and Research Division, Council of Europe

Fuada Stankovic, University of Novi Sad, Serbia and Montenegro, Member of CEPES Advisory Board

Aleksa Bjelis, University of Zagreb, Croatia

Klaus Hübner, Chairperson of CEPES Advisory Board

Kenneth Edwards, Member of CEPES Advisory Board

## Appendix 3 CEPES: List of publications 2000 – 2005

### *Monographs on Higher Education:*

1. GEORGIEVA, P. (2002). *Higher Education in Bulgaria*
2. TIRON, ȘT. et al. (2003). *Higher Education in the Republic of Moldova*
3. KREMEN, V., and NIKOLAYENKO, S., eds. (2005). *Higher Education in Ukraine*
4. MIZIKACI, F. (2006). *Higher Education in Turkey*

### *Paper on Higher Education:*

5. FARRINGTON, D. (2005). *Legislative Initiatives in the Context of the Bologna Process: A Comparative Perspective*
6. VLĂSCEANU, L., GRÜNBERG, L., and PÂRLEA, D., eds. (2004). *Quality Assurance and Accreditation: A Glossary of Basic Terms and Definitions*
7. MIROIU, M. (2003). *Guidelines for Promoting Gender Equity in Higher Education in Central and Eastern Europe*
8. CAMPBELL, C. and ROSZNYAI, C. (2002). *Quality Assurance and the Development of Course Programmes*
9. DINCĂ, G. (2002). *Financial Management and Institutional Relationships with Civil Society*
10. VLĂSCEANU, L. and PURSER, L. (2002). *From Words to Action: Approaches to a Programme*
11. TAYLOR, J. and MIROIU, A. (2002). *Policy-Making, Strategic Planning, and Management of Higher Education*
12. KOUPISOV, O. and TATUR, Y. (2001). *Quality Assurance in Higher Education in the Russian Federation*
13. UNESCO-CEPES (2000). *Internationalization of Higher Education: An Institutional Perspective*

### *Studies on Higher Education*

14. SADLAK, J., ed. (2004). *Doctoral Studies and Qualifications in Europe and the United States: Status and Prospects*
15. VLĂSCEANU, L., and BARROWS, L.C., eds. (2004). *Indicators for Institutional and Programme Accreditation in Higher/Tertiary Education*
16. PAWŁOWSKI, K. (2004). *Rediscovering Higher Education in Europe*

17. MOON, B., VLĂSCLEANU, L., and BARROWS, L.C., eds. (2003). *Institutional Approaches to Teacher Education in the Europe Region: Current Models and Developments*
18. YONEZAWA, A., and KAISER, F., eds. (2003). *System-Level and Strategic Indicators for Monitoring Higher Education in the Twenty-First Century*
19. GRÜNBERG, L., ed. (2001). *Good Practice in Promoting Gender Equality in Higher Education in Central and Eastern Europe*
20. UNESCO-CEPES (2001). *Transnational Education and the New Economy: Delivery and Quality*
21. UNESCO-CEPES (2000). *Ten Years After and Looking Ahead: A Review of the Transformations of Higher Education in Central and Eastern Europe*

### ***Studies on Science and Culture***

22. GIARINI, O. and MALITZA, M. (2003). *The Double Helix of Learning and Work*
23. THEODORESCU, R., and BARROWS, L.C. (2002). *South-East Europe: The 24. Ambiguous Definitions of a Space / L'Europe du Sud-Est - les définitions ambiguës d'un espace*
25. THEODORESCU R. and BARROWS, L.C. (2001). *Politics and Culture in Southeastern Europe*
26. VĂDINEANU, A. (2001). *Sustainable Development: Theory and Practice Regarding the Transition of Socio-Economic Systems towards Sustainability*



## Appendix 4 Higher education and global developments

Until the mid-1990s, most international agencies treated higher education to a large extent as an anomaly, with the majority of international education projects focused on the level of primary schooling. International donors and partners regarded universities, for the most part, as institutional enclaves without deep penetration into the development needs of especially the developing countries. This view was promoted by, for example, the World Bank for many years.

The World Bank (WB) position began to move away from this compartmentalized approach in the late 1990s, with support for education at all levels accelerating and becoming more sectorally integrated. In 2000, the Bank along with UNESCO commissioned a Task Force on Higher Education and Society to draft an investigative and analytical report on the role of universities in the developing world. Concluding that higher education can ill afford to be considered a luxury good for developed as well as developing countries in an era of globalised knowledge and commerce, the Task Force played a key role in influencing World Bank policy in the new decade. By 2002, the WB openly recognized “the need to embrace a more balanced, holistic approach to ... the entire lifelong education system, irrespective of a country’s income level”<sup>5</sup>. As the WB has been called one of the world’s most “influential actors in the education policy arena,” this change in approach had the effect of prompting new initiatives of support for higher education among other international actors.

One way in which this new attitude was manifest was in the approach to African development adopted by the G8 countries in 2002, which saw the creation of the G8’s “Africa Action Plan”. Yet despite the recent renewed emphasis on the importance of higher education, the role of higher education in international education projects is as contested as various models of development themselves.

Three basic positions with respect to higher education’s role in education and development initiatives can be distilled from the literature. The first could be called ‘*higher education as luxury ancillary*’. From this perspective higher education is a sector that every country should have, but it is a ‘luxury sector’ compared to, for example, (the rates of return on) primary education (World Bank, 1980’s), or infrastructure development which provides more direct poverty relief than education

---

<sup>5</sup> World Bank. 2004. *Constructing Knowledge Societies: New Challenges for Tertiary Education*. Washington.

or health (World Bank, 2004)<sup>6</sup>. This approach is not only supported by international policy agencies, but unfortunately also by many governments. Uganda, amongst others, increased the share devoted to primary education in its overall education budget from 52% in 1995 to 68% in 2002, while the concomitant share for higher education decreased from 28% to 16% (Mamdami, 2005)<sup>7</sup>. The World Bank itself decreased the proportion of its education budget for higher education from 17% in 1985-89, to 7% by 1995-99 (Bloom, 2005)<sup>8</sup>.

The second approach acknowledges a role for higher education in educational policies, but conceptualises it as '*a producer of appropriately skilled professionals and applied knowledge*'. Jeffrey Sachs (2005) in "The End of Poverty" posits financial commitment and the strengthening of vocational and technical training as the key educational drivers for development.

The third position locates higher education as the "**engine of development in the new knowledge economy**" (Castells, World Bank, 1991)<sup>9</sup>. According to this view, the new modes of economic production are increasingly dependent on knowledge and information technology. Knowledge and 'informationalism' have become central to development in the global economy. The availability and use of information and communication technology is a pre-requisite for economic and social development. Econometric studies show the close statistical relationship between diffusion of information technology, productivity, and competitiveness for countries, regions, industries, and firms (Monk 1989;<sup>10</sup> Castells 1991). A recent World Bank calculation shows that the knowledge sector adds more value than the business process to a product (Serageldin, 2000). So, "if knowledge is the electricity of the new informational international economy, then institutions of higher education are the power sources on which a new development process must rely" (Castells, 2001)<sup>11</sup>.

There is increasing evidence that high levels of education in general, and of tertiary education in particular, are essential for the design and productive use of new technologies, while they also provide the foundations for any nation's innovative

---

<sup>6</sup> World Bank. Annual Review of Development Effectiveness. The WB's Contribution to Poverty Reduction.

<sup>7</sup> Mamdami. 2005. Thinking Through the Makerere Reform, 1989 – 2005 (Unpublished).

<sup>8</sup> Bloom, Canning and Chan. Higher Education and Economic Development. WB Seminar, June 2005.

<sup>9</sup> Castells M (1991). The University System: Engine of Development in the New World Economy. Paper for the World Bank Seminar on Higher Education and Development.

<sup>10</sup> Monk P (1989). Technological Change in the Informational Economy. Printer Publishers, London.

<sup>11</sup> Castells M (2001). Universities as Dynamic Systems of Contradictory Functions. In: Muller J, Cloete N and Badat S (2001). Challenges of Globalisation. South African Debates with Manuel Castells. Cape Town: Maskew Miller Longman.

capacity (Carnoy and Castells, 1993;<sup>12</sup> Serageldin 2000<sup>13</sup>). Recent data show that higher education participation in Sub-Saharan Africa remains under 5%, while for many high income countries it is well over 60% (Bloom, 2005).

A number of countries are putting higher education at the core of their development strategy. The best known model in a developed country is that of Finland, which, following the deep recession of the early 1990s, selected knowledge and education as the major cornerstones of the new (economic) development policy<sup>14</sup> (Hölttä and Malkki, 2000)<sup>15</sup>. Ireland, Australia and New Zealand have also followed this route successfully.

The development model of the East Asian countries in the 1970s and 1980s, in particular that of South Korea, Taiwan, Hong Kong and Singapore, and to a lesser extent Malaysia, was a product of the massive investments made in education in general and in higher education in particular. The latter became especially important when some of these countries decided to shift the emphasis in their economic development strategy to high value-added production.

The Chinese and Indian economies which have been displaying unprecedented levels of sustained growth since the early 1990s, on the other hand, exhibit two important characteristics with respect to higher education that sets them apart from both the 'East Asian tigers' of the 1980s and from other contemporary developing countries. First, investment in higher education is seen as a parallel process (and not a consecutive one) to providing broader access to and improving the quality of primary and secondary schooling. In other words, they have shown that if poor countries want to participate in the globalized knowledge economy, investments in higher education are crucial, at the same time as improving access and quality in schooling. The second, related point illustrated in the development pattern of the Chinese and Indian economies is that the traditional growth path of domination first of primary sector activities (agriculture and mining) followed by manufacturing and then by services, does not necessarily hold. The speed and extent to which developing countries are

---

<sup>12</sup> Carnoy, Castells, Cohen, Cardoso (1993). *The New Global Economy in the Information Age: Reflections on our Changing World*. Published by the Pennsylvania State University.

<sup>13</sup> Serageldin I (2000). *University Governance and the Stakeholder society*. Keynote Address, International Association of Universities, Durban, SA

<sup>14</sup> From being amongst the lowest on a number of Human Development Indicators of Western European countries during the 1980's, Finland is now 13th overall in the world and amongst the top 5 in areas such as ICT usage, researchers in R&D and the highest in terms of public expenditure on higher education. (World Human Development Index, 2002)

<sup>15</sup> Hölttä S, Malkki P (2000). *Response of Finnish Higher Education Institution to the National Information Society Programme*. Published by Helsinki University of Technology and International Relations.

able to absorb, utilize and modify technology developed in the north, will ensure a more rapid transition to higher levels of development and standards of living.

Capturing the new attitude towards higher education, **The Economist**, in a special issue, says the following:

*Across the developing world, higher education is coming in from the cold. Gone are the days when it was purely a luxury for the elite. Governments are rapidly expanding their higher-education systems, with China probably witnessing the biggest expansion of student numbers in history. ....The main reason for this flurry of activity is the dramatic growth in the supply of potential students. Secondary school enrolment rates have grown rapidly across the developing world. But there has also been a revolution in economic thinking. Not so long ago the World Bank pooh-poohed spending on higher education as both economically inefficient and socially regressive. Now many development economists are warming to higher education, pointing to the demand for graduates—as demonstrated by their wage premium—and to the positive effect of university-based research on the economy. (September 8, 2005: p14)*

These arguments, examples and considerations show that higher education has become a core public sector in national development. Practically all other international agencies are involved directly in the growing efforts to strengthen higher education in developing countries. There are convincing arguments for UNESCO to become a more central actor in these efforts. Here we can quote, for example, UN Secretary-General Kofi Annan who stated recently at a meeting of the Partnership for Higher Education in Africa: “We need Governments not to forget higher education, when efforts to achieve universal primary education are scaled up. No single group can meet these urgent needs on its own. All of us – the Partnership, UNESCO and other UN agencies, and university networks and associations – must work together to support Governments and higher education institutions in Africa. The United Nations system is fully committed to doing its part”<sup>16</sup>. The new flagship initiative is a good example of the potential role UNESCO can play in this.

This sheds an important light on the question what the role of CEPES in the international efforts to strengthen higher education in the developing countries should be. It is up to UNESCO Headquarters to answer this question.

---

<sup>16</sup> UN News Centre (16/09/2005) Secretary General SG/SM/10099 AFR/1250 ([www.un.org/News/Press/docs/2005/sgsm10099.doc.htm](http://www.un.org/News/Press/docs/2005/sgsm10099.doc.htm))

# Appendix 5 CEPES PROJECTS 2000 - 2005

## A SYNTHETIC PRESENTATION OF UNESCO-CEPES PROJECTS IMPLEMENTED DURING THE PERIOD 2000 – 2005

[Background document for evaluation of UNESCO-CEPES]

19 October 2005

### INTRODUCTION

Considering the UNESCO Programme in higher education and the correspondent main lines of action, specific to each biennium, and the emerging developments in higher education in the European Region, UNESCO-CEPES focused its work-programme, since 2000, on the following three strands/priority areas of activities:

- I. Higher Education Policy and Reforms;
- II. Higher Education Developments and their Relevance for EFA and Sustainable Development; and
- III. Networks and Capacity Building in the context of Globalization and Knowledge-based Societies.

Various projects have been so designed for the period 2000 – 2005, along these strands of activities, as to ensure both a degree of continuity, which would be specific to UNESCO-CEPES as a decentralized unit of UNESCO, and a degree of flexibility and adaptability to the higher education emerging issues. It is widely recognized that higher education is essential sector of education and research systems in the context of knowledge society. Taking also into consideration the constraints and opportunities deriving from the processes of globalization, it has been a real challenge for UNESCO-CEPES to keep up with that balance of continuity and flexibility, thus addressing timely and relevant projects for the beneficiaries at the regional, national and institutional levels. The basic way for meeting this request has been that of close collaboration in order to achieve better synergy and relevance for policy and development and promotion of good practices.

A key strategic “point of departure” in the overall development of the projects undertaken in the period covered by this paper was a need to undertake the evaluation of higher education reforms carried out in Central and Eastern Europe in the period 1990-2000. This project identified past experiences in higher education reforms all over Europe in a comparative manner, thus preparing the grounds for approaching those developments that have then been specific to current pan-European initiative - the Bologna Process [started in 1998 and in which at present are participating 45 countries]. UNESCO-CEPES, which has a “consultative status” of the Bologna Follow-Up Group (BFUG), is actively contributing to a number of actions set for the implementation process.

In what follows, UNESCO-CEPES projects are allocated to the areas previously mentioned. While undertaking evaluation of the specific results it should be kept in mind that there is a degree of complementarity between above mentioned three strands/priority areas of activities.

In addition, in order to have a comprehensive perspective about the mission and work carried out by UNESCO-CEPES, this synoptic presentation should be seen also in the context of various advising services as well as active participation in the activities of other international organizations, national bodies and higher education institutions as well as contacts with media and civil society.

## **I. HIGHER EDUCATION POLICY AND REFORMS**

This strand of activities took as the key reference the World Declaration and the Framework for Priority Actions adopted by the UNESCO World Conference on Higher Education (Paris, 5 - 9 October 1998) and the corresponding UNESCO programme for higher education. In addition, considering the developments in the European Higher Education Area, UNESCO-CEPES had to adjust its programme in such a way as to respond to the expectations of its constituency, which is the Europe Region. The main thrust of the UNESCO-CEPES strategy was that of building bridges for that academic cooperation which would bring together countries from all the European sub-regions. South East Europe (SEE) and Central and Eastern Europe (CEE) remained however the main areas of interest. We have thus implemented key activities specific to the countries of Eastern and South-Eastern Europe on their way of joining the Bologna Process.

The projects related to academic mobility and recognition were so designed as to increase students and staff mobility and develop those methodologies which would facilitate academic credential assessment and recognition. Two projects, funded from the budget of the Regular Programme and from extra-budgetary sources (the

European Commission and Japanese Funds in Trust for Promotion of International cooperation and Mutual Understanding), developed indicators relevant to statistical analysis and policy making in higher education and experienced policy design and implementation at institution and systems level, particularly in the areas of higher education governance and management. Postgraduate education, specifically the doctorate, was also a topic of interest for making a thorough analysis and identifying policy recommendations relevant to increasing the role of research and innovation in the development of contemporary knowledge societies.

University ranking and league tables, so widely regarded today in higher education policies, have been the object of a project for scrutinizing specific methodologies in the field, comparing them and identifying ways of improving their relationship with academic quality assurance.

The main outcomes of these projects covered the areas like:

- policy design;
- management of change at institutional and system level;
- policy documentation;
- capacity building in designing, implementing and evaluating higher education reforms.

No.	Project/event	Period of implement.	Partners/ co-organiz.	Results	Participating and beneficiary countries/ regions/ organizations
I.1	Ten Years After and Looking Ahead: A Review of the Transformations of Higher Education in Central and Eastern Europe	1999-2000		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Institutional and national case studies presenting higher education reforms in the Central and Eastern European (CEE) countries;</li> <li>• Comparative analysis of higher education reforms in CEE countries;</li> <li>• Publication <i>Ten Years After and Looking Ahead: A Review of the Transformations of Higher Education in Central and Eastern Europe</i> (UNESCO-CEPES, 2000), under UNESCO-CEPES Series <i>Papers on Higher Education</i>;</li> <li>• Policy recommendations on how to focus further higher education reforms.</li> </ul>	Countries of Central and Eastern Europe, in particular Bulgaria, Czech Republic, Estonia, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland, Romania, Slovak Republic, and Slovenia as well as international organizations with programmes in higher education
I.2	Quality Assurance in Higher Education: Russian Experience in the International		UNESCO Office in Moscow, Ministry of Education of the Russian Federation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Publication <i>Quality Assurance in Higher Education in the Russian Federation</i> (UNESCO-CEPES, 2001), under <i>Papers on Higher Education</i>;</li> </ul>	Russian Federation and its higher education institutions



I.3	Context  Promotion of Academic Mobility: Follow-up of the Council of Europe/UNESCO Lisbon Recognition Convention	Permanent activity within the UNESCO-CEPES workplans	Council of Europe, the European Commission	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Capacity building in the field of recognition of qualifications and human resources in Europe (ENIC/NARIC Networks and country offices)</li> <li>• Initiating debates on issues related to European academic recognition and mobility, in the context of the objectives of the Bologna Process.</li> <li>• Providing facilities for dealing with the External Dimension of the Bologna Process, in the countries not belonging to the European Higher Education Area (EHEA). [during the 2005 ENIC/NARIC Meeting, a panel discussion, bringing together representatives of the UNESCO Regional Convention for the Recognition of Qualifications in the European Region, the Arab States, Africa, and the Mediterranean Region, was organized to address issues related to the way the Bologna developments with regard to the recognition of qualifications are perceived by the other regions of the world, thus providing input to the Bologna Follow-up Group approaches and developments].</li> <li>• Elaboration of subsidiary documents to the Council of Europe/UNESCO Lisbon Recognition Convention in view of increasing mobility of academic staff and students. The following normative, standard-setting documents have been elaborated: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <i>Code of Good Practice for the Provision of Transnational Education</i>, and Explanatory Memorandum (Riga, 2001). In addition, a revised version of the Code on TNE was approved by the ENIC and NARIC Networks at their 12th Annual Meeting (Dublin, 2005) and will be submitted for the adoption by the Intergovernmental Committee of the Lisbon Recognition Convention, at its fourth session in 2007;</li> <li>2. Recommendation on Criteria and Procedures for the Assessment of Foreign Qualifications (Riga, 2001);</li> <li>3. Recommendation on the Recognition of Joint Degrees and the Explanatory Memorandum (Strasbourg, 2004);</li> </ol> </li> <li>• Elaboration of information documents in support to the recognition matters or in support to the work of the ENIC and NARIC Centres, i.e. <i>Code of Good Practice in the Provision of Information</i>, and Joint ENIC/NARIC Charter of Activities and Services (2004).</li> <li>• Providing inputs to the approaches and developments at global level by UNESCO</li> </ul>	All Member States of the Europe Region (also parties to the European Cultural Convention, or member and accession countries to the EU)
-----	---	--	--	---	--

				HQs and OECD, especially for the project on “ <i>Guidelines on Quality Provision in Cross-border Higher Education</i> ”.	
<b>I.4.1</b>	Strategic Indicators for Monitoring Higher Education in the 21st Century - System-Level Indicators for Higher/Tertiary Education	2000-2001	- Research Institute of H.E. of the Hiroshima University - Japanese Funds in Trust for Promotion of Internat. Coop.& Mutual Understanding; DAAD - German Academic Exchange Service; UNESCO/ Division of HE	<p>Mobilization of higher education researchers and experts in order to cooperate in :</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• undertaking a thorough analysis of the currently used statistical indicators in the quantitative description and assessment of higher education;</li> <li>• exploring the needs of introducing changes in the construction of existing indicators and possibilities of formulating new ones;</li> <li>• building up closer links between statistics based on indicators and higher education policy making;</li> <li>• formulating a set of strategic indicators reflecting the common vision of higher education presented in both the</li> <li>• World Declaration and Priority Action Plan of the World Conference on Higher Education (WCHE, October 1998).</li> </ul> <p>Dissemination of results through UNESCO-CEPES publication “<i>System Level and Strategic Indicators for Monitoring Higher Education in the Twenty-First Century</i>”(Bucharest, 2003)</p>	All countries of the Europe Region and countries from other UN Regions (Asia and Africa )
<b>I.4.2</b>	Strategic Indicators for Monitoring Higher Education in the 21st Century - Indicators for Institutional and Programme Accreditation in Higher/Tertiary Education	2002-2003	Japanese Funds in Trust for Promotion of International Cooperation and Mutual Understanding; DAAD - German Academic Exchange Service	<p>Continuation - at institutional and programme level – of the research initiated at system level within the first strand of the umbrella-project</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Thorough examination of : <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. existing standards and indicators used in the process of institutional and programme accreditation;</li> <li>2. causes which lead to the move from indicators focused on institutional inputs and resources to quality standards and performance indicators focused on outputs like institutional capacity and educational effectiveness.</li> </ol> </li> <li>• In-depth comparison of different standards and indicators from the perspective of their relevance for providing valid and reliable information on the quality of higher education provision</li> </ul>	Countries of Europe Region and Japan

				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Proposal of a set of core standards and their corresponding performance indicators</li> <li>• Proposal of a comparative analysis method – CIPOFS (context, inputs, processes, outputs, feedback, strategic management)– to be used in reviewing accreditation both national and national systems, as well as in preparing an institution for evaluation in view of accreditation</li> <li>• Elaboration of a glossary of terms in quality assurance and accreditation</li> <li>• Dissemination of project results through UNESCO-CEPES publication series: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ <i>Indicators for Institutional and Programme Accreditation in Higher/Tertiary Education</i>, Bucharest, 2004 (under <i>Studies on Higher Education</i>);</li> <li>▪ <i>Quality Assurance and Accreditation: Glossary of Basic Terms and Definitions</i>, Bucharest, 2004 (under <i>Papers on Higher Education</i>)</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	
<b>I.4.3</b>	Strategic Indicators for Monitoring Higher Education in the 21st Century - Methodologies of Ranking and League Tables	2001-2003	“Leon Kozminski” Academy (LKAEM) in Warsaw; Activity financed in the framework of the 3-years project funded by the Japanese Funds in Trust for Promotion International Cooperation and Mutual Understanding; Supplementary	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Analyzing of conceptual frameworks, methodologies, and organizational aspects of the elaboration and use of ranking and league tables.</li> <li>• International cooperation in the field of capacity building and networking.</li> <li>• Contributing to the overall improvement of the quality assessment of higher education institutions and their activities.</li> <li>• Organization of a debate in order to address these issues in an international setting.</li> <li>• Publication of papers on methodologies of ranking higher education institutions in UNESCO-CEPES quarterly review <i>Higher Education in Europe</i> (vol. 26, nr. 4, 2002);</li> <li>• Identify further issues to be addressed and launch further debate on the topic.</li> </ul>	Countries of Europe Region and other UN Regions

			financial support received from DAAD - German Academic Exchange Service		
<b>I.5.</b>	Higher Education Ranking Systems and Methodologies: How They Work, What they Do	June - December 2004	Institute of Higher Education Policy, Washington, USA	<p>In-depth analysis of the existing ranking/league tables methodologies used in the elaboration of the ranking/league tables.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• International cooperation in the field for capacity building and networking.</li> <li>• Elaboration by UNESCO-CEPES of a collection of texts on <i>Ranking and League Tables of Universities and Higher Education Institutions - Methodologies and Approaches</i>.</li> <li>• Set up of the International Rankings Expert Group (IREG)</li> <li>• Preparatory work for the 2<sup>nd</sup> Meeting of IREG, May 2006, Berlin, Germany</li> </ul>	Countries of Europe Region, and other countries, in particular Japan and China
<b>I.6</b>	EC/UNESCO Project on Regional University Network on Governance and Management of Higher Education in South East Europe	January 2002 - April 2004	European Commission [EuropeAid Office]	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Integration of the countries of SEE involved in the project (Albania, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Croatia, FYR of Macedonia, Serbia and Montenegro) into the “European Higher Education Area” as defined in the Bologna Declaration, already signed by a number of central European candidate countries. A set of recommendations on the policies to be developed by the SEE countries in order for them to join formally the Bologna Process has been approved and forwarded as an input to the Berlin Summit (September 2003) within the Bologna Process.</li> <li>• Setting up a network of the authorities and institutions involved in higher education through which good practice on academic governance, policy making, strategic and financial management in higher education can be exchanged. For the sustainability of the HE transformations in SEE, the four networks, having as the main nodes the UNESCO Chairs are operational. They will further act as channels of communication, research and policy exchange.</li> </ul>	South-East Europe, in particular Albania, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Croatia, FYR of Macedonia, Serbia and Montenegro; and UNMIK

				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Three new UNESCO Chairs on Governance and Management of Higher Education have been established at the: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Babes-Bolyai University, Cluj-Napoca, Romania;</li> <li>- University of Zagreb, Croatia;</li> <li>- Alternative Academic Education Network (AAEN), Belgrade, Serbia and Montenegro</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Build up stronger national institutional capacities and skills, strategic management and policy making in higher education - through training seminars (3), study visits (3) joint workshops (3) and practice materialized in : 9 case studies – the external dimension of the Bologna Process; 5 national higher education policy documents; 8 university strategic plans; 9 university financial strategic plans; 9 case studies on quality assurance mechanisms. Each country/entity has now a higher education policy document while 10 HE institutions from the region operate on the basis of strategic plans.</li> <li>• Introduction of new structures and mechanisms for financial management, based on the principles of university autonomy and accountability, while encouraging the establishment of links with civil society and local economy. The first extended analysis of institutional financial management has been undertaken and now the institutions operate on the plan of improving their financial structure and policies.</li> <li>• Dissemination of knowledge and skills of institutional quality assurance, credit transfer systems and curriculum development. Developing institutional mechanisms and procedures of quality assurance. Quality assurance has become a key challenge for national authorities and institutions across the region. Almost all countries are in the process of establishing national agencies in charge of quality evaluation and accreditation. The evaluation of study programmes and institutions includes internal assessments and external reviewing. Given the small size of the respective higher education systems, the introduction of more systematic and effective institutional quality assurance mechanisms, including a wider European dimension, becomes ever more important. To promote the development of a quality culture at institutional level, 9 universities of the region elaborated detailed strategic plans within the Project.</li> </ul>	
--	--	--	--	---	--

				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Elaboration of reference and training materials (handbooks) used in the capacity building activities of the project and meant to provide further support in the process of implementation of the project results in the participating countries: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- <i>From Words to Action: Approaches to a Programme</i>, UNESCO-CEPES, 2002 (under series <i>Papers on Higher Education</i>);</li> <li>- <i>Policy Making, Strategic Planning, and Management of Higher Education</i>, UNESCO-CEPES, 2002 (<i>Papers on Higher Education</i>);</li> <li>- <i>Financial Management and Institutional Relationships with Civil Society</i>, UNESCO-CEPES, 2002 (under series <i>Papers on Higher Education</i>);</li> <li>- <i>Quality Assurance and Development of Study Programmes</i>, UNESCO-CEPES, 2002 (under series <i>Papers on Higher Education</i>);</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	
<b>I.7</b>	Higher Education in the Twenty-First Century: Its Role and Contribution to our Common Advancement	2002	Joint patronage of the President of Romania and the Director-General of UNESCO, the German Academic Exchange Service-DAAD	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Promoting and debating the conclusions and recommendations of the WCHE, the follow up conferences and the Bologna Process through critical worldwide high level reflection on main issues/dilemmas in higher education (an international conference);</li> <li>Dissemination of national and international experts points of view and recommendations through: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- a series of invited papers and</li> <li>- a special issue "Higher Education: its Role and Contribution to our common Advancement" (UNESCO CEPES review "Higher Education in Europe", vol. 27, nr 1-2, 2002)</li> </ul> </li> <li>Contributing to transfer of knowledge in topical issues dealing with higher education in the 21<sup>st</sup> century</li> </ul>	Countries of Europe Region and selected number of countries in other regions. International organizations with programmes in higher education
<b>I.8</b>	Doctoral Degrees and Qualifications in the Contexts of the European Higher Education Area and the European	January 2003-June 2004	Elias Foundation of the Romanian Academy, DAAD, Germany	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Contributing to the implementation of the Bologna Process (mainly the 2003 Berlin Communiqué) by supporting reforms of doctoral and post doctoral programmes viewed as bridges between the European Higher Education Area (EHEA) and the European Research and Innovation Area (ERIA)</li> <li>A thorough critical analysis of doctorate studies in Europe and USA</li> <li>Transfer of knowledge and good practice in developing and reforming doctorate programmes by: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- organizing an international seminar</li> <li>- elaboration and dissemination of a set of national case studies (Norway, Romania, Sweden, Spain, France, Austria, Russian Federation, the Netherlands, UK,</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	Austria, France, Germany, Italy, Netherlands, Norway, Poland, Romania, Russian Fed., Spain, Sweden, UK, USA, Slovak Rep.

	Research and Innovation Area			<p>Germany, USA);</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- a Comparative Analysis on Issues, Challenges and Policy Implementation;</li> <li>- a set of background papers;</li> <li>- a volume on <i>Doctoral Studies and Qualifications in Europe and the United States: Status and Prospects</i>, UNESCO-CEPES, 2004 (under <i>Studies on Higher Education</i>)</li> </ul> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Dissemination of results and policy recommendations contained in the meeting report in view of supporting the reinforcement of national and institutional capacities to reform their tertiary education</li> </ul>	
<b>I.9</b>	Higher Education in Ukraine and the Bologna Process	2004	National Technical University of Ukraine "Kyiv Polytechnic Institute", European University Association (EUA), Council of Europe and the Ministry of Education and Science in Ukraine	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Promoting the Bologna Process by supporting new candidates for memberships</li> <li>• In depth analysis of the state of the higher education system in Ukraine in view of identifying developments and problems linked with the requirements for accession to the Bologna Process (publication of Higher Education System in Ukraine, UNESCO Monographs on Higher Education)</li> <li>• Capacity building for key players in the higher education system in Ukraine through: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- organization of an international seminar</li> <li>- elaboration and dissemination of a set of expert papers on key aspects concerning: Quality Assurance in the Bologna Process; Public Good and Social Responsibility in Higher Education; European Dimension Agenda in Higher Education in Transition Countries</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Fostering the development of the Ukraine higher education system in line with the objectives set up in the Bologna Process by elaboration and dissemination to decision makers in Ukraine of a set of policy recommendations</li> <li>• Networking between Ukrainian institutions of higher education at the national and international level</li> <li>• Formal access of Ukraine to the Bologna Process</li> </ul>	Ukraine, Belgium, Lithuania, France, UK, Hungary, Romania, Russian Fed., Netherlands, Poland, Austria, Germany, Sweden, Estonia, Norway, Armenia, Czech Rep., USA, Bulgaria
<b>I.10</b>	Renewal, Modernization and Research	January-April 2005	Elias Foundation of the Romanian	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Open a critical debate on the state of research in Romania (by gathering main key decision and policy makers/actors from both institutional and national level for a round table)</li> </ul>	Romania

	Quality in Romania		Academy	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Promoting the objectives of the Bologna Process concerning the establishment of the EHEA and ERA</li> <li>• National capacity building by offering (through elaboration and dissemination of a set of papers prepared by experts) a European and global framework of approaching issues such as: quality of higher education/research, indicators for monitoring higher education, methodologies of universities ranking.</li> <li>• Elaboration and dissemination of Recommendations for the Ministry of Education and Research in Romania and implicit for the Romanian Government and Parliament for implementation of appropriate development policies in higher education and research.</li> </ul>	
<b>I.11</b>	Private Higher Education in Europe and Quality Assurance and Accreditation from the Perspective of the Bologna Process Objectives	November 2004 - November 2005	"Leon Kozminski" Academy (LKAEM), Warsaw	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Analysis of the evolution of private higher education sector (based on time-series information) as well as on the relationship between the higher education private sector and the quality assurance/accreditation system. in the countries involved in the project. (national case studies elaborated on Austria, Bulgaria, Estonia, Germany, Italy, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Russian Federation, Spain, Turkey and Ukraine).</li> <li>• Comparative analysis (based on national case studies) on the private higher education in Europe and on its role in the context of the Bologna Process.</li> <li>• Analysis of the questionnaires sent to heads of private higher education institutions from the countries involved in the project .in order to evaluate the level of awareness and implementation in these institutions of the Bologna objectives and principles.</li> <li>• Compilation of a selected bibliography in the field combined with the elaboration of a reader on the theoretical and policy analysis of the higher education private sector in the Europe Region.</li> <li>• Formulation of policy recommendations on the ways of increasing the role of private higher education institutions in the implementation of the Bologna Process (based on the survey of the literature in the field and by considering the information provided by the national case studies, the comparative analysis and the analysis of the questionnaires).</li> </ul>	Austria, Bulgaria, Estonia, Germany, Italy, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Russian Fed., Spain, Turkey, Ukraine, Czech Rep., Cyprus, Norway



<b>I.12</b>	CCA/UNDAF	2003-2004	UN agencies in Romania	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Promoting UN inter-agencies collaboration through activities undertaken in the framework of the United Nations Assistance Framework (UNDAF) exercise in view of better harmonizing programmes and activities</li> <li>• Contribution to the elaboration of the second generation of the Common Country Assessment (CCA) for Romania: coordination of the chapter on Education, inputs on other chapters and on gender mainstreaming the document.</li> </ul>	
<b>I.13</b>	Promotion of Gender Equity in Higher Education in Europe		UNESCO HQs	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Follow up to the special project on Good Practice in Gender Issues in Central and Eastern Europe (1998-2000) : <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- special issue of the UNESCO-CEPES review <i>Higher Education in Europe on Academe and Gender: What has and What has not changed</i> (no 2, vol. XXV, 2000)</li> <li>- <i>Guidelines for Promoting Gender Equity in Higher Education in Central and Eastern Europe</i>, UNESCO-CEPES, 2003 (under <i>Papers on Higher Education</i>): a practically oriented reflection and gathering of information on the topic in view of increasing awareness and competence among decision makers in their efforts to promote gender equity on higher education in the region</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Activities related to responsibilities linked with acting as one of UNESCO Gender focal point in the region (networking, dissemination/sharing of information, providing inputs to documents, training consultancy on gender mainstreaming issues, etc),</li> </ul>	
<b>I.14</b>	UNESCO-CEPES documentation and information services	Continues activity		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Support for UNESCO-CEPES projects - provision of information and contribution to elaboration of relevant “informational basis” [usually in a form of Readers]: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The Entrepreneurial University and Study Programmes on Entrepreneurship - A Collection of Texts and Bibliography (2004)</li> <li>2. Ranking and League Tables of Universities and Higher Education Institutions – Methodologies and Approaches (2004)</li> <li>3. Ethical and Moral Dimensions for Higher Education and Science in Europe (2004)</li> <li>4. Statistics on Higher education in Europe (2005)</li> <li>5. Contractual Regulations and Institutional Practices Relating to “First Place of</li> </ol> </li> </ul>	

				<p>Employment” and additional Teaching/Research/Consultancy Contracts of Academic Staff (2005)</p> <p>6. Glossary of Terms in Quality Assurance and Accreditation (2003)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• UNESCO-CEPES web page (<a href="http://www.cepes.ro">www.cepes.ro</a>): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- design and maintenance of the Center’s webpage</li> <li>- since 1999, provision of basic statistical data in higher education in the Central and East European countries</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Providing services to stake-holders: Thematic bibliographies on request  <i>Topics:</i> Academic Staff Development/Evaluation/Mobility/Promotion; Academic Profession/Change/Opportunities/Patterns; Academic Standards; Bologna Process; The “Brain Drain” in Europe; Competences in Higher Education; Educational Policy/Quality/Strategies; Organization of studies, study programmes; Evaluation Criteria; Evaluation Methods; Financing Education/ Policy/Resources; Internationalization in Higher Education; Legislation on Higher Education; Performance Indicators in Higher Education; Private Higher Education; Student Evaluation/Mobility; Teacher Education/Development/Evaluation; University Entrepreneurship/University Research; Virtual University vs. Traditional University; Women Academic Staff.</li> </ul>	
--	--	--	--	---	--

## **II. HIGHER EDUCATION DEVELOPMENTS AND THEIR RELEVANCE FOR EFA AND SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT**

Despite the fact that higher education is only indirectly related to achieving EFA objectives, institutions and systems of higher education are expected to act in such a way as to enhance the opportunities for those actions and measures which would make general education operate effectively and efficiently and improve its quality. For this to happen, UNESCO-CEPES considered through its projects that higher education should be harmoniously integrated in the overall education system and closely related with other system components and levels. Within this strand of activities, UNESCO-CEPES designed and implemented projects focused on the overall articulation of the education system, educational ethical values and teacher education. The issues of interest were the following:

- a) The harmonization of higher education design and functioning with other components of the education system. In this regard, we looked closely at the "new generation" of policy documents and legislation in the field, particularly from the perspective of the objectives of the Bologna Process, and explored in depth the links between vocational education and types of vocationalism emerging in higher education.
- b) The ethical and moral values promoted in and through education and how the focus on values transmitted in education is correlated with a pragmatic approach to educational management, have been those issues addressed in the project which highlighted the need to pay more attention to values in education. There resulted from this project that higher education should be more concerned with the types of values that are shared by students, researchers and academics, mainly when considering that universities are the depository of key social values.
- c) Teacher education is mostly related to EFA objectives since higher education institutions are the places where most of the teachers' pre-service and in-service education and training are carried out. UNESCO-CEPES looked closely at how teacher's professional development is undertaken in various higher education institutions and what are the new contractual regulations regarding teacher's employment [particularly in higher education].

No.	Project/event	Period of implem.	Partners/ co-organizers	Results	Beneficiary countries
<b>II.1</b>	Institutional Approaches to Teacher Education [within higher education] in the Europe Region: Current Models and New Developments Planning Meeting for National Case Studies	December 2000 - March 2002	Austrian Commission for UNESCO, Austrian Ministry for Education, Science and Culture, KulturKontakt Austria, German Commission for UNESCO Free Univ. Berlin, Federal Foreign Office Education International/ GEW Senate of Berlin	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Promotion, in collaboration with relevant partners, of the processes of reform and innovation in higher education systems in order to strengthen their role in society; supporting, in this context, the effort which is currently manifesting in Europe Region to make teacher education more effective by raising the standards and the quality of the specific study programmes</li> <li>• Analysis of the factors influencing current policies in teacher education; identification of issues, innovating developments and new trends in designing institutional models of teacher training in Europe (achieved by means of individual research and elaboration of 14 national case studies written by experts in the field from Austria, Canada, Croatia, Finland, France, Germany, Hungary, Italy, Ireland, The Netherlands, Poland, United Kingdom, Yugoslavia (Serbia and Montenegro).</li> <li>• Comparative analysis of the different institutional approaches to teacher education within higher education (based of national case studies).</li> <li>• Provision of additional information with regard to possible future policies and possible common lines of action in teacher education aimed at improving the performance and the status of teachers and the promotion of EFA objectives.</li> <li>• Dissemination of project results through the volume Institutional Approaches to Teacher Education within Higher Education in Europe: Current Models and New Developments. UNESCO-CEPES, 2003 (Studies on Higher Education)</li> </ul>	Austria, Canada, Croatia, Finland, France, Germany, Hungary, Italy, Ireland, The Netherlands, Poland, Romania, United Kingdom, Yugoslavia (Serbia & Montenegro)
<b>II.2</b>	Ethical and Moral Dimensions for Higher Education and Science in Europe	2004	European Academy of Arts, Sciences and Humanities -Academia Europensis, the United Nations University (UNU) and the Div. of Basic & Engineering Sciences-	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Opening global debate on the moral and ethical dimensions of higher education and science in view of strengthening (or initiating) national and institutional policies in the field</li> <li>• Capacity building in the area of setting up standards of ethical conduct in higher education and research and in teaching ethics in academia</li> <li>• Elaboration, dissemination and implementation of the Bucharest Declaration concerning Ethical Values and Principles for Higher Education in the Europe Region in view of pressing policy makers, academics, researchers, managers and students to do more in view of fulfilling the ethical vocation of HEI and research institutions;</li> </ul>	Turkey, Italy, Belgium, Russian Federation, France, Croatia, Romania, UK, Germany, Israel, USA, Portugal, Austria, Poland, Spain,

			UNESCO	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Transfer of knowledge on how to develop and increase individual and corporate responsibility for promoting ethical and moral dimensions in teaching, research, services as well as governance and administrations of HEIs and research institutions through elaboration and dissemination of: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- a set of expert thematic papers (on issues such as: ethical dimension of "culture of peace"; ethics in and for higher education and science, ethical framework of governance of higher education and science; ethics, moral contexts and justice-how they affect modern higher education and science);</li> <li>- vol. XXIX, nr 4, 2004 of the UNESCO-CEPES Journal on Higher Education in Europe on "Ethical and Moral Dimensions for Higher Education and Science in Europe";</li> <li>- a collection of texts and Selected Bibliography on Ethical and Moral Dimensions for Higher Education and Science in Europe; high level international conference on the topic (September 2004).</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	Hungary, Ukraine, Finland,
<b>II.3</b>	"New Generations" of Policy Documents and Laws for Higher Education: Their Thrust in the Context of the Bologna Process	April 2004-January 2005	Institute of Knowledge Society, Warsaw; Council of Europe; EUA; Polish Ministry of National Education and Sports; Conference of Rectors of Academic Schools in Poland (KRASP)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Elaboration of policy recommendation in view of adapting the national legislations in line with the Bologna Process convergence, taking also into consideration the national diversity ;</li> <li>• Elaboration of a Comparative analysis of the national laws in higher education of the countries participating in the Bologna Process. The Comparative Analysis was published under UNESCO-CEPES Papers on Higher Education, Legislative Initiatives in the Context of the Bologna Process: A Comparative Perspective, by Dennis Farrington.</li> <li>• Providing policy inputs to the Bologna Follow-Up Group (BFUG)</li> </ul>	All countries taking part in the Bologna Process
<b>II.4</b>	<b>Vocational Content in Mass Higher Education? Responses to the Challenges of the</b>	October 2004 - October 2005	UNESCO-UNEVOC, the Centre for Comparative and International	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Background Paper on evolving role of vocational content in Higher Education prepared by Oxford University, UK</li> <li>○ A Collection of Texts and Bibliographical References (prepared by UNESCO-CEPES)</li> <li>○ International Seminar, "Vocational Content in Mass Higher Education? Responses to the Challenges of the Work Place and Labour Market", Bonn, Germany (8-10 September 2005)</li> </ul>	Germany, UK, Norway, Australia, Jordan, Malaysia, Philippines,

	<b>Work Place and Labour Market</b>		Studies in Education, University of Oxford	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ A set of Conclusions and Recommendations (forthcoming) based on the International Seminar</li> <li>○ A publication of the Research Papers, Presentations Conclusions and Recommendations of the Seminar (forthcoming 2006, Springer Press)</li> <li>○ Establishment of a Network of Experts and Stakeholders via the UNEVOC list-serve to expand the debate on best practice in the vocational content in higher education programmes.</li> </ul>	Romania, Japan, Finland, Afghanistan, Uganda, Kenya, France
<b>II.5</b>	Contractual Regulations and Institutional Practices related to "First Place of Employment and Additional Teaching/Research/ Consultancy Contracts of Academic Staff"	January/ December 2005	Observatory of the Magna Charta Universitatum, German Commission for UNESCO	<p>Deepening and complementing the debate on ethical and moral dimensions of higher education and research (launched by CEPES in 2004) by focusing on the particular set of issues dealing with contractual regulations and new institutional practices.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Further the implementation of the UNESCO Recommendation Concerning the Status of Higher-Education Teaching Personnel (1996)</li> <li>● Capacity building in understanding the complexities of the problem and in design suitable solutions</li> <li>● Formulate and disseminate policy recommendations regarding the professional standards and the status of higher education teaching personnel through: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- an international debate (Berlin, October 2005);</li> <li>- elaboration and dissemination of 5 thematic expert papers and 4 case studies on topics such as: staff recruitment and employment in higher education; multiple employment issues and additional sources of revenue; professionalisation of institutional governance and management;</li> <li>- elaboration of a collection of Texts and Selected Bibliography on "Contractual Regulations and institutional Practices relating to First Place of Employment and Additional Teaching/ Research/Consultancy Contracts of Academic Staff", dissemination of the Conference Recommendations</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	USA, Poland, Russian federation, Germany, Italy, Canada, Finland, France, Romania, UK, Serbia and Montenegro, Croatia

### **III. NETWORKS AND CAPACITY BUILDING IN THE AGE OF GLOBALIZATION AND KNOWLEDGE-BASED SOCIETIES**

This strand of activities brought together projects which reflected the impact of globalization on higher education. Since this impact is by its very nature multifaceted, UNESCO-CEPES has attempted to capture both globalizing waves and local responses to such challenges. From the perspective of higher education globalization, UNESCO-CEPES has looked at the developments of cross-border or transnational higher education, being one of the most active player in the field.

Together with its partners, UNESCO-CEPES made a thorough analysis of cross-border/transnational higher education monitored the adoption of European international documents, and led UNESCO HQs and OECD to embark on the preparation and adoption of globally relevant documents in the field.

On the other hand and closely related to such developments, UNESCO-CEPES has undertaken actions focused on brain circulation (drain and gain) in the age of globalization and prospected and stimulated local policy responses to globalizing challenges. Networking and capacity building at local and international levels have been as designed and implemented as to lead to the development of entrepreneurial universities and entrepreneurial studies in higher education in the context of knowledge-based societies, to the formation and consolidation of networks of UNESCO Chairs which would assure a sustainable development of higher education systems and institutions. When looking closely at the results achieved through the implementation of our projects such a general statement becomes more concrete and substantiated.

No.	Project/event	Period of implem.	Partners/ co-org.	Results	Beneficiary countries
<b>III.1</b>	The Bilingual University - Its Origins, Mission, and Functioning	September 1999-May 2000		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Contribution to the promotion of linguistic and cultural diversity and multiculturalism in higher education (part of UNESCO global strategy in education)</li> <li>• A thorough analysis of the bilingual university model (mission, administrative structure, content and organization of studies and services) by elaboration of a series of case studies (Canada, Finland, Switzerland, Puerto Rico, Germany, Italy)</li> <li>• Capacity building on ways and means to establish, maintain and develop bilingual policies within university by organizing and exploratory international seminar on the topic</li> <li>• Sharing of experiences and good practices on implementing and experiencing bilingualism/multiculturalism in universities in view of increasing regional/international cooperation</li> <li>• Contribution to international reflection/action in the field through publication and dissemination of the work and findings of the project <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- meeting report, containing conclusions and recommendations</li> <li>- special issue of UNESCO-CEPES review <i>Higher Education in Europe</i> (vo.25, no 4)</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	European Region: Canada, Finland, Switzerland, Puerto Rico, Germany, Italy, Austria, Netherlands, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Hungary, Belgium, Republic of Macedonia, Poland, Romania
<b>III.2</b>	Role of Higher Education Institutions in Local and Regional Development	January-December 2001		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Contribution to a promotion of higher education as important factor for local development</li> <li>• Sharing of experiences of successful initiatives</li> <li>• Contribution to UNITWIN/UNESCO Chairs Programme</li> </ul>	All countries of the Europe Region, in particular those of Central and Eastern Europe
<b>III.3</b>	Inter-Regional Co-operation in Central Europe and South Eastern Europe in	January-December 2001	Elias Foundation of the Romanian Academy	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Identification of strengths and weaknesses in regional co-operation in Central and South East Europe in the field of education, science, culture and communication by organizing an international symposium</li> </ul>	Central and Eastern Europe and in particular those



	the Field of Education, Science, Culture, and Communication			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Assessing the needs in the SEE and Central Europe regions in the field of education, science, culture and communication through: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- elaboration of a thematic papers(10) and</li> <li>- publication of selected papers in UNESCO-CEPES reviews “Higher Education in Europe” vol. 26, nr. 3, 2001)</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Providing inputs to UNESCO global strategy of inter regional cooperation by elaboration and dissemination of meeting report on Regional Co-operation in Central and South Eastern Europe in the field of Education, Science, Culture and Communication</li> <li>• Using the decision making bodies to networking in view of strengthening sub regional co-operation</li> </ul>	of South East Europe as well France, Austria Canada, Sweden
<b>III.4</b>	Teaching and Organization of Studies in the Virtual and Classical University: Conflict and /or Mutual Reinforcement	January-December 2001	University of Puerto Rico in collaboration with the Puerto Rico Council on Higher Education and the Hispanic Educational Telecommunications System	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Contribution to the international debate on the impact of information and communications technology (ICT) on higher education -by organizing an international seminar</li> <li>• Transfer of knowledge (by sharing experiences and good practices through a series of papers and publications) concerning various institutional/national responses to ICT challenges</li> <li>• Elaboration, publication and dissemination of materials in support of capacity building (at national and institutional level) in adapting learning, teaching and research to the new ICT developments: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- meeting report on "Teaching and organization of studies in the virtual and classical university: conflict and/or mutual reinforcement,</li> <li>- set of experts papers/case studies (15);</li> <li>- UNESCO-CEPES review “Higher Education in Europe” (vol. 26. nr. 4, 2001)</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	Europe, Latin America, North America and Africa

				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Dissemination of the meeting Conclusions and Policy Implications/Recommendations in view of better international networking for addressing, with responsibility and creativity, the changes and challenges induces by ICTs in higher education (with a special focus on quality issue)</li> </ul>	
<b>III.5</b>	<b>Brain Drain and the Academic and Intellectual Labour Market in South East Europe</b>	December 2001-December 2004	Austrian Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Task Force Education & Youth - KulturKontakt	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Seven National Case Studies describing the extent, effects and counter-measures of Academic Brain-Drain in each country.</li> <li>Collection of References and Background Reading from an International Perspective prepared by UNESCO-CEPES.</li> <li>International Roundtable to debate the findings of the National Case Studies and supplementary perspectives, "Brain Drain and the Academic and Intellectual Labour Market in South East Europe", Bucharest, Romania, 18-19 June 2004.</li> <li>Conclusions and Recommendations aimed at policy makers, determined on the basis of the roundtable.</li> <li>An issue of the journal "Higher Education in Europe", (vol. 29, nr. 3, 2004)</li> </ul>	South East Europe (Albania, Bulgaria, Croatia, Macedonia, Moldova, Serbia and Montenegro, Romania)
<b>III.6</b>	<b>Database on Transnational Education Providers / Trends and Developments in TNE</b>	November 2001 – January 2006	Council of Europe, European Commission	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Prototype Database of TNE Providers in the Europe Region.</li> <li>Establishment of International Working Group to examine the feasibility and implications of a TNE database and to analyze Trends and Developments in the field.</li> <li>Contribution to the <i>UNESCO/OECD Guidelines on Quality Provision in Cross border Education</i>.</li> <li>Research Paper on <i>Developments and Trends in TNE</i>.</li> <li>Revision of the <i>UNESCO-CEPES/Council of Europe Code of Good Practice for the Provision of Transnational Education</i>.</li> <li>UNESCO-CEPES Publication on <i>The Trends and Developments in TNE</i> (forthcoming 2006).</li> </ul>	Member States of the Europe Region
<b>III.7</b>	Entrepreneurial Studies in Higher Education and Institutional Entrepreneurial Management		The University of Applied Sciences Gelsenkirchen, HRK (Hochschulrektorenkonferenz),	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Contribution to the international/global debate on the major paradigm shifts in higher education in the 21<sup>st</sup> century-by organizing an international expert meeting on the specific topic of the "entrepreneurial university"</li> <li>Strengthening the UNITWIN networks and UNESCO chairs by establishment of a UNESCO Chair on Entrepreneurial Studies;</li> </ul>	SEE (Rep. of Macedonia, Romania, Serbia and Montenegro, Croatia),

			the German Commission for UNESCO	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Transfer of knowledge by sharing good practice in developing entrepreneurial universities/entrepreneurial culture through a series of materials elaborated, published, disseminated: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- set of expert papers/case studies</li> <li>- collection of Texts and Bibliography on "The Entrepreneurial University and Study Programmes on Entrepreneurship"</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Inter regional networking (South East Europe with Western and Central Europe)</li> <li>• Contribution to the advancement of the entrepreneurial culture within higher education institutions in Europe by elaboration and dissemination of the Gelsenkirchen 2003 Declaration on Institutional Entrepreneurial Management and Entrepreneurial Studies in Higher Education in Europe (including recommendations)</li> </ul>	Western and Central Europe (Switzerland, Netherlands, Belgium, Poland, Austria, Scotland, France, Germany)
<b>III.8</b>	Support to UNESCO/UNITWIN Programme	Permanent		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Contribution to the process of reforming higher education, at both national and institutional level, in the South – East European countries helping them to integrate their undertakings into the flow of changes generated by the Bologna Process.</li> <li>• Active involvement in the creation of the necessary expertise in the region through common research programmes, academic mobility and international cooperation.</li> <li>• Prospecting the development of institutional networking and of establishing new UNESCO Chairs/Networks.</li> </ul> <p>1. In support of the EC/UNESCO Project on Regional University Network on Governance and Management of Higher Education new UNESCO Chairs on Governance and Management of H.E. have been established at the University of Zagreb (Croatia), Babes-Bolyai University, Cluj-Napoca, (Romania), and the Alternative Academic Educational Network in Belgrade (Serbia &amp; Montenegro). Institutional networking activities have been developed between the newly created UNESCO Chairs in the field of governance and management of higher education.</p>	Bulgaria, Belarus, Croatia, Moldova, Poland, Romania, Russian Fed., Serbia and Montenegro, Turkey, Ukraine

				<p>2. As a follow up to the UNESCO-CEPES Project on Entrepreneurial Studies in Higher Education and Institutional Entrepreneurial Management a new UNESCO Chair/Network for Entrepreneurship and Intercultural Management has been established at the University of Applied Sciences, Gelsenkirchen, Germany.</p> <p>Providing expertise and financial support to successful existing UNESCO Chair in order to expand their programmes. About twenty UNESCO Chair benefited from UNESCO-CEPES support for: elaborating curricula and teaching materials, networking, publication of research results, etc.</p>	
<b>III.9</b>	Establishing a Network of UNESCO Chairs on Entrepreneurial Studies	August 2004 - June 2005	The University of Applied Sciences Gelsenkirchen, Germany	Establishment of a UNESCO Chair/Network for Entrepreneurship and Intercultural management MBA concept and curriculum (with teaching materials)	Germany, Romania, Bulgaria, Brazil, Finland