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1. The brief

This is Deliverable 2.4 of Work Package 2. The Deliverable Title is:

*Final Country/Region Reports*

The Work Package Title is:

*Field Research*

It runs from month 1 (January 2011) until the end of the project (December 2012).

Deliverable 2.4 is summarised in the work plan as follows:

*This Deliverable is required by the beginning of June 2012 [August 2012 in the revised schedule] in order that the conference season can open with public displays of many completed country and region reports on the wiki. (Of course it is in the nature of a wiki that reports are never complete – updating is expected throughout the life of the project – and indeed beyond.) This early due date also allows the teams to focus in the final months on reporting on other workpackages such as Success Factors (WP4) and Piloting (WP6).*

In the sense of completed country reports, the deliverable was largely ready by August 2012; there was relatively little further country report activity in September-December 2012 except for a last push to get better coverage of EU countries and to update some country reports where events had made this necessary, or where new reports were required to be linked in. However, we felt it better to finalise it right at the end of the project in order to provide a definitive record of all the country report activity during the funded period of VISCED.

The specific descriptions of which partner was responsible for what country are given in the VISCED work plan, especially Section F.3 of workpackage 2 which describes what the various partners were to do. The material below is extracted from that, with the descriptions reordered so as to be in order of partner number. This Deliverable also reports on the planned changes in allocations of countries that took place in 2011 over the summer, and the more ad hoc changes of responsibility in 2012 as the project team reacted to opportunities and events.

Finally it documents and celebrates the efforts of the wiki editors, both inside and outside the VISCED project, who brought this set of 116 country reports into existence – while acknowledging the debt the team owe to the Re.ViCa project and related activities which first brought into existence an education wiki with reports on ICT in education on every country in the world.

Having said that, it should be remembered that the **prime** purpose of VISCED is to identify and understand the virtual schools and college “phenomenon”. Thus the work on country reports is **secondary** to that purpose. Countries need to be reported on only to the extent that the phenomenon and its context are understood. This is one of the reasons (not the only one) why country reports vary considerably in their depth of analysis.
1.1 Partner 1: Lambrakis

Specific studies on countries:

- Greece and Cyprus
- the federal country India
- regions Middle East and North Africa as well as non-Commonwealth Oceania (those countries in Oceania not in the Commonwealth of Nations)
- a small “float” of days held for the Rest of the World (all countries not covered as countries or in regions) in case some become important.

1.2 Partner 2: Sero

Specific studies on countries:

- UK (England and other home nations)
- Ireland¹
- US
- Canada
- Brazil
- Hispanic America
- Anglophone Africa
- New Zealand
- Commonwealth LAC (Latin America/Caribbean including UK colonies).

1.3: Partner 3: EFQUEL

EFQUEL is a specialist partner contracted mainly for Workpackage 4. No work was to be done on country studies.

¹ This was later transferred to ATIT.
1.4 Partner 4: ATiT

Specific studies on countries:

- Belgium (Flanders and Wallonia) and Netherlands
- Kenya\(^2\)
- South Africa
- Turkey
- Australia
- Commonwealth Oceania (those countries in Oceania in the Commonwealth of Nations – such as Samoa and Tonga).

1.5 Partner 5: MENON

Specific studies on:

- region EU (apart from countries studied separately)
- Francophone Africa (Sub-Saharan)
- East Asia (excluding India)
- French/Dutch LAC (Latin America and Caribbean – French-speaking and Dutch-speaking countries including Overseas Departments and Territories of France – plus entities within the Kingdom of the Netherlands).

1.6 Partner 6: University of Leeds

Leeds is a specialist partner contracted for evaluation. No work was to be done on country studies.

1.7 Partner 7: EITF

Specific studies on:

- Baltic countries Estonia, Lithuania and Latvia
- regions Eastern Europe (former CIS) and Central Asia (former CIS)
- and also Yugosphere (countries of former Yugoslavia – thus not Albania)

---

\(^2\) This was later transferred to Sero.
1.8 Partner 8: Tensta
Specific study on country Sweden.
Adding “local nuances” to reports on other countries with students now at Tensta.

1.9 Partner 9: Aarhus University
Specific studies on countries:
- Denmark and Norway

1.10 Partner 10: TIEKE
Specific study on country:
- Finland.

Advice to other partners’ country/region reports based on prior international experience (outside Europe) – in particular for East Asia and for Nordic Council and Baltic countries.
2. The templates

The templates used were reported on in Deliverable 2.1. In summary, by August 2011 a stable template was agreed on, called the *Merged template revised*. This was used right up to the end of the project, and beyond – in fact it was modified, but only slightly, for the successor project POERUP. The template was as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Partners and Experts in Country</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Country in a nutshell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Education in Country</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Schools in Country</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Further and Higher education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>Universities in Country</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>Polytechnics in Country</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>Colleges in Country</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Education reform</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>Schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>Post-secondary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Administration and finance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>Schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>Post-secondary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Quality assurance, inspection and accreditation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>Schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>Post-secondary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Information society</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>ICT in education initiatives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.1</td>
<td>Virtual initiatives in schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.2</td>
<td>Virtual initiatives in post-secondary education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Lessons learnt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>General lessons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.2</td>
<td>Notable practices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>References</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Slightly simplified variants of this template were used for smaller and/or less important countries, but always with the 12 main sections even if under marginally different names in some cases.
### 3. Changes in the work plan

#### 3.1 In Year 1

At the kick-off meeting in Brussels in February 2011 there was some discussion over the allocation of countries. This was continued at the WP2 meeting in Brussels in April 2011. After that meeting a table was issued containing the agreed amendments to the allocation of countries to partners. This table is summarised below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Partner</th>
<th>Country/supra-region</th>
<th>Countries within that</th>
<th>Regions within country</th>
<th>Fruitfulness (1&gt;2&gt;3)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>P1 LRF</td>
<td>Greece</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P1 LRF</td>
<td>Cyprus</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P1 LRF</td>
<td>India</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P1 LRF</td>
<td>Middle East</td>
<td>12 (in Arab Middle East)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P1 LRF</td>
<td>North Africa</td>
<td>(7) Morocco, Algeria etc</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P1 LRF</td>
<td>Non-Commonwealth Oceania</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P1 LRF</td>
<td>Rest of World</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P2 Sero</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>EWNJ (England, Wales, and Northern Ireland) and Scotland</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P2 Sero</td>
<td>Kenya</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P2 Sero</td>
<td>US</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>Yes (States)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P2 Sero</td>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>Yes (Provinces)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P2 Sero</td>
<td>Brazil</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P2 Sero</td>
<td>Hispanic America</td>
<td>(13) Mexico, Chile, Argentina etc</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P2 Sero</td>
<td>Anglophone Africa</td>
<td>&gt; 10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P2 Sero</td>
<td>New Zealand</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P2 Sero</td>
<td>Commonwealth LAC</td>
<td>&gt;10 but small ones</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P3 EFQUEL</td>
<td>(specialist)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P4 ATiT</td>
<td>Belgium</td>
<td>Flanders, Wallonia</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P4 ATiT</td>
<td>Eire</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P4 ATiT</td>
<td>South Africa</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P4 ATiT</td>
<td>Turkey</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The changes were small – essentially one swap of countries. They are listed as follows:

1. LRF: no change
2. Sero: gain **Kenya** from ATiT; lose **Ireland** to ATiT (Sero has an expert on Africa)
3. EFQUEL: no change (no countries)
4. ATiT: gain **Ireland** from Sero; lose **Kenya** to Sero (ATiT has an Irish national)
5. MENON: no change
6. Leeds: no change (no countries)
7. EITF: no change
8. Tensta: no change
9. Aarhus: no change
10. TIEKE: no change.
3.2 In Year 2

There were no major changes, but some reallocation took place. In particular:

1. EU: the remaining countries that it was felt to be important to do were shared out among the partners still active in country reporting

2. Caribbean: there was a wider group of partners engaged in these countries due to serendipitous opportunities

3. Oceania: as for Caribbean, especially in view of Paul’s visit to New Zealand where much information about Oceania was made available

4. Denmark and Norway, especially the entities in these countries, due to changes in partner ability to deliver activity.
4. Execution of the country/region reports

As noted earlier, the prime mission of VISCED was to find virtual schools and colleges, and to provide enough information about the countries in which they are found so that judgements could be made about policy, success factors and so on. *The writing of country reports was thus an intermediate goal, not a final goal.*

The task split into the creation of country reports for countries listed in the work plan; and the creation of region reports for regions listed in the work plan.

Exactly 21 country reports were produced for specifically chosen countries – so-called “Tier 1” countries. See Section 4.1 for details.

In addition, exactly 77 country reports were produced for countries within specifically chosen regions – so-called “Tier 2” countries. See Section 4.2 for details.

Finally, 18 country reports of a more limited nature were produced for countries within these regions which were small (typically under 300,000 population) or otherwise did not merit deeper treatment – so called “Tier 2S” countries.

This makes over 100 countries which have VISCED country reports – in fact, 116 in all.

### 4.1 Country reports

The plan was as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Partner</th>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
<th>Fruitfulness</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EU</td>
<td>(11 out of EU 27 countries studied)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 P4 ATiT</td>
<td>Belgium</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 P1 LRF</td>
<td>Cyprus</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 P9 Aarhus</td>
<td>Denmark</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 P4 ATiT</td>
<td>Eire</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 P7 EITF</td>
<td>Estonia</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 P10 TIEKE</td>
<td>Finland</td>
<td>plus Åland studied separately</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 P1 LRF</td>
<td>Greece</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 P7 EITF</td>
<td>Latvia</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 P7 EITF</td>
<td>Lithuania</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 P8 Tensta</td>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 P2 Sero</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>four home nations studied separately</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rest of Europe</td>
<td>(two countries studied in detail)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 P9 Aarhus</td>
<td>Norway</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 P4 ATiT</td>
<td>Turkey</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As can be seen from the table, there is, as expected, a focus on the EU specifically and on the wider Europe, but each mainland continent has at least one country studied in detail and most (except Asia) have at least two.

The countries were chosen originally when the bid was written to represent those countries where prior work (especially but not only for Re.ViCa) had shown that virtual schools or virtual colleges had been found, or were likely to be found, or (in some cases) had been found in the past.

The 21 countries listed in the table are called the Tier 1 countries.

The execution of the plan is described below with further details of who did what in Section 5.

**Implementation of Tier 1 countries**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Partner</th>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
<th>Country report author(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EU</td>
<td>(11 out of EU 27 countries studied)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>P4 ATiT</td>
<td>Belgium</td>
<td>Flanders and Wallonia incorporated into Belgium page</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>P1 LRF</td>
<td>Cyprus</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>P9 Aarhus</td>
<td>Denmark</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>P4 ATiT</td>
<td>Eire</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>P7 EITF</td>
<td>Estonia</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 6       | P10 TIEKE | Finland |                                       | Finland: Sjöblom
|         |         |         |                                       | Åland: Sjöblom |
## 4.2 Region reports

By and large with the Tier 1 country reports, a partner had responsibility, an editor was assigned, they sought help and advice as necessary from partners and external advisors, and the report was done. With the region reports the issues were more complex:

- In the project plan the effort allocated for each region was usually little more than that allocated for a large country or couple of countries, so short cuts had to be found.
- Inevitably this implied that any related country reports were shorter.

Details of all individuals who edited country reports on the wiki are in Section 5. Note that in addition to those who edited the country reports (listed as the authors of this deliverable), a wider range of people wrote pages on provinces, government departments, schools, colleges and universities, and researched country reports.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Partner</th>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
<th>Country report author(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7 P1 LRF</td>
<td>Greece</td>
<td></td>
<td>Zygouritsas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 P7 EITF</td>
<td>Latvia</td>
<td></td>
<td>Löszenko</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 P7 EITF</td>
<td>Lithuania</td>
<td></td>
<td>Löszenko</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 P8 Tensta</td>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td></td>
<td>Öström</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 P9 Aarhus</td>
<td>Norway</td>
<td></td>
<td>Harlung</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 P4 ATiT</td>
<td>Turkey</td>
<td></td>
<td>Levec</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 P2 Sero</td>
<td>Kenya</td>
<td></td>
<td>Cortoos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 P4 ATiT</td>
<td>South Africa</td>
<td></td>
<td>Cortoos, Jeans &amp; Levec</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 P1 LRF</td>
<td>India</td>
<td>33 province entries by Bacsich and Clarke</td>
<td>Zygouritsas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 P2 Sero</td>
<td>Brazil</td>
<td>8 province entries by Bacsich</td>
<td>Inamorato dos Santos &amp; Bacsich</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 P2 Sero</td>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>(province entries were done in 2010)</td>
<td>Phillips</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 P2 Sero</td>
<td>US</td>
<td>51 state entries mainly by Clarke</td>
<td>Bristow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 P4 ATiT</td>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>9 province entries by Bacsich</td>
<td>Phillips, Cortoos &amp; Levec</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 P2 Sero</td>
<td>New Zealand</td>
<td></td>
<td>Bacsich, Kay &amp; Davis</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
• It had been hoped that the regions chosen would have sufficient geographic or political coherence that there were both commonalities of education systems across the region and, more importantly at a practical level, there would have been prior reports by experts that could be drawn on. In the event there was either a lack of coherence (as there is across the EU with school systems) or there were no prior reports of relevance. It was really only in Hispanic America and the Caribbean, and to some extent in Anglophone Africa, that some commonalities were to be found and exploited.

4.2.1 Overview

An early decision was taken not to use the word “region” to denote groups of countries – instead, the word “supraregion” was coined. The wiki defines this as follows:

A supraregion is a collection of countries with geographic and sometimes political and cultural coherence. VISCED has chosen a number of these to study as well as specific countries – see VISCED supraregions.

Where possible we try and maintain compatibility with the UN geoscheme – http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/UN_geoscheme

The list of supraregions and their final assignment to partners is below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Partner</th>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
<th>Fruitfulness</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EU</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P5 MENON</td>
<td>EU (rest of)</td>
<td>the 16 countries not specifically studied</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P7 EITF</td>
<td>Yugoslav</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P7 EITF</td>
<td>Eastern Europe</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Africa</td>
<td></td>
<td>(three supraregions studied)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P1 LRF</td>
<td>North Africa</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P5 MENON</td>
<td>Francophone Africa</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P2 Sero</td>
<td>Anglophone Africa</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asia</td>
<td></td>
<td>(three supraregions studied)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P1 LRF</td>
<td>Middle East</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P7 EITF</td>
<td>Central Asia</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P5 MENON</td>
<td>East Asia</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Americas</td>
<td></td>
<td>(one supraregion studied)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P2 Sero</td>
<td>Hispanic America</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3 See http://www.virtualcampuses.eu/index.php/Supraregion
With many of these regions there were many issues of definition. In the end a good deal of responsibility was left to the individual partner – though the WP2 management did add clarificatory descriptions on the wiki.

### 4.2.2 The regions

The regions are described following the order of the last table:

**European Union**

**Definition**

The European Union consists of the following 27 countries: Austria, Belgium, Bulgaria, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Ireland, Italy, Latvia, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Netherlands, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, and United Kingdom.

**Execution**

This is described in the table below – for convenience this includes the Tier 1 EU countries also.
### EU Country | Tier | Partner – in (…) if Tier 2 | Country report author(s)
---|---|---|---
10 | France | 2 | (MENON) | Proli
11 | Germany | 1 | (MENON) | Proli
12 | Greece | 1 | LRF | Zygouritsas
13 | Hungary | 2 | (MENON) | Proli
14 | Italy | 1 | (MENON) | Proli
15 | Latvia | 1 | EITF | Lössenko
16 | Lithuania | 1 | EITF | Lössenko
17 | Luxembourg | 3 | (not updated) | (Bastiaens)
18 | Malta | 3 | (not updated) | (Bacsich)
19 | Netherlands | 2 | (MENON) | Proli & Cortoos
20 | Poland | 3 | (not updated) | (Cortoos)
21 | Portugal | 2 | (MENON) | Proli
22 | Romania | 2 | (MENON) | Proli
23 | Slovakia | 3 | (ATIT) | Bacsich & Cortoos
24 | Slovenia | 2 | (EITF) | Lössenko
25 | Spain | 2 | (MENON) | Proli
26 | Sweden | 1 | Tensta | Öström
27 | UK | 1 | Sero | UK overall: Bacsich, Pepler & Jeans
England: Jeans & Pepler
Scotland: Pepler & Jeans
Wales: Bacsich
N Ireland: Bacsich

Note that the “authors” are the authors of the VISCED updates to underlying Re.ViCa entries. Authors in (…) are authors of the Re.ViCa version if not updated – however, all such entries are updated to the VISCED template.

**Western Europe outside EU**

A number of other countries in Western Europe have been studied in VISCED including Norway, Åland Islands and Isle of Man. All other microstates\(^4\) and autonomous entities outside the EU/EEA/Switzerland area in Western Europe have been updated to the VISCED template and minor changes made. Details are in the table overleaf.

---

\(^4\) This is not a term we use in VISCED. For its meaning see [http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Microstate](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Microstate). For our possibly over-zealous taxonomy see [http://www.virtualcampuses.eu/index.php/All_countries_by_population](http://www.virtualcampuses.eu/index.php/All_countries_by_population).
Yugosphere

Definition

The original short definition of the Yugosphere was “those countries not (yet) in the EU which made up the former country of Yugoslavia”. This was expanded into a regional overview as follows:

The Yugosphere is a category used to describe the present day states which succeeded the collapse of the Socialist Federal Republic of Yugoslavia. For its members see Category:Yugosphere. The territory of the former Yugoslavia is roughly coterminous with the geographical region of the Western Balkans; in the EU’s definition of the term, the Western Balkans excludes Slovenia but includes Albania.

Slovenia is the only country of the former Yugoslavia in the EU. Croatia, Macedonia, and Montenegro are official candidates, while Serbia has submitted an application for membership and has been recognized as a “potential candidate”. Bosnia and Herzegovina and Republic of Kosovo have not submitted an application but are nevertheless recognized as “potential candidates” for a possible future enlargement of the European Union. All states of the former Yugoslavia, with the exception of the disputed Autonomous Province of Kosovo, have subscribed to the Stabilisation and Association Process with the EU.
The CIA Factbook has estimates for the populations of Yugoslavia’s successor states as of July 2011 which amount to a total population of 23.0 million. Net population growth over the three decades between 1981 and 2011 was thus practically zero (below 0.1% p.a. on average). Ethno-linguistically, the majority of the former Yugoslavia is South Slavic, speaking a dialect continuum clustered around the Serbo-Croatian, Slovene and Macedonian. Other larger ethnic groups include Albanians (mostly in Kosovo), Hungarians (mostly in Vojvodina), Roma and other minorities.

Execution

The original Yugosphere region page was expanded by Jüri Lõssenko of EITF into a “regional report” done in the style and format of a typical VISCED country report. There was enough coherence in the region and insufficient evidence of any substantial virtual school activity in any of the countries to make this an acceptable approach. Because the countries in the Yugosphere were judged as not fruitful for virtual schooling (and so it has transpired) they have not been updated since their Re.ViCa entries, with the exception of Slovenia which has been updated since it is in the EU.

Eastern Europe

Definition

The original short definition of Eastern Europe was “those countries formerly part of the USSR which are culturally part of Europe”. This has now been expanded into a regional overview as follows: Eastern Europe is defined for VISCED purposes as the countries of the former Commonwealth of Independent States that are mainly or partially in Europe, as judged by cultural as well as geographic frontiers. Thus in particular the countries of Transcaucasia are all included but Kazakhstan is not. The complete list (excluding partially recognised countries) is: Armenia, Azerbaijan, Belarus, Georgia, Moldova, Russia, and Ukraine. For other groupings of some or all of these countries see Transcaucasia and CIS. See also the Re.ViCa categories Category:Transcaucasian countries and Category:European former CIS.

Execution

The original Eastern Europe region page was expanded by Jüri Lõssenko of EITF into a “regional report” done in the style and format of a typical VISCED country report. This also contains pictures of the education system in each recognised country in Eastern Europe. For this reason and

5 See http://virtualcampuses.eu/index.php/Eastern_Europe
6 This covers Armenia, Azerbaijan, and Georgia.
because the countries in Eastern Europe were judged as not fruitful for virtual schooling they have not been updated since their Re.ViCa entries – however, specific searches were done, including in Russian, to look for virtual schools in Russia, and some were found.

North Africa

Definition

This is defined as the mainly Arabic-speaking countries in the north (or north east or north west) of Africa, mainly (but not all) along the Mediterranean coast of Africa, including Egypt, plus also Sudan (but not South Sudan). In more detail, the supraregion page notes:7

North Africa comprises the seven countries of Algeria, Egypt, Libya, Morocco, Sudan, Tunisia and Western Sahara. We also include the autonomous part of Western Sahara called Sahrawi.

The term is used in the precise UN sense (not the wider geographical sense) as described at http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Northern_Africa

Not included are: The Spanish exclaves of Ceuta and Mellilla on the Mediterranean coast but surrounded by Morocco; The Spanish Canary Islands and Portuguese Madeira Islands in the North Atlantic Ocean northwest of the African mainland; Mauritania; Azores

Note that the new (2011) country of South Sudan is not in North Africa.

Execution

A systematic update of the education material of the Re.ViCa entries for each of the five Mediterranean-facing countries was done by Nikos Zygouritsas of Lambrakis. It was not felt a good use of resources to update the entries for Sudan or Western Sahara given the political and economic situation in these countries and the unlikelihood of relevant ICT in education initiatives.

Francophone Africa

Definition

There is some considerable debate8 about the precise or at least the most appropriate definition of Francophone Africa. In the end VISCED opted for a pragmatic definition excluding any countries in North Africa, whatever their history. This leads to the following:9

Francophone Africa is the supraregion consisting of those countries in Africa where French is both a widely-spoken language and an official language, where the country was a former

---

7 See http://virtualcampuses.eu/index.php/North_Africa
9 See http://virtualcampuses.eu/index.php/Francophone_Africa
colony of France or Belgium, and where the educational infrastructure is or until recently was organised along “French” lines.

This leads to the following list: Benin; Burkina Faso; Burundi; Cameroon; Central African Republic; Chad; Comoros; Côte d’Ivoire; Djibouti; Equatorial Guinea; Gabon; Guinea; Madagascar; Mali; Niger; Republic of the Congo; Senegal; Seychelles and Togo.

For reasons to do with the instability of the definition, VISCE decided not to introduce a category for Francophone Africa.

Execution

Although Francophone Africa was originally assigned to MENON, Sero was offered an intern in early 2011 – Graham Clarke – and it was agreed that he would work on Francophone Africa to parallel and work with Nick Jeans at Sero on Anglophone Africa. In addition, Paul Bacsich – as supervisor of Graham and because of his long-standing interest in Africa (he had set up many of the Africa country entries prior to 2011) – contributed to several studies. In summer 2011 Cristina Brecciaroli of SCIENTER continued some of the work along with Paul and Graham, in particular for Benin, Madagascar and Mali. By the end of VISCE only Cameroon, Senegal and Seychelles had not been updated and these were judged to be not worth spending more effort on since there was no evidence there of virtual schools activity. The country pages all itemise the author details.

Anglophone Africa

Definition

Anglophone Africa is the supraregion consisting of those countries in Africa that are predominantly English-speaking. The definition states:\textsuperscript{10}

Anglophone Africa is in theory the supraregion consisting of those countries in Africa that are predominantly English-speaking.

All such countries are members of the Commonwealth of Nations – see Category:Commonwealth_countries.

A pragmatic list would be Botswana; Gambia; Ghana; Kenya; Lesotho; Liberia; Malawi; Mauritius; Namibia; Nigeria; Rwanda; Seychelles; Sierra Leone; South Africa; South Sudan; Swaziland; Tanzania; Uganda; Zambia; and Zimbabwe.

For related concepts see Category:Africa and Category:English-speaking countries.

For background information on ways of categorising Africa see http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/List_of_regions_of_Africa

\textsuperscript{10} See http://virtualcampuses.eu/index.php/Anglophone_Africa
In VISCED we treat Kenya and South Africa separately even though they are in Anglophone Africa.

For similar reasons to that for Francophone Africa, there is no category for Anglophone Africa.

**Execution**

This region was originally assigned to Sero but a wider group of people took part in editing, determined to some extent informally by interest, availability and prior knowledge of each country.

An overall regional report [ICT in schools in Anglophone Africa](#) was produced by Nick Jeans.

At the country report level, most of the countries had entries dating from before VISCED started, done either during Re.ViCa or in the two years in between projects – these were mostly done by Paul Bacsich.

In the VISCED era, Rwanda was edited by Paul Bacsich. Botswana, Gambia, Lesotho and Sierra Leone were edited by Nick Jeans. James Kay did many minor updates. Several people including some not from Sero updated South Africa.

There was insufficient effort to update Ghana, Nigeria, Seychelles, Tanzania, Uganda, and Zambia. It was felt pointless to update Zimbabwe. A new stub entry was created for South Sudan but the editors struggled to find much relevant content.

The country pages all itemise the author details.

Despite some lack of updating of country reports, searches for virtual schools were carried out across all countries in Anglophone Africa.

**Middle East**

**Definition**

In general terms, the Middle East defines a geographical area, but does not have precise defined borders. According to Wikipedia\(^\text{11}\) “the modern definition of the region includes: Bahrain, Egypt, Iran, Iraq, Israel, Jordan, Kuwait, Lebanon, Oman, the Palestinian territories, Qatar, Saudi Arabia, Syria, Turkey, the United Arab Emirates, and Yemen. Egypt, with its Sinai Peninsula in Asia, is considered part of the Middle East, although most of the country lies geographically in North Africa. According to international media, North African nations without Asian links, such as Libya, Tunisia and Algeria, are increasingly being called North Africa.”

For the countries that Re.ViCa regarded as Middle East see Category:Middle East. This was in line with Wikipedia.

---

\(^\text{11}\) See [http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Middle_East](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Middle_East)
Initially VISCED took a stricter view:\[^12\]

*For the purposes of VISCED, it is more convenient to think of a somewhat stricter definition with more geographic and ethnic coherence – the Arab Middle East, consisting of Bahrain; Iraq; Jordan; Kuwait; Lebanon; Oman; Palestine; Qatar; Saudi Arabia; Syria; United Arab Emirates; and Yemen.*

*In other words, Egypt, Iran, Israel and Turkey are not included – Egypt in particular being considered by VISCED as part of North Africa.*

**Execution**

*Arab Middle East*

The countries of the Arab Middle East were updated by Nikos Zygiouritsas to the extent judged appropriate. It was decided that it was not useful to update Palestine since the current political situation was judged as unlikely to be conducive to the development of ICT in education and virtual schools in particular (even though there are virtual universities).

**Remaining countries**

Iran was also updated by Nikos Zygiouritsas and various Iranian experts consulted. It was found surprising that there were no developments in virtual schools in view of the significant development of virtual universities in Iran.

Israel was also updated and as expected some virtual schools were found.

Turkey was handled separately since it is one of the Tier 1 countries (and in any case is regarded for VISCED as being within Europe).

**Central Asia**

**Definition**

Historically, according to Wikipedia\[^13\] Central Asia is a core region of the Asian continent from the Caspian Sea in the west, China in the east, Afghanistan in the south, and Russia in the north. The VISCED definition goes on to say:\[^14\]

*It is also sometimes referred to as Middle Asia, and, colloquially, “the ‘stans” (as the five countries generally considered to be within the region all have names ending with that suffix) and is within the scope of the wider Eurasian continent.*

---

\[^12\] See [http://virtualcampuses.eu/index.php/Arab_Middle_East](http://virtualcampuses.eu/index.php/Arab_Middle_East)

\[^13\] See [http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Central_Asia](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Central_Asia)

\[^14\] See [http://virtualcampuses.eu/index.php/Central_Asia](http://virtualcampuses.eu/index.php/Central_Asia)
Various definitions of its exact composition exist, and no one definition is universally accepted. Despite this uncertainty in defining borders, it does have some important overall characteristics. For one, Central Asia has historically been closely tied to its nomadic peoples and the Silk Road. As a result, it has acted as a crossroads for the movement of people, goods, and ideas between Europe, West Asia, South Asia, and East Asia.

In modern contexts, all definitions of Central Asia consensually include these five republics of the former Soviet Union: Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Tajikistan, Turkmenistan, and Uzbekistan, with a total population of 61.5 million as of 2009 – in other words, in total around the size of one of the larger members of the European Union.

Other areas often included are Mongolia, Afghanistan, northern and western Pakistan, northeastern Iran, Kashmir, and sometimes Xinjiang in western China and southern Siberia in Russia.

For VISCED purposes, Central Asia is defined in the stricter sense above purely as the countries of the former Commonwealth of Independent States that are mainly or partially in Asia, as judged by cultural as well as geographic frontiers.

The complete list is: Kazakhstan (pop. 16.0 million); Kyrgyzstan (5.5 million); Tajikistan (7.3 million); Turkmenistan (5.1 million); and Uzbekistan (27.6 million).

This corresponds exactly to the definition of the Central Asia subregion in the UN geoscheme (http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/United_Nations_geoscheme_for_Asia). It is thus a subset of the countries in the wider supraregion of Category:Asian former CIS which includes Transcaucasia also.

Execution

The original Central Asia region page was expanded by Jüri Lössenko of EITF into a “regional report” done in the style and format of a typical VISCED country report. This also contains pen-pictures of the education system in each recognised country in Central Asia. For this reason and because the countries in Central Asia were not judged as fruitful for virtual schooling they have not been updated since their Re.ViCa entries – however, specific searches were done, including in Russian, to look for virtual schools – but none were found.

East Asia

This is one of the hardest regions to pin down. The VISCED definition has a lengthy section of reasoning, ending in quite a short list of countries:

East Asia or Eastern Asia (the latter form preferred by the United Nations) is a subregion of Asia that can be defined in either geographical or cultural terms. Geographically and geo-

---

15 See http://virtualcampuses.eu/index.php/East_Asia
politically, it covers about 12,000,000 km\(^2\) (4,600,000 sq mi), or about 28 percent of the Asian continent, about 15 percent bigger than the area of Europe.

**Background and scope**

More than 1.5 billion people, about 38% of the population of Asia or 22% of all the people in the world, live in geographic East Asia, about twice Europe’s population. The region is one of the world’s most populated places, with a population density of 133 inhabitants per square kilometre (340/sq mi), being about three times the world average of 45 /km\(^2\) (120/sq mi), although Mongolia has the lowest population density of a sovereign state. Using the UN subregion definitions, it ranks second in population only to Southern Asia.

Historically, many societies in East Asia have been part of the Chinese cultural sphere, and East Asian vocabulary and scripts are often derived from Classical Chinese and Chinese script. Sometimes Northeast Asia is used to denote Japan and Korea.

The UN subregion of Eastern Asia and other common definitions of East Asia contain the entirety of the People’s Republic of China (including all SARs and autonomous regions), Republic of China (commonly known as “Taiwan”), Japan, North Korea, South Korea, and Mongolia.

Chinese-speaking regions (including the cultures of mainland China, Hong Kong, Macau and Taiwan), Japan, Korea, and Vietnam are commonly seen as being encompassed by cultural East Asia.

There are mixed debates around the world whether these countries or regions should be considered in East Asia or not. Vietnam (considered either East Asia or Southeast Asia here the primary question is geographic due to it being part of the Sinosphere)

Siberia in Russia is considered either East Asia or North Asia – here the primary question is political, with culture and geography also at issue.

In business and economics, East Asia has been used to refer to a wide geographical area covering ten countries in ASEAN, People’s Republic of China, Japan, South Korea, and the Republic of China (Taiwan) for the purpose of economic and political regionalism and integration. United States foreign policy under the Obama administration considers Southeast Asia a part of East Asia. The tendency of this usage, perhaps, started especially since the publication of World Bank on The East Asian Miracle in 1993 explaining the economic success of the Asian Tiger and emerging Southeast Asian economies (Indonesia, Malaysia, the Philippines and Thailand).

In addition, this usage has also been driven by Asia-wide economic interconnectedness since the co-operation between ASEAN and its three dialogue partners was institutionalized under the ASEAN Plus Three Process (ASEAN+3 or APT) in 1997. The idea of East Asian Community arising from ASEAN+3 framework is also gradually shaping the term East Asia to cover more than greater China, Korea, and Japan. This usage however, is unstable: the
East Asian Summit, for instance, includes India and Australia. East Asia is considered to be a part of the Far East, which describes the region’s geographical position in relation to Europe rather than its location within Asia. However, in contrast to the United Nations definition, East Asia commonly is used to refer to the eastern part of Asia, as the term implies.

Observers preferring a broader definition of ‘East Asia’ often use the term Northeast Asia to refer to the greater China area, the Korean Peninsula, and Japan, with Southeast Asia covering the ten ASEAN countries. This usage, which is increasingly widespread in economic and diplomatic discussion, is at odds with the historical meanings of both ‘East Asia’ and ‘Northeast Asia’.

**Execution**

The entries for China, South Korea and Mongolia were substantially updated for VISCED by Daniela Proli. In the case of Japan VISCED benefited from substantial additional work carried out by Terumi Miyazoe of the Open University of Japan. It was not thought useful to update the entry for North Korea.

Regarding Taiwan and the two Republic of China SARs (Hong Kong and Macao), desk researches did not yield any examples of virtual schools, thus it was decided not to update these entries. This view was confirmed by visits (on other business) to Hong Kong and Taiwan by staff associated with VISCED.

**Hispanic America**

**Definition**

Hispanic America is very clearly defined as the supraregion comprising the American countries inhabited by Spanish-speaking populations. For related concepts see Category:Central America, Category:South America, Category:Latin America and Category:Spanish-speaking countries. The VISCED definition goes on to say:16

Wikipedia at [http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Hispanic_America](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Hispanic_America) lists these countries as: Argentina; Bolivia; Chile; Colombia; Costa Rica; Cuba; Dominican Republic; Ecuador; El Salvador; Guatemala; Honduras; Mexico; Nicaragua; Panama; Paraguay; Peru; Puerto Rico; Uruguay; and Venezuela

It is a debatable point whether in cultural/political terms, Puerto Rico should be included – since it is effectively a colony of the US. [We include it.]

Most mainland countries of Central America and South America thus belong to Hispanic America, with the major exception of Brazil and the minor exceptions of some former colonies of Netherlands, France and UK.

16 See [http://virtualcampuses.eu/index.php/Hispanic_America](http://virtualcampuses.eu/index.php/Hispanic_America)
Execution

The original Hispanic America region page was expanded by Giles Pepler of Sero into a “regional report” done in the style and format of a typical VISCED country report. This contains both overview and selected detailed material on aspects of the education system in each recognised country in Hispanic America. Four major country reports on Hispanic America for Re.ViCa were significantly updated for VISCED (Colombia, Mexico, Paraguay and Uruguay); six more were briefer and/or had more minor updates (Argentina, Bolivia, Chile, Panama, Peru and Venezuela); a further nine (mainly in Central America) were not updated. However, searches were done for virtual schools and virtual colleges across all countries of Hispanic America.

Commonwealth Oceania

Definition

Commonwealth Oceania consists of all those countries in Oceania which are members of the Commonwealth of Nations or British Overseas Territories of the UK. The definition goes on to list the specific countries: 17

*Commonwealth members in Oceania: Kiribati; Samoa; Solomon Islands; Tonga; Nauru; Fiji Islands; Tuvalu; and Vanuatu*

*Realm of the UK – British Overseas Territories: British Indian Ocean Territory; and Pitcairn Islands*

While reviewing this definition at the end of 2011 it seemed worthwhile to extend this definition in 2012 to include dependencies of the UK and other Commonwealth countries. This added the following 10 territories to the list. All of these have small populations or in some cases 18 effectively zero (permanent residents).

| 1. Ashmore and Cartier Islands | 6. Norfolk Island |
| 2. Christmas Island | 7. Cook Islands (NZ) |
| 3. Cocos (Keeling) Islands | 8. Niue (NZ) |
| 5. Heard Island and McDonald Islands | 10. Tokelau (NZ) |


18 See e.g. [http://virtualcampuses.eu/index.php/Ashmore_and_Cartier_Islands](http://virtualcampuses.eu/index.php/Ashmore_and_Cartier_Islands) and [http://virtualcampuses.eu/index.php/Heard_Island_and_McDonald_Islands](http://virtualcampuses.eu/index.php/Heard_Island_and_McDonald_Islands)
Execution

Lead responsibility for Commonwealth states in Oceania resided with ATiT. The main work was done by Nikki Cortoos and Tom Levec of ATiT, with help in some cases from Paul Bacsich of Sero, for the countries on which he could bring to bear knowledge from his meetings in New Zealand. Paul also updated the entries on the two British Overseas Territories.

Non-Commonwealth Oceania

Definition

Rather obviously, Non-Commonwealth Oceania comprises the territories that are not in Commonwealth Oceania. A list of countries comprises:

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Palau</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>New Caledonia (France)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>French Polynesia (France)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Federated States of Micronesia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Marshall Islands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Northern Mariana Islands (USA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Wake Island (USA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>American Samoa (USA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>Easter Island (Chile)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>Guam (USA)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The US state of Hawaii is also geographically within Oceania.

Execution

This supraregion was assigned to Lambrakis. The countries were checked for virtual schools but little of interest was found. Consequently it was decided that it was not a good use of time at Lambrakis to update the country reports to VISCED level. In passing, the Marshall Islands report was updated slightly by Tom Levec of ATiT.

Commonwealth LAC

Definition

The Commonwealth LAC consists of all those countries in Central America, South America and the Caribbean which are members of the Commonwealth of Nations or British overseas territories of the UK. The definition on the wiki goes on to list the members as follows:  

Commonwealth members in LAC

The Commonwealth Caribbean consists of: Antigua and Barbuda; Bahamas – east of the Caribbean Sea; Barbados; Dominica; Grenada; Jamaica; St Kitts and Nevis; St Lucia; St Vincent and the Grenadines; and Trinidad and Tobago

The Commonwealth Mainland Caribbean consists of: Belize – in Central America; and Guyana – in South America

All of the above are full members of CARICOM.

Realm of the UK – British Overseas Territories

These are the British West Indies Territories: Anguilla; British Virgin Islands; Cayman Islands; Montserrat; Turks and Caicos Islands

And also: Bermuda – north east of the Caribbean Sea out in the Atlantic

All of the above are Associate Members of CARICOM – with Montserrat being a full member.

Execution

This was assigned to Sero – with the team of Paul Bacsich and James Kay mainly carrying out the work. The first overriding point to make is that most Caribbean countries are very small, mostly under 300,000 people, several well under this limit – and so the scale of work has to be judged accordingly.

As with a number of other supraregions an overview report was prepared: on Commonwealth LAC. Searches were done for virtual schools – with little result: a few minor examples were found, with rather more at the college level.

Many of the country entries were updated: in fact both the large island countries (Jamaica, Trinidad & Tobago) and both the mainland countries (Belize, Guyana) were updated and put into the VISCED template. Among the smaller countries, Dominica, St Kitts & Nevis, and Cayman Islands were also updated and put into the template, and most others given a briefer update.

A few countries were not updated during the funded VISCED period, such as Barbados, Grenada and St Lucia, but these had in fact been researched and updated during January-February 2010 as part of the prior research for the VISCED bid, and it was felt that they did not justify further updating, especially considering the few examples of virtual schooling that were being found across the Caribbean.
French/Dutch LAC

Definition

The French/Dutch LAC is the supraregion comprising those nations in Central America (none), South America (two) and the Caribbean (several) which are former French or Dutch colonies, and also the current DOMs/TOMs of France and the “special municipalities” of the Netherlands and autonomous countries in the Kingdom of the Netherlands. The definition on the wiki lists the countries as:

Islands

1. **Aruba** – a country of the Kingdom of the Netherlands
2. **Guadeloupe** – French LAC
3. **Martinique** – French LAC
4. the constituent parts of the former Netherlands Antilles:
   - Curaçao and Sint Maarten – now countries of the Kingdom of the Netherlands
   - Bonaire, Sint Eustatius and Saba – now special municipalities of the Netherlands
5. **Saint Barthélemy** – French LAC
6. **Saint-Martin** – French LAC

On the mainland – of South America

1. **French Guiana** – French LAC
2. **Suriname** – a Dutch-speaking sovereign state

Execution

This supraregion suffers from a lack of coherence and a complex web of differing relationships with European nations and language groups. A complicating factor was that the Netherlands Antilles (which used to form an autonomous part of the Kingdom of the Netherlands) was dissolved in October 2010: Curaçao and Sint Maarten became autonomous countries within the Kingdom of the Netherlands and Bonaire, Sint Eustatius and Saba became special municipalities of the Netherlands. This dissolution happened after the VISCED bid was submitted but before the VISCED project started.

Consequently when the time came in summer 2011 to analyse this region we had to rethink our approach. As with some other island regions there was no strong evidence that it was “fruitful” for the development of virtual schools – thus significant effort was hard to justify. The region had been

---

assigned to MENON/SCIENTER but by mid 2012 it was clear that further analysis of EU countries was a higher priority than a thorough analysis of French/Dutch LAC.

It could have been argued that the “special municipalities” no longer qualified as “countries” even in VISCED’s relaxed view; however, the decision was taken to create or update entries on all five components of the former Netherlands Antilles – but to do it expeditiously. This was done by Paul Bacsich, in view of his interest in the region and his links with Dutch experts on the region (at the Dutch Open University). Aruba, which had not been part of the Netherlands Antilles, merited more thorough treatment, and for this Paul worked with Cristina Brecciaroli of SCIENTER.

Entries on the French-speaking islands – Guadeloupe, Martinique, Saint Barthélemy and Saint-Martin – had been created (as with some other Caribbean ones) in early 2010 as part of the research for VISCED – and in view of the fact that they were not full nations (being DOMs or TOMs of France) it was not felt to be a good use of resources to update them again so soon. The mainland countries of French Guiana and Suriname were judged as insufficiently fruitful to justify effort.

Rest of the World

Definition

This is not a coherent supraregion: rather it is all the countries not covered by other supraregions studied. Some of the countries in the Rest of the World are (Americas are all covered):

1. Europe: Albania and the smaller European countries within the EU boundaries but not in the EU (Monaco, Isle of Man, etc)
2. Africa: Hispanic Africa and Lusophone Africa; Ethiopia
3. Asia: South East Asia especially Vietnam and Indonesia; and Pakistan
4. Australasia: Papua New Guinea
5. Islands in the Indian Ocean and in the Atlantic Ocean

Execution

The general principle for this group of countries was to avoid spending money unless the reasons were compelling. Considerable use was made of interns and volunteers.

1. Europe: Albania and the smaller European countries within the EU boundaries but not in the EU (Monaco, Isle of Man, etc). Andorra and the Isle of Man were updated by Paul Bacsich (he has relatives in the Isle of Man). All other West European microstates and autonomous regions were restructured to the VISCED template.

2. Africa: In Hispanic Africa, Equatorial Guinea was updated in 2011 by Graham Clarke, a Sero intern. In Lusophone Africa, all countries (Angola, Cape Verde, Guinea-Bissau, Mozambique, and São Tomé & Príncipe) were updated by Gabriela Job Di Laccio, a consultant to Sero. Ethiopia was updated in 2011 by Nikki Cortoos of ATiT.
3. Asia: Indonesia was updated in 2012 by Cecilia Sianapar, a high-school teacher from Indonesia (see Section 5.2 for more on our volunteers).

4. Australasia: Papua New Guinea was updated in 2010 (in preparation for the VISCED bid) and no further update was deemed useful. (However, very late in the project a few virtual schools were found and documented in Deliverable 2.5.)

5. Islands in the Indian Ocean and in the Atlantic Ocean. For the Indian Ocean, the Comoros was updated by Graham Clarke. For both oceans, some entries were updated in early 2010 as part of the preparation for the VISCED bid.
5. Analysis of contributions

5.1 Contributors to the wiki from among the partners

This section focuses purely on contributions to country reports, not to entries on virtual schools. Note that in line with the VISCED project plan, and confirmed in the Progress Report, the main bulk of WP2 work on country reports was in 2011. Year 2012 was planned to round out the country reports and check any which had not been in the original plan or which were in the plan but had for various reasons not been covered in 2011.

Lambrakis

Nikos Zygouritsas

In 2011, major updates to countries in EU (Greece and Cyprus), Middle East (Bahrain, Iran, Iraq, Jordan, Kuwait, Lebanon, Oman, Qatar, Saudi Arabia, Syria, United Arab Emirates, and Yemen), North Africa (Algeria, Egypt, Morocco, and Tunisia) and India.21

Sero

Paul Bacsich

In 2011, entries for Northern Ireland and Wales; updates to New Zealand and many Caribbean countries; many entries and corrections for US states, Indian provinces, Spanish autonomous communities and German Länder; vast amount of regional definition, recategorisation, reorganisation, etc.

In 2012, massive update on New Zealand (with 30 subsidiary entries), substantial update of entries for most island nations in Oceania, and minor updates to Argentina, Mexico, Spain and Rwanda.22

Nick Jeans

In 2011, new entry on England; updates on South Africa and nearby countries in Southern Africa (Botswana, Lesotho) and West Africa (Gambia and Sierra Leone).

In 2012, significant and sustained updates to England and Scotland, and major update on Anglophone Africa.23

21 http://www.virtualcampuses.eu/index.php?limit=500&tagFilter=&title=Special%3AContributions&contribs=user&target=Nikos+Zygouritsas&namespace=&year=&month=-1 – note that the concentrated time period was only that required to put the reports online – they had been prepared offline (in Word) in the preceding weeks
Giles Pepler

In 2011, new entry on Scotland; minor updates to England; major updates to countries in Hispanic America (Argentina, Bolivia, Chile, Mexico Colombia, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, and Uruguay) – and several virtual school/college entries and a report on Latin America. Major updates to England and Spain.

In 2012, updates to England, Scotland and Spain. Creation of many virtual school entries for Spain.24

Barry Phillips

In 2011, major update to Canada; minor updates to Australia – and many virtual school entries.

In 2012, new entry on Globalskolen and updates to some UK virtual schools and European virtual schools.25

Philippe Ugochukwu

In 2012, major update to Bulgaria with two associated virtual school entries.26

Consultants

Sara Frank Bristow

In 2011, massive entry on United States – and entries on almost every virtual school in the US and many in other countries.27 Sara also edited and updated several methodology pages including on typology of US virtual schools28 – in this she was assisted by Barry Phillips.

Graham Clarke (intern)

In 2011, updates to almost every country in Africa with especial focus on non-Anglophone countries (in chronological order: Guinea, Togo, São Tomé and Príncipe, Niger, Burkina Faso, Mali, Djibouti, Eritrea, Chad, Mauritania, Benin, Burundi, Central African Republic, Comoros, Ivory Coast, Mauritius, and Morocco), plus entries on over 30 US states and all provinces in India.29

Gabriela Job Di Laccio (contractor for Lusophone report)

In 2011, updates to Angola, Cape Verde, East Timor, Guinea-Bissau, Mozambique and São Tomé and Príncipe.

Andréia Inamorato dos Santos (contractor for Brazil report, chosen by open tender)

In 2011, major update of Brazil, entries on three Brazil provinces.

James Kay

In 2011, minor updates to most Anglophone Africa entries and many Caribbean entries; also major update to New Zealand – and many virtual school entries.

EFQUEL

(No work in 2011 since they did not work on WP2. In 2012 they did work on country reports in respect of WP4 which is reported on here for completeness.)

Mart Achten

In 2012, updated Belgium in respect of quality and inspection aspects.

Ann Fastré

In 2012, updated the following country reports in terms of quality and accreditation: within Europe, Austria, Bulgaria, Cyprus, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Netherlands, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Scotland, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Turkey, and United Kingdom; and outside Europe, Australia and New Zealand.

ATiT

Nikki Cortoos

In 2011, large amount of organisation, coordination and updating work on Australia, EU countries and countries in Oceania – and many entries, updates and corrections on virtual schools.

31 http://www.virtualcampuses.eu/index.php?limit=500&tagFilter=&title=Special%3AContributions&contribs=user&target=Andreia+Inamorato+dos+Santos&namespace=&year=&month=-1. In this she was assisted by Dominic Newbould.
34 http://www.virtualcampuses.eu/index.php?limit=500&tagFilter=&title=Special%3AContributions&contribs=user&target=Ann+Fastr%C3%A9&namespace=0&year=&month=-1
In 2012, over 250 entries for consistency, categorisation and ease of access, including updating many Re.ViCa-era country templates to VISCED level – and updates of Netherlands and Slovakia.  

**Tom Levec**

In 2011, major work on Australia, Belgium, Turkey, South Africa, and Kiribati plus many other islands in Oceania.  

**Sally Reynolds**

In 2011, updated/created two virtual school entries. In 2012, created two virtual school entries.  

**MENON (SCIENTER)**

**Daniela Proli**

In 2011, major updates to eight EU countries (Austria, Czech Republic, France, Germany, Italy, Netherlands, Portugal, and Spain) – and many virtual school entries. In 2012, within EU: major updates on Austria, France, Germany, Hungary, Italy, Netherlands, Romania and Spain. Outside the EU: updates on China, Japan, Mongolia, South Korea and over a dozen associated virtual schools/colleges entries.  

**Cristina Brecciaroli**

In 2011, minor updates on Aruba, Benin, Madagascar, and Mali – plus some virtual school entries.  

**University of Leeds**

(The evaluator is not active in WP2.)  

**EITF**

**Jüri Lössenko**

In 2011, major updates to Estonia, Lithuania and Latvia; and regional reports on Central Asia, Eastern Europe and Yugosphere – plus some entries on virtual providers.

---


In 2012, major updates to Slovenia and Eastern Europe, and further update on Latvia. Also added several virtual school entries.\textsuperscript{40}

**Tensta**

**Mats Öström**

In 2011, major update to Sweden. In 2012, further update to Sweden and entry on NTI.\textsuperscript{41}

**Aarhus**

**Asger Harlung**

In 2011, major updates to Denmark and Norway – plus entry on VUC Flex.\textsuperscript{42}

**TIEKE**

**Merja Sjöblom**

In 2011, massive update to Finland and minor update to Åland Islands – and several virtual schools entries. In 2012, further significant update to Finland and creation of virtual school entries.\textsuperscript{43}

### 5.2 Contributions to the wiki from other sources

As of 31 December 2012, there are 333 users registered on the wiki since it came into existence on 9 November 2007. A few of these are duplicates or were created for specialist system purposes but there are over 300 distinct human users. (Note that “user” means a user for editing purposes: any person can read any of the pages in the wiki.) Exactly 99 users were created between 1 January 2011 and 31 December 2012, the funded period of VISCED.

However, many of these users have never actually done any editing. Some user codes were set up for groups of students or conference delegates when the wiki was used as a teaching aid (for example at conferences or universities); other users are likely to be spam users who auto-registered before monitored registration was set up (note that any users who did carry out spam were rapidly detected and blocked – 12 in the VISCED period 2011-12);\textsuperscript{44} and many others no doubt registered with the best of intentions to edit pages but never got round to it. (A situation rather similar to that which pertains to MOOCs.)

\textsuperscript{40} http://www.virtualcampuses.eu/index.php?limit=500&tagFilter=&title=Special%3AConsusions&contribs=user&target=lyr&namespace=&year=&month=-1

\textsuperscript{41} http://www.virtualcampuses.eu/index.php?limit=500&tagFilter=&title=Special%3AConsusions&contribs=user&target=Mats%E5%96%89m%E5%86&namespace=0&year=&month=-1

\textsuperscript{42} http://www.virtualcampuses.eu/index.php?limit=500&tagFilter=&title=Special%3AConsusions&contribs=user&target=Asger+Harlung&namespace=&year=&month=-1

\textsuperscript{43} http://www.virtualcampuses.eu/index.php?limit=500&tagFilter=&title=Special%3AConsusions&contribs=user&target=Merja+S%C3%B6blom&namespace=&year=&month=-1

\textsuperscript{44} See http://www.virtualcampuses.eu/index.php?title=Special:BlockList&hideaddressblocks=0
There are 130 users who have carried out one or more edits. Exactly 50 users have been created and carried out edits in 2011-12, the two funded years of VISCED.

Most of these 50 users are users who are staff (including interns) at or consultants to the partners: they have been reported on in the last section. In this section we report on the volunteer users, that is, users who are not staff at, or consultants to, one of the partners – so our list includes any IAC members who edited pages. (We exclude from consideration any who merely edited their name entry.) The list is of 11 people that we celebrate for their volunteer efforts.

1. D.L. Bearden: update to Saint Kitts and Nevis (Caribbean)
2. Rachel Beckett: update to entry on Quality Assurance Agency
3. Jacqueline Daniell (member of IAC): update to The Interhigh Story
4. Niki Davis (member of IAC): update to New Zealand
5. Ignaty Dyakov: update to Periplus Home Education
6. Olavur Ellefsen: update to economic statistics on Faroe Islands
7. Margaret Korosec: entry on The Virtual School
8. Terumi Miyazoe: major update to all aspects of page on Japan
9. Cecilia Sianipar: major update to page on Indonesia, and other contributions
10. Gareth Simpson: update to a list of e-learning publications
11. Connie Swiderski: update to Texas Virtual School

The three (in bold) who have made major updates to country reports are further celebrated as co-authors of this Deliverable.

5.3 Envoi

This completes our description of contributors to the wiki. Again we celebrate our authors:

Paul Bacsich (author and editor), Giles Pepler, Barry Phillips, Daniela Proli, Nikos Zygouritsas, Jüri Lõssenko, Mats Öström, Merja Sjöblom, Nikki Cortoos, Nick Jeans, Anne Fastré, Graham Clarke, Gabriela di Laccio, Andreia Inamorato dos Santos, Asger Harlung, Tom Levec, Philippe Ugochukwu, James Kay, Niki Davis, Terumi Miyazoe, Cecilia Sianipar, Mart Achten, Cristina Brecciaroli, and Sally Reynolds

With that vote of thanks, we complete this Deliverable 2.4.