

## OUTCOMES OF THE QUESTIONNAIRE, COMMENTS FROM THE PARTICIPANTS AND A BRIEF REFLECTION

*Below you will find the outcomes of the questionnaire we asked you to fill in prior to the NY symposium. We'd like to thank those who have taken the time to reply (a response rate of over 50%) and are pleased to note that many have done so. Per question we have listed the mean response and standard deviation. As you can see, opinions are diverse! We have included all comments participants have made as we feel this might help jump-start the debates during the conference. Per theme, at the end, we also have listed some of our reflections on the basis of these outcomes and comments, to which we ask you to give some thought prior to the conference.*

<b>Theme 1 Means, Standard Deviations, and Comments</b>	<b>Pages 1-9</b>
<b>Reflection on Theme 1 Results</b>	<b>Page 9</b>
<b>Theme 2 Means, Standard Deviations, and Comments</b>	<b>Pages 10-14</b>
<b>Reflection on Theme 2 Results</b>	<b>Page 14</b>
<b>Theme 3 Means, Standard Deviations, and Comments</b>	<b>Pages 15-19</b>
<b>Reflection on Theme 3 Results</b>	<b>Page 19</b>

### Theme 1: The role of higher education in the New Economy

#### ***1. Traditional HE is incapable of adapting quickly enough to meet the needs of the emerging knowledge economy. (mean score: 3.15; standard deviation 1.32)***

Most institutions have quality assurance processes that take time, and it is these processes that 'slow down' response times. Universities have too important a role to take the 'six months is all you get to get the new curriculum through' approach that is appropriate to business. Define traditional.

To some extent the answer depends on the interpretation given to the word "traditional". It a sense if it means traditional universities, e.g. Brown University doing traditional things it must be the case that they will lose out to those who are able to adapt more quickly. But universities are remarkably adaptive institutions given the right financial and other messages. I have no doubt that many universities will flourish in the emerging knowledge economy - though not all will survive which will create some problems this side of the Atlantic Ocean.

Parts will move fast, others stay behind.

See the comment on Q1-6.

Higher education is adapting. It could be doing so faster, but given sufficient pressure, the pace accelerates

Traditional HE has the potential to respond to the needs of the emerging knowledge economy. The onus is on leadership, both in the HE sector itself and in government, to steer systems towards greater flexibility and responsiveness.

Traditional HE is probably too slow, but the so-called innovative or entrepreneurial universities will be able to catch the demand.

The major stakeholders in traditional HE don't have a stake in quick adaptation.

I understand traditional HE as knowledge-oriented, discipline-based, professor-centred, and having long-term social contributions; I take the needs of the emerging knowledge economy to mean the need for individuals possessing a new set of skills and competencies, including the ability to learn. Therefore I do not see the latter as being the only -perhaps not even the main- goal of the former, or as representing the only needs of the emerging knowledge SOCIETY.

Having said that, I believe traditional HE will not respond to the needs of the emerging knowledge economy as fast as the job market demands, and will continue to be behind it.

In some disciplines/vocational areas HE will adapt reasonably quickly but will not do across the whole of the field.

But I take traditional HE to mean traditional HE departments. The extent to which institutions or systems can be described as still traditional is exaggerated. Higher Education in our part of the world, East Asia, is largely a closed system. The prestige of higher education institutions has also rendered the institutions insensitive to changes in the larger community.

Although I think that traditional HE will have a hard time to adapt quickly to meet the new needs, they are never the less very important component of HE, principally the University segment due to the important values they represent to society such as ethics, passion for learning, academic freedom and so on.

Other knowledge entities have already moved into the space that higher ed. might have occupied, both in the NICs and 3rd World. There are major changes needed in some areas of education but not in all aspects of traditional HE This has been known for some time.

The present structure of traditional HE institutions, characterised by the lack of integration of the academic units, where decisions respond to the interest of individuals or groups and not to institutional or societal interests make very difficult the adoption of changes, specially if they threaten the power structure behind the present organisation.

To face the present challenges it is necessary to change the structure and the mechanisms for decision making in HE and these changes are impossible without a shared vision of the role of HE. This vision should be the result of a dialog with all stakeholders, facilitated by a strong leadership.

***2. For-profit education is a passing thing; traditional higher education will respond through market pressures and government-induced protectionism and will recoup its leading position. (2.09; 0.81)***

The reaction to market pressures by HE-when it happens- tends to be superficial and without a long term perspective. In most of the cases it is not the result of a comprehensive and critical evaluation of the whole institutions but of individual programs. There is no evidence for an increase in government protectionism. In most countries the indications suggest a trend to a reduction of this protectionism and in the cases where it is maintained or increased it is in response to changes in the HE institutions or coupled to the results of government oriented mechanism of evaluation and accountability

Commercial providers are a lot more flexible, no matter what country they are in.

For profit education is here to stay. There will be a rebalancing of the market; some higher education institutions will have stronger market positions as a result, others will die.

Depends on where in the world you sit. In many parts the leading position of public HE has never been in doubt, in other parts for profit HE appears to have a long-term future.

The way I see it is more a complementary relationship. I believe that traditional HE (Universities) have to be strengthened world-wide, and they have an important role of ensure critical mass for the development of the societies, however, there is still space for profit oriented HE institutions, that usually are more flexible and dynamic to market needs.

Elite higher education and government protectionism go hand in hand, for-profit education is only one option among many to assert new objectives

There will be a mixture.

Perhaps in the long term it can be considered as passing but for now it is here and that is reality. Government protection is not possible because the choice lies with the clients

It appears that the for-profit sector has already broken the market barriers. On the other hand, I don't think many more for-profit institutions will survive than those that exist already.

In Europe, government-backed education will remain as an area of public responsibility.

For profit education has always existed where needed

There are two statements here. I do not believe that for profit education is a passing thing, but in many countries trad HE will keep its leading position, insofar that it has not lost it that is not the need to recoup.

The important role of public HE needs to be protected through the promotion of greater efficiency within the public sector as well as the firm regulation of private HE. Given prevailing ideologies, for-profit education will continue to grow. Traditional higher education institutions have however, responded aggressively.

I am not sure. I wonder at this point we could draw any clear conclusion. I do not know how to properly mark my reaction to this statement. I do not think for-profit education is a passing thing. However, although I believe traditional HE will regain its leading position, I am not sure this will be due to the forces mentioned in the statement. I believe traditional HE will become even more closely associated to knowledge than it is at present, therefore emphasising research and concentrating in graduate education much more than in undergraduate education.

For-profit education will become even more ubiquitous in serving undergraduates and life-long learning needs. Prestige will remain the domain of the research institutions.

Again not quite clear of the price meaning of certain words. I have no doubt that for-profit activities will remain in the portfolio of successful twenty first century universities, but I would be surprised to see many major universities where this is the dominant activity. Again government-induced protectionism is ambivalent. There must certainly be some quality regulation of many professional preparation activities for example and there must remain some link between large

scale research and research training and many undergraduate students will be attracted to

**3. New technologies offer developing countries the opportunity to enter the new economy without the massive investment that is required for traditional industries (such as steel, chemicals or auto manufacturing). This can help these countries avoid the danger of being left further behind as the growth of the new economy accelerates. (3.27; 1.39)**

NT is nothing but the brains behind it

Massive capital requirements

(a) The putative "new technologies" require considerable investment; and (b) if you ain't makin' stuff, too, your economy is vulnerable

There is still a massive investment

Partly true, as digital infrastructures are costly, fast changing; moreover, their use requires literacy and a Western sense of time.

Infrastructure is not the only problem: there is also average income per person.

New and old technologies alike require investment friendly social and economic environment.

The new technologies also require significant levels of investment - not only in terms of the necessary infrastructure but also in the development of high level human resources. The necessary investments must be made in HE, as well as in education more generally.

Hard to vote on this question. Part 1 is true (opportunities of new technologies). But it is not at all clear that they can make the required investment to become knowledge economies quickly--especially the investment in education.

I agree up to a certain extent. Industries are still very important for sustainable development and economical stability. I think the new technologies increase the access to knowledge, therefore the development can occur at a faster pace and the new technologies also allow for smaller and more efficient industries, many times at a lower level of initial investment capital.

This is evidenced in the cases of China and India, and in some Latin American countries. However, this is not automatic. Policies and strategies play an important role.

To avoid the danger of being left further behind as the growth of the new economy accelerates developing countries should have more access to the new technologies. The real challenge will continue being how the benefits of the new economy reach broad sectors of society specially those who right now are considered among the poor or extremely poor. Access to knowledge and to the new technologies must benefit all sector of society if it is going to be part of a real consolidation of democracy.

Although this is true, it also requires a better infrastructure than what exists today. Thus, the new technologies could improve the educational environment for some developing countries, it is likely to only improve the environment for a select few.

The opportunities are there, but the HR development investments, and an environment supportive of this sort of venture is considerable and has a long lead-time.

Certainly can help but a lot of work will need to be done to ensure that it does happen. There is I understand some evidence that countries such as India are already benefiting from global information in such areas as publication and process control.

**4. The business and industry sector will get more and more involved in education. On the one hand because in the new economy they will not want be dependent on providers (i.e. traditional further and higher education) that may or may not deliver sufficiently qualified students. On the other hand because public education (from primary education onwards) is deteriorating rapidly as a result of the complexity of demands placed upon it, pushing business and industry to provide adequate teaching and training facilities for the children of their staff as bonus packages. (3.68; 1.13)**

There will be more involvement but I doubt whether it will be much more than the way in which the medical profession or the legal profession have long been involved with the training of physicians and lawyers think the opposite will happen. As new technologies and new education providers multiply and flourish, the business and industry sectors not directly involved in education will simply demand their staff, their employees and the general workforce to have the education and training they require; some will pay for that education and training to be provided on-line, but these payments will be few and small in comparison with the overall educational efforts and expenditures. I believe that the deterioration of public education is: 1) partly a perception that originates in the fact that education has become so widespread and easily accessible, thus it is seen as less "valuable" than before; 2) Also, and since the population as a whole is more educated than before, the educational edifice moves to higher and more sophisticated levels of education: we expect and demand more of education than before, while also trying to teach many more things than previously; 3) it is also partly due to the rapid pace of change brought about by science, technology and information and communication technologies, a pace not all institutions are able to keep. I believe what I am trying to say is not that public education is not deteriorating, but rather that such a statement hides many other aspects that pervade and affect all types and levels of education. They have at different times, but usually by pressuring governments to supply better education.

Could be cheaper for business to bet on traditional education rather than on fragmented provision of tailor made services.

This statement begs a number of questions. Is business even clear about the type of graduates it values? What is the evidence to suggest that public education is "deteriorating rapidly"? What evidence is there to support the view that greater private sector involvement in education leads to improved quality, especially in the developing world?

Their involvement will increase modestly

Again, there is an ideology that is driving this. I agree but not for the reasons stated above. I think the raising concern of civil society related to the social responsibility of industries and the need to advance rapidly in technology will make industries an important partner for education.

The business and industry sector will get more and more involved in education. This phenomenon will have an impact on the present landscape of education with the appearance of elite schools, funded by business and industry and with limited access. This will be more a challenge to the social relations that are the foundations of the present democratic order, than a challenge to the traditional school system.

But seldom in the field of traditional first-degree studies. The decline of public education varies again by country, and corporate schools must be rare in the extreme.

It is time they get involved as consumers of the products of education Apart from the incapability of the school system to catch up with the changes in the society, there is a more fundamental issue: the school system, which largely aims at producing pyramidal manpower through lifelong qualifications, is becoming obsolete. The society expects lifelong, on-demand, just-in-time learning. And this requires very firm basic competence in people, which ironically is what schools are weak at.

Also, business provides a lot of "education" that is really about their business.

**5. Higher education must move from traditional content/curriculum-based teaching and learning to competency-based teaching and learning. (3.23; 1.51)**

There is need for a balance between the two. There are now other venues for competency-based education and that is a good thing.

Learner and program centred education is needed. This statement oversimplifies complex curricula issues. There must be a place for content-based teaching and learning but within a context which promotes the development of core academic literacy skills such as critical thinking etc. Competency based learning on its own has serious limitations in HE.

It's not either but both. A curriculum can be based on competencies. But competencies aren't everything. There's still something to be said for studying the 19th century novel or Eastern religions for CONTENT, not just competencies.

A lousy dichotomy: who is to say one cannot learn "content" without demonstrable competence?

Both probably inadequate.

Pass. Very much an on the one hand on the other hand, depends what you mean by competence based issue. There is, regrettably likely to be an increasing amount of remedial work to be done to develop skills we used to take for granted would be done by secondary schools and the kinds of competencies students need will evolve: verbal communication as well as written communication; interpreting symbolic information. But I expect content to retain a central position in much of mainstream higher education - though the content of the content will change.

Balance required.

Undergraduate Higher Education has to move -indeed it is already moving- closer to competency-based teaching and learning in regards to core-skills and basic competencies required by modern societies. This movement will certainly bring changes in the traditional curriculum contents, perhaps greater than those that took place in the twentieth century, as well as the emergence of new fields and disciplines. However, a number of these competencies and skills will move to high school education. That will leave higher education not so different from the one we know but for its being stronger in information and data handling, thus not requiring so much memorisation and leaving more space for concept development and reasoning. Graduate education will continue being much as it is today.

Without losing the link to content through agreed on learning paths.

I would add the humanity dimension to the narrow sense of competence: attitudes, values, ethics, responsibility, ...

**6. Academics are too much focussed on their own specialised fields of knowledge to make this change to competency-based teaching and learning feasible. (2.82; 1.18)**

It is the demands on a day to day basis that do not leave room for thinking about those changes

The problem most of the time have to do with the management of HE institutions than directly with individual academics.

See 5 above. It is already happening. The Southern Accrediting Association (SACS) requires it.

To agree with this would be to abandon hope for reform (which I'm not prepared to do). The needed reforms will be difficult, however. The system as currently articulated does not help academics to work together

Some are; some are not. But in the UK there is a growing realisation that few specialisms have all the answers and both degree programmes and research are becoming less specialised. (Though we continue to have some problems arising from the fact that high status preparation for entry to higher education continues to be very specialised. I expect that to change.

Again, a statement that assumes a false dichotomy. Plenty of academics who conduct specialised research and instruction also generate competency-based materials for on-line.

In my experience they are resisting because of pedagogical beliefs, not over-specialisation.

Not the young ones.

They are capable of adapting!

They could be enticed to see the importance of change.

Unsure, both whether and why they are unable

Couldn't agree more.

To make this necessary change possible, a new way of designing and deciding about curriculum is needed. This new curriculum design should be the result of a shared vision about this new focus on teaching and learning.

***7. The human factor is stronger than the e-factor; despite all the hype about virtual education, basic first-degree education (undergraduate) will remain face-to-face education. (3.86; 0.94)***

I wonder how much of this will change when technology advances. Could we have said the same about television and telephones?

Balance

The human factor is stronger than the e-factor, but not in the sense of information and knowledge transmission. The latter could easily be replaced by e-modes. Face-to-face interactions will still be essential, but playing roles at a higher level.

As mentioned earlier there is need for a balance and not a swing over from one side to the other

In the future the structure of HE will be more complex. Professional training, technical training, customised training requested by business and industry will probably have a strong orientation to the e-factor. The human factor will continue playing an important role in all kinds of formal

Students need mentors, encouragement and live models

It is a question of motivation: the lonesome learner needs a lot of it!

Also, few young people have the skills and discipline required to do the entire first degree virtually.

For traditional age group, doubts about which face and how far away the face will be!

To be trained at HE is more than content, it has to do with values, behaviour and social consciousness. For that to occur it is important the human contact, group interaction, principally in the first degree.

Yes in the rich countries, but one way of moving to mass HE in developing countries is to use greater elements of open and distance learning combined, where possible, with personal even face-to face-support.

Think about it: would you rather this Conference be conducted by e-mail?

Supplemented by all sorts of e-material in the same way that since the invention of printing it has been supplemented by textbooks and university libraries.

This is particularly important for first generation HE students.

Except for some individuals who enjoy the e-world.

***8. Life long learning is a luxury for developed economies. Developing economies will need to focus on widening access for initial higher education. (2.45; 1.14)***

I think question is directed at developing economies, and it is no luxury unless limited to mature wealthy students taking classics and flower arranging. It depends on how you define lifelong learning. Developing economies need both. Widening access is part of lifelong learning (re-entry points. Also people with outdated educations need updating to contribute to economic development.

The need for LLL will go alongside or even in some ways be in advance of the need for mass HE.

The need to focus on widening access for initial HE should be the priority for developing countries but this do not necessary means that they will have to neglect the life long learning principle.

This principle should be present in the design of curricula, so that the new students are aware of the need of life long learning attitude. These countries also need a life long learning approach in order to face the challenges of the new economy and globalisation.

Life long learning is a value fundamental for a HE graduate. The capacity to learn, unlearn and relearn should be part of any HE program, independently of the institution or the country where it is located.

I would say that developing countries should perhaps place more emphasis on learning after schooling, and create the economical way of achieving lifelong learning.

Lifelong learning is essential for all. One important mechanism for widening and increasing access in developing countries is to recruit adult learners who have missed out on post-school HE opportunities. Life long learning is not a luxury but a necessity for developing economies, especially in the context of the HIV/AIDS pandemic.

There are 2 questions here, and my answers go in different directions. Lifelong learning is not a luxury in ANY economy.

As it is often the case, this statement contains in fact two: I partially disagree with the first and partially agree with the second, but do not think they are at odds with each other.

Undoubtedly much of what is currently advocated by the lifelong learning lobby in this country (UK) is a luxury and special pleading by interest groups who already have good initial education. But keeping up with knowledge advances in the professions and elsewhere will be essential for all economies.

What is initial education?

Is that a necessary choice? I would say that you need both.

Economic realities will guide such decisions.

For lifelong learning, life must be long and work sufficient to be distributed in a larger group of society.

### **Some questions and issues that come forward on the basis of the responses to Theme 1: The role of higher education in the New Economy**

- There is a good deal of agreement that our HE systems are becoming, or even are already, more complex than ever before, catering to multiple stakeholders [and having some problems with that] and that in that provision there is a role for private, for-profit HE.
- Also, quite a few people point to the fact that HE is more than just responding to fashion and fads (see further under Theme 2)
- Throughout the comments, emphasis can be found on the role of leadership and institutional decision-making. On the one hand, several pleas are made for substantive and visionary leadership. But what do we mean by this? Some argue for more effective decision-making processes, but it also is clear that HE is seen as a species *sui generis*, rejecting the notion of copying practices from the business-sector. Yet, what does this mean? What are approaches in terms of leadership and decision-making that allow for HE to remain HE, keep its broad social role (again, see further under Theme 2), but at the same time ensure greater responsiveness of HE to the multiple demands of multiple stakeholders?
- Obviously, the answers to the above questions are far more complex than simple references to market pressures and market mechanisms. And equally obvious, we are not talking about the demise of the university 'as we know it'. But how can and should this institution deal with the increased complexity and multiplicity of the demands placed upon it, i.e., meet its responsibilities?
- In this respect, several people have pointed to the differences between undergraduate, graduate and post-graduate education. But also here, simplistic notions of teaching, competencies, transmission of knowledge and socio-cultural norms and values do not suffice, as many of the comments underscore.
- Which ultimately brings us to the issue of the boundary conditions or prerequisites that need to be established within our HE institutions to make sure that the "responsibilities gained" indeed are met, both in terms of leadership, management and decision-making and in terms of the core activities: teaching, research and community/society services – what are they?

## Theme 2: Are core values under threat?

### **1. The prime focus of higher education will be the support of economic growth and development. (3.18; 1.14)**

Had the question said "A prime focus" I would have ticked "fully agree"

It should remain one of the roles of universities.

I suppose one could argue that any education is in "support of economic growth . . .," but that depends on taking a position other than the student's.

HE will have to devote more efforts to support economic growth and development, but if economic growth continues excluding broad sectors of society this development won't be sustainable.

Therefore, HE must also make important efforts to educate for a critical and humanistic citizen

Universities have several goals

HE clearly has a critically important role in supporting economic growth and development. However, this cannot be its prime focus alone. HE must continue to promote social, cultural and political development of society - without which economic development cannot be adequately sustained.

It will be increasingly for some, including governments and other funders, but not for most academics

I would add social and cultural development

Supporting economic growth is but one of the major foci of higher education. In a knowledge economy, and in a knowledge organisation, team work and group dynamics are even more intensive than the industrial society. Higher connectivity also poses higher demand on human relations.

We need to focus on human values too

Yes, considering that 60% of an age cohort enters higher education.

Alas, yes.

Partly because many of the activities that universities have traditionally done are now central to the knowledge economy.

### **2. Humboldt is dead; teaching universities have the future. (2.22; 1.02)**

There will continue to be a place for both, and for combined unis; the great choice age will ensure a multitude of types of institutions!

No, I would see in the end a hierarchy of institutions. From Humboldt to purely on-line universities.

Research by academics is not dead despite new forms of knowledge production

As part of the diversification in HE that is now taking place and will be formalised in the near future a more clear cut difference between research universities and other types of HE institutions will probably occur. Fundamental research and research on cutting edge topics will be concentrated on few institutions with the necessary funding. Applied research will increase as links between HE and industry become more intense. Research should also continue being an important part of the new curriculum design.  
New knowledge is still critical

Teaching must continue to be shaped and informed by research and scholarship. However, this does not mean that all teachers must be active researchers; they should nevertheless be engaged in some form of scholarship.

In numbers yes, in leadership and prestige I doubt it.

Research universities are still needed... but not in all places.

The world still wants and needs great research universities. There may be fewer of them in the future, however.

Too simplistic. A small number of research universities will retain the Humboltian tradition. However, this will (should) cease to be the ideal for the vast bulk of universities where the primary responsibility is value added in education.

The meek will inherit the earth, but not the mineral rights! Teaching universities have most of the world market already, but not the league tables.

The binary system found in many countries is an example of this. In a mass system there is no more need for many teachers of undergraduates to be doing research than there was for schoolteachers in the days of elite secondary education. There is still a need for scholarship, but this need not be the same thing as research

Most of it but not all.

### ***3. Research and post-graduate education will be concentrated in the Northern Hemisphere. Its derivative products will be distributed globally. (3.18; 1.05)***

Highly Eurocentric

It sometimes feels like that already from down here!

I think not. I suspect that a much smaller proportion of the world's research is concentrated in the "North" than was the case at the beginning of the twentieth century. Spectacular growth of Asian universities and to a lesser extent South America. The picture is partly clouded by the academic domination of the United States.

Fundamental research and research on topics at the cutting edge of knowledge will continue being concentrated in the North. Access to these results will be more difficult for countries in the South. Countries in the South will have to make special efforts to develop their own research capacity focused on topics relevant to economic growth, reduction of poverty and the rational use of natural resources among others.

Australia and New Zealand??? (This question means what it seems to suggest only if one normalises for population.)

Let's see what will happen in Asia

Research and post-graduate education is currently concentrated in the North and will, in all likelihood, continue to be the case. However, there is capacity for targeted post-graduate development and research in the South. This capacity must be protected and enhanced.

Capital intensity and investment predominate

This is most likely to be the case. If one takes China as a microcosm of the world, graduate education is concentrated in the developed coastal institutions.

As is the case now if North is not understood strictly geographically, and if distributed includes sold.

In most fields, requiring lots of money, yes; in others-even in software development, the South has a chance.

Unfortunately, I agree with this statement as far as it applies to the short term.

Yes, this is already happening.

#### **4. Higher education predominantly will remain a public good. (3.04; 1.07)**

I don't know what this mean.

The real situation will very much be dependent on the performance of the economy. Uncertainty in the economy will favour more participation of the private sector but participation of the public sector will remain important

I worry that this role is slipping. It already has in the US; it seems to be eroding in parts of Europe.

The market is alive and well in higher education around the world.

To some extent it always has been mainly a private good but it has suited influential segments of the population to claim it is a public good and get it publicly provided.

Wishful thinking?

It is giving evidence of losing that property: see John Ralston Saul

Will depend on the area.

HE will continue to bring a combination of public good and private gain.

Extremely variable by country. Yes, in developing world. Doubtful in near saturation mass systems

I would think so. It is still an inevitable social investment.

#### **5. Fundamental research will move out of the traditional academic-university domain and because of economic and capacity reasons will be concentrated in multi-national, specialist research centres. (2.64; 1.00)**

Doubt this, at least in the mid-term, say 15 years. Microsoft went to Cambridge after all.

Basic research will occur in both places.

There will certainly continue to be shifts in this direction but there will for many decades continue to be strong links with universities.

A rare phenomenon now, and likely to remain rare. The exception lies in the research centres of multi-national corporations

Not everywhere...all the more so as researchers will still need to be trained... in universities.

There will be a continuing role for quality research universities in the developing world.

Maybe in some expensive fields, but multi-national specialist centres within HE are another possibility.

I don't think I can judge at this juncture.

Such a fundamental change will not occur.

Both places.

See comment on Q2-2.

Especially in some disciplines

**6. The university as the guardian of cultural heritages has no role to play in the knowledge society. (1.55; 0.96)**

!!!!

As I hinted in previous answers, against all beliefs, humanity, and culture, will play an even more essential role because of the changed workplace. People are moved out of traditional bureaucracies and hierarchies. I have done some observations of the major firms, and am convinced that is the case.

Nothing to add.

Nonsense!

Concern in broad sectors of society about the impact of globalisation and the new economy on cultural heritages will raise the need for institutions that can play the role of guardian of cultural heritages. Since this has been a role played by universities, it is expected that they will continue doing so.

See response to 1 above

A different more contested role, but not none whatsoever.

Danger lies in ignoring the past

If knowledge were not anchored in the past, had not past, this would be true.

It has a huge role to play. The question is whether funders and policymakers have the wisdom to recognise this crucial function.

**7. The "core values" trumpeted by those who wish to "preserve" higher education have historically only existed for an elite class. They have no place in the realities faced by those people and countries threatened by the digital divide. (2.23; 1.15)**

Depends what the "core values" are considered to be. To me they are respect for truth: respect for empirical evidence: acceptance of the "provisionality" of any knowledge; understanding that any issue has a past and a future as well as a present and others in the same vein. These are important for all people and all countries though some of us are privileged in being able to pursue them more than others. See the us higher education operation. Academic freedom, liberal learning, and other core values can and do apply to a mass system. Developing countries need these in higher education as much (if not more) than developed countries. Otherwise, their higher education will be second class.

The "core values" of traditional HE take on new importance as systems massify. This is particularly the case in systems characterised by serious historical inequalities, such as South Africa. It is important that the 'traditional excluded' who come into the system benefit from the best values of traditional HE. E.g. the need for sound, general formative undergraduate education as a basis for post-graduate studies and research.

Dominating values are usually carried by dominating groups. Digital science will not change that.

True to some extent only.

This is too sweeping a statement. The core values of traditional higher education is a complexity that could not be easily reduced to "elitism". Again, the issue of the digital divide does not lend itself to a clear-cut and apply-to-all conclusion.

This ignores the democratisation of those values in numerous institutions including the Church, over a period of time. We shouldn't confuse economic conditions and the wish of an educated class to spread the benefits of education.

First sentence seems historically accurate.

Second seems immensely debatable!

I do not think this is the real issue since HE, even in the poorest countries claims the same core values. The problems are how these core values transcend HE and have an impact on society. In this respect most HE institutions have failed keeping those values limited for an elite group. If HE is to be preserved, then those values have to be transmitted from HE to society.

### **Some questions and issues that come forward on the basis of the responses to Theme 2: Are Core Values Under Threat?**

- Clearly, as was also indicated by many in their reactions to the statements of Theme 1, HE has core values. Though we might differ on the exact formulation or definition, there appears to be little divergence of opinion that these have to do with the transmission of norms and values, and with the 'formation' of independent, critical and responsible (young) individuals.
- Also, there appears to be little disagreement that whatever type of HE we are talking about (see below), these should be part and parcel of everyone's HE experience.
- Despite the fact that Von Humboldt indeed has passed away, his legacy would appear to remain very much alive. At least, many still see a prominent role for research universities, though there also is agreement on the fact that not each and every university can, or ought to, be a prominent research university. In fact, a tendency can be discerned towards further institutional differentiation, with an ensuing concentration of research in a limited number of institutions, and to an extent regions.
- Yet, what the consequences of these positions and argumentations are remains to be seen. Remarks have been made about league tables, status and mineral rights. But how does this relate to core values? The responses to the statements show a very low standard deviation compared to the other two themes. Does this imply a non-issue, or do we all believe that our own institutions will be part of the premier league?
- If institutional differentiation is considered the result of forces at play at the moment (and in the past), can we say anything about what type of diversity is desirable in relation to the core values ascribed to HE?

### Theme 3: Who is in charge?

#### **1. National governments will lose their prerogative over higher education; the market will be the co-ordinating mechanism. (2.64; 1.14)**

Can't be so clear cut - diversity of influence and co-ordinating forces

National governments cannot afford to lose their prerogative over HE, if HE is to respond to the range of demands (both equity and development driven) which should be placed on it.

I doubt if governments can abrogate their rights over education fully; education and health are defining national activities.

This will be the trend.

Governments will partly reassume their role of protecting universities against the ravages of the market. The shift towards siding with the market to destroy the accumulated vested interests of the professoriat was a temporary necessity in this country following forty years of excessive privilege but I confidently expect to see the pendulum swing back.

Raising concern, especially in developing countries about the effectiveness of the market forces to achieve social justice and a sustainable development will make necessary for national governments to oversee HE. If public interest is the driving force of development then HE and government should be interested on reaching a common understanding about co-ordinating mechanisms, financing and other issues.

In 5, 10 years from now? For the moment, the market is no co-ordinating mechanism.

The question is who really has the prerogative

National governments will retain responsibilities for some level of funding and for QA, including audit of information provision to the market.

The jury is out on this one. If they don't wake up and think about policy for the new environment, this prediction could come true.

The triple helix will still function

From a North American perspective, this is a moot question

I don't think totally. This is not only a matter of education. The government as a social institution has to catch up with the new economy.

#### **2. A supra-national body for quality assurance will arise. (2.95; 1.32)**

Such bodies have already arisen in the worlds of certification and licensure.

There may be global information and benchmarking clearinghouses, but they won't have authority for QA.

Not more than a supra-national government would run the world!

But international accrediting organisations will arise

GATE tried, there are many obstacles. A NGO might work, but the co-ordination effort is massive

I predict too much resistance from national agencies. What is needed and what various agencies will tolerate may be two different things.

Good ideas do gain wide acceptance, but this wording is odd.

I am rather sceptical about the notion of quality assurance, and am in doubt whether or not this is still a viable notion in new social institutions.

Beyond the many already? or the "UN international standards" agency

Possible.

Not an all-powerful one but an agency that is able to be informed about the strengths and weaknesses of higher education in different countries would have some value.

The need for some kind of supra national quality assurance system will arise. Most probably national and regional accreditation agencies will come to agreements of internationally recognised standards and indicators. The driving force of this development will be the increased mobility of the work force and the consolidation of regionalisation processes.

Yes, maybe. But this does not negate the need for strong, well-resourced national and regional quality assurance bodies.

This is not to say that there will not be national arrangements for some aspects. But the mobility of certain types of graduates will lead to the establishment of some supra-national bodies.

### ***3. National governments must protect consumers from the dangers of for-profit, (transnational) higher education providers. (3.31; 1.25)***

I could have answered fully agree instead of fully disagree but I took the question to mean that there are special dangers from for-profit institutions. When operating outside their own borders most public institutions are operating on a for profit basis

?? Highly authoritarian language.

Not from the dangers but from their excesses...like among national providers.

Either national governments or other quality assurance agencies need to do this. Left to its own devices, the market will be dangerous to unwary consumers.

More likely: Consumer organisations

Government has to play a role in assuring the public that the offer of HE conforms certain requirements. In developing countries the problems arises from local providers with a very low quality mostly as the result of weak regulations

This is possible to a degree.

But the best that could be done is to provide a handy database for the consumers, perhaps interactive with fellow consumers' input. I don't think it is viable to have a transnational

Again, information is key. National governments have a responsibility for consumer protection from false and misleading information about the efficacy of all HE offerings, including from

There is need to check credibility status before allowing them to operate particularly in Third world countries

And not only for-providers. Competition for customers in a market where there are basically too many suppliers is likely to be the key quality problem

The recent history of transnational, for profit, HE providers (the new colonialists) in the South has been deplorable. Governments have the responsibility to protect their national systems and citizens from unscrupulous providers who have no regard for national or regional agendas.

One cannot expect that caveat emptor will work in all countries, for all 'consumers'.

### ***4. The bulk of the costs for higher education will be carried by national governments. (2.91; 1.11)***

For the time being, most governments see this as their role. In Australia, government share of uni costs is on average down to 65%.

Not if we talk about lifelong learning.

Depends on the time period but if by "bulk" is meant more than 50% I doubt it even in the medium term.

National governments have to guarantee the basic functioning of HE and have to support the access to HE to students from the poor sector of society. Students from families with high income should contribute with the financing of HE. HE institutions should also develop mechanism to complement state funds.

Can't vote on this one either. National or state or provincial governments, depending on the system. I don't see, even in the US, government totally abandoning higher education.

This will be highly variable.

In the case of universities in the South, governments will continue to carry a significant portion of the costs. However, the proportion of funding from government will decrease.

Yes but a the bulk (proportion) will decrease

Yes, if higher education remains a public responsibility... all the more so if access to knowledge should be wide.probably

It is the case in third world countries and will remain so for sometime even though it is changing in other countries where the bulk of the cost is being shifted to students through sophisticated loan systems.

### ***5. International higher education consortia have the future (cf. global industries/conglomerates). (3.33; 1.24)***

Not one has worked yet in a business sense AS consortia and many have failed before launch because of cultural problems. Scottish Knowledge works as a marketing arm of the unis involved, and is an aggressive sales arm.

They have a future.

I certainly hope not!

Need to explore what this means

Strong, local institutions will still be in high demand

This will be a strong tendency.

As I said, there will be a hierarchy of institutions, and international higher education will have big share, but not the entire "market".

A future certainly: "The" future" I doubt it.

Only in some markets. Higher education is still a national enterprise, and will be for the foreseeable future.

Yes, if they manage to have a core common mission...i.e. an identity

### ***6. Universities will disappear as institutions and be incorporated in global and regional industrial conglomerates. (1.59; 0.80)***

Not likely

Very unlikely

Knowledge Management has always existed...and been entrusted to some kind of "priest-hood"... the medieval clerics, the republican professor, and the information guru. Such a division of labour will survive, even in conglomerates.

No comment

No.

Not likely at all.

It is too early to judge. But obviously, the meaning of higher education will change.

### ***7. Higher education is business and thus should be run as a business. (2.32; 1.25)***

It is a public good.

It is to be efficient but does not have to run like business

No. It is much more and quite different. I know both.

Yes, it is, but no two businesses are same. It is just another type of business.

There is an absolute need for a more professional management of HE but even if considered a business in which participation of the stakeholders requires special considerations.

That is "management for idiots". Anyway, what is a business?

Depends what you mean. Universities should be "business-like" in their ability to manage toward their goals, but the goals are not the same as business's. Too complex an idea here. In some parts yes, in others no.

HE is not a business in the traditional sense but HE must nevertheless conduct its work in a manner that is efficient, effective and accountable.

But an upmarket consumer goods business not a pornography business or a drugs business.

### ***8. Student demand will dictate higher education provision. (3.27; 1.03)***

Only if that is the only measure of provision. And what level of demand will keep a Classics course alive? In which institution? How can students 'demand' what they don't know about?

It already does in many countries.

This will be a trend.

No. Many factors influence the provision of education

Student demand obviously shapes higher education provision, but it can't be the sole driver. It already has to some extent; but student demands, which changes from cohort to cohort, still retains some surprising core values.

I am more sure if students will "dictate" higher education provision, but given the on-demand and just-in-time nature of learning, I am quite sure learners will have greater say in determining the paths, contents and modes of learning. This will be accompanied by student-oriented funding (some kind of voucher) and more flexible/portable credit unit systems.

Not "dictate" but will continue to have a big influence on.

Service of the demand will grow...after all, even in Bologna, the students were the pipers!

Yes, but the market needs far better information that at present in order to function effectively.

It has always been a major factor in many countries will have more influence in highly competitive HE markets

### **Some questions and issues that come forward on the basis of the responses to Theme 3: Who is in charge?**

- The answer to the question of who is in control is mixed, but at the same time clear. Mixed in the sense that a role for the various stakeholders is envisaged, thus reinforcing the multiple demands that will continue to be placed on HE. Clear in the sense that many still see a distinct role for national governments, despite the unmistakable tendency towards deregulation. Areas identified for governmental control and influence are system co-ordination, consumer protection and funding.
- Obviously, reactions vary according to the geographical (and historical) backgrounds of the respondents, but these reactions serve to underscore the fact that deregulation does not imply absence of government control and influence.
- Yet, the issues of funding and quality control appear to require some further thought. Regarding funding, a more “shared burden” picture can be identified, though this immediately raises questions for developing economies with low per capita income. This, in turn, raises the issue of boundary conditions / requirements under which “shared systems” can function. Regarding QA, the international dimension appears problematic, though the ‘general’ idea seems to be to incorporate this within national systems, rather than through some form of international co-ordination.
- From the above, the key issues to address during the conference would appear to be the role of national governments in relation to other stakeholders (who for what aspect of HE?), the options for ‘consumer’ funding, especially in relation to issues such as equity and access, and the information and regulation aspects of quality assurance, including the international dimension.