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HE and Society

- Social development
- Cultural transformation
- Economic growth
- Political participation

2014 APHERP Leadership Institute
Society and HE

- Economic development
- Social development
- Cultural development
University Reforms

Global influences

National responses

HE
Impact of Globalization on HE

- Economic globalization
- Global rationalization
Economic Globalization

• Knowledge-based economy
• Universities as sources of human resources, technology and innovations
• HE is central to national competitiveness in the global economy
• Universities shaped by demands of the labour market and changing economy

“Economic Determinism Hypothesis”
Global Rationalization

- System of world culture
- Similarities of educational reforms
- Restructuring of HE is a worldwide phenomenon
- Common trends of the restructuring process
Hybridization

Homogenization

Particularization

HYBRIDIZATION
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I. Access and Equity of HE
Tertiary Gross Enrolment Ratio
Tertiary Gross Enrolment Ratio by Region, 1970 to 2007

Source: UNESCOUIS (2009), Global Education Digest 2009
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Gross Enrolment Ratio in the world

Source: UNESCO Institute for Statistics in EdStats, 2009
Note: Data displayed if for the latest available year
### Gross Enrolment Ratios (%) in Higher Education

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Korea, Rep. of</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Singapore</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thailand</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philippines</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malaysia</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indonesia</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vietnam</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>China</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>India</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cambodia</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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A “Mega University” is a university with a minimum of 100,000 actively enrolled students.

When the term was coined in 1995 by John Daniel, there were almost 50 worldwide, some with well over 1,000,000 students.
Access and Equity

Figure 1.10. Graduation rates from university-level education, by gender, 2009

This figure shows the percentage of young men and young women who are first-time graduates from university-level education.

II. Marketization of HE
Commercialization of HE

- Corporatization of universities: Australia, Malaysia, Japan
- Entrepreneurial universities: Singapore
- Autonomous universities: Indonesia, Thailand
- People-founded universities: China, Vietnam
- Expansion of private higher education
Common Features of Corporatization

- University heads as CEOs
- Increased power of central administration
- Pressure to generate revenues
- Pressure for more internal and external quality control
- Delinking from the civil service
Expansion of Private Higher Education

Share of Enrolment in Private Higher Education

Source: World Bank data
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III. Corporate Managerialism
Bureaucratization

Greater size and complexity of higher education institutions

Bureaucratization and standardization

Corporate managerialism and entrepreneurship

Greater concerns over quality, efficiency, productivity and accountability

Autonomy-accountability trade-off

Quality assurance mechanisms
Corporate Culture

- Vision and mission statements
- Strategic planning
- Total quality management
- ISO certification
- Right sizing
- Benchmarking
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Times Higher Ed. Supplement, 2008</th>
<th>Shanghai Jiao Tong University, 2008</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16 Australian National University (Australia)</td>
<td>19 Tokyo University (Japan)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 University of Tokyo (Japan)</td>
<td>23 Kyoto University (Japan)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 Kyoto University (Japan)</td>
<td>59 Australian National University (Australia)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 University of Hong Kong (Hong Kong)</td>
<td>65 Hebrew University Jerusalem (Israel)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 National University of Singapore (Singapore)</td>
<td>68 Osaka University (Japan)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37 University of Sydney (Australia)</td>
<td>73 University of Melbourne (Australia)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38 University of Melbourne (Australia)</td>
<td>79 Tohoku University (Japan)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39 Hong Kong University of Science and Technology</td>
<td>97 University of Sydney (Australia)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42 Chinese University of Hong Kong (Hong Kong)</td>
<td>97 Kyushu University (Japan)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43 University of Queensland (Australia)</td>
<td>101-151 Nagoya University (Japan)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44 Osaka University (Japan)</td>
<td>101-151 National University of Singapore (Singapore)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45 University of New South Wales (Australia)</td>
<td>101-151 Technion Israel Institute of Technology (Israel)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47 Monash University (Australia)</td>
<td>101-151 Tel Aviv University (Japan)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50 Peking University (China)</td>
<td>101-151 Tokyo Institute of Technology (Japan)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50 Seoul National University (Korea)</td>
<td>101-151 University of Queensland (Australia)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56 Tsinghua University (China)</td>
<td>101-151 University of Western Australia (Australia)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61 Tokyo Institute of Technology (Japan)</td>
<td>152-200 Hokkaido University (Japan)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65 University of Auckland (New Zealand)</td>
<td>152-200 Nati Taiwan University (Taiwan)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77 Nanyang Technological University (China)</td>
<td>152-200 Seoul National University (Korea)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>166 Chulalongkorn University (Thailand)</td>
<td>152-200 Tsukuba University (Japan)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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IV. Cross-border Higher Education
The Definition of CBHE

Cross-border education
- The movement of people, knowledge, programmes, providers, and curriculum across national or regional jurisdictional borders

Internationalization of higher education
- The process of integrating an international, intercultural, and global dimension into the purpose, functions (teaching, research, service) and delivery of higher education

Source: COL/UNESCO (2006), Higher Education Crossing Borders
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Source: UNESCO-UIS (2009), Global Education Digest 2009
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Student Mobility

Source: UNESCO-UIS (2009), Global Education Digest 2009
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Student Mobility

Students flow in Asia-Pacific region
- Flowing out more than flowing in
- Leading destination: Australia, UK and USA
- Largest outflow: China (421K) – India (153K) – Korea (105K)
- Regional Providers: Australia and Japan

Source: Kazuo Kuroda (2010)

Students flow in China-Japan-Korea from 1997 to 2007

(Unit: Number of students)
Sub-regional Student Exchange Programmes

**MIT mobility program**
- Malaysia-Indonesia-Thailand

**CAMPUS Asia Project**
- Collective Action for the Mobility Program of University Students, China-Japan-Korea

**UMAP**
- For the Asia-Pacific region
Programme Mobility

Franchise

- An arrangement whereby a provider in the source country A authorizes a provider in country B to deliver their course / programme / service in country B or other countries.
- Qualification is awarded by the provider in country A.

Twinning

- A situation where a provider in source country A collaborates with a provider located in country B to develop an articulation system that allows students to take course credits in country B and/or A.
- Only one qualification is awarded.
### Programme Mobility

#### Double or joint degree
- An arrangement where providers in different countries collaborate to offer a programme for which a student receives a qualification from each provider, or a joint award from the collaborating partners.
- Many MBA degrees in private universities in Malaysia.

#### E-learning or distance
- Arrangements where providers deliver courses / programme to students in different countries through distance and online modes.
- “U21 Global” by Universitas 21.
University of Nottingham – Malaysia Campus
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V. Qualification Recognition and Quality Assurance
On recognition of studies, diplomas and degrees in higher education:

1975: Latin America and the Caribbean
1976: Arab and European States bordering the Mediterranean
1978: Arab States
1979: Europe – revised 1997 (co-depository Council of Europe)
1981: Africa – up for revision in 2012 (co-depository African Union)
1983: Asia and the Pacific – up for revision in 2011
Parties to the 5 Regional Conventions on Recognition in Higher Education
Main Objectives

Promote international co-operation in higher education

Reduce obstacles to mobility of students and teachers through mutual recognition of degrees and qualifications

Contribute to preserving and strengthening the cultural identity and diversity of peoples, respecting the specific character of their educational systems
1983 Asia-Pacific Convention

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>States</th>
<th>Date of deposit of instrument</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>China</td>
<td>25/09/1984</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>23/09/1985</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sri Lanka</td>
<td>10/01/1986</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turkey</td>
<td>28/04/1988</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Democratic People's Republic of Korea</td>
<td>26/04/1989</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Republic of Korea</td>
<td>29/08/1989</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nepal</td>
<td>02/11/1989</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maldives</td>
<td>14/05/1990</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russian Federation</td>
<td>16/11/1990</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mongolia</td>
<td>19/10/1991</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tajikistan</td>
<td>28/08/1993</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Armenia</td>
<td>05/09/1993</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Azerbaijan</td>
<td>24/04/1995</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holy See</td>
<td>10/07/1995</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kyrgyzstan</td>
<td>07/11/1995</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turkmenistan</td>
<td>04/06/1996</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kazakhstan</td>
<td>14/03/1997</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>India</td>
<td>02/08/2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lao People's Democratic Republic</td>
<td>02/01/2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philippines</td>
<td>26/11/2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indonesia</td>
<td>30/01/2008</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Key Concepts

Fair recognition

Information and networking at the expert level

Supporting instruments (guidelines, good practice, recommendations)
Principles of Fair Recognition

- Applicants have the right to fair assessment of qualifications
- Recognition is granted if no substantial differences can be demonstrated
- If recognition is not granted, substantial differences are demonstrated
- Applicants' right to appeal
Emergence of National QA and Accreditation Systems

• Decline of academic standards due to massification of HE
• Lost of public confidence on HEIs
• Budget cuts and pressure to increase efficiency in public expenditure
• Greater public accountability
• Changing H.E. context
• Side effects of university rankings
Diversity in National QAs

International Variations:

- Definition of the concept of quality itself
- Purpose and functions of QAA
- Methodologies used in QAA
- Responsible agency/unit
- Issues of ownership and stakeholders
- Voluntary or compulsory nature of participation
- Focus on research or on T-L or on both
- Focus on the review of programmes or institutions
- The reporting
- The range of follow-up activities
Convergence in QAAs

- 3 stage peer-review approach (self-evaluation, site visit, and report)
- Criteria employed in external evaluations (input- and process-characteristics, learning outcomes)
- Approaches to QA (accreditation, assessment or audit)
- National Qualification Frameworks
VI. University Social Responsibility
Social Responsibilities of HE

“Faced with the complexity of current and future global challenges, institutions of higher education have the social responsibility to advance our understanding of multifaceted issues, which involve social, economic, scientific and cultural dimensions and our ability to respond to them. To do so, institutions must increase their interdisciplinary focus and promote innovative thinking which contributes to the advancement of sustainable development, peace, well being and development, and the realization of human rights, including gender equity.”

UNESCO WCHE (2009)
Forms of USR

- Third Mission
- Community-Service Learning
- University – Community Engagement
- University – Industry Linkages
- University as Intellectual Centres
University Reforms

- Institutional change
- Programatic change
Institutional Initiatives

• Policy environment, resource allocation, personnel recruitment, role model
• Environmental sustainability
• Examples: green buildings, green campus, healthy campus
Sustainability in curricula

- Post-graduate programmes
- ESD-related courses for undergraduates
- Embedded ESD curricula
- Compulsory ESD courses
- Sustainability literate graduates
Concluding Remarks

- 2 concurrent but opposing trends
  - Homogenization
  - Particularization
- HYBRIDIZATION - local variations