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EVROPAEVM

The Europaeum was founded in 1992 as an association of leading European universities, with a mission to:

- promote excellence in academic links in research and teaching collaboration between the Europaeum partners;
- act as an open academic network linking the Europaeum partners and other bodies in the pursuit of study;
- serve as a resource for the general support and promotion of European studies;
- function independently in the search for new ideas;
- provide opportunities for the joint pursuit of new pan-European initiatives;
- serve as a high level ‘think-tank’ exploring new ideas and new roles for universities in the new Learning Age;
- provide a ‘pool of talent’ to carry out research and inquiry into problems and questions confronting Europe today and tomorrow;
- help train and educate future leaders for a new Europe.
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Introduction

How Europe’s leading universities can – and must – stay at the forefront of the Knowledge Revolution

In a world driven by new technologies and constant, rapid innovation, ‘knowledge’ is the new capital of the globalised economy. The revolution in communications technology now makes knowledge available in new forms at the press of a button. The discoverers, disseminators and manipulators of knowledge have become the driving force of the modern economy. Our leading universities, major producers of knowledge, have a key role to play – and remain the key instruments of economic and social development.

At the same time, there are many new knowledge providers in this new world, ranging from company-based ‘universities’ and other independent groups, through think tanks and document centres, to sponsored advocacy groups. Universities, therefore, can no longer rely on its traditional monopoly of advanced knowledge and highly educated people. In order to compete, Europe’s leading universities need to seek out a new public and economic role at the heart of democratic society.

Just as the universities adapted to the arrival of the printing press, 500 years ago, so today they must adapt - and indeed are adapting - to a bigger challenge: the information revolution since the 1990s.

This was the thinking that led to the launch of a major international dialogue or ‘conversation’ involving university leaders, academics and students with business leaders, politicians, policy-makers and researchers. These conversations would take the form of an inquiry to study just how European universities can stay at the forefront of this new Knowledge Revolution, and indeed lead it.

The idea was born from conversations between Lord (George) Weidenfeld, whose energetic and creative fizz has led to a myriad of innovations down the decades, including the founding of the Europaeum association itself, and Dr Klaus Mangold, the cerebral Chief Executive Office of the DaimlerChrysler Services AG, which primarily looked after the IT needs of the huge conglomerate born from a trans-Atlantic merger.

Lord Weidenfeld has always wanted more lively and flexible dialogue involving leading universities. He sees the Europaeum as a vehicle for promoting pan-European initiatives and cross-European pollination. “The strengths of European universities should become more visible to the world at large,” he said. For Dr Mangold it was all about participating and benefitting from an international dialogue with universities. “In a globally networked society, cooperation between globally cooperating companies such as DaimlerChrysler, and the best universities in the world,” he said. For the Europaeum, the project provided an exciting opportunity to allow its partner universities to work together on a set of issues of both wide and societal concern, but with particular resonance to their own future development.

The proposed ‘conversation’ was mapped out at a series of advisory board meetings chaired by Professor David Marquand, then Professor of Politics at Oxford University, with important contributions from Lord Weidenfeld, Sir Peter Scott, Professor Michael Krielle, Dr Robin Jackson, Professor Paolo Pombeni, and Dr Michael Jochum on behalf of Dr Mangold, and the Secretary-General who mapped out how the conversation might work over a series of three international ‘dialogue conferences’. It was good that all the Board, which retained overall responsibility for the project, were also able to play their part in the project that unfolded.

The project set out with three specific questions in mind: What are the purpose and role of the European university in the face of the Knowledge Revolution? What changes must take place to allow these to be fulfilled? How best can Europe’s leading universities deliver their new role and responsibilities? In addressing these questions, it was agreed to focus on three modes of operation – possible links and partnerships between the corporate world and the higher education world; possible opportunities and challenges thrown up by the emerging modes of ‘borderless’ teaching and research; and evaluating, self-critically, ‘new’ responsibilities in a changing, globalised society.

It was agreed to build the dialogue around three international ‘conversations of experts’, and to focus on a full range of participants – from universities, employers, funding agencies, governments, as well as the media, think-tanks, research institutes and of course the student body. The first ‘conversation’ was to in Berlin, where the sponsors are based, attended by more than 50 experts and some 20 graduates, hosted by the renowned Humboldt University, still re-emerging after 40 years of ‘frozen’ thinking under Soviet communist role, seeking its way back to its pre-eminent Nobel Prize-winning ways. Themes covered included how universities can adapt in the age of globalisation, the competition in the borderless...
education market, the impact of information and communication technologies, and the effect of enlargement on the intellectual landscape of Europe.

The second international conversation, with 40 experts and 20 graduates, was held at Paris I Panthéon Sorbonne, following issues that had emerged specifically from Berlin – on progress of post-1989 educational reforms in the ECE universities; promoting simultaneous language diversity and academic mobility across leading universities; steps on sharing data research; and an evaluation of the impact of the internet and e-learning on university teaching. The overall theme was an analysis into the 'new' roles and responsibilities of the European university.

The third conference, hosted the University of Bonn, drawing in again more than 40 experts from universities, government, the media, and policy think-tanks, and 25 Europeaem students, discussed the challenges facing European universities over the coming years, competitively, technologically, internationally, and, of course, financially, seeking to identify both opportunities and risks.

In all there were some 120 active contributors – listed in the annexe - to these three conversation meetings, several attending all three to provide continuity. The range included rectors, leading researchers and teachers, experts, industrialists, heads of institutes and research bodies, media experts, senior politicians, commentators, policy-makers, and graduates. An important feature of the conversation was the central involvement of 15 to 20 graduates in each, drawn from across the Europeaem. They participated fully with specific contributions. Submissions from this student body are included in the report, and cover such themes ICT usage, the impact of student fees, who should pay and what is the purpose of higher education. In all more than 225 contributed to the project.

The project, as envisaged, was wide-ranging and provided benefits, as hoped for, on many different fronts – and certainly to all who took part, as evidenced by feedback, letters and contributions. This report encapsulates in full the conversations and exchanges that took place at each of the three expert events, and they repay reading. The report also sets out to encapsulate the lively debates that took place.

Key findings together with some wide-ranging 40 recommendations are listed in the Executive Summary - including the spirit of education; universities and new technology; university responsibilities in society today; universities promoting culture and diversity; universities and public advocacy; relations with corporations and funding. But a fuller flavour of the debates and discussions is given through a few illuminating quotations. There are many other such lively ideas hidden in the rest of the text.

There were critical contributions at each event. Professor Peter Scott, former editor of perhaps Europe's premier journal on university education, vice-chancellor of an emergent UK university, pointing out that European universities conscious of a possibly widening trans-Atlantic gap, must nevertheless seek out their own strengths and not simply ape US models. Herr Gerd Schulte-Hillen, a chairman of the Bertelsmann Company, nevertheless urging university rectors to produce students that are "critical thinkers". Professor Marcella Pera focussed attention on the strength that comes from the very diversity that is Europe today. Lord Moser, advisor on education to Tony Blair, then UK Prime Minister, and Mary Robinson, former President of Ireland, reminding universities respectively of their 'duties' both towards their communities and to the less-developed South. Then Ben Okri reminding us all of the higher ambitions that made universities: "We are more than our functions. We are more than the jobs that we do."

There were also four important commissioned papers as part of the inquiry each of which produced important conclusions. Yoni Ryan, looking at the impact of new technology on knowledge production, urged universities to put the emphasis on producing "trusted data". Volodemar Tomusk, looking at the position of the emergent universities from East and central Europe, revealed that much remained to be done, with a clear implication that Western universities retained an obligation to help deliver a 'full return'. Leszek Kosinski agreed that much more needs to be done to make public research far more accessible, not least among fellow researchers. Finally Rosalind Greenstein provided a blueprint of how universities can remain both multi-lingual and communities of learning. Summaries and full discussions are included in the report that follows, while the full research reports are available on the Europeaem's website.

An actual survey of computer and laptop culture practice across members of the Europeaem consortium, was also commissioned as part of the inquiry, which revealed relatively poor use of the Internet and computers for 'learning' and 'study', with the academics lagging severely behind their own students in both use, understanding, valuing, of new technology for teaching and research. More than half the students reported their professors did not use online resources for teaching, while only 15 per cent of academics reported that they regularly provided online tutorials. One in four academics complained that new technology was under-used in their own universities - a finding one feels sure must have improved since then.

The conversation also featured a series of case studies, including the Fern Universitat at Hagen model for distance learning involving some 50,000 students studying via distance learning with parity of esteem;
the new Observatory on Higher Education which provides updates and research on borderless teaching; a new set of Knowledge Tools for Law, new Internet approaches to Linking Universities, and of course The Europaeum itself.

These recommendations, thus, urge Europe’s top universities to focus on teaching ‘wisdom’, critical thinking and producing true citizens. Europe’s universities must work much harder to disseminate their knowledge, to make their research more accessible and reach out to all sectors of society, and make use of traditional and new electronic modes of delivery. They must face up to their responsibilities in ‘bridging’ with other universities at all levels, across north-south divide, East-West inside Europe, and promote international mobility, collaboration and networks. In terms of diversity, universities must promote respect of all cultures, recognise and promote their own diversity, in terms of gender, race, culture and language. Universities also have a critical role in enhancing and safeguarding democracy within their nations, as the homes for unpopular ideas and causes, and to research and speak out for minorities, the marginalised and the less well placed. Europe’s top universities must make their own case for more public funding and support for their institutions, seek new relationships with business, explore new sources for funding and support, while always maintaining the highest ethical standards.

The output of the conversation comes in the form of this extensive report, alongside the keynote papers and many contributions, the evocative debates, the research papers and the recommendations. It could have been constructive to have been able to arrange one more concluding event, with appropriate experts present, when each recommendation could have been re-analysed and developed with detail. That may need to come in the future.

This report and its findings are offered now as a contribution to our continuing debates about the future of European higher education, in the wake, for example, of the Bologna Process to create a standardized educational system and structure, to promote equivalence and greater mobility. Then there are continuing discussions to create a Europe-wide Higher Education Research Area, and to set up a new European Research Council, which might end up channelling funds to specializing centres of excellence presumable at leading European universities. There are continuing debates over university autonomy: proposed reforms in France have already led to such great upheaval and protests in 2003, undue interference from the Länder continues in Germany, while devolution has been causing disquiet in Spain, while in Italy the power of Rome remains a given. The need for clear ‘autonomy’ is rather taken for granted within this inquiry. Its success in, say, Denmark and especially in the Netherlands rather points the way. Finally, questions of public funding, private support and student fees, key themes for the Bonn conference, remain as contested as ever. Public support for universities varies across Europe from a high in Scandinavia of 1.8 per cent of GDP, to 1.1 per cent in the UK, with France and Germany also below a European average of some 1.2 per cent. Fees remain hotly contested, though now part of the landscape in the UK, and with dim prospects of alternative funding on offer, may edge in other European countries in coming years despite palpable opposition.

So, shifting through the report and contributions now, is it possible to define a trajectory for our leading European universities, including the 10 members of the Europaeum consortium, in the face of radical new technology, in a far mobile world, globalised activity, and the demands of life-long learning, and sift out key ideas to contribute to that global dialogue that our founding Advisory Board sought.

First, it is clear that our universities must adapt, and, moreover, build in a new culture of flexibility and adaptation – not at all easy for long-lasting, traditional, and somewhat necessarily conservative institutions. This involves moving away from traditional ‘models’ – away from the famous Humboldt concept, built around excellence and elitism, and from the Napoleonic and Newman conceptions – and looking, constantly at how to make the best use of new technology, new methods and mode of delivery, and the opportunities of working in a more internationally interdependent world. The lead is being set by places by MIT, which is not only putting its top lectures on the Internet but even making its curricula openly available, something that no leading European counterpart has come close to contemplating.

Second, it became clear that our leading European universities should not indulge in an inferiority complex. They should make fuller use of their identified, inbuilt advantage over their American counterparts as necessarily pluralist institutions, derived from diversity. There is much they can learn, and much they can improve, but they certainly do not need to fall into a simplified marketization of curriculum and recruitment, to try to compete; nor probably would they succeed. Packing in more students with the same, or perhaps even less funding, is certainly not the way forward, either.

Third, universities need to reach out and make many new kinds of partnerships, reflecting the globalised, international, arena in which they must now operate. They need partnerships with other leading universities; with governments and corporations to deliver still independent research in return for improved public funding; with their communities to support schools and local needs; and internationally to allow improved understanding, exchange, problem-solving, with perhaps improved recruitment resulting.
Fourth, leading universities need to promote more conscientiously improved awareness and use of websites and laptops within their own institutions to enhance teaching and learning, accept the slogan “every student a laptop, every professor a website” – to match the prevailing culture of most American universities. They need to invest to stay ahead in laptop culture, especially in regular training for their academic workforce.

Finally, universities must work much harder – and continuously - to remind governments and the public of their particular significance to the economy, to knowledge production and to society, building civic engagement, citizenship and sound leadership, and to improving the all round quality of life and health of society, especially in the era of globalisation. The inquiry concluded that universities needed to defend themselves better and to forego polite arguments, following some 20 years during which they have been undervalued and under funded by governments across Europe. Successful societies have successful thriving universities. They had to ‘go out’ and make their case for more funding to allow governments to prioritise their case over many other worthy cases.

To try and sum up, using Lord Weidenfeld’s words: “This was an important project for us. We know universities have a key role to play in the integration process that has dominated Europe for the past 50 years. Now we want our universities to re-focus their energies more energetically on this role – looking at issues of language, mobility, funding and technology. Many of our great institutions need to reinvigorate themselves and engage in more public dialogue. This project has reaffirmed many sound old ideas, but also produced some important new ones.”

Our universities must operate today in a fast moving, complex, commercial, global, and ever-changing world of e-learning, CD-ROMs, management systems, trans-national learning and distance learning programmes. They have no choice. Indeed, there is much to be gained. They must also take the best of the US model, but retain what remains good from our own models. They must, ultimately, of course, retain their primary task to produce critical thinkers.

But they must also move forward, not each re-inventing a wheel, but, in the prevailing character of this age, to share and to cooperate, and to open themselves up on content and means. These will be tough challenges, certainly. They must strive to face up to them together - and with due confidence.

Paul Flather
Secretary-General, the Europaeum
Mansfield College
University of Oxford
Executive Summary

This report emerges from an international investigation into how European universities can—and must—operate at the forefront of the Knowledge Revolution in the 21st century, involving some 200 experts, academics, policy-advisors, politicians, and practitioners and 50 graduate students drawn from across and beyond Europe. What follows is a selection of some what can be deemed to be key statements, key quotes and key recommendations, worthy of further and wider consideration emerging from a three-year inquiry. Not every participant will, of course, have agreed with every recommendation.

(i) The Spirit of Education

European universities should not seek simply to ape the leading American universities because of any feeling of inferiority. They should not live in the shadow of the Ivy League. They should seek to study US universities and other models of success to improve their performance and all round quality while understanding and maintaining their own special qualities, particularly linked to of diversity of approaches in study and learning, in funding support, and in composition of student and staff bodies. It was agreed that they must then move forward with confidence.

Universities have a key role to play in the production of economic and social knowledge. Universities also have a key role in the production of the qualified, the professional and the leaders. However, universities must always aim beyond merely producing more and more ‘trained’ people, with the right skills that meet the immediate demands of society and government. They must be citizens. They must be complete individuals.

In the words of Professor Sir Peter Scott, Vice-Chancellor of Kingston University and a former editor of the Times Higher Education Supplement:

“I believe the fears that European universities are lagging behind are exaggerated. I believe European universities are at least as capable of meeting the challenges as those from the US or Australia… In a world of shifting cultures, we may in fact be better placed than universities … linked [simply] to the market.”

In the words, Herr Gerd Schulte-Hillen, then Chairman of the Supervisory Board of Bertelsmann AG and Board member of its Foundation, a leading European business figure, who gave an address during the third conference in Bonn:

“Universities must produce students that are obviously well trained, that are international and mobile, but who are also critical thinkers.”

In the words of the distinguished writer, Ben Okri, who addressed the inquiry during the Paris conference:

“We are more than our functions. We are more than the jobs that we do.”

Recommendations

• European universities need to take the best from the US model in terms of teaching modes, accountability, fund-raising, and resource provision, but they must also retain what remains good from Europe’s own variety of models
• All European universities should enjoy the fruit of real autonomy so that they can deliver change
• European universities must help equip all graduates with a deep understanding of the history, culture, economic and social dimensions of Europe, past, present and future.
• Universities must emphasize the teaching of ‘wisdom’ and the importance of producing critical thinkers
• Universities must produce graduates who are also worthy and engaged citizens
• European universities must play their part in preparing and equipping leading young scholars and professionals to become tomorrow’s leaders in Europe.

(ii) Working in the New Knowledge Age

All leading universities must face up to continuing consequences of the e-learning revolution and create a culture of flexibility and adaptation to cope. They have no choice and, indeed, much to gain. They must ensure their graduates are provided with fully up-to-date ICT skills, and that all academics are continuously fully trained in the productive use of ICT in their teaching and research work. This emerged from a Europeaum survey of ICT Usage in the consortium’s universities, where professors themselves said they wished for more training to help them make better use of the Internet.
They should take all steps possible to share their knowledge, e-content and research and digital resources and texts. “Every student a laptop, every professor a website” would be a good slogan to match the prevailing culture of most American universities. But they must not seek to ‘reinvent the wheel’ reach time but to share ideas, content and even curricula and research.

Universities must continue to work hard to build up electronic facilities of the kind that students expect. This would involve using websites to provide details of lectures, courses, notes and so forth – as well as web discussion groups on specific research themes, and providing lists of experts. However, universities must also recognise the differences and demands of ICT in different disciplines. Nor must they neglect tried and trusted traditional methods of study and teaching.

Additional insights came from the Europeum survey on ICT usage including the following key findings across the Europeum partner institutions: 91% of students use the Internet for less than one hour a day to retrieve course or lecture materials, while 50% access the internet for more than 4 hours a day for ‘entertainment or personal interest’; 53% of students report that their lecturers do not use online resources in lectures – and they say they should – while 87% would like course-specific web pages to support class-based learning; 15% of staff use online tutorials – and a further 45% of staff would like to know more about the potential benefits, and would like to use more ICT in their teaching.

In conclusion, the survey showed just one in four staff assessed the integration of ICT in their university into their course as ‘excellent or good’, and both staff and students remained ‘unsure’ about whether current levels of ICT usage in universities ‘enhances’ the learning experience of students.

Recommendations

- All European universities need to be willing to reform and to adapt to the new revolution, to remain at the forefront of knowledge provision
- Universities must produce accurate and trusted information and data that continues to raise the profile of the higher education sector, amid the sea of electronic and media information now on offer
- Each university – as public bodies – should seek to share and cooperate on both knowledge content and e-technology means
- Universities need promote and disseminate knowledge they produce more actively, to share research findings, essentially free via the Internet
- Universities must allocate resources to advertise their digitised resources and texts properly, both to the informed general public and intellectual community of scholars
- Universities should seek to spread knowledge and learning, using now tried and tested open source methods, which can be built upon by others in the academic community
- Incentives should be set up to ensure and encourage university researchers to share research findings via the Internet, especially large scale European-wide data sets across the research community
- Universities must engage in the ‘laptop culture’ to enhance teaching and learning, promoting awareness and use of study websites.
- Universities must strive to maintain an integrated approach of both traditional and electronic methods and instruments of teaching, research and publishing, recognising different needs of different disciplines.

(iii) International responsibilities

European universities have a critical role in making European citizens more aware of the history, society, economics, and culture of European societies. They must play their role in encouraging academic links and academic mobility across frontiers and boundaries, and across religious, racial, economic, social, historical and ethnic lines. They should seek to set up active and effective federations, and it was noted that perhaps smaller associations such as the Europeum itself could be more effective in building deeper alliances, as compared to more common, large, and relatively unfocused, university gatherings.

In the globalised world, where knowledge is increasingly key, leading European universities must also recognise their growing international role, in bridging the North-South divide, between the developing and developing world, provide access, opportunity and advice which can aid those less well-off and less professionally equipped, than their home graduates.

Universities in the former ECE region and beyond had made great strides in rediscovering intellectual diversity, autonomy and quality, especially in the early years since the fall of the Berlin Wall. However, the speed of change has gradually slowed, and in some cases even faltered in the face of falling funding levels, both from national governments and outside bodies, of tapering off of reforming zeal, and of entrenched old guard academic sectors.

As Mary Robinson, former UN Commissioner for Refugees, told the Bonn international conference:
“You’re comfortable; you have the resources. You must reach out particularly to the South, particularly to the less developed universities. Make fresh partnerships.”

Recommendations

- European universities must continue to play their full role in the new, democratic, integration of Europe, building bridges, mixing cultural understanding, and spreading ideas across frontiers.
- European universities must work hard to promote academic mobility, by reducing obstacles, and by building active federations and collaborative networks.
- Universities must continue to promote academic exchange and collaboration with their leading counter-parts from the former East/ Central European region to complete their full ‘return’ to European higher education.
- European universities have a duty to help bridge the divides that mark our new age of globalisation, between North and South, between those with rights and those without, between those living in poverty and those who are not, those with access to digital resources and those without.
- Above all, European universities must reach out and “bridge the divide” between the top universities in the West and those struggling in the developing world.

(iv) Culture and Diversity

Cultural diversity is built into the very heart and essence of leading European universities, and they need to recognise this key feature. They must not take it for granted.

They need to celebrate this special quality of diversity and they need to promote it within the long held traditions of internationalism and multiculturalism that mark European higher education at its best.

In the words of The Hon. Professor Marcello Pera, President of the Italian Senate, who pressed the case for a common European education dimension during the first expert conference in Berlin:

“Sharing the same ideal, tradition, and method has had the positive consequence that no [European] culture is radically incommensurable with the others. There are no insurmountable boundaries or frameworks that imprison us or prevent us from understanding one another. Dialogue is possible. One must simply want it and push oneself to achieve it. Our students want it and achieve it.

“I am convinced that cultural diversity is not only compatible with integration, but rather, if governed by appropriate political direction, can be strengthened by it. In the final analysis, my conviction is based on the fact that at the core of our tradition and of our way of thinking is precisely the value of cultural pluralism.”

Recommendations

- Universities have a duty to respect all cultures – but must promote none specifically
- Culture and Cultural Studies cannot be taught in a relative vacuum, but must be done critically, positively, carefully
- Universities must recognise, understand, and enjoy their own, inbuilt, cultural diversity
- Universities should seek to document their cultural diversity and analyse the atmosphere, costs and benefits, of inter-racial and inter-cultural relations on campuses it to aid their own understanding
- European universities should investigate how they can continue to promote academic mobility while respecting the value, integrity and diversity of Europe’s linguistic heritage

(v) Community involvement and Public Advocacy

Leading European universities must rediscover their critical and central roles in wider society. They must recognise their continuing responsibilities in helping to safeguard democracy, to provide space for the airing of difficult and less popular views, and of thinking the unthinkable.

Universities also have a duty to their local communities. Every leading university was encouraged to consider ‘adopting’ one or more local schools to help improve educational standards and instil a love of learning, as it is schools that not only provide future entrants but impact on the core standards of learning in universities. This should be easy as schools are geographically near and may often have sent future students to the university. Professors and teachers should be encouraged by government, local authorities and institutions, to go “back and forth” between such schools and the universities

Lord (Claus) Moser, a Government education advisor and a former Warden of Wadham College, Oxford, addressed the Bonn experts’ conference:
“If the schools get it wrong, or are ill-equipped, or under-funded, or do not attract the right level of teachers because of lack of prestige, then it makes the work of universities very much more difficult.”

In the words of Dr Avi Primor, then Vice-President at Tel-Aviv University and former Israeli Ambassador, who addressed the final experts’ conference in Bonn:

“Universities are at the forefront of civil society, and must do what others don’t do, and we must do it very boldly. We must put the counter-arguments, the difficult arguments, the unpopular arguments and we must produce space for this to happen. The media can’t be relied on to do that. Political parties can’t be relied on to do that. Dissident individuals can do it, but they need the space.”

**Recommendations**

- Universities must re-discover their role within democratic society and focus on their full responsibilities to their nation, to their citizens and to their local communities
- European Universities must reach out and help to safeguard democracy and play a key role in advocacy on behalf of civil society
- European universities must always be willing to defend ‘academic freedom’
- Leading European universities have a primary duty to serve as the “home for “unpopular” and dissident causes and views
- Top universities must seek to reach out both to local universities and schools - to help improve access, impart knowledge and to raise standards.

**(vi) Funding and Transparency**

Successful societies are those that have successful thriving universities. It is accepted that Europe’s leading universities, especially in the era of globalisation, mobility and migration, are critical to economic and social development, and improving quality of life for the country.

Yet universities everywhere today are under pressure, suffering under the twin threat of economic stringencies and ever increasing demands from government, often on behalf of national and economic interests. It was agreed that universities must seek new funding, from a variety of resources in the new climate. All participants – from Rector-level to graduate student level - recognised the paramount need today to raise additional funding, from public sources, from external corporate funding and other sources though there no agreement on student fees. They urged new tax incentives for donors.

But European universities must never compromise their traditional autonomy and independence and, above all, academic standards, or academic goals. They must be seen to demonstrate this continually, with a strong and clear commitment to complete transparency.

However, leading universities also had a duty to make the case for additional funding more publicly and with greater unity, even across European boundaries, thereby allowing governments to prioritise better their case over other worthy cases. Universities today must, more than ever, stand up for their rights and defend themselves more forcefully, and to forego polite arguments, following some 20 years during which they have been increasingly undervalued and under-funded by governments across Europe.

**Recommendations**

- Universities must face up to their new financial challenges, and seek funding from a diversity of sources, including business and industry.
- Universities must work harder to tell governments of their critical role as significant institutions contributing to growth, stability, socialisation and democracy
- European governments were urged to introduce new tax concessions (perhaps on a European level) for donors to higher education, along the lines common in the US
- Universities should aim to diversify their income sources, to empower them to refuse or resist any pressures to amend academic policies or academic selection
- Universities must ensure they follow the highest ethical standards in all their fundraising activities at all times
- Universities must at all times continue to operate as democratic, open and entirely transparent institutions in keeping with the values they wish to foster within their students and across their communities.
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Welcome & Introduction

Lord Weidenfeld
Founder of the Europaean and Chairman, Weidenfeld and Nicolson Publishers

I am very privileged and gratified to talk to you today. I think it is most appropriate to have this meeting at the Humboldt University, Berlin, because of the impetus for the creation of the European network, the sequence of events, and that great turning point of history, which is symbolised by the fall of the Berlin wall. It was that particular impulse that started an enterprise to bring together teachers and students in, first of all, Western European Universities to offer resources to those universities which had only recently emerged in other parts of Europe – the reason we started the Europaean network. Six universities joined us initially; we then approached the University of Prague to join us for the beginning of a round of enlargement which would also include universities previously behind the Iron Curtain. The group that we have assembled around the Europaean logo is by no means exclusive and we would very much like to enlarge it. The term ‘variable geometry’ is very fashionable in international politics, but I think it also applies to our intentions: we want our association to expand and include other universities and free-standing research institutes as full members and associates.

Thanks to the generosity of our German sponsor Daimler Financial Services AG, and particularly the Davies Group of the organisation, Dr Klaus Mangold and Dr Bensel, we are now engaging in a study of the roles of universities in the future. We have a number of ideas regarding how to set about answering these three major questions: What is the future role of the university? Once we have established what it is, how do we equip it to produce the resources to do its job? And what role does it play in our society? We hope to have a number of ongoing conferences and exchanges of views on the subject thanks to the friendly cooperation of Humboldt University.

We are now in a new era since 11 September. I think that one day we will come to regard as significant the approximate decade from the fall of the wall in Berlin to the destruction of the World Trade Centre in New York. In what we now see in the plateau of Central Southeast Asia, an unholy alliance of barbarism, fanaticism and the high-tech products of the information society. The university, by having an important dose of humanism, makes all the difference between a Robespierre-like revolution and a continuation of the human spirit with the new resources and tools, carefully husbanded, monitored, and controlled.

Thanks also to the President of Humboldt University, Professor Michael Kreile, Professor Marcello Pera, Dr Paul Flather, and their colleagues.

Jürgen Mlynek
President, Humboldt University, Berlin

There are universities because knowledge is always being created and has to be passed on. Research is the lifeblood of the university! Good universities can be recognised by the way they impart the knowledge from their research facilities. These premises apply to American, English, Italian, Japanese, French, Russian as well as German universities; they apply to all Universities. However, within our fast moving, complex and global world the general framework has changed. The worldwide competition between highly developed scientific communities regarding the creation, placement, and use of scientifically well-founded knowledge, as well as between those supporting this knowledge, has become aggravated. This competition is increasingly apparent in the globalised employment and education market, where its possibilities have reached totally new dimensions through the Internet and its global availability.

The EU ministers of education have recently announced that they are trying to develop the European Union to become a dynamic centre of learning and education for the world. This strategic aim requires suitable support for a new education policy on national and European levels. What exactly does this imply for each individual university? Is there still a future in the classical concept of a university education, according to the Humboldt education ideal, in the age of globalisation? Or do we have to be afraid that research and education will be increasingly aligned along political and mercantile models?

Is there still a future in the classical concept of a university education in the age of globalisation?

I think: no. The international competition of education systems has without a doubt brought movement into the German university system. We have evaluated, accredited, and started a modular study system and improved the general framework for up-and-coming academics. This shows the inner will for reorganisation and renewal of German universities. Moreover, I think it is essential to talk about the idea of the university again, even though it is now two centuries since the concept of Humboldt's (now globally imitated
and famous) Berlin University was set into action. It is necessary to point out the modernity of Humboldt’s education model in order to use it as a new point to start from.

Wilhelm Humboldt's vision, which was based on linking the traditional idea of the university with the modern organisation of the scientific world, became a role model for new universities all over the world. Today, especially the top American universities refer to Humboldt's educational methods with great emphasis, and we should also pay attention to such successes.

Some might say it is unfair to compare under-funded German public universities with the small group of ten top-quality American universities. Let us be honest: who knows the remaining 2000 universities and colleges of the "Higher Education System" in the USA?

I would like to examine the formula of success of those top Universities. A survey would surely highlight different and equally valid causes for their accomplishments. However, I once asked an acclaimed professor of physics at the MIT what the formula of success for a university should be and his answer seems applicable enough. His answer was very brief: "It's very simple. First: Science is elitist. Second: Bright people attract bright people. Third: Young people should not work for old people."

What does that mean for us?

Regarding the first proposition, "Science is elitist." Our American colleagues focus very strongly on the excellence and success of their elites. We concentrate more on an all-round education, whereby in my opinion the principle of equality gets confused with equalisation. The experience from everyday life demonstrates that not everyone is blessed with the same talents. The consequence from this would be to treat unequal people in an unequal way. This is how American universities select their students and university lecturers.

Regarding the second, "Bright people attract bright people." If a university already has some really good researchers it is easier to win more top quality researchers to join the team. This clearly means that top people will bring in top people. Stanford University has been able to achieve the Nobel Prize in Physics three years in a row, an achievement about which the president of Stanford was embarrassed: it might have given the impression that the award merely depends on the candidate having the appropriate references!

The appeal-politics of the top US universities are based on the so-called Harnack Principle. Andrew Harnack was a theologian at the Berlin University as well as the originator and first president of the Kaiser-Wilhem Association. His principle consisted of establishing scientific institutes for outstanding research scholars. Those were recruited immediately under the motto "the best are just good enough." The consistent obeying of the Harnack principle is the secret to the success of organisations like the Max Planck association. Whatever suits the Max Planck Institute is just about right for our Universities.

As for the third proposition, "Young people should not work for older people," it introduces the topic of academic offspring and upcoming generations. Up-and-coming new scientists need clear opportunities to plan a secure future for their careers. The most important aim for a university committed to guaranteeing careers for promising new academics is to delegate responsibility and teach students the importance of independence and autonomy at an early stage.

I think it has become clear that the success formula of American top universities can also be applied to German universities: competition for excellence and optimised foundations for new academic achievements. This implies a new, rational orientation. A natural consequence of this re-thinking process will be an explicit hierarchy in the quality of German universities. To assume that German universities are all the same is complete fiction. Officially, there are no rankings of German higher education institutions. However, in a subtle, unnoticed way, the competition between German universities to join the international league table of top universities has long ago begun.

Successful universities follow simple success formulae. German universities are only able to exist next to other universities on an international level if they identify themselves more strongly with ideals of excellence and optimised academic achievement, and take the actions necessary to achieve these ideals. This is our claim: The Humboldt University of Berlin describes itself as a university that will push the boundaries of excellence. Our history, our location and our name do not leave us any other choice.

It is the duty of political and economic leaders to ensure that universities' knowledge is used efficiently

Humboldt: this name stands for reform and tradition at the same time. Berlin developed new principles of contemporary science in the beginning of the 19th century and it was then introduced all around the world. Einstein, Max Planck, Marx and Bismarck all studied in Berlin. Hegel's study desk is still in the Faculty of philosophy and in front of the Senate Conference Hall there are portraits of the 29 Nobel Prize award winners that have the name "Humboldt" in the history of their studies.

The names of the brothers Wilhelm von Humboldt – the founder of this University – and Alexander von Humboldt – the world-travelling
scientist — express a unity of the natural sciences and the study of humanities, and are a timeless role model. Wilhelm emphasizes the cultural accomplishment of the sciences, their own dynamic development and the conditional freedom and responsibility of the individual. Alexander accentuates the importance of the sciences for the future of a society and its prosperity. Together these perspectives provide the foundations of our modern understanding of academic institutions.

The founding ideas of Wilhelm von Humboldt were influenced by the reforming ideas of the philosopher Johann Gottlieb Fichte and the theologian-philosopher Friedrich Schleiermacher. Schleiermacher understood education as the "process of becoming mankind." It was the destination of the human race to engage the world and to present itself in the world.

Now I come to the third characteristic feature of Humboldt University, which is its position in the middle of Berlin, close to the government quarter and the cultural district, as well as in the middle of Europe: the turning point between east and west. Our aim is not only the higher education of all our students, but also their general education, based on the ideas of Humboldt and Schleiermacher, which means to achieve knowledge and competency on social, political and cultural levels. The events in autumn have made it clear that universities have a much broader dimension according to the Universitas. Universities have the responsibility to inspire generations to develop the interest and understanding necessary to become world citizens and whole people. All the thousands of universities in the world have a profound knowledge, which is not being used efficiently by political and economic leaders. It is their duty to ensure that this knowledge is used and passed on appropriately. Even the scientific community demands an informed and an enlightened citizen, who will be able to recognize new findings and to gauge new options. In return, those findings and options should be kept ready for the community, the economy, and the lives of all humans.

Wherever the German and European universities will strive, Humboldt's ideals should always be preserved.

Michael Jochum  
Management Board, Daimler AG

Borderless Competition in the Age of Global Markets

One of the risks of holding a conference like this is the European weather in December; sometimes airports close completely, stranding delegates, and this is exactly what has happened to Dr Norbet Bensel. He sends his sincere apologies that he cannot be here in time and will try and join us as soon as possible.

I am responsible for corporate issues and messages on behalf of our Chairman. As the representative of a services company with global activities but local roots here in Berlin, I am particularly happy you have chosen this venue. It is a University becoming more flexible, more competitive and more international. President Mlyniek has outlined its characteristics, which have not always been general wisdom in Germany, but which we as Daimler Financial Services AG support vigorously. Still, neither Humboldt nor any other university will be able to meet transnational challenges by remaining isolated. In other words, when the world is becoming borderless so too must education become borderless. Since action speaks louder than words, I suggest that we start here at home in Europe.

**If the "clash of civilisations" is to be avoided, we must be able to let our citizens see the world through the eyes and with the understanding of people who live in cultures different to our own.**

The title of the conference, "Borderless Education Bridging Europe," is probably the key challenge for Europeans struggling to secure their future. I know people who say that God created time, but He said nothing about haste. That sounds good, but unfortunately it is not the whole story. For we are actually living in times of unparalleled change. To quote Charles Darwin, "it is neither the strongest nor the most intelligent species that survive but the ones most responsive to change."

In the last 10 years the world has collected more data than in 2500 years before. "How lucky" one might think, that today's computers have about 70,000 times the storing capacity of computers in 1975, but data and knowledge can be quite different things. More often than not, the problem today is one of too much, rather than too little data. Even goldfish catch fewer water fleas if they are confronted with too many at the same time; they fail to make up their mind in the face of abundant attraction. Human beings may well encounter similar problems. We are drowning in data, but we are still thirsting for knowledge. The conclusion is clear, more than any earlier era, the Internet age requires the ability to distinguish between data garbage and data gold. So again the question is, "how are we supposed to acquire and maintain this crucial capacity if not with the help of new and future-orientated teaching methods?"

Globalisation is, of course, another factor that forces us to rethink, and possibly restructure, our educational systems. The need to be present in borderless markets and to benefit from economies of scale has led to a plethora of mergers and
acquisitions in almost every industry. Many of these mergers are cross-border tie-ups creating multi-national, multi-cultural companies: in short, global players. To play successfully it takes equally global employees. Unfortunately the number of qualified university graduates that fit these criteria is limited. According to survey of the European Union, roughly 14,000 European students take part in exchange programmes across Europe every year. This is good but not good enough. The same survey says that 76% of European students are able to have a conversation in another European language. This again is a success compared with only 44% of all Europeans who can do the same things. But it is still not acceptable that every fourth European student is unable to communicate in a foreign language.

Finally, only 13% of German students have spent some time at a foreign university; 87% have not. This is clearly short of what is necessary and far short of what is desirable. Mere language skills will not suffice. What is needed is intercultural competence, a quality which cannot be acquired through the internet but only by living in a culture for some time. If the “clash of civilisations” is to be avoided, we must be able to let our citizens see the world through the eyes and with the understanding of people who live in cultures different to our own.

If this is true for everybody, it applies even more to the future manager. At Daimler Financial Services we are always on the lookout for young, intelligent, open-minded, internationally orientated and curious employees. We want these employees to be mobile, but we don’t want them to be homeless. A reliable home base is a decisive human anchor and often a prerequisite of personal stability in the storms of globalisation. Even today our managers are almost always involved in international activities, and by that I mean not only working abroad but also managing international projects, international negotiations, taking over board functions in joint ventures, corporate presentations, and introducing products and services overseas. Small wonder we are anxious to maintain and further increase our intercultural competence.

To achieve that we are not, I repeat, not calling upon universities to throw away their classical ideals and concentrate on mass-producing streamlined business classes. If that were our target we would not be sponsoring this conference. No, we do believe in individualism and we do believe in such a thing as corporate social responsibility, helping people find their individual path in this ever-changing world arena. You know, whenever we tell students how super-changing, super-mobile, and super-global they need to become, they ask us how on earth they are supposed to achieve that. The answer is we will help, and experience will teach the rest. Intercultural competence is not just there, it needs to grow and it will take first-hand experience to achieve this growth. We also tell the students, “the only thing that you need to make sure of is that you stay responsive to change. Never think that you know it all, lifelong learning is the key.” Laying the foundation for this open-mindedness is what we ask of you, representatives of the top universities.

---

**Laying the foundation for this open-mindedness is what we ask of the universities**

When Lord Weidenfeld initiated the Europæum several years ago, he did so in order to create a university without walls. How far have we come? My personal wish is that this conference may help not only tear down the walls between different nations and cultures, but also different spheres of societies, especially between academia and business. Neither political institutions nor universities nor companies will successfully meet future challenges if they are isolated. It is in this spirit of the call for new partnerships, that I wish this conference the best of success.
Session I:  The European University: What is its Future?

Chair: Marcello Pera  
President of the Italian Senate

I am honoured to be here before representatives of the oldest European universities, and since I have dedicated my life to teaching and research at a prestigious European university, I would like to address the topic of our meeting from a viewpoint that I hold to be fundamental for the future of European universities and for Europe itself: knowledge.

As you know, it is a part of the European and Western tradition to consider knowledge not as an instrument or economic means, but as an end in and of itself. *sophia*, the love of pure, disinterested knowledge, is one of those pillars of our civilization that transcends our national and cultural peculiarities and aims for universality. Of course, today we are no longer willing to interpret *sophia* in the original Greek sense. For example, we no longer accompany the defence and diffusion of *sophia* with a devaluation of practical activities and manual labour. Nevertheless, despite all the transformations that the concept of *sophia* has undergone, from antiquity to the renaissance to the modern day, it is thanks to this concept that we can speak of a Western cultural model.

At times, we hear that this continuity is in danger of being broken with the advent of the industrial and technological world: pure knowledge has been bent, even in universities, to the needs of production. This is not so. From the beginning of modern science, practical, productive and experimental activity have accompanied theoretical reflection. Galileo, Newton, Boyle, Huyghens and all the Founding Fathers of modern science would not have been successful without the artisans that put their ideas to work. Similarly, the scientific research carried out in our universities must correspond to the criteria of the hard sciences.

I fear that the cultural significance of technology is often misunderstood: by both its detractors, who (unfortunately) are numerous, and its supporters, who are diminishing and have an increasingly feeble voice. From an historical perspective, technology was born as a discourse on techniques, or rather, as knowledge aimed at justifying our practical comprehension, not as a grouping of instructions for the achievement of particular goals. Technology is both *episteme*, scientific knowledge, and *techne*, art. In other words, to return to a traditional distinction, technology not only concerns knowing how, but also knowing why; certain ends can only be achieved through certain means.

I am mentioning this European root of science not to highlight a peculiarity that belongs solely to us. I have already stated that *sophia* contains within itself a universal need. Nor do I intend to make a reference to our would-be superiority, even if we have good reason to hold that scientific and technological progress – which incidentally is another Western concept – makes our modern day civilization better than that of our ancestors. Rather my purpose is to show that the universality of *sophia* is not incompatible with the preservation of national traditions.

Anyone who has had teaching experience in a European university can attest to the great ease with which students from our countries are able to integrate by overcoming the undeniable cultural differences carried with them from their home countries. Why? My answer is that they were educated under a single ideal and they belong to a single tradition, that of advancing ideas and testing these with the sole method of critical discussion. “Trial and error” and “conjectures and refutations” are not only methods recommended by Darwin and Popper; they are the very essence of Western culture.

For this reason it is easy for us to understand, maintain and respect the particular cultures of our nations or of our places of birth. Sharing the same ideal, tradition, and method has had the positive consequence that no European culture is radically incommensurable with the others. There are no insurmountable boundaries or frameworks that imprison us or prevent us from understanding one another. Dialogue is possible. One must simply want it and push oneself to achieve it. Our students want it and achieve it.

There are no insurmountable boundaries or frameworks that prevent us from understanding one another – dialogue is possible.

My call to European *sophia*, which as I have said, aspires to universality, could be answered with the question: doesn't this universality imply a risk of creating only one way of thinking? In view of the integration and enlargement of Europe, this question can be posed in another manner: will it be possible to reconcile the process of integration with the protection of the cultural differences present in each European country? Does not the cultural and historical specificity of each European
nation risk being lost in a “common market of education” and an undifferentiated koine? I think not. However, since this issue is so controversial, I must say a few words to address it here. I am convinced that cultural diversity is not only compatible with integration, but rather, if governed by appropriate political direction, can be strengthened by it. In the final analysis, my conviction is based on the fact that at the core of our tradition and our way of thinking is precisely the value of cultural pluralism.

This is an important point. Usually we tend to think that cultural pluralism relates to the coexistence of different cultures, a sort of peaceful cohabitation in which each culture lives alongside the other without interference. This is simply not so. Pluralism is competition, as the history of our knowledge itself demonstrates. In its historical evolution, all the disciplines in the academic world were and still continue to be characterized by a plurality of approach in reciprocal competition. The hard sciences themselves, apparently immune from cultural differences, evolve through comparison and conflict. A French or a German physics does not exist, but as the great Pierre Duhem reminded us, there is a French and a German tradition in formulating problems in physics. It is not only in art and literature, but in the sciences as well that schools, styles, and specific ways of thinking or perceiving the world exist. Remove these schools and you will have removed the impetus for scientific progress. Remove pluralism and, in the end, you will have destroyed sophia itself.

I understand the fears that many have for this way of thinking. But these fears are unfounded. From its Greek origins sophia has been accompanied by diversity. It is enough to remember that for Aristotle scientific research was closely tied to the dialectic method, where mutual criticism of different solutions to the same problem was the condition of the search for truth. The same holds true for Galileo, according to whom one form of scientific proof was dialogue, and for Darwin, who described his proofs for the evolution of species as one long argument, that is, a discussion.

I have to add that the preservation of diversity, of cultural pluralism, is not, from my point of view, only a reality or a question of need. It is also a benefit. The habit of comparison and debate makes for good citizens, and, with respect to university students, good future executives, professionals, and technicians capable of evaluating independently and critically the problems which they will face in their particular careers.

Naturally, we must defend this benefit and thus we must create common political and institutional instruments capable of facilitating the mobility of, and discussion among, our students and instructors and to render their experiences visible and comparable. The creation of a sole European education market is nothing more and nothing less than the creation of such a common institutional framework.

---

**We must create common institutional instruments to facilitate mobility and discussion, to render diverse experiences visible and comparable**

Albeit briefly, the means available to us today are worth remembering. First of all, we have the Socrates programme, which incorporates the objectives of the old Erasmus programme. The Socrates programme, based on articles 126 and 127 of the Maastricht Treaty, seeks to promote the movement of students and instructors, facilitate the reciprocal recognition of diplomas and encourage an intercultural dimension in teaching. The more general and ambitious purpose of the programme is that of contributing to the improvement of the quality of instruction in each member state through transnational exchanges.

We then have the Leonardo da Vinci program, which gathers another important aspect of European cooperation: the professional training which takes place in European businesses, through a greater exchange among schools, universities and the business world.

I would like to mention here as well the Europass Formation program, which has among its objectives that of promoting the adoption of a personal book to certify a European citizen's training and work experience, making it transparent and comprehensible across borders.

These are ambitious and important projects, the effects of which can only be evaluated in the long term. They in any event embody the philosophy which I have tried to delineate: integration in order to enhance specificity.

There are certainly many obstacles to the realization of the goal of achieving a common dimension in European research and education. One of these obstacles is the much-debated problem of language. Allow me to say a few words on this point.

A language is not a neutral vehicle for ideas and concepts since it contributes to defining and forming them. Thus, relinquishing one's own language amounts to renouncing an important part of one's culture. At the same time it is evident that the creation of any cultural community propels toward the selection of one language.

Will it be possible to reconcile these opposing exigencies? I think that there are two approaches which are equally and symmetrically erroneous.
The first of these approaches is to try to defend one's own linguistic identity with an active policy of discouraging the use of other languages in the universities in one's country. This approach would have the negative consequences of creating isolation and the loss of the benefits of intercultural exchanges. We should also remember that the hermeneutic effort to overcome linguistic barriers is in itself a process of cultural enrichment, en route to what has been described as the process of a fusion of horizons.

The second approach is to impose a single language in all universities. This is also an untenable solution. After all, how could we possibly justify such a requirement? Would we choose the language that is spoken by the largest number of individuals? Or choose the language that is historically the oldest? Or the language which appears to be the easiest and most flexible?

**If we believe blindly in cultural equivalence we will lose the possibility of arguing for a tolerant world vision**

My answer consists in stating that the scientific and academic world is an open system, i.e. an order among different components whose characteristics emerge spontaneously. National languages are components. Whether the use of a single language or of a limited number of languages emerges within this system is an issue in which politics cannot and should not enter, as it would do violence to the autonomy of the academic, cultural and scientific worlds.

I would like to end my address by returning to its beginning. I spoke of *sophia*, the ideal of universal knowledge, as one of the pillars of European and Western civilization. However, it is not the sole pillar. Even for the ancient Greeks, *sophia* had to be coupled with *sophrosune*. We need not only knowledge, but wisdom as well.

There have been periods in Europe's history in which some great thinkers sought to construct wisdom according to a model of knowledge, that is to say, to build it upon secure foundations. The most ambitious example is Spinoza's search for an ethics demonstrated geometrically. However, there have been other periods in which other great thinkers held that such a foundation was impossible.

We live in a time after the collapse of any attempt to establish a foundation for our values. As we often read in books and essays written by our intellectuals, we are "post-modern". This attitude, which is widespread today, is considered more open-minded, more tolerant and more democratic. Perhaps it is. But it is an attitude which carries a risk, and we must be very honest in pointing it out. It is the risk of considering all cultures, all civilizations, all traditions, as relative and then, since they are all relative, as equivalent. If we do not avoid this risk, not only do we destroy the idea of the single, true and just view of the world — which is a good thing — and not only do we destroy the myth of a mathematical demonstration of ethics, but we also lose the possibility of arguing for or against one or another world vision. In essence, if we believe in the equivalence of all cultures, we lose the very concept of *sophrosune*, of wisdom.

We cannot allow this, especially in a moment such as this in which the Western world is engaged in a difficult duel against those who would like to destroy its roots. We must reaffirm that concept of *sophrosune* made up of dialogue, mutual understanding, tolerance, solidarity, and open-mindedness, which are the values upon which the West is founded today. This wisdom did not simply land on us from up high. Its price has been discussions, debates, and conflicts, as well as bloodshed and suffering. We want to build a Europe which is more united within itself because we want to leave behind us this bloodshed and suffering. But it is precisely because we want and we must build a more united Europe we cannot forget the deep cultural roots of our union.

**Peter Scott**
**Vice-Chancellor, Kingston University**

This, the first conference organised by the Europaeum, addresses the future of European universities, a theme that is both timeless and timely — but it further addresses two more specific, and potentially contradictory, themes. The first is the idea of borderless education, which is typically associated with the forces of globalisation (and so with the liberalisation, and even commercialisation, of higher education). The second is the idea of bridging Europe, which is associated with the process of creating a European higher education space and, therefore, is the responsibility of nation states and of other European institutions. The first, borderless education, is likely to be largely a process driven by the enterprise of individual universities (or groups of universities) and, therefore, will be essentially a market process, although national governments or the European Union may play a facilitating role. The second, bridging Europe, is inevitably a state (or, at any rate, public) process driven by the policies of national governments. This is why there is a question mark in the title of this contribution to the debate: "The European university: what is its future?" Deep down there may be a fear that the European university is at a disadvantage compared with, say, universities in the United States (and possibly Australia) to meet the challenges of borderless education and the wider challenges of globalisation.
One reason for this apparent disadvantage may be the European university’s subordination to state bureaucracies. Although significant progress has been made in the liberalisation of higher education in many European countries, and universities have been given much greater administrative and legal autonomy, European universities may still be seen as insufficiently adaptable as organisations to match the entrepreneurial drive of American universities. A second reason may be the European university’s fundamental commitment to speculative science and disinterested scholarship, the ideal of the so-called Humboldtian University – although there are, of course, other traditions, notably what I will call the Napoleonic tradition represented by the grandes écoles in France and the English tradition of liberal education. But, despite this diversity within the European university tradition, it is still difficult to match – let alone challenge – the utilitarian traditions of the American land-grant universities. A third reason may be the continuing segregation between universities, as providers of scientific education, and higher professional and technical institutions, which provide vocational education, in many European countries. Again this is not universally true. Sweden established a unified higher education system in the 1970s, Britain followed a decade ago, and several other European countries have created common legal frameworks for all their higher education, both university and non-university. But, again, there is a concern that our systems are too regulated and rigid compared with the much more fluid “market” hierarchies typical of American higher education.

These fears may be groundless and concerns exaggerated. The European university, even in its classical form, is at least as capable of meeting the challenges of borderless education and globalisation as American (or Australian) higher education – or other rival systems that may be emerging in East Asia, the Indian sub-continent, and eventually in Africa – especially South Africa and Latin America. Europe may be an old continent, and European universities may be the original archetypes, but this does not mean that the European university tradition is exhausted. The argument presented here is the opposite: that, just as late-20th-century forms of globalisation in which markets were dominant are being complemented by subtler and more pluralistic (and “political”?) forms of globalisation, so the European university with its strongly “public” ethic, and critical and scientific culture, may actually be better placed to respond to this shifting environment than, for example, American universities which have nailed their colours so firmly to the mast of the “market”.

Globalisation

This may appear to be a counter-intuitive, even a revisionist, argument. Of course, if globalisation (and so borderless education) is interpreted exclusively in terms of the market, then it is difficult to deny that the average European university is a less market-oriented institution than the average American university. But, if globalisation is regarded as a more complex process characterised by tensions and contradictions, European universities may no longer inevitably lag behind.

If globalisation is understood as a complex process of tensions and contradictions, European universities may not inevitably lag behind

The most obvious of these tensions and/or contradictions is that globalisation is not simply a technical process in which the power of new information and communication technologies have created the capacity for the operation of round-the-globe, round-the-clock financial markets, the spread of global brands such as Coca-Cola and the global penetration of the mass media. It is also a powerful cultural process, which is reshaping individual, class and gender identities, creating hybrid (so-called “Creole”) cultures in which “western” brands and icons take on new and sometimes radically different meanings. Nor can globalisation be simplistically equated with the End of History and the triumph of democratic capitalism. Even before the events of September 11, “History” was very much alive – even, or particularly, here in Europe in the former Yugoslavia. And the physical and political resistances to the IMF / World Bank / G8 “new world order” have been apparent on the streets of Genoa, Prague, Seattle, Washington and also in the activities of organisations such as Greenpeace. These resistances are part of globalisation, as are the re-invented nationalist rivalries in the Balkans or Islamic fundamentalism.

Finally, globalisation is as much an “internal” as an “external” phenomenon; it is not only about the world-wide projection of “global” (i.e. American) culture, power and global markets; it is also a powerful element of a wider process, often labelled post-modernity, in which the classifications, categories and systems characteristic of modern society – such as the state, the market, culture, and science – are becoming increasingly fuzzy. These old demarcations are being constantly transgressed and it is far too simple to reduce these complex phenomena to the triumph of the market.
Borderless education

Borderless education, which can be regarded as an aspect, or sub-set, of globalisation, is therefore an equally complex phenomenon. Too often it is interpreted in conventional spatial terms simply as education that transcends national boundaries – the establishment of global learning and researching alliances by universities in different countries, perhaps in partnership with mass multi-media corporations; the establishment of "branch" campuses by universities from one country in other countries; the more intense use of information and communication technologies in higher education. Arguably the Europaeum is an aspect of this straight-forward account of borderless education – although, as has already been suggested, there is a tension between being European and being global, or borderless.

However, borderless education can be seen in ideological as well as spatial terms. This may take essentially benign and unthreatening forms, such as the drive to internationalise higher education. From a European perspective this takes two forms: (a) what can be termed "short-haul" internationalisation within and adjacent to the European Union through the Erasmus-Socrates and successive Framework programmes; and (b) "long-haul" internationalisation, principally the recruitment of international students by European (and American and Australian) universities. Sometimes the motive is sentimental, to maintain post-imperial connections; sometimes it is much more hard-headed, to exploit the new global knowledge by boosting university revenues or importing human capital. But it can also take less benign and more threatening forms. One example is the development of a new ideology of higher education that is highly instrumental and thoroughly commercialised, which treats universities as knowledge businesses. Closely related is another new ideology of higher education that rejects the traditional culture of science and reason characteristic of the University as elitist and imperialist. Both these new ideologies seek to uncouple the processes of modernisation from the values of modernity, although for different motives: the first is concerned with profit and the second with politics.

Europe

Just as there are different aspects of globalisation (and so of borderless education), so there are different accounts of Europe and of the European university tradition. Europe is both a place (a continent), and also an idea (a culture). But neither is straightforward. Even in spatial terms Europe has always been notoriously difficult to define. First, there is the European Union – but even within the European Union there is a distinction between the “Euro-zone” and the rest.

Next, cross-cutting the EU’s boundaries, there is the contrast between northern – really “Atlantic” – Europe and “Mediterranean” Europe, inaccurately aligned with the contrast between Protestant and Catholic Europe. Next comes the contrast between “West” and “East,” the latter once represented by Orthodox / Ottoman culture and more recently by Communism (although Karl Marx lived his whole life in western Europe and is buried in north London). Another, more recent, dimension is the multiculturalism of modern Europe, certainly Western Europe. Europe is now a microcosm of the global world. So where are the boundaries of Europe to be set: at the old Soviet frontier which may eventually coincide with the borders of an enlarged European Union (expelling Tolstoy from “Europe”), or on the Amur river, or in eastern Anatolia (but surely Boston or Buenos Aires are as “European” as Istanbul or Irkutsk?)?

There is a tension between being European and being global, or borderless.

These difficulties of definition – which, of course, have been resolved for the practical purposes of designating a European higher education space in the context of the Sorbonne and Bologna Declarations or European Union exchange and co-operation programmes – demonstrate the dialectic between the particular and the universal which is at the heart of the identity of Europe. And it is this dialectic which, it can be argued, constitutes the European university’s advantage in confronting the challenges of globalisation – in a profound cultural rather than superficial “market” sense. Goethe’s whole life was spent in a small space, bounded on the west by the battlefield of Valmy and the east by Cracow, on the south by Venice and the north by Hanover (certainly he never saw the Baltic) – yet this experience and his existence were universal. In this he was an archetypal European. The physical canvass of Immanuel Kant’s life was ever narrower. Two centuries later this dialectic between the particular and the universal enables the European university to navigate among the various dimensions of a global, borderless, world.

Europe is not simply a place, an ill-defined continent; it is also a space in our consciousness, an idea and an ideal. This is not intended to be reactionary reference, a throwback to the Christian Europe of the Middle Ages in which the first universities were created. Universities are really novel institutions, re-created in the turmoil of Revolutionary Europe at the end of the 18th and beginning of the 19th centuries (notably, of course, in Berlin) and ceaselessly re-engineered later in the 19th century and throughout the 20th century to meet the new challenges posed by the industrial
revolution and the advance of democracy. Even here in Europe, the university’s ancient heartland, the majority of universities has been established in the last half-century. Europe is a state of consciousness because of its role as the cradle of modernity. It was here on this continent somewhere between 1770 and 1850 that recognisable modern societies emerged. This is where industrial and urban societies replaced customary and traditional patterns of social engagement with a new form of mass society. This is where the nation-state, still the dominant element of political organisation despite the great strides made in recent years towards European integration, reached its most mature and enduring form – and, some would say, also its most lethal form because it was within the growth of a modern consciousness that virulent nationalism flourished. Europe is also where democracy, particularly the highest forms of democracy represented by the achievements of social democracy and the welfare state, has its strongest roots – despite the tragic interludes of totalitarian rule.

“modern” (perhaps today we must also speak of the “post-modern”) is undiminished. So far this contribution to the debate on the future of the European university has concentrated on two aspects. First, the multiple dimensions of globalisation – and consequently the multiple possibilities of borderless education: the argument has been that it is misleading to concentrate almost exclusively on the “market” dimension of globalisation, and consequently to over-emphasise the commercial possibilities of borderless education. Second, it has considered the diversity of Europe in terms both of geography (Europe is the least well-defined of all the continents), and of ideology (where the idea of “Europe” is equally ill-defined because of the dialectic between particular and universal). In the light of this analysis Europe may be well – not badly – placed to meet the challenges of globalisation (and so of borderless education). It is now necessary to consider the European University more directly.

It is misleading to concentrate on the “market” dimension of globalisation, and consequently to over-emphasise the commercial possibilities of borderless education.

Europe is also where not only the structures but also the values of modernity have been most fully expressed. The Enlightenment was both a European, and a universal, achievement – or, to adopt more contemporary language, it was both a local and a global phenomenon. Europe is where the culture of science – or, perhaps more broadly, the culture of secular rationality – has been at its most powerful. And Europe is also where modernism, in an aesthetic sense, with all its contradictory resistances to mass society was at its most intense. But two points in particular deserve to be emphasised. The first is that, when “Europe” is spoken of as an idea or an ideal, this does not imply that these achievements were the particular possessions of the inhabitants of this continent – however prominent the role played by Europeans in their creation. These ideas and ideals, structure and values, were (and are) the first and fullest expression of globalisation (although that word has only been recently coined). In this sense “Europe” is both a metaphysic and a universal. The second is that the European idea or ideal is not a thing of the past. The rhetorical contrast between a tired “old world” and a vigorous “new world” is almost two centuries old – and it is no more accurate today than when it was first drawn. The centrality of European institutions in the construction of the American and European higher education.

The contrast between America and Europe is an inevitable one. The American system of colleges and universities is seen as market-oriented and student-focused, open and adaptable (and much is sometimes made of the presence of a significant private sector). European systems, on the other hand, are seen as hide-bound and bureaucratic with little regard for students (at any rate as “customers” on the American pattern) and a very limited entrepreneurial capacity (partly because state regulations inhibit, or forbid, such activities but also partly because they go against the academic grain). But, like all inevitable contrasts, it may also be misleading – at best simply wrong. Stereotypes are treacherous. Many US colleges and universities are state institutions, more tightly regulated than the average European university (and more exposed to direct and partisan political pressure). The private sector is a mixed bag of institutions, extending all the way from Harvard with an endowment equal to the GNPs of many nation-states (which is why it is able to preserve an exceptionally high degree of academic autonomy) to colleges that are simply in the training business and have no real pretensions to provide proper higher education.

It is the same story with Europe. Two points are worth emphasising. First, generalisations about European higher education are fraught with danger. Within Europe there are at least three separate traditions – the so-called “Anglo-Saxon” with its emphasis on liberal education; the Humboldtian with its emphasis on scientific education; and what was earlier described as the Napoleonic tradition (because it is most fully expressed through the French grandes écoles) which emphasises professional education. There are, of course, exceptions within these broad
traditions and the sometimes deep differences between individual institutions. It will take much more than the convergent pressures embodied in the Bologna Declaration to make all European universities the same – and, of course, this is not the intention behind the proposal to create a European higher education space.

Secondly, there are many non-university higher education institutions in most European countries, which are at least as socially and vocationally relevant as many American colleges (only Sweden and Britain have tried to unify their higher education systems; the rest of the continent has maintained a binary division of higher education). In fact Fachhochschulen here in Germany or HBO (higher professional) schools in the Netherlands are probably more focused and more relevant than most American community colleges in which general education, recreational education, and technical education are all combined.

**It will take more than the Bologna Declaration to make all European universities the same – and, of course, this is not the intention behind the proposal to create a European higher education space**

If the thesis is accepted that the Knowledge Society is as much about culture as it is about commerce, it is by no means obvious that the more market-oriented American system is better placed to respond to the challenges of the future than the European system (or other systems) of higher education. Even if these challenges are seen primarily in terms of developing marketable high-technology products and of educating students in entrepreneurial ways, it is still not obvious why and how European universities would be unable to compete successfully with American institutions. But my argument is broader: if the challenges posed by the Knowledge Society and globalisation are posed in wider terms, embracing social and cultural knowledge and also personal identities, then it seems to me that the values and practices of European universities may actually confer on them an advantage.

It is possible to make an even wider point, and to argue that the European Union represents an alternative attempt to transcend the limits of the nation-state – but in terms of politics and, hopefully, democracy, rather than in terms of markets. This alternative must be set alongside the vision of global free markets in almost everything: goods and services, but also images and identities. This alternative is no less plausible, nor less likely to succeed. Indeed, if the broad thrust of this argument is accepted, the “European” road to internationalisation (and to globalisation) may represent a more humane and civilised path than the “American” road that focuses too narrowly on markets and consumers, rather than communities (real and, increasingly, virtual) and citizens.

**The Future of the European University**

What, then, is the future of the European university? Of course, it is possible to develop a counter-argument to the argument presented here, namely that the process of European integration represented by the Sorbonne and Bologna Declarations (i.e. “bridging Europe”) can be represented as a parochial exercise. Europeans can be accused of huddling closer together for warmth in an increasingly cold and competitive global environment. This process of integration can even be stigmatised as just another aspect of Fortress Europe, which also includes increasing restrictions on the entry of refugees and asylum-seekers. This is not a comfortable thought – that the eloquent words spoken at Bologna (and, more recently, in Prague) are an analogue of the patrols by border guards along the vulnerable frontiers of the European Union.

However, it is not only unfair but also inaccurate to characterise the process of European integration, and the efforts to create a common European higher education space, as attempts to resist globalisation or to strengthen the external borders of Europe while lowering internal European borders. It is clear that, even if a wholly “market” definition of globalisation is accepted, this process and these efforts are designed to promote market objectives in two senses. First, the closer integration of European higher education systems reflects the creation of a common labour market within the European Union, which is itself an expression of economic liberalisation. Secondly, it is designed to establish a more coherent European presence within the global Knowledge Economy – and, in particular, the market for international students – in the face of American, Australian and other competition. Europe, like the United States, is anxious to import the best and the brightest from other continents to bolster its competitive position.

However, if a much broader interpretation of globalisation is accepted, the European university tradition has much to offer. There are two ways in which the European university may be at an advantage. First, its resistance to excessive commercialisation of its mission enables the European university to understand better those other strands within globalisation. For example, the global resistances to the reductionism of the market and the ways in which the local and the global, the particular and the universal, are being combined to reshape individual and group identities. But, there is a second, more important, advantage arguably possessed by the European university. Globalisation is one element in the
intellectual turbulence of our ages, which has been immensely fertile in terms of scientific discovery and of the incorporation of new, more democratic, knowledge traditions. A higher education system that sees itself as a “knowledge” enterprise is perhaps less well placed to make sense of such turbulence, volatility, and contradictions – and also the associated creativity – than a university tradition that still holds to the critical values of the Enlightenment.

Modern Europe represents an alternative model of internationalising globalisation, far more compatible with the preservation of civic values, democratic structures, and a free and critical scientific tradition

There are other ways in which the European university is potential a leader, rather than a laggard, in the encounter with globalisation in its fullest and most subtle sense. It is possible that we in Europe will be able to construct strategies for developing borderless education. This is not merely a wish for the future: Europe is already engaged in this project – even if the Erasmus / Socrates and Framework programmes are very different from American initiatives such as the for-profit University of Phoenix or the (apparent) proliferation of, again mainly American, “corporate universities.”

The European university is going through one of its most dynamic and creative phases – and it is a key element in the building of a new Europe, a noble project because its significance extends far beyond the frontiers of Europe, however liberally drawn. This new Europe represents nothing less than an alternative model of internationalising globalisation, which is far more compatible with the preservation of civic values (because communities can be destroyed by market globalisation), with democratic structures (because only consumers, not citizens, count in global capitalism), and with a free and critical scientific tradition (because in market globalisation higher education can be reduced to a “knowledge” industry).

Piet Akkermans
Professor of Public and Administrative Law and Rector of the College of Europe

I am Professor of Public Law in the Netherlands and the Dean and Rector of the University of Europe. I already live in very international surroundings. We have only a few hundred students in the College of Europe, but more than forty nationalities. We have only 150 Professors but they are constantly coming and going. In my view, the future of the university is already a reality, although the College of Europe is a small unit and a postgraduate institution. I liked the title of this conference, Borderless Education, because I think we often neglect the functions of universities in the field of education. Until recently, education in Europe was generally a privilege based on the social background of students, considered in conjunction with their intellectual merit. But in the past 20-25 years, highly encouraging policy debates have developed on justice, equal access and equal opportunities in education, as well as life-long learning.

It is not immediately evident that universities are a normal part of the education system. But I would argue that their academic freedom is comparable to the freedom of education of schools and institutions within the same system, and thus, is not unique. Traditionally, national universities were training grounds for the national elite. Now, universities are coming to terms with multicultural societies and immigrant minorities, which are challenging the old role and format for higher education. Universities are no longer training grounds for future classes of scholars: only a very small percentage of students go into academia for the rest of their life. Universities are not, of course, at the centre of compulsory education, but perhaps some university education may become compulsory in time. Already, many policies aim to secure the successful participation of a certain percentage of new students in higher education. Under these circumstances, universities are becoming a normal part of the education system just as schools are, and they, too, will have to meet social and political demands.

Political decisions such as the Sorbonne Declaration are compelling, and not just an invitation to development. The normal reflex for universities in these situations is to make a strong appeal to academic freedom and autonomy. I disagree with that kind of behaviour. I think that the political system is entitled to decide on the framework, outline, goals and means of the educational system – including universities. For example, Humboldt University has no Faculty of Technical Sciences. The University might prefer otherwise, but it is not necessarily their decision. There is a perfectly good technical university here in Berlin and the two institutions have to cooperate. This seems like a sensible “political” decision. As another example, think of the curriculum set out for lawyers or medical doctors. There is a clear task for the state there, particularly as it is a natural role for the state to handle the assessment systems and supervision of doctors and lawyers once they are employed.

Overall, universities in Europe have made marvellous achievements. University education of a good quality used to be as rare and narrow as the
spires atop our old buildings. Now, in many European countries, we have a range of good, comparable universities capable of forming well-educated graduates.

I prefer this classless approach, rather than a stronger “elitist” approach. I think it is a challenge for Europe (by which I mean the European Union and the enlargement countries). It will be quite an effort to build up a European Higher Education of high quality and, in the meantime, to maintain the high quality of national systems. Where national systems need to be upgraded, we must ensure that the processes of equitation and quality assessment are of a suitable standard. Since the inception of the European Union, its future has been conceptualised in all kinds of economic and geopolitical forms. We now seem to have dealt with those questions fairly satisfactorily, and are in a position to include the Balkan countries as soon as possible.

**There is no future in the survival of the fittest as far as the educational aspects of European Universities are concerned**

This brings me to the market idea. I think that politicians and university authorities use the word “market” too easily. It is tempting to use the metaphor of the market, but at the same time it is deceptive. Given the public interest in higher education and a connected financial obligation of the political system, it is not wise to refer to the higher education system as a “market.” If people begin to believe this language, the political system may treat the university as a real market and leave it to fend for itself, under the harsh guidance of the “invisible hand.” As the European Union grows, a market approach will give the wrong stimulus to new member states. If they push their universities into a European marketplace, they will likely destroy their national higher education systems. There is no future in the survival of the fittest as far as the educational aspects of European Universities are concerned—“streamlining” of this kind is a false economy.

I sincerely hope that the European Union leads to the achievement of comparable quality among all of the European universities—and I do not mean that they will all sink to a standard minimum. Let every coin have at least two sides. We have to define our priorities, also, in the field of research and education. We can do it on our own, but here, again, is a also case for political involvement, in making the state responsible for certain important parts of education.

Regardless of whether it is the universities or the politicians making the choice, in the future there will be a loss of proclaimed autonomy of the Universities as they become more specialised (and therefore interdependent). Some universities may not be able to continue offering a full spectrum of disciplines, but this approach will enable universities as a whole to respond to market-type challenges with a kind of collective response. Why should every university have a department of Latin and Greek? That is no longer necessary. The difficult decisions come when we are discussing economics, medicine and other “profitable” subjects. Furthermore, I would argue that there should be less emphasis on research. Ask people responsible for university what their assets are and they will inform you about their research, but only a few academics combine the characteristics of a good researcher and a good teacher. However important and interesting research may be, it is not particularly important for the majority of students. State direction, with its outsider’s perspective, would certainly recognise this. How do we insiders feel about it?

Universities cannot forever be stand-alone organisations. They have to participate in networks, national and international, in order to cope with restrictions of specialisation, particularly in areas like e-learning, lifelong learning and internationalisation. In my eyes, exchange of staff is more necessary than exchange of students: a kind of franchising among universities.

I could easily continue to expound the needs and developments of Universities as a part of the Education system conducted, as in an orchestra, by a political system. Especially with regard to the development of e-learning, there will be a revolution not aiming at a replacement of traditional forms of education but an addition to the whole system. It will be an expensive one.

**Universities cannot forever be stand-alone organisations; exchange of staff is more necessary than exchange of students: a kind of franchising among universities.**

Until now I have spoken about public functions in the field of education, partly to be realised in a market model. It is not just a theoretical development any more; you are all familiar with this dynamic in reality. The European Union has now opened tenders. The word itself is significant; there is a commercial market. Big firms are organising their own corporate universities that contract out to traditional universities. There are many commercial institutions coming into the market of higher education, particularly in e-learning. If we do not deal with these commercial forces actively, they will prove to be the troll under the bridge.

For all the talk of interfering politicians, national governments are trying to distance
themselves from universities for financial reasons. Universities have to convince governments to stay in the system, to stay responsible for them. It is not wise to say that the government should not have a role in education systems. On the contrary, governments will always play some kind of role – and if (when) national governments open the market by expending education systems to commercial newcomers, it will be an occasion for national government to cut budgets of the universities and force them to find money elsewhere... we will be forced to confront the “monster” regardless of who makes the decisions. Universities must be aware of the public responsibilities within the system of education in the country, and they have to be aware of their own activities. Already, many universities are doing commercial activities, such as counselling, which can become real money-makers.

**Universities have to convince governments to stay in the system, to stay responsible for them**

The consequences of these mixed activities are obvious. Universities are strange, ambiguous institutions, with an uneasy mixture of public and market activities at the moment. Instead of trying to identify with one side or the other, universities must deal with their responsibilities by finding special kinds of organisation and special ways of management. Functions are related to funding, so it makes a difference whether you have public or private money to do things with. It is understandable that market money must be related to market activities, just as public money must stay related to public responsibilities.

If the earlier argument about specialisation is accepted, it is no longer self-evident that universities must combine research and education. Such doubling-up in any case requires ambiguous functions, structure and management. My question is: is there an emerging need for, or already a new model of, a university like a holding with smaller firms connected to it, with their own responsibilities and risks? Is there – I realise how unthinkable this may be – a scientific version of the multinational company? As far as I know, European legislation would have to be adapted for that kind of construction. But it may be worthwhile to think about such a possibility. Why would we want to do this, rather than copying Anglo-Saxon and American examples? Peter Scott has given an eloquent argument against such copying, framed in terms of an “idea of Europe.” The further you go out of Europe, the more you feel you know what Europe is. European universities have to look for, and even will into existence, a European university culture. They have to look for possibilities to develop that culture, not only on a national level but also a European level.

**Discussant**

**Herman van Gunsteren**

*Professor of Political Theory and Philosophy of Law, Leiden University*

I have been working a long time in the university as a professor. I'm a middle-level worker from the university, a member of the Scientific Council for Government policy in the Netherlands, and a member of the Royal Academy. I'm also a member of the Global Business Network, based in California. My university is like an idea factory: we try to make a prototype and test it, rather than discuss too much.

I found both of the previous speeches to be very learned, but they also talk about what we and the university have to do. I am more uncertain than they are. Peter Scott was comparing the American university with an average European university, then obviously weighing the chances of success, saying “well the Europeans are not doing too badly, and they have special characteristics which may give them advantages at present, in a new state of globalisation.” What he did not consider is that both European and American Universities may both go down and disappear. He was quite optimistic saying the Universities are going through one of their dynamic stages. I hope so, but sometimes it looks quite different.

Piet Akkermans is also quite knowledgeable but has quite definite opinions on the formula for success. He says: “The university is a school like others; the state or the political system has the right to decide on a framework. You cannot be university in the old sense by having the old array of disciplines, and combining teaching and research is not always good because some of the researchers are such bad teachers,” which is all true. But it depends also on what kind of teaching you ask them to do. I tend to disagree but it is also grounds for discussion.

The first thing I think of when I talk about the university is that the future has many surprises we cannot predict. The second is: how can you prepare for a future you don’t know yet? I suggest the only way is to build up resilience. Third, the obvious question: we have to decide what the university is. Is it the government, or people, or students, or something else?

I think of the university as a truth-oriented institution where you teach and learn in a disciplined way on things you only half understand. The disciplined work is done in a difficult position: it will only produce half a product, which is still developing and for which there is an enormous demand and competition. To work on half-products means: you are constantly...
testing ideas against colleagues, who must ask the right questions and must be able to find the gaps – the ignorance – when you present your knowledge. In this process, Universities have an advantage, but the advantage may be given away.

I see the university as a very special institution.

For certain reasons, in the nation-states in Western Europe, we have wanted many of our young people to spend part of their lives in these truth-orientated institutions. We thought it would be good for character, morals and other things – but this is in part an enormous deception, as people who have trained in universities have done awful things. So we have to ask, why do we want our elite, and increasingly the population as a whole, to spend part of their lives in an institution where you do something that you won’t exactly do later in life?

Why do we want our elite, and increasingly the population as a whole, to spend part of their lives in an institution where you do something that you won’t exactly do later in life?

When I taught first-year students in Law, I told them about natural law. It is a subject which we don’t actually understand very well, and a person won’t need it in life unless in a very difficult situation. That is my idea of university: where you can spend three or four years acquiring a certain way of thinking, on a subject which you may not ever come across later in life.

We are living in the middle of a knowledge revolution. The ways knowledge is acquired, used, and spread are changing. Everyone is feeling that when we talk about the Internet, the library, etc., we don’t know what the outcome is going to be. University was part of a fantastic system of knowledge management: libraries, footnotes, journals, exchanges, accreditation, which has been in place quite a long time. Now we wonder whether the university, with its traditional ways of organising knowledge, can bring that into the new combinations that are now being made.

On the one hand we have a knowledge revolution which constantly makes the current wave of knowledge outdated, albeit sometimes in the form of planned obsolescence. University libraries have had trouble coping with this because they have to spend much more money on modern ways of data retrieval and they couldn’t maintain their old collections. Under these circumstances, the obvious answer is to specialise.

The second issue is that the future is no longer what it used to be. I was a member of the Scientific Council for Government, whose legal task it is to do studies on the future. But nobody wants to do that anymore. We could make different scenarios like the Global Business Network does, and Shell and Glaxo-Wellcome used to, but even then, if you identify the driving forces and posit certain events in history and say, “what do they mean to me,” it is still difficult.

The future is unknown and has many surprises in store, so how do we prepare for this? We can try to outsmart it, but we know that doesn’t work. For this reason, universities are finding it difficult to invest for the long term. But we have stumbled upon a strategy: building up resilience.

Resilience doesn’t reside in unity but a free society: resilience located in conflict and in institutionalised ways of dealing with conflict. Competition of the market, hearing both parties in the law and government, opposition in politics and different views on the truth on scientific and university work. That is a heritage which I think is quite important.

We have to invest in diversity and then pragmatically select the priorities that seem best. I think that part of the discussion about the American versus European model that Peter Scott presented to us is about what the selection criteria can be.

Points from the Discussion

The discussion has been summarised to highlight key points. Every attempt has been made to reflect the spirit of the debate. Where it is helpful, contributors to the debate have been identified.

Why “think European”?

Beyond imparting mere professional competence, universities need to fulfil their obligations in the cultural-educational field of a nation, region or continent: that’s why Europe needs universities and the Chinese need universities. There is an enormous need in a united Europe for people who can think and act European, and (perhaps more importantly) emotionally feel they are Europeans.

Globalisation and the emergent knowledge economy have put universities at the very heart of the change that’s happening in modern society as the producers of ideas. At the same time, globalisation is moving with such momentum and speed that no one is in control. But we can try to find our own solutions to these challenges, rather than have one global “right answer”.

Universities need fresh approaches

Universities across Europe are taking on increasing numbers of students, due to need for highly-educated graduates and (in some cases) government encouragement of higher education. In order to reach government enrolment targets and answer funding challenges, universities need new target groups, e.g. life-long learning; new approaches, e.g. new technologies and smart use of
IT capabilities; and to look for fresh approaches to cooperation of state universities with the private sector. As one participant put it, "within not too many years our old-fashioned companies won't survive unless they go into mergers, and I think the same is true for universities."

**Democratisation of higher education**

According to a recent report on European higher education, about 16% of people aged 50-54 are graduates. Among people aged 40-44, the figure is 20%. For 30-34-year-olds it is 24%: this is a tremendous success. Every nation, where you define it in the European way, needs a certain volume of educated people, and we need institutions to do that. But the Humboldt University model, for example, was conceived for a very small fraction of the population, and is geared toward the production of academics, scientists etc. As more of the population enters university, their requirements and expectations will not fit this model, and indeed university degrees may lose their value if everyone has one. Is there a limit to how many people can go to university or do we carry on?

The consensus was: yes, there is an upper limit, but we are not sure where it is. Historically, there have been times when we have asked the same question, but we have always transcended those limits, and there are powerful arguments for carrying on towards mass education. Among other things, the level of educational achievement is an important determinant of people’s status and life chances; issues of gender, race, or social class are less important than how much education they have had. To have a say over where you end up, you have to study at university. In the extent to which you exclude people from universities you are denying certain democratic rights.

**The role of universities**

Precisely because we are a knowledge-rich society, all kinds of organisations have to use knowledge, so universities are no longer so special. So do we need “idea factories”, and are universities the best ones to supervise or control the process?

If universities are “truth-orientated,” research is the truth that governs our teaching. But the other hand research can play only an advertising role in attracting students. The mood among employers now is: “thank you for the level of education, but it is up to the individuals to use the knowledge in any direction.”

Universities must teach professional competence (e.g. a surgeon must know anatomy), but more important for most graduates are the tools to cope with change. Students must be able to approach new challenges, and should be confronted with research problems whilst at university. Similarly, students should learn to cross intellectual borders and learn to solve interdisciplinary and environmental problems, and not be pinned down to one discipline. Even the old-fashioned state universities in Germany are being made to abolish the restrictive boundaries of faculties as much as possible.
Session II: How Should Universities Use Technology?

Chair: Max Huber  
Professor of Physics, Bonn University, and Managing Director of the Institute for Theoretical Nuclear Physics  

First, a personal tribute Lord Weidenfeld: it is largely due to his enthusiasm that the seven Universities that so far form the Europaeum network are particularly concerned with borderless education, international co-operation in research and teaching and international exchange of students and professors. It is my firm belief that in the years to come, networks like the Europaeum will be even more necessary than they have been in the past.

We are all aware that we live in a time of rapid innovation, especially in the field of information technology: this affects all segments of life, and the field of education in particular. It is necessary to change aspects of what we do, and fascinating to see how it happens, as learning becomes more defined – and possibly improved – by e-learning and tailored teaching. The new opportunities offer new challenges, which will now be discussed.

There are of course limitations to e-learning. In the following we will have a few experts to introduce aspects of those new technologies.

Pier Ugo Calzolari  
Professor of Electronics and Rector, University of Bologna  

New perspectives are opened to the Universities by e-learning. Information and communication technologies (ICT) have already firmly entered into fields considered incompatible with “computer” technology a few years ago, like photography. The leading and unifying factor is digital coding of information, which allows us to transfer, store, mix and manage the information produced at a source that is different but of the same nature; that is, computers. This is the phenomenon often referred to as multi-media. A further, and really revolutionary, offshoot has been produced by two events. The first is the simultaneous transmission to the user of both information and the software tools needed to use it. Second, the possibility of using these tools on any computer, i.e. platform independence.

The general feeling is that ICT is potentially able to modify the style of higher education by producing quality results and reducing costs. So far, trials have generated enthusiasm, but scepticism as well. A clear reproduction of a well-known natural conservative principle has also been observed: the clear trend has been to maintain traditional organisational schemes and mental attitudes, even in a completely new technological context. For example, the unity of time and space in education has been assumed in the lesson plans for courses which are by nature used by students in different ways. This mimetic disposition leads to ignoring some other peculiar educational potentialities of the information and communication technologies. For example, the substitution of the traditional “synchronist” style in connection with the learner and the knowledge source with a more flexible, “asynchronous” way, where the selection of a personalised learning path fits a specific learning attitude or paradigm.

The history of the incorporation of ICT into our educational scenery is a long list of problems and uncertainties. The most obvious change is the shift of educational focus from the lecturer to the learner, as teachers are asked to assume the role of a tutor who intervenes according to the specific needs, proficiencies and learning styles of students.

The educational focus has shifted from the lecturer to the learner, as teachers become tutors who intervene according to the specific needs of students.

Large economical and intellectual investments are necessary to overcome the threshold for real and permanent advantage from the deployment of such educational systems. Academics need almost to be “re-socialised” to become accustomed to the structural shifts of the new system. Their capacity to adapt to these changes will be the main determining factor in the success of future programmes.

Distance learning is often presented as an alternative to traditional face-to-face education, but even traditional courses can benefit from the availability of net-based resources. Is so called dual-delivery a solution for the traditional University? (The term dual delivery means a system where a course can be attended in a traditional way, in a classroom, or through accessing suitable materials on the Internet.) One bad experience, using bad technology, or using good technology poorly, can have a once-bitten, twice-shy effect, but the new generation of communication technologies really do work well.

Even universities which want to remain traditional may be able to embrace aspects of ICT as it enables them to cope with the need for integration and diversification. It doesn’t need to be all “cyberlearning” – simple teleconferencing
and library software can improve the quality of instruction at the most conservative institutions.

Firoz Kaderali
Professor of Electrical Engineering, Fern University, Hagen

My topic is straightforward: strategies for exploiting the potential for new media, particularly for Open Universities. In Germany we have just started a two-year project to evaluate, develop and (hopefully) introduce a new Open University. Besides providing an excellent education, one of the goals of the project is to give German universities a competitive edge by learning how to make use of all the technological possibilities around us.

There are three questions that Universities have to answer when they want to use new media; mostly they don't realise they have these three tasks to accomplish. First is how to administer the working of new media, known as "e-learning platforms." The second is how to go about creating content. The third is the problem of content in tutoring.

In Europe, my experience is that content providers, University tutors, authors and so on do not realise that they need a platform at all. They come up with different programmes for each environment, reinvent the wheel several times, and a lot of effort is wasted.

In Europe, content providers, University tutors etc come up with different programmes for each environment, reinvent the wheel several times, and a lot of effort is wasted

If you look around, you have about 250 platforms to choose from. You can comparison-shop on the basis of 300-400 criteria before you decide what exactly you want to do, but this is ridiculously time-consuming. I think the Universities have to identify their individual relevant criteria. The one thing to keep in mind is that the most difficult design element for any platform is administration: handling students, supporting staff, managing publications, etc. Bearing that in mind, what system attributes are most important to you? Which systems offer solutions for those specific problems?

At the macro-level, what kind of general approach does your university want to take? A commercial solution, your own development, open-source software, or an application service provider (where either you have a commercial solution partner who offers the service for teaching the network, or you have an open-source partner who offers a similar package with open applications)?

Commercial, off-the-shelf systems are relatively cost-efficient to purchase, indeed very cheap at present, and have many functionalities. The drawback is that the software determines how you can teach. Often you will find special functionalities are missing, and the system is not flexible because the source code is not available, meaning you cannot change the system to reflect your needs, and licensing agreements require you to stay within the commercially available options.

Off-the-shelf systems are relatively cost-efficient to purchase and have many functionalities, but the software determines how you can teach.

The question, also, of whether you can also integrate the commercial solution into your IT infrastructure is a difficult problem to solve. This is one of the reasons many universities, professors, teachers, and tutors develop own systems. They get a customised solution: a business model can exactly be met. They can make a system that will go nicely with existing infrastructure and can be changed around as necessary. On the other hand, it is expensive and often it is not quite professional-grade, because it was not created by professionals.

The third possibility is to use Open Source, which is a low-cost alternative. Open Source is freely available programme code, produced from a cooperative ethos. The software is flexible and extendable, as it does not usually have restrictive licensing agreements. You can make use of existing standards and add in as many bells and whistles as you like, but you do have to give your programme developments back to the shared programming pool. With such a system, you will not have proper professional commercial support and implementation, but much can be done with little, making it a good solution for Universities who do not have funding.

The last solution is the Internet solution, which allows you to concentrate on content because you do not need any hardware or any software - the application service provider offers you all that. The drawbacks to this approach are that you will be heavily dependent on service providers, you have a necessarily limited business model, and you cannot customise the system.

At Fern University we have chosen the second solution. We have currently two platforms and one assignment system, all in operation with research projects. We are now looking at developing our own platform. The systems we are currently using are available as open-source systems at www.campussource.de. This website is part of an
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initiative funded by the German Ministry of Education - the government realises that every university in Germany (not to mention Northern Australia) would potentially be interested in using cheap, high-quality, functional e-learning tools. The aim of this initiative is to set up a cooperative process for the development of software tools and infrastructure for e-learning at Universities; currently six such platforms are available. If you or your university decide to try such a platform, have a look there.

In Germany we have a large project, MBF, dedicated to major new e-learning initiatives. More than €60 million a year are given out and there are more than a hundred projects running at the moment. At the last check, 8 projects have chosen platforms from the CampusSource initiative, 6 chose commercial platforms, and 50 have not made a decision. This particular platform we developed at my department is an open-source platform available on Campus Source.

Content creation is very expensive, but digital education content offers considerable value. The real difficulty is that the altering process is very complex; you need special authoring tools and skills, authors and designers, programmers and so on. The consequence is that the process is expensive and time-consuming; so it makes sense to share content and achieve economies of scale. But of course not everyone would be willing to put their special content into a common pool. In any case, modular design of course material is important, as it facilitates the reuse of expensive materials. It is also good to have a large student body, to keep cost per student low.

There are three approaches to content: one is in-house/own development, the second is corporate development, and the third is open content. A few technical aspects of content creation: you must be independent from media tools; your learning material must be interoperable, meaning you must be able to change from one place to another, so different students can use it on different home systems. You must separate content, structure and layout into meta-data, and different sorts of didactical structuring must be supported. However, most commercial multimedia packages share an important limitation. XML is one of the languages which is used as a technical basis standard for such material, but it is not a uniform standard – we have two standards currently in use in Europe.

What does Fern University do about content? Our strategy is to prioritise high-quality content, which cannot be stolen as it is not portable. It is, however, expensive to acquire: our flagship multimedia CD cost about €70,000 to develop.

About 100 universities are cooperating in a strategy to share content between project partners, and each project has at least four partners: content is created and available to all partners involved in the project. Strategy and responsibility for long-term usage is fixed before the project is started.

Another approach is open content, for example MIT's "open courseware" programme, where MIT teaching material is available on the web for all non-commercial usage. MIT faculties retain ownership, and they retain intellectual property rights. The funding they require is $7.5m to $10m per year. Their goal is to have 500 courses up and running by September 2003. The obvious question is, if you can get content on the network free of charge, why prepare your own content? I do not know how this system will function in the future.

Technology in the field of e-learning is rapidly changing. I have been looking at it for 8 years, and every few months we have a big new surprise. As such, to have any longevity, investments must be as neutral (and mutable) as possible. If you want to be on the safe side, stick with standards, but I recommend that you cooperate and use open source product as much as possible.

The possibilities of e-learning extend beyond simple coursework delivery, of course. Even the most technophobic among us is aware that advances in communication technologies, especially the Internet and mobile wireless technology, facilitate nearly instantaneous collaboration across vast distances. Some services have already become an integral part of research and teaching, for example: email, news groups and the World Wide Web. But there is more to come, as communication and computing devices are becoming smaller, more powerful and cheaper. On campus, Internet technology can mean flexibility, mobility – it is not unrealistic to think that soon students will expect to be able to use laptops and PDA’s to do research in a digital library while sitting on the cafeteria steps. But this will require infrastructure, including functional networks and a good system of wireless access points.

Soon students will expect to be able to use laptops and PDA’s to do research in a digital library while sitting on the cafeteria steps

For a university, the obvious communication scenarios are student to student, student to professor, student to tutor, and student to administration. Thinking in these terms, you can imagine what sort of communication environment is necessary for the best exchange of ideas. For the purposes of education, you can divide these groups into synchronous and asynchronous groups ("asynchronous" means not everybody is there at the same time). Synchronous learning is an easier method for universities because the effort is somewhat unified – there are specific times that people must be there and work. Asynchronous learning is time-consuming and expensive for the
university to develop. However, from a student’s point of view, it is a cheap education (in the favourable sense), because materials are always available; they can have “normal” jobs and study whenever it is possible for them. Using open content for courses, I think that the quality of tutoring will become a major criterion for universities in the future – if content is standard, universities will differentiate themselves by the quality of their support for students.

**Discussant**

**Richard Huggins**  
*Senior Lecturer in Politics, Oxford Brookes University*

I come from Oxford Brookes, one of Britain’s new universities, in which discussions have been different from those in today’s sessions. We have less scope to consider some of the issues that have been focused on today. We have been asked deliver information technology, very rapidly, to support lifelong learning and professional development, rather than principally undergraduate and postgraduate work.

One thing that occurred to me throughout the talks today is that we have to bear in mind that what matters is the type of ICT skills that our student and client base will have when they arrive at the university, or wherever else they pick up their courses. We have noticed in our institutions that a lot of students are arriving with very significantly developed IT skills, which are often way beyond some of the things that we would like to be able to do. What are the expectations of students, what are their skills when they arrive? What would we like graduates to go out with? These discussions have huge implications for restructuring and organisation: how do we know students have the necessary skills, and how do we know our staff and colleagues have the skills to get information to students – let alone deliver support to them?

**What matters is the type of ICT skills that our student and client base will have when they arrive at the university, or wherever else they pick up their courses**

Another thought is the reality of the borderless university. Two years ago, when I was giving a paper on distance learning and ICT at the University of Wales, a colleague from an Australian University revealed to me that she had her email monitored 24 hours a day to make sure she was returning support to students who were being distance-taught across Australia.

I think that for some of us in Higher Education, discussions of “IT” are much more about the nature of delivery, access and support, than discussing the idea of having a university in the 21st Century. It is very important to keep a focus on student and staff experience when using ICT.

That is why the Europaeum is completing a survey on how ICT is used in universities and how staff and students feel about it – we are still in the very early stages, though.

I would like to stress the preliminary nature of these findings; we still need to increase the number of respondents and we will be interrogating the information more. These are just quick responses at this stage.

So far, our results indicate that student use of the Internet (and access in general) is not a problem, but they are using electronic resources for entertainment or personal interest. Only 9% of students we questioned use the Internet for at least 1 hour a day to retrieve course or lecture materials.

This is not a huge surprise, but it does tell us that we have to think very carefully how students use online and electronic materials – we must consider the differences between their use and our use of the Internet.

**We have to think very carefully how students use online and electronic materials – we must consider the differences between their use and our use of the Internet**

According to our student respondents, 47% of lecturers are “using online resources” (which could, of course, be interpreted in a number of ways). At any rate, it is an encouraging figure, but it shows there is a long way to go. 87% of students would like official course web pages to support class learning – and this seems to be a sensible idea, as it would give students access to materials in addition to the ones that they might now get. So far, very few students have direct computer-assisted assessment, which may or may not be a good thing.

There is a mixed review of ICT’s impact on teaching quality in the institutions of the Europaeum. Students say it reduces face-to-face contact, but staff say it doesn’t. Students appear unsure about the impact of ICT use on the quality of their own learning, and learning for all students. Even so, 54% of students would like online tutorials.

Finally, the staff perspective: 36% of staff say they use computer presentations in their lectures, and 55% of staff use online resources in their lectures (maybe the students are not paying close attention); 15% of staff use online resources in
their tutorials; and 45% of staff would like to know about potential benefits of more ICT.

Half of the staff think that the ICT hardware in their department is good, which again is a “half full, half empty” type of position; you could see that as good in some ways. 23% of staff assess the integration of IT in their courses as excellent or good – meaning about 75% don’t. 44% of staff would like to use more ICT in their teaching.

Points from the Discussion
The discussion has been summarised to highlight key points. Every attempt has been made to reflect the spirit of the debate. Where it is helpful, contributors to the debate have been identified.

Cooperation and ICT
Professor Kaderali mentioned one of the underlying aims for his €60m project was for German universities to gain a competitive edge, and this fits in squarely with what the Sorbonne, Bologna and Prague declarations hint at (they use a slightly different word, saying that universities must become “attractive,” particularly in relation to American universities). But in his presentation, Professor Kaderali said that when moving into ICT, cooperation is fundamental – we must not “reinvent the wheel.” How can we resolve this tension?

Professor Kaderali: When speaking about competition, the German government was spending €60m with a clear goal, i.e. to create a good IT platform. The other part of it was that I was trying to show where the competition was within the ICT field and how to survive against the opposition. In the case of electronic platforms, the competition is between commercial platforms and platforms being developed internally or by open source. There are opportunities here and a question of who is going to win.

The second part is content. It is not clear what is going to happen with content, when certain groups come together. If a university adopts that approach, it must be sure that the phenomenon of “not invented here” does not come in. Not whole lectures, but certain pieces of lectures should be distributed around. At present, the universities I speak to feel that they should have their own content, because the content is very good at the moment. But if we pool our resources, the only competition will be in how the content is delivered.

Content and competitiveness
Professor Scott said that we must not bow to being driven by the market; universities are not “products” for sale. Clearly we would all agree with that. But then we have this notion of competitiveness.

You are competitive when you have some kind of exclusivity: when you can produce something quicker or cheaper, and cannot be copied. For example, MIT have a grant to make all their programme material free on the Internet. They are throwing a fantastic challenge to all leading universities because they are saying, “you can have our materials for free, but you will still need us to tell you how to use them.” But perhaps this is in itself a devious form of competition: if MIT decides to put in everything in to the network free of charge, their strategy may be to discourage other universities from developing their own content. There should still be competition and we should not give up straight away.

Under some circumstances, openness will certainly not harm competitiveness. A recent graduate suggested that newsgroups were an underexploited area which would be especially helpful for postgraduate researchers, as they facilitate communication across universities. Newsgroups require effort to set up, but the graduate felt that students would be happy to maintain their own groups, once operational.

In another vein, European universities can add value by joining efforts, creating common databases, common lecture materials, joining efforts or co-operating in research areas. Examples include the European Cultural Atlas Initiative and various collaborative programmes to teach European law.

Converting to e-learning
If teachers change their lectures into e-courses, it will require an enormous effort to write everything down, set up lessons, etc. Participants questioned the efficiency of this, as it requires time, energy and money, which most lecturers and departments don’t have. Furthermore, we still have to learn how to teach with these media: how can an individual approach be maintained with e-teaching?

In the view of Professor Kaderali, it need not be a question of all-or-nothing. Rather, lecturers must ask themselves whether they can use new media to teach better than they can at present. In European Law, for example, online resources have quickly become indispensable as a source for references, but they are not a substitute for lectures. Every subject can find some aspect of e-technology to help, but of course the possibility to use the technologies depends on the areas you work in.

Rather than trying to supersede books, we can use the Internet to make better books. For example, you can write a text book, and put it on the web for 2-3 years before printing it, making the material available while leaving room for improvement before final publication.

Content versus delivery
Figures presented by Professor Huggins corresponded broadly to the experience at other universities. Often, the quality of the content had
an impact on the attitude towards the specific means of incorporating ICT into teaching.

For example, in the humanities, even language can be part of the content. You can distinguish between content and means of conveying the certain content, but even two colleagues in the same department, delivering the same material in the same kind of classroom, can have vastly different reactions (and uptake) from their students.

The content itself is like textbooks: certain authorities may write their own unique guides, but not every lecture needs a tailor-made set of readings. It is not a question of losing your individuality, but of making use of the available resources.

Analytically speaking, the best use of these new data-management tools would be to replace kinds of learning which do not need discussion, but only the acquisition of knowledge, e.g. databases, historical censuses, political surveys, aerial photography, and documents which would normally only be available in local libraries.

**Content versus communication**

A recent graduate noted that students use the web for personal interest rather than course work. The way they use their mobile phones is quite similar, using text messages for leisure, not to discuss coursework or to arrange scientific meetings in the evenings.

Perhaps the communication aspect of technology is more important than replacing books with CD-ROMs and large application servers provided with software; ICT seems suited to facilitate communication more than access to textbooks or other materials. If it is really so expensive that MIT has to pay US$5- to $10m to create adequate content, then content may not be the best investment.

**E-learning and interaction**

E-learning offers interesting possibilities for students to interact as part of the course. The Internet can create space for students to interact around the issues which teachers have raised, and even interact with students in another university with tools like webcams.

At the same time, there were fears that universities may lose their “culture of spoken language.” Students may paradoxically become less able to interact because they may come to accept the authority of something written on a screen, as opposed to having real-time dialogue. Without interaction, we may develop a class division in society, with a large section of the population unable to debate.

**E-learning and sense of community**

Universities have developed as marvellous communities of teaching. Can screens be a tool for making a good community?

On the other hand, in the case of lifelong learning, students might say they belong to other communities, and need universities' help and support to carry the relevant learning into their communities, for example healthcare or youth workers. Universities should not feel that they exist on a level above their neighbours; they need to support those learning communities that require their help. Although they do have a special atmosphere, at no point should universities form exclusive communities that shut out others.
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How are Universities from Central and Eastern Europe to respond to the new challenges? In a nutshell, I would dare say by assuming their own future proudly and in their own way, by refusing charity and by opposing the lurking brain drain, especially to the aggressively-recruiting USA.

To launch this debate let me make two or three observations stemming from my own experience in my younger days. I had the opportunity in the '70s to work in the field of consumption economics with a (then) very powerful Soviet academic. In the early '80s I was responsible for a very ambitious, but now very outdated, research programme devoted to the flow of funds and accounting systems in several planned economies. We were at that time in very close contact with Soviet economist and planners, and their colleagues in the German Democratic Republic, Czechoslovakia and Poland. We got a strong feeling of the collapse of the centrally planned system, but nobody would have dreamt it would have come around in the way it did in the last years of the 80's. We thought that it would happen, as is experienced in Japan now, with monetary collapse bringing about periods of stagnation and insecurity in the economy of the political system.

I tell you all that to show that I have a little experience with today's subject.

What does this experience tell me? I would say something about the boundaries of Europe. At the present time, we heard yesterday, we are somehow thinking of Europe as a European Union on one hand and candidates to membership in the European Union on the other. That excludes a couple of European Countries and probably one of the most important – the Russian Federation. Nobody wants Russia to join the EU during our lifetime. But certainly, academically and culturally it was clearly said yesterday: Russia is part of Europe.

But in regards to higher education, we must see beyond this and bring about real partnerships between Universities all over Europe – because what we most need to be aware of is the brain drain out of Eastern Europe, out of Russia. Academic exchange, in my view, is not a one-way channel from the East to the West. It must be a two-way road, with student and faculty exchange. Then there is the problem of infrastructure. To make an exchange possible we have to imagine in Europe some sort of a plan, maybe the Humboldt Plan, to enable the universities of middle Europe and Russia to catch up with our universities in the West.

We all need to be aware of the brain drain out of Eastern Europe, out of Russia – academic exchange is not a one-way channel from the East to the West.

There cannot be any meaningful competition between Eastern and Western universities, let alone any benchmarking or quality assessment, as long as the available infrastructures are not comparable. In this very university, with which I had the good fortune to work in the 80's, it was very difficult for our Eastern European colleagues to live up to the expectations we had of them to gather large databases, because the main concern of our colleagues was their leaking roof.

Within the discussion of the prospects for new membership countries, university matters have not yet been properly assessed or addressed, compared to the bargaining over labour, freedom of movement and agriculture. Universities are treated not in terms of a European programme, but in terms of infrastructure.

And with that, I turn the floor over to Professor Mach.

Zdzisław Mach
Director, Centre for European Studies, Jagiellonian University, Krakow

I am pleased to address such a distinguished audience. I would like to share with you a few thoughts on the current situation in the region east of Berlin. Let me first say that the Universities of Eastern and Central Europe are in search of new identities in their societies, a new role for universities to play in Europe and in the global context. They want not only to fulfil the role of Research and Education centres, but also something which has not been done for generations: cooperation with industries and non-academic public institutions. Some years ago there was a debate initiated by the European Union's project on ‘institution building’. Nobody knew
what this was, of course, but it was an attempt to cooperate with non-academic institutions in the region and it worked well. But it was a major challenge for the Universities, something they were not used to doing. There was a search for identity; a desire to maintain what was good of the tradition and also to respond to new challenges and the need to change.

A lot of myths have been circulating about the situation of academia in Eastern Europe. First, there is a myth of total isolation, which was in fact not so complete. It varied from country to country, but Hungarian and Polish Universities, for example, were never totally isolated. Czechoslovakia was in the worst position after 1968, but before it was more flexible and able to keep in touch with Western Europe and the United States. But of course total freedom simply didn’t exist. There is also a myth of total backwardness: people from the region like to believe, especially in the natural sciences, that the working class excellence was there, but that natural science suffered from structural disability especially concerning equipment. In many ways social science and the humanities were in a better position, contrary to the popular belief that they were confined to Marxism.

**We must move beyond the myths of total isolation, total backwardness and social sciences locked into Marxism in Soviet Europe**

I think a lot of what was believed about the academic research situation of the Central and Eastern European universities was not true. Before 1989 nothing really was expected from an academic who took part in a conference in the West, so everything was received with enthusiasm. Westerners were pleased, overjoyed to find out they had a colleague from Eastern Europe, who was able to speak their language or have a knowledge of the basic literature. So it was very easy in a way to get an enthusiastic response.

After 1989, normality slowly came and, with that, normal criteria of quality began to be applied, which often resulted in disappointment and frustration. People said they no longer liked us: everyone had been positive about what we had done and suddenly there was this new criticism. There was a strong sense of the need of innovation. This was symbolised in a slogan which my own university chose, the slogan was “our future has a great tradition”. Of course the tradition was there, but what we wanted to emphasise was that we had a great future.

There is still a big difference between humanities and natural science. Hard science departments still do lack equipment, which often leads to different problems and questions being asked. One of my relatives – a chemist – followed me in a period of study at Oxford. I went there and for me it was a very positive time. As a sociologist, I came away enthusiastic, but he was devastated. He said that Oxford was not just ahead of us, they were doing completely different things. So he quit, and opened a jewellery shop instead. I believe there are many people like that in the field of science; they wouldn’t be able to cope or compete in a different world.

In the humanities, contrary to what people thought, it was not just Marxism. Isolation was never compete and because relatively little money is needed for social science, sociology, archaeology and history developed quite well. However, after 1989, some new vocabulary was incorporated and some new questions were asked: issues like cultural diversity and political correctness appeared. New ideas and thoughts... and to our surprise, Marxism, which was completely discredited in Eastern Europe, was not so completely discredited in the West. So of course there were some curious debates on the value of Marxism between Eastern and Western Scholars, which I happened to witness.

One of the strengths of Central Eastern Europe in social science is the fact the whole region is like a social laboratory. Trauma and transition create magnificent opportunities for social science; many Sociologist colleagues from the United States and Western Europe have already been attracted by that and come to the East to study what is happening there.

A lot of change has been introduced within the Universities themselves since 1989. Officers like directors, deans and heads of departments are elected. New curriculum has been introduced: European studies which did not exist before, and more flexible ways of teaching. There are careers offices that students can use to combat unemployment – internationalisation is a big thing. Universities of the region benefited greatly from European Union programmes.

The Tempest programme really made the big change; in my University it is really visible. I think most Polish, Hungarian, Czech, Slovak, Romanian universities have benefited from equipment, teacher training, and student exchange. Now Socrates covers the region as well, but there is an ambiguity about it because there is a financial problem with Socrates, with all those bureaucracies and delays which are irritating for the Western Universities. Eastern Universities are not only irritating but often make the exchange completely impossible. The research Fifth Framework Programme is also valuable for Eastern Central Universities and it is a separate issue to what extent they can take part in it.

One great change is the introduction of tuition for students and the development of private higher education institutions, and competition. At least in
Poland the number of students has tripled, but two-thirds of those students pay for their education.

The universities are struggling financially. Maintaining the tradition of a relationship between professor and student, quality of teaching, and intensive teaching on one hand, responding to the needs of mass education on the other is very difficult. One of the strengths of the best Universities in Europe is very intensive teaching; many contact hours, fewer students per professor. Now this has gone. In order to cope financially, professors also have to look for additional jobs. This is one of the biggest problems we have: staff work extra hours, and have more than one job. Professors in the broad sense can still be employed, and can make a salary equivalent to a German or an American salary, but have to work three of four times more.

What can we contribute with our different experience, our dimensional social transition and the social situation it creates? For many students this is an attractive thing, and is why we can open courses for international students in such fields as social science, European Studies and medicine. The social sciences and humanities are preoccupied with the issues of cultural diversity, minorities and the change from imposed uniformity to reconstruction of diversity, memory, continuity and change. For European Studies in Eastern Europe, from the Urals to the Atlantic is European: our “European Studies” programmes cover the whole of Europe with more diversity and more richness: in the search for a common ground, heritage creates a new perspective. I believe this because it happens to be my field, of course, but European Studies seen from the perspective of Eastern Europe is richer and more interesting than if seen only from the perspective of the European Union. This allows us to look for new interpretation: what is Europe, what is its heritage, what are European values? There is a gap in the historical and social backgrounds to the contributions.

What is needed to bridge this? More symmetry in exchange: academic exchange has to be made easier, including financially easier. For example, the Temple III programme excludes Central Europe. It is possible for European Union Universities to co-operate with the former Soviet Union, but Central European Universities cannot participate in this, so instead of building bridges we are maintaining the old gaps and isolations. More information about achievements and quality and also social economic realities is needed: most students and staff contemplating visiting Central European regions know next to nothing about the social reality and this prevents them from accepting many invitations and suggestions, making exchange difficult. The East knows the West better than the West knows the East. The mental distance is really huge. If you look at the map, Poland is only a couple of hours’ drive from Berlin, yet the mental division is still there and I think this needs to be changed.

The East knows the West better than the West knows the East

In practical terms it might be a very good idea to do more to incorporate Central Eastern European Universities into large research consortiums. For instance, with the Sixth Framework Programme it has been the experience that in order to have a chance in the competition you really need to create a large consortium. Central Eastern Universities do not have this potential, but they may contribute to existing consortia and become involved members of established research circles.

Another practical thing to contemplate would be more joint courses, joint degrees, and double degrees to bring Central European Universities in Europe to the teaching activities of Europe. A lot has been done thanks to Socrates and prior to that Temple: courses offering joint credit do exist and do work very well. Some experiments in this direction with degree courses have been successful and should be developed further.

Jan Sokol
Professor of Education, Charles University, Prague

My points may be parallel to those of Professor Mach. I first of all would like to stress the depth and vigour of the impact that changes after 1989 have had, which is often underestimated in the West. Even here on the territory of the former GDR you can hardly appreciate the hardships that came upon the heads of citizens. First there was this huge isolation, for example the famous oil shock of the 70’s came upon us after the change. Being small and heavily focused on foreign export trade, we had to re-orientate our foreign trade from an 80% Eastern market to the West in 3 years, because the East ceased to be a commercial partner. There was the negative side of freedom, the rise of criminality, which surprised the Eastern citizens who were not prepared. Other things, like violence on the TV, pornography in all shapes, etc were a shock. And of course the phenomenon of unemployment, which was unknown before.

I would like to list some achievements of the reforms I see as most important to Higher Education. First the legal reforms: the achievement of autonomy, freedom and self-government for universities. There is in most countries a movement to separate the universities from the state. Since 1998 universities are not state universities, but governed by independent boards. There are a lot of new regional universities, the introduction of a credit point system and the
division of study programmes into Bachelor, Master and PhD. This is an important move in accordance with the Sorbonne and Bologna declarations; a very deep change in events, partly de facto and partly legal. For example, in language education: there has traditionally been foreign language education in general, but it had to be re-oriented. In 1989 there was obligatory Russian education, so the first foreign language was always Russian. You can imagine what it was like to retrain and find teachers for the other foreign languages! But I was surprised how swiftly this went: after four or five years we are able to require other languages in our entry exams.

In the Czech Republic, we have a new method of accreditation. For university programmes there is an independent accreditation board of some 20-30 reading scholars, domestic and foreign, who have to approve every old and new university programme. An important change: a more or less efficient grant system has been introduced for financing for science. I mentioned the Sorbonne and Bologna declarations, which I see as very important steps for a European future for higher education, which require interdisciplinary and student and staff mobility. We have set a goal that each student will spend at least one semester in another country. This is an ambitious but worthwhile goal.

Another important challenge is the increase in the number of students, which has been mentioned by Professor Mach. It is very similar in most Central and East European countries and, it should be said, has happened for the most part without any investment. Contrast this with two-tier Universities in Western Europe in the 60s and 70s, which received huge investment support. Nothing like this happened in my country so you can imagine how crowded the university buildings and classrooms are.

Therefore an important reform has been the introduction of a sort of institutionalised norm financing. In most countries the financing depends upon the number of students. In the Czech Republic the state subsidy per student per year is something like $2,000 and this is the budget of the university, out of which all expenses must be paid. The scheme has considerable impact and it helps greatly to increase the number of students.

The non-financial. There is this tension between research and teaching, which is not a specifically East European problem, but which has particular resonance in Eastern Europe. We have got, of course, excellent scientists and researchers, but very often at the expense of their teaching engagement. Elsewhere people who are teaching don’t have time for any individual research. This is a deep and unsolved problem. It could be argued that you have to separate research from teaching, but I think this would be a dangerous idea in view of our history.

An important change has happened as many countries have revised the relationship between teaching and research. In communist times part of the limitation of academic freedom was the conscious goal of separating teaching and research, because in the research institutions, you had to have a certain freedom to make research possible. That is why the government economists tried to keep research out of the universities. It was not only a strategic mistake, but one which continues to have consequences for us. The traces of it you can see in all East European Countries, including Russia, and it is not so simple to overcome them. I would warn every Western visitor against taking at face value the complaints of one party against the other. If you visit a university you can never hear a good word about the Institution of the Academy of Science. If you visit the Academy of Science you will not hear a good word about the universities. It depends mostly upon which institution you happen to be visiting. You must have a deeper insight to judge who is the bearer of true academic quality and excellence.

*It could be argued that you have to separate research from teaching, but this would be a dangerous idea*

Another important point is academic rigidity. Universities are conservative institutions, and they have overcome many periods of instability thanks to their conservatism. On the other hand, social change is leading to 40% of an age cohort entering university education in most of Eastern Europe. These students cannot be educated as professional academics as in the past; universities have to offer more flexible programmes. They have, in my opinion, to reflect their students’ needs and provide education in much more practical applications. This has been usual in the European tradition.

Another important tension is between students’ preferences and the choice or state of job opportunities. In most Eastern European countries, students have a clear-cut preference for humanities, whereas the top opportunities are mostly in technical disciplines. Should we regulate this, or should we indulge the students’ preferences with no regard to the possibilities of finding a job? This is another great problem.

The problems of backward laboratory equipment and libraries have been mentioned. We have got in Prague this huge, formerly excellent, university library for everything up to 1939. Whatever you need for scientific literature up to 1939 it has everything. After that it’s very poor, and since the 70’s there is practically nothing in humanities. This is a gap that cannot be bridged without massive support.
I mentioned, of course, the problems of financing. There is the unanswered question of paid and unpaid university education. In some countries it has been declared completely free, which seems very liberal and clever, but has led in many countries to a deep hollowing out of traditional universities. Teachers of public universities accepted part-time jobs at the private universities paying much better, so the university education at the public institutions sometimes suffered. Now, we are talking about tuition fees is going on, and in the Czech Republic the development has been a lot slower. There have been private universities only since 1998. In a small number of public universities students that study longer than the normal study time have to pay modest tuition fees. Tuition is socially considerate. I would like to draw your attention to the present-day situation where students do not pay anything, but must pay their own living expenses. University is a very heavy financial burden with no support. In consequence more than two-thirds of students have part- or even full-time jobs.

A very important change has been achieved in establishing links with other academic and non-academic institutions in the country and abroad. First, of course, in the West, but in recent times, in increasing amounts, also in Eastern academic institutions. We try to support student exchange under equal conditions between Eastern countries, which in my country is particularly important in relation to Slovakia. We have an increasing number of students from Russia, Ukraine, Bosnia, Serbia and Croatia who study at Czech Universities under equal conditions as Czech students (i.e. no fees).

I am not very enthusiastic about any formal benchmarking. Exchange of students in my opinion is the most efficient way of benchmarking, because broad student and faculty exchange gives you very good feedback as to whether your teaching is on a comparable level. I think that student exchange on the Socrates model can provide the best possible benchmarking between Eastern and Western Universities. The European programmes help greatly to improve such exchange but, as my Polish colleague has mentioned, there are bureaucratic difficulties which can be lethal for our institutions. We cannot expect all students that come to study in Czech Universities to study in Czech. But programmes taught in English or other European languages require immediate and considerable investment, so we are trying to build up exchange programmes with American Universities who are able to bring money with students on the spot, without much bureaucratic hassle.

I would like to finish with a few points about what could and should be done in the European Framework. I am greatly in favour of a European University Network, I think this is an excellent idea and in fact has deep roots for us, towards our ancestors and predecessors; because the European universities up to the end of the Middle Ages established just such a European network.

Second, I think we have to vote for this European Network; we must find a positive, alternative programme, rather than merely an anti-American programme. I see no sense in allergic reactions against American university education: it leads nowhere. I was pleased that Professor Mlynik mentioned the Humboldt idea of the university as a research and educating institution, not only as professional or vocational schooling. I think this should be a very attractive alternative programme for Europe.

We must find a positive, alternative programme... I see no sense in allergic reactions against American university education: it leads nowhere

Thirdly, I mentioned the importance of young faculty and student mobility and I greatly approved when Professor Mach mentioned trying to make it more symmetrical. I think there is on our side a drawback of small languages, particularly in humanities. A programme to support translation in both directions would be very important, to help to overcome this natural language barrier between Eastern and Western universities, which I think is necessary to overcome the political division. I have mentioned the problem of larger investment in higher education, meaning investment in buildings, student housing, libraries and laboratory equipment. There, I think, Eastern Europe cannot help itself without foreign assistance.

Jürgen Schriewer
Professor of Comparative Education, Humboldt University, Berlin

As those of you who are comparative scholars know, comparing means focusing on differences with a view to deepening the analysis. I would like to highlight some differences, first of all between the challenges that European universities in general are facing and the particular challenges of Central and Eastern universities. Secondly, the differences between Central and Eastern universities at the institutional level, at the level of developmental student enrolments and in other respects. Finally, I would like to bring up differences between international models.

As to the first aspect, I would like to recall the title of the session, "How are universities from Central and East Europe responding to the new challenges?" as if the challenges are the same for all. I think there is a real difference between challenges that European universities are generally
facing. These were evoked yesterday, not least in
the presentation by Peter Scott. The necessity to
reconcile academic excellence with open access to
higher education or to reconcile, as the Humboldt
University President mentioned, the vital character
of advanced study with the no less necessary
broadening of access to higher education; the
necessity of achieving technological and economic
performance and competitiveness in the
framework of knowledge-based societies; or the
necessity of coming to terms with the increasing
globalisation of communication and research. In
addition to such general requirements, the
universities in Central and Eastern Europe are
confronted with additional challenges. They must
contribute to the restructuring of the social,
political and economic life in their respective
countries. What is at stake, further, is to achieve
scientific and technological parity with the West in
order to facilitate forthcoming EU membership of
their countries. It is also important to overcome
the heritage of isolation and to ensure intellectual
pluralism, theoretical innovation and the constant
adaptation of both content and faculty. Beyond
their socio-political role, Central and Eastern
universities must improve equipment and provide
adequate learning tools, be they libraries, access to
international literature or equipment for
laboratories.

The participation in EU research programmes
seems to produce many more difficulties. It turned
out that participation in international exchange and
communication raises no less a challenge to
Western European universities. The exchange
processes, particularly student exchange processes,
at the European level need to be much more
balanced, implying more balance in the level of
knowledge of other countries. This raises obvious
linguistic problems. These problems, which all my
predecessors have mentioned, are raised also in the
framework of exchange programmes limited to
Western universities. I am an associate member of
a team working on a programme to improve
European training and mobility of young
researchers, and I see what difficulties the
Portuguese have in attracting young scholars from
other European countries because of the language
problem.

There is also the problem of budgeting in
general in universities. In the East, this is quite a
different situation, considering the massive
expansion of higher education institutions without
the kind of investments that were made in Western
European countries from the 1960's onwards.

The second point I would like to mention is
obviously Central and Eastern European
universities do not present a homogenous entity,
they represent an enormous variety. Professor
Mach mentioned the different experiences of the
past, of isolation and of communication during the
Cold-War period, and of the different institutional
patterns which resulted. Consider the broad range
of highly specialised higher-educational
institutions which have been prevalent just in
Russia since the late 19th century. There are
differences in integration of academics and
universities in their social environments and
obviously different forms of cooperation with
Western universities. Between Charles University
in Prague and higher education institutions in
Vladivostok, the differences might be much
greater than between the Jagiellonian and Charles
University.

Against this background one certainly has to
take into account the current situation in higher
education, especially in Russia and Ukraine, which is
different from that in Central European
countries. Looking at the results of a survey from
the mid 1990s: only 8% of rectors of higher
education institutions in Russia claimed to be in "a
normal situation"; 81% judged their institutions to
be "in a state of deterioration"; and 11% had
reached a "crisis state". In addition one should
bear in mind a comparative insight, which suggests
that even the ways of perceiving and interpreting
similar challenges, as challenges, will vary in
accordance with different intellectual traditions
and collective experience. I think that all these
differences are reflected in the uneven
development of student enrolment. According to
UNESCO statistics, taking into consideration
student movement up to 1995/6: Estonia, Latvia,
Bulgaria, Hungary, Poland, and Romania showed a
modest or even considerable increase in student
enrolment since 1991. By contrast, in Russia and
Ukraine there was either a very uneven
development with an open break in 1993, or in the
case of Russia a continued decrease since the
1980's without any considerable change after

Social science analysts have even assumed, on
the basis of such a data, that the pre-war patterns
do differential involvement tend to be re-emerging,
with liberal education ideals, individual
development ideals and the concept of civil
society.

"The US model is more a kind of
projection than it is the result of a
careful comparative analysis"

To my third and last aspect. Higher education
debate all over the world repeats reference to two
models: their own, and foreign models that are
worth following. This is not new. The Humboldt
model served this purpose from end of the 19th
Century up until the World War II period. Now it
is the US model which seems to be predominant
all over the world. Yesterday I counted about 40
references to the US model, but such references as
a rule present a decontextualised vision of the
model, highly selective and removed from the original setting. "The US model" is more a kind of projection than it is the result of a careful comparative analysis. Seen against this background I wonder what impact such references had, and continue to have, in an institutional setting which has little experience of the American universities, or the complex higher education university system in the US in general.

This leads me to take up the difference between the levels of structural reform carried out across Central and Eastern European countries introducing new administrative patterns and changes from state universities and public universities and the definition of new courses of study. But the difference between paper and reality is in the realisation of such reforms, the spirit with which they were carried out, and with what meaning. I am unsure that we all agree on the meaning of references to benchmarking, the market, competition and privatisation in different countries – taking into consideration, for instance, that up to 1994, 141 private institutions emerged in Russia.

**Discussant**

**Lenka Rovná**  
*Vice Dean, Faculty of Social Sciences, Charles University, Prague*

My faculty is a little bit older; we celebrated our 10th anniversary a year ago. I would like to share our experiences with you and mention some plusses coming from a University which went through the process of transition.

One of the plusses was that we came along at the right time to get new equipment for the university under European initiatives. My faculty’s buildings are comparable to what you have, and when we have visitors from Humboldt or Britain they are impressed, saying, “we wish we had something like that.”

The other thing is that the Czech Republic was able to join the European Community, giving us mobility of students and professors at the same time. Humboldt University started some 6-7 years ago, and Charles University was included in the exchange from the beginning, even though the Czech Republic was only a candidate country at the time. Thanks to Socrates, our students are here now – we require that they spend one term abroad, especially as part of the West European Studies programme. As to the knowledge of languages, all Charles University students have to pass entrance exams in two foreign languages, and they have to study three foreign languages altogether.

As to teacher mobility: we have got 23 professors as permanent faculty members. On top of that we have five French professors, six German professors who are teaching in our university, two German professors who are working at the delegation of the EU and teaching in English, two Americans and one English. As to our staff, one-third have worked as visiting professors abroad. We have 60 foreign students in our University and they are taking courses in German or English.

My faculty is a Jean Monnet Centre of Excellence in European Studies, and proud to be the first one in Eastern Europe. I am involved in the team which is based in Poland, and has published several books together with other colleagues from the European Political Science Network, based in Budapest. Other colleagues from German studies are taking part in international research projects. The worst thing is our libraries, one of the main reasons I would like my students to study abroad. There is also the problem of staff, with the average salary so low that it is difficult to persuade people to stay in academia. I try to involve my younger colleagues in different projects to get some extra money and keep them in-house. So far we have been successful but it is quite a challenge. All expenses are paid using grants, so if we run out we would have to close the show.

**Points from the Discussion**

The discussion has been summarised to highlight key points. Every attempt has been made to reflect the spirit of the debate. Where it is helpful, contributors to the debate have been identified.

**Tools for post-Cold War restructuring**

During the Cold War, churches and theology faculties were often able to keep up the channels between the East and West. Even in countries like Romania, there were quite close links during the Cold War. To what extent are the churches still involved in re-structuring the universities? And to what extent are post-communist structures a re-establishment of pre-communist structures – with all their advantages and drawbacks?

There has been a lot of structural continuity in Polish Universities, in the sense that structural changes have not been mandates. However, there has been considerable change from the decentralisation of finances. The Jagiellonian University, for example, which consists of 12 schools and faculties, is now being run by the Deans, who have control over their finances. Because of these pressures, some universities have chosen to establish inter-faculty departments, or incorporate old institutions within faculty structures, which superficially resembles the 19th-century university with its fewer faculties.

In the Czech experience, there has been very little re-establishment of structures, because there is no living memory of previous structures due to the interruption of the Communist regime, and before that, with the liquidation of Czech higher education during the Second World War.
Regarding theology faculties and churches, in most universities in Poland, there is no direct influence of churches on universities or education policy. There are 2 or 3 Catholic universities in Poland, but in all the rest, the theology departments were separated from the universities in the 1950’s. Although there have been talks about whether it would be a good idea to re-incorporate them, it seems that neither the universities nor the churches like the idea, and they will remain separate in Poland. There is no direct influence on the universities from the Churches.

**Even 10 years after the fall of the Berlin Wall and the restructuring of Europe, Eastern students still go to the West more than Western students go East**

In the Czech Republic, the role of churches has been very different to Poland. The churches had no contact with the West, particularly the Catholic Church, though the Protestant minority was in a better position. This contact had an effect on the related theology faculties: the Protestant Theology faculty in Prague is a fairly good one, whereas the Catholic one was re-incorporated within the university because it was not sufficiently robust to stand on its own. It is a true picture of the terrible damage which was inflicted by the Communist regime.

**East-West student exchange**

Even 10 years after the fall of the Berlin Wall and the restructuring of Europe, Eastern students still go to the West more than Western students go East, mostly because Western European students do not know a lot about Eastern Europe. They learn English and French at school and have an idea what England and France would be like, but many students would not know what to expect if they decide to go to Prague or Warsaw. When we speak about European diversity, we are here to find out what we have in common, but Eastern universities should make more of their individuality to make their countries and universities more attractive.

Czech participants noted that they should offer programmes in English, French, etc, because it was not realistic to expect all exchange students to learn Czech. However, they cannot do this without support. For the moment, they have had to rely on American universities, because their tuition fees help pay for the course. But one participant noted that, “I am always sad that we have to teach European studies to people from Texas, who know nothing about it.”

**Building a Europe of East and West**

Eastern Europe seems so very far away, and the boundaries are mental, not physical: if you live in Vienna, Prague is, geographically, to the West. What are the mental divisions between East and West, and what are we doing to overcome these divisions? Mental plurality, obviously, is one of Europe’s great strengths, but what do we have in common? Perhaps we as Europeans should cling to the notion of university education.

In the effort to create a European mindset which is more than an anti-US reaction, Europe should search for answers to the challenges of globalisation: e.g., how can the process be made more human, social, fair?
Session IV: What Next for Pan-European Co-operation?

Chair: Peter Scott
Professor of Education and Vice-Chancellor, Kingston University

I will only say two things about the process represented by the Sorbonne Declaration, the Declaration of Bologna and its subsequent revision in Prague. First of all, the extension of the circle of the people involved: the Sorbonne Declaration was a very narrow declaration, signed by four Ministers of Education and determined by political rather than academic considerations. I cannot speak for what happened in Germany, France and Italy, but I am certainly aware that in Britain, the Minister did not consult the universities in any way before signing in Sorbonne. The Bologna Declaration was broader, signed by 27 Ministers of Education, and an even larger group was involved in the discussions in Prague. There has been a gradual extension of the process of European cooperation and also I think there has been a shift from the political motivation to a broader set of objectives, bringing in the concerns and perspectives of universities.

Nevertheless, I think there are two issues outstanding, one very obvious: the role of the European Union itself, and of the European Commission, in particular in Brussels. Those of us who were in Bologna know there was a slight delay in the proceedings, and I think this is no secret that this delay was produced by the insistence of French Minister and British Minister, that the European Commission should be written out of the script. They believed it should be a process taking place between the member states of the European Union, in which the European Commission should not have a significant role. That was related to particular difficulties the European Commission had at the time, nevertheless I think there was an unresolved tension about whether this is a cooperation between states or whether it is going to proceed to a higher level of integration.

To what extent is European higher education integration a process of internal re-structuring?

The second issue also seems unresolved. To what extent is it a process of internal re-structuring within Europe, part of the wider project of European integration? To what extent is it a process of external representation? Part of the global competition with the USA, Australia and others is to make Europe a more attractive destination for international students.

Fabio Roversi Monaco
Rector, University of Bologna

The idea of drafting a declaration of academic rights emerged from a meeting of some of Europe’s oldest universities held in Bologna in 1986. The proposal was taken up with considerable enthusiasm and meetings with a number of Rectors and Vice-Chancellors in Bologna in 1987. This led to the setting up of an editorial committee, the members of which are listed in the document. It was distributed on 18 September 1988. Some 430 universities were represented in the signing of the document in Bologna.

What is particularly significant is the way the Magna Carta was drafted; it began from the bottom upwards, that is to say the universities, as part of a long process attracting widespread support. On the one hand, it is a statement of the fundamental values of the European tradition of higher education and on the other a real effort to include universities from outside Europe, that became involved on a larger scale, resulting in the strengthening of links between all the universities who were in the framework of the 9th Centenary of University of Bologna. This took place within the framework of legislation of the wider states and the characteristics of each system of higher education, but also with regard to the state authorities.

Based on the spiritual unity of Europe in the Middle Ages and the free movement of teachers and students that characterised that period, our shared heritage is set out in the Magna Carta in general terms; in order to uphold the autonomy of valued systems of higher education, and even universities. In a similar manner, it reaffirms a number of fundamental principles with which the leading universities of the world could easily identify.

A century ago, the celebration of the 8th Centenary of Bologna University in 1888 was inspired by cultural unity and the rediscovery of the origins of the higher education. And there we

* Unfortunately, Professor Fabio Roversi Monaco was unable to attend the conference. His contribution was read by Paolo Pombeni, Professor of Comparative History of European Political Systems, University of Bologna
were again in 1988, in a completely different world in which technological progress has eliminated the limits of time and space with enormous benefits. It has also come with an excessive degree of specialisation, which should remind us of the need for cultural unity brought about by the super national nature of higher education and the need to share knowledge and integrate our research efforts. In 1988 there was a need to re-examine the origins of the university, accept the challenge of innovation and clearly redefine the integration between higher education and society as a whole.

In order to represent society as a whole, universities need to address the issues arising from the unequal distribution of resources that characterises the world today: environmental and energy issues, social exclusion and inequality between peoples and regions of the world. Higher education teaching is a field which is continually moving forward, aiming to solve serious problems facing a society in continual evolution.

The actors who drafted and signed the Magna Carta and supported its principles recognised that, in order to play its part, universities expect states and parliaments to recognise their autonomy and independence, yet this principle is denied in constitution of many countries. Universities need the freedom of faculty members to engage in research and teaching, and freedom for students, who have the right to be educated as scientists, administrators and professionals but also as individuals and human beings.

Giving faculty members and students the tools to carry out research requires a complex and costly organisation, as well as facilities without which, in today’s world, research would not be effective. There is a risk that our teaching may become outdated and inadequate, giving rise to the idea that the university is simply a place for taking exams, rather than a forum for discussion, training and scientific knowledge. We must be particularly aware of this risk and of the fact that higher education cannot be the slave of contemporary thinking. The fundamental values inspiring the Magna Carta have to a significant extent been taken into consideration by governments.

The Bologna declaration of 1999, signed by 30 European Ministers of Agriculture, expressly refers to the Bologna Magna Carta before going on to produce a document of historical importance, aimed at reconstructing the unity of European culture inspired by European humanities.

If higher education in Europe does not defend its own aims and ability to produce knowledge in an independent manner, there is a risk that universities may suffer from restrictions and be subjected to unacceptable pressures. This might be the case with regard to the universities and institutions, and with regard to the component parts of the universities such as faculties and departments and institutions, and within the structures with regard to the fundamental rights and freedoms of individual faculty members. The student body and the rights of individual students may also be infringed.

If higher education in Europe does not defend its own aims and ability to produce knowledge in an independent manner, there is a risk that universities may suffer from restrictions and be subjected to unacceptable pressures

At Bologna, we have established the Observatory for the Rights and Values of Universities, whose mission is above all to acquire information, evaluate individual cases, examine all relevant issues and express an opinion whenever there appears to be a violation of a university’s rights as an institution, of their internal structures for autonomous research, such as the department of individual faculty members, or the mental rights of students laid down by the charter of the university. Clearly the Observatory cannot decide upon sanction or directly intervene in critical situations, but it can bring moral authority to bear.

But what does it mean, to be a “European” university? I would argue that in many ways, the 19th-century University was much more European than its 20th-century successor, because in the 19th century, there were very few national universities. Lately, we have lost much of that cosmopolitan air. What is our problem? Can we speak of a European culture, or can we speak of a Western culture? I would argue that there is no such thing as a “European” university because Europe does not share a common culture in the way it once did, at least at the university level.

Lenka Rovná
Chair, Department of Western European Studies, Charles University, Prague

I was asked to comment on the Prague Declaration and meeting. I don’t know whether you realise that May 2001 was quite rich intellectually; there were several important speeches dealing with the future of Europe. Perhaps to us, the most important event was a meeting of the 32 signatories of the Sorbonne and Bologna Declarations. Ministers who gathered in Prague confirmed their commitment to the objective and establishing of the European Higher Education area by 2010.

I would like to briefly look at several topics which were came up at that meeting, connected to the Bologna declaration. The reason why they
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want to build a European Higher Education Area is to improve attractiveness and competitiveness of higher education institutions in Europe. What I considered important was that they stressed higher education should be considered a public good, and should remain a public responsibility. I must say I was not extremely happy yesterday when the American educational system was criticised all the time, but I do agree that, there, education is seen as a mainly private responsibility.

So to advance the European process, we must adopt an easily readable and comparable system of degrees. Along with helping to recognise course units, mutually comprehensible degrees are essential for the European Area because of free movement of labour and the essential freedom of European Union. One thing from the Americans: a system based on undergraduate and graduate studies. When I was talking about the advantages of Central and Eastern universities which went through the process of transition, we could implement this system from the beginning, which gave us an advantage because we have already been through the process which is now going on in some French universities. We should do the same with the system of credits. We were talking this morning about promotion of mobility and the free movement of students, teachers, researchers and administrative staff and I think that this would be an important contribution: and I was able to make two new arrangements as to the exchange of students and professors.

Then there is a question of European cooperation in quality assurance. It is extremely important that universities can collaborate in establishing a common framework of reference and disseminate best practice. What helps is the exchange of students and professors, because it is important to have personal experience of other systems.

What I am extremely interested in is promotion of the European dimension in Higher Education, i.e. increased development of modules, courses and curriculum at all levels with European content. It was mentioned here that I am chairing the Department of West European Studies, which mainly examines and analyses the development in Member States, looking at their political systems, economic, judicial, cultural and history and of course the EU problems. From next year we are opening the new European Studies programme, concentrating on the EU's history, political system, the enlargement problem, etc. I also mentioned the fact that we are quite proud to be awarded a title as the first Centre of Excellence. Universities must also cooperate, especially with state institutions in our fields. We are closely cooperating with Ministry of Foreign Affairs, working as advisers for the team of negotiators preparing Civil Service reform, which is still a problem for the Czech Republic. All my colleagues were working in a joint venture with Czech and German Historians and they were negotiating Czech/German relations and our history, to be the basis for the declaration which was then signed by both governments.

Life-long learning is extremely important; this is where I see an enormous contribution of e-learning. Our experience with that is quite rich too, because we established a programme called Europaicum (same name, different spelling), established 5 years ago. Ours is a programme for civil servants, preparing them for the EU and for state institutions connected with the EU. The number of participants was growing and suddenly this year it dropped: we realised that we are now competing the programmes on the Internet, and for civil servants it is much easier for them to sit in their office. I still prefer the face-to-face relationship between professors and students, but what is important is that the programmes are there for students, and improve their graduates' employability.

I still prefer the face-to-face relationship between professors and students, but what is important is that the programmes are there for students, and improve their graduates' employability

At the May meeting, they also called for increased collaboration between European countries concerning the possible implications and perspectives of transitional education and I think our conference is a contribution to that. Ministers committed themselves to cooperation based on the objectives set out in the Bologna Declaration and they want to build on similarities and benefit from the differences between cultures, languages and national systems. From this point of view I think this was a tremendous step forward and we are here to work in this direction.

Discussant

Gesine Schwan
Professor of Political Science and Rector, European University Viadrina, Frankfurt/Oder

I think a common point of both speakers was the meaning of “European” in a “European university system,” what I might describe as a kind of centralist approach. I wanted to follow up what Professor Pombeni said about the supranational nature of higher education. In the first sense, of course, higher education should not be nationalistic, and the supranational nature might be true for natural sciences. However, on the other hand there might be differences between our social sciences and humanities.
Concerning the social sciences, humanities, etc., what appears to be typically European is exactly a mixture between super-national ambitions, traditions and values on the one hand, and clearly national traditions in our approaches. This goes together with dialogue and tolerance. Students should cultivate their own knowledge and skills and this is also true for American and any other universities, as I have observed in my own scientific work. I chair research work linking Polish, French and German colleagues. We discovered that even if we had a common issue of memory, identity, etc. (soft stuff), we live within very different traditions. What the French would call democracy wouldn’t be the same as what the Germans would call democracy. When the French speak about république, it is not the same as what we call republic. I think what should develop as a European approach is a much more intense dialogue between the various national traditions of university work and of research and science. Of course we have a number of research projects, but this does not yet mean that our education we offer to our students already presents such a dialogue.

The main aims of the Sorbonne, Bologna and Prague process, i.e. international competitiveness, mobility and employability, this is not so typically European. If I try to find what could be the European approach, exchange is a wonderful first step in order to know each other, to come to know universities and traditions. But if we leave it to the exchange programmes, we leave it to the students to make a synthesis of what they have experienced. This is like interdisciplinary work, where you leave it to the student to make a synthesis.

What should be the outcome of a really European University is to practise this kind of dialogue about European traditions. Therefore I was really fascinated what is happening in Prague. Being a president of a European university I am really thinking of that direction, at least as a kind of experiment, to try to construct multi-lingual and multi-national curricula within one university or one institute. To enable researchers, students and teachers to have the possibility to really talk to each other constantly about their various traditions. One should really be in a much more intense exchange about that, and not just have a nose full of whatever approach and then go back to normal life.

This of course cannot be done only by norms or strategies of instrumental validity. You need a lot of personal impetus and exchange of personal trust in order to bring forward such a European institution. Cooperation is important in addition to all the common norms, so degrees can be mutually acknowledged, etc. It should be possible (and necessary) to teach the young people and learn by their teaching how to combine “European” and national traditions. I think such experiments should be brought forward by young researchers who have maybe just finished their PhD thesis, who are still interested in new combinations and could see what would be a traditional Polish, French or German contribution to this matter of cultural study. We need to move away from regional studies.

In a typical European system, we can teach how various cultures are embedded in various languages and vice versa

What I would like to plead for is to strengthen multi-lingual studies. If ever we have a kind of advantage in Europe in comparison with the USA, it is our understanding of complexity and diversity. We cannot imitate the American system by teaching everything in English. It is right and necessary to have a lingua franca that we want to live with (and have to). But we can teach in a typical European system how various cultures are embedded in various languages and vice versa. This could be a real advantage, not only for social sciences, but even soft science and maybe even for natural sciences. We can have interesting studies to see how the cultural framework fosters or strengthens particular approaches even in the natural sciences, which grow up in their cultural surroundings. There my even be a European advantage bringing together the cultural environment and the natural sciences for progress in that field.

I want to make a plea for realising the diversity of Europe and I would really try to define Europe by that cultural diversity, to realise that diversity in a number of institutions so that students and researchers can experience that European world of diversity.

Points from the Discussion
The discussion has been summarised to highlight key points. Every attempt has been made to reflect the spirit of the debate. Where it is helpful, contributors to the debate have been identified.

European integration at the postgraduate level

There has been very little distinction been made between graduate and undergraduate studies. As the Bologna declaration becomes more widely implemented and we get an increasingly two-tier degree system, perhaps European integration is more positively pursued at the masters level.

First again which age, I also tend to plead to try out in Bachelor times is important. French are to be sent out at the end of third year of education. The stimulating effects for further development of their context in foreign countries is very important.
Probably many arguments speak for your position that it is more feasible on the masters level. Nevertheless and experience for my university is that if you require a certain number of languages and if you give the opportunity to teach it, often we don’t have the finances to do it. So why not just try out, we have to find out if there is enough room to acquire two more languages besides the mother languages. We have to start at schools. Trying to start early ages. May be we can try it out in a number of institutions. To find out how it works.

I was talking before that our MA students, this is the must to study abroad, one term especially because of MSc’s. There are a lot of BA students who would like to go and are able, as they are passing and entering exams from two foreign languages so they must master one of them and be very good in the other. Whenever they are studying abroad they are doing quite well. Once we can expand and have even more students there would not be a big difference between MA and BA students.

Pharmacist from University of Bonn: we have a very exchange programme for students, but only for advanced students. I agree it doesn’t make much sense to send undergraduate students to a foreign country. Our programme works very well because we find individual solutions for every student and each institute.

Secondly, in defence of student exchange even on the pre graduate level, you should not look at it not only from the point of view of their professional achievement in their field. Don’t estimate the side effects. It is my experience that this sort of benchmarking is highly efficient. Very important in the context of their education personal education, much more than they’re academic achievement.

**Languages**

For example, at the London School of Economics, in the International Relations Department, MA applicants must have knowledge of three languages. The best represented are Germans, and the Brits are very under-represented, for reasons you will understand.

In Prague, even though they teach partially in English, German, French and even Russian, it doesn’t seem to be harming the Czech language.

I was a bit surprised we didn’t hear more about the consequences of the Bologna declaration, which strengthen my idea that the facts are somewhat underestimated. We are still talking about student exchange as if it was our students that we want to give experience abroad. What I think will happen after gaining a bachelor’s degree they will have the free choice of University to take a masters degree either directly or after a few years of job experience, that will force universities to offer those with different languages. English, French and German and will lose students to universities that do and will not have enough students to compensate for that. I think it will have more effect than most people believe.

For example some of our students work in a research group so when they go to Charles University they work in a research group and don’t have to speak Czech, but they learn some and when come back they know some Czech. This is a good possibility.

The personal context is vital to ensuring high-quality exchanges. Anyone in higher education will know of many gratia exchanges based on personal contacts. Professor A in Berlin knows Professor B is in Prague and they can rely on each other to consider whether the courses students take are in context with their home programme.

**Competition vs. convergence**

Problem: the attempt of implementing common standards all over Europe by credit point system. On the other hand the idea of competition, it seems to me these are basically incompatible concepts. I am involved in developing a new course, international course of study at my university, we tried to apply the credit point system, my feeling is the more I work with these credit points, the more I am convinced they are not helping with anything. Except disguising the differences in education which have been there all the time. I wonder whether a healthy competition which involves different structures, because one university is convinced another university convinced of one structure another. Whether we ought to stress individuality.

**Public accountability and professional growth**

The role of the universities and academia in European societies is eroding at a rapid pace. So that where as formally we could take for granted a professor was a professor and could be taken seriously, this is no longer the case. We must consider much more seriously, and how to be more accountable to the taxpayer, to what we do, it seems to me there are far too few programmes popularising and support, such as paying a professor to write a book, a sabbatical. To try themselves something they have not done before. There is tremendous personal risk. I wonder whether an organisation such as the Europeum like that could be fostered. There is support for the idea that university teachers should be encouraged to write popular books, not necessarily mean sabbaticals. Should be acknowledged as scientific achievement for example, because this is what a University Professor is expected to do.
Session V: Conclusions and Recommendations

Christa Müller
Vice-Rector for Planning and Financial Affairs,
Bonn University

First of all I would like to thank the organisers and the Europaeum. It is my first contact with this organisation but think that it offers a great possibility to bring the universities in Europe closer together and have a common future for European universities. I would like to thank Daimler for the sponsorship. We will have a meeting in spring 2003 to discuss more possibilities of public/private partnerships with industries like Daimler or other companies. Finally, I thank the students for their participation. I think in the future they should have a more active role and be heard even more.

My impression? I am a natural scientist, a pharmacist. In the beginning there was a discussion about the future of the European universities, about the American way, and I think we all agree that the American way is worth studying and things can be learnt but we have to go our own way. I did my postdoc in the USA. It was the first time I felt that I was European, because of the different cultural background of the Americans.

The problems of the universities in Eastern Europe are not so different to Western Europe. The libraries, financing... we have the same difficulties. A little smaller, but not much. Indeed, Americans have the same problems; they are a global issue.

We have to take concrete steps to make everything public and to distribute the information within our universities, so that everyone knows about this

We have to take some concrete steps. Talking, summarising, writing books, putting on web are very important but we have to take concrete steps to make everything public and to distribute the information within your universities, so that everyone knows about this. The second step to do exchange programmes and to sign contracts to do this. All the universities within the Europaeum ought to decide to encourage exchange of students. Another possibility would be to form a consortium for the sixth framework programme of the European Union to get some money. I think the Europaeum is a very good platform for that. We can explain that we have had contact for a while, and these meetings, and this will enhance the chance for money from Europe.

I would now like to introduce Mr Klingler who comes from an entirely different background, Energetic innovative young entrepreneur, running an interesting company based in Basel, Geneva who is very interested in ideas, intellectual life, promoting culture but obviously comes from a commercial background and share a few thoughts with us having attended the whole conference.

Wolfram Klingler
Founding Partner, Baklin Finanz

I have some more general remarks. I think there were a lot of observations and questions about what is good and what is not so good, and some suggestions. My contribution is this: we should ask questions in a more active way, not passively examine the future. The future is not something to observe but to create. Of course it is dynamic and unpredictable and the approach has to reflect this, but we can set the goals we want to reach in the long term. If we know our goal then the question is how to reach it.

I think this is something we can learn from the USA, borrow its entrepreneurial spirit and combine it with the university culture of Europe. I think that will be a big advantage in the globalised world.

I find interesting the point the gentleman made earlier: what do we want universities to be, what is the real strength, what is their unique selling point? I think he is right when he says universities are a creative space, where he can think and do say things you can’t say in a corporate world. That is where new impulses come from and future is shaped. This role of universities as a creative space is very important.

In a general sense, what is the future we want and how should we act now so that we can go in this direction of this future? Whether we can reach it is another question. We should see what role universities should take in this process and how we do things now. This practical approach might be appropriate for learning in general, because what drives society is not so much knowledge but how to select it, filter it and, most importantly, implement that knowledge. We need to teach students how to implement new creative thoughts and ideas.

What I would give as a suggestion is not only to take the money from the entrepreneur but also to learn from the entrepreneur’s spirit, and to integrate entrepreneurs more actively. The future doesn’t just happen it is created by us and we can go forward in a chosen direction very dynamically.
Paul Flather  
Secretary-General, Europaeum

The two overarching themes of the conference were that:
- Universities must be pro-active and practical;
- Simple marketization is not the answer;

Education is more than just vocational teaching: European universities have a structural inbuilt advantage over the American system because of our inbuilt cultural diversity; and we have no choice but to take part in the e-learning revolution. But we must co-operate, share, and must not reinvent the wheel.

We should try and set an agenda for where we go next. This is a project which has an 18-month cycle, launched formally today, involving three conferences, and this is the first one. The second one is in Paris in September 2002, and will focus on the theme of the new responsibilities of universities, the role they must play in the new globalised society. How can it be a defender of truth/trusted knowledge? How can it defend the notion of ideas produced by intellectuals over mere expertise? The third conference will be in Bonn, in spring 2003, focusing on the theme of new partnerships with industry and commerce, with each other and new partnerships with civil society. Maybe we ought to also think about universities beyond Europe in some sense.

*We have no choice but to take part in the e-learning revolution. But we must co-operate, share, and must not re-invent the wheel.*

We will open up our own website and will put up the papers from this meeting, several are in written form and others we are going to transcribe and send to the authors to edit before we put them up.

There are three related elements to our project, which are immediately identifiable. Firstly, the survey. You got a taste of the early responses and we are very keen to continue to develop that. We will send you the results of the survey, broken down by the averages, aggregate and by your institutions, so you can see how activity in your institution compares to the general average. This may be of interest. Secondly, we hope to develop a student element. Thirdly, we will publish a report on the three conferences.

Let us connect to all the interesting projects that are going on. The Europaeum can be that networking engine, connecting with the Observatory on Higher Education. We don’t have to follow everything going on; let the Observatory do that for us. But I would like the Europaeum to be a link. Let us look at this Viadrina Law School, the new tools they are developing.

Let us work with Hagen, who are developing an exciting distance learning software, available free. Professor Kadarali is willing to work with us. Let us use the Europaeum Knowledge Centre. We are very privileged to have this new software, which has been given to us to connect scholars across Europe.

Professor Tschopp’s suggestion of what he calls the Humboldt Plan: can we come up with some kind of strategy for working with the East Central European region, which looks at mobility, the inevitability of tuition fees, building real partnerships, building up the infrastructure, libraries. If the Charles University library goes up to 1939, surely we can help them go further.

Addressing this question of the brain drain: I think we could put our resources together and develop some kind of plan. We should look at knowledge tools generally, the question of languages, and the question that Professor Müller has emphasised of working together to get European Commission support. We have had a successful conference, and look forward to Paris, but won’t be idle over the next few months!
II. NEW TIMES: NEW RESPONSIBILITIES

Host University: Paris I Panthéon-Sorbonne
Dates: September 27-28th 2002
Introduction to the Conference

This is the second part of a major international investigation into how European universities can continue to operate at the forefront of the Knowledge Revolution launched in Berlin in 2001 in front of more than 75 expert participants – including representatives from all Europaem partner universities. The discussions were held in the magnificent Sorbonne palace rooms.

The Berlin meeting, which involved participation from rectors, academic experts, politicians, journalists, policy experts and civil servants, plus 20 student representatives, concluded that European universities must make fuller use of their inbuilt advantage over their American counterparts as pluralist institutions based on – and derived from – diversity. Simple "marketization" of curriculum and recruitment would never be the answer, they concluded.

It was agreed that this would be one ‘big idea’ incorporated into the study launched as part of The Future of European Universities Project, which is being supported by Daimler Financial Services AG, based in Berlin.

The Berlin meeting agreed that all leading universities had to take part in the e-learning revolution – they had no choice and, indeed, there was much to be gained. But, equally, they should each not seek to re-invent the wheel. Rather, they should share and cooperate on both content and means, and seek to do more in terms of teaching ‘wisdom’ as distinct from the production and use of ‘knowledge.’

These conclusions were underlined by the preliminary findings from a Europaem-wide survey involving universities across seven European countries, which found students universally wanted their universities to embrace the use of Internet and communications technology (ICT) more fully in the delivery of curriculum and coursework.

The Berlin meeting then gave four specific recommendations for further work and four special reports were commissioned as the themes for workshops at the Paris event – on progress of post-1989 educational reforms in the ECE universities; promoting simultaneous language diversity and academic mobility across leading universities; steps on sharing data research; and an evaluation of the impact of the internet and e-learning on university teaching. The debates are re-produced here, and the full reports can be on the Europaem’s website.

The full FEU Project will be constituted from three international expert conferences, the first in Berlin, held at the Humboldt-Universität zu Berlin, the second at the University of Paris I Pantheon-Sorbonne in 2002, and the third at the University of Bonn Rhineland in 2003; the linked international Europaem ICT Staff and Student University Survey and the special policy research studies.

Paul Flather
Secretary-General, Europaem
Conference Programme

27th September 2002
9.30am  Student Session I
12.00pm  Press Briefing (by invitation)
1.00pm  Registration and Buffet Refreshments
2.45pm  Welcome & Opening
    Chair: Lord (George) Weidenfeld, Founder of Europaeum, and Chairman, Weidenfeld
    and Nicolson Publishers
    Professor Michel Kaplan, President, Université Paris I
    Dr Michael Jochum, Senior Manager, Chief of Staff, Daimler Financial Services AG, Berlin
    Mr Komlavi Seddoh, Director, Division of Higher Education, UNESCO
3.00pm  Session I: The University as Policy Maker and Society’s Friend?
    Chair: Professor Peter Tschopp, Director, Graduate Institute of International Studies, Geneva
    Dr Christina von Furstenberg, Head of Section, Policies and International Cooperation in Social Sciences, UNESCO
    Dr Dominique Moïsi, French Institute for International Relations and Editor-in-Chief, Politique Étrangère
4.45pm  Coffee / Tea / Refreshments
5.00pm  Demonstration: Europaeum IT Survey
    Dr Richard Huggins, Oxford Brookes University
5.15pm  Session II: The University as Agent for Change?
    Chair: Professor Michel Kaplan, President, Université Paris I
    Mr Jack Lang, Former Secretary of State for Education, France
    Professor Tomas Halik, Charles University, Prague
6.45pm  Break
8.00pm  Reception at British Embassy
    Hosted by Sir John Holmes, British Ambassador to France (co-host Mr Peter Zieringer, Daimler Financial Services AG, had to give his late apologies)
8.30pm  Dinner at British Embassy
    Dinner chair: Lord Weidenfeld, Founder of the Europaeum and Chairman, Weidenfeld & Nicolson Publishers
    Evening Address: Mr Ben Okri, writer, author and poet

28th September 2002
9.15am  Session III Simultaneous Workshops
Workshop A: Accessing Data across Europe
    Chair: Dr Douwe Breimer, Rector, Leiden University
    Dr Leszek Kosinski, Secretary General, International Social Science Council, Paris
    Professor Christa Müller, Bonn University
Workshop B: **Learning Networks**
Chair: Professor Michel Kaplan, Rector, Paris I University,
Professor Yoni Ryan, Monash University, Australia; Association of Commonwealth Universities
Discussant: Professor Robert Barnett, Institute of Education, UK

10.00am **Workshop C: Bridging Europe: New Links to the Centre and East**
Chair: Dr Joost van Asten, Leiden University
Dr Voldemar Tomusk, Open Society Institute
Discussant: Professor Zdzislaw Mach, Jagiellonian University, Krakow

**Workshop D: Language Policy for the Networking Age**
Chair: Professor Peter Tschopp, Director, Graduate Institute of International Studies, Geneva
Speaker: Professor Rosalind Greenstein, Université Paris I Panthéon-Sorbonne
Discussant: Dr Robert Vanderplank, Director, Oxford University Language Centre

11.00am **Coffee / Tea**

11.15am **Session IV: Stakeholder views on the University**
Chair: Dr Dominique Moïsi, French Institute for International Relations and Editor-in-Chief, Politique Étrangère
M. Daniel Vitry, Minister-Delegate for International Relations and Cooperation, France
Ms Marie-Louise Ruggeri, Mouvement des Entreprises de France
Marie Christie Heinze, Europaeum Inquiry Student Group Presentations
Mr Richard Yelland, Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development

12.00pm **Session V: Conclusions and Recommendations**
Mr John O’Leary, Editor, *Times Higher Educational Supplement*
Dr Paul Flather, Secretary-General, Europaeum

1.15pm **Lunch and Departure**

2.00pm **Project Advisory Board Meeting (private)**

2.00pm **Student Session II – Conclusions and Follow up**
Welcome & Introduction

Lord Weidenfeld
Founder of the Europaeum and Chairman, Weidenfeld and Nicolson Publishers

Ladies and gentleman, a few words of welcome that you could find the time to come here and support this venture of the Europaeum. Also, I express my gratitude to our host, the Sorbonne, and our sponsors, Daimler, one of whose senior managers is here, and will address us later. Thirdly, a few words of orientation, of the genesis of the project and the future vision, and the relevance of the project. It is exactly ten years ago that the Europaeum was founded and the spark of the idea came really as a result of the great changes in Europe. The first impulse was to make it possible for postgraduate students from Central and Eastern Europe who had been behind the Iron Curtain to be in constant touch and be able to study, to exchange teachers and students with universities in the west of Europe. Now, ten years later, the level of teaching and the intellectual excellence in universities that were in the Communist domain is clear, and so it was with great pleasure that we received recently the Charles University of Prague as the seventh member of the Europaeum. We intend in the next few months and years to reach to three more universities, one in Spain, one in Scandinavia and one possibly in Poland.

What makes the Europaeum different from programmes like the Erasmus scheme, which now celebrates its 15th anniversary and has registered its millionth student? The Europaeum is on a much broader basis: it is all-encompassing, concentrating on those fields of learning that are important and useful to people who want to be in public life or leadership positions in the private sector and the professions. It is loose and flexible and is not exclusionist. We have the best contacts with other universities, even if they are not part of the immediate network. There is a sort of variable geometry within the network, so certain courses, certain diplomas and degrees are in common with some universities but not others. There is bilateral, trilateral, multilateral contact between universities, because we don’t want to be inflexible. The important thing now is that this European idea is not exclusivist in an “intellectual fortress” style, reaching out to universities across the Atlantic and to the other continents, with the idea that people can use us a base, a springboard to find out about Europe, and we are the right people to put them in touch with students and teachers.

It is quite interesting that this conference we are organising, part of a three-year programme funded by our friends Daimler, has already inspired other related events from sponsors from outside. We seek contact with people who are interested in what we are doing, and to whom we can be of some use. So I hope this conference, the second of three conferences on the Future of European Universities, will be fruitful and will contribute to exploring this subject as thoroughly as we can. The first conference was at the Humboldt University in Berlin last year, and the next one will take place in Bonn. I would now like to ask Dr Jochum to say a few words, having been one of the architects of the relationship between us and Daimler.

Michel Kaplan
President, Paris I University

First, I bring you greetings and thanks from René Blanchet, Rector of the Academy of Paris and Chancellor of the University. Thanks to the sponsors.

One of the interests of the Europaeum, apart from the collaboration of sciences and creating links between our PhD students, is to think about the European universities and try to be, in a way, the avant-garde of this idea. Following the conferences of the Higher Education ministers, an area of European Education has been drawn; in France, the government has taken legal action in order that in 2004, University Paris I will have reformatted its training according to this European Area of Education. This brings us back to our present theme of the Europaeum Project, which is under the imaginative and kind rule of Paul Flather: the future of European Universities, a wide theme which will give us the opportunities of fruitful debates. The University has new responsibilities, which shall be discussed over the next two days. We will try to understand the university’s role and place in the slow or fast, tendentious or adversarial changes that they have to face today.

Michael Jochum
Senior Manager, Daimler AG, Berlin

On behalf of Daimler Services, the sponsor of this conference, I too would like to welcome you to this second of three European gatherings supported by our company. Lord Weidenfeld thanked Daimler services, but I think he deserves the thanks. It is a little over three years now that we’ve been working not just with the Europaeum, but with other international projects as well, and I guess I would just like to take this opportunity to say how much I appreciate your professional cooperation, but also our personal relationship. Thank you very much indeed. I would also like to
thank you, Professor Kaplan, for hosting this event in this beautiful venue, in one of Europe’s most exciting cities.

Next I would like to share rather spontaneous thoughts with you about the title of this conference: *New Times: New Responsibilities*. The very fact that it does not come with a question mark at the end triggers a lot of questions, such as ‘is there more substance in New Times: New Responsibilities’ than there was in the ‘new economy’ for instance? If so, what exactly is new about the times that require universities to adopt new responsibilities, and what exactly is new about these responsibilities? Everybody here would appreciate that students should know how to use computers, Internet search engines etc, but I assume that is not really what we are talking about here.

**The quality that universities should seek to impart to their students is a certain state of mind, an intellectual and psychological capacity to deal with the ever-increasing complexity of life, without losing orientation**

So what are we talking about? If we were to identify responsibilities of universities, which used to be very important until, say, thirty or fifty years ago, but have become somewhat less important since then, which ones would we actually name? Or the other way around: if you were to list responsibilities, which are key today and did not really matter that much until recently, what would you actually put on the list? Let us assume you asked students in 1970 why they were going to university, and let us assume 50 per cent of them answered “to get a good job”. Let us also assume you ask the same question in 2000, 30 years later, and 70 per cent replied with the same answer, “to get a good job.” Would it then be fair to conclude that universities have a greater responsibility to help their students into good jobs than before?

On a pragmatic level, which is often adopted inside companies, the answer may well be yes. But I still have the feeling that we are looking for something deeper that goes beyond computer literacy, job market orientation, and even language skills. No doubt foreign languages are crucial, unless you are striving for the highest political offices in Germany, France, Britain or the United States. But even language is more of a facilitator than an end in itself. The end itself, the quality that responsible universities should seek to impart to their students, in my opinion, is a certain state of mind, an intellectual and psychological capacity to deal with the ever-increasing complexity of life, without losing orientation. Maybe the best way to phrase it is ‘responsiveness to change,’ in the sense that Charles Darwin had in mind when he said: “It is neither the strongest nor the most intelligent species that survive, but the ones most responsive to change.”

I have long been intrigued by this sentence, and I think that it best captures what has become more and more important over the last four decades. The times have always been changing. But they have rarely been changing as fast as in recent history. The difference between the worlds of 1882 and 1902 is much smaller than the difference between the worlds of 1982 and 2002, and the degree to which the world at large impacts on the everyday life of the man or woman on the street is much greater. We are more capable today than ever. But we are also more vulnerable. We enjoy a greater degree of freedom, but we are also more dependent on one another. The combination of both is new and it requires human beings, both at the individual level and as a people, to develop new qualities to cope with it.

If this conference were to become somewhat more concrete regarding what these qualities are, and how universities can evoke them in their students, I think it will be a highly rewarding enterprise. And that is what I wish all of us: a rewarding enterprise and a stimulating exchange of ideas and opinions.

**Komlavi Seddoh**

*Director, Division of Higher Education, UNESCO*

I am very happy to be able to participate to this conference. Two weeks ago, in Bucharest, UNESCO celebrated the 30th Anniversary of the European Centre of Higher Education, which had a similar theme to today’s. The seminar you are organising relates to a similar preoccupation for UNESCO.

What is UNESCO doing for Higher Education? UNESCO is working around a central theme: contributing to peace and development in a world dominated by globalisation. Its tools: education, science, culture and communication. UNESCO has a medium-term plan which is based on 12 strategic objectives and two inter-sector-based themes, which include higher education. For the higher education project, UNESCO is collaborating with three regional offices (Dakha, Beirut and Bangkok), a centre (CEPES in Bucharest) and an institute (IESAC).

The structure has four sections, as follows:

First, Mobility, access, and quality: globalisation of study and diplomas. Every two years, UNESCO organises a regional meeting; every four years, at a worldwide level. It publishes a guide for higher education and study abroad, including a section looking at brain drain. Another activity, which is close to the Europaeum’s projects, is to organise a worldwide forum to
ensure and emphasise the quality and the
reconnaissance of diplomas, and also to discuss the
marketisation of higher education. What are the
advantages and disadvantages of this market? How
can we create and develop some ethical norms to
preserve universities and students? The next
meeting will be held 18-19 October, 2003.

Second, Reforms and innovation in higher
education. Its activities are based on the follow-up
of the worldwide conference on higher education,
which was held in Paris in October 1998. It
gathered 5,000 participants from 182 countries and
adopted a worldwide declaration on higher
education, which has become the basic document
for the reforms and politics on higher education.

The follow-up is to make sure that the
declaration is put into practice. A forum at the
UNESCO offices is organised to discuss research
and its financing, and one of our subjects of
research is women and higher education. From the
worldwide conference, several working groups
have been created: one in particular is looking at
the renewal of higher education, directed by the
Commonwealth Secretariat, one on governance
and management which is overseen by the OECD;
one on teaching and teacher training; one on
research directed by the Société pour la Recherche
de l’Enseignement Supérieur; one on globalisation,
work, communication and information technology
with the OECD and ILO (International Labour
Organisation); one on internationalisation and
mobility with the international Association of
Universities; and one on higher education and its
contribution to general education with the French
Commission of UNESCO.

The fruits of all these groups are going to be
gathered in another conference, to be held in 2007
to check our progress.

Third, Cooperation between universities and
linkage: A third section of UNESCO action is
international cooperation based around this
programme (involving 113 countries and
numerous subjects).

Fourth, Teacher Training, based on two ideas:
on status and reinforcement of links with the
teachers’ associations; and on research that will
help teachers (in particular, innovations in
teaching).

As you can see, the activities organised by the
Europaen are very much in keeping with
UNESCO’s preoccupations.
Session I: The University as Policy Maker and Society's Friend?

Christina von Furstenburg
Head of Section, Policies and International Cooperation in Social Sciences, UNESCO

The task lying ahead of me is rather impressive. When thinking about my speech, I realised that it would be very difficult for me to do justice to everything that can be said under this heading, so I will have to restrict myself to what I deem to be the most important part: educating for governance and what universities have to do with the upcoming governance needs of different stakeholders of society. I shall very quickly run through the text, applying to it a kind of analytical grid, which addresses normative dimensions, and analytical dimensions, both of them very briefly, and then the political-strategic dimension.

Education, as the primary process of socialisation, is the agent for change everyone is placing his or her hopes in, but it can fall victim to outdated mental processes and organisational structures in urgent need of reform. Today’s universities are increasingly being called upon to rise to new challenges and are subject to some serious soul-searching, much like society itself, and to the global questions being raised in many domains. Globalisation is indeed triggering the need for collective social efforts involving people as a whole and their political leaders, each according to their own capacities, with the much-needed assistance of science and academia. Universities are uniquely positioned to play a major role, but we are dealing with an overall political effort. Education cannot assume alone a task that belongs to the whole of society. It cannot operate in a social void. Universities need to adapt as well as possible to foreseeable cultural demand (research) and the knowledge explosion it fosters, as well as to the professional competence-building schemes we need, and to other societal developments.

Universities should furthermore contribute to local and global sustainable development that is socially and humanly fair, and in line with ethical and moral values. Universities are pressing now, more than ever, to mediate the sort of higher education we want and the kind of society we want it for. This is the question and the challenge facing all higher education policies and any higher education reform should respond to cultural, economic and social circumstances, hopes and expectations. The future role of higher education will depend upon the quality, contents and scope of basic and applied research, which may furnish the answers to basic questions posed to every branch of knowledge.

Liberal arts, and social and human sciences, should carry substantially greater weight in the core curricula for higher education

Today because of the world’s many interacting and interdependent problems, issues like the future of the environment, sustainable development, international cooperation or studies on the future of society and the university should be dealt with through such an approach. Consequently, it should also embrace the modernisation of traditional professions, the anticipatory design of new professions, and the evaluation and updating of curricula. Naturally, such innovations entail many changes in focus and content, and in particular much broader cultural coverage. Thus, the liberal arts, and social and human sciences, should carry substantially greater weight in the core curricula for higher education. Similarly, the ultimate aim should be the implementation of an interdisciplinary philosophy, bearing in mind that this concept is supported by the realisation that economic, social and cultural conditions are not isolated, but can only be understood in relation to human beings – something policies seem to forget rather often.

The above considerations should be reflected in the very essence of university studies with the recovery of some basic knowledge, thereby promoting incentives for academic achievement, as well as stimuli and methods for lifelong education. Aside from the continuous updating of content in the light of research, curricula tend to gradually recognise the merits of intersectorality and internationalisation.

Although we are still a long way from the desirable model of the so-called global classroom, teaching or research on any specific subject is going to demand an increasingly broad approach in terms of space, time and relationships to all other areas of knowledge. However, these and may other changes of focus, content and scope in future higher education will only be achieved if they stem from a profound renovation of the student body, faculty, and the university administrators. In the near future higher education will have to be subject to periodic retraining or refresher courses to ensure academic degrees remain fully valued. Adequately paid professors should not only have an expert command of their respective fields of research and
teaching, but also hold universal and interdisciplinary views. Teaching will involve more and more of the kind of dialogue characteristic of interactive pedagogy in addition to an interest in further stimulating student minds through the part-time collaboration of distinguished professionals in the field working outside the academic domain, especially those involved in new technologies and avant-garde experiences.

The administrators of higher education for the future need not only to be efficient in everyday management, but very particularly at planning institutional development, for which they should be held accountable. They must also consistently explore new and flexible ways to cooperate with society, including appropriate arrangements to provide for higher training at the workplace in industry, services, agriculture or trade, as well as at institutes for applied research and cooperation with the surrounding community.

**In our current situation of reflexive modernity, expert knowledge becomes more relevant, but at the same time less sufficient, as the basis for complex decisions that are acceptable to the public**

In my view, the major challenge lying ahead for universities relates to democratic governance. The increasing need for public consultation is part of a large pattern of change in modern societies. Ulrich Peck has pointed out that we are moving into an area of reflexive modernisation, where governments become facilitators between divergent interest groups, rather than being powerful decision-makers in their own right. In this situation of reflexive modernity, expert knowledge becomes more relevant, but at the same time less sufficient, as the basis for complex decisions that are acceptable to the public. We have to bear in mind that the spread of participatory approaches may either enrich or further destabilise the already rather vulnerable relationship and contested boundaries between science and policy making.

Traditionally, parliaments have been a primary institutional forum for organised and pluralistic debate. Other institutional spheres for public debate include referenda, governmental hearings, informational campaigns, and political party gatherings. We all have recently witnessed a certain amount of disaffection of citizens with these means. The media are frequently counted among the main actors in the public space. This is an accurate reflection of society if the media are considered in their multiple roles as channels of communication between actors, but also as actors in their own right. NGOs, social movements and local communities not only claim access to institutional forms of public debate and the media, but organise debates themselves; so does business, in addition to lobbying relevant political institutions and securing access to (or control over) the media.

In comparison to this, the scientific and educational community still has large tasks ahead. The European university is not yet prepared, let alone endowed, with the necessary means to cope with more than just some open-door actions on public problems, which are of interest to educated laymen. Public awareness and financial means must be mobilised to a much greater extent if the university is to meet the educational needs of the responsible citizen. The genuine contribution the university can make to policy making and public debate is to be organised according to content and to process.

Content contribution relates to the power of scientific analysis and the examination of social behaviour and perceptions, cultural norms and values, institutional dynamics, economic processes, and the relationships between the social world and the natural world. Process contribution relates to the understanding and facilitation of methods and procedures that can enhance policymaking and public debate. These methods and procedures can include advocacy, mediation, conflict resolution, policy exercises, focus groups, dialogue workshops and participatory integrated assessments. Meaningful processes of public consultation or stakeholder participation have thus to achieve an integration between scientific knowledge and citizens and stakeholders views. Some procedures of this type have been experimented with successfully within the UNESCO chair scheme, of which my colleague, the Director of the Higher Education Programme of UNESCO, has given a short overview.

The question of what degree the university, and especially the Social Sciences, are able to generate new insights into relevant policy questions, lies at the heart of the matter. What is needed for policymakers and citizens alike, is an integrated assessment of complex questions, a composite picture rather than highly detailed (but unintegrated) pieces of information. This includes a longer and more structured discussion process, which allows participants to explore current research findings, check them against their spontaneous feelings, and eventually summarise their views themselves.

Very much in line with this philosophy is the technique of videotaping the participatory action research for eventual selective transcription. The transcripts can be scanned for discussion sequences related to the topics of primary interest with the help of software that performs qualitative
content analysis. Within the UNESCO network on sustainable development, for which I am personally responsible, we have tried such approaches and had some success. Knowledge networking as practised under this model is a new form of relating discrete actors to one another by trying to reduce barriers to human communication. The afore-mentioned UNESCO chairs on sustainable development are part of a multidimensional knowledge networking system of public and private partners based on an integrated framework and an evolving quality-controlled cross-referenced knowledge base. Designed in response to the increasing complexity of global realities, they are geared to support knowledge management and meta-networking functions dedicated to improved decision making and policy.

The use of virtual techniques, which has proved to be quite effective in meeting local needs, must be given new attention to distil the most appropriate organising principles to make local knowledge available. By recognising that increased cultural diversity shall be the rule and not the exception of future development, multilingualism is also an important issue for enhancing multicultural citizenship and creative social change. Member universities of such networks are exploring new paths for distributing knowledge systems, drawing on cyberspace’s strategic potential for citizenship, entrepreneurship and the creation and promotion of new actors. The application of knowledge to action requires a full set of new working interfaces for partners to cope with hierarchical levels and needs. All of this entails substantial and coordinated efforts to transform existing higher education institutions with a view to the brilliant future.

Dominique Moisi
French Institute for International Relations and Editor-in-Chief, Politique Étrangère

The reflection I would like to draw upon is the qualification of the title of this presentation. There are two events which represent a new challenge for the Europeans: 11 September and the Enlargement of the European Union. At the same time, we have to promote universal values in order to be able to answer the 9-11 event and also to direct Europeans towards a political expansion of Europe.

Universities have a role which goes beyond education. Firms create jobs, and universities form future workers, but firms and universities have to go beyond this simple definition.

Why? I think that 11 September has been an accelerator, and revealed some deep forces in our world. In particular, it revealed the hidden and tragic side of globalisation: along with the free circulation of goods, there is the circulation of evil.

11 September represents the bridge from the illusion of perpetual freedom to the reality of perpetual war. It was an attack against modernity from the most radical threshold of a civilisation in crisis within itself, Islam. 11 September is also the first truly global event in the history of mankind: no other event has been lived simultaneously by the entire world. This feeling of interdependence and fragility, fragmentation and integration, poses questions for the leaders of the universities. How do we carry on from here? My spontaneous answer is to come out against the politics of chaos. We have to reinvent the Enlightenment, while taking on board the criticisms of the original revolution of “scientific” approaches. We have to create an Enlightenment of the twenty-first century.

11 September poses further questions for us: the authors of the bombing came from middle classes and were educated in our European universities. They embody the contradiction between technological modernity, which we taught them, and the ideological fanaticism that we might have helped to reinforce by our lack of communication of values or by the fact that we have not promoted their integration in our society. Can the university be again what it used to be in the Middle Ages or in the seventeenth century in the Netherlands at Leiden University: a place for exchanging values; of tolerant dialogue between people who accept others while knowing that they are deeply different?

We have to create an Enlightenment of the twenty-first century, taking on board the criticisms of the original revolution of “scientific” approaches

What could our new Enlightenment be? I think that it should be redefined by integrating religious discourse. The eighteenth-century Enlightenment was hostile to and critical of religion, which was perceived as fanatical and intolerant. We need to rethink this: today, we would be betraying our societies if we did not contribute to the formation of tomorrow’s elites with discourses of tolerance and dialogue. Religions ought to be perceived as media of fraternity, so that they can again encourage tolerance in the face of fanaticism. That is one of the major responsibilities of the universities.

Maintaining a dialogue of tolerance means opposing false scientific drifts which allow researchers to hide themselves behind abstract – and often irrelevant – concepts, in order to avoid confronting real problems and engaging in debates with their students. I think that we should give our students the keys to be able to understand the world. We should not be afraid to ask questions
about values. This quest for universality goes through the rediscovery of two essential subjects: political philosophy and history. They should be indispensable in any disciplines.

All of this should contribute to making university a place of dialogue and, more specifically, a place of religious dialogue. If there is one place today in Europe where moderate, tolerant, open and modern Islam can be created, it is doubtlessly our universities.

Beyond the universal issues of globalisation and the implications of 11 September, in Europe, regional questions are becoming more prominent. I feel that, at the moment, there are more people in Europe and fewer Europeans. The euro creates Europeans, because globalisation creates Europeans in its own way, but we do not know where we are going, and we do not know what sort of Europe we are building. As European expansion and integration continue, universities have to contribute to the creation of European citizens.

My professional experience saw the creation of a School of Democracy in Moscow for the Russian elites. What I learned from that experience was that one could contribute to the creation of Europeans through education with modesty and open-mindedness. Eastern Europeans and Russians can learn from our mistakes as much as from our gains.

---

If there is one place today in Europe where moderate, tolerant, open and modern Islam can be created, it is doubtlessly our universities

---

This double dialogue, religious and European, are part of a fundamental, eternal debate, questioning the value and purpose of universities cut off from humanist and classical traditions. The university’s task cannot be simply to prepare students for a permanent and secure job, because nothing is secure in this complex world. The university’s task is to contribute to the creation and exchange of values from an open dialogue between cultures.

Discussion

Paul Flather
Secretary-General, The Europaeum

The two preceding contributions were complementary in that one was more practically orientated and the other was more philosophical, but both had important lessons. I have one observation for Professor Moisí and one question to Dr von Furstenberg. Before I begin the observation, I am still pondering Dominique’s thought that there are more people in Europe, but less Europe in people. We need to think more about it. We’ll have to work it out during the conference.

My observation is this: I once played a game in which we tried to find the point when a university became no longer a university, saying: let us remove elements from the university until there is only the core left, and see what that core is. The last department to be removed was the department of philosophy. We felt that once you had removed the department of philosophy you had lost the core of the university. I offer that as an observation as I think it fits with your contribution.

To you Christina, you talked a little bit about the media, and I think we all agree that the media are very powerful. I wonder if you felt that in some sense, and I mean this descriptively, that we are all victims of the media because the media can determine the exposure of certain bits of knowledge and they can determine how much this knowledge is repeated to society at large. In your analysis of how universities can play their role in building governance, for which you mean good governance, I thought you didn’t quite explain this link between universities and the media. Could you say more?

Voldemar Tomusk
Deputy Director, Open Society Institute

I hear words like “market” and “stakeholders,” and we are talking about university as an agent of socialising the society and something is changing here. The problem is that I’m afraid we seem to know what university is for, and that troubles me in some ways: I don’t know if there are enough questions left, if we perhaps know too well what universities are to do. Perhaps philosophy has no place there anymore, because philosophy is to ask the questions that cannot be answered, like “what is the good life”. So if this is answered, and the university knows what it is for, why do we have such trouble delivering it?

Christina von Furstenburg
Head of Section, Policies and International Cooperation in Social Sciences, UNESCO

I was essentially referring to the use of visual techniques, which is an absolute must. It is not covering the media scene, it’s a means of calling upon technology to accommodate different actors with very different levels of academic background, which can be a tremendous problem in the distribution of available knowledge.

We all know that; I think many of us are involved in constructing knowledge bases, which must be user-friendly to a multiplicity of stakeholders, and we are continuously struggling with this total diversity of backgrounds and how to make available different levels of knowledge to
different users and their needs. Visual means are an absolute must as you have among your clients sometimes, and specifically me as I’m working a lot outside of Europe, clients who are not literate. Visual techniques have proved incredibly powerful in making knowledge available. It might backfire in the sense that it provides to the university community a little bit of media power by coming up with such products. We are all storming into the scene by producing CD-ROMs and launching wonderful web addresses, but most of our colleagues in other parts of the world are not really able to use them for political or technical reasons. But it is a matter of fact that academia is storming into the media scene by making use of all the technical means we have now, and occupying a lot of conceptual space by doing so. None of this is structured yet. It is promising, but I am really awaiting your insights as it would be of great help to the university networks I’m trying to support.
Session II: The University as Agent for Change?

Viviane Reding*

*European Commissioner for Education and Skills

Mr. Secretary General,

I wish to send you and all your colleagues of the Europaeum consortium my greetings and my congratulations on the occasion of your meeting in Paris today.

I understand that this is the second of three international conferences in your major research project on how European universities can contribute to leading economies and societies into the new Knowledge Revolution. I am pleased to have this opportunity to share with you some thoughts about this issue, which is indeed crucial for academia and society as well as for Europe.

Many of the challenges entailed by the knowledge revolution, the dissemination of ICT or today’s multifaceted globalization, are of a similar nature and intensity for all universities around the globe. They have to do with how we maintain the quality of teaching, learning, and research, or of supporting the community locally and globally. In the spirit of the project for which you are gathered in Paris today, I wish to draw your attention to three other challenges with a more specifically European dimension.

The first of these is the need for European universities to keep – or some would say regain – their prominent place in the world.

For a long time, Europe enjoyed the privileged position of being the number one destination of university students and scholars from the rest of the world. This is no longer the case. Over the last two decades, we have lost our leadership to the United States of America.

In March 2000 in Lisbon, the European Council set a new overall goal to the European Union: to become the leading knowledge-based economy and society in the world. Earlier this year, the Heads of State and Government at the Barcelona European Council endorsed a further objective that by 2010 Europe should:

- Be recognised as a world-wide reference for the quality and relevance of its educational systems and institutions; and
- Be the most-favoured destination of students, scholars and researches from other world regions.

Similar messages can be found in the Bologna and Prague Declarations on the creation of the European Higher Education Area. The future place of Europe in the world will, to a significant extent, depend on our ability to achieve these ambitions. Leading universities have a particular role to play there, and I know from reading your research proposals that the Europaeum universities are fully conscious of this. It will be of great importance to get a clear picture of the strengths and weakness of European higher education in face of world competition and to identify the main levers for building up Europe’s image and role in this area in the years ahead.

For a long time, Europe enjoyed the privileged position of being the number one destination of scholars from the rest of the world, but we have lost our leadership to the USA

In order to strengthen worldwide links with Europe in higher education, the European Commission adopted last July a proposal for a new programme called Erasmus World (Erasmus Mundus). When adopted by Council and Parliament, Erasmus World will support, as from 2004, the cooperation of European universities at Masters level and an exchange of the best students and scholars with other continents.

The second, specifically European, challenge facing higher education on our continent is that of genuinely pan-European cooperation and mobility. The education, training and research programmes of the European Union have been open to universities of candidate countries before their formal admission as new Member States. Hundreds of networks and joint projects have been set up and contacts of all types have brought faculty and students in different parts of our continent closer together. Yet, many universities in countries in Central and Eastern Europe are still facing particular difficulties. Some stem from the political transition in progress. Many others are directly related to the accelerating phenomena of the knowledge society and globalization. True academic cooperation can only develop on equal terms.

It is in my opinion a major duty of all European universities to work together more intensively and to learn about and from each other. This need is also reflected in your research project, which wants to “focus energies specifically on bridging Europe.” I would strongly encourage you to give it the prominent place it deserves, and to identify

---

* Mme Reding was not able to join the conference due to conflicts in her schedule – her statement was read to the conference in full.
ways and means through which bridging Europe can be effectively achieved.

The contacts established thanks to Community programmes such as Tempus and Socrates can be consolidated and reinforced.

Finally, maybe the most widely shared and deepest imperative for European universities in the new age is to acknowledge their new, “European” responsibility to those who study, teach and research within them.

European society must invest in its higher education, as knowledge is our main resource.

In spite of diversity and the variations between national cultures within which institutions, curricula and degrees are founded, students in Europe need to be certain that the qualifications they acquire in one part of Europe can lead to possibilities for further study and for work elsewhere, first and foremost in other countries within the European Union.

I am convinced that students are increasingly aware of this, and will therefore favour universities, curricula and degrees offering the highest acceptability beyond the country where they are awarded. This is the main thrust of the Bologna-Prague process towards a readable, common framework of reference for the European Higher Education Area.

The Commission encourages and supports this process. In their Salamanca Message of March 2001, European universities “recognised that their students need and demand qualifications which they can use effectively [...] all over Europe.” They also acknowledge their own role and responsibility in achieving this and confirmed “their willingness to organise themselves accordingly within the framework of autonomy.” The challenge of being in a position to award to graduates degrees with a European (rather than national) labour market is key for the attractiveness of European universities. This applies both to European students and to those from abroad.

Can we really expect European degrees to be recognised at their real worth worldwide if they are not easily recognised within Europe itself? This is a major issue in terms of quality, competitiveness and attractiveness of our universities, and in my view a key determinant for the future of European universities.

You are gathered to discuss New Responsibilities in a New Age. I hope you will find my words some impetus and encouragement to move forward with your valuable and promising work, and I have no doubt that when the Europaeum shows the way, many will see it.

Jack Lang

Former Secretary of State for Education, France.

I would like to emphasise Mme Reding’s remarks: despite what has been accomplished by programmes such as Erasmus and Leonardo, the EU needs to increase its budget for education to a maximum 2 or 3 per cent, and more should be given to certain research programmes. The EU is subsidising agriculture, it is promoting the free circulation of goods and so forth. It should also be fighting for a Europe of intelligence, of creativity, of university and youth.

The EU needs to increase its budget for education to a maximum 2 or 3 per cent, and more should be given to certain research programmes

A number of decisions have been made for education, such as the ones that Mme Reading has underlined (e.g. uniformisation of diplomas, which will improve student mobility in Europe). But our universities and governments should help their students financially much more. In France, we have created a new kind of grant, which is called bourse de mobilité (mobility grant). 12,000 grants have been given away during the first year and we want to double them next year. If all of the other universities would follow and create such a grant, it would create a current for exchange, based on reciprocity, which would allow more students to go from one country to another.

We should be more ambitious: for instance, professors should travel as well, and teach in another university. It should be part of their contract. This would facilitate the Europeanisation of Europe. We should also create “European Universities” with diplomas and special teaching. There already exist what we call “bi-universities” for France with Germany and Italy.

One last point I want to raise is about languages: our governments should make compulsory the learning of languages from the youngest age.

Discussant

Tomáš Halík

Professor of Religious Studies, Charles University, Prague

Can the university withstand the global culture of pluralism? I can offer three short remarks. I confess I am bringing more questions than answers, but we university people know that such questions may be important.

My first remark is that the university has always represented an intellectual side of religion.
However, to avoid any misunderstanding I hasten to clarify in what sense I am employing the term “religion” here. When I say “religion,” I do not mean any particular religious system or religion in the post-Enlightenment meaning of this word (i.e., certain faiths, spirituality, rights or beliefs). What I have in mind is the old European concept of religio, as it was used in ancient Rome and most clearly defined by Cicero: the ritual contact with sacred foundation of a society, the symbolic expression of a common identity which holds a society together.

In my opinion, the main power of religion, in the sense of religio, resides in its ability to be the common language of a given society. But this language has always at least two levels, a popular one and an intellectual one. It took several centuries before Christianity took the form of a religio, then it played a political role in the practical sense throughout the Middle Ages. In this cultural context, the university was born. The medieval university held a responsibility for health. The Theological Faculty looked after health of doctrine; the Faculty of Medicine looked after health of the body, the Faculty of Law the healthy relationships with society, the Faculty of Arts healthy thinking. On the threshold of the modern age, Christian theology, the intellectual university form of religio, began to lose the role of common language of society. Theology has gradually become a dead language, used like Latin only for ceremonial purposes or at congresses of experts. In a certain sense, Science became the religio of the West. Universities became the temples of science. However, in the course of the twentieth century, modern science became so complex that it, too, lost the ability to be the common language of Western society.

It is my feeling, in post-modern Western society, that the social role of religio, the integrative power of society, is most likely played by the mass media. They increasingly influence ways of thinking and behaviour, creating symbols and networks among people. For many, the media are arbiters of truth: what is real and important is what can be seen on the television news. What the majority of people know about politics, sport, religion, culture, and science, they know through television, radio, press or the Internet. The influence of universities in society depends, whether we like it or not, on the access of universities to the world of the mass media. Do we have any other chance to initiate and cultivate the public debate, to inspire public opinion?

But the problem of relations between universities and media is not only technical and political, but also a problem of hermeneutics. Is it possible to translate the discourse of the academic milieu into the style of mass media? The spread of traditional theology and metaphysics, which dominated the age when the university was born, was genuinely universal. All aspects of knowledge tended to one centrum. However, the Enlightenment worldview inherited the Western universalism instead of the metaphysical God that was the logos, as said Sigmund Freud.

Nietzsche was perhaps the first to realise that modern rationalism might just be the shadow of a dead God, a culture which still depended on the Western canon of values. In our post-modern age, with global mass media as contemporary religio of the West, there is no sense of universality, but a radical pluralism. How can this sign of the times be compatible with the universalism that was the original heritage of the university? This is an important but very difficult question. In the global multicultural discussion, as Huntington said, this universalism for the West is imperialism for the rest. So, I ask, can the university withstand the global culture of pluralism?

The influence of universities in society depends, whether we like it or not, on the access of universities to the world of the mass media

The second remark I would like to make is on globalisation, the socio-cultural revolution of our time. When we speak about the role of universities in society we must take into account that the political context of our activities is not the nation-state but a global civil society. But already in the Middle Ages, universities were global players. For example, the crisis of the Charles University in Prague started with the very beginning of nationalism, with the Kutenberg Decree in 1409. The task of combating our contemporary provincialism is of special importance for the post-communist countries. I am convinced that it was the globalisation process that swept away communist regimes. Regimes based on rigid, state-planned economy and censorship of ideas were unable to withstand the onslaught of competition and the free market of goods and ideas. With the fall of the Soviet empire, the countries of Central and Eastern Europe won back their independence. The Second World has disappeared. Now the former First and Third worlds stand before the task of redefining themselves and finding a new common language.

Radical Islam tries to offer a common language for a great part of the former Third World. What will be the common language of the West? What are the foundations of our cultural identity? What holds our society together? I don’t believe in artificial invented languages like Esperanto, but how are we to interpret tradition in a new context and define the basic value of our civilisation? How are we prepared to communicate with the rest of
the world, and who will deal with these problems if universities do not?

I also see an important role for universities in the process of European integration. I would prefer ‘Europeanisation’ of the European Union to the Enlargement of the EU. The EU of today represents only a fragment of Europe. We must first overcome in our minds the naïve and arrogant identification of Europe with its western part. Integration should be more than unification of financial markets or connections of political and economic structures. It is not only bureaucratic process; it is a culture and spiritual practice. The core of European integration should be creation of European consciousness, the common space for sharing intellectual and moral values. This is I know the thinking behind Lord Weidenfeld’s vision for the Europaeum. So I am very happy to be making these remarks here today. In my country, the Czech Republic, intellectuals have played a very important role in public life for centuries. Perhaps we can take Jan Hus as an example of one of the first public intellectuals in Europe. He became an archetype of a man of conscience confronting power.

The role of intellectuals, academics and artists in dissent against regimes (particularly the Communist regime) is well known. We could be excused for thinking that, in a democratic society with a parliamentarian system, the public and political role of intellectuals and universities is over. We believe that we should respect the elected politicians and institutional structures of modern society. On the other hand, the effective functioning of political structures supposes a certain political culture and moral climate. Democracy supposes a competent public opinion and public debate. Without this “biosphere” of democracy, of certain political culture, the political structures are like the organs in the body but without blood circulation. So I leave you with this final question: do you not think that creating and mutually cultivating such a climate is also one of our responsibilities?
Evening Address: What are Universities for?

Ben Okri
British writer and poet

The academies of the future will do one thing we do not do today. They will teach the art of self-discovery. There is nothing more fundamental in education. We turn out students from our universities who know how to give answers, but not how to ask questions. The wisdom centres in our culture do not reach our students. They leave universities with skills for the workplace, but no knowledge of how to live, or what living is for. They are not taught how to see. They are not taught how to listen. They are not taught the great art of obedience, and how it precedes self-mastery. They are not taught the true art of reading. True reading is not just passing our eyes over words on a page, or gathering information, or even understanding what is being read. True reading is a creative art. It means seeing first; and then an act of the imagination. Higher reading ought to be a new subject in the academies of the future. As we read, so we are. I meet people in all walks of life, and most notoriously in the fields of literature and science, who, though professionals, do not actually read what is in front of them. They read what is only already inside them. I suspect this is true of listening; and that it is happening now, even as I speak to you, or as you read this page.

All our innovations, our discoveries, our creativity come from one source; being able to see what is there, and not there; to hear what is said, and not said. And above all to think clearly. And above that — the science of intuition. The academy of the future will have to engage this mysterious necessity of the value, the sublime value of intuition in our lives, and our work. How to make those intuitive leaps that transformed the science and the art of humanity a quality that is available to all, and made of constant value to humanity — this will be the true turning point in the future history of our civilisation. Discipline, hard work, rationality, calculation, can get us only so far; and in time will become the norm. But with it only we will produce efficient, but mediocre citizens. These are tools that can be used for good or ill. But the science of intuition — the mysterious spark that separates the great discoverers and philosophers and artists from the nearly great, this will one day have to be studied, and used for the common good.

We need to widen, at base, and invisibly, the inevitable necessity of teaching students the need for self-discovery. Consciousness studies ought to be a fundamental part of a liberal or scientific education. All students ought to be aware that they are the true spark of the transformation of the world. All students ought to be practical dreamers. Universities ought not only to turn out students for the various spheres of business, science, the arts, the running of the economy, management and information technology skills, but people who as human beings ought to enrich the life of the planet. We are more than the functions and jobs that we do. We are the co-makers of this world we live in. And the moral force of our citizens are too little used in the greater enrichment of our world. We take the living potential that are young minds and turn them, reduce them, into job-fillers and economy providers. We have regressed from the wonderful project of the academy of Plato’s dream. Every student is a light, a creative spark, waiting to be of use in dispelling the darkness. The terms in which I speak must be alien to you; but they will become inevitable. Every day the crisis of purpose grows larger over the lives of people; and prosperity or poverty does not diminish the paralysis it brings if not addressed.

The true purpose of the academy, the university, ought to be to unleash the bright and sublime possibilities of the human being

A society can die of a lack of an understanding of why it exists, or its larger purpose in the scheme of things. The universe grows more mysterious around us even as we find out more about it. The true reason in this; we are more than we suspect, but are taught to see less into ourselves, to ask no questions about our true natures, and so the great mystery that we are peers out into the greater mystery that is out there. A mystery stares into a mystery; this is a hopeless position. We ought to substitute faith in evidence with the knowledge of self-discovery. Only by knowing ourselves can we begin to undo the madness we unleash on the world in our wars, our divisions, our desire to dominate others, the poverty we create and exploit, and the damage we do with all the knowledge we have which has been only a higher ignorance.

The true purpose of the academy, the university, ought to be to unleash the bright and sublime possibilities of the human being. Education is still in its infancy. The true art and science of education looms over the horizon, where our disasters are being born. There we will learn to avert what evils we ourselves create, and then start again the project of humanity, with humility and a new light.

(Copyright: Ben Okri, 2002. All rights reserved)
Session III: Policy Analysis Workshops (simultaneous)

WORKSHOP A: Accessing data across Europe

Chair: Leszek Kosinski
Secretary-General, International Social Science Council, Paris

There is no doubt that the trend toward greater use of massive amounts of data will continue, and challenges for archivists and users alike will only become more complex. Following RT Campbell, I think three main issues are important in making effective use of data:

- The research community should pay more attention to comparability and replicability. There is still much to be done to develop efficient and effective electronic documentation and metadata.
- Access for qualified researchers to data needs to be streamlined. One of the stumbling blocks here is the concern with privacy and the need to prevent disclosure.
- Most importantly, with increasing availability of data sets related to the same question, a better way of using multiple data sets (including relevant macro-data) has to be found.

These challenges require different approaches as they relate to different types of problems. The first concern is creating data sets and survey methodology which would enable to better comparability and replicability over a period of time. The second concern deals with matching different data sets. Both these concerns must be addressed by the scholarly community, including survey promoters, researchers and archivists. The third challenge has wider ramifications, involving legal and financial communities and even the public at large. Increasing concern with privacy and intellectual rights, as well as potential financial rewards, will have to be addressed in a manner acceptable to all parties involved.

At the present time, the tendency is to restrict rather than open access to data. There are various reasons for this trend:

- Fear of losing one’s monopoly over data (not unusual among researchers);
- The fear of disclosure and its legal consequences;
- The desire to recover the cost of acquiring, storing and making data available leads to increased fees;
- The complexity of procedures introduced by data archives which discourage potential users; and
- The preference for data from well-established researchers, which makes life difficult for newcomers.

In order to address these problems, a new approach is needed. Researchers have to be encouraged and indeed rewarded for generating data that can be of wider use, and for depositing data sets in the archives. This can be partly achieved by agreeing on widely acceptable rules of the game, perhaps in the form of a code of access as well as code of usage of data. On the other hand, data archives must be interested in making access easier by streamlining procedures, reducing accessibility restrictions and reducing the fees, at least for some users. This in turn will require subsidization from other sources, most likely public.

New theoretical perspectives have created a need for new data, which can be satisfied by a combination of new data-generating projects and ever-increasing computer capabilities. At the same time, new databases themselves may stimulate new or modified theoretical perspectives. Research infrastructure of the social sciences will continue to expand as new developments in data management and analysis will provide new tools and methods for researchers.

Will this lead to better and more relevant social science? Only time will tell but the research community must be aware that producing more efficient tools should not be seen as a substitute for critical and creative thinking.

---

WORKSHOP B: Learning Networks

Yoni Ryan
Monash University, Australia; Association of Commonwealth Universities.

The term "borderless education" has many dimensions. The notion of borderless education has been hijacked by commercial providers of education, especially in relation to online and distance education. New providers of borderless education were, and are, perceived as clear and present dangers to research universities. Yet there was also a wide perception three to five years ago
that the demand for content, especially in continuing professional education, would benefit prestigious research universities, especially since brand names such as Oxford, Harvard and Berlin could utilise their knowledge expertise for teaching.

The prevailing ideological climate favoured, even demanded, new entrepreneurialism in public universities, initially in research partnerships with industry but increasingly in education and training for the needs of the knowledge economy. It was suggested that public-private partnerships would fund university expansion and drive administrative efficiencies and teaching productivity via the new technologies. Provincial and national governments provided seed funding for virtual learning networks, and non-government agencies, such as UNESCO, the World Bank and the EU, announced multi-million-dollar grants to support virtual and distance projects for the public good. But three years after the e-education bubble of 1997-99, it is apparent that much of the euphoria about the commercial potential of e-education was hype. The year 2000 saw spectacular crashes in technology industries and the beginning of a long decline in telecommunications and media companies, hardware and software manufacturers and e-business firms, culminating in the 2002 collapse of companies such as Worldcom and the difficulties of media giants such as Vivendi Universal.

These industries are the very sectors that underpin e-education activities. The convergence of these factors – the potential of technologies for global research and education, an ideological climate in which public funding for tertiary education is declining, and the emergence of education as a tradable good or service beyond the local campus – have forced us to reassess the nature of university education itself, both in the present project and in like projects, such as Brown University’s Futures project.

It is no simple matter to infer a winning formula in borderless education. Reliable and comprehensive data on enrolment figures, attrition rates and meaningful sales figures are fairly elusive. However, it is possible to trace the activities of the major players in e-education and to make some tentative generalisations. Tentative, because the education remains embryonic, both in relation to the technology and in its application to teaching. The following paper considers the activities of three major categories of players in borderless education: online providers, infrastructure providers, and the so-called “Global University” consortia.

There are two overlapping sub-categories of online providers: sub-degree and non-credit providers, and degree providers. The first represents the continuing professional education and leisure market, and the second, the undergraduate and graduate market. The fortunes of sub-degree and non-credit providers should be salutary to those interested in targeting this market. For example, Columbia University has thus far committed nearly US$19 million to its e-learning venture, Fathom, which was designed to capitalise on the prestige of its professoriate and the extensive resources of the Smithsonian, Cambridge University Press, the London School of Economics and the Universities of Washington, Michigan and Chicago. The idea was to offer alumni short low-cost courses and online seminars in topics ranging from Shakespeare to Archaeology. However, participating universities have failed to gain the 100-200 students required for viability in the programmes, and Fathom has changed its business plan several times. It now has partnerships with commercial e-learning firms offering generic business skills courses.

A second example: Harvard University Business School launched its Online Enterprises Solutions as a non-profit subsidiary with a target audience of corporate executives. Short courses are broken into 10-minute chunks of learning, which make up modules ranging from 30 minutes to 2 hours. For a fixed price, of about US$195 for a 1-2 hour unit, individuals can access the materials for a calendar year. Yet a survey of corporate clients showed that fewer than 10% of students completed the Certificate-level programme. They were enthusiastic about the materials, but they wanted just in-time training for immediate work-related problems. Their intention was to improve their work performance, not to gain a qualification.

A further example: the Alliance of Lifelong Learning was established as a non-profit distance education company by Oxford, Stanford and Yale for alumni of those universities. However, the short courses appear not to have attracted sufficient numbers of their own graduates, and the company is now offering fifty courses to the
public, including A History of Spies, which, I take it, comes from Oxford. The name of this alliance is All Learn. But there is little evidence here that a research university name guarantees any commercial success.

Among degree providers, success appears equally elusive. The UK Open University, even with its highly respected brand name in the Commonwealth and Europe and its long-standing distance education experience, failed in its expansion into the United States. It spent US$20 million over the four years to 2002 before closing: a victim of a crowded market, a US-centric sentiment and a lack of national accreditation in the regionally-based chaos that is the US accreditation system.

There are many further examples of high-profile failures, of prestigious universities entering the distance market and finding that low enrolments and high costs simply did not warrant the maintenance of the programme. Again, a research reputation has not transferred into degree-level enrolments. There has been only one outstanding success, measured in commercial returns, amongst online degree providers and that is the University of Phoenix Online. UOP Online is a subsidiary of the giant US Apollo Group, which accounts for 15% of the for-profit and highly fragmented education market in the US. UOP Online was floated off from the parent body UOP when enrolments in its online programmes soared to over 10% of the total student body at UOP, of over 105,000 students. Online enrolments are now over 30,000, so UOP has reached the economies of scale that Cooper, in one of the Observatory reports, suggested (requiring 25,000 students).

UOP’s success can be put down to the fact that it was a first mover in the corporatised business of borderless education. In 1976, its founders saw a niche market of working adults who were poorly served by the structures of traditional university programmes: time, place and pace. UOP classrooms are located in rented office premises in high-density urban areas in the United States and Canada, and close to major highways for easy access. Permanent staff develop a centralised curriculum and convert this curriculum into programmatic teaching guides, which are then taught by casual staff, who are practicing professionals in the vocationally oriented disciplinary areas. There are 250 full-time staff at UOP, but 8,000 casuals. There are no physical libraries, although UOP provides access to a digital library. No research is done by staff and there are no computer facilities. Subjects are six weeks in duration and, to accommodate legislative requirements for contact time, students must attend four hours of classes per week, and then another three to four hours of student-led group work off campus. Only working adults are admitted and tuition costs are more than those at state universities, but below those of most non-profit or private universities. UOP Online charges higher tuition fees than its on-campus parent because class sizes are kept to 10-12 students per tutor, yet its profit margin on the online subsidiary is much higher.

UOP Online charges higher tuition fees than its on-campus parent because class sizes are kept to 10-12 students per tutor, yet its profit margin on the online subsidiary is much higher

The success of UOP Online has been built on its parent company’s existing reputation as a convenience provider. It uses saturation television advertising and telephone advisers, who straddle a fine line with marketing. It utilises an automated database of subjects from hundreds of colleges and universities, mostly US but increasingly from overseas, to ascertain previous credits for transfer to the UOP programme, and thereby it cuts costs to the individual student wanting to gain a degree. Because the curriculum is fixed and all teachers follow a pre-determined schedule, a highly mobile US professional can transfer to another campus at any time during the class period without disruption. And of course, the online division eliminates the need for transferring altogether.

Such strategies will be unpalatable to most traditional universities. It is clear that UOP Online’s recipe for success is not replicable in the context of research universities, although there are some transferable lessons, as I will argue below.

In terms of infrastructure, providers of electronic learning and administrative platforms were amongst the early success stories in borderless higher education. Companies such as Blackboard, Web CT and e-College have significant numbers of university clients in most Western countries. But failed infrastructure providers have produced problems for a number of universities. In 1999, for example, Pensare appeared to be one of the leaders amongst platform firms in the United States. It was chosen by the prestigious Duke Fuqua Business School to develop and serve its global executive MBA programme, which was predominantly online. But Pensare went bankrupt in 2001 and the university was obliged to buy the company out to ensure continuity of service for its programme, because the materials couldn’t be converted quickly and easily to another platform.

One company, however, stands out amongst the infrastructure providers: Thompson Learning. The company has swallowed a number of publishers, such as Harcourt, and has also forged partnerships.
with other firms involved in e-learning. For instance, it is working with Blackboard to integrate Thompson's text material into a Blackboard platform on a hosted web service. Individual teachers can use all or part of what is called a course cartridge, or generic unit, and 700 courses are available in their own subjects.

One further activity of infrastructure providers demands attention. Software and hardware providers entered the training market early, in order to globalise their businesses and guarantee a standard level of quality service. Novell, Oracle, Sun Microsystems and Microsoft have all developed certification training materials and testing systems, which they franchise to training organisations or sell direct to individual customers. Certification in such specialist IT products is the largest global training market segment. Australian universities and, increasingly, UK universities are incorporating these certification products into degree programmes in order to attract students who are eager to be job-ready with both a degree and industry certification. The arrangement is considered win-win. The universities generally receive equipment and local support, and the training materials produced by the companies concerned, while companies gain a supply of trained graduates with a predisposition to certain IT products. It is a significant inroad into the autonomy of university curriculum decision-making.

**Infrastructure providers are reluctant to participate because they see there is no easy route to profitability in cross-border online education**

One strategy adopted by non-profit higher education providers hoping to become transnational has been the formation of consortia into for-profit ventures. However, the global model has not demonstrated any convincing commercial returns to date.

Universitas 21 Global, freshly re minted as Universitas Global, is the most highly publicised of these consortia due to its collapsed partnership with News Limited and its more recent and controversial relationship with Thompson Learning. This venture was another public-private partnership undertaken because the founding Chair, Professor Alan Gilbert of the Driver University of Melbourne, understood that no single public university could muster the financial resources, or possess the global reach, to establish a brand and a service that could capitalise on the supposed worldwide demand for education.

The consortium will avoid the intellectual property challenges faced by many universities in their distance education ventures through commissioning Thompson's own stable of writers instead of academics from the participating universities. While this is commercially sensible, it has raised the ire of staff in participating universities, as well as student unions, because a separate company, Universitas 21 Pedagogica, will determine the validity and quality of curricula, not members of each university’s academic board. Pedagogica will have a representative from each university’s board, but the accreditation process is far more streamlined than the usual academic processes.

Another feature, which may contribute to any eventual success of the venture, is that Universitas Global will develop new programmes that will not directly compete with member institutions' existing trans-national programmes. It is also instructive that, while the original 1997 Universitas 21 plan was to advertise exclusively online through a game structure, the most recent plans appear to encompass video, satellite and perhaps even face-to-face classes: a measure of the lessons learnt by Pedagogica since the dot-com bubble burst.

A further example concerns UK e-Universities Worldwide, the British e-University, which was announced by the government with a commitment of £62 million in 2000. The government sought private partners but was only able to attract a relatively small investment, mostly in the form of in-kind support from Sun Microsystems. By 2001, it was clear to commercial software companies that there was no easy route to profitability in online education across borders, hence the reluctance of infrastructure providers to participate.

As with Universitas Global, the brand name of e-Universities Worldwide is not recognised, and marketing costs could well prove enormous. Further, neither venture seems to have considered the moral challenges of online teaching in China, where censorship laws continue to block access to sites that should be deemed essential in business and management courses. One might question whether a research university should actively participate in a censored education.

The lessons of e-learning provision can be summarised as follows. First, online and borderless education requires a heavy investment in money and in the systems that can accommodate student-learning needs for support, contextualisation and technical assistance. Research universities have been slow to focus on the use of technology for teaching, especially at undergraduate level. Their IT systems have often been bolted onto heritage teaching and learning approaches. They have established semi-autonomous continuing education units, premised on commercial principles, as with the Fathom experiment at Columbia, which are not well integrated into the institution as a whole. They have not had the institution-wide debates on
system change that are critical to 21st-Century contexts. The present seminar series on Borderless Education is an excellent beginning, but the debate must be engaged at the level of each institution, much as the Massachusetts Institute of Technology undertook when it mooted its Open Knowledge Initiative. Non-profit and public universities must carefully consider how they might fund such investments and support them in the long-term. The lesson, thus far, is that system change and borderless ventures must be sustained from operating monies or profit and not simply be reliant on one-off grants or foundation funds. One Australian estimate, for example, projects a 25-30 year profit pay-off for the establishment of an offshore campus in Asia.

There is a real tension between the time frames of traditional universities and those of the business world

This leads to my second point. There is a real tension between the time frames of traditional universities and those of the business world, with universities measuring their reputational brand over generations and the lifetime of their graduates, and businesses measuring their return on investment over a tax year, if not a tax quarter. Related to this is a fundamental clash of values, traditional university customs espouse slow, careful and inclusive deliberations. Curriculum decisions are not made at net speed. Many of the ventures that failed in the dot-com crash did so because government and institutions lost patience when they lost money in the short-term. Partly for this reason, public-private partnerships carry some risks for universities, as the Fuqua story illustrates. Research universities would be well advised to ensure that their contracts with private partners contain ongoing disclosure requirements of the private partners and they should have sound risk-management strategies in place.

The third point is that only 2% of the for-profit education market in the US consists of online programmes. The for-profits themselves capture under 10% of the total degree market in the United States, so research universities are not facing a massive challenge by for-profit online providers, whether from the US or elsewhere. Rather, they are contemplating a more insidious threat, dominance of the publishing market by media giants, such as Thomson Learning. These giants are covering all bases through strategic alliances with business firms, like IBM; targeting the corporate market for short courses, through partnerships with online providers like Cardian; and through investment in potential global consortia like Universitas Global. Like Novell, Sun, Sap and Microsoft, Thomson is keen to insert its prepared learning materials into university curricula. Research universities must work assiduously to protect their autonomy in relation to their curricula. They must apply the same standards to vetting the quality of online and prepared courses as they do to the choice of textbooks, without being seduced by equipment trade-offs and proprietary laboratories such as those offered by SAP and Microsoft.

Fourth, with a few exceptions in niche programmes such as Fuqua’s elite Global Executive MBA, the online market appears to be a convenience standardised curriculum market in high-demand vocational areas and it is largely confined to North America. Non-credit courses have attracted the most investment by corporations, but these corporations are finding that employees are not completing a full certificate and are dropping out at high rates, forcing them to mandate training and to demand company-specific customisation of generic learning products. Research universities can, undoubtedly, use their reputation to commercialise their teaching activities, but I think they should do so by convincing potential corporate clients and individuals that their value lies in very careful targeting of elite cohorts, such as Fuqua’s programmes do.

What then are research-intensive universities, committed to developing a learning network, to do in a borderless world? From the evidence of the last few years, it would appear that loose networks of like-minded universities, such as the Europaeum, provide the basis of more formalised consortia. These consortia are more likely to succeed, I suggest, where they are regional, rather than global. It also seems clear that cross-border collaborations in research are enormous beneficiaries of the new technologies. Private funding and supra-national agencies, such as UNESCO, have fostered borderless research, particularly in health, engineering and IT.

It may be, as Hilary Perrion has argued, that research networks are likely to be a more achievable and productive use of the technologies for development aid than teaching activities, and this form of development aid could be a major focus for research universities’ public-good activities. But the real benefits of new technologies in universities will not be realised until we harness their educative powers. That means less emphasis on supplying the technical infrastructure, a lesson the World Bank learned in relation to its sponsorship of the African Virtual University, and more emphasis on pedagogical and systems issues. In the European context, it means progressing from Bonn, Bologna and Prague agreements to pursue mutual recognition of programmes and subjects, to encourage physical and virtual mobility of
students. This is the lesson of credit transfer that we can learn from the University of Phoenix. As more national governments introduce or increase tuition fees and our students become more conscious of the costs of their education, there is a real danger that the cross-cultural benefits of student exchanges and inter-institutional enrolment will be lost unless we can do more to harmonise programmes and policy and funding settings.

In the tradition of public good within universities, harnessing the benefits of new technologies should also mean developing standards and protocols to enable the sharing of teaching resources with universities here and in the developing world. Realising the potential of borderless education also means more collaboration in devising a core curriculum of subjects acceptable to all members and subjects which are supported, not replaced, by e-learning opportunities and digital learning materials, whose development costs can be split amongst the universities. In this way, the universities will have learnt the lessons of high development costs that Cardian University learned to its detriment, and the lesson that purely online providers have learnt to their cost: with some exceptions, students, even postgraduate students who were predicted to flock to online courses, prefer what is called the hybrid, or blended approach, a mix of face-to-face, online, print and other material delivery modes.

This is certainly the lesson that the Fuqua programmes illustrate. Harnessing the benefits of new technologies also means a heavy investment in the professional development of academic and general staff in the appropriate application of new technologies, and the pedagogical applications that networked learning supports, for example, approaches such as constructivist learning and more independent learning amongst students. It means a careful monitoring of student attitudes and readiness for less dependent learning, like Oxford Brookes University’s summary. It means raising the awareness of all university staff that the nature of the institution itself is changing yet again, in response to the social, economic and technical forces that swirl about us all.

And finally, in the light of our themes, New Times: New Responsibilities, it seems to me that a learning network such as this has an old responsibility in a climate where society is induced to view the world through the prism of the market and market values. The revelations of unethical behaviour and the drive for short-term returns that have rocked the business world over the past year make this an opportune time for universities to reassert and reaffirm the values of a disinterested scholarship, which sits outside the market. In a community of scholars, this means ensuring the integrity of our processes and our people in research and teaching as emblems of our continuing responsibility to act in the public good. This does not absolve us from the necessity of observing market forces as they impinge on universities, but it does require us to demonstrate the value of the long-term perspective in an institution that is charged with conserving knowledge, like the university.

**Discussant**

**Robert Barnett**  
*Professor of Education, Institute of Education, University of London*

It is very helpful to have the recent data that Professor Ryan has given us this morning. I want to pull out some of the issues that arise from his paper. One of the challenges, in front of us, given his analysis, is to try to work out, as it were, the balance sheet. What are the profits and what are the losses that the new information technology revolution offers? In the last seminar in this series, where you looked at some of the empirical data, it emerged that 80% of students want course-specific web pages to support their class-based learning. So there is a considerable interest, if not demand, within the student body for their academic courses to take advantage of the new opportunities that information technology offers.

**To what extent is a student being reframed as a consumer and no longer as a co-participant in a genuine educational transaction?**

What changes, if any, are likely to arise in the pedagogical relationship as between student and lecturer through the use of these technologies? What are the pedagogical possibilities and drawbacks? A computer cannot smile and, trite as it may seem, there may be something in that reflection that lies behind the attrition rates that we have been hearing about. I think we can say, without irony, that an educational relationship is a human relationship and so there are challenges in front of those who want to use these technologies to, as it were, model or find substitutes for the human dimension. It may be that they exhaust or go beyond the limits of these technologies. To what extent is a student being reframed as a consumer and no longer as a co-participant in a genuine educational transaction? Then, again, for those who are actually designing web pages, what considerations go into the design of the web pages themselves? Where students have been given the responsibility of designing their own web pages it is interesting to see the kinds of web pages they design compared with their lecturers. Students
apparently want a different kind of visual in front of them.

Again to pick up points that Professor Ryan made, if we are seeing a loss of immediate academic control over the curriculum, whether because of consortia of universities designing core curricula or because they are being designed by commercial partners, are we seeing a change in how we understand the character of the Western university? Are we seeing a shift in what we take learning to be in this environment? We use the phrase “learning networks,” but to what extent are we seeing networks develop? We may, for example, be witnessing the development of new and exciting networks between students. There is evidence to suggest that some students find it easier to network with each other in this environment where they are less exposed and less under the gaze of the lecturer. Are we seeing a shift in the character of learning itself, to less deep modes of learning and to more surface modes of learning, and are we seeing a shift in epistemologies as the discourse changes from one of formal propositions to one of visual imagery? So there may be some fundamental changes going on here in the educational process.

Again, these are simply pessimistic reflections because it may be that there are real opportunities here, real gains that computers can offer students in some subjects, exposure to experiences that would not be possible in the real world. Even in subjects like Medicine and Engineering simulations are now possible to give students exposure to experiences that would not otherwise be available to them. Then again, it may be, as Professor Ryan has suggested, that computers and information technology are opening up education for populations that otherwise simply would not have access to it, not just for rural communities or communities in developing countries, but also, for example, disabled students.

How does the information technology revolution, if it is that, impact differently on different disciplines? Is it going to have a different impact on Medicine, for example, as compared with Philosophy?

What other quality considerations? We have heard about attrition rates and possible plagiarism. What are the options for students to give feedback on their educational process? Professor Ryan has clearly indicated that the costs are themselves difficult to assess. I take it that one of the drives here is towards efficiency gains, or hoped-for efficiency gains, but are they really available? I think the jury is still out on that one.

Perhaps we need to be a little bit more modest in what we can expect from the so-called information technology revolution. That is not to say there are not gains to be had – it looks as if there are, but I think we do not know exactly how far they are real gains, and it may be that we need to see information technology much more as a supplement to existing face-to-face programmes. How it is used and taken up in mixed-mode educational processes needs considerable consideration in local situations, in the different disciplines and institutions. So I will conclude in the time-honoured way that researchers tend to conclude on these occasions, by saying that we need more research into the matter, both empirical and analytical, to explore these different balances, both the advantages and the possible disadvantages that lie in front of us.

Points from the Discussion:

Students as Commodities

A participant warned against relying simply on market and business forces, and described just-in-time production of students as a “horrible idea.”

The Europaum has an old responsibility in a climate where society is induced to view the world through the prism of the market and market values. The revelations of unethical behaviour and the drive for short-term returns that have rocked the business world over the past year make this an opportune time for universities to reassert and reaffirm the values of disinterested scholarship which sits outside the market. In a community of scholars, this means ensuring the integrity of our processes and our people in research and teaching, as emblematic of our continuing responsibility to act in the public good. This does not absolve us from the necessity of interacting with market forces as they impinge on universities, but it does require us to demonstrate the value of the long-term perspective in an institution charged with conserving knowledge approaches that networked learning supports, such as constructivist learning.

Cross-border Networks

Loose networks of like-minded universities (such as the Europaum) provide the basis for more formalized consortia. These consortia are more likely to succeed where they are regional rather than global.

Cross-border collaboration in research, and currency in research, are enormous beneficiaries of the new technologies. Private funding and supranational agencies such as the European Commission have fostered borderless research, particularly in health, engineering and IT.

Realising the potential of borderless education means more collaboration in devising a core curriculum of subjects acceptable to all members, and subjects which are supported – not replaced – by e-learning opportunities and digital learning materials whose development costs can be amortised among the universities.
Content vs. Delivery

It may be that research networks are likely to be more achievable and more productive in using technologies for development aid, as opposed to teaching activities.

Hardware and Access

We must not forget the digital divide, or "scientific apartheid," where there are fewer computers in the whole of Africa than in Paris or Berlin. This underscores the point that the issue is about values as well as technologies.

The real benefits of new technologies in universities will not be realised until we harness their educative powers. That means less emphasis on supplying the technical infrastructure – the lesson the World Bank learned from the AVU (African Virtual University) case – and more on the pedagogical and systems issues.

In the tradition of conceptualising public good within universities, it should also mean developing standards and protocols to enable the sharing of teaching resources with organisations such as the AVU and universities in the developing world.

Models for Online Courses

Universities will have learned the lessons of high development costs that Cardean University learned to its detriment, and the lesson that purely online providers have learned to their cost: that with some exceptions, students – even postgraduate students who were predicted to flock to online courses – prefer what is called the ‘hybrid’ or ‘blended’ approach, a mix of face-to-face, online, print and other material delivery modes. This is certainly the lesson of the Fuqua programme.

Universities must make a heavy investment in the professional development of academic and general staff in appropriate application of new technologies, and the pedagogy of independent learning amongst students. It means careful monitoring of student attitudes and readiness for less “dependent” learning. It means raising the awareness of all university staff that the nature of the institution is changing yet again, in response to the social, economic and technical forces that swirl about us all.

Student Exchanges

In the European context, it means using the Sorbonne, Bologna and Prague agreements to pursue mutual recognition of programs and subjects to encourage physical and virtual mobility of students. This is the lesson of credit transfer we can learn from UOP (University of Phoenix Online), especially as more national governments introduce or increase tuition fees and our students become more conscious of the costs of their education. There is a real danger that the cross-cultural benefits of student exchanges and inter-institutional enrolment will be lost unless we can do more to harmonise programs and policy and funding settings.

Availability of Resources

Access to books had changed partly because students expected them to be available as easily as net-based material. They do not think it should be necessary to wait for days for books that had been ordered from the other side of the country.

WORKSHOP C: Bridging Europe: New Links to the Centre and East

Chair: Joost van Asten
Director of International Relations, Leiden University

Over the past decade higher education in Eastern and Central European countries has been subjected to managed changes which maybe we have not all been fully aware of, and private institutions now contribute to higher education next to the classic or public ones. I am very pleased that Dr Voldemar Tomusk, who is a well-known expert on this field, has prepared to share his views on the developments with us this morning. Dr Tomusk is from Estonia and worked in various posts in universities and in the government before joining the Open Society Institute in Budapest.

Voldemar Tomusk
Deputy Director, Open Society Institute (Budapest)

There is one important point I have to stress before I move closer to the core points of my paper, which I have struggled with over the past several years. It is that I cannot deal with the Central-East European region as a single entity. I thought that this time had already passed; that already, some of the former Communist countries are members of NATO, others belong to the OECD, and several will join the European Union shortly, while other countries are in different positions. However, in this paper, I am supposed to look at the entire region, which is a little problematic.

There is an argument, against that of Burton Clark, which basically says that universities are expensive and good universities are very expensive. Now when we look at the costs of universities in the former state-socialist countries, we see that they are not expensive at all. One of
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the sad commonalities across the region is that these universities are very cheap, unfortunately. That is bad, and that makes their life difficult and limits what they can do. So that’s first. The second point, and I passionately stress it, is that we should not divide the region once again. I am very strongly against excluding, for example, Russia, Ukraine or Belarus from “Eastern European development.” For the academic environment we should look at the entire region. We cannot afford on this continent to exclude certain countries because the political divide happens in another place. This practice has given us a sad history.

Some people are very much afraid that this may happen again with the enlargement of the European Union in 2004, excluding Ukraine, Belarus, the Russian Federation and other countries from potential cooperation with Europe and the USA.

When we look at countries like the Russian Federation, Ukraine, and Romania, we can see that their universities are spending, per student, per annum, about two or three hundred dollars. It’s bad. The other side of the story is that when we are looking at the political discourse, let us say in Russia, they say that they are setting the world standard. So we are in a conflicting situation, a very controversial situation, where political discourse lives its own life while there real life is lived within the universities. It is difficult to put this together.

In my report I have tried to look at both sides, and around them both, and tried to understand the complexity. In the end, I have come to believe that post-state-socialist higher education reforms, which many expected to happen in 1989, did not happen. Radical reforms, which were expected to trigger renewal of the societies, did not happen for a variety of reasons.

Some of the revolutions that happened in 1989, and a few years later, against the centrally-planned totalitarian systems, happened thanks to intellectuals, either in the universities or as “independent” dissidents. At the point of revolution, intellectuals wanted passionately to separate higher education from central planning, planned economies and industry. Quite often it was referred to as the return to the Humboldtian model. When we look back at the discussions seven or eight years ago, some people accused East European universities of being Humboldtian, of being turned into ivory towers.

This has changed now, but that was their intention, and perhaps it was a good intention. There was a strong desire to return to the values lost over the previous decades. This did not happen for a variety of reasons. First, higher education systems were very large. Some of the higher education systems in the East European region had already reached what Martin Trow would call mass higher education level. In the 1980s and 90s, these countries were not in a position to fund top-flight higher education on massive scale, so there was (and remains) a fundamental conflict between quality and quantity.

What was more important, I believe, was what happened when the economies crashed. With fewer jobs to go round, more young people looked for places in higher education institutions. Of course, social and economic insecurity have increased enrolment, moving more and more desperate young people towards higher education, demanding free-of-charge higher education. But there are other factors at work when we are looking at the Russian Federation, where enrolment is now beyond 40% of the age cohort. People say it is about creating a knowledge society. This tells you something about how fast the country is moving ahead. People also point to the war in Chechnya, with young men trying to avoid army conscription by going to universities. They are spiritually going to universities not to die in Chechnya.

This relates to my own experience when I was a citizen of the Soviet Union, 20 years ago, when I was a student, and there was the Afghanistan war. It really made me study very hard, because I did not want to go to Afghanistan. It was very clear – you drop out and within five days the report is in the military office, and you go.

Instead of the turning to the Humboldtian ideals or the new Western model for education, many East Europeans are suddenly thinking that the pre-1989 system might be worth another look

Curiously enough, when the idea of what Westernisation really means developed, suddenly East European universities did not want the Westernisation model, which the consultants and others who came to Eastern Europe brought. They wanted something else. They did not want university-industrial relationships, they wanted the opposite. We did not want to have new managerialism. We wanted to have research for its own sake. This, combined by the “new realities” of the 21st Century, created some disappointment and, worse, cynicism about how to resolve growing tension and competition regarding funding, fee paying students, etc.

Looking at the recent past, some 10 years after the revolutions, we suddenly see that these higher-education systems are old. State-socialist higher education wasn’t that bad after all. Of course, it was, actually – I mean we made some bad compromises – but it was fairly high-quality. Instead of the turning to the Humboldtian ideals or
the new Western model for education, many people are suddenly thinking that the pre-1989 system might be worth another look. Much of this sentiment comes from the universities themselves, where much of the faculty is a holdover from the previous era.

In some countries, in the early 90’s there were attempts to bring significant change into faculty, to (I don’t know how to say this properly) get rid of, replace the old professors of Marxist political economy and other scientific disciplines like that. A few years later they had a new accreditation law, and according to that accreditation law they have to have certain number of positions filled with higher degree holders. Of course, the only higher degree holders available were the former professors of scientific communism, so they had to be rehired.

It is a contradictory story. If nothing else, it tells you about the complexity of higher education. It tells you that higher education is more than what happens in the university. Higher Education is as much a product of what happens between the university and the society. Of course, we would like to sit in the university and do our work the best we can, but if one returns to the discussion we had last night about Philosophy, I think Hilary Putnam has this argument: he says one cannot really be systematically solipsistic. You can promote a solipsistic philosophy, but if you really want to be consistent, you will have a problem, which faces you as soon as you take your car and you drive to the first cross-roads. You have to decide whether the outside world exists or not, and at the first cross-roads the world becomes too real to you to say that it doesn’t really exist. It’s there, it’s out there and we have to consider that.

I will now move to the final part of my paper and say what I think we can do and what universities in – I can’t say Western Europe because there is no Western Europe and Eastern Europe – maybe traditional liberal morality across this continent, can do for the other part.

One of the problems I have – my perspective is of course different to that of the university perspective – outside of the university that I am working with, and what is really troubling me, is this cynicism about cooperation with East European universities. This cynicism comes from the root assumption that these people really don’t know anything. Western friends come with a sense of superiority, which shouldn’t be there. And what I see happening in the cooperation projects is that it’s more about establishing alliances to get money out of the system, whatever the system might be; whether it’s a Soros foundation as we are, or the European Commission or anything. But the issue out there is how to get money out of the system, it’s not how to get anything done. That’s a problem and in this partnership the Western partners, let’s put it like that, act as senior partners while Eastern partners seem to be those poor neighbours who have to agree with anything and often what they can get out of this cooperation is a few computers, their president travelling for a new experience somewhere which is not terribly relevant for him and he doesn’t know the language of this place where the meeting happens, but that’s what they get. Meanwhile, the Western partner receives nice consultancies and so forth, but for various reasons the real cooperation, the real work is not really happening. There is exploitation, in various senses of the term, and I think the partnership is not really there.

The Western partners act as senior partners while Eastern partners seem to be those poor neighbours who have to agree with anything

We have to first start from the work we have to do and then to look at the means of getting it done, and it is increasingly difficult. Western universities have been forced to go out and earn the consultancy funds to bring back to their universities, and it plays out in a very sad way in the East European context. And there is the gap between the academic disciplines. It is very difficult to have a discussion between somebody doing cultural studies, say in the British context, and somebody promoting cultural studies in Russia. These gaps are difficult to overcome. There should be dialogue between disciplines, but I believe that what is largely missing in East European Higher Education is the horizontal structures, academic communities, academic societies, and international peer-reviewed academic journals. Then they would be in a position to challenge the overwhelming hierarchical bureaucratic ethos prevailing in the system.

We have to think how to organise doctoral training in a way that will be recognised in East European countries which are very rigid, and to combine doctoral training in Eastern Europe and Western Europe; perhaps establishing joint doctoral programmes with dual degrees in both countries so that people can study in both countries, and not contribute to the brain drain. When training is only provided by Western universities, there is the threat that these people will never return. The World Bank is thinking about structural reforms and we do not think about how this will affect students. We can take the Bologna initiative, to which East European countries have formally committed, but when we get to the university level, what we get is another strict dividing line between the undergraduate and graduate studies. But, when I’m asking what sense
does it make for a student, e.g. has there been any curriculum change between those levels?, they say: “No – we have introduced bachelor degrees, often we see that this bachelor degree is not recognised on the labour market, it is not vocationally designed in a way that students have something that they can use to their benefit, and it is there to meet the political requirements.” When discussing those initiatives, I think we should look through the students’ eyes and think about what they get out of it. Another suggestion is international student summer schools where students get together from East and West European universities for an inter-disciplinary summer school on various subjects. When we discuss the horrible events last September in New York, we can take this one example and see what it means, what it is politically and economically, and what the religious background is.

We need something that can get East and West European students excited again about the life of the mind

We need something that can get East and West European students excited again about the life of the mind. We are in great difficulties introducing inter-disciplinary studies in Eastern Europe. It is not happening. Disciplines are weak, and inter-disciplinary study is even weaker, and perhaps this would be one of the ways to make sense of that. Not through the faculty but through the students. Putting these various perspectives together, getting faculties from various sites into such programmes, and creating new excitement around learning – that is the aim.

Discussant

Zdzislaw Mach
Professor of Sociology, Jagiellonian University, Krakow

It is not very easy for me to make comments on the paper, which I liked very much. There are several points on which I would like to be polemical. Let me first say that my own experience comes from Poland, to some extent also Hungary, and the Czech Republic, but I have very little experience in the former Soviet Union, and this makes my situation here rather difficult because I have a feeling that a lot of what you have said would be more relevant to Russia and the former Soviet Union than to other countries, although I may be mistaken. You have said yourself that you would not like to consider the whole region of Eastern Europe as homogenous. On the other hand I don’t want just to say that Poland is different, because it is not very helpful to say such things.

So let me concentrate on the general issues here. I definitely would support the diagnosis that the most important difficulty that Eastern European universities have to face is the lack of funds, and even a decrease of state funding. For instance in the Polish case, we know that to catch up with the leading countries in research would require spending 3% of the GNP for research, and what the country actually does spend is 0.5%. Of course it is really very difficult, and also funding for education has been steadily decreasing, not only in absolute, but also in relative terms. So, on the one hand, governments all over the region are really not paying enough; on the other hand they are expecting, certainly in Poland, universities to generate their own funds, which means the government expects universities to charge fees.

There is a kind of an illusion, which Eastern European governments try to maintain, that education is free, as it said in the Polish Constitution ‘education is free for all citizens’. On the other hand, not only is the reality different, but also governmental policy is different. In fact, it forces universities to top up the state budget with fees. Also, the lack of funds means that academics’ incomes are very low, and therefore professors or lecturers need to have two or three, or even more, jobs in order to survive at a decent level. This is done at the expense of research, family life, and health. This is really a very difficult point, although, even here, the situation is not identical across the region. For instance, colleagues from the Ukraine come to teach in private higher education institutions in Poland because Polish schools pay five or ten times more than Ukrainian schools, so even here the generalisation has to be very careful.

I do not quite agree with Tomusk’s conclusion that reforms, which were supposed to happen, did not happen. I think a lot of reforms did happen: democratisation of decision-making processes within the universities, decentralisation of funding, autonomy granted to the universities, which are now able to decide on their own curricula, their own research programmes, and they do not have to ask the government permission for most things. Also the internal procedures, like promotion being based on peer review, are a great difference. In Poland, the universities were able to maintain the peer review-system throughout the communist period. I know that elsewhere it was not that easy, but this has to be remembered, that it is not bureaucratic machinery that does it all. The review system and evaluation is there, and I would strongly defend this statement.

Many objections which conservative academics have against introduction of new ideas, new reforms, including those coming from the West,
are that they resemble the ideas that the communists had. For instance, the introduction of short-cycle courses instead of 5-year degree programmes resembles what the communist regime tried to do 50 years ago, to give degrees quickly and easily to their own people. So we do not want to have a one-year Masters degree, for instance, because it feels recidivist. Academics need to be convinced that this is completely different, but the objections and reservations come from the wish to defend quality rather than only power. The very painful and long process of acquiring higher doctorates and professorships and promotion is also defended on the grounds that it maintains quality, as otherwise everybody would become a professor, and everybody would establish higher universities everywhere and charge fees, and the quality would drop. Maybe part of this argument is cynical, but I think a lot of it is really quite genuine and people really mean what they say.

**Cooperation should not just be exchange of experience and things, but really doing things together like joint teaching, joint degrees, joint courses**

I support Mr Tomusk's view that the way to proceed now is further cooperation between West and East. If a Western European university wants to cooperate with an Eastern European university, there is a need to select a partner very carefully, but when one is selected it should be treated as equal in all respects, including the contribution to the intellectual and theoretical background of whatever project is in question. This is essential. It's better to limit the number of participants. Of course, if there’s money available, there is always a temptation to jump for it, but circumspection is essential, because otherwise the cooperation would not be real, and these are dangers that we have just been describing. Also, cooperation should not just be exchange of experience and things, but really doing things together like joint teaching, joint degrees, joint courses: people actually teaching jointly and giving degrees for which they are jointly responsible. This is the way, of course, to full recognition of quality and they are good examples of such practice. My own university is involved in several projects that lead to joint degrees and joint diplomas, and these are really good examples of very good practice. I think this is the way to achieve progress.

**Points from the Discussion**

Europe is in fact larger than people think. It stretches further to the East than we sometimes remember. Western European and American people rarely consider how East Europeans cannot always gain access to education and public discussion. Within the other Eastern European countries, access to the West depends on how close they are and how well the relationships are established. In Berlin we were discussing programmes to involve Eastern European universities. Courses should be taught in English because it is not very realistic to think that people can learn Czech or Hungarian in a short time and go to these countries for a year to study.

There has been a steady increase in the popularity of such courses, so they should be further developed. It is important to convince academic circles, but also bureaucrats, that these courses are expensive, and therefore self-financing, but that the costs are justified. Sometimes people don’t want to take a risk of establishing a course and investing a lot of money in it, risking that it will be a failure. Governments are not prepared to support this, but autonomous universities can do it themselves.

Regarding equality in cooperation projects, two partners should be treated identically and should represent similar levels to prevent any danger of an inferiority complex. Weaker partners can interact with those who are more advanced and be shown how they can improve. This partnership of unequals also has a role of bringing up the level of the weaker partner. This is a delicate question of personal sensibilities and sensitivities.

We were wrong in our assessment of educational systems in Eastern Europe. We thought if their economies were backward, their education system must be like that also. That was not true. There are fields in some Eastern countries in which they are more advanced than us. Eastern Europe has a state educational system, we have a mixed system. We should avoid a Colonial attitude, because the state educational system can work. Don’t forget that Japan, South Korea and most Asian countries have state educational systems that work very well. We should not be too rigid when we approach Eastern countries, and must be equal partners.

We should stress the crucial problem of the level of freedom and autonomy in universities. In the Czech Republic, the level of autonomy we have could be seen as an example for other countries, including France and Germany.

The gradual adoption of English as a means of communication between universities has greatly enhanced the interaction and the exchange of ideas between universities in Western Europe.

The European tradition is multi-lingual, so we should learn languages - we should learn English, French and German. It would be good if Western colleagues also learn Russian, Ukrainian and Polish. Behind each language there is another
world, and we shouldn’t reduce it to one single world. In Europe, English is not enough.

Not everybody can cooperate with everybody. It is not the West versus East anymore, but a wider diversity. Choose partners very carefully.

WORKSHOP D: The Place of Language

Rosalind Greenstein
Paris I University

Although my report on the place of language in the borderless university is not aimed specifically at academics or language specialists, the issues raised and the recommendations proposed for discussion are based in part on theoretical considerations about language, culture and society, pedagogy and didactics, and human and machine communication. When I sat down to prepare it I began, however, by simply jotting down a number of recommendations that came intuitively to mind. They were initially in no particular order but were a reflection of my experience as both a senior lecturer in English for law and a professional translator and technical rewriter for researchers in artificial intelligence, two very different specialised fields of knowledge. I then put the list aside and started to research the theoretical aspects of language and culture. I also devised and sent a questionnaire to students who had studied or were still studying at a foreign university and who had to use a foreign language. It was only once I was ready to draft the report that I returned to my list of recommendations and saw that my intuition had not been far off the mark since much of what I had read supported and justified the various points. The common thread running throughout is the conviction that plurilingualism is the only way forward, if we are to progress as human beings, as social beings living in the real as opposed to the virtual world.

When, in an academic context, we read a book or an article either directly in the foreign language in which it was written or translated into another language that we understand, we don’t say to ourselves “Aha, I’m part of the borderless university”. When we work in a specific field and systematically use a foreign language, we still don’t think of ourselves as functioning in a borderless university. When we use Internet, I’m not sure we think of it in terms of a borderless anything, but as something which can provide a lot of information fast. Never have I heard anyone in any of the above-mentioned contexts make any reference, direct or indirect, to borders or absence thereof. Borderless education is a fine concept but what does it mean, what are its objectives and how should they be achieved? In order to try and answer these questions it is first of all necessary to identify different types of border, the order being of no relevance here. Traditionally, they may be:

- Geographical, i.e. borders that separate countries.
- Spatial, i.e. physical distances between prospective students and places of learning. These borders include geographical ones but also exist within countries.
- Temporal, in the sense that the acquisition of knowledge may be synchronous with its dissemination, as in the presence of students at a lecture or tutorial, or asynchronous, as in the reading of written materials, the use of recorded materials, etc.
- Financial, i.e. those borders that separate well-endowed universities from those less fortunate, richer students from the less well-off, people who can afford to study from those who cannot.
- Generational, i.e. borders between those who undertake university studies at a more traditional age (today, more or less straight from school, sometimes after a gap year) and those who either go to university for the first time a number of years later or go back to university, having already been there at an earlier stage, i.e. lifelong learners.
- Psychological, i.e. between those who adapt easily to university life and take full advantage of their studies with little or no difficulty and those who find it harder to adapt.
- Functional, i.e. the borders that outline the different objectives of university education, from the point of view of the institution, the teaching staff, the students, society. These objectives may be utilitarian, vocational, a question of personal fulfilment, a question of providing an educated population, a way to advance knowledge, a way to train people for the future, a way to respond to market needs, etc. and they often overlap.
- Linguistic and cultural, the two elements being intimately connected. Though several countries may well share a common language, the United Kingdom and the Republic of Ireland, for example, or Germany and Austria, or France, Belgium and Switzerland, the cultural differences may be such that the notion of border would not be inappropriate. At the same time, cultural similarities exist despite linguistic differences.

Today, however, many of these borders are becoming blurred, notably through the development of Information and Communication Technologies (ICT). This process, which began with the Open University and more traditional distance learning, in different forms, is now
accelerating not only in quantitative terms but also in qualitative ones. Students and teachers no longer have to be physically present but can communicate on-line in real time, thus breaking down the notions of spatial and temporal borders, for example. This offers the possibility of increased access, thus broadening the potential student population in terms of number and background, enabling people to study full time at a distance, to work and study part-time, to reconcile university with other commitments. It facilitates initial learning and enables the notion of lifelong learning to become a reality.

But as a corollary, new borders are appearing in the form of machines and technology which come between the different users. Consequently, students and teachers need to be computer literate; they also have to rely on a solid technological infrastructure and backup when things go wrong. Moreover, much information on the Internet is available mainly or only in English, or at least an international form of English, the new lingua franca of the technological age. Although these changes do increase access to learning and knowledge for many, they may also close the doors to others who have neither the money nor the computing or language skills to use these technologies, thus increasing the economic, digital and linguistic divide and gravitating the risk of social exclusion. In other words, while physical distances are breaking down, thus bringing people closer together, at least virtually, cultural and linguistic distances risk pulling people apart, unless they are prepared and acquire the competences necessary to overcome them.

Returning now to the important question, what are the different objectives of borderless higher education? It would be a truism to say that it is a question of breaking down the various borders, and impossible to break down all those mentioned above. But what is necessary is to rethink the borders, see how they change our expectations and, conversely, look at how our expectations and needs inform the way we see the borders. Perhaps the one general objective would be to break down the different barriers between individuals and peoples of different countries, languages, cultures or generations, so as to encourage greater understanding and tolerance, to enable people to benefit from each other’s experience and view of the world, thus combating xenophobia and contributing to transforming globalisation from something that is endured by most to something that is enriched by all, both individually and collectively. This is a very lofty ideal and goes far beyond the confines of higher education, but although fewer people attend university than do not, university as a seat of learning, as one of the places in society where values are developed, strengthened and passed on, where the boundaries of knowledge are pushed out, has a seminal role to play in the achievement of this ideal.

In more concrete terms, how can the borderless university be achieved? Does it mean taking the university to the student, through greater use of Information and Communication Technologies, thus reducing or erasing the obstacles of the spatial and temporal borders? This is however a two-way process and can either make university available to those who traditionally do not or cannot attend by taking it into their homes or, on the contrary, send back home those who traditionally study at university. It is, therefore, a double-edged weapon because however good it may be to increase access to university and learning, the attendant risk is to isolate people from each other by forgetting the social and community element of academic exchange, the cut and thrust of face-to-face discussion, the informality of chance meetings and unplanned activities that, by definition, cannot exist when people have to log on at the same time. There are certain things that ICT (and libraries, for that matter) cannot replace, as a German Erasmus student studying law in Paris so aptly pointed out: “I could have read the books back home in Germany, but attending the classes taught by the professors who wrote them and, more importantly, taking part in student discussions during tutorials were irreplaceable and by far the most enriching aspect of the experience”.

One general objective would be to break down the different barriers between different countries, languages, cultures or generations

Does the borderless university mean that just one language should be used? This can be seen in both positive and negative terms. Having one common language, presumably English, could be cost-effective in that it could be taught as a core subject to everyone, and only those who wish to do so would learn other languages. In terms of numbers, too, more people will be able to communicate if they have the same foreign (or in some cases, native) language than if there is an exponential number of combinations. But what about language diversity? What about the relationship between language and culture? What about the fact that using a language as a means of access to information has little or nothing to do with knowledge and understanding of the country and of the people for whom it is their native tongue? What about the fact that one’s view of the world is intimately connected to the language and culture one is brought up in? If only one language is used, is imposed, to what extent will the community created by the borderless university be a world unto its own, cut off from the countries,
cultures and languages of origin, as is already the case with what is known familiarly as Eurospeak or Eurobabble, a tongue that only those working in Brussels really understand?

**The sole use of English would be a threat to languages that are less widely used and taught**

It is clear that several inter-related issues are at stake here. The first is the place of ICT in education, the second the choice between a *lingua franca* and a plurilingual and pluricultural education, i.e. a choice between a form of efficiency and an attempt to preserve language and cultural diversity. The third is the question of physical mobility, i.e. of students actually going to other countries to study. The fourth is what I would call intellectual mobility, i.e. the ability to function in another language with its own way of thinking, which is essential whether the student is physically mobile or in front of a computer screen at home. If the global aims of education in general, and the borderless university in particular, are personal development, employability, greater tolerance and understanding of others, what policy decisions have to be made, remembering of course that whatever is decided it will have a cost?

**Recommendations**

The following recommendations have been grouped into different categories. They are here to serve as a basis for discussion, not as a list of things that must be done without question. Reasons for the recommendations are also given.

**Language diversity**

The more languages a person learns, the more each language can fertilise the others.

In the name of short-term efficiency many promote the study of English, to the detriment of language diversity. A way to reconcile the two would be to offer English and a wide choice of a second language, to similar levels.

Why language diversity? Without being over dramatic, I feel that the sole use of English would be a threat to languages that are less widely used and taught. Many studies have been done on the disappearance of languages. They disappear either through such modification that they are no longer recognisable and, to all intents and purposes, no longer exist (Latin, for example) or through the losing battle between an existing language whose social prestige or usefulness diminish and another language that is seen to be better and that is socially and politically dominant. This won't necessarily happen overnight but the process is accelerating.

If English continues to be encouraged as the *lingua franca* and no other languages are learnt, it can only accelerate the process even more. Moreover, since the borderless university can mean e-learning within and across national frontiers, a problem would arise if, for example, course providers devised materials only in English, say, thus obliging native distance learners to use a foreign language in their own country. The consequences would be the following:

- Resentment on the part of native speakers whose languages become 'second class'.
- An increasing gap between the language and the culture of the speakers.
- An increasing gap between the generations: the older generations would still speak the 'dying' language, the intermediate ones would speak a modified form greatly influenced by the dominant language, the younger generations would speak the dominant language and no longer be able to communicate with the older. This is an over simplification but the phenomenon has been observed in many language communities.

However, we cannot be naïve and we must also consider the question of efficiency. Can our society afford the financial cost of promoting language diversity and how will this help or hinder communication? One might be tempted to say that teaching one language makes practical and economic sense but can we think purely in these terms? I suggest that in the long run the human and social cost outweighs the others and that if one were to be realistic the best solution would be to promote proficiency in English and in at least one other language.

Investment needs to be made in two major areas: teachers and a solid ICT infrastructure that is cheap for the user and easily accessible.

In a borderless university more teachers are needed rather than fewer, to help students use ICT intelligently and wisely whatever the language and to prepare the students to work in foreign languages, whether at home or abroad.

Many people think that the development of Information and Communication Technologies (in both quantitative and qualitative terms) reduces the need for human teachers (once the student has learned to master the technical aspects of the tool). But precisely because of the huge amount of information available, students (and others, for that matter) are not necessarily in a position to distinguish between 'serious' sources and unreliable ones. Although this is true whatever the source, it is compounded by the sheer quantities involved.

As for the learning process proper, there is a general problem when a student writes an essay or prepares a paper that some or much of it may be lifted straight from the sources (with or without
acknowledgement). When an essay used to be handwritten, the very process of copying out the source at least meant that the student retained some of the information while copying.

I'm not suggesting that we should turn the clock back - it would indeed be impossible - but we should think carefully about the fact that with a couple of mouse clicks it is now possible to cut and paste large extracts without reading or understanding them and no actual learning takes place. The role of the teacher is therefore essential, not to monitor 'cheating' but to make sure the subject is understood and that the student is pushed to think about what he or she has found and to appropriate the new knowledge and skills.

Remember too that learning is essentially a human activity. This is another reason for teachers to continue to play an important role, though they may have to rethink their current teaching methods. ICT can free them from traditional activities but will make different demands on them. Employing teachers and retraining them, where necessary, costs money.

Lastly, Information and Communication Technologies cost money too and the question is 'who should pay?'. In order not to exclude the less well-off sections of society, access should be cheap, easily available and provided by the system (whether publicly or privately funded is an aspect that needs to be addressed but does not change the fundamental principle). If the cost is borne by the end user, the financial borders will be exacerbated and the social divide will grow, again contrary to the spirit of the borderless university.

Language Teaching

The general approach to language teaching should be that of plurilingualism.

This means that the five skills as defined in the Common European Framework of Reference (listening, reading, spoken production, spoken interaction, writing) do not necessarily have to be of the same standard and that a student may well have highly developed passive skills in one language, reasonably developed active and passive skills in a second and survival level in a third. As and when the need arises, the relevant skill can be developed.

A student who stays 'at home' and consults the Internet passively will not need the same skills as a student who is preparing to go abroad to study. But both need to work on reading skills. A student who takes part in a video-conference and a student studying abroad will both need to work on their spoken production and interaction. The latter will probably also need survival skills in addition to more academic ones. Students who follow classes given by visiting professors in a foreign language will have the same academic language needs as those who are mobile. In all the above cases the language is taught with a utilitarian aim in mind but of course the student's personal development and the broadening of his or her horizons is very much part of it too.

There should be a greater focus on Languages for Special Purposes (LSP). One might well say that each time language is used it is used for a special purpose, so what are we talking about? The notion of Languages for Special Purposes is based on the idea that although the grammar and lexis used to talk or write about a specific domain (law, medicine, economics, architecture, etc.) are of course part of the general language, certain grammatical structures may appear more often while others may rarely be used, and the lexis is either specific to the domain or has different meanings depending on whether it is used in the general language or the domain.

Students who have done badly at languages at school don't want to find themselves doing the same thing over and over again and failing over and over again. Learning language as a means to understand and work in their field of study is more motivating and more efficient than learning language in the abstract. When the incorrect use of lexis or grammar not only makes communication difficult or impossible but, even worse, gives a totally different (or wrong) message, the student will make the necessary effort. In other words, at university level the foreign language should be seen as a tool to do other things rather than just as something to be studied for itself.

Learning language as a means to understand and work in their field of study is more motivating and more efficient than learning language in the abstract

Student mobility

In order to develop and promote plurilingual and pluricultural competence, more exchanges and more combined degrees involving two or more countries should be encouraged. Examples include the joint degrees in law offered by the Université Paris I (Panthéon-Sorbonne) and different partners, depending on the option. An equal number of students from Paris I and the partner university (King's College, London; Cologne; Complutense, Madrid, etc.) spend the first two years together at the partner university, the last two years in Paris. They graduate with two law degrees, one from each country, have access to the Bar exams of the two, and have attained excellent levels of linguistic, cultural and sometimes professional proficiency.

At the same time, it is necessary to promote greater awareness among faculty and
administrative staff of the presence and specific needs of foreign students and the contribution they make to university life.

This involves, among other things, rethinking assessment and grading criteria to allow for language difficulties and cultural differences, problems of method (at least at the beginning) and gaps in background knowledge (students who have studied in the host country are assumed to have this knowledge). When a student arrives in the host country, much more attention should be paid to the student’s immediate needs. Induction courses of some kind would be useful (and more efficient and more economical than doing the same in the original countries). They must be practical and could include the following:

- Intensive language training and support for those who need it, in the field of study.
- Training in specific techniques such as note-taking in the foreign language.
- A short course in method, e.g. how to write a dissertation in law, how to present a scientific experiment, how to give an oral paper. Although local students may also have problems of method, general method classes for all students (local and foreign) is not the solution, since foreign students have specific difficulties that need to be addressed.
- A detailed explanation of course requirements, methods of assessment, the university system and culture of which this particular degree course is a part.
- Specific help, preferably from volunteer students from the host country, in finding accommodation, carrying out the various formalities (opening a bank account, registering with a doctor, filling out different university forms, etc.).

In terms of housing, although student halls of residence are an excellent way of bringing people together, it would be better to have as broad a mix as possible of ‘native’ and foreign students rather than have specific halls for foreigners.

If possible, the accommodation office of a university should pay particular attention to students from abroad and include flat sharing and bedsits with the local population among the offers. Mixing with native speakers of the host country is the best way to learn the more colloquial aspects of the language and to meet people from different walks of life. This is of course a personal matter and it is the student’s responsibility to make an effort to meet ‘native speakers’. Housing policy can, however, have an influence.

Similarly, Erasmus students (and other foreign students) should be part of mainstream university life, rather than follow courses designed specifically for them, with little or no contact with local students.

This recommendation corresponds to the model of mobility where foreign students spend a semester abroad. The drawback of their following courses designed specifically for non-native speakers is that they only communicate among themselves, thus reinforcing language mistakes and cultural misunderstandings and cutting them off from the general population. Culturally speaking, the result is often very enriching but more in terms of tourism than in terms of getting to know the country and the people who live there. However laudable this may be, it is not perhaps the main aim of this kind of student mobility.

With the exception of universities in countries whose languages are less widely used and less taught (Denmark, Finland, the Netherlands, for instance), it would be better to offer degree courses to foreigners in the language of the country rather than in English, as seems to be a worrying trend today.

I am referring here to self-contained diplomas or degrees targeted specifically at foreign students rather than classical degree courses which foreign students follow in part. It seems to me that economic interests are used to justify offering such courses in English, as the universities think they can thus attract foreign students from as yet untapped markets such as China. Maybe, but the students remain completely isolated from the host community; the linguistic and cultural aspects of courses such as an LLM (where the legal concepts are completely embedded in the language and where translation makes a nonsense of the subject) are distorted; the language of the country is not defended at all. Unfortunately, this is a developing trend in France and seems somewhat contradictory when we consider the general policy of France to defend (and quite rightly so) her language and culture. This does not of course mean there should be no visiting professors (whose only medium of expression is English) and that no course should ever be given in a language other than that of the country, but this is true for classes for all students and not just foreign ones.

**Evaluation**

It would surely be more efficient if each country were to develop and expand its own scheme(s) for its own language (DELF and DALF in France, for example) and train teachers and testers in other countries.

Although the Common European Framework of Reference for Languages provides a comprehensive, transparent, coherent and flexible system to refer to in terms of teaching, learning and assessment objectives and accreditation, and although it is right to enable each country to develop and introduce such teaching and assessment schemes for different languages (including its own), this is not necessarily the best
or most efficient way of defending languages, and in particular lesser used and less taught ones. Currently, many resources are devoted to the setting up of assessment and accreditation, to the detriment of actual teaching and learning.

Regardless of the number of candidates taking the test, the actual designing and preparation of the tests is the same. It would therefore be far more cost-effective to have a French test of French, a German test of German, etc. rather than Greek, Spanish and Danish tests of French and so on. Testing would be done locally and the Spanish would train local teachers and testers for the Spanish test, Italians for the Italian test, etc. In addition, the risk of credential inflation and lack of credibility would be reduced. Last but not least, if each country is responsible for its own language it can defend that language by the very fact that evaluation and accreditation exist. After all, given the financial and material constraints that we have to work with, it would be very unrealistic to think that all countries would provide testing in all languages.

In conclusion, let me repeat that the borderless university is but one facet of an open, tolerant and peaceful society and student mobility is only one part of the picture. Plurilingual and pluricultural competence should be encouraged not only for immediate or utilitarian purposes (academic, economic, business, etc) but also with a view to personal development and enrichment. I have said enough. I hope that this short presentation, taken with the background report, have given you food for thought and that the exchange of ideas will be fertile and productive.

**Discussant**

**Robert Vanderplank**  
*Director, Oxford University Language Centre and Fellow of Kellogg College, Oxford*

I found much to agree with in Professor Greenstein’s paper. She illustrates very well the current ambiguities in terminology, the tensions and paradoxes between the technological and the human, between the monolingual convenience of English and the life-enhancing diversity of plurilingualism, between the old world of books, libraries and paper, and the new world of instant access to databases and journals with the convenience of cutting and pasting, between the awareness and understanding of other cultures gained by travel, residence and acquaintance and the easy availability of e-mail, chat rooms, and other sites for cultural and linguistic exchange between individuals and groups at a distance from one another.

Examining the concept of the borderless university within the themes of language diversity and plurilingualism is particularly challenging, especially when it is incorporated into language policies which concern networking, collaboration and exchange of staff and students. While Professor Greenstein in no way underestimates the issues which need to be tackled, at the heart of her thesis is a vision which maintains that in linguistic terms, the borderless university, as outlined, is benign and beneficial, promoting international tolerance and understanding. I have two particular issues with this thesis.

Firstly, Professor Greenstein suggests that getting rid of borders is, on the whole, a good thing. I should like to make a distinction between borders and barriers. Getting rid of barriers, I wholly welcome. But getting rid of borders, I am less supportive of. I quite like borders. Borders provide enclosure, they mark out spaces where people can grow and develop, they define limits, too, and mark the places where cooperation with others may be needed. Many of us quite like crossing borders. Have we not all felt the relief at crossing some border at some point in our lives? Ask Scots how they feel at passing Gretna Green on the way home. Within universities, our borders or boundaries are between subjects and disciplines. We may welcome or not collaboration and exchange with other subjects and disciplines from the safety and security of our own subjects, while forging new interdisciplinary ventures, particularly at the cutting edge of research. From this perspective, the borderless university may mean the loss of a great deal of what we value and even cherish. Linguistic and cultural borders are fine with me, they mark other people’s spaces which I respect, value and hope to understand. Linguistic and cultural barriers are what we want to bridge, if not break down.

**I quite like borders; they provide enclosure, they mark out spaces where people can grow and develop, they define limits**

Secondly, as presently conceived, “borderless education” seems to me to be more about the promotion and development of e-universities, universities with large continuing education programmes and for-profit education corporations than about breaking down barriers between peoples and individuals to encourage greater understanding and tolerance. The early optimism has already evaporated. The British government-supported e-university was a failure. The “borderless university”, as reported by regular bulletins from the Observatory on Higher Education, tends to be quite large, American, British, Canadian or Australian, a public or private university or large business. The target population
tends to be adult, working, willing to pay often quite high fees, interested in professional or personal development. The language of instruction is almost invariably English, with a few exceptions. Not surprisingly, much of the focus has been on courses in IT, business and management. It is a competitive business with high investment required.

As I stated earlier, much of the detail of Professor Greenstein’s paper I fully support. However, I would like to explore those areas which are, perhaps, more contentious, for example, the formulation of language policy. In principle, a plurilingual policy sounds little short of ideal; in practice there are a number of issues, some practical others more theoretical. It is certainly important to consider language policy in the context of networking, in the sense of collaboration and exchange, whether by physical contact or by any other means of communication. But any to attempt to consider language policy for the “borderless university” even within our Europæum context is bound to be a challenging enterprise.

For example, the idea that universities should offer English plus another language in order to promote language diversity sounds inherently good in principle. In practice, we already know what English has done to “third” languages throughout Europe. Let us take Finland as an example. Finland has two national languages, Finnish and Swedish. The teaching of Swedish as national language has declined as have standards of performance in the language over the past twenty years or so since English became the main vehicle for internationalisation in the mid 1980s. In theoretical terms, it would be difficult to see how students might be motivated to learn a second foreign language imposed on them as a matter of university policy. Language learning needs to be driven by genuine need and interest, not by a slot in the timetable or a credit requirement. Chinese language learning has taken off at Oxford (and in the UK) for entirely practical and pragmatic reasons.

Sadly, there are few learners around these days who are motivated primarily by the love of a language or culture

Professor Greenstein’s proposals would also mean greater investment in both language teachers and the ICT infrastructure. But few universities these days are willing to increase spending on both of these. At Oxford, it is far easier to obtain grants for computers than additional teaching resources. Paradoxically, there is, at present, no research which suggests that ICT for language learning is more cost-effective than classroom teaching, indeed there is a fair amount of evidence to suggest the contrary, but the money is there for ICT not for classroom-based language teaching. The reality is that we can only have more language teachers if new sources of funds are found and if we can persuade university authorities and fund providers that our language teachers are now able to integrate ICT fully into their syllabuses.

In discussing the language-specific skills needed, Professor Greenstein is absolutely right to advocate an approach which sets out different levels of skills in different languages: the languages for specific purposes approach. Sadly, there are few learners around these days who are motivated primarily by the love of a language or culture. For the majority, the best motivation is the need to perform work or study tasks in the foreign language and this is often a greater motivator than going to live in a foreign country.

Many European universities have already established collaborative model networks which conform to the ideal of a language for specific purposes approach. Let me quote the language training policy document of UCARS, the association of over thirty universities and colleges involved in agriculture and related sciences with respect to their activities within the SOCRATES Thematic Network Project AFANet.

“The aim of this activity has been to support language teaching for students of agriculture and related sciences within universities where the objective is to develop competence in a second language as a necessary skill in communication to complement professional knowledge, rather than seeking to develop linguistic excellence”

One employer succinctly put it: we need good understanding and information exchange, not good grammar. Such language teaching is not the language teaching traditionally provided by university modern language departments and has to be orientated towards the language of science and technology.

UCARS has set up Recommendations for Best Practice of Language Training at UCARS which include the following

• All UCARS students should receive language training
• Efficient language training should be designed for students' future professional needs. Teaching material and assessment methods should be developed with this in mind.
• We recommend that each UCARS student, at the time of graduation, has communicative skills in English and at least one other foreign language.
• Efforts to improve language teaching at UCARS will not be restricted to English language training, but cover all European languages at different levels.
• We recommend that language teachers at UCARS should have a professional status and identity in their institution. This can be achieved by disseminating information from project working groups and encouraging contacts.

• HERMES (the name for their network) will provide a platform for discussion and exchange of ideas between UCARS language teachers across Europe.

• HERMES will support the professional development of LSP teachers.

The UCARS HERMES network has raised awareness among foreign language teachers from all over Europe regarding their common purposes and has also provided a common identity which had been lacking until its establishment.

On evaluation, assessment and testing, I remain open-minded. Professor Greenstein rightly points up the issues involved in cross-border recognition of qualifications and in reconciling different situations, needs and expectations. While I have great respect for the work of ALTE and its members, we have not found it practical to use the national teaching agencies to assess our students. Dates of examinations are inflexible and involve substantial travel, frequently out of term-time when students may be anywhere in the world. If national testing agencies were as developed as IELTS, the International Language Testing Service for students intending to study at English-speaking universities, we would be happy to use them. In the meantime, we have found the ALTE guidelines invaluable in setting standards for our own tests. The current approach in the UK as a whole, particularly for non-specialist language learners, is to set up national standards, linked to the Common Framework, across all languages at all levels.

Awareness of exchange students’ capabilities and how to integrate them in the host university’s life is now far greater than it was. We have already come a long way in the past 20 years in student mobility and the promotion of language diversity and plurilingualism. I would argue that the success of these schemes has had very little to do with the computer or the Internet, though these have undoubtedly helped in the last 10 years. For example, when I moved to Heriot-Watt University in 1986, student mobility was something only language specialists took part in and there was no funding or incentive for other disciplines to create networks either for staff or student mobility. Ten years later, when I left Heriot-Watt and moved to Oxford, there were joint degrees with a number of European universities involving both language specialists and non-specialists, and a wide range of staff and student exchanges in the Sciences and Social Sciences, in addition to modern languages. Even the thorny question of mutual recognition of awards had been largely resolved through a process of building mutual trust and respect between partner universities, while the University-wide language learning programme had been greatly expanded to accommodate those intending to spend time away on exchanges. What we had been doing was not creating a borderless university or a borderless higher education system but breaking down barriers and building bridges of respect and trust, of understanding and accommodation. I can well remember the first two students from Lyon in the Physics Department and the amazement on the part of the colleagues at just how good they were in both Physics and English. Similarly, when one of our International Business and Languages students came in the top ten of his year at Strasbourg in the new double degree, perception of just what could be achieved shifted radically.

In other words, at the level of networking on a human, social, and physical level, involving exchanges and collaboration, I think the language diversity model has already prevailed in Europe. Plurilingualism and pluri-culturalism are well established in many university departments, even if this does mean knowing a smattering of this and that language and more or less about different cultures, as needs and interests dictate. Having English as a mother tongue and a lingua franca has not prevented thousands of staff and students at Oxford learning foreign languages for study, for research, for international contact, exchange and collaboration. What has driven the model, in addition to funding, I would argue, are the interests of subject disciplines themselves and the response of members of these disciplines to the internationalisation (if not globalisation) of subject fields. After all, subjects or fields can be conceived as cultures in their own right. Take medicine, for example. Medicine is probably the most developed international subject culture. A doctor in Mexico or China shares a strong cultural base with doctors all over the world in terms of shared knowledge, values and beliefs. It has not been surprising to me that at Oxford, clinical medical students hoping to go to Spanish- or French-speaking parts of the world on placements have turned out to be among the best language learners I have ever encountered.

The status and conditions of employment of many language teachers in universities leaves much to be desired in view of the key role they play

I was struck by the fact that Professor Greenstein did not take up the cause of language teachers more forcefully in her recommendations. The status and conditions of employment of many language teachers in universities leaves much to be
desired in view of the key role they play. What we have seen in the English language teaching world over the past twenty years is the steady professionalisation of teaching staff in universities, with many holding masters degree and doctorates in applied linguistics and related disciplines. Teachers of English for academic studies now have standing in many UK universities and are properly regarded as authorities and experts in the field, drawing on large bodies of research to underpin their teaching.

In other languages, universities have been much slower to take on this approach, though now we would be reluctant to employ teachers who did not have qualifications in FLE or DaF or the Spanish and Italian equivalents. Our teachers are experts in their field and deserve to be employed and treated in these terms. We cannot hope to meet the language teaching and learning demands of the networking age in modern universities unless we have a substantial cadre of expert language teachers, properly trained and employed, and able to create their own networks of collaboration and exchange with teachers in other European universities.

I described the UCARS HERMES network as provide a model of good practice in breaking down barriers and building bridges between institutions which have a common purpose. This model may not provide for the ideal of the borderless education which Professor Greenstein has in mind, but in promoting linguistic diversity, in building trust and confidence, in creating shared identities, raising awareness, establishing the important status of professional language teachers and in sharing good practice, it takes us a good way along this road. I commend this approach to the Europeaum.
Session IV: Stakeholder Views on the University

Summary finding from the four workshops were presented to the Conference

Marie-Christie Heinze
Graduate, Bonn University

We would like to summarise what was discussed yesterday morning in the Students' Session. Our discussion was much less philosophical or ideological than the discussions we have heard in the last one-and-a-half days. We were much more pragmatic about things and questions were not about the need for ICT usage or the utility of networks, but what we can expect from these facilities. How can we make use of them? What can be done to improve these opportunities? We ended up with three main issues that concerned us most, and these were ICT usage, networks, and funding. We will quickly give an overview of these issues, and then make some concrete suggestions to teachers and the Europaeum especially, and also propose some things that students can do in order to improve these issues.

Rachel Ziemba
Oxford University

We do all agree that ICT usage is very important, and on the whole we would like to see more of it. But that does not mean that we do not want more actual interaction with faculty members. We think ICT is a very useful tool in the education process, but it is only a tool. Up-to-date information on the Internet is a very useful way of getting information across, but we think it is most important to know where to look for this information, and to establish ways of ensuring collaboration among students and faculty.

Students are concerned about universities spending money on technology, where perhaps the hardware are not powerful enough to properly use the software

One of the things that came up in our discussion was concern about universities spending money on technology, where perhaps the hardware was not powerful enough to properly use the software. I understand there are professional development costs, and we would like to see academics using more ICT and accepting sources found on the Internet. Obviously, one of the big problems with the Internet is that there is less ability to check on the sources, but there is a lot of very useful up-to-date information. We discussed networks between students and between students and faculty; networks within universities, between universities, and with the outside world. A big issue is learning what networks already exist, since different groups are doing similar things. One of our group mentioned that more than a hundred networks between European universities exist. Most of us had not even heard of the Europaeum until very recently. It needs to become clearer where the different networks are involved and to raise their profile. There's clearly a lot of good work being done, but we had not heard much except about the Erasmus and Socrates exchanges. Raising the profile of such networks is clearly very important.

In terms of the Europaeum, we are a little unclear on what the scope is intended to be. Is it supposed to be a professional domain, a forum for professors or a group for student initiatives? That is still under debate. We thought we would propose some suggestions for the academics and also try and see some role for students to be more active within the Europaeum. In terms of raising the profile, we thought this was a job for both academics and students. There should be more coordination between and within the universities. For example, contact professors of the Europaeum should coordinate with those in other areas to increase the scope of the network. For students, we can raise the profile through student coordinators in each of the member universities. These students should be compensated in some way. There should be a way for specific programmes and more student initiatives. There should be more information on the website, including a list of the coordinators.

Student exchanges are very important. There is some bilateral exchange within European universities, but we would like to see more multilateral exchange and more coordination. It's important to maintain the diversity of different universities, but making it easier for students to move is also very important. We briefly discussed the idea of a European degree, or perhaps further joint degrees between universities. Basically, what we would like is qualifications that would be accepted internationally or at least by many European countries. Finally, there is the issue of funding: it is very important that students know about sources of funding.

Marie-Christie Heinze
Graduate, Bonn University

Following on from Ms Ziemba, we have observed that of late, universities have to go to other sources for financing. We believe that
education is a public benefit and should therefore be state-financed. Research should not be profit-oriented and be bound by market conditions. In the future, the funding of universities will be much more diverse than it is now. We will have funding coming from the state mainly, but there will also be the private sector and foundations. We have to be realistic as the educational market expands: if universities don’t sell what they can sell, somebody else will.

We have to be realistic as the educational market expands: if universities don’t sell what they can sell, somebody else will

What goods can universities sell? There are three main points:

• University status – what we have is the image of independence and the image of reliability and academia.
• The location – host conferences, organise workshops there, and use the rooms you have.
• Access to academic material and expertise – this could be sold to companies, although we realise the danger of losing independence and academic integrity.

The question is how far we can go and what limitations and regulations should be set. We suggest the Europeum should hold a follow-up conference after the Bonn conference on “The Role and Limits of Private Funding in the Universities.”

John Tod
Director, British Council, Paris

I would like to contribute four areas where both government and society ask things of universities in the United Kingdom, and I would like to start with some challenges set during the last two years by the British Ministry of Education. The title is the Department for Education and Skills – and I hope Mme Ruggeri will welcome the use of the term skills alongside the Department for Education and Skills – and then turn to what society expects of universities, particularly in the areas of culture, the arts, and cultural exchanges with European and other countries of the world.

A major priority for the British Minister of Education is that of widening participation and unlocking the potential of the poorer sections of society in British universities. A target has been set that 50% of those aged between 18 to 30 should be in higher education (HE) by the year 2010. At the moment, according to OECD figures, the UK has one of the highest HE participation rates amongst OECD countries, and its graduation rate of 35% is also one of the highest. But there are many problem areas still to be tackled, including inequalities in access for women students, for mature students, and those coming from ethnic minorities. Universities are seeking to increase the number of students who come from poorer backgrounds, and those who come with non-traditional qualifications.

Another major challenge to the British universities set by the current UK government is to make sure that universities work better with industry and with the wider community. There has been, in the last two years, quite an increase in sponsored research income coming from industry. 12% of that research income in the UK university sector is now coming from business, which is a higher percentage than in the United States. In the past year, 200 spin-off companies have been created. Many universities have science parks, and these have helped to contribute to cooperation with local industry. Indeed universities are a large and prominent part of the local economy. It is estimated that London’s university higher education institutions represent 5% of the gross domestic product of Greater London. If we add in the health sector, it is even larger. The local university should be at the heart of the local economy – in some university towns in Britain, the university is the largest employer in the town.

We have an expression in Britain about “Town and Gown.” Professor Roderick Flood, the President of Universities UK, the umbrella body, said a fortnight ago “the age of town and gown is long past.” However, there have been, and there still can be, difficulties from the sense of isolation created by universities and the towns and cities in which they are located. British universities are trying very hard to break this down. Universities seek to contribute to the cultural life of their community, and are working particularly hard in the arts and culture. Examples of this include schools of art and drama, and music conservatories which attract students from the whole of Europe and the Far East, as well as the UK. University museums and art galleries are another area of excellence, on a par with those supported by local authorities and the National Ministry of Culture. The Sainsbury Centre at the University of East Anglia is a major centre for contemporary art with a substantial permanent collection and a centre for exhibitions from Britain, France, Germany and Italy. The University of Warwick also has an arts centre, which is primarily used by citizens of Warwick, the nearby town of Coventry, and the county of Warwickshire. Other art fora – art galleries, theatres and dance centres – are mainly used by people from the area where the university is located. Universities have held an honourable role in encouraging writers, artists and poets in residence, located initially within the universities,
but now often out-posted to commercial centres and popular centres in towns and cities.

Some recent developments may be of interest to people attending this Europeaum conference. The new French Minister of Culture is conducting a survey of the degree to which France welcomes artists and creators from other European countries, and from Africa, Asia and the Americas. One aim of the survey is to establish what the obstacles are to people coming to study at the Conservatoire, and the schools of dramatic art and dance in France, as well as to longer term writers and artists in residence.

Student representatives mentioned the importance of exchanges and we are committed in the British Council to supporting the efforts of Erasmus, other European schemes and bi-lateral schemes, to encourage two-way exchanges and cultural dialogue within the European Union, as well as between the European Union and the other regions of the world.

Universities have held an honourable role in encouraging writers, artists and poets in residence, located initially within the universities, but now often out-posted to commercial centres.

The British and French ministers of education have been working on a wide range of projects to strengthen educational partnerships between teachers, pupils and heads at primary and secondary levels, and we are hoping to introduce two pilot projects later this year: one between Greater Paris and Greater London, and another in the area of ICT between a rural region of England and a rural region of France. These are intended to help the teaching of French in England and the teaching of English in France at both primary and secondary level. And finally, in what I think is a very imaginative project, partly influenced by the experience of the Franco-German and the Franco-Italian universities, there is a project called the University of the Trans-Manche. This university is intended to contribute to economic and human development in the region. The partners for that project are the University of Kent at Canterbury, the three Lille Universities, and a very interesting university, the University of the Literal, which exists on three sites at Bologne, Calais and Dunkirk. Such academic collaboration can happen with state-of-the-art video-conferencing and distance learning between sites: the Vice-Chancellor of Kent says he often feels as if he is already in France. That is one very concrete proposal, which I hope will get the blessing of the Ministries of Education, heads of Government of Britain and France, and contribute in a helpful way to both economic and social and intellectual development, in those two regions.

Richard Yelland
Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development

My work is with the Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development, on the management of policy concerning higher education. We are an inter-governmental organisation and we try to listen and communicate as much as we can with business, and with the social partners, as part of our consultative process. The title of this session refers to that mythical beast, The University. I confess I find it more and more difficult to sustain the idea that all universities share common characteristics, still less identities or missions. John Tod has just sketched out very briefly a fascinating example of new university collaboration.

In the face of such diversity, the parlour game Paul Flather suggested yesterday might lead us to conclude that many of the institutions which currently call themselves universities do not qualify as such. Now that is an interesting possibility.

But at OECD we duck the issue. We did a study in 1998 reviewing trends and issues affecting universities and higher education institutions in OECD countries called Redefining Tertiary Education. People in the industry have talked a lot about breaking down old barriers and setting up new ones, and we felt that was to be avoided.

I am not going to spend much time on that book, but I will give you one quotation from it:

While all might not agree with the details of the vision, the forces at play suggest a sweeping shift in orientation towards higher levels of participation at the tertiary level, that is post-secondary school, driven strongly by demands reflecting the diverse interests of clients, rather than the supply-led, institution-directed expansion witnessed previously.

I actually wrote out that quote before hearing the three presentations we have had. But it was pretty refreshing to hear three speakers making it clear that business, students, and governments have some pretty pragmatic and down-to-earth expectations, requirements and needs, to which universities and higher-education institutions may not be obliged to respond, but which they need to take into account. This report actually uses the words “stakeholders” a lot. I was intrigued by the title of this session, because “stakeholders” went a bit out of fashion for a few years and it’s nice to
see the term come back. The university is in some sense an entity which now has to determine its own destiny in the midst of a web of sometimes conflicting needs and motivations. The question for us, of course, is “what destiny?” I do not know how many institutions can be all things to all men, or rather all people. Maybe some can, but not all.

Yoni Ryan’s old university, Queensland University of Technology in Brisbane, styled itself a “University for the Real World,” and that has resonance with a lot of what we have been saying. We are talking about the real world, and how we relate to it. To which it is alleged, and I think it may be true, that the response of the rather longer established university of Queensland (not long established in Bologna and Oxford terms, but quite well established in Australia) was to call itself a “real university for the world.” This is a clear implication that things are changing, including a lot of new responsibilities and a lot of challenges.

---

**Universities have not been good at taking up the responsibility of life-long learning, at reaching out to new student groups**

The most obvious of these changes is perhaps moral and ethical responsibility. I think some of that is not unique to universities – we have talked about global and regional responsibilities. Anyone who has not seen the film *L’Auberge Espagnole* will find it a highly amusing and wonderful tribute to the Europeanisation of higher education, and will probably do more for the image of Erasmus and other things, than almost anything that Brussels can have done. But there is, and this is where we come to the crux of this session, a social responsibility which is politically determined. I think it is fair to say that universities have not been good at taking up the responsibility of life-long learning, at reaching out to new student groups. I do not think that being expected to change the way you do things to adapt to new needs is necessarily an assault on autonomy. It is a fairly normal process of change. I have spent quite a lot of my time working in continuing education, and I still find it hard to understand why some higher education institutions don’t see it as part of their core mission, but as something that has to be done to raise money because the government will not give us enough if we do not. I would like to throw that out as a challenge to the university people: why are continuing education and life-long learning not part of the core mission but an optional add on? In many universities, these things are fine insofar as they help cover costs, but not really what the universities are all about. I do not think we are bound to transient qualification or course structures, but to a mission of learning which is constantly being redefined.

Almost finally, there is a responsibility to survive. That is very difficult to handle in troubled times, and that brings us down to the bottom line: cash, money and the means to survive. What universities face is a responsibility to find the balance between observing the real world and having your own values, and tolerating those of others. That is not new. I think the message from our three stakeholders was clear: there are some strong expectations of you.

My last book title is a plug for our own latest book, called *Responding To Student Expectations In Terms of the Management Of Institutions*. No one can oblige anyone to assume la responsabilité in the French phrase, which, I think, says it much better than “assuming your responsibilities” in English.

---

**Points from the Discussion**

*The discussion has been summarised to highlight key points. Every attempt has been made to reflect the spirit of the debate. Where it is helpful, contributors to the debate have been identified.*

**Mixed Funding Sources**

- In Bonn, university financing is dependant on the State Minister in Düsseldorf. We are also encouraged by the Ministry to go out and get private money, because if we do we also receive more state money. So that is a strong incentive to get private funds from German foundations, and private sector companies.
- It is, of course, the responsibility of each professor how far he or she goes, what he or she accepts. The university does not control that.
- We are moving quite quickly away from a time when national governments determine what happens only in their own countries. This meeting is itself international. Governments will continue, of course, to be major funders, they will have major impacts on policy and major impacts on behaviour. But in a global world, without a world government brings all sorts of problems.
- Diversification of funding is clearly something that we have moved towards; and it is something universities should be aiming for, but it does complicate life.
- Commercial funding of research can create some difficulties including the selling of courses. But we cannot run back to some “golden age” when government gave all the money.

**Lifelong Learning**

- The importance of life-long networks is not just to pass a degree but what students learn at the university.
• Studying before a first degree is not really meaningful research, but it seems even undergraduates study more seriously now: they accept this is now something they have to do for the rest of their lives.

Openness and Universality

• Nowadays, universities must take into account futures at intermediary or High Schools that are not able to provide the education.
• Under these circumstances, universities which are selective in enrolment are less able to provide universality and the ability to think in an open way about community needs.
• The excessive emphasis we have on ICT and the Internet, which are very important to infrastructure but seem to have little to do with the actual content of the thoughts being expressed and developed through them. The Internet is not the actual mission of the university.

We have to promote openness in all senses, and in all faculties

• We have to promote openness in all senses, in all faculties. When we talk for instance about the money researchers stand to make in medicine or physics or pharmaceuticals, this is important but to a certain extent irrelevant. What we have to promote is something that goes beyond short-term concerns and makes students go beyond the limits of our knowledge, our ability to transmit knowledge.
• We should not say, “you do that because you will make more money and will make your country richer,” in terms of growth because that is not what universities should do.

Stakeholders and Higher Education

• In all the debates, and dare I say even in some of our writings, we’ve structured the arguments as if the stakeholders are always on the outside of the university and never really within it. Yet some stakeholders are within the academy itself. We then have a sense of negotiations between different agendas and different parties.
• In 1997 there was a major national enquiry into the future of higher education led by the then Sir Ron Dearing. Lost in the 400 pages of that report was a proposal that we develop a policy forum for higher education generally, a compact.
• Can we imagine there might develop in society a compact across these different views and ideas, and even visions as to what a university might be? Perhaps the Europaeum could establish a forum within which such a compact for the negotiation of these different ideas and perspectives might be negotiated.

Student Involvement in the Europaeum

• It is often discussed that The Europaeum network should not only be a professorial network but also based on student initiative.
• We should resolve to inform students at each member university about the Europaeum network and offer a presentation addressed to the wider university public. Because in the end, it all boils down to what the people who are members of the network do and contribute, using e-mail, newsletters and a web platform to build on personal contacts.
Session V: Conclusions and Recommendations

John O'Leary
Editor, Times Higher Educational Supplement

I think it would be impossible to try to sum up a meeting like this, where there has been such disparate and often fascinating discussion, especially since a lot of the summation has been done very ably already this morning. I would just like to focus on a couple of the key themes that have emerged, dealing mainly with the discussions on media and business links between universities. Dr Jochum noted yesterday morning that there were no question marks at the end of New Times and New Responsibilities, and I wonder, are we really so sure that these are entirely new times, or indeed that they bring such new responsibilities? Certainly, technological developments require some additional consideration, but I think it would be dangerous to assume the basic role of the university is changing.

On the Times, there was no consensus as to whether 9/11 had brought about a "new time," but I suspect that the organisers of this event were thinking more about globalisation and the knowledge economy when they set the title of the meeting. I sometimes think that the extent of the knowledge economy's newness is overstated. Knowledge has been power ever since the invention of the wheel, and I think that the accumulation of knowledge is a much more gradual process than people have given it credit for, and perhaps not so new.

On responsibilities, the basic responsibilities of a university are surely the same as they ever were: pushing back the boundaries of knowledge and transmitting basic values, although we can argue about how universal any values are nowadays, and whether the university's responsibility is to enable its students and a wider public to understand and develop their own values. I think there are fundamentals that a university, a European university, should be trying to transmit, and I think nearly all of them are trying to do that and will continue to do so. Governments are asking universities to expand their roles somewhat, and indeed universities are finding it necessary to play new roles in a time when they are having to seek new sources of finance, and that is perhaps where the business links come in.

But these are not, surely, basic responsibilities; they are financial imperatives. I accept that such imperatives change a lot of what you do - and we have not addressed Paul Flather's issue about intellectual property - and could easily be the subject of entire meetings. But I think the discussion showed that there was an agreement that universities had to at least address values. The question was rather whether it fell to them to try and communicate them to the wider world, and how their relationship should be managed with the mass media, which I think, without question, has taken over moulding society's views.

Media organisations naturally have an agenda, with which universities may not necessarily wish to be associated

As a representative of the media, I see obvious dangers for universities in this relationship, far beyond simple political bias. Media, certainly the news media, deals in certainties. They do not like the qualifications which are the stock-in-trade of academics, so you must be extraordinarily careful in trying to become an agent of change in partnership with media organisations, or indeed with politicians, who have their own coteries. Tony Blair in Britain has an academic coterie of his own, which includes David Marquand, whom you honoured recently, and the director of the London School of Economics. But I do not think anyone would pretend that he or any other politician is listening entirely to the academics with whom he confers on a regular basis, any more than media organisations do. Al Jazeera and NBC were not looking for the same kind of objective analysis of 9/11.

Media organisations naturally have an agenda, with which universities may not necessarily wish to be associated, and which they may not be able to control as skilfully as they might hope. There are certainly academics and universities that are very good at it. Popular scientists for many years have been very good at getting their message across. Historians, at the moment, certainly in Britain, are enjoying a particular fashion, and are reaching a far wider audience through television and other media than they were ever able to in their own campuses. But universities as a whole have not evolved to be good at mass communication.

Professor Ryan, in her paper, underlined how difficult it has been for universities to get into the global education market, even in distance education. Commercial partners soon lose interests when the profits fail to materialise, or when they dip after an initial boom. And both media and politicians have the same sort of short-term agenda that often conflicts with university's natural instincts and mission. That is not to say that I would suggest for a moment that universitiss
should turn back into monasteries or that they have no international role. Quite the reverse.

Perhaps yesterday’s discussions were, in some ways, too rarefied in comparison with today’s. The tension that was acknowledged right at the beginning of the meeting, between students' natural desire to be employable at the end of their course, and the pure role that people in this room might prefer universities to be taking on, is a real one. Indeed, Ben Okri, last night in his address at the dinner, discussed what he called a crisis of purpose amongst students which does appear to be a problem associated with mass higher education. I have a sense that there is a class of student that drifts into education purely as a ticket to employment, without much concern for the deeper and more traditional questions that the university has addressed throughout history.

**Universities would be well advised to focus on their core competencies; namely opening up chances for young people**

The Europaeum is a very particular group of universities, a very eminent one, but while I am not suggesting that your finances are easy to manage, certainly the pressures on the majority of universities in Europe and elsewhere are quite different. If they were to depart from the near-market approach that they take up at the moment, they would be bankrupt very swiftly indeed.

So the relationship between business and academe is critical, and equally important for universities to address as the one with the mass media. I do think that Dr Ruggeri’s point this morning about the trend toward more vocational courses, starting even before university, is very important to address, and a difficult one to cope with. Certainly in Britain, at school level the vocational approach is seen as the only way to entice students who might become disaffected with school, and the only way to encourage more of them to stay on into the higher education phase. Whether this is commensurate with your view of the purpose of universities, I leave to you.

Whatever the case, I think that these courses need to be designed with a wider focus than they have at the moment. Whether we go as far as the compulsory philosophy that was discussed yesterday, I rather doubt, but certainly there needs to be a broad education, whatever the title of the course. Where all this leaves the Europaeum, I am not sure. There are not easy answers, obviously, to big questions such as these. But they are the sorts of questions that your universities have wrestled with over the centuries, and ones that I think the Europaeum is ideally placed to discuss.

**Michael Jochum**

_Chief of Staff, Daimler Financial Services AG, Berlin_

Two very brief remarks on behalf of the sponsor. One on substance, and one as a word of thanks. The more I have listened to the discussion yesterday and today, the more conservative I have become about the proliferation of responsibilities of universities. I felt that as soon as you start to think about new responsibilities, the more you realise that anything goes: you can ask for the promotion of values, you can ask for refraining from promoting values and just concentrate on pushing back the limits of knowledge, you can go ask for accelerating change, but you can ask for preserving good traditions, and there are many other things that have been hinted at but haven’t really been spelt out which would be just as plausible. So, it seems that the conclusion that I come to is that universities – much like states and companies, by the way – would be well advised to focus on their core competencies and to do what they can do best, namely opening up chances for young people. If that were to happen, it would not be the worst of worlds.

It may look as though everyone has already thanked everybody. I think Paul Flather and his team have not yet received the credit that they really deserve, and this is why I would like to thank, and I guess I am speaking on behalf of everybody here, Paul Flather and his whole team, Sheila Coxford, Terry Johnson, Katharine Schofield and all the other very efficient conference assistants here, thank you very much for a job well done.

**Paul Flather**

Four underlying themes emerged from the two days of discussion in Paris:

**i) Underlying role of universities**

The conference strongly endorsed the notion that universities should be in the business of dealing with fundamental intellectual challenges, that universities should ask “big questions” and should play a key role in promoting critical thinking, in developing cohesive human forms of communication, and in promoting what in the past used to be considered the _religio_ or _biosphere_ of human kind. Indeed, the conference was reminded that in Medieval days, when many Europaeum partners were founded, the spiritual element of self-inquiry was a key component of higher education. Today however, this would be revitalized as the “philosophical” element. In the words of Ben Okri in one of the keynote contributions to the conference, universities had a duty to prepare their students for the “act of self discovery.”
ii) Opening up trusted data research

Universities had to show students how to deal with the mass of knowledge that was now available from traditional and new sources, and had a key role in promoting, developing, and disseminating data through libraries, publications, the Internet and other means, that could be trusted by the outside world. This was a particular duty for the older established universities, such as members of the Europaeurn. They needed to rise above the stringencies and requirements of the commercial and public sectors which had to operate for profit, for policy making, or expediency. The older universities in particular had to maintain their autonomy in producing open and reliable data.

iii) Education for governance

Universities had a primary duty to prepare their students for citizenship and for their role in promoting civic society, including democratic values, human rights and good governance. They had to instil values and ideas in their students that would lead them to be engaged in political and public life, and in the duties and responsibilities of society.

iv) Promoting dialogue with stakeholders

In the Knowledge Economy, universities needed to promote dialogue with business, to build new partnerships, to understand the needs and requirements of business, and at the same time to maintain their independence. Universities needed to maintain and renew their dialogue with students, to understand the practical and vocational needs of students coming to study at universities, in preparation for future life as well as promoting critical thinking, civic values and so forth. Universities also needed to understand their public and social responsibilities to society, and to continually review these in the light of changes in society itself.

I could perhaps identify the following key recommendations emerging from the last two days of discussions:

1. Compulsory Civilisation Course

Several papers at the conference referred to the fundamental objectives of universities in terms of “individual self-discovery.” Tracking this through, it was noted that many students had no opportunity to study such themes and great ideas of humanism and religion. Yet these should inform both their overall thinking, and their particular subject of study.

It was recommended therefore that leading European universities should think of introducing a course – at least optional, and perhaps compulsory – offering civilisational studies to all.

2. Funding Review

Leading European Universities are having to rely more and more on a variety of funding sources, with the amount received from public governmental sources declining everywhere. Oxford University, for example, now receives almost 45 per cent of its annual income from non-governmental sources such as trusts, foundations, business and industry, in the form of research contracts, consultancies, donations, conference income, “spin-off” commercial companies exploiting the university’s own intellectual property, and even Oxford University Press. Noting such developments, the conference felt that there was increasing ambiguity in universities with regard to their autonomy and the independence of their academic mission.

Universities had a primary duty to prepare their students for citizenship and for their role in promoting civic society

The conference therefore recommended that the Europaeurn consider some kind of audit or guidance notes on how universities should continue to secure their academic integrity while going to the market in the search for increasingly vital additional funding.

3. Academic and Student Mobility

The conference readily endorsed the importance of developing Europe-wide learning networks which were derived not just from co-operation between institutions, departments, and individual academics, but aimed to produce genuinely joint programmes and courses. In this context, the conference welcomed the strategy of the Europaeurn to develop new joint MA-level programmes which involve students spending at least one semester at least one other university in addition to their home, validating university institution. It therefore recommended all universities to seek to promote joint teaching, and for the Europaeurn to continue to develop joint offerings. It was noted that the European Commissioner for Education, Mme Viviane Reding, would be promoting such programmes over 2003.

4. Degree Recognition

The conference endorsed the general move across Europe to develop increased mutual degree-recognition and harmonisation, ultimately based on a system of credit transfer as is common in the United States. Only with such developments could the frontiers and barriers that exist between international higher education systems be eased
and permeated. Clearly, such developments cannot be rushed, although it is clear from the experience of the last decade that great strides have been made and Germany was a case in point, having moved from a process of scepticism to endorsement of international credit transfer. However, it would be highly ambitious, and probably not entirely desirable, for credit transfer to be envisaged across all university institutions and across all countries.

Obviously the Bologna process, whereby degree structures are being harmonised across Europe, will greatly aid this process, and the statement contributed by the European Commissioner for Education in support of this process was noted. The Conference therefore endorsed the idea of groups of like-minded universities, of similar quality, promoting credit transfer across their institutions as a specific contribution to this general trend. It was noted that the Europaeum, with its like-minded membership, could be a prototype for this. It was recommended that this process be encouraged and the Europaeum consider developing its own processes to encourage such credit transfer.

5. Learning Networks

Learning networks would require high levels of co-operation, transparency and commitment, and were often best aided with some external funding to help in the initial building stage. Above all, they relied on the energy and commitment of a leading advocate in each of the partner institutions. An organisation like the Europaeum could provide the essential external stimulation and linkages to allow such learning networks to come to fruition. The conference noted the statement of the European Education Commissioner endorsing this approach and urging higher levels of learning corporation over the coming years.

6. Language Policy

The conference discussed the strategies for promoting languages, particularly in the Humanities (e.g. literature), in the face of an increasing Europe-wide reliance on English as a source for information and the means for common communication. The conference endorsed the concept of *pan-lingualism* in Europe, not least to encourage more mobility across European higher education, but also to encourage more joint degree learning.

---

The Conference endorsed the idea that there should be better access and better comparability in research studies and surveys undertaken across Europe

---

It was recommended that the Europaeum should seek to “pick up the ball” of a two-language policy and argue that all students, regardless of their chosen subject of study, should leave university with some level of proficiency in a second language. This would be a statement of their Europeanness as well as providing them with the benefits of having studied a second language and being able to have a second-language perspective. Such policies promoted by a leading group of leading European universities could have an impact on the whole system.

7. Data Transparency

The conference argued strongly that the Europaeum should lead an academic campaign to ensure that information and data collected by the European Commission on behalf of the member nations under the aegis of EUROSTAT be opened up to analysis and scrutiny, as appropriate, by the academic community. It is clear that a vast number of surveys, polls, and other forms of data collection, including work done by research institutes, individual scholars and the like, would be desirable. It is important too, to encourage comparative policy analysis and interpretation across the EU zone, and that more information on data availability and data sharing could be produced. This could begin with the access to European information which is, after all, collected on behalf of member governments.

National governments contribute to the collection of data by the IMF, the World Bank, and other such public bodies, yet individual scholars and taxpayers often do not have access to the information. It was recommended that the Europaeum should lead an academic campaign to ensure that information and data collected by the European Commission be more widely available and open to public scrutiny.

8. Comparative Research

The Conference endorsed the idea that there should be better access and better comparability in research studies and surveys undertaken across Europe. Much survey and research work is little-shared or little-known. Surveys have restricted access ostensibly for reasons of commerce, profit secrecy, and so forth. However, these restrictions are often overstated, or left in place well beyond the necessary time limits.

In order to encourage greater openness in sharing of data, it was suggested that the Europaeum should encourage mechanisms across the academic community, promoting greater credit to researchers for carrying out research studies and surveys. This could be done by creating a citations index for quoted research and shared use of original methodology. It is therefore recommended that the Europaeum highlight excellence in
research and survey methodology, and encourage greater sharing of data.

9. Links with Central Europe

The conference devoted one of its workshops to reviewing links between established universities in Western Europe and those in Central and Eastern Europe still in the process of emerging, or re-emerging, after the Communist Bloc period.

Progress and reforms were duly noted, though equally it was acknowledged that developments in terms of transparency, curriculum reform, teaching pedagogy, and so forth, was clearly patchy, and that partnerships encouraged by external agencies, including the European Commission, had had varying degrees of success.
III. NEW PARTNERSHIPS: OPPORTUNITIES AND RISKS
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Welcome and Introduction

Professor Klaus Borchard
Rector, Rheinische Friedrich-Wilhelms-Universität
Bonn

When the former American Ambassador to Germany, Richard Bird, was asked to speak about his experiences in Germany, he expressed his astonishment at the Germans’ talent for listening to long speeches. Perhaps the Germans and other European nations have a little more patience and calmness than the rest of the world. Because of our long and rich European history, we need more staying power, but do not worry; I do not intend to deliver a long address.

One of the most important and influential intentions that came into existence in the Middle Ages through European genius was the institution of the university. The characteristic of the European university was the presence of the faculty. The character of the European university was formed over hundreds of years. The first European universities came into being in the Middle Ages, in Bologna, Oxford, Prague, Heidelberg, Leiden, Parma and other towns. I think it is a fine coincidence that four of the first university foundations in Europe are represented in the Europaeum network. The university itself is the European Institution for excellence. It is the only European institution whose fundamental structure and social role have not only endured, but has been expanded and strengthened over the course of its history. Of the three recognized powers of the Middle Ages in Europe, Imperium, Sacerdotium and Studium, the first – political power – has undergone significant change. The second, religion, has been able to preserve its structure in the Roman Catholic Church, but has lost its monopoly on salvation. The third, the university, in true fulfillment of the promise made in its name, has gained universal acclaim all over the world. It is distinctly European because it generates and distributes scientific insights and methods deeply rooted in the European heritage found in universities all over the world.

One of the most important and influential intentions that came into existence in the Middle Ages through European genius was the institution of the university

Compared to these venerable places of higher education like Bologna, Paris, Prague or Oxford, our university, Rheinische Friedrich-Wilhelms-Universität in Bonn, is quite a young foundation. Founded as an academy by the Cologne-Bonn Archbishop 225 years ago, and re-founded as a reform university by the King of Prussia and his minister Wilhelm von Humboldt in 1818, it should serve the distinct purpose of combining research and teaching, by leading the best students to the research projects of the best researchers. That is exactly what we have been doing successfully for the past 185 years, even under the most difficult circumstances of a mass university with almost 40,000 students. Bonn University’s alumni include famous scholars including a professor awarded the Nobel prize for economics in 1994.

With seven faculties, more than 700 successful PhD candidates, an annual expenditure of approximately €500 million, and more than €75 million in third party research funding, the University of Bonn is at the forefront of German universities. The seven collaborative research centres, 11 postgraduate colleges, and 6 special research and clinical research groups demonstrate that our university meets the requirements we have set for being one of the leading research universities in Germany. Furthermore, the Rheinische Friedrich-Wilhelms-Universität is in an international location for studying and research: 14% of our students come from abroad, which is well above the average for German universities.

One of the main ideas behind European universities was to link teaching to research and this should be maintained in future. It is important to adjust European universities to new requirements and new challenges, but it is at least as important to maintain European advantages and achievements. A German writer once said, “Europe undoubtedly is a cradle of culture, but you cannot stay your whole life in a cradle.” We should be confident about strengthening our abilities in order to carry on competing with the best universities around the world and to set the standards and rules for being a top teaching and research university.

In this conference, we will have the opportunity to discuss the future of European universities and to exchange experiences and ideas in order to learn from each other. This conference, with its three core workshops, has again been made possible by the support of Daimler and, on behalf of the Europaeum network, I would like to express our deep gratitude for their invaluable support.

Professor Wolfram Kinzig
Professor of Church History and Dean of the Faculty of Evangelical Theology, Bonn University

It is my pleasure to introduce you to the theme of this conference, and to the speakers of this first session, which is open to the public. As you know, the title of our conference is New Partnerships:
Opportunities and Risks. It is part of the project The Future of European Universities, which has been generously sponsored by Daimler Financial Services.

In a world driven by new technologies and constant rapid innovation, knowledge is the new capital of the globalised economy. The revolution in communications technology now makes knowledge available in new forms at the press of a button. The discoverers, disseminators and manipulators of knowledge have become the driving force of the modern economy. The leading universities as key producers of knowledge have a role to play, remaining the key instruments of economic development but also adapting to a world where learning must be lifelong.

At the same time, there are many new knowledge providers in this new world, ranging from company-based universities and other independent groups, through think-tanks and document centres, to sponsored advocacy groups. The university, therefore, can no longer rely on its traditional monopoly of advanced knowledge and highly educated people. In order to compete, universities will need to seek out a new public and economic role at the heart of democratic society.

It is this new role, which our project seeks to explore. There have been two conferences so far: in Berlin at the Humboldt University in 2001, and in Paris at the Sorbonne in 2002. The Berlin conference focused on the nature of borderless education and how Europe can be bridged technologically, intellectually and geographically, with the return of the ancient universities of Central and East Europe. The conference questions examined were: how universities adapt in the age of globalisation, how universities harness new technologies, how central and eastern European universities are responding to the new challenges, and what lies next for pan-European cooperation after the Sorbonne, Bologna, and Prague agreements.

The second conference, in Paris, focused on four reports commissioned for the conference, addressing issues like language diversity, online teaching, cooperation with universities in Central and Eastern Europe, and access to and sharing of data and research findings across Europe.

This final conference will examine the opportunities and risks of new partnerships between universities, on the one hand, and political, economic, and academic bodies and institutions on the other: links that have emerged over the past few decades, and are continually increasing. The preparations for the upcoming conference have basically been guided by three questions:

- Why does the university need new partners?
- Who are the new partners?
- What has to change and why?

The second part of the conference is divided into three workshops, each dealing with a different topic. The first workshop is called Knowledge Transfer and the Future University. The new media have facilitated knowledge transfer within Europe and beyond to a hitherto unknown degree. As the production and dissemination of knowledge is one of the core tasks of the universities, we have to ask how the future university will relate to the new channels of information opened up by the new media.

The second workshop deals with Funding and Ethics. Given that state funding for higher education is constantly declining, vacant positions are no longer filled and promising interdisciplinary projects are discontinued, we will have to consider alternative ways of financing future research. But we will also have to discuss where such alternatives will be feasible and to what end the funding ought to be used.

The third workshop is entitled University and Good Globalisation. The traditional university has always been closely interlinked with civil society and, while this will doubtless continue in future, the framework may change. In the political and economic sphere, our human relationships are more and more dictated by global thinking. As a consequence, the relationship between the university and civil society will have to be reassessed and defined. It will be necessary to establish who the key players in the future society will be; what impact, if any, globalisation will have on the universities; and how the universities should respond to this challenge.

When we define the future university, we have to think about the spiritual and moral values that should be at the heart of the European university in a multi-ethnic, multi-religious, and multi-cultural world

When we define the future university, we will also have to think about the spiritual and moral values that should be at the heart of the European university in a multi-ethnic, multi-religious, and multi-cultural world. This wide range of topics should help to define the role of European universities in the 21st century.
Session I: **European Universities in the Global Age**

**Gerd Schulte-Hillen**  
*Chairman, Supervisory Board of Bertelsmann AG and Vice-Chairman, Executive Committee of the Board of the Bertelsmann Foundation*

**Universities and the Business World:**  
**Challenges for the Future**

The task of dealing exhaustively with the subject of “Universities and the Business World: Challenges for the Future” within twenty minutes is one which cannot be fulfilled to anyone’s satisfaction. The subject matter is simply too complex, a lecture of even a full hour would not be sufficient: rather, a whole course over a semester would be appropriate. Due to the limited time accorded for my speech, I would like to restrict myself to the main points, naming a few aspects of the subject which, from my point of view, are central.

Some time ago, I was invited to take part in a talk show on one of the German public television channels. The subject under discussion was the reform of the education system. I was invited as a representative of the business world and spoke out for shorter studies per degree, a higher rate of achievement to be demanded from the students, and a better match of university education with the demands of future employers or, to put it better, to the demands of the market. A charming journalist was sitting next to me who, during my contribution, showed more and more signs of unrest. Finally she burst out: No, Mr Schulte-Hillen, this is not the kind of university, which I want to send my children to. My children should receive a comprehensive education at university, yes, they should even read Hölderlin. In any case, they should not become products of a factory, which churns out tailor-made business executives on schedule. And which, to top it all, is financed by the state!

This passionate reply surprised me because just like my neighbour, I was of the opinion that the goal of universities was not only training students to do a specific job, but also to provide a good all-round education. This should be the task of our educational institutions. That is how they came to be called that way.

Obviously, in my contribution I had focussed too much on the practical side of training for a job and forgotten about the called-for *universitas*. But both are needed. Striking the balance is the problem. One thing is undisputed: Businesses create employment and generate taxes and thereby contribute to the financing of our education system. Of course they are not the only ones which have a part in the generation of an economy’s net product.

What concerned me was the sharp antithesis between education and training, between pragmatism and the ideal of education. Do not worry ladies and gentlemen, I will not go into the deeper philosophical considerations of this interesting question. There are enough informed people in the audience who could treat this subject better. Let me consider this point therefore from a different perspective, which leads us directly to the subject. For I am convinced that the engineering student who reads Hölderlin – if I may use him as a representative of all future academics who are interested in a more all-round education – probably also has better job prospects. The increase in demand from employers for general knowledge, for the ability to look beyond the borders of one’s own subject, is proportional to the increase in demand for a comprehensive knowledge within one’s own subject. In an increasingly interconnected and more complex world, the ability to think against the background of a comprehensive overview is a great advantage. Applicants who have this ability are more likely to become the business leaders of tomorrow. However, reading Hölderlin does not make a top manager. What is needed, apart from an excellent knowledge of one’s subject, is a special mixture of abilities and characteristics. But studying humanities, a knowledge of art and aesthetics, and a fascination for ideas derived from this, are very often a precondition of creativity in engineering and other jobs. This degree of passion, motivation and all-round skill happens to be found partially beyond purely training in one’s own subject.

**I am convinced that the engineering student who reads Hölderlin also has better job prospects**

You all know: however unique Hölderlin – or I could also say Picasso, Goethe or Wagner – may be, whether art or music, the ability to feel passion for an idea or a cause is an important precondition of success, no matter in what area. A passionate human being is more productive and likely to be a better leader. In any case, this person is the more creative employee. Passion can be awakened and acquired.

In my area of business, we are especially aware of the importance of artistic and also of passionate human beings. They are very often catalysts for creativity. In the publishing business, without creativity there can be no success. And let me add from experience, a passionate maker of pages or
Publisher is not available prêt à porter. No matter whether it is a student of German reading Hölderlin or an engineer, whoever wants to have a complete picture of the world, and then acquires it, has advantages. Education is only one condition for creativity. Creativity is often associative and can also be awakened. For this reason, also, the study of subjects other than one's own can generate positive results.

At Bertelsmann, we call this kind of philosophy oriented towards the up-and-coming generation, potential-oriented. "Potential-oriented recruiting." An awful word for a great art. Future executives at Bertelsmann are first of all not employed to fulfill a specific function. The most important criterion for employment is a positive evaluation of the applicant's potential, i.e. of the person as a whole, which is presented. A specialist background is important but is not the only criterion. At our firm, future executives are pooled in a circle of juniors of the Bertelsmann group. At the moment, this consists of forty-three young employees. You can understand the meaning of potential-oriented recruiting by looking at the following: one quarter of the juniors are from the law or arts faculties. This is not a uniform troop of economists or engineers. They are a colourful lot and could be even more colourful. This is positive for a media firm because we need this creative assortment of employees. And I should tell you that it is especially those crossing boundaries and deepening their knowledge in different areas who have the best chances. And, of course, this is not only valid for the media industry.

When I was chief executive at Gruner & Jahr, the decisive criterion when choosing employees was never the specialist subject of the candidate. Of course, I have a preference for the exact thinking of natural science people. But the ability to recognise a good text, and to generally know what moves people, is also a part of it, as is a sure feel for aesthetics. The most successful of my assistants from Gruner & Jahr is currently the chief executive of another publishing company, with which we have a good relationship. He gained his PhD in music. As you see, the choice of subject does not make anything impossible. Maybe it makes quite a few things easier.

Firms have great interest in recruiting from a university system which balances all-round education with training for the job

What does all this mean for our topic here? Firms have great interest in recruiting from a university system in which an all-round education and training for the job are found in a well-balanced proportion. A good training must not replace a good education. The broad basis of the first academic qualification is important. Interdisciplinary study is just as important. Looking beyond one's subject must be practised and encouraged at an early stage. Professors should set an example in this. We want "university" in the best sense of the word, a comprehensive offer of all faculties. A reduction of the full range of the universities' subjects to the economically useful is not in the best interest of the economy and also is not an economically successful path.

Universities have an impact on the cultural climate of a country. This climate is of a central importance. I dare to make the supposition that an over-emphasis on apparently economic advantages has contributed to the difficulties which Germany is in at the moment. The highest form of efficiency cannot be attained by adding the actions of individual egoisms. It is, rather, their result once they are tamed and oriented towards a common goal. In a business, the goal is to obtain the objective of the business; in the state, the goal must be the common good. Education helps to discern such connections. Therefore an education which focuses on the character of the student is important.

Basically, education starts at home. However, the quality of this dowry depends on the individual family. Schools have the task of teaching the basics which will be built upon later on.

But let us return to the narrow constraints of our subject. Another question is whether each university should have the maximum number of faculties and offer a full range of subjects. Creating a distinctive image via specialisation makes sense. Specialisation makes the optimal use of resources possible and creates a clear-cut image of the university. A more defined image also entails a stronger connection with the alma mater. People graduating from universities with a well-defined image will be proud to be alumni and alumnae. Whoever had the chance of participating in an American graduation ceremony knows what this means. A lot would be gained for students, applicants and directors of human resources, and I am sure that the cultural importance of the universities would in the end not be diminished by a more structured and more distinctive university system. On the one hand, this provides solid basic knowledge, and on the other, it offers more options for development for the searching student.

But let us keep in mind that in spite of all necessary and reasonable specialisation, a lively cultural climate is part of the job training. It should be encouraged and examples should be set. For young academics there is a lot to discover and to add. Not to lose sight of this goal when reforming the system is not the most important, but an important, part of the challenge faced by the business world and the universities.
I would now like to present the details in the context of two central challenges which universities and the business world face together. You have heard about the first challenge from the extensive media coverage of the past months. It is the topic of demographic change. It concerns, albeit to a different degree, the whole of Europe. The expression of “old Europe” makes sense in this context. The factual basis for Germany is quickly outlined: in Germany the population will decrease by around 12 to 17 million people by 2050. If there is no net immigration within this period, the population could decrease by 23 million people. Increasing life expectancy leads to a massive change of the age structure: in 2050, half the German population will be over 51 years old. The average age today is 40. In Germany the potential workforce, 41 million people, will be reduced by up to 39% by the year 2040. At the same time, the number of people over 60 years of age potentially working will increase to 3.6 million. In the years leading to 2020, we will see a significant rise in the 45-60 age-range in the workforce.

That is the factual basis of the demographic change. The consequences for the economy are significant: We can only maintain our economic productivity by a significant increase in the productivity of work and an extension of the effective working life. Education and life-long learning are key factors in this context.

Universities are affected by these developments in several ways. If we do not make a determined effort, the number of students will massively decrease. With under 20% of university graduates per annual age-group, Germany is nowadays already in the lower level of the OECD comparison table. The universities will have to take up the new challenges of “Lifelong Learning” and “qualification.” The traditional assumption that graduates are released by their alma mater ready for their job in the job was never altogether true and is even less true for the future. The first university degree will assume more and more the nature of a basic qualification. It will provide the tools necessary for additional phases of qualification. Against this background, the introduction of a system based on subsequent cycles as envisioned in the Bologna process makes sense. Students quickly gain a first degree, which, according to the law, qualifies them for a job. It is important for this first degree not to pour old wine into new skins. The contents of the degree programme must be checked; studies must become more focussed and structured. It is positive that continuous learning is required more and more from the students. Shorter degree programmes, lower student drop-out rates and better results are the goal.

Considering the present situation of the reform of the university, one aspect however is clear: It would be fatal if old and new structures continued to coexist and compete for a longer period of time. The current coexistence of these two structures in Germany diminishes the potential of the just-mentioned system based on subsequent cycles for our university system.

First university degrees will assume more and more the nature of a basic qualification

The introduction of the system based on subsequent cycles will also be advantageous in another aspect: an easier passage between university and the world of work will be possible than before. It should be possible, within the new structures, that students who have obtained a Bachelor’s degree, and who have already been working for a few years, can start studying for a Masters degree. This is already the norm in England and the USA. Businesses have to recognise this as a sensible form of staff development.

A lot has to be done for Bachelor’s degree to be accepted in Germany. Businesses also have to contribute to this. The BDA (Confederation of German Employers’ Association) is intensifying contact between businesses and universities. The expectations of the business world should be considered when designing new study programmes. A survey among the directors of higher institutions of education in Europe had the following result: 91% of the people asked considered the “employability” of graduates to be the decisive criterion when designing study programmes. Therefore the contribution of businesses is urgently needed.

Universities are beginning to discover for themselves the subject of “Lifelong Learning” under the heading of “Academic Further Education.” This is done in co-operation with the business world. The current 10-point plan of the BDA, DIHK (Association of German Chambers of Industry and Commerce) and the HRK (Association of Universities and Other Higher Education Institutions in Germany) is proof of this. Once again, more autonomy for universities and their professors is necessary. Because it is clear that without adequate incentives, universities will hardly enter the market of further qualification. For the future, interesting business opportunities will take shape on the periphery of increasingly autonomous universities. New forms of co-operation between the business world and universities will be possible. In this context, new innovative models of exchanging staff between universities and the business world will have to be
considered. If directors of human resources go, for a limited period of time, into politics, why not also in the field of university education — and maybe even with greater success? In any case, I hope that politics will open up the necessary freedom for universities. This would be a substantial contribution towards the liberation of universities. Entrepreneurial thinking and acting could be practised at the periphery of the universities. However, it is clear that this could only work if the basic conditions are right.

Let me make one final remark on the subject of demographic change. We will not achieve the necessary increase in the number of graduates in Germany only by reforming our university system. Too few young people find their way into the tertiary education system at all. Schools and all institutions of education for small children and children face new challenges. They must be enabled to open the way into universities, even for those who are not necessary inclined to academic studies if they are seen to have the necessary potential to succeed. Here lies an unused potential that must be activated — not only against the demographic development.

I will now talk about the second set of challenges that universities and the business world face together. They are the subjects that are discussed publicly under the heading of “Globalisation.”

Globalisation in my business at first does not mean more than the international aspect of business and employees. Bertelsmann is a media group, operating worldwide. Only roughly a third of the group’s turnover was generated in Germany during the last business year. If we are looking at it from the European point of view, we reach roughly two-thirds of the turnover. “Business location Europe:” that is probably the appropriate term for such a distribution of turnover. Also the majority of our employees are no longer in Germany: 32,000 of our employees work in Germany, 49,000 work abroad.

But globalisation also, and especially, means an intensifying of competition in all markets. This includes the area of recruiting: graduates of our universities compete with international competitors for the best positions. The businesses compete internationally for the best people. For the university this means that the international competition mercilessly shows the strengths and weaknesses of national educational systems. This international competition, whether we like it or not, forces transparency and increases in productivity upon us.

Universities and the business world face this situation of competition together. It cannot be in the interest of either a German business, or a European one, to be losing the top academic people in a brain drain to American universities.

However, at the moment the USA seems to have, for some German top academics, the more attractive university and research system. Even though the subject of promoting research is a subject of its own, the rigorous introduction of an internationally comparable Bachelor/Master system will play an important part in making Germany a favourable location for studies and research. The new academic generation will not flourish well in a uncoordinated and nationally isolated university system.

---

**International competition mercilessly shows the strengths and weaknesses of national educational systems**

Globalisation as a common challenge of universities and the business world: this has a special aspect for Germany, which I want to finish off with. I am of the conviction that we can cope with the results of global competition better in cooperation with our European partners. Against this background, the integration of Germany into the European academic area of higher education is necessary. Not only is the business location Germany at stake, we should also keep the business location Europe in mind.

This is also the framework in which we should lead the debate on the reform of the university system in Germany. It is not a purely German reform of the university system that we want to encourage, it is a European one. We need to be more conscious of that. The goal set in 1999 in Bologna to develop a common European area of higher education by 2010 is convincing. I hope that the forthcoming conference of the ministers of education in Berlin will take us closer to this goal. And it is good not just to leave the realisation of this goal up to politics. The Europaem and the conference of Bonn are contributing their part to the creation of a European area of higher education. Therefore I would like to thank the initiators, the universities and the sponsors of the Europaem.

---

**Uwe Thomas**

*State Secretary, German Federal Ministry for Education and Research*

**European Universities and the Bologna Process**

My lecture on European universities in the Bologna process is divided into four parts.

The first section examines science and its relationship to government. A famous German scientist, Goethe, who was also a politician and poet, coined a delightful sentence about science: "to one man it is the highest thing, a heavenly
godess; to another it is a productive and proficient cow who supplies him with butter." Whoever wants butter has to give the cow plenty to eat, but even goddesses cannot live on air alone.

The second section considers the origins and aims of the Bologna process in the light of the observations made in the first section. The third section then looks at globalisation in the education system and the enormous opportunities the "brain drain" and the internationalisation of science have to offer. The lecture concludes with a few remarks about the tension between scientific freedom and science's ethical responsibilities, a subject that occupies the minds of many people at this university and will lead to heated debates in Brussels over stem cell research.

The divine goddess, Science: is it possible to formulate any more clearly, and yet poetically, what science must always be about? Science has to be about unrestricted basic research as part of both Europe's and the world's cultural development. Universities have always known this, which is why they have sought to defend scientific freedom against government intervention, and religious and ideological dogma. However, universities have to finance themselves somehow and it takes particular effort to prevent the dictum that "he who has the gold makes the rules" from prevailing in the end. It seems to me that Germany has found a good path with its focus on federal consensus, which is reflected in the Science Council.

How do things look for Europe? Let us examine the role that European research funding plays in this connection. It is no accident that a shift in vocabulary is taking place here □ from the word "research" to the word "science." This is because, for many years, the European Union's efforts to foster research were primarily concerned with the cow that is supposed to provide us with butter. Thanks to Commissioner Busquin an instrument that also does homage to the goddess Science was created in the current Sixth Framework Programme for Research and Technological Development with the establishment of the Networks of Excellence.

Creating a European research area requires a commitment to scientific excellence, which cannot be achieved with an insistence upon regional balance.

I would like to use the opportunity here to propose incorporating this to an even greater degree into the next □ the seventh □ Framework Programme and anchoring in this programme elite fixed-term European research centres under conditions only the European Union can offer. These would be elite research centres with research groups for doctoral candidates where the best scientists from Europe and throughout the world can conduct research together for a fixed period of time, where they would work closely with universities yet be free from bureaucratic and financial constraints. These scientists should then take their findings, their knowledge and their friendships and pass them on to students at their universities. The major objective of creating a European research area requires a commitment to scientific excellence, and scientific excellence does not follow the law of large numbers, nor can it be achieved with an insistence upon regional balance.

Let us shift our attention from the goddess to the cow and from Europe back to Germany. Our cow finds its food in the triangle of universities, non-university research and industry in Germany and other European countries. The last few years have seen a sizeable dynamic force emerge within this triangle, a force that is pulling down barriers and opening up new opportunities. There is however still much to be done. I would encourage universities and non-university research facilities, including institutions like the Max Planck Society, the Hermann von Helmholtz Association of National Research Centres, the Gottfried Wilhelm Leibnitz Science Association and the Fraunhofer Society, to network with each other much more than they have in the past.

Universities should make use of these research organisations with an eye to creating elite courses, as has been done in Bonn in the area of the information sciences. We must offer our best and our brightest better teaching and research conditions than are possible at mass universities, and nevertheless have these people integrated into the university structure. That is the challenge. Research at universities cannot be allowed to dry up, and non-university research must become □ in practical rather than legal terms □ inter-university research not through rigid structures but through voluntary networking that is borne by the will to achieve. In my opinion, however, the Science Council went too far with its deliberations on the future science system in Germany when it fundamentally questioned the duality between university research and non-university research. I hold this duality to be one of the strengths of the German science system; all we have to do is break down the dividing walls.

And now I would like to turn to another duality, the relationship between publicly financed research and industry. There is a nonsensical quotation that publicly funded research cannot be allowed to become industry's extended workbench.

Before I present my opinion on this, I would like to digress for a moment with a few words on behalf of my own professional interests. As you know, here in Europe and in other parts of the world, we add up expenditure on research and
development in Europe and then measure them in terms of their share of the respective country's gross domestic product. Not all that long ago, Europe's heads of government agreed in Lisbon to increase the share of GDP spent on research and development to three percent by 2010. A wise decision. Finland exceeded this benchmark long ago with 3.7 percent, Sweden has also topped the three percent mark. Germany weighs in with 2.5 percent, Great Britain lags substantially behind Germany as do the southern member states of the European Union. If you believe the statistics released by the EU, the USA is at 2.7 percent GDP but with a strong bias toward military research.

Those are the facts or, to be more precise, those were the facts. The science sector and the Federal Ministry of Education and Research are grateful that the present administration boosted funding for education and research from 1998 through to 2002, particularly after seeing spending slowly decline for several years during the previous administration. Since then, we had been heading for the three percent mark for several years, at least when we look at federal funding.

**Europe's heads of government agreed in Lisbon to increase the share of GDP spent on research and development to three percent by 2010**

I fear that we have since strayed from our course. The federal budget and fiscal plans submitted by the federal minister of finance for the years 2004 onwards will allow the cow to grow thin in Germany and cause the goddess to break out in a cold sweat. The Lisbon resolution will be irrelevant as a result. Most of Germany's regional governments are also making sizeable cuts in education and research funding. This is understandable given that money is tight, but it is also wrong. A Germany that is resolutely headed for the three percent mark inspires confidence among investors, and the increase will therefore finance itself through greater economic growth.

What is the actual picture behind these figures? Who pays for research and development (R&D)? The picture in Germany shows that privately-financed R&D accounts for nearly seventy percent of all R&D, but at most ten percent of this goes to research. In other words, research is being primarily financed by the taxpayer, not by industry, and the lion's share of this research is being conducted at universities. Given that you have to conduct research before you can start developing, it is clear that universities and non-university research facilities bear an enormous responsibility. They are the ones who ultimately determine the future through their focus, their quality and their willingness to achieve. This is why we should invert the dictum that "he who has the gold makes the rules" and say instead that industry is the workbench of publicly funded research. This workbench, industry, lives from outstanding, publicly financed research, from the transfer of research findings to innovation and from the well-trained scientists that our universities produce.

Now, just how does this workbench work when it comes to the transfer of research findings? It apparently works through contacts between people, through contracts, through joint projects with existing companies, but above all through the founding of innovative companies that have their origins in the research sector. To illustrate this I need only cite the role that the Max Planck Society plays in setting up new biotech companies in Germany. Europe currently finds itself in a major crisis in this area after a number of bountiful years, particularly between 1998 and 2000. The seed capital market for young innovation-generating companies has collapsed, at least in Germany. We have not had a functioning technology stock market since the collapse of the New Market and public-sector assistance for start-ups is wasting away. The French government has already drawn its conclusions from this in the form of its Innovation Plan.

The German government is discussing a plan to foster the founding of innovative companies. We urgently need new initiatives in this area because existing companies are not able to modernise economic structures on their own, as a glance at the USA shows: where would the American economy be today without its young and fast-growing innovative companies? It is time that we overcome the crisis in financing young innovative companies and the government implements Minister Bulmahn's plan, along with its general tax rules.

Which brings me to the second part of my lecture. Following my observations about the importance of universities, I would like to make a few comments about the justifiably famous, but somewhat slow-moving, Bologna process. Why do we need the Bologna process? Because the European Union wants Europe to be the strongest science-based economic area in the world? How did the process come about? Where is it going? It is evident that systemic changes have long been taking place above and beyond the individual arrangements made at European level and that these developments will indelibly change the face of universities in Europe by the year 2010. From Germany's perspective, this development took the following course: During the rebellious 1960s and 1970s, during the years that the Federal Republic of Germany reinvigorated its education system and founded new universities, the debate on human
capital that Picht kicked off, took a turn toward the debate on democratisation and participation. The expansion of higher education and the increase in the number of students led to mass universities. Both were perhaps needed, but it took much too long before we could finally decide to implement vigorous reforms.

German reunification led to new encounters and new expectations in the 1990s. The struggle over a redistribution of influence among the world's major regions and powers is growing and Europe is beginning to reflect once again on the role it wants to play in the world. Everyone is talking about the knowledge society and, along with it, education and research. The new GATS agreement, which sought for the first time to include the education services sector in the liberalisation of global trade, is an expression of this movement and is particularly topical to the current debate. Europe began to take up this challenge in the university sector. The Erasmus Programme and the EU's chain of research framework programmes have increasingly included the tertiary education field. Erasmus celebrated its millionth student in 2002. However, although a number of experiments and studies are heralding new developments, a systematic about-face in the structuring of European higher education has yet to occur.

Credit goes to the French minister Claude Allègre for constructively addressing the disquiet in Europe's university sector in 1998 on the occasion of the Sorbonne's 800th anniversary. Looking back, even though it was only a vision at the time, the Sorbonne Declaration issued by the four major EU nations France, Great Britain, Italy and Germany appears to be the first step toward freeing ourselves of old restricting structures. The vision initially aimed systematically to divide university studies into two stages, the structure that leading Anglo-American universities have helped make the international standard. 29 nations translated this vision into a policy statement at the famous Bologna Conference in 1989. This was the start of the Bologna process, which not only embodies the political agreement between the ministers involved but is also supported by university rectors and the university sector.

The Joint Declaration on the European Higher Education Area adopted in Bologna on 19th June 1999 cited six fundamental objectives that Europe's education ministers consider of prime importance for the establishment of a European Higher Education Area and the promotion of European universities worldwide:

- Establishment of a system of easily readable and comparable degrees in conjunction with the establishment of a two-cycle degree system (bachelor's and master's).
- Introduction of a credit system (based on the ECTS model).
- Promotion of mobility by overcoming obstacles to free movement.
- Promotion of European cooperation in quality assurance.
- Promotion of European dimensions in higher education.

In 2001, two years after the signing of the Bologna Declaration, the education ministers of the (by then) 33 European signatory states meeting in Prague declared a broad acceptance of the goals laid down in Bologna. In the ensuing years, most of the signatory states and universities have come to view these goals as a crucial foundation for their development. The Prague Communiqué reinforced the goals laid down in the Bologna Declaration and underscored three further aspects of the European Higher Education Area as being particularly important:

- Lifelong learning.
- The involvement of students.
- Promoting the attractiveness and competitiveness of the European Higher Education Area (including trans-national education).

At the Berlin conference on 18-19th September 2003, we will face the difficult task of stepping up the overall process and putting it on a firmer, more sustainable foundation. In addition, the conference will have the new goal of reaching agreement on comparably structured doctoral studies and a stronger relationship between the higher education area and the research area in Europe. The third stage of higher education will thus complete the system. Above and beyond this, action must be taken to establish a more systematic relationship between the individual goals that had been somewhat unsystematically stitched together in Bologna and Prague. We want to set priorities and express this in the presentation of these goals.

**Mobility is the litmus test for convergence in Europe, and will boost the attractiveness of the European Higher Education Area**

What is this difficult process primarily concerned with? What takes centre stage? At the top of this list is the implementation of reliable quality assurance processes in all countries, making the transition to a two or three-cycle system by the year 2010 and improving reciprocal recognition of credits and degrees. By contrast, other goals cited in Bologna and Prague, such as putting the ECTS system into practice or the complete implementation of diploma supplements, are more technical in nature.
Finally, the objective of increasing mobility is not a structure-forming element than the product of structural change. Mobility is the litmus test for convergence in Europe, as is boosting the attractiveness of the European Higher Education Area. This is augmented by the conditions for fostering student participation and incorporating higher education into the concept of lifelong learning. Quality, structure and results/recognition are the cornerstones for European universities in the 21st century. European universities must be able to rival international competition, especially international competition for the best minds.

This brings me to the third part of my lecture: internationalisation. The initiative to establish a European Higher Education Area fell on fertile ground in Germany. The present government made this initiative a priority in 1998 and has linked it with making funds available for opening education up globally.

There has been concerted action on the part of the federal and Land governments, the science sector, and industry to increase Germany's attractiveness as a place to obtain an education; developing a professional marketing campaign for Germany in general and its universities in particular. The Hi! Potentials logo has a worldwide presence today, enabling and mobilising our universities to recruit in other countries, and introducing attractive awards to give top scientists from throughout the world the opportunity to conduct research for several years in Germany with their own research teams.

By doing this we want ultimately to raise the share of foreign students in Germany from approximately six percent in 1998 to ten percent (we had reached 7.7 percent in the 2001/2002 winter semester) and we want our academic staff to be more international: foreigners presently account for approximately five to seven percent of the teaching staffs at our universities. We also want even more of our own students and young scientists to be able to gain experience in other countries.

These are big aims today. However, it is helpful to recall the degree of internationality in "old Europe." In Germany's case, as early as 1900 approximately ten percent of all students came from abroad, while in earlier centuries students encountered Europe in Paris, Heidelberg, Bologna and Krakow.

In this connection, I would like to comment on the much-discussed "brain drain." The "brain drain" that involves European and Asian students going to the USA or the brain drain from Eastern Europe to Germany is just as attractive for the country these people are leaving as it is for the country that receives them. I would like to cite an example of microelectronics in South Korea to illustrate this point without generally proving it.

The global microelectronics industry in South Korea in the early 1980s involved young women in huge factories attaching contacts to chips, but then Korean scientists returned home equipped with all the knowledge Silicon Valley had to offer and started building their own factories.

Today South Korea is a leader in the microelectronics field, just as Taiwan is and China will soon be; all thanks to the "brain drain" which, in this remarkable case, was nothing other than an incubator for transferring new industries to Asia. With its exceptionally productive engineering schools, Germany could serve a similar function for Eastern Europe and perhaps even Asia with regard to so-called conventional industries that, contrary to the opinion of some New Economy prophets, still constitute the mainstay of economic performance.

The new media are changing learning processes, but not because you learn how to think better with their help

Marketing makes sense only when you have a high-quality product to market. This would also involve fundamental innovations such as the introduction of junior professorships and the restructuring of the salary system for university professors. However, first and foremost it would include quality through greater autonomy and more competition including more competition over the best students. And finally, this also takes money; quality does not come free. As much as we sympathise with our finance ministers at federal and Land level for having to deal with spending constraints, there is no getting around the fact that our universities are under-financed. I am not saying that American universities are generally doing better than European universities; I even think that, with the exception of the top-flight universities, they are generally worse.

However, we do have to make better use of what we have. We have to take on international competition over quality and face international ranking without forgetting that non-university research should also be taken into account in such rankings. We should view the network made up of universities and the non-university research associated with them as a strength, and market it aggressively worldwide, perhaps even on a joint basis as Europeans.

When doing so, we should not forget the rapidly-growing role played by new media. The new media are changing learning processes, but not because you learn how to think better with their help; that remains the province of interpersonal communication. Rather, today's new media can help people learn the skills necessary
for thinking much more quickly and efficiently. This new media will change education as profoundly as the Internet has changed communication. Whoever realises this too late will have problems, which is why the German government allocated more than €200 million over five years for the development of educational software. Europe should collaborate in this field like it did on the Bologna process. And I mention here only one pronounced bottleneck that we were made excruciatingly aware of in our New Media in the Education System programme.

There is far too little research being done in Europe on learning processes. We know much too little about the fundamentals of how people learn efficiently and with lasting effect. This would be a rewarding field for the Seventh Framework Programme for Research and Technological Development, which is supposed to bring education and research much closer together than ever before.

**We know much too little about the fundamentals of how people learn efficiently and with lasting effect**

This brings me to the fourth and final part of my lecture: the conflicting relationship between scientific freedom and science's ethical responsibility. This subject occupies the thoughts and minds of scientists here in Bonn and elsewhere, particularly when it involves such exemplary and existential topics as research on human embryonic stem cells. I will briefly examine this example because it will lead to heated disputes in the European Union this year. Germany has opted for the oddest possible stance as a compromise with a limited lifespan. We permit research on human embryonal stem cells under certain circumstances in Germany but forbid the growing of stem cells from surplus embryos.

We have laid down in law that only older stem cell lines – in other words, stem cells that have been contaminated with mouse feeder cells – can be used for research.

I think that research policy has to take people who oppose research on human embryonal stem cells and their motives seriously. But these opponents should take the principle of freedom of research just as seriously, provided that this freedom accepts ethical restrictions like those defined in an exemplary way in France, for example. I openly declare my support here for the French debate and the solution it has produced and would like to see an equally rational and values-oriented debate in Germany so that the current moratorium in the Sixth Framework Programme can be lifted on a consensual basis.

However, this debate points to a more fundamental problem. How should we organise the dialogue between science and society? How can we bring the still valid concept of enlightenment, which originated in Europe, into line with science's responsibility to act ethically?

Those of us who were involved in the "Year of Science" years in Germany, in particular the *Year of the Life Sciences* in 2001, can take hope. During these activities, science as a whole opened itself to society and did not shy away from seeking discussion in the public marketplace. The science community discussed ethics and that highest of things, the heavenly goddess, but it did not forget the cow that is supposed to provide our butter in Europe. This is the only way it will work: we have to take the discussion on scientific values to the public and endeavour to address ethical problems directly when doing so.

**Avi Primor**

*Former Ambassador of Israel in Germany, currently Vice President, Tel Aviv University*

**Universities and Politics: Friends or Foes?**

I am happy to hear that I am supposed to speak German.

I did not know how multilingual the conference was. First I received a letter from the vice-chancellor in German, then, everything printed in English. Herr Professor Kinzig introduces me in English. *Alors j'ai préparé un document en Français, si ça ne vous derange pas.*

Actually I was a bit unsure in reference to the topic: universities and politics, friends or enemies? I asked some colleagues at my university: What do you think about such a topic? Either I got a contradictory answer or no answer at all.

What does it mean: politics and the university? Most people think that politics at the university means being against the government or defending oneself against the government. The government or the authorities have always tried to influence universities. That is a tradition for the universities. If we take a look at the Middle Ages, then we see that the main work of the universities was the attempt to separate itself from religion in order to analyze and study religion from a neutral view point instead of being influenced by the official bodies of religion. In this point, they were almost successful. In later times it was the state, the kingdom, the empire, whoever, who tried to influence the universities. The universities also tried to remain independent, in which they often succeeded. But I do not think we want to talk about that. These are obvious details, part of the tradition of universities all over the world except maybe for dictatorships.

Actually we want to talk about the influence of the university and especially the university's
influence on politics. Do universities have influence on politics? What do we actually mean when we say politics? Do we mean the government’s politics? Or everyday policies? Do we mean society or how we should shape society? I think that the university is a part of society, even its standard-bearers, and therefore naturally very political. As standard-bearer for science, clarification and research, the university has to have influence on society; otherwise it has no purpose. People talk a lot about universities that actually aren’t universities any more. They are colleges for career training. Students go to university in order to learn a profession. They do not really want to do research. Philosophy, etc. is not appropriate any more. They want to learn a profession so that they are marketable. Nonetheless, universities are still a place of research. As a rule everything is taught and everything is symmetrical and if someone wants to learn Sanskrit, then he knows that he won’t be able to go to the stock market with it. The supply is very small and the demand even smaller, but people still study and people still learn. What purpose does it have for politics? For society? If we take a brief look at the history of the 19th century, then we’ll see that the students had a great deal of influence on politics and the development of nations.

In Germany in 1848 it was evident what was going on. The university and students were at last being suppressed. The Prussian king got the upper hand, but this does not mean that their influence has disappeared. What the students achieved in 1848 has remained an integral part of history moulding it for many years even though it was not clear at that time what had occurred. I think the student movement 120 years later in 1968 was also very influential. Not only because the students wanted to reform the university themselves, but because they very quickly realized if they wanted to introduce reform, it would have to be complete societal reform. What really impressed us Israelis in Germany at that time was how the students called upon their parents, teachers and professors to finally tell the truth about what they knew about the Second World War. “What did you cover up from us?” they wrote. “What were you doing during the Nazi era?” That was for us the beginning of the end of the repression in Germany. A hindrance for us, were the barriers that prevented, or at least hindered, the development of the Israelis and Germans. This repression of the post-war era ended with the student movement. I do not mean that all Germans repressed the truth. There was a part of the Germans that never repressed the truth and made a great effort to get others to take note of the truth and admit it. They wanted the others to have a good look at their own history. But they were not very successful. It was the student movement that got things moving and since then it has only gone forward. But do such movements mean that the impetus came from the university? Was it the universities that influenced politics in 1848 and 1968? Or does it mean that, despite the universities, the students were influential? I do not know. In any case it was no coincidence that it was the students of all people, and not the workers.

As standard-bearer for science, clarification and research, the university has to have influence on society; otherwise it has no purpose

There were the workers’ revolts in the East, for example in 1953. But were they really influential, these revolts for democracy and freedom? We know that it was actually a rebellion of the unions, although it was not called that. It was the living and working conditions of the workers that led to the workers revolting. But revolution that comes from students has a completely different meaning because students come from the university.

They have a different education, a different starting-point, and different intentions. It’s not about personal interests. Those are the ideas and thoughts because they come from the university. I maintain, however, that it was not the university as such. The background was the university. The source was the university. But the university did not change politics. The students wanted to reform the university themselves. I know that the universities in Europe and in North America have a totally different meaning than those in Israel. The reason is that Europe lives in peace, and although Europe has to deal with political problems, it is not about fateful problems like in Israel where political questions are vital matters, nor or for the Americans either.

I noticed that there was a lot of resistance at the American universities before the war in Iraq. Was it influential? What did it bring about? Well, can one even say that there is influence from the intelligentsia in America? Recently I talked to a German friend who was in America on the eve of the war on Iraq. A friend that spends a lot of time in America, not only on visits, but who has a house there, lives and does business there. He studied in America. He knows America very, very well. He told me, “I knew when I flew to America, that most of the Americans supported the war. I knew that the polls pointed out that the majority of Americans were for the war and supported Bush, but in the three weeks I spent in America I did not meet one single advocate of the war. Not a single one!” Of course, whom did he meet? The intelligentsia. Maybe students and especially people who read the New York Times and the
Washington Post. People who are interested in the outside world, people who travel to Europe, people who welcome foreigners in America. But they are not representative of the majority of the American population. Regarding this, the American universities couldn’t influence that much. It was not a whole lot different during the Vietnam War. There was a lot of protesting at universities against the war, but when the Americans saw on TV what was really going on there, when the coffins started coming home, then there was true resistance in America against the war. This was not the university’s doing.

In Israel we think we have to do it differently. We have to have a lot more influence on the general population. Not because we want to be political or think that we are biased or want to be, although the universities are often accused of that. For years the university in Israel has been accused of being biased, politically more left-wing. But when you say “left-wing” in Israel, it’s neither Socialism nor really left, according to Middle Eastern politics. It can be compared to Fascists all over the world. The interesting thing is, that these right extremist professors can usually be found in faculties of science. In humanities there are a lot less extremists. That probably has to do with the profession. First of all, because those who are involved in science do not have time to read newspapers and books. They are so engrossed in their work and that is good. In addition, I think that scientists have the habit of being able to have the complete truth in front of their eyes, that one can actually separate the world into black and white. There is the absolute truth that you thankfully do not have in humanities.

But most students aren’t scientists. Most of them read the newspaper, show interest and want to influence politics. But when it comes to student activism, I would say nowadays, at least in Israel, it is not only the students. I would even say that it’s usually not the students. It is the universities themselves. Different from the student movement in Germany in 1848 or 1968, it is not really the students at the universities in Israel that try to influence and shape politics and society. It’s the universities, the committees and the authorities of the universities. Our students are different than those in Europe. They’re older. They first have to serve in the military. This is a long-term process – usually three to four years and sometimes even longer, depending on which profession or field you serve in the army. In any case, by the time we see them, they’re older and have other worries and they have to work themselves. Parents cannot always help. Sometimes they are already married and have children of their own. In other words, they have little time for politics or society. They take care of themselves, their studies and their future. They really aren’t publicly active.

The universities themselves are different. They understand that they have to do something today. For example, at my university, we have a centre for Middle East research. It’s not a student centre and it’s not suitable for students, although naturally some participate. We have a university centre for international, security and strategic problems. They’re also centres where you can discuss and do research. World problems, regional and strategic problems: for whom? For the public. There are, of course, professors who work on such things but all of their efforts are dedicated to the public. People discuss, and problems that concern us all are talked about. The general public is invited and they come to listen.

Why do we want such things? Today in Israel we have a problem with our politics. The people think that we’re actually completely helpless, and have no chance of bringing about or moving something. People think we’ve tried everything possible with the Palestinians: we have made all concessions and the Palestinians have refused everything, and reciprocated with terror and violence. Not necessarily in the occupied territories but mainly in the heartland of Israel. By this logic, the Palestinians want nothing but to destroy Israel and if that is the situation we have no choice but to defend ourselves and as far as defence is concerned, Mr Sharon can do that. That is the reason that the population supports Sharon. It’s unbelievable because if you consider the opinion poll, then you’ll be surprised as a foreign observer because Sharon is actually supported by a majority of the population. But the Israeli population supports the idea of the concessions just as much. The large majority of the Israeli population is ready to make concessions, to evacuate the occupied areas, to move out of the settlements and to accept a real Palestinian state. But how can this be arranged? It can be arranged by the Israeli people saying that it would be ready to make concessions, if it had a credible interlocutor. Unfortunately, they do not have one and, as a result, Sharon is the right man.

In Israel, it’s the universities, the committees and the authorities of the universities that carry out “student politics”

Yesterday I had a conversation with the retiring British Ambassador to Israel. Very privately he told me a story – I do not think I am really allowed to repeat it, but everything at the university is allowed. He was the head of office at the British Foreign Ministry in January 2001 when the Bush administration came to power. The new American foreign minister called his British colleague and had a long conversation with him discussing
various things including the Middle East. He informed him that the Middle East did not interest him and that he was not going to get involved in the Middle East, different from what Clinton had done. Why? Firstly, because there is no purpose and secondly, what is the problem in the Middle East? It’s the problem of terror. The Palestinians are terrorists. And who can cope with that? Sharon. One should just leave him alone. He should continue to do his work and not interfere. That was the official attitude of the American government two and a half years ago. Since then they have changed their mind, but interestingly enough, they saw things exactly like the Israelis did. And if the Americans do not want to get involved and if the Europeans cannot get involved and if the Israeli population thinks they cannot do anything anyway and only the settlers have the last word with their boss Sharon, what can we do?

We at the university think that it’s our duty to discuss this problem in front of the population and to force them to open their eyes and not just settle with the fact that there is nothing to do. One must continue to live although it’s incredibly grim. No, there are always other possibilities. The truth is never absolute. We aren’t scientists and we have to force the people to consider different possibilities. That is why we have different centres and various activities that are interesting and exciting for the people. This forces them to take a good look at their problems. Recently we had a two-day symposium at the university about the relationship between Israel and Europe. We had guests from Europe, political scientists from Israel, journalists and politicians. You know that the relationship between Europe and Israel is so bad, as bad as it’s probably ever been, and that each party accuses and suspects the other. A real discussion about this topic aroused a lot of interest because people suddenly asked themselves: Are we living in truth or do we not actually understand the situation? Everything that was so self-evident for us, is it really so?

As part of my university’s political responsibilities, we held a symposium about torture, which changed public opinion enough that torture is now forbidden by the Supreme Court.

As part of my university’s political responsibilities, we held a symposium about torture. Torture was a big topic with us because the security authorities always say that under some circumstances some people must be tortured. Why? Because he is a ticking time-bomb. If you did not torture him, then you wouldn’t be able to save people’s lives. In other words, torture should be allowed, or at least tolerated, under some circumstances. A judge at a higher court in Israel even admitted this. He did not speak of torture, but of, let us say, “unusual methods” or whatever. The public accepted it. It’s all about the fight against terrorists and saving lives, etc. The university simply cannot accept the idea that a democracy thinks that torture in an institutionalized way is OK, so we had a seminar about that, and not only with Israelis. The Vice-Chancellor of the University of Heidelberg, Professor Hommelhof, came to us and gave a speech about this topic where there was not a definite denial of torture and therefore was somewhat more credible. The speech created a lot of interest. I can tell you that the general public in Israel sees the question very differently today and torture is absolutely, and once and for all, forbidden by the Supreme Court.

In a similar political vein, we recently held a conference where we discussed the meeting at Camp David in July 2000. Like I said, everyone thinks that our Prime Minister Barak offered everything to the Palestinians at Camp David. The Palestinians refused everything and replied with terror. Why did Camp David fail? Is it really plausible that the Israelis can offer everything possible to the Palestinians, who live in misery under occupying forces, and yet the Palestinians still refuse all options and reciprocate with terror. How is this possible? Why? That is what we wanted to discuss openly: with the Palestinians who participated in the meeting at Camp David, with colleagues of Clinton that had come from America, and naturally with Israeli participants. Barak, who at that time was head of the government, sat in the front row for two and a half days listening to everything. Mostly he stood in the stocks. And at the end, naturally, he at least tried to, let us say, justify his actions. In any case he was ready to participate in everything and I can tell you what took place in the media.

On the first day, a TV crew interviewed the professor who presented the whole thing and asked why he was doing this. Why would the public be interested in such a seminar and why would the university go through such trouble to hold something like this? From the crew’s perspective, it was all so clear and we knew what had happened at Camp David. We knew why this meeting had failed. To this, the professor said that it is not so simple and that there were various hypotheses, theories and opinions. The journalist said that was not true: we all knew exactly what happened also knew why the Palestinians refused everything.

The professor said that this was the reason for the seminar: to examine why he and most Israelis spoke this way. And this seminar did create quite a stir. Now there are a lot of other seminars about society in Israel with Jews, Israelis and Arabs who
are Israeli citizens. Such things are everyday occurrences at the universities in Israel.

Are such activities political? Does it mean that universities are political? I do not think so. You just cannot say that. I think that the university fulfills its duty. I think the university is an important part, if not a main part, of society. Standard-bearers of society have to generally influence society. The university cannot only be a place of further education. The university can and must do what no other body or part of the population can do. At least I'm happy if universities in Israel can somewhat do that. I believe that my colleague Mosche Zimmermann will talk more about this tomorrow. Thank you for your attention.

Mary Robinson
Executive Director of the Ethical Globalization Initiative, former High Commissioner for Human Rights for the UN, and former President of Ireland

Bridging the Divide: The Challenge for Universities

I am convinced that if the divides in our world between North and South, rich and poor, religious and secular, us and them, are to be bridged, then we need to give more emphasis to a values-led or ethical approach to national and international policy-making, drawing on the international human rights framework.

I also feel strongly that we need to engage and involve a wider range of constituencies in the work of building bridges of understanding and shared responsibility. There is a clear case for involving universities directly: after all, the opening words of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights describe it as:

...a common standard of achievement for all peoples and all nations, to the end that every individual and every organ of society, keeping this Declaration constantly in mind, shall strive by teaching and education to promote respect for these rights and freedoms.

And yet, over 50 years later, the majority of people in our grossly divided world are completely unaware of their rights and in no position to assert them. This is a gap which universities can help to fill, and the new project I am currently developing – the Ethical Globalization Initiative (EGI) – seeks to encourage innovative thinking on how to bridge such divides.

The theme of your conference – New Partnerships: Opportunities and Risks – recalls to mind some of the challenges we faced within the UN as we worked to develop, through the Secretary-General’s UN reform program, deeper engagement and partnership with the private sector and wider civil society to achieve the organisation’s objectives. During my time as High Commissioner, I took a number of steps to develop new partnerships for human rights. I worked, for example, with the business sector to promote good corporate citizenship through the UN Global Compact and other initiatives, and I encouraged the World Bank to view the human rights framework as offering valuable tools for empowering grass roots groups to tackle poverty.

We were acutely aware of the potential risks involved in developing public-private partnerships, both to the integrity and independence of the UN and to the perception that such partnerships could be seen as shifting established responsibilities for implementing public goods from governments to non-governmental actors. But as I was leaving the UN last September, I felt that these risks could be managed. We had only begun to scratch the surface of where partnerships in support of human rights could be fostered with other “new actors,” such as academic institutions from all regions.

I would like to reflect here on the potential value of multi-stakeholder partnerships in addressing the complex challenges posed by the forces of globalization, which have left the majority of the world’s people feeling less secure and less able to control the decisions that impact directly on their lives.

Just as there are exchange programmes for students in European universities, we can promote exchanges to link universities from North and South

I would also like to offer some thoughts on how universities might contribute to such partnerships, building on their own evolving responsibilities in a global age. For me, the single most important task of the university lies in teaching the skills which students need to be responsible citizens. But there is an added dimension, which needs further exploration. To what degree and through what strategies and methods should institutions of higher education be involved in addressing the moral and ethical challenges of our day? Many universities are already doing a great deal and are actively working in collaboration with governments, international organizations and civil society to address problems at home and abroad, but I want to challenge the Euopeanum to do even more in helping to define the role of universities in seeking to make globalization a positive force in the lives of all people.

For a start, having had this three-part discussion among yourselves, as a group of distinguished
European universities, would you consider opening a similar dialogue with universities from the South? Just as there are exchange programmes for students in European universities, could more be done to promote exchanges with students from other regions as part of developing links between universities from the North and South?

**Cultivating Humanity**

Before going any further, I wish to stress how important I believe the contributions of scholars and academic institutions have historically been to the cause of human rights and social justice. For centuries the work of scholarship survived the passing of kings, tyrants, wars and plagues. It did so with difficulty and through the courage of many scholars, some of whom suffered in consequence. That historic commitment to academic freedom has in itself been an enormous contribution. Equally important, academia has shed light on the origins of rights, which exist in every society. This effort has been instrumental in shaping the legal understanding of human rights at national, regional and international level. Perhaps most important of all, academia has provided a space for students to examine their own beliefs, to see the world through the eyes of others, and to understand the importance of honouring the inherent dignity of every individual.

Yet despite these achievements, we should ask ourselves: is it enough? In a global age, is it enough to teach law, if we are not also concerned with questions of global justice? At a time when different cultural perspectives and interpretations of religious beliefs are locked in ideological battle, is it enough to value the study of philosophy, if it is not informed by current ethical considerations in our divided world? At the start of a new century, is it enough to have amassed more knowledge than at any previous time in human history, without also giving proper attention to how that knowledge will be disseminated and used by and for others, particularly those who have been most excluded from the potential benefits of the technology and knowledge revolutions?

**In a global age, is it enough to teach law, if we are not also concerned with questions of global justice?**

I was particularly interested in learning about the outcomes of your previous conference in which you explored the issues of new responsibilities for universities in a new age. The recommendations that emerged from your conference in Paris this past September were noteworthy in their attention to the underlying role of universities in preparing students for responsible citizenship. As Ben Okri put it in his presentation, a primary responsibility for universities is to set their students up for the “act of self discovery.” I have also heard this notion described as the role of the university in helping students acquire the “skills of freedom.”

Participants at your Paris meeting also focused on education for governance, a helpful concept which underlines the need to prepare students for responsible citizenship and their role in promoting democratic values, human rights and good governance. These central duties of every university are summed up well by University of Chicago Professor Martha Nussbaum in the title of her book, *Cultivating Humanity*, where she highlights the growing difficulties of providing students with ethical and citizenship skills at a time when “marketable” skills are most in demand.

As you all know well, we find ourselves under pressure from an increasingly market-oriented approach to higher education, with all its attendant dangers. A growing number of leading universities today receive sizeable portions of their annual income from non-governmental sources, and in order to ensure that the fruits of scientific research can be optimally developed and distributed, universities have entered into new partnerships with multinational companies. I do not mean to suggest that these changes are inherently dangerous, but they are moving into uncharted territory and raise a range of ethical concerns which need to be addressed.

Changes in the global economy have pushed these developments forward. Universities face intense competition for the best students, for scarce resources and for international recognition. Universities recognize that these students are largely focused on pursuing subjects which they believe will be the most useful degrees for them as they seek employment after their studies, such as business, law and medicine.

According to research done in the US by James Engell and Anthony Dangerfield, courses in computer and information services, health professions and business management increased in enrolment up to threefold between 1979 and 1994, while courses in the Humanities such as philosophy, religion, history and languages, all experienced steep declines in new students.

How will universities in Europe and around the world be able to “cultivate humanity” in their students, which you have identified as being a fundamental responsibility of the university, when the fields of study most dedicated to teaching these themes are rapidly losing ground to other disciplines? How will you be able to ensure that every student is exposed to what Professor Nussbaum has proposed as the basic skills needed for citizenship: first, an education that inculcates “the capacity for critical examination of oneself and one’s tradition — for living what, following Socrates, we may call “the examined life”; second,
a curriculum that provides students with a greater “knowledge of non-Western cultures, of minorities within their own, of differences of gender and sexuality”; and third, the cultivation of narrative imagination, or “the ability to think what it might be like to be in the shoes of a person different from oneself, to be an intelligent reader of that person’s story.”

The importance of preparing students to be responsible citizens is all the more important today given that the very concept of citizenship, of what it means to belong to a community and to be a responsible member of it, is being transformed by the forces of global communications technology, markets and transportation.

These are difficult issues, going to the heart of the university’s role in promoting respect for human rights. Fortunately, I believe students themselves are also beginning to recognize that there is a need for a renewed focus within the curriculum on issues of ethics and responsible citizenship. What has been encouraging for me as I have spoken with a wide range of students over the past eight months, mainly at universities in the US, is the growing awareness that professional courses are desperately in need of grounding in ethics and values, in the “skills of freedom.”

The Aspen Institute, one of the partners in the Ethical Globalization Initiative, has recently completed a report titled Where Will They Lead? MBA Student Attitudes about Business & Society 2003. This survey of student views in leading business schools in the US and Europe shows that ethical conduct in the workplace has become increasingly important to students. But many are concerned that their courses of study may either not address these issues adequately or worse yet, teach questionable values that may later contribute to mismanagement and failure to counter corporate fraud.

**Human Rights**

That common framework to which I refer is the body of international human rights standards that have been agreed by governments over the past 55 years, starting with the adoption by the UN of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights in 1948. Some of you will rightly remind me that your institutions already have faculties of law, history, political science, philosophy and anthropology with impressive records in teaching and research on the theory and practice of human rights. And you will likely point out that many of your universities have already taken steps to support students in other countries who are interested in benefiting from your programs.

But I would challenge you to consider whether the subject of human rights has perhaps remained for too long solely the domain of a committed but still relatively small group of lawyers, activists and academics. I would urge you to give thought to the further utility of human rights not only as expressions of shared values or as international legal standards, but also as policy-making tools which could assist those charged with making complex decisions about global issues in the areas such as trade, development, the environment, security or public health, to name but a few.

This still relatively new concept of taking human rights outside their traditional academic home and applying them to other fields, particularly development and economics, is known as a “rights-based approach.” But to date it has been more rhetoric than reality, lacking in conceptual clarity, practical impacts and academic rigor. Many academics and practitioners remain to be convinced of the relevance of human rights approaches within other policy frameworks.

The new project I am developing — the Ethical Globalization Initiative — seeks to work with others in moving forward rights-based approaches to policymaking at the national and international level. Our aim is to promote good practices or model projects of how human rights approaches can produce results. We also plan to be a “chorus leader,” linking local activists and networks with academics and policy development, which together can produce the analysis and recommendations needed to influence decision-makers at different levels in government, international organisations, the business sector and civil society.

To give an example, one of the issues to be tackled from a human rights perspective is health, in particular access to life saving treatments for HIV/AIDS. One of the first projects we are developing, in cooperation with leading African Aids bodies, is to reduce women’s vulnerability and to combat stigma in the HIV/AIDS pandemic in Africa. We hope to build greater understanding among African leaders and AIDS experts that the disease could be more effectively addressed by

**How can political issues be linked to solving real-world problems facing the countries from which your students come?**

How can universities do more to engage their increasingly diverse students in questions of political and public life? How can these issues be not only debated in the classroom but also linked to solving real-world problems facing the countries from which your students come? I believe part of the answer lies in drawing on common values, a common framework that applies to all people and a common set of tools that all academic disciplines can use as a guide in addressing these challenges.
emphasizing the extent to which it is also a women’s rights issue both from the perspective of women as victims of the disease as well as primary caregivers for the sick and orphaned. As one slogan has put it: “The best investment in an AIDS vaccine is an investment in protecting women’s rights.”

To give another example, we are co-developing a new Business Leaders Initiative on Human Rights. It aims to involve senior business leaders from multinational corporations in a consultative process with different stakeholder groups to better define the extent of business responsibilities for human rights, particularly in countries facing problems of extreme poverty and deficient governance. We plan to involve academics in this initiative with the aim of supporting businesses committed to promoting human rights and avoiding practices which may lead to rights violations, while recognising – indeed emphasising – that the primary responsibility for human rights protection remains with governments.

---

**Universities have a central role to play in making sure that partnerships are not only effective, but based on sound principles**

Earlier this month I travelled to Thailand to participate in the launch of ESCR-Net, an International Network on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights. The network has brought together social movements and non-governmental organizations working in human rights, development and the environment worldwide. As it develops, it would benefit from a partnership with universities committed to bridging the divides and seeking to connect concrete local struggles for social justice with international human rights standards and mechanisms for advancing their rights.

Each of the constituencies EGI seeks to influence, from government leaders to business executives, from activists to academics, will need to see the issues we plan to address presented in a way that they recognise. Each will need to understand how human rights standards can be used to help make ethical decisions.

**Principled partnerships**

The key to success will be in shaping principled partnerships, which can bring together groups which may have diverging views but which are committed to using human rights as a shared framework for solving real-world dilemmas.

I was interested to read about the new partnership recently launched by two of the founding universities in the Europaeum association – Leiden and Oxford – which aims to provide future leaders in industry and government with the tools to operate more effectively in the politically, legally and culturally complex system of Europe. This new initiative exemplifies the role universities can and should play in helping business and government leaders work more effectively together.

I conclude by stressing again that despite the risks, partnerships are in my view the only way that global challenges such as HIV/AIDS, extreme poverty and environmental change, to name only three, will be effectively addressed. In many respects, the future of governance lies in making partnerships work. Universities have a central role to play in making sure that partnerships are not only effective, but based on sound principles.

You are well placed to be objective mediators of political and economic disagreements. You can ensure that decisions about complex issues are made on the basis of sound analysis, and you can help see to it that the viewpoints and concerns of those who have been marginalized are heard when decisions are being made which impact their lives.

I would welcome the involvement of the Europaeum in the development of the Ethical Globalization Initiative and I look forward to hearing your views on how the “doing” of human rights can contribute to the success of principled partnerships.
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Workshop A: Knowledge Transfer and the Future University

Professor Caja Thimm
Managing Director, Center of Communication and Media Studies, University of Bonn

The media play a key role in global learning, knowledge transfer and internationalisation in academic development. Not only do we communicate worldwide via email, collect information in databases and search the web for the most recent developments, we also employ e-learning strategies as a new tool for distance learning.

The new communication technology fuelled a wave of new digital learning programs. Whether online, or offline as CD-ROMs, computer-based trainings (CBTs) have won a promising market position in recent years. Even after the introduction of online courses or virtual universities (see below), after multiple research programs and pilot studies (like the multimillion Euro project by the German Government on New Media in Education), there is still a lot to be done to establish proper e-learning tools and, perhaps even more important, a positive attitude towards e-learning in university education. The same holds true for business and organisational use of e-learning: after a wave of enthusiasm, the hype has died down and given way to a more realistic attitude.

This paper explores some of the central questions on e-learning development and will argue for a more embedded approach. The rediscovery of social learning competence, it will point out, is one of the most important goals for media-based learning.

Types of online learning

When looking at the different ways of employing e-learning within university curricula, it is necessary to introduce some differentiating features. Two general types of e-learning can be distinguished:

Embedded e-information: E-learning as a means of organising academic learning. This includes course subscription and enrolment online; homework or assignments being submitted via email; online student papers, scripts and magazines; chat rooms, newsgroups and general information via the university’s homepage.

Exclusive e-information: E-learning organised in a virtual campus. This means all information and learning materials are put on the web and exams are monitored online.

Many European countries offer online universities of various sorts. Some are restricted to certain subjects, others combine distance learning and vocational training. Just to name some examples, here are three German virtual campuses:

FernUniversität Hagen: The only distance university in Germany designed exclusively for external students. Oral exams and some tests are being carried out in Hagen, but all other coursework is carried out on the basis of “Studienbriefe” (printed course materials). It has now been supplemented with online learning programs. (www.fernuni-hagen.de)

Virtual Campus Rheinland-Pfalz: A campus organized by the state of Rheinland Pfalz, which is not affiliated with a specific university. (www.vcrp.de)

VIROR (Virtuelle Universität Oberrein): A collaboration between four universities (Karlsruhe, Freiburg, Heidelberg, Mannheim) in Baden-Württemberg. This virtual campus offers different subjects, with some courses in English. (www.viror.de)

With the exception of the distance university Hagen, which was designed from the start to be a distance university, none of these “virtual classrooms” or “virtual campuses” has been very successful so far. Many students criticise the coordination of curricula, the lack of personal contact with staff and fellow students, and the quality of materials on the web.

A lack of experience on the part of the students and the organisers of the virtual campus might explain some of the problems. Unlike in the US, German students often have limited experience of online communication. Perhaps one needs to start at an earlier age: the US government, for example, has raised the number of “cyber schools” dramatically. Today in the US there are 67 such schools with 16,0000 students in fifteen states, and the numbers are increasing every year. The reasoning is primarily practical: charter schools provide more equal opportunities for children in problematic living situations, for example those that have had to leave school or that live in rural areas. These schools have the additional advantage of preparing children to process any kind of online information later on. But even if the effects on these students are found to be mostly positive, the lack of appropriate cyber-curricula and sporadic contact with classmates remains a problem for this group.
Online-learning and usability

Having outlined some of the most recent developments and problems in media-based online learning, I want to explore some of the possible reasons for the mixed attitudes toward this method. The central focus is on the perspective of usability, especially with regard to the user’s perceptions.

When using websites the following are important:
- The start page: this is important for orientation, it offers selection choices and often determines the future motivation of the users. If it is not well organised, users might leave the site right away.
- Orientation: users must be able to recognise at any time where they are, even after a period away from their work. If not, they might get lost and/or frustrated.
- Navigation: flexible and easily recognisable modes of navigation are needed, depending on the type of user personality and the level of expertise.
- Coherence: the user must be able to understand the relevance and coherence of pages within their context. Here, text type and wording come into focus.
- Linkage: headings, buttons, links, text types etc. have to be precisely phrased and clearly linked.

However, it is not only these general issues that have to be taken into consideration. Individual differences between the users in terms of experience, goal orientation and skill level can determine successful online learning. One can distinguish the following user typology:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Content motivation:</th>
<th>Exploring</th>
<th>Goal oriented</th>
<th>Structured</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>beginner</td>
<td>Exploring</td>
<td>Working through looking up</td>
<td>Researching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>advanced</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>expert</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 1: Online learning user typology*

When applying this user typology to the intended content of online learning tools, it is also necessary to evaluate closely which groups reach what results in specific visual and textual environments.

It is therefore important to conduct a well-structured evaluation. This evaluation should include user and producer perspectives and be the basis for successfully adapting new content. The following criteria should be included in the evaluation system:

- A full evaluation has to include more than learning success and score results.
- Usability criteria have to be taken into account and related to learning success, learning time and the path chosen.
- Evaluation of responses has to be aligned and coordinated with product optimizing processes.
- Methods should be combined to enhance evaluation depth.

Even though we find more and more awareness towards the usability/evaluation relationship, there still is a lot to be considered if e-learning should really become more successful.

Development and prospects of e-learning

When we look at the most recent developments on the e-learning market, it becomes obvious that things have been rather unsteady during the last years. Starting in 1999, when we experienced a lot of hype about e-learning, “content is king” was the dominating motto of e-learning development.

After the sharp sales decline in 2001, it became clear that content does not sell by itself and consulting came more into focus. Subsequently, the results of the producer-client contact in the consulting process showed there was a pronounced need for context. Research showed that embedded information, which was part of a broader context, was understood and processed more easily. These three phases “content is king”, “consulting is king” and “context is king” mark the development of e-learning from a market perspective. After the hype, the sharp decline and the disappointment, there is now new growth and, based on new realism, more progress can be expected.

Online-learning and social learning

Looking at today’s concepts for media-based learning, it becomes obvious that solutions were often too technical and did not take the users’ perspectives into account. As is often the case, technology and human nature do not develop at the same pace. Technological progress is faster than human nature: human competence cannot be as easily enhanced as a computer program. The development of e-learning has been focused strongly on content and has left out didactical considerations. Therefore, there is still a lot to be desired in terms of acceptability and usability:

- Computer-based trainings (CBTs) are mostly based on tutoring systems with rigid rules. They lack contextual information.
- CBT also poses problems for social learning, as current formats do not support group learning.
- Team learning needs to increase. New concepts for “embedded” learning and more sociability have to be developed.

*Source: Back/Bendel/Stoller-Schäi, 2001, E-Learning im Unternehmen*
**E-Learning as blended learning**

One of the approaches that focuses more on the learning process itself is the concept of “blended learning.” Blended learning proposes the interchange of media orientation and interpersonal exchange. It can be conceptualised in the following chart:

![E-Learning Diagram](image)

Apart from working on modules that are computer-based (this can be either WBT – web-based teaching – or CBT) learners also get together in face-to-face interpersonal contact situations. They might choose from a variety of opportunities including tele-learning, virtual collaboration and locally focused CD-ROMs. These choices are determined by the particular focus of the respective media: discussion phases can be carried out by web-based tools (whether ICQ, email or business chat solutions), whereas creative group work depends on interpersonal face-to-face contact.

**Future partnerships**

At the moment e-learning is in transition from its pioneering and experimental phase to a more long-term, sustainable implementation. However, e-learning should not be seen as a tool that can easily be employed to save resources in terms of staff or course costs. On the contrary, e-learning is a very costly and demanding approach. It also has to be accompanied by changes in the university organisation, a prerequisite that is not clear to many e-learning enthusiasts.

Changes of university structures and quality management considerations are becoming more and more important. From this perspective, e-learning can become a motor of change for organisational modernisation and for the attitude of staff – from research assistant to professor – and, of course, for the students.

This approach is not only important for the modernisation of universities: it has also been widely adopted in the corporate world. Small and large companies, and even world-wide operations, are confronted with similar problems: the internationalisation of communication, production spreading all over the world, the fast turnaround of knowledge and a vast amount of information that has to be processed to be used properly. E-learning thus poses a serious challenge for all organisations, whether educational or business interests are concerned. This makes universities and business natural partners, as both depend on global knowledge transfer, both rely and depend on well educated, highly motivated employees and staff members and both can be considered “learning organisations.”

Even though e-learning seems to hold a lot of possibilities for both companies and universities, this positive view is not supported by recent developments as universities and business organisations face severe problems in establishing modern learning systems. This is illustrated by some figures concerning company usage of e-learning:

- 46% of larger companies (more than 1,000 employees) in Germany use e-learning strategies (2001).
- 24% of medium size companies (50-1,000 employees) use e-learning (2000).
- 5% of smaller companies (5-50 employees) use e-learning (BIBB 2001).
- However, only 10% of employees in larger companies are actually making use of e-learning.

Exact data on university usage are not easily accessible, but most estimates are roughly equivalent to those of the smaller companies.

These numbers demonstrate one decisive factor: there will be no success unless those who are supposed to make use of the e-learning tools are included. Therefore, we will have to look for closer cooperation between university and business so that experiences and research can be shared.

**Summary and outlook: Future Universities**

Having pointed out some of the concepts, approaches and difficulties on the issue of global learning as an important mode of change for future universities, the question arises of what steps we need to take in the near future. What kind of university do we need? What are the prospects of global learning in the information age and how can problematic issues like the “digital divide” be integrated?

Most of these questions cannot be answered easily. Recipes do not apply, simple solutions are not available, and at the moment, we have more questions than answers – but asking the right questions might lead to important steps forward.
I believe that some of the important issues for our future universities are:

• **Cultural Codes**: Global learning can bridge continents, but online learning concepts will have to be adapted to cultural codes like semiotics, language and media didactics. Media-based learning is almost entirely a western privilege and universities will have to get involved in political activities to overcome this digital divide.

• **Standardisation**: Standardisation of what to learn seems necessary, but might cause conflict between interest groups. National and local interests might conflict and there is a danger that measures of standardisation will lead to a loss of perspective. Virtual campuses offer the chance to bring together a worldwide group of students, but there will have to be intensive discussions on the standardisation of knowledge.

• **Global Competition**: In the future, modern universities will be evaluated by their online service profile, as students will have more choices due to virtual campuses and virtual classrooms. One could live anywhere and still study at Harvard, Stanford or Oxbridge. Consequently, there will be more competition between universities for the most gifted and motivated students from all over the world.

• **National education responsibility**: It might become very tempting to concentrate on the globally shared interest in science, but university education should reflect the national responsibility of the various nations. This does not only embrace regional and local cultures (like cultural studies), but also national and regional identities based on religious beliefs and language. The emergence of English as a lingua franca in the international scientific discourse is not necessarily an asset, and may even become a liability as it can be seen as a severe loss of culture and a threat of dominance by non-native speakers.

Universities are in an important restructuring phase: old and new, tradition and modernisation, new and old subjects and media are sharp contrasts that have to be integrated. This is an especially big challenge for many of the traditional European universities.

Even though the media can be seen as a decisive mediator for change, there will be one traditional aspect of university teaching that will not change: personal relations between students and teachers will remain an essential part of academia. Students will always feel the need to see and experience their colleagues in person, exchange ideas in the cafeteria and gossip face-to-face. The "virtual professor" will not and should not replace those who stand in front of a class and communicate, with personal conviction, how important it is to learn and to go on learning.

**Excerpts from Discussion**

**Professor Christopher Tremewan**
*Pro-Vice Chancellor for International Relations, University of Auckland*

Speaking as a UNESCO expert for e-learning, we wanted to develop CD-ROMs to send to developing countries with information, but without the bareness you get from a Google search. Our legal experts said there might be a problem if we used tables and figures from other people. Perhaps the Europeauem could look at how to overcome this through an agreement that such teaching knowledge transfer is acceptable as long as it includes appropriate citations.

It may be cheaper to send one CD-ROM than a pile of books, but in developing countries not everyone has access to the CD-ROM and computers do not always run properly. There is also a social side to education, which we should not overlook: it is not just about the exchange of information.

**Workshop Summary**

**Markus Pins**
*University of Bonn*

Knowledge transfer has often been addressed as a matter of facilitating the foundation of start-up companies. Entrepreneurs leaving universities are supposed to bring their research results to the market, but this would be a once-in-a-lifetime task wasting dozens of further opportunities to enter mutually beneficial relations. The future university must find additional ways of transferring its knowledge. It is not enough to maintain good relations with companies whose founders once spent their wildest years on campus. These new ways must involve the best, fastest, cheapest and most far-reaching means of achieving contact with other sectors of society. At present, these are often by electronic means: detailed websites, comprehensive databases and focused newsletters can sustain the exchange between universities and corporations.

The future university – as well as the present university – needs to justify the use of its money as research and education are both very expensive and valuable. The criteria for justifying what a university does are hardly in dispute (some accountability to the public and internal academic measures) but the means of fulfilling the justification requirements are ever changing. Citizens’ demands to access information have increased and it is, once again, electronic media
that allow universities to be proactive in disseminating their research.

The principal idea behind electronic media in universities used to be the introduction of e-learning: education at your fingertips, the ever-accessible teacher, global access to teaching documents had been the catch-phrases of the e-learning wave. However, expectations of the added value of e-learning and the costs of producing materials comparable to a good lecture were too high and e-learning had to be evaluated and adjusted.

Nevertheless, where universities are thousands of kilometres away and funds are scarce, e-learning may be the only way to access any form of education at all – apart from the likely problem that the sheer number of prospective students qualified for higher education could far exceed the number of available places. If affluent universities want to make intelligent use of e-learning, they may need to invest in electronic equipment and networking in poorer regions of this world and offer education to bright students in remote areas. If universities worry about equal access, their concern must not stop at national borders.

Efficient knowledge transfer, satisfactory justification and focused e-learning require academic efforts to design, evaluate and redesign universities’ web strategies. The Centre of Communication and Media Studies at Bonn University already does this for e-learning. Professor Caja Thimm evaluates the success of online learning and formulates criteria for e-learning material. She distinguishes embedded e-learning – information for an academic course on campus – from exclusive e-learning, which does not accompany on-campus learning. Examples for both types of e-learning in Germany and the US show that, despite its successes, appropriate cyber curricula and sporadic contact with classmates remain a problem.

In addition to these challenges, which are external to e-learning, there are clear internal problems. Online learners face problems on an informational content level and on a potentially culture-dependent operational level. The success of e-learning depends on the performance in both these areas. The quality of e-learning material, on the other hand, seems to depend on the web adaptation process – the transformation of linear text into a multimedia, hypertext structured web document. It is, however, debatable, whether a web project, which starts from a linear text, will ever make use of all the opportunities electronic media has to offer and whether it is affordable at all. The future university may need to stimulate web projects that are not based on traditional linear texts.

A good example of a university using e-learning to offer a global degree is the University of Auckland in New Zealand. Pro-Vice Chancellor Christopher Tremewan, responsible for the development and implementation of the university’s internationalisation policy, aims to send 500 students per year on exchange by the year 2005. Students are offered one or two semesters at 60 universities in 18 countries all over the globe including Japan, Korea, China, Germany, France, the United Kingdom, Canada and the United States of America.

### A good example of a university using e-learning to offer a global degree is the University of Auckland in New Zealand

Apart from this internationalisation by travel, the university has joined a global electronic programme offering an electronic and virtually global degree. As a member of Universitas21, a network of 17 universities in 10 countries, the University of Auckland is now partner in an exclusively online MBA course run by Universitas21 Global, a joint venture of Universitas and the Thomson corporation. The target groups of this online course based in Singapore are mainly students from the Asia Pacific region who may not have access to a high-quality campus university. This global MBA will therefore combine high-quality higher education and ease of access for students from disadvantaged regions. The virtual environment of this course includes online discussions, a global library for learning resources, chat functionality, discussion forums, blackboards and tools for note-taking. All of these facilities are designed to offer students an e-learning environment that provides all necessary means for a successful e-learning experience. All e-learning efforts must always be tied to the reasons why online courses were set up in the first place. The reasons are the guiding principles – not the technical opportunities on offer.

The two examples of Bonn University and of the University of Auckland demonstrate both new and old opportunities for education and, at the same time, new and old problems for teaching. A teacher who is not willing to use a piece of chalk to visualise his thoughts to students will not make use of multimedia presentations either. A lecturer offering no office hours or being inaccessible on campus will not respond to his email either. One should not attribute these difficulties to new technologies. There might, at least at first sight, be some unknown problems: people still talk about incompatibilities of their operating systems or web browsers and about the fluidity of electronic information or the danger of data loss.

These worries appear minor technicalities in the face of greater problems in disadvantaged regions.
The technological means to access virtual universities are not available to poorer young people, who are nevertheless willing and able to participate in education. However even these major problems seem less severe than the difficulties in accessing bricks-and-mortar campuses. It may be cheaper to access the world of research by expensive computers than via even more expensive campuses.

Electronic teaching materials cannot just be minor copies of real-world teaching. The quality of e-learning material must meet or exceed traditional standards. In order to guarantee this quality, the academic system must reform its merit system. There is a demand for academic merit, if people are expected to produce multimedia-teaching material that will never be transformed into or does not stem from a linear textbook. The evaluation of academic work comprises research and teaching – the latter sometimes being neglected. The criteria for this evaluation are usually twofold as form and content are considered separately. It would be a misunderstanding, if one ranked electronic media only amongst the form criteria. Taken seriously, electronic media may stimulate the production of entirely new knowledge unavailable with pencil and paper.

Recent experiences have shown that universities cannot provide the necessary technological means themselves or install proper network operating systems. Both on a large scale and on smaller scales, like the Thomson–Universitas 21 partnership or the Erfurt University cooperation, universities need to outsource their information technology services. This is yet another field of promising public private partnerships. It may turn out to be similar to the co-operation between universities and publishers, which are mostly private companies even when they are subsidiaries of universities. Academics are used to buying a word processor or a locally-installed operating system, and it will become common to buy a web platform and a network operating system as well.

The usage of electronic media is not an issue of all or nothing. In some cases, traditional ways of doing research and teaching may remain the best, but there may be other areas where new media is better. Life-long knowledge transfer, increased legitimacy demands, the scarcity of university places, difficulties of access to campuses in poorer regions and the potential of new knowledge sources exceed by far the unquestioned benefits of new media for basic organisational and administrative matters. It is for the future university to explore and apply intelligently the available means of new technology.

WORKSHOP B: Funding and Ethics

Russell Willis Taylor
President and CEO, National Art Strategies, Washington, DC

Knowledge Transfer and New Media: Global Learning?

Good afternoon, and thank you to the organisers of this conference for inviting me to speak to such a distinguished audience, and in such distinguished company. As I was preparing for this event, I researched corporate / academic partnerships across the world, and I confirmed what I have long known: how grateful I am for those who lead universities, and how glad I am that I am not of your number. The challenges facing the academic world are greater now than ever before. As a member of society who benefits from your work, I thank you. As a fellow member of the global non-profit community, who seeks private support without inappropriate intervention, I sympathise with your current dilemmas.

For over 20 years I have worked in the non-profit world, with occasional work in the commercial sector. Most of my work has been in the field of the arts, and I have also worked in a teaching medical centre and at a University in Chicago. National Arts Strategies, the company that I now lead, partners with the leading business schools in America to contextualise business thinking for the arts. I have far less experience of the academic arena than all of you, but I have long worked in a community that relies absolutely on private money for its survival and prosperity, while at the same time seeking creative independence from the influence of that money. In short, we fight the same battles, and share many of the same value systems regarding civil society and what enriches it.

This is an uncomfortable time for Americans to give advice to anyone else in the world, as you will all be aware. Winston Churchill once noted “The United States will always do the right thing, after having exhausted all other possibilities.”

Many of the partnerships that have arisen in the academic and corporate arenas in the past decade are very much the right thing, but I fear that an equal number of them fall under the heading of “exhausting all other possibilities.” In the next few minutes, I hope to share with you the concerns of the non-profit community about the use of private money in advancing our causes, and offer some thoughts on what characterises a good corporate partnership.

Arts organizations depend on corporate and private money to survive in the United States, and have had, by necessity, to become adept at creating patronage relationships that do not hinder artistic freedom. Universities, both public and private, are
facing the toughest time in their history in the United States, and are finding that an increased reliance on corporate money presents them with complex challenges and a need to reaffirm those principles which represent their core values. Increasingly, Universities are finding that corporate monies for research can quickly become a Faustian pact, when not approached with confidence and certainty about lines that will not be crossed, principles that will not be compromised.

The entire higher education sector in the United States is facing a crisis. Beginning with the dramatic erosion of endowments that had only very recently seemed mighty, and sometimes even excessive, the problems on Wall Street are now affecting all areas of university life. Donations from individuals, who still constitute the greater majority of donors to all non-profits in America, are dramatically down. Most annual funding drives at universities have dropped 50% or more in the past two years.

Collectively, the 50 state governments are facing a deficit of an estimated $70 billion. Unlike the federal government, and the treasury, the states have to balance their books every year. So, alongside the private universities, the state universities are looking at slashed budgets across the board. Tuition is on the rise, with some universities raising tuition mid-year in an unprecedented, and extremely unpopular, trend. The first cuts come from administrative budgets, then hiring freezes come into play, then buildings are not repaired as quickly, and then research is scaled back. The final level, which is the most dreaded, is that of abolishing departments and laying off tenured staff.

Those universities in America who have had to resort to the third level cuts are keeping it as quiet as possible, but their number will increase. The financial crisis is so dramatic that some universities have even had to do the unthinkable, cut back on sports. (Some of you may be familiar with the Dartmouth swim team who protested their elimination from the University budget by putting themselves up for sale on e-bay – when the bidding got high enough the University was sufficiently shamed to reinstate their program.) The need for corporate support has never been higher, and the need to actively dictate the terms of that support has never been greater.

Corporations are not inherently evil, and universities are not inherently good. Samuel Johnson once noted that “people are never so innocently engaged as when making money.” Perhaps in today’s world of global economics, we don’t believe this any longer, but any partnership must be approached with some degree of optimism. It is undeniable true that at first glance, corporations and universities are unlikely partners. Corporations exist to make money, to demonstrate profit for shareholders. They are inherently conservative with a small c, and risk averse in the larger definition of that term. They face the pressures of short-term shareholder profit, and are as hostage to the volatile economy as the rest of the world.

Universities exist to serve the public good, and to promote knowledge for its own sake. They seek to take the longer view, and to make decisions apart from those that are financially motivated. When the need for these two communities to partner is acute, as it is now, then we must accept that these partnerships will exist and that we should manage them properly – rather than be forced by circumstances to erode the foundation of our role in society by entering into them.

Between 1985 and the early 90’s in the United States, the amount of money that corporations spent underwriting university research soared from $850 million to more than $4.5 billion. The principal motivations for this increased underwriting were profit and recognition, two motivations that do not sit easily at the heart of scientific learning. In the US, the federal government provides about $15 billion a year for academic research, or about 60% of the cost of academic research at American universities. But the rate of growth in federal funding has been dropping for over 14 years now, and corporate giving is on the rise. The cost of research is increasing, as is the cost of running the large facilities that are American universities of today.

Many if not all of you will know that the sea-change in the corporate relationship with academia in America was triggered by the passage in 1980 of the Bayh-Dole act, which made it possible for the first time for universities to patent the results of federally-funded research. The purpose, as again almost all of you will know, was to use academic research to promote productivity in the economy generally. Since that time, the American government has passed other laws, not so well publicised, that sanction the ties between academia and corporate America, including tax breaks for corporations that invest in academic research.

One of the most widely quoted and little-known names on the web is sociologist Robert Merton, who wrote over 60 years ago that “The scientists’ claim to intellectual property is limited to that of recognition and esteem. It is of the nature of scientific knowledge that as soon as it is discovered, it should be widely and freely disseminated.” This quote is often used on the web
because it in one sense defends the collaborative nature of the Internet – shared information without the taint of the profit motive. But it is an important thought because it reflects the generally held view, by the non-scientific global community, that scientific knowledge should benefit all of us. It is this same vox populi that supports the idea (if not the practical reality) of universities. The increased investment of corporate dollars, and the commercial constraints that this introduces into the academic world, put significant strain on this utopian view of shared and quickly disseminated knowledge.

The influence of corporations comes not just from the dollars they spend. According to Professor Ben Bagdikian of the University of California, corporate executives are the largest single group represented on the governing boards of colleges and universities in America. Now, I work in the arts, and I know that I rarely if ever am publicly (or privately for that matter) critical of artists and arts organizations. Similarly, the governing bodies of universities will naturally be favourable towards corporations if the bulk of them are made up of corporate representatives: it’s human nature.

There are scores of horror stories about the corporate relationship with academic research, including the highly suspect medical journal reviews of an appetite suppressant which was subsequently pulled from the market: the reviews were written by academics who did not disclose their own involvement in and personal financial gain from the development of the drug. Despite an increasingly enforced disclosure policy by publications such as the medical journals, a recent study aimed at measuring how drug company money might influence scientists points to a need for greater disclosure. The study found that 96% of the researchers who wrote favourable articles about a controversial class of drugs for treating hypertension and angina also had financial ties to the makers of those drugs. (This study was published in the New England Journal of Medicine three years ago.)

Ross Gelbspan, who wrote a widely discussed book in the late 90’s about global warming, called The Heat is On criticised members of the scientific academic community for failing to disclose the financing of their research by coal and oil companies. These professors’ work was taken out of context to discredit theories about the danger of climate change, but they remained strangely silent.

Before you think that I am saying that corporate relationships are always dangerous, or that I am promoting conspiracy theories everywhere, let’s look at what is happening in the wider world beyond the United States. George Monbiot, who has written a lively book called the Captive State: The Corporate Takeover of Britain, lists the named chairs at Cambridge, among others. The Shell Chair of chemical engineering, BP professorships in organic chemistry and petroleum science, an ICI chair in applied thermodynamics, a Glaxo chair of molecular parasitology, the list goes on and on.

On one level, this type of corporate support is to be applauded – if colleges can be named after monarchs, as they were hundreds of years ago, then surely there is much to be celebrated when companies provide real support in exchange for recognition. It is only when the funding begins to determine the direction of research that we worry – the end of blue-sky research is bad for all of society, and the determination by corporate entities of what constitutes blue sky is worse. For example, the research shows that five times as much money in British Universities is spent on oil and gas research as the sum that is invested by those universities in research on renewable resources. This may be coincidental, but I suspect that even the least scientific among us believes that it is not. I stress that this does not always happen, but there is evidence that it happens enough that we should pause and consider the limitations of corporate support.

The commercial constraints from corporate dollars put significant strain on the utopian view of shared and quickly disseminated knowledge

The most famous, or perhaps infamous, corporate/academic partnership in the United States will be familiar to most of you. I will describe it now because it provides a salutary lesson about the backlash that corporate partnerships can be subject to. In 1998 The University of California at Berkeley signed a controversial agreement with Novartis, a Swiss pharmaceutical giant and producer of genetically engineered crops. Under the terms of the agreement, Berkeley received $25 million for research funding in the Department of Plant and Microbial Biology. In exchange, Novartis was awarded right of first refusal to negotiate licenses on one-third of the department’s discoveries, including the results of research funded by state and federal sources as well as Novartis. It also gave the company unprecedented representation, two of a total of five seats, on the department’s research committee, which determines how the money is spent. Student protests and an endless litany of academic community outrage was sparked. The Dean of the College of Natural Resources sent a letter to all professors directing them not to speak to the press.

The Dean stated publicly that he felt that criticisms of the deal represented ignorance about
the deal as well as ignorance of the changing economic realities of higher education. He felt that the partnership would result in elevating Berkeley's research profile, which it most certainly has, but perhaps not in the way he imagined.

American higher education has always veered much more toward the practical and applied than European higher education, but many felt that this was taking the Jeffersonian and Dewey tradition too far. The congressional act in the mid 1800s which established the bulk of American public universities specifically instructed the States to establish schools that would teach "agriculture and the mechanical arts in order to promote the liberal and practical education of the industrial classes."

America has always tended toward education with utility, but the explicitly commercial nature of the Novartis deal jarred the public consciousness, and subconscious, of what academic research should be about. The endowment by K-Mart of a chair in management at a West Virginia University that required the holder of that chair to assist in the training of store managers did not get this much press. The sponsoring of a chair in environmental studies at Tulane University by Freeport McMoRan, a mining company that was at the time embroiled in allegations of environmental misconduct in Indonesia, didn't get this much press. Even the 60 Minutes programme on corporate-sponsored research wasn't talked about as much. By becoming what a fellow of the Open Society Institute described as an "eager co-capitalist" with Novartis, Berkeley raised its profile beyond anyone's wildest dreams.

American universities have also become eager co-capitalists by setting up their own companies within universities: The office of technology licensing at Stanford University is the poster child of this type of activity and the envy of many universities. It should be noted that Stanford employs far more lawyers than it does humanities professors, a not unrelated fact. The registration of patents is on the rise in American Universities: as they work more with corporations they are becoming more corporate, and more commercially savvy. But intriguingly, 20-plus years after the Bayh Dole act was made into law, no real assessment of its economic impact has been made.

The Association of University Technology Managers, a consortium of over 300 universities and research institutions that engage in technology transfer, does publish an annual statistical survey of its members. In 1998, $34 billion was generated by these activities, and 280,000 jobs were supported. This cannot, in an age of diminishing resource for academic institutions, be an entirely bad thing! Indeed, my research brought up that the University of Munich has spun off a number of private companies in the past five years.

---

As universities work more with corporations they are becoming more commercially savvy: Stanford now employs more lawyers than it does humanities professors

It is not just the scientific and high-tech areas of universities that are struggling with these issues. Programme funding for the humanities is down across the United States, with a recent article in the Harvard alumni magazine noting that "Since the late 1950's the humanities have been neglected, downgraded, and forced to retreat" as part of the market-model university (the authors of the article, James Engell and Anthony D'Aniello, describe the market-model university as one where subjects that make money, study money, or attract money are given priority).

Humanities professors that still have their jobs are discovering to their surprise that there is a heightened interest in their subject matter for its marketability online. Berkeley, who didn't seem to have learned a great deal from the Novartis affair, recently signed a deal with America Online, with humanities course content. Electronic education that is corporately marketed and controlled is shaping up to be the next big battleground.

In the mid-90's UCLA entered into an agreement with exclusive control including copyright regarding its electronic courses to Online Learning.net. They had not counted on Professor Edward Condren, a noted Chaucerian scholar who is also a noted authority on intellectual property law. I have not met him, but would love to. He sounds like one hell of an academic! As an expert witness, he has testified in numerous cases on intellectual property, and his voice and others are being heard in insisting that academic institutions put learning, and intellectual property rights, before corporate profit motives.

I have spent a lot of time telling stories about all the things that can go wrong. I have tried to stress that corporate support of academic work can be a positive factor, but would now like to tell you how this might be possible, taking the example of how the arts manage patronage relationships.

How can we establish relationships that foster academic freedom while answering to market imperatives and economic realities? The first lesson to be learned from the arts is clarity of purpose. Sometimes, in commercial competitive advantage terms, this means doing less, better. The freedom of both universities and arts institutions in the past from market constraints is what allowed them to foster open-ended research and critical debate of society. This must be protected. New guidelines that are confident and not defensive, encompassing full financial disclosure and protecting academic freedoms, must be drawn up.
by universities that recognise economic realities. We cannot leave it to the corporate world to preoccupy themselves with these matters; it is not their remit.

Refusing to delay publication of scientific results more than the shortest permissible period of time is akin to refusing to write a play that is motivated by a patron's whims

Refusing to delay publication of scientific results more than the shortest permissible period of time is akin to refusing to write a play that is motivated by a patron's whims. There is a price, yes, but surely it is worth paying? Fighting to preserve public funding for universities is part of the job of every University president. Refusing to commodify great works of literature out of context is the responsibility of every humanities professor. Accessibility to a wider public can be one of the benefits of increased corporate investment in the academic world, but it is not the only avenue open to us. Opening our world to the community around us, as the arts have had to do, to make advocates of those who do not directly benefit from our services, must become part of our remit.

Approaching corporate partnerships as an opportunity, to be carefully evaluated and in which balanced compromise predominates, is not impossible – surely the sophisticated challenge it represents is designed for the academic and learned mind? Corporations are not our enemy, but neither are they our saviours. Universities, like the arts, help people comprehend the human condition, we strengthen the world corporations inhabit. Our belief in this strength, while recognizing the role that corporations play in a capitalist society, forms the basis for a dialogue of equal partners, and this is an essential requirement for structuring deals that serve us as well as the corporation. The much-feared McUniviversity cannot be created without our express permission.

Most American universities have become adept at encouraging philanthropy from individuals that expects no academic influence in return. The relationship begins with a discussion of recognition, not return on investment. The conversation with corporations is understandably different in nature, but the same philosophical platform must be established. These are lofty ideals and difficult goals, but that is what universities are all about. The business of the difficult is your business, and you excel in that arena.

The Carnegie Commission noted over 30 years ago that “taken, as a starting point, 1530, when the Lutheran Church was founded, some 66 institutions that existed then still exist today in the Western world in recognizable forms: the Catholic Church, the Lutheran Church, the parliaments of Iceland and the Isle of Man, and 62 universities. They have experienced wars, revolutions, depressions, and industrial transformations, and have come out less changed than almost any other segment of their societies.”

Perhaps, in the end, the confidence we need both to identify the appropriate intellectual partners and structure beneficial corporate relationships comes from knowing that there is not a single Fortune 500 company today that was here in 1530. Academic institutions are enduring, for they represent a hunger and a curiosity that increases with each century.

I wish you luck in your endeavours, and I thank you again for the opportunity to address you today.

Workshop Summary

Andrea Mantovani
Bologna University

Can we set up rules for private investors – how money is distributed in the university between targeted research and blue-sky research – without putting off investors? Would it be possible to say to investors that we will use 70% of the money for what they want but that, due to the rules of the university, 30% of the money will go to other research?

This would have to be negotiated with the sponsors or donors and, as soon as you start negotiating, you lose part of the ideal for full independence. Some universities would be able to negotiate 30% and to use that 30% for other research, but some firms would not accept this and some universities would use the 30% to fund overheads instead of additional research.

You have to assume every donor wants something. You cannot believe there is some very noble, pure, Christian motivation or pure altruism behind each gift. Indeed the problem of "strings attached" is getting worse because, with stock-market changes and with people getting wiser about what they might or might not get, donors are becoming more demanding. The problem is not the dangerous demands, but the grey area in the middle.

In Oxford a leading pharmaceutical company has given £40 million to build new chemistry laboratories in return for first right access to the marketing of major discoveries. That is not considered controversial because the discoverers may wish to market it anyway. The university has the right to arrange how the marketing is done, but the donors have the first right of refusal. If the process is not agreeable, then the university can drop it.
Another non-controversial example might be to name a building or a scholarship, although this can pose some dilemmas. In Britain, The Tate is a very famous gallery.

Tate made all his money from slave-trading, and many of the slaves died on his ships before they got to Britain. We cannot change the name—it is just a historic fact. You get the rare case like George Soros, who gives 300 or 400 million a year for philanthropic causes. He does not demand much; he demands efficiency, and effectiveness. He does not consider himself generous because he has so much money that even such a huge sum is not important.

The problem is in the grey area between this "hands-off" approach and genuine interference. Recipients have to ask what donors want and whether the funds can be pushed towards the non-controversial areas. The recipients probably have to draw up codes and recognise that different cultures operate differently: Italians might agree a grant over a drink in a bar, while Japanese might take weeks and weeks of negotiations and contracts.

We have to be pragmatic. Twenty years ago, the major multinational firms had their own development laboratories, but most closed them for economic reasons and outsourced the research to universities and institutes. When universities were too strict about what was often pre-competitive research, the firm went to another university with a different attitude. If Europe wishes to remain at the forefront of developments in the world, we have to find pragmatic ways of handling this, we cannot just say, "no—impossible." As far as pre-competitive research is concerned, we could think about the example of an intermediate organisation in Holland that brought firms together and defined the areas where they would like development to take place. Having formulated the key areas that they were interested in, they left it to the university to decide whether to take it up.

**Diversifying the funding portfolio would allow universities to say, “No—this has too many strings attached”**

We should not reject such an approach, but we should make it into a possibility to get money for research not sponsored by industry, so we have a little bit of pocket money to maintain non-industrial departments like Egyptology.

Financial independence is being able to say no. If an institution depends entirely on one source of income, unless that source of income is extremely generous, it will always be beholden to the donors and forced to make concessions. Even government funding in Europe is having more and more strings attached. Diversifying the funding portfolio would make institutions more independent, allowing them to say to the Government, "we do not think this funding is worth it with so many strings attached." From discussions at this workshop, it seems that this process is occurring and that, from a university point of view, it makes sense to have as many different sources of income as possible.

The title of this conference was New Partnerships: Opportunities and Risks. At the beginning, the organising committee had long discussions about how to phrase this title: some insisted on putting in risks and the Secretary-General of the Europaeum said: "you shouldn’t put this too prominently, because you want to have sponsors participate in this conference." That is precisely the dilemma addressed in this workshop: the state’s intervention in universities also poses a risk, but not on the same level as long as the state gives universities a general budget to distribute. When institutions seek money for a specific project, they will act as their own censors, excluding possibilities that will not attract sponsors.

**Workshop C: The University and Good Globalisation**

**Professor Moshe Zimmermann**  
*Director, Richard Koebner Center for German History, Hebrew University, Jerusalem*

**Encouraging Trans-Nationalism: The Globalising Role of Academic Cooperation**

The discussion has focused on trans-nationalism, but psychology and studies of the human brain have shown the right-hand side of the brain is still in the Stone Age. People will not be trans-nationals with their creative brain. They do not think about poverty in Africa, they think about their neighbour. Although the discussion referred to globalisation, what you were talking about is not globalisation. What you were thinking about is an ideal: globalisation is simply a movement all over the world, driven by the over-capitalised free market economy.

The term globalisation started to flourish during the middle of the 1980s. We know that concepts of this kind are not just descriptions: they are also constructs. What could be behind this construct? Why do we need to construct our reality in such a way that it is over-arched by the term globalisation? And what sort of globalisation are we really talking about? There are different systems of globalisation, and we have to define more precisely what we are really talking about.

Globalisation refers to time-space compression, but this does not bring us any further in talking
about the dispersion and transfer of knowledge. We should return to the term trans-nationalism and stress again that we are captives, not only of the state, but of the nation-state. This construct, which was created about 200 years ago, may be deconstructed. The moment we deconstruct nationalism and the nation, the whole question of university and the academic world has to be dealt with in a totally new way.

Why is the state no longer interested in funding universities? In Germany, part of the explanation is that the public does not care. I am sure why this is, but it is certainly my experience. We have an administration in Germany that has little to do with academia, and many of our politicians have not been trained in universities. People often formulate policies affecting universities without having the faintest idea what they are talking about.

When we first learnt that GATS (the Global Agreement on Trade and Services) might be applied to higher education, it seemed peculiar that education could become a commodity to be traded. A few years ago every country was trying to maintain an indigenous computer system. Then we realised that what matters is that industry has access to computers, but that it did not matter who made the computers. Is higher education the same? Does it matter if we do not have our own indigenous home-grown, home-owned higher education systems, as long as our citizens have access to knowledge, training and education? I think these questions need to be addressed, as their answers are not self-evident.

**Does it matter if we do not have our own indigenous higher education systems, as long as our citizens have access to education?**

If we are going to maintain our higher education systems, we cannot stand out against the GATS process. If we want our university systems to compete, they need radical reform and more funding. Taxpayers are not going to fund the scale of investment universities need; the priorities are further down the education train in the schools and nurseries. We must reform the funding, management and organisation of our universities ourselves.

One might ask if we are all trying to save ourselves from the pressures of modern times. What if universities did not exist any more in their current form? I assume that science, research, enquiry would not be destroyed. There is always a quest for knowledge, and this will be financed or provided by other organisations than the state.

With internationalisation, universities are returning to their roots and saying they are not necessarily owned by the state. We are international institutions, and part of our mission is to bring students together in one place for teaching and research. States support this because they see its contribution to the nation-state, especially in terms of economic development. One of the reasons why the European Union is so engaged in research funding, and interested in student and staff mobility, is to be able to compete, especially with the USA. That is a European interest. Therefore, by being international, a university can actually help the nation-state.

Do we want to try to educate elites and create an Ivy League of Europe, or to serve society in the broadest sense of the word, for free, and educate thirty percent of the future generations?

European universities have a responsibility to think seriously about their heritage. Of course, Napoleon wanted to learn everything possible about Egypt in order to control and dominate Egypt, but because of this there is a great deal of knowledge about Egypt, a great understanding. Such knowledge is very important in our world. The chances of international relations being conducted in a more responsible and humane way, with less loss of life, would be greater if European universities took their knowledge of their former colonies more seriously and used it for more benign purposes. I would therefore welcome the idea of creating an alternative brand to Harvard and Stanford.

I do not see the difference between the threat of the state to academic freedom and the threat of the market. In the 17th and 18th century, universities were dependent on princes and private sponsors. In comparison, the current alternative to state control is not a bad alternative.

Universities have always been embedded in the history and culture of the times. When religion was dominant, monks were doing research. When the nation state developed, it developed universities. Now at the beginning of the post-modern world, we have all kinds of forces: the nation-state is still prevalent in Europe, but the market is starting to come in.

After the Soviet Union collapsed, most of the people believed that education had always been free, and it was hard to make them believe that it had not. Show me a period in history where education was completely unrelated to market economy or to markets.

Universities' independence is their strength and when the private sector wants to buy us, it wants to buy our independence. When we lose our independence, we stop being interesting. However, I am optimistic for three reasons:

First, basic economic theory: knowledge and education are superior goods. The richer you are the more knowledge and culture you want, and the more you are willing to pay for education.
Second, in the US you have maybe 100 top universities and about 50 research universities. In Europe, we have just as many, but we are not focused enough. We usually assess what we do through US journals because there are insufficient European criteria. With the European state developing, there will hopefully be more and more assessments based on European indicators, European journals and European criteria.

Third, today we have the Europaeum as a transnational enterprise. From the grass-roots we are building this up as a trans-national phenomenon. We have market recognition. We have a brand—most of us have very old brands.

I work in a new United Nations Development Programme centre in Oslo. The reason why a development programme has an office in Oslo relates to what we have been talking about: funding. Since a significant amount of the UNDP’s support now comes from the Nordic countries, it seemed a good idea to have a centre there. Having done that, the UNDP is interested in what is going on in European universities.

As the UN is located in New York, out of sheer practicality, any consultants tend to come form nearby universities. At this historical juncture, the idea of Europaeum or European universities seems awfully important because the main power is on the other side of the Atlantic. But in many respects the United States, which currently talks most about civilisation and the civilised world, is a new settlement and it is Europe that has more valuable knowledge about the rest of the world.

In the US, to go to university, even a state university, costs tens of thousands of dollars, and I think that is what will happen here. It is a moral question: the beneficiaries need to share the cost with the taxpayer. All the evidence is that employers are not looking for students who have been trained for a particular job. They are looking for people who have had their minds developed and are able to work flexibly. However, if the consumer is paying, they are certainly going to want to be satisfied that they are paying for something worth having.

**Discussant: Professor Wim van den Doel**

*Professor of Modern and Contemporary History, Leiden University*

I would like to offer six provocations.

The first deals with the universal and the particular. We are looking for students to be Spanish/Italian and to study in other universities; to guard their identity as nationals but to become more than that. I am fascinated by the fact that we are all speaking English as the universal language? All across Europe, certain subjects, such as economics and political science, could be taught in French or German, but the texts are in English and come from the United States.

The second provocation is the notion of the marginals, whether in Europe or on the margins of Europe. Fortunately, or unfortunately, we all deal with the lead institutions; we pride ourselves on having lots of people apply for few places. How can we talk to those who are not admitted, and are we not talking to a special kind of marginal who can pass the entrance examinations to get in?

The third provocation deals with the relation of the university to the state. Professor Zimmerman argued that the university should not be taken over by the state, and should not be politicised. Whether fortunately or unfortunately, many of us come from state-run universities and, following the golden rule, he who has the gold... rules. Politicians make decisions about our budgets, and we cannot naively expect the general public or local politicians to ignore their own interests when deciding what we should teach and how much money we should receive.

Fourthly, according to Professor Zimmerman, the university is supposed to form critical thinkers and so, by its very nature, the university becomes subversive. Why then should a government pay to form people who may criticise it? It seems to me to be counter-productive, if not counter-intuitive.

Fifthly, we talked about the notion of free movement of goods and services, which the WTO works on constantly. Why should students be privileged, when we do not allow refugees or internally displaced persons to go from one place to another? What makes a student a special category, who can do what I sometimes call academic tourism: "if it’s the fall - I’m in Venice, if it’s the spring - I’m in Spain." And they move from one place to another, as if the passport of being a student allows them to do things that other people cannot do.

My final provocation deals with the notion of critical mass. One of the things I hear in the speeches is a kind of wonderful anti-Americanism in that people think the Europaeum should be a counter-force. Yet, everyone wants to go to Harvard and the University of Michigan, and if you have not been to Cal-Tech, or wherever, you do not have the stamp of legitimacy to get tenure at many European universities. But having published a lot of articles in European journals will not help you get tenure in the United States. If this is all true, and there is a creation of a European identity, academically and intellectually, where are the critical masses such as Cambridge Massachusetts or Stanford? Instead of moving people around all over and diluting resources, why are resources not concentrated in certain places that can compete...
with MIT and Harvard in certain subjects? In the business world, we can compete with Silicon Valley, because we have understood that you need a critical mass of people and intelligence. In education, moving people around more and more seems to me to be counter-productive and does not create a critical mass.

Excerpts from Discussion

Moshe Zimmermann
Director, Richard Koebner Center for German History, Hebrew University, Jerusalem

I am quite astonished that so many people are afraid about the fate of the universities. Maybe the time of the university really has passed. Either a different type of university is going to emerge, or a different framework in which science may be practised.

I do not understand why the term “commodity” is so frightening. What the university tries to sell was always a commodity, and a commodity has to be marketable. That is, it either has to be attractive or convincing. We have to convince those who are interested in the commodity that our good, our commodity is useful. If one can sell football stars, I am sure one can also sell good science in a world where privatisation is going strong.

We drifted between two terms: “globalisation” and “privatisation,” which was not actually mentioned during the discussion. In the United States or in my country, the university is financed by the State, by private funding and by the tuition fees. So it is not an ultimatum that if the government is less interested in paying, or if there is more interest in privately funding activities, the state is going to invest less. If you are attractive enough for the state, as long as there is enough state, you might have growing state investment and growing interest from private entrepreneurs.

Larissa Douglass
St Antony’s College, University of Oxford

In the student session we went through similar debates about administration: about problems at the local level, the state level and the trans-national level. Then we were confronted with a fundamental problem: globalization. If you accept it as a general process, it will force us to question all of our basic assumptions, including the unequal relationship between the developed and less developed parts of the world. So if you use new forms of technology to integrate less developed parts of the world into educational exchanges, debates, or courses with the Europaeum universities, you will encounter a whole set of values and a whole history of which we are all to some extent largely unaware. Hence, even good or bad globalisation becomes meaningless, because our own conception of good and bad will be challenged in this new, pluralistic context.

All our fundamental assumptions have maintained a westernised viewpoint and an integrated educational system on a global level will obey different rules that we have not begun to conceive.

Putting it very simply, globalisation is like a Trojan Horse. We are talking about Europe and America, but if you consider the development of a world market economy and the creation not just of exchange programmes that bring people from Africa to study in the highly developed programmes in Europe, but also sending people from Europe to places that are less well developed. There is no way of knowing exactly what will happen: you cannot go to different societies, transplant a set of exchange programmes, and not be changed yourself, as much as the people you are dealing with. This creates an integrated educational system, which, not necessarily straight away or in the next twenty years, but, say, in the next hundred years, will create a different set of fundamental premises for social activity and political activity.

Dr Paul Flather
Secretary-General, Europaeum

At our recent council meeting, we discussed two themes for the coming years: one focuses on projects and relationships with the Islamic world to try and create some kinds of partnerships and the other focuses on a transatlantic European/US dialogue, for which we wanted to find a suitable group of American universities. The challenge is that we know who we are, we will grow from eight probably to ten by the end of the year, but there is not an obvious partner group in the US. So, any suggestions would be welcome.

Workshop Summary

Larissa Douglass
St Antony’s College, University of Oxford

The findings of the workshop on Universities and Good Globalisation focused on defining globalisation as a process that, in one way or another, affects the independence or character of universities, and affects their ability to deal with the implications of globalisation. The workshop tried to propose measures to bolster the position of universities in this context.

Thus, globalisation was examined as part of a process of privatisation in which the traditional free stance for independent inquiry and research of the universities was assessed as a function of either the nation-state or of the market economy. These
two separate influences were treated with some concern but the benefits of interaction with the nation-state or the market economy were also discussed.

By focusing on fees, the West becomes isolated, incorporating only the wealthy parts of Asia

In terms of the market economy, the emphasis of the debate fell on the positive or negative definition of globalisation – or, in the roughest of terms, of a process likened by Professor Zimmerman to American imperialism versus a Euro-driven transnationalism – the latter of which might be more insightful due to the European historical experience of coping with diverse nationalities and balancing small and large national interests. A general consensus was reached that it was more worthwhile to suspend value judgements with regard to the characterization of globalisation as a good or bad worldwide economic development. It was considered helpful instead to deal with it as an existing phenomenon.

The workshop focused on the capability of universities to survive within the global economy and specifically on assessing the impact on education and research funding, which are clearly connected to market-driven forces and attitudes. The panel found that we are not focusing on exchanges with non-profitable areas (e.g. Latin America, the Islamic world and parts of Asia) because of a perceived inability to pay fees. We therefore risk not being able to connect with these parts of the World, as by focusing on fees, the West becomes isolated, incorporating only the wealthy parts of Asia.

A proposed solution was to clearly publicise and augment the highly-sophisticated European academic programmes that specialise in the study of these parts of the world. These programmes stem from Europe’s history and the collection of information and artefacts from that period, but are conducted in what is currently seen as progressive terms. The students felt, though, that it was important to intensify the discussion on the implications of transnational integration of education to address non-Western perspectives.

The question was raised of whether education is a public good or a market good. As a reflection of the latter, the panel recognised that education is subject to real market patterns, such as the founding of subsidiary branches in main universities in newly developing regions which could be a beneficial pattern.

With regard to funding that is tied to corporate interests, the autonomy of research from funding bodies’ agendas was discussed. It was suggested, somewhat pessimistically, that a code of funding could be developed to specify that money should only be accepted for corporate-related research on condition that a proportion of the total amount might be diverted to independent research. It was also considered possible to refuse to accept money from certain organisations for ethical reasons.

The workshop also considered the influence of the policies of the nation-state on educational development. Speakers emphasised that the universities had served the rise of the nation-state but should now make efforts both to reflect and transcend the current decline of the nation-state in a transnational environment. The discussion focused on encouraging the humanities to overcome national divisions among students through the emphasis on relative perspectives. The onus lies with the universities to create enlightened, insightful and critical thinkers who can treat different cultures with sympathetic imagination, and this depends on the creative funding and execution of humanities curricula.

Some concern was expressed that education was becoming isolated from, and irrelevant to, the general public, thus making taxpayers increasingly unwilling to fund the universities. It was suggested that academics should not over-debate funding issues, thereby handing over decision-making to politicians who take quicker or more direct action. Finally, both themes were united in the view that European universities’ relationships with American universities were fundamentally problematic.

It was suggested that resources and research be concentrated, in top European universities, forming a sort of Ivy League within Europe, which the Europaeum itself might particularly address. In response it was suggested that resources and educational development becoming concentrated in American universities might not be so threatening as long as European universities could co-operate with them and had access to research results.
Evening Address: *Universities and Society*

**Lord (Claus) Moser**  
Chairman, British Museum Development Trust,  
London, formerly Warden, Wadham College

At this late moment in the evening, I will confine myself to a few basic points. But first, I want to look back 40 years. I was involved in a major government review of higher education in Britain. Its outcome was the historic Robbins Committee on Higher Education, linked to the name of the Chairman, Lord Robbins, a professor at the London School of Economics and one of the country’s leading economists.

Since then there have been enormous changes. At the time of Robbins, we had 30 universities; now there are 120 or so. Then, six percent of the age group went to university; now, it is 48 percent. Moreover, there are now far more part-time and mature students, and universities play an increasing role in life-long learning. Government funding has fallen drastically over 10 years - a drop of perhaps 40 percent in unit costs per student - so that universities are under enormous pressure to do their job and protect standards.

Universities have multiple roles, and I always like looking back to the way the Robbins Report categorised them briefly:

- To provide instruction in skills;
- To promote the general powers of the mind;
- To advance learning, scholarship and research; and
- To transmit a common culture.

Clearly teaching and research are the core roles, everything else being mere by-products. However, the mix of vocational and more strictly academic teaching was recognised even 40 years ago. Knowledge transfer is an increasing emphasis.

Universities have developed splendidly along these lines, despite the financial pressures. But in what is now a mass rather than an elite system, differences between the various initiatives are one of the topics of interest.

**Top universities should be concerned with the whole system, and try to help their less-favoured fellow institutions**

I am conscious that this conference is focused on “top” or leading universities. That is fine. But I do regard higher education in any country as a seamless web of institutions, ranging from the biggest to the smallest, the most to the least specialised, the best to the least good. All have something to contribute.

What this means, to me, is that I would wish the top universities - the ones with greatest international standing - to be concerned with the whole system, indeed to try to help their less-favoured fellow institutions. More than that, I regard education generally as a seamless web. The quality of a country’s schools are of direct concern - or at least should be - to universities, and I believe all of us working in higher education should be actively involved in our school worlds.

If I may labour this point about the role of the leading universities: they should not, so to speak, sit on their privilege and distinction. On the contrary, they should use their special position to press society and government to back all universities, all colleges, all schools.

But of course different universities have different missions, and the European picture presents a wide range of possibilities. There are great technical universities: an example to us all; there are institutions with other specialisms; some have close regional ties, some are closer to business and industry, and so on. What is important is that each university knows where it wants to shine, and builds on its strengths. I speak with feeling. Some years ago, we in Britain transformed our so-called polytechnics into universities. I wonder now whether this was not a mistake. The strength of the polys lay in their industrial links and part-time education. Once they were graced with the title of university, some of their former strengths were left behind, and they began to look like other more traditional universities. What we sometimes call “mission creep” has to be curtailed.

So what does the term “university,” as such, mean? It is a time-honoured title, with its roots in ancient medieval times, not least within the countries represented at this dinner. To my mind, a university means an institution that clearly combines teaching with research and scholarship. Only such institutions deserve to be regarded and funded as universities.

Let me turn to another angle. In Britain the relationship between higher education and government is changing subtly, partly because of the change of scale. Now with 120 universities, the overall costs are of a different order than at the time of Robbins. The main cost is covered by the state and there are temptations for more and more government intervention. I think I can still say that academic freedom in the traditional sense - that is, the freedom to teach, write and research without interference - remains safe, as also everything to do with appointments, but the state may become more involved in broad strategies and how money is spent.
All this needs to be watched. However, given the overall resources needed to ensure standards, it is now inevitable that we in Britain will move towards students paying for more of their cost of their education. I regard this as not only inevitable, but also as right.

**I believe that students everywhere will increasingly cover the costs of their higher education, whether just after school or throughout life**

Moreover, speaking here in Germany, I do not see any other country – even Germany – forever avoiding this step. I believe that students everywhere will increasingly cover the costs of their higher education, whether just after school or throughout life.

To conclude, with higher education everywhere catering for a growing minority, perhaps even a majority, of our young people, our universities deserve great public support, time, and prestige. I make this remark because this kind of thinking is not as strong as it was a few decades ago. Too few of our politicians in Britain and Europe generally recognise, even less publicly proclaim, how much society depends – for its economic success and its social and cultural quality of life – on the health of its universities.

They deserve positive recognition, and it is partly up to University Presidents, Vice-Chancellors and Rectors to bring this about. They should be outspoken champions of academic as well as wider national values, leaving society in no doubt about what their institutions contribute. They should be seen in public not as heads of businesses, but as protectors and disseminators of what is best in society, in learning, in guarding ideas and values, even in underpinning democracy.

I have spent most of my life in universities. I regard them as a nation’s proudest possessions, and deserving to be treated as such.
Session III: Students and Universities

Chair: Professor Harald Bolhár-Nordenkampf
Member, Austrian UNESCO Commission

I would like to start with a story. A scientist, exhausted from work, went on holiday to a farm. On a rainy day, he asked the farmer if he can do some work for him. The farmer said, "Yes -- in the cellar there are some old potatoes. It would be good if you could sit in the cool cellar and separate the big ones from the small ones, because we will eat the big ones and the small ones will go to the pigs." So the professor went down to the cellar. The farmer came down about three hours later, and there were two small potatoes on one side of the professor, and three big potatoes on the other side. The farmer said, "What are you doing here?" The professor, completely stressed and sweating, said, "you know -- that is too much for me! Every hour -- a decision!"

We are in the same position. We have to make decisions today. We have to make good decisions, and we do not have three hours.

Graduate Speaker:
Marie-Christine Heinze
University of Bonn

To use national stereotypes, it would be a typically German way of doing things to create another office in the university and ministry of education to promote private funding of universities. This approach would also bring with it the question of which of Germany’s hundreds of universities would benefit from it. At any rate, the government is not likely to create such a programme so perhaps it is better to limit partnerships to the university and the business in question.

But first, the question of education as a commodity. If the university provides a very broad education -- an education in critical thinking -- it doesn’t matter whether you study Oriental Studies, Science or Law. The problem is how to combine it: to do what you really want to do and to sell it somehow. I think this is possible.

Islamic Studies is the perfect example of what we are telling the public: you never know when knowledge will be useful

After 11th September, I am not sure it is true to say Islamic Studies is not a marketable good. In Warsaw, we now have over 220 candidates for 15 places in Arabic Studies. After graduating from the university, I found Oriental Studies graduates working in many very prominent places in Bertelsmann. Islamic Studies is the perfect example of what we are telling the public: you never know when knowledge will be useful. We complained at our university about Orientalists: they were kept for 25 or 30 years with no outcome. But now we are keen to have them.

There was an important statement at the beginning that we could agree on: the subject must not be influenced by sponsors. There are two ways sponsors can have influence: by not giving money to some subjects and by asking for a particular result.

Students have enormous power that they may not realise: if students decide that they do not want to go to a given university, the university is finished. If students do not want to study Egyptology, you cannot have a department without any students. Students see themselves as clients, in the context of education as a commodity. The government or the sponsors, the paymasters, may say they do not like what the university is doing, but if there is an increase in student enrolment, there must be a level of satisfaction.

I think we students are aware of our impact on what is on offer in the university. However, what we have faced recently in Bonn has given us rather a different picture. In Bonn we face financial problems that endanger the small subjects. We do not think we can combat that merely by interesting ourselves in those subjects.

The market-based system functions well if the provision of higher education is sufficient in all areas. But this is not the case in many European countries where this mechanism is blocked by the shortage of student places: enrolment on a course or with a faculty is not a good indicator of popularity as it may be due to a lack of alternatives.

I wonder whether some inefficiency of research, allowing several universities to research the same topic, is not actually desirable. If you put all your eggs in one basket, that research place may not come up with good or accurate, let alone the best, results. The research results that are published often seem to come from the most surprising corners, not necessarily the famous experts for a particular area. So, pushing this efficiency of research argument too far may impinge in a negative way on the quality of research.

We can assume that independence in science is good, but I think it should be rightly understood. In the judicial system, for example, the game is that there are two lawyers trying to disprove each other’s case. Therefore, there is not a problem if
somebody is paid to prove something. If everybody is paid by the same company, we are lost, but not if there is somebody paid by one company and there are other researchers trying to prove the opposite position.

Therefore, when we talk about pooling resources, we are not talking about chucking everything into one basket. We are concerned about having, say, five departments each with five professors and five students, all doing the same subject. In that case, it might be advisable to put those subjects together and guarantee a proper university course put on by fifteen professors.

But if you do that, then you have to chuck out most of the small subjects. Do we, for example, need five departments of Latin and Greek, with perhaps twenty students each so that there is competition between the departments?

Given limited funding, there is a trade-off. If you have an unviably small department of Latin and Greek, it is at the expense of something else. Having a terrific staff-student ratio in those subjects means scientists and historians have to operate in bigger classes. The US is dealing with this very imaginatively: they have created a consortium that are pooling their courses in Latin and Greek and using Internet classes. They have managed to develop viable Classics departments, but in a cooperative way, not through each university trying to maintain its own atomic unit.

In Australia, they started more than 10 years ago to concentrate within fields. They promised not to do it, but it has happened. We have a law in the EU where you have to keep some studies and cannot kick them all out, but limiting money will lead in that direction. We need a very good organisation, committee or method for deciding how to pool these activities.

**Universities need to show values, they cannot just be restricted to technical knowledge**

I do not always like to use the terminology of the market, but I think we have to link the question also to the cost of an education. For example, I chose a very marketable subject, law, with which I was sure I could find a job and earn money. On the side, I chose philosophy because it was something that interested me, but which would not necessarily offer me the same opportunities afterwards.

Instead of the sponsor always going towards universities, could students not get grants to form spin-off companies where knowledge can generate a commercially valuable product? That could be a solution for knowledge transfer and deployment of students.

It was said that values should not be taught at universities, but all teaching transfers knowledge and values, you cannot avoid it. When I am teaching, I will transfer some values that I inherited during my life. I will show my values in body language and my sentences.

Universities need to show values, they cannot just be restricted to technical knowledge. We demonstrate values and the students have to choose the good ones. That is an essential part of the university – they should provide a climate where every value can be expressed, and where there is a dialogue between different value systems.

Universities are not just about education and research, they also have a social responsibility. If they want to be the forerunner of civil society, they need to be in civil society, which means having a social role. During a time of globalisation, we have a responsibility, coming from a privileged position, to empower the whole world to profit from globalisation. We have a responsibility to do so without imposing a certain set of values, but by providing guidance and assistance, while accepting that we also have to learn from other cultures and from the developing world.

Universities should go to the public a little more than they have done in the past. The impetus for this should come from the university – not the people, interested politicians, or industry.

**Points from the Discussion**

I. Workshop A: Knowledge Transfer and the Future University

The focus of this workshop was on knowledge standardisation in the future university, which seems to go hand in hand with an increasing use of new media. Participants were asked to consider the following questions:

- Is it possible to standardise knowledge?
- How would such standardisation relate to the traditional scientific claim to truth and independence?
- Will people come to the universities or will the universities come to the people?

These questions relate to knowledge transfer between universities, but first the participants wished to draw attention to other fields where such a transfer takes place: between universities and the market, between universities and policy making bodies, and between universities and their students, who provide a connection between different universities and between universities and the market.

Defining knowledge transfer as “a means to teach students and create knowledge through relevant research,” participants differentiated between marketable knowledge (produced and sold mainly by the natural sciences) and marketable capabilities (produced and sold by the humanities). Participants came to the agreement
that universities should shift their focus from the new media and not forget that, in the end, it is through people that knowledge is transferred.

II. Workshop B: Funding and Ethics

Participants felt that education is a public good and that research should not be profit-oriented, and therefore bound by market conditions. Participants were convinced that these values could best be guaranteed if universities were financed by the state. However, they acknowledged that state funding is decreasing and that other sources of funding must be found. Private funding needs to take place within a framework of ethical standards; research, and the choice of research topics, must not be subject to influence by sponsors. Instead, funding ought to take place in return for tangible benefits, like the prestige and social relevance that go with being associated with the name of a good university.

Therefore, participants suggested creation of "ethical contracts" between university and sponsor, which would be open to scrutiny by the public, in order to maintain universities' reputation for independent research and education. Participants also suggested the creation of a legal framework and tax benefits by the state to promote a funding relationship between the market and universities. In order to promote such investment, universities would have to make their budgets more transparent and should to reconsider how they spend their money. Through a better Europe-wide coordination of research and education and through the creation of joint projects, double spending could be significantly reduced.

Concerning tuition fees, the participants believed that education is a good that should be accessible to everyone and should therefore be as cheap as possible.

III. Workshop C: University and Good Globalisation

It was agreed upon that the term "good globalisation" is hard to work with, if not wrong, as the good effects of globalisation cannot be separated from the negative. This issue therefore ought to be considered from both perspectives. To the student participants in the workshop, the positive effects of globalisation for universities were the internationalisation of studies through exchanges, workshops, summer schools and conferences, leading to cultural exchange and dialogue; and greater competition among universities promoting progress.

The negative effect was the commercialisation of knowledge, which could lead to marginalisation of less marketable subjects.

Participants believed there is a dichotomy between the fact that the impact of globalisation on universities does not stop at state borders, and the fact that the responsibility of education administration and the power of decision-making remain at a national, or even regional, level. Therefore, in order to increase the effectiveness of European education and enhance the capability to react to global changes, certain topics relating to education in Europe ought to be co-ordinated at a European level – for this, state governments would need to transfer more competencies to the EU.

Participants observed the following risks and opportunities:

**Risks:**

- Access to education for less financially equipped students may be endangered due to the rising cost of education.
- The future of less marketable subjects may be endangered due to a lack of funding.
- Education ought to be in some sense market-oriented (by creating marketable knowledge and capabilities), but universities ought not to forget that universities are knowledge centres and that knowledge is a good in itself.

**Opportunities:**

- New partnerships (with the private market, with policy making bodies, etc.) may open up the chance to further integrate universities in society. New media and new technologies may open up new possibilities to transfer knowledge to countries outside Europe with less developed educational systems. This would help fill the educational gap and decrease the inequality that arises from it.
- Through networks, universities may be able to internationalise the outlook of students in a way that was not possible before.
- The increasing link between universities and the market may make students better informed about the demands for personnel.

With view to these essential points, the participants believed that answers would need to be found to the following questions:

**Student funding:** How can we solve the dichotomy between the objective of accessible education for everyone and the financial situation of the universities, which leads to rising tuition fees?

**Compatibility of degrees:** The introduction of the bachelor/masters system is a good step, but we are already seeing that the newly introduced bachelor programmes are not even compatible on a national level. How can such co-ordination on the national and the European level be enhanced?

**Universities and the private market:** What tools and procedures ought to be adopted to guarantee freedom of research and education?
Session IV: Building Global Partnerships

Dr Guy Haug  
Senior Advisor Education Directorate, European Commission

Diversity and Compatibility in European Higher Education

The title of my presentation is Diversity and Compatibility in European Higher Education. I will approach this from the perspective of the European Commission, for whom I currently work, but what I am going to present is my vision of this process, not an official position that would be shared necessarily by the European Commission.

I would like to make four main points. First, I would like to show that universities have moved from the periphery of EU policy to the core of building up Europe. Secondly, I would like to sketch the main strands of action in progress at European level concerning universities, which I think are quite impressive. Thirdly, I would like to focus on the recent communication issued by the European Commission on the future role of universities in the "Europe of Knowledge." Finally, I would like to share some thoughts about diversity, compatibility, and the role of networks and partnerships.

So, the first point. Universities have moved from the periphery to the core in building up Europe. If you look back, say, two decades, you will see this has happened very quickly in two or three stages. Until the mid 1970s, there was absolutely no action on education, including higher education, at the EU level. Things started changing in the middle of the 1980s, with the generation of programmes like Erasmus, Connect, Lingua, and, soon after that, Tempus. These programmes focused on mobility, both intra-EU and intra-European. They produced a number of interesting results. Apart from the mobility itself, among the more positive outcomes is the development of networks for absolutely everything, involving all types of institutions and topics.

Universities have moved from the periphery to the core in building up Europe

In the last five years, we have entered a new phase of systemic change, characterised by convergence towards main European objectives – especially the search for sufficient compatibility in Europe. Originally, in the mobility-focused phase, it was clear that mobility should happen within strictly-defined structures. There are people who accomplished miracles: swapping students in spite of sometimes really incompatible aspects in higher education and research. We have also learned that it is not enough just to swap students, researchers and teachers, even if we were to exchange ten times more people. If we do not touch the basic incompatibilities of systems, we will probably make very little progress.

We have now entered this new phase, which is about structural change, convergence towards shared objectives. This did not come from the educational community, the research community or the higher educational community itself. It was driven by major changes in the environment of the knowledge society, new ways of creating and disseminating knowledge, and by knowledge being recognised as a key factor for growth and change.

Secondly, Globalisation: we are seeing a worldwide convergence in higher education and research, which is not limited to Europe. This is particularly important for what I want to show. To a significant extent, what we see now – this new phase marked by convergence, by change in policy and structures – is a reaction to a perceived diminishing attractiveness of European higher education and research. Until the end of the 1980s, maybe the beginning of the 1990s, Europe was in the privileged position of being the preferred destination of students and researchers across the world. This has changed: now it is the USA, and I think this change went unnoticed for a long time.

The second aspect of globalisation, which explains the shift from increasing mobility to structural change, is a result of the greater mobility of people, especially those with special talents. I am not referring only to the mobility of students, but also post-graduate students, researchers, and teachers. This mobility has increased, and will probably continue to increase. One other factor, which I think has become important in very recent times, is the awareness of policy makers in Europe of universities’ role as vectors of European values: the values, the culture, the science and technology in the world. This is something that has only really developed at the policymaking level in the last couple of years.

The third factor, which is why I think we have entered this new phase, is to do with EU policy itself. Everyone has already heard that in Lisbon, in March 2000, the EU announced a new, ambitious goal to become by 2010 the most prosperous economy and knowledge-based society in the world. So there was this goal, which may be realistic or may be a little bit too ambitious, but has certainly mobilised a lot of energy. I would like to add that at the same time as the heads of state announced the goal, they said that this would entail very deep-reaching change in social systems,
and in education and research. Since the Lisbon summit, the energies of policymakers at national and European level have been channelled in this direction.

Two years later, at the Barcelona summit in March 2002, the stakes were put even higher. The European Union and the heads of state endorsed three additional goals. First, they announced that the European Union would make all efforts necessary to reach the spending level of 3% of GDP on research and development by the year 2010. Secondly, they announced that European education systems and institutions, and this applies specifically to higher education, should be seen as a worldwide reference due to the quality and relevance for what they develop. And thirdly, Europe should again become the preferred destination of students, scholars and researchers from other regions.

This is an extremely ambitious agenda, and some of the goals are probably even more ambitious than they already sound. In particular if you keep in mind that the movement towards these goals must by necessity be combined with two others that also bring up additional needs: one is the enlargement of the EU to include ten new countries including many universities and schools, the other is the ageing population. So the background, the context in which we operate, has completely changed, at least in policy terms from what it was only five years ago.

This, of course, has profound implications on the organisation of higher education and research: new missions for universities and new ways to fulfil these missions. There is growing tension between fully nationally-based structures of funding, degrees, reference, and recognition; and the worldwide challenges for universities in general. The implication of this is that we are in for a more diversified situation with greater differentiation between institutions, and possibly also between the systems; regional differences are likely to grow in this context. At the same time, in this new phase where it is clear that mobility is not enough, where convergence and structural change policies are needed, this provides a new legitimacy for action at European level. I would not say there is common European policy in this area, but there is shared action to achieve shared goals at the European level. In particular, I would like to emphasise that after many years we now have a new balance between the intra-European aspects of these policies. There is now a much more acceptable and probably sustainable balance because the external aspects – cooperation and the place of Europe in the world – have grown tremendously in the EU context over the last three years.

Coming now to my second part: there are now three main strands of action in progress at the EU level. One is the so-called Bologna Process, as a movement towards the creation of what has been called the European Higher Education Area. At the same time there is a movement towards the completion of a European Research Area. But there is a third process, much larger than these two but still largely unknown in Europe, which comes directly from the Lisbon summit, called the Objectives Process. This is a short name for the Programme Towards the Future Common Objectives of Education and Training Systems in Europe.

This whole external dimension, aimed at building up the attractiveness of the European higher education area, has grown considerably

The Bologna Process, the creation of a European higher education area, has two main aims, although only one of these tends to be emphasised. One is to create more coherence and more compatibility within Europe in order to enhance the readability of the system and mutual recognition. The main instruments in the Bologna Process are the introduction of Bachelor's and Master's programmes, and also now an emphasis on the Doctoral level, which existed everywhere but was not a necessary part of higher education everywhere. So the internal coherence is now nearly a generalised move towards the introduction of three levels of degrees: first degree – Bachelor's type; second degree – Masters type; third degree – Doctoral degree. At the same time, the introduction of the ECTS credit system has been widely accepted. Either it is being applied within countries and institutions, or the existing systems are being made compatible with ECTS. The third aspect is some kind of quality assurance or accreditation. These three elements, combined, are those that you find in nearly all Bologna-type reforms of systems of higher education. It is still not well enough known in Europe that many countries have completely rebuilt their degree structure: I am thinking of Italy, Germany and, more recently, Spain, but the list is much longer than that. This process has made a huge difference already and is going to continue.

At the same time, the Bologna agenda also has an external strand, which was not strong in the original declaration, but has become much stronger during the implementation phase: the need for European universities to have readable qualification structures, not only for European students, but also for those students from the outside who might be in getting a degree from a European university, which they may use
throughout Europe and get recognised more easily at home.

So this whole external dimension, aimed at building up the attractiveness of the European higher education area, has grown considerably. It has to do with the readability of degrees and some kind of marketing. I am not referring to commercial marketing, just to providing arguments and reasons for students to come to Europe. There is a distortion in competition at the moment. We cannot be satisfied to attract students just because they do not have to pay as much in Europe as they would in the USA. If we want to compare our ability to attract them, we have to come up with other arguments as well.

**We cannot be satisfied to attract students just because higher education is cheaper in Europe than in the USA**

The process is continuing, country after country is coming in, but there is definitely a risk of a chaotic transition from where we are to where the process would like to lead European universities. I have many doubts concerning this notion of public good. Not that I do not share it, but I do not see action going in the directions needed to make it happen. If higher education is to remain a public good, we need public policies to make it happen. Right now, I see a lot of resistance from member states; someone talked about the decay of nation-states, but in education they are very, very present. They control the territory, and this raises many questions for me.

Higher education is unable to remain a public good if everything is over-regulated within the country, but relations between the EU countries are left to market or private agreements. If we cannot put in place, for example, a quality assurance system based on agencies or mechanisms that guarantee the public-good aspect of higher education, we will be in trouble. In particular, whether Berlin is a success or not will depend on the ability of the promoters of the Bologna Process – that is ministers, but also universities, in particular the European University Association – to come up with some sort of clearinghouse of quality control or accreditation in Europe.

The Bologna Process

The process towards the European research area: It is quite clear that the role of universities in research in Europe has been recognised much more in the recent policy instruments than was the case in the past. First, we now have this goal to spend 3% of GDP on research and development – not all of it at universities and not all of it coming from public sources – but it means a significant jump forward in the quantity of money available for research and development. Another new aspect in the building up of the European research area is the much stronger emphasis on excellence. If you compare the current policy instruments with the previous ones, you will see greater emphasis on funding the best projects without too much attention to having universities from each EU member state.

The weaknesses of European research have also been fully recognised. I think the imbalance across countries and regions has been recognised much better in the current instruments. In particular, the concern about what is, in effect, brain drain has grown considerably, and the exodus of researchers and research centres to the other side of the Atlantic has become an important item in European policymaking. At the Graz convention of European universities last month, the commissioner in charge of research quoted a survey by the European roundtable of industrialists which brings together some of the biggest multinational companies in Europe, and they were asked: "Where will you invest for your research and development in the coming years?" The vast majority of these European based multi-nationals said they would invest the majority of their money for research and development in the USA.

So there is now the Sixth Framework programme, which is the main instrument to make European research happen. I think it should be reassuring to some that the place of humanities has been increased in the framework programme. The mobility schemes are still there, but they have been reorganised. I find it very interesting to observe that the new Marie Curie scheme is now one programme with three strands: intra-EU mobility, mobility from the EU to the rest of the world and from the rest of the world to the EU. It is one integrated scheme, and this is certainly a step in the right direction. There is € 1.6 billion in this framework for human resource development, especially for young researchers. The selection criteria in the Sixth Framework programme are more quality- and merit-based than before, with fewer political aspects.

The third main strand of action is the Objectives Process. In the wake of what heads of state announced in Lisbon in 2000, Ministers of Education were asked to increase their contribution to the Europe of Knowledge. The heads of state, not the ministers of education, announced that investment in education, training and research should be increased. This has led to a complete target figure in research of 3% of GDP, but not to a complete target figure in education and training for which the Commission also considered proposing a minimal percentage of GDP.

The Objectives Process is comprehensive, covering all of the education and training systems. Ministers agreed on a list of 13 main objectives,
which are shared across the European Union and will serve as the main targets towards which they will converge. We have 13 objectives to be achieved by cooperation between EU countries and the European Commission. A number of important documents are being prepared or have been prepared. There are working groups to make these objectives a reality and a number of new programmes have been announced, including the Erasmus Mundus programme.

Universities are now the focus of these movements; the role of universities in the European research area has been recognised. From a policy point of view, it is important that these processes all have the same timeframe: the horizon for all of them is 2010. They all cover the same countries or almost the same countries – there are about thirty countries involved. They all apply the same methods: coordination without any directives coming from the top. It is cooperation between the countries and the European Commission to achieve these common goals, which also means that all these strands are based on networks and on partnerships.

The European Commission has circulated a number of messages that it could not have issued three years ago, because member-states would have considered some of them to be things the Commission should not even touch. Within the new context, with these new policy instruments, the European Commission has been able to send a few messages, which I think are useful for the university community:

(i) The role of universities is now fully recognised and acknowledged. However, one of the main conclusions is also that European universities are not generally well enough prepared to play their full role in the knowledge society and that they need to change a lot if they want to retain their role in European society and the world.

(ii) Universities in Europe are under-funded because they are at the intersection of two under-funded lines: higher education and research. If you compare them with the United States of America, the document insists, universities in Europe need more resources, more diversified resources and to manage their resources much more efficiently. A number of areas where this should be possible are listed in the document.

(iii) Good higher education and good research are not only dependent on academic quality. The management of institutions and systems plays an extremely important role and there are particular question marks over the quality of human resource management at European universities.

(iv) The creation of the conditions for excellence could not be found in previous EU policy documents. There is a lot of concern expressed about making careers at European universities more attractive with regard to access, rewards and, in particular, the management of European resources. In this regard, the role of networks is particularly emphasised.

(v) Links to industry, society and regions are an ongoing, though not particularly new, concern. Europe produces more graduates in science and technology than the USA, but employs significantly fewer.

(vi) The cost of non-Europe. How much does it cost, not only in financial terms, not to have a coherent picture of European higher education and research? The result from fragmentation in terms of careers, recognition, accreditation and funding are evaluated in the document.

These are the messages. We have received about 130 answers from the academic community, government and industry, some of them consolidated from conferences, unions and industry at European level. We must now analyse these responses.

Finally, some ideas about diversity, compatibility, and the role of networks: It is interesting how the ministers and the heads of state phrased the approach to compatibility in the Objectives Process. You have all heard praise for diversity in thousands of documents; we all like, respect, and need diversity. But ministers were encouraged to approach it in a different way. The way they phrased it is that we need enough compatibility to make the diversity a new possibility for students to choose from, rather than something that limits their possibilities. This is a totally new political message – we want diversity, but we want it used positively – that will entail deep-reaching consequences in the years ahead. If diversity is used to recognise something that is different, it is used positively. If diversity is used to exclude a student or a researcher from a career or a curriculum, this will not be beneficial for Europe.

We need enough compatibility to make "diversity" a draw for students, rather than something that limits their possibilities

Concerning networks and partnerships, I think European higher education and research is all about networks. Networking is a tool, not an end in itself, and sometimes I think this can be forgotten. I said we have networks in Europe for everything, all kinds of institutions. This is positive, but only up to a point; networking may also mean the distortion of attention or resources.
To conclude, of course networking within leagues of equals is important because it allows the pooling of strengths and resources and because it makes mutual learning more attractive and more efficient. However, it is not sufficient to solve some of the issues that we have in Europe. For example, every now and then we run into the belief that it would be sufficient to have networks of universities in Europe, that we then would not need quality assurance or accreditation. This is wrong. We will need accreditation and quality assurance on top of networks.

The second point I would like to make in conclusion is that we need “league” types of networks, but we also need them to be very open. Quality and excellence do not hang in the air, they can only prosper if they are nourished by other types of institutions. Another aspect of this openness is that the communication of the European Commission on the role of universities fully ignores the role of European universities in developing countries. I think this is a shortcoming of the communication, but also something that should receive attention in big networks like this one. The networks very often function within a European dimension, but in this case they also function in a worldwide perspective.

Finally, European universities have learned a lot over the last two decades about networking between themselves and making things happen within Europe. We have not learned a lot about doing things together in other parts of the world. For example, a European network of universities opening a campus somewhere else in the world. This is a new need and a new possibility that has been opened by the Erasmus Mundus programme. I hope that some of your universities or the network will take advantage of this.

I happened to be involved in the negotiations between the European Union and the Latin America and Caribbean countries, for the setting up of a common higher education area, which is a very ambitious political project. However, in general these educational networks are not happening. I am not only referring to your network, but also, for example, to Columbus. There are about 250 branch campuses of American universities in Europe, but how many European universities have branch campuses in the USA? For example two or three European universities could create a common doctoral degree or Master’s degree. Equally, too few of our universities involve universities elsewhere in the world, particularly those in the developing world.

The only hope to change conservative, protectionist attitudes, which should not find their way into the European higher education, is for students to go to the media and policy makers. Sometimes you get amazing results. The whole development of the EU programmes – starting with Erasmus, Lingua and Comet – was made possible because a student went to the European court in Luxembourg and won a case against a Belgian university.

There is not an increase in the powers of the EU as compared to national authorities. However, national and regional authorities, and national academic bodies have now generally recognised that they face the same problems and that even the big countries in the EU cannot solve them by themselves. This adds to the treaties, but does not modify the sharing of power. The need to cooperate and go beyond the treaties is driving Bologna, the European Research Area and the Objectives Process.

It would be an interesting initiative to develop more joint programmes, particularly at doctoral level. I would expect universities, especially within consortia or networks like this one, to nearly automatically recognise each other’s doctoral studies, even if not all Bachelor’s degrees. I believe that the discrepancies in course lengths are a problem. When you have access to the unified European labour market, and the same qualification takes eight years in some countries, and five years in some others, we have a problem and students have an opportunity.

There is little we can do about Brussels bureaucracy: it is as bad as member-states want it to be

The discussion mentioned ambitious targets. I have heard legends about the Brussels bureaucracy and met many scientists who claim much more money is wasted on bureaucracy in Europe than in the USA. However, I can think of two concrete examples from my university this year. First, Erasmus staff from my university showed me new formulae for Erasmus, which created five times more paperwork than two years ago. Secondly, I recently received an invitation from Barcelona to join a project about utilitarian totalitarian societies, which Barcelona then withdrew when they learned they had to hire professional lawyers to complete the paperwork for Brussels.

There is little we can do about Brussels bureaucracy, because it is as bad as member-states want it to be. We can only function within what member-states define, and the kind of checks which member states impose on programmes like this are numerous and quite cumbersome. But when European multi-nationals start taking their funding research to the USA, the financial situation, which is already quite severe, will be exacerbated considerably. I know it is very easy to criticise bureaucracy, but is there a chance of eradicating unnecessary bureaucracy from EU projects?
Session V: Conclusions and Recommendations

Dr Bahram Bekhradnia
Director, Higher Education Policy Institute, UK

I want to pick up one point that has arisen at various points in the presentations about one of the risks facing European higher education systems. It arises from the notion of the commoditisation of higher education, the peculiar, in a historic sense, view of higher education as a tradable commodity. The way, for example, that the World Trade Organisation is taking an interest in higher education, as if we were dealing in fridges or cars: whether we open our doors formally through the GATS process, or not, it is a real process. Increasing international competition is going to create real pressure, putting our universities at risk of decline, certainly of increasing weakness.

We have discovered that it does not matter much whether countries have their own car industry or even their own computer industry. What mattered was the ability to buy cheaper, better computers and make good use of them. So, does it actually matter if we increasingly cede our higher education overseas? The University of Phoenix is making quite significant in-roads in the USA, around the world and eventually, probably, in Europe. Does it matter if students in Europe increasingly enrol in their courses? We have heard about the campuses of American universities in Europe. Does that matter to us, as long as our citizens are well-educated citizens? As long as they get their education, does it matter from where they get it, so long as they go on to build better industries and play their part in civic society? From everything I have heard in the last two days, and I would share this, the answer is yes, it probably does matter for various reasons. One is the role of universities in civil society and democratisation of societies. This is a question we do need to address, as this competition is coming.

We have heard about the campuses of American universities in Europe. Does that matter to us, as long as our citizens are well-educated citizens?

Does it matter if our university degrees are going to be devalued and our students find they are emerging from our universities with less valuable degrees because the very best universities are not those that have their base in Europe? If it matters, my conclusion is that we had better reform fairly urgently to make universities more adaptable, which means less state control of our university systems. We need to enable universities to adapt to the changing environments, changing knowledge and changing student demand. In England, perhaps in contrast to the rest of Europe, we are anticipating a big growth in student demand in the next decade. We are expecting another quarter of a million students to be qualified for and demanding higher education.

The other reform, therefore, that we need to look at seriously is funding reform, and here I find a great ambivalence although I think there is general agreement that reform is needed. I see no alternative to students, the beneficiaries of higher education, paying increasingly for the privilege that going to university gives them. It is a public good, and the state needs to pay, and pay appropriately, but there is no appetite, in any country that I see, for increasing taxation to the extent required to enable our universities to compete with the global universities that are developing primarily in the USA. If that is the case, we need to reform our funding systems urgently to enable proper funding of our universities, so the degrees students obtain from those universities are not devalued because they are seen as second-rate universities in an international context.

My conclusion from this is that we do need our own indigenous university systems, but that there is no point in having them if they are not really high quality and able to compete in the increasingly global environment. If you look at some other countries, apart from America, they identify this need and are focusing much better than us. So, reform is needed: reform of structures and reform of funding and I see ambivalence about this among university systems that want to put in barriers to stop people being able to move around freely and recognise each others' degrees, even within Europe. We have to overcome all of this: otherwise we are going to lose our high-quality universities completely.

Professor Christa Müller
Professor of Pharmaceutical Chemistry, Bonn University

The conference has examined the opportunities and risks of new partnerships between universities, and political, economic and academic bodies and institutions. These partnerships have emerged over the past few decades and are constantly increasing.

Knowledge Transfer

Information and Communication Technologies (ICT) have become increasingly important in universities and should be promoted as valuable
instruments of teaching and research. However, we have seen during this conference that ICT use varies widely between the different disciplines. For example, I think ICT is more common in the natural sciences than the humanities. We have to develop an integrated and synergistic approach incorporating both traditional and electronic methods and instruments of teaching, research and publishing.

Ethics and Funding:

In my workshop we saw that universities are facing a real financial crisis, not only in Europe, but all over the world. There are, though, large differences between different universities in different countries. For example, the Spanish members stated that they have had a crisis for the past ten to twenty years. Although the situation is completely different in the United States, there is still a crisis, as we heard from Russell Willis Taylor.

Dr Paul Flather
Secretary-General, Europaeum

I found this a fascinating and intriguing conference. I feel that we have so much experience and expertise in this room, and the meeting has been fruitful. We have been given a lot of challenges and I want to remind you of some of the challenges that we, either collectively as an association, or individually, have been given.

First, our senior business representative, Gerd Schulte-Hillen, who runs one of the largest companies in Europe, asked us to produce students who were well-trained, international and mobile, but also, interestingly, critical thinkers, which is quite reassuring to us because that is the kind of education we want to do. However, I sensed a slight diversion or division with what the government (in the words of Dr Thomas) wanted, because Dr Thomas wanted us to produce more trained people that the society and government wanted, and yet business was saying: give us able people but give us critical thinkers.

The second challenge, on behalf of civil society, came in Avi Primor’s talk, particularly towards the end, where he gave universities a significant role of advocacy in modern democratic life. He said we were at the forefront of civil society and must do, very boldly, what others do not do. We must put the counter-arguments, the difficult arguments, the unpopular arguments, and we must produce space for this to happen. The media cannot be relied upon to do that, nor can political parties. Dissident individuals can do it, but they need the space.

The third challenge, which I call the Bridging Divide challenge, came from Mary Robinson. She told us: reach out; you’re comfortable, you have the resources, reach out, particularly to the South, to the less developed universities, and make fresh partnerships there. And I was pleased to hear from our last speaker, because I am worried as to how we do it, because we collectively are stretched, we are tired, we are feeling poor, we have enough on our plates. But there was a hope in the Erasmus Mundus programme, which offers us a vehicle to build some incentives to do precisely that.

We are great institutions – tell government and society how much your research helps improve life

The fourth challenge, which is a double challenge, from Claus Moser, is huge. It is terribly important and staring us in the face: reach out and work with other universities – the best way to describe them is less-advantaged universities. Reach out to them, because they may have the potential in academic work, in research, in students, but we are better able to be at the top. Reach out to schools as well, because, as he said, if the schools get it wrong, or are ill-equipped, or under-funded, or do not attract the right level of teachers because of lack of prestige, then it makes the work of universities very difficult.

I produced a paper for Oxford, which was never picked up, in which I said every college should adopt a local school in Oxford. A small proposal, but I thought it would have started this process. What I want to suggest now is that every university should adopt some schools. It is easy to do it, because you are in the towns and the schools are nearby, and some of the university students have come from there, so the professors and teachers can maybe go backwards and forwards.

Recommendations

- First, in the area of what might be called the laptop/website culture. There is a slogan that I jotted down: “every student a laptop, every professor a website.” Certainly every American university would expect every student to have a laptop. I think, as our survey showed, we should offer training to professors who want to make better use of the Internet, and I think we should work hard to build up facilities of the kind that students expect. I also think we should heed Markus Pins’ point about creating processes to allow our expertise to be found more easily. The London School of Economics has a very good system for selling its expertise that we could learn from. I think we should plug ourselves in and I am going to plug in a network called opendemocracy.net, which is a totally independent forum run by academics for intellectual discussion, to which the Europaeum
has access, and we can waive the fee for members.

- Second, fundraising and transparency: we need to work for tax benefits. Obviously this varies in each country – we have nothing in Europe like the regime that the Americans have. But I think an equally good structure could be created both at a European level and in our own countries. Following the interesting discussion earlier, one way of building in an ethical component is to have a scrutiny committee; we have one in Oxford, which looks at big grants. We could develop codes, but they are often impractical. I liked the comment that “we must have the ability to say no, we must build diversity in our resources.”

- Third, culture: we agreed that we must respect all cultures – that is what a university ethos is all about – but must promote none. The point made to me was that we cannot teach culture in a vacuum; we must do it more positively, but we have to do it carefully. Maybe we need to think about what that actually means. I would remind you of a discussion in Paris, reflected in an essay in our Europaeum Review, which is that medieval universities spent most of their time talking about spiritual, cultural and religious issues, which we in modern universities have completely forgotten.

- Fourth, when Claus Moser spoke last night, this tune from Bob Marley suddenly came into my head: “Stand Up For Your Rights.” We have been too shy. We are great institutions, important institutions. We have been knocked for ten, fifteen, twenty years. Tell government and society what you actually do. Tell them how much you help the economy; tell them how much your research helps improve life. It is rare for a successful society, both in terms of economic well-being and democratic well-being, not to have successful universities; I think there is a direct correlation there. To get students to come and to get governments to give us money, we must make the case and help government make the case.

- Finally, we must play our role in Europe. The Europaeum is well equipped to do that, and that will help European universities play our role in globalisation as well.

To finish, I would like to point out how high we have reached in our thinking. It strikes me that we are almost reaching for a new model of what our universities should be like. We have had the Humboldt model built on excellence and an elite academic life, the Napoleonic model built on centralised structures, and the Newman model, in the 20th Century, built on a statist model of universities.

In the discussions, we have found that some of our universities are still too statist for the 20th century, let alone the 21st. We have also had a model, which I call the Thatcher model, that universities are about wealth creation and training people for key jobs. Now we are looking for a new model based on access, lifelong learning, mobility, internationalism and multi-value systems.

The two phrases I want to leave you with are both from important contributors to this conference: Mary Robinson said universities must teach skills to make our students responsible citizens in a globalising world; Claus Moser reminded us that universities are about transmitting common culture. It is a complicated phrase, but it gets around some of the problems.

**Thanks**

Now, I want to thank the Bonn hosts, who have been brilliant. To Christa Müller, to Wolfram Kinzig who has chaired a committee here and has worked very hard, Harmut Ihne… there are other Bonn colleagues here, and there are one or two who worked hard like Uwe Holtz, who is not able to be here. We thank you for your hospitality, and we ask you to pass on the thanks to the Rector as well, who performed so many tasks for us yesterday and did a terrific job. I want to thank the participants and the students: I hope you have all found it worthwhile and will take away positive ideas. I also want to thank the team behind the scenes, my colleagues from the office, Andrew and Tom, the colleagues from Bonn and the students. Finally, Barbara Tonn for all her hard work and commitment.
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Appendix 1: Participants in the Inquiry

Conferences that each participant attended are listed in brackets:
- **BERLIN**: Humboldt-Universität zu Berlin, December 2001
- **PARIS**: Université Paris 1 Panthéon-Sorbonne, September 2002
- **BONN**: Friedrich-Wilhelms-Universität Bonn, June 2003
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Professor Piet **AKKERMANS**
Rector, College of Europe (Berlin)

Professor Pierre **ALLAN**
Dean of the Faculty of Economic and Social Sciences, University of Geneva (Paris, Bonn)

Dr Joost **VAN ASTEN**
Director of International Relations, Universiteit Leiden (Berlin, Paris, Bonn)

Professor Ronald **BARNETT**
Institute of Education, London University (Paris)

Dr Bahram **BEKHRADNIA**
Director, Higher Education Policy Institute, UK (Bonn)

Dr Norbert **BENSEL**
Member, Board of Management, Daimler Financial Services (Berlin)

Mr Christoph **BERTRAM**
Director, Siftung Wissenschaft und Politik (Berlin)

Professor Harald **BOLHÁR-NORDENKAMPF**
Member of Austrian UNESCO Commission, Institute of Ecology and Conservation Biology, Head of Division of Horticultural Plant Physiology and Primary Production (Bonn)

Professor Klaus **BORCHARD**
Rector, Rheinische Friedrich-Wilhelms-Universität Bonn (Bonn)

Professor Stephan **BREIDENBACH**
Professor of Law, Europa-Universität Viadrina Frankfurt-Oder (Berlin)

Dr Douwe **BREIMER**
Rector, Universiteit Leiden (Paris)

Professor Pier Ugo **CALZOLARI**
Rector, Università degli Studi di Bologna (Berlin)

Dr Ladislav **CERYCH**
Former Director, European Institute of Education and Social Policy, Paris (Paris)

Ms Jen **CHAN**
Observatory on Borderless Higher Education, Association of Commonwealth Universities (Paris)

Dr Ray **CUNNINGHAM**
Deputy Director, Anglo-German Foundation for the Study of Industrial Society (Berlin)

Professor Wim **VAN DEN DOEL**
Professor of Modern and Contemporary History, Universiteit Leiden (Bonn)

Ambassador **SILVIO FAGIOLI**
Ambassador of Italy in the German Federal Republic (Berlin)

Dr Paul **FLATHER**
Secretary-General, The Europaeum, and Fellow of Mansfield College, Oxford (Berlin, Paris, Bonn)

Dr Peter **FLOOR**
Universiteit Leiden; former Chairman of Coimbra Group, former Secretary of the Europaeum (Bonn)

Professor Robert **FRANK**
Director, Institut Pierre Rénévin, Université Paris I (Berlin, Paris)

Dr Christina **VON FURSTENBURG**
International Social Science Council, UNESCO (Paris)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position/Institution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Professor Vera GOWLLAND-DEBAS</td>
<td>Head of Human Rights Section, Institut Universitaire de Hautes Etudes, Geneva (Berlin)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professor Rosalind GREENSTEIN</td>
<td>Rector, CERLAC, Université Paris I (Paris)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Andrea GRUGEL</td>
<td>Department of Transfer and Public Relations, Rheinische Friedrich-Wilhelms-Universität Bonn (Bonn)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professor Herman VAN GUNSTEREN</td>
<td>Professor of Political Theory and Philosophy of Law, Department of Political Sciences, Universität Leiden (Berlin)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revd. Professor Tomáš HALÍK</td>
<td>Theology Faculty, Univerzita Karlova v Praze (Paris)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr Guy HAUG</td>
<td>Directorate General for Education and Culture, European Commission (Bonn)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr Thomas HENSCHEL</td>
<td>Director, European School of Governance (Berlin)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professor Dietmar HERZ</td>
<td>Professor for Comparative Government and Head of the Professional School Project, Universität Erfurt (Berlin)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms Sandra HILDEBRANDT</td>
<td>Daimler Financial Services AG (Berlin)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sir John HOLMES</td>
<td>HE the United Kingdom Ambassador to France (Paris)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professor Uwe HOLTZ</td>
<td>Professor of Political Science, Rheinische Friedrich-Wilhelms-Universität Bonn (Berlin, Paris)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr Mirko HOLZER</td>
<td>CEO, Pi-Consult GmbH (Berlin)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hans-Henning HORSTMANN</td>
<td>Director General, Head of Foreign Department of the Press and Information Office of the Federal Government (Berlin)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professor Max HUBER</td>
<td>Managing Director, Institute for Theoretical Nuclear Physics, Bonn (Berlin)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr Hubert-Lance HUET</td>
<td>Private Banker, Switzerland (Paris)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr Richard HUGGINS</td>
<td>Senior Lecturer in Politics, School of Social Sciences and Law, Oxford Brookes University (Berlin, Paris, Bonn)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr Wolfgang HÜRTER</td>
<td>Mayor of the City of Bonn (Bonn)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr Hartmut IHNE</td>
<td>Director, Zentrum für Europäische Integrationsforschung, Rheinische Friedrich-Wilhelms-Universität Bonn (Berlin, Bonn)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms Kerstin IMBUSCH</td>
<td>Osteuropa-Institut, Freie Universität Berlin (Berlin)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professor Anne-Barbara ISCHINGER</td>
<td>Vizepräsidentin für Internationales und Öffentlichkeitsarbeit, Humboldt-Universität zu Berlin (Berlin)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr Michael JOCHUM</td>
<td>Senior Manager and Chief of Staff, Corporate Issues &amp; Messages, Daimler Financial Services AG (Berlin, Paris, Bonn)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr Hywel CERI JONES</td>
<td>Chairman, European Policy Centre Executive Board, Brussels (Paris)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professor Firoz KADERALI</td>
<td>Professor of Electrical Engineering, FernUniversität Hagen (Berlin)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professor Michel KAPLAN</td>
<td>President, Université Paris I (Paris)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr Jean KAWECKI</td>
<td>Director, International Relations Office, Université Paris I (Paris)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professor Hubert KEMPF</td>
<td>Director, Équipe Universitaire de Recherche en Economie Quantitative, Université Paris I (Paris)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sir Anthony KENNY</td>
<td>Emeritus Professor of Philosophy, University of Oxford (Bonn)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Position</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professor Wolfram <strong>KINZIG</strong></td>
<td>Evangelisch-Theologisches Seminar, Rheinische Friedrich-Wilhelms-Universität Bonn (Berlin, Paris, Bonn)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professor Christian <strong>KIRCHNER</strong></td>
<td>Dekan, Juristische Fakultät, and Professor of German, European and International Civil and Business Law and New Institutional Economics, Humboldt-Universität zu Berlin (Berlin)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr David <strong>KIRWAN</strong></td>
<td>Deputy Director, British Council, Paris (Paris)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr Wolfram <strong>KLINGLER</strong></td>
<td>Founding Partner, Baklin Finanz (Berlin)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr Dariusz <strong>KOLODZIEJCZYK</strong></td>
<td>Institute of History, Uniwersytet Warszawski (Bonn)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr Rainer <strong>KNUBBEN</strong></td>
<td>Director of Communications, Daimler Financial Services AG (Berlin)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professor Andrei <strong>KORTUNOV</strong></td>
<td>President, Moscow Public Science Foundation (Berlin)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr Leszek <strong>KOSINSKI</strong></td>
<td>Secretary-General, International Social Science Council, UNESCO (Paris)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professor Zdeněk <strong>KOVÁŘ</strong></td>
<td>Rector Emeritus, Technická univerzita v Liberci, Czech Republic (Paris)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M. Jack <strong>LANG</strong></td>
<td>Former Minister of Education, Research &amp; Technology, France (Paris)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr Heike <strong>LINDNER</strong></td>
<td>Lecturer of Evangelical Theology and Religious Education, Universität Heidelberg (Bonn)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr Henning <strong>LOHSE</strong></td>
<td>Correspondent, Die Welt am Sonntag, Paris (Paris)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms Monika <strong>LÜTKE-ENTRUP</strong></td>
<td>Programme Manager, the Bertelsmann Foundation (Paris)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professor Zdzisław <strong>MACH</strong></td>
<td>Professor of Sociology and Chairman, European Studies Centre, Uniwersytet Jagielloński, Krakow (Berlin, Paris)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr Bernard <strong>MAIER</strong></td>
<td>Evangelisch-Theologisches Seminar, Rheinische Friedrich-Wilhelms-Universität Bonn (Bonn)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professor Michael <strong>MEYER-BLANCK</strong></td>
<td>Evangelisch-Theologisches Seminar, Rheinische Friedrich-Wilhelms-Universität Bonn (Bonn)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professor Dr. Jürgen <strong>MLYNEK</strong></td>
<td>President, Humboldt-Universität zu Berlin (Berlin)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr Dominique <strong>MOISI</strong></td>
<td>Deputy Director, Institut Français des Relations Internationales, Paris (Paris)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professor Javier <strong>MONTERO DE JUAN</strong></td>
<td>Vice-Dean for Research and International Relations, Faculty of Mathematics, Universidad Complutense de Madrid (Bonn)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lord Claus <strong>MOSER</strong></td>
<td>Chairman of the British Museum Development Trust, London (Bonn)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professor Christa <strong>MÜLLER</strong></td>
<td>Vice rector for planning and financial affairs, Rheinische-Friedrich-Wilhelms-Universität Bonn (Berlin, Paris, Bonn)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr Ben <strong>OKRI</strong></td>
<td>Author and former Booker Prize winner (Paris)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr John <strong>O’LEARY</strong></td>
<td>Editor, Times Higher Educational Supplement, UK (Paris)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hon. Professor Marcello <strong>PERA</strong></td>
<td>President, Senato della Repubblica Italiana (Berlin)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professor Ingolf <strong>PERNICE</strong></td>
<td>Director, Walter-Hallstein-Institut für Europäisches Verfassungsrecht and Professor of Public, International and European Law, Humboldt-Universität zu Berlin (Berlin)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr Wim <strong>VAN PETEGEM</strong></td>
<td>EuroPACE 2000 (Berlin)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Mr Markus Pins
Bonn University graduate, Guideguide AG (Berlin, Paris, Bonn)

Professor Paolo Pombeni
Professor of Comparative History of European Political Systems, Università degli Studi di Bologna (Berlin)
Vice-President, Tel Aviv University; Former Ambassador of Israel in Germany (Bonn)

Mr Avi Primor

Professor Mary Robinson
Executive Director, Ethical Globalisation Initiative; Former Director of UNHCR (Bonn)

Dr Maurits Van Roojen
Head, Leiden Worldwide, Universiteit Leiden (Bonn)

Professor Wulf-Henning Roth
Law Faculty, Rheinische-Friedrich-Wilhelms-Universität Bonn (Bonn)

Professor Lenka Rovná
Jean Monnet Chair, Department of West European Studies, Faculty of Social Sciences, Univerzita Karlova V Praze (Berlin, Paris)

Professor Paolo Rossini
Economics Faculty, Università degli Studi di Bologna (Paris)

Ms Marie-Louise Ruggieri
Chef du Service Formation et Régionalisation, MEDEF, Paris (Paris)

Professor Yoni Ryan
Head, Educational Design Group, Monash University, Australia (Paris)

Professor Knud-Erik Sabroe
Former Director of International Relations, Aarhus Universitet, and former Chairman of the Coimbra Group (Bonn)

Mr Gadgimed Safaraliev, MP
Deputy Chairman of the Committee for Science and Education, State Duma of the Russian Federation (Berlin)

Claire Sanders-Smith
Correspondent, Times Higher Education Supplement (Bonn)

Mr Marc Schattenmann
Wissenschaftlicher Mitarbeiter, Professional School Projekt (Berlin)

Dr Reimund Scheurmann
Head of Directorate on Higher Education, Ministry of Education and Research, Germany (Berlin)

Professor Günter Schödl
Professor of Eastern Central European History, Humboldt-Universität zu Berlin (Berlin)

Professor Jürgen Schriewer
Professor of Comparative Education, Humboldt-Universität zu Berlin (Berlin)

Mr Gerd Schulte-Hillen
Chairman of the Supervisory Board of Bertelsmann AG; Vice Chairman of the Executive Committee of the Board, Bertelsmann Foundation (Bonn)

Professor Gesine Schwan
Rector, Europa-Universität Viadrina Frankfurt Oder (Berlin)

Professor Sir Peter Scott
Vice-Chancellor, Kingston University, UK (Berlin)

Mr Komlavi Seddoh
Director, Division of Higher Education, UNESCO (Paris)

Ms Andrea Seibel
Editor-in-Chief, Forum of Die Welt (Berlin)

Mr Andreas Siegel
Head of Unit, European Section, German Foreign Office (Berlin)

Professor Jean-Claude Sergeant
Director, La Maison Française, Oxford (Paris)

Professor Jan Sokol
Dean of the Faculty of Humanities, Univerzita Karlova V Praze (Berlin)

Ms Auriol Stevens
Editor, Times Higher Education Supplement, London (Berlin)
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Professor Josef STINGL
Pro-Rector, International Relations, Univerzita Karlova V Praze (Bonn)

Mr R. SUDARSHAN
Advisor-Justice, Oslo Governance Centre Norway, UNDP (Bonn)

Mr Russell WILLIS TAYLOR
President and CEO of National Art Strategies, Washington, DC (Bonn)

Professor Caja THIMM
Managing Director at the Centre for Communication and Media Studies, Rheinische-Friedrich-Wilhelms-Universität Bonn (Bonn)

Dr Uwe THOMAS
State Secretary, Bundesministerium für Bildung and Forschung, Germany (Bonn)

Mr John TOD
Director, British Council, Paris (Paris)

Mr Voldemar TOMUSK
Programme Manager, Open Society Institute, Budapest (Paris)

Ms Barbara TONN
Research Assistant and Conference Coordinator, graduate of Rheinische-Friedrich-Wilhelms-Universität Bonn (Bonn)

Professor Christopher TREMEWAN
Pro Vice-Chancellor International, University of Auckland, New Zealand (Bonn)

Professor Peter TSCHOPP
Director, Institut Universitaire de Hautes Etudes, Geneva (Berlin, Paris)

Mr Alexander VON UNGERN-STERNBERG
Director, guideguide AG, Germany (Bonn)

Dr Robert VANDERPLANK
Director, Oxford University Language Centre (Paris)

M. Daniel VITRY
Minister-Delegate, relations internationales et à la coopération, France (Paris)

Mrs Brigitte WAGNER-HALSWICK
Honorary Consul of the Republic of Ireland (Bonn)

Dr Danny WARNER
Deputy to the Director, Institut Universitaire de Hautes Etudes, Geneva (Bonn)

Lord George WEIDENFELD
Chairman, Weidenfeld and Nicolson Publishers (Berlin, Paris)

Ms Stephanie WILD
Research Fellow, Department of Educational Studies, University of Oxford (Berlin)

Ms Karen WILEY
Research Assistant, Observatory on Borderless Higher Education (Berlin)

Mr Richard YELLAND
Head of Institutional Management in Higher Education Programme, Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (Paris)

Mr Peter ZIERINGER
Managing Director, Daimler Financial Financial Services France (Paris)

Professor Moshe ZIMMERMAN
Professor of German History, Hebrew University, Jerusalem (Bonn)
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PROFESSOR ROBERT BARNETT is currently Dean of Professional Development at the Institute of Education, University of London, and Chair of several committees. He is a world authority on the conceptual understanding of higher education and the nature of the university in the modern world, with a recent conference devoted to his work. Professor Barnett’s work has included numerous funded research projects and consultancies.

DR NORBERT BENSEL is currently a member of the Board of Management of Daimler Financial Services AG, responsible for Human Resources. He studied chemistry in Berlin, completing his Doctorate in Natural Sciences. He has held the posts of Head of Human Resources R+V Versicherung, Wiesbaden, Head of Human Resources Development/Senior Executive Support Daimler-Benz Aerospace AG, Munich (appointed Director, Daimler-Benz InterServices in 1994). He stepped onto the Board of Management (debis) AG, Berlin in 1996, responsible for Human Resources and Real Estate Management, as well as being a Member of the Board of Management of debis Systemhaus GmbH, responsible for Human Resources.

PROFESSOR DOUWE BREMER became director of research of the Center for Biopharmaceutical Sciences at Leiden University in 1989 and in 1991 LACDR's Director of Research. He is also chairman of the Board of the Centre for Human Drug Research. He is a member of the Royal Netherlands Academy of Arts and Sciences and currently the chairman of its Section on Medicine. He is a member of Academia Europaea and of the Netherlands Health Council, as well as correspondant étranger de l'Académie National de Pharmacie in Paris and corresponding member of the Royal Medical Academy of Belgium. He is a fellow of the American Association of Pharmaceutical Sciences (AAPS) and honorary fellow of the American College of Clinical Pharmacology. He is a member of the International Policy Board of the Centre for Medicines Research (CMR). He is the holder of honorary doctorates from the Semmelweis University in Budapest (1989), the University of Ghent (1990), the University of Uppsala (1992) and the University of Navarra in Pamplona (1998). He also received several other scientific distinctions, among them the gold Flückiger medal (Davos), the Nagai Foundation Award (Tokyo) and the Høst Madsen Medal (International Pharmaceutical Federation, FIP).

MR JOOST VAN ASTEN read chemistry at Leiden University and obtained a Master's degree in 1971. After a period as junior lecturer he became programme coordinator and student counsellor. In 1989, he was appointed financial coordinator of the Faculty of Mathematics and Natural Sciences, and secretary to the Faculty Board a few years later. From 1993-1995 he took a Master's course in public administration at the Netherlands School of Government. Since 1996 he has worked as a senior adviser to the University Board.

DR BAHRAM BEKHIRADNIA established the Higher Education Policy Institute in 2002, which he directs. He was Director of Policy of the Higher Education Funding Council for England (HEFCE) since its formation in 1992, having briefly worked for the Universities Funding Council (UFC). He was responsible for developing the national policies for learning and teaching, widening participation and research in higher education. He directed the group responsible for policy on reach-out to business and the community, and he oversaw the development of new funding methodologies, and the development, conduct and review of the 1992, 1996 and 2001 Research Assessment Exercises. He also chaired the Steering Group overseeing the development of Performance Indicators for higher education. Before joining the UFC he had spent his career in the Department of Education and Science, latterly as Head of the Teacher Supply Division.

DR RAY CUNNINGHAM studied German and French at King's College, London University, and taught English at the University of Würzburg in Germany for two years while completing his PhD (on political allegory in Thomas Mann). He subsequently worked for five years as commissioning editor in literary and cultural studies and politics and international relations for Open University Press before becoming Projects Director of the Anglo-German Foundation for the Study of Industrial Society in 1991. He was acting Secretary-General of the Foundation from June 1999 to March 2000, and moved to Berlin to become German representative and Deputy Director of the Foundation in November 2000. He is a co-founder of the Anglo-German Environmental Forum.
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Professor Dr. Klaus Borchard has been Rector of Bonn University since 1977. He studied Architecture and Town Planning at the University of Technology, Munich. He became a Government Building Surveyor in 1967 and, then, was appointed Chief Research Engineer in Munich, concurrent with a lectureship in Regional Development at the University of Technology, Munich-Weihenstephan. In 1976, he was appointed to a C4 level chair in Urban Development and Settlement politics at Bonn University, and became Director of the Institute for Town Planning, Land and Soil Management and Cultural Technology. He has undertaken urban development planning in many overseas countries, and has made foreign research visits and lecture tours and is a member of several professional societies of town planning and urban development, and holds many honorary posts. Since August 1998 he is also Vice-President of the German Higher Education Rectors Conference.

Professor Wim van den Doel (b. 1962) received his MA (1987) and Ph.D. (1994) from Leiden University. He will be professor of Contemporary History at this university from July 1, 2003. He is a specialist on the history of imperialism and colonialism and author of several books on the history of the Dutch East Indies. At present he also serves as chair of the Leiden University History Department and the Europaeum Academic Committee.

Dr Paul Flather is Secretary-General of the Europaeum and Fellow of Mansfield College, Oxford. He is an academic, human rights activist, and journalist specialising in education and politics having worked at the BBC, Times Newspapers, and served as Deputy Editor of the New Statesman. His research is on Indian political development since Independence. He worked with dissident movements in the 1980s, and with race equality groups in the UK, and was an elected member of the former London Council in the 1980s (chairing its committee on post-school education 1986-1990). He was founding Secretary-General of the Central European University (1990-1994) set up in Budapest, Prague and Warsaw, by George Soros, and their Director of international and external affairs for Oxford University (1994-1999). His BA and DPhil (Phd) are both from Balliol College, Oxford. He is trustee of several charity boards.

Peter Floor Studied geology at Leiden University. From the Geology Department he moved in 1973 to the Leiden University administration with responsibility for academic affairs. He led the Coimbra Group of Universities from 1986 to 1997. In 1993 he became involved in the construction of the EUROPÆUM and acted as its secretary from 1995 to 2000.

Dr Christina von Fürstenberg is an epistemologist and also holds degrees in agronomy and managerial sciences. She taught for 10 years at the French universities of Angers, Nanterre, Assas, and at the École d'Architecture de Paris, La Défense. She implemented development projects in Southern Chile for 3 years, joined the UNESCO task force for the Rio Earth Summit in 1991 and became a staff member in the Sector for Social and Human Sciences in September 1992. She worked on the development of the interdisciplinary UNITWIN/ UNESCO. She chairs a programme of social sciences and sustainable development. At present, she is responsible for the Section Policies and International Cooperation in the Social Sciences.

Professor Vera Gowelland-Debbas, Professor of Public and International Law at the Graduate Institute of International Studies (HEI), Geneva; has been Visiting Professor at the University of California, Berkeley and the Institut des Hautes Etudes Internationales, Université Panthéon-Assas Paris II. She is the author of Collective Responses to Illegal Acts in International Law (1990), which received the 1991 American Society of International Law Certificate of Merit, and is Editor of (amongst others) The Problem of Refugees in the Light of Contemporary International Law Issues (1995), Multilateral Treaty-Making (2001) and United Nations Sanctions and International Law (2001).

Professor Rosalind Greenstein was born and educated in Great Britain and has lived and worked in France since 1972. She is Maître de conférences (senior lecturer) in English for Law, Université Paris I (Panthéon-Sorbonne); Director of the Centre de recherche en langues de spécialité et cultures (CERLAC) at Paris I; and a professional translator and technical writer, specialising in Artifical Intelligence Research. Her major publications include Les bases du droit anglais, (1993); Regards linguistiques et culturels sur l'èuro (1999); and Regards linguistiques sur le secret (2001).

Professor Tomáš Halík is currently Head of the Department of the Religious studies, Faculty of Arts, Charles University, Prague; Rector of the University Church of the Holy Savior; and President of the Czech Christian Academy. During the Communist regime, he studied theology clandestinely under Josef Zvěřina, and, after 1989, at the Pontifical Lateran University, Rome (Th.Lic. 1992). In 1997 he became full Professor of Sociology at Charles University. From 1972–89, he worked as a psychologist and psychotherapist. He was clandestinely ordained in Erfurt, in 1978, and worked in the “Underground Church” where he was a close colleague of the late Cardinal Tomašek. In 1990–3, he became General
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Secretary of the Czech Conference of Bishops, Assistant Professor at the Roman Catholic School of Theology, Charles University, and Consultant of the Pontifical Council for Dialogue with Non-believers, Rome. He frequently gives guest lectures at universities throughout the world.

**Dr Guy Haug** is a European expert and advisor on education policy issues in an international setting. He is currently Principal Administrator to the Directorate for Education of the European Commission, Brussels. Previously, he served as Principal Advisor to the Association of European Universities, Geneva/Paris. He was instrumental in the preparation of the Bologna Declaration on the European higher education area and subsequent developments (Salamanca Convention of European Universities, Prague Summit of Ministers of Education) and has first-hand experience with the process of educational convergence in Europe. Until 1998 he was Vice-President and Director General for Europe of the Council on International Educational Exchange, New York/Paris. He worked for the EU for the inception of the ERASMUS, TEMPUS and Asia-Link programmes. He has also cooperated with the Council of Europe, the Nordic Council of Ministers, OECD, UNESCO and many NGOs involved in international education. He holds a Master's degree in law (Strasbourg), an MBA (Ottawa) and a Ph.D. in Political Science (Tübingen).

**Dr Thomas Henschel** is Director of the European School of Governance (Berlin). He studied History and German Literature at the Freie Universität Berlin, and was a DAAD Fellow in Washington, DC, in 1990. Between 1001 and 1999 he was Director of the research group *Youth and Europe* at the Center for Applied Policy Research (CAP), University of Munich. He is also a political consultant to the Federal Government of Germany, the German Parliament, Bertelsmann and Deutsche Bank. He has held numerous visiting chairs worldwide related to conflict prevention and since 2000 has been Guest Lecturer at the University of St Gallen for conflict management and negotiation.

**Professor Dietmar Herz** holds the Chair for Comparative Government at the University of Erfurt. He studied Law, Political Science, Philosophy and History at the Ludwig-Maximilians-University in Munich and the London School of Economics and Political Science, as well as Public Administration at the John F Kennedy School of Government at Harvard University. Before taking up his current position, he served as professor of Political Science at the University of Bonn (1997-2000) and as Distinguished Visiting Fulbright Professor for German and European Studies at Vanderbilt University, Nashville, Tennessee (1999-2000).

**Professor Uwe Holtz** is Professor of Political Science at Bonn University and a development consultant. From 1972/3 to 1994/5 he served as a member of the German Parliament and the Parliamentary Assembly of the Council of Europe. He has worked as a scientific assistant at the University of Kiel, lecturer at Bonn University and senior fellow at the Center for European Integration Studies (Bonn). He has published widely on development policy and Europe.

**Professor Max Huber** is Vice-President of the German Academic Exchange Service (DAAD) and Special Delegate of the Federal Government for the Promotion of German Universities Abroad and professor of Theoretical Physics at the University of Bonn. He has also been Vice-Rector (1992-1997) of the University of Bonn. His research interests are in the field of Nuclear and Particle Physics.

**Dr Richard Huggins** has been senior lecturer in Politics at Oxford Brookes University since 1992. His research interests cover EU Telecommunications and Media policy, Political communication and marketing in Italy, Britain and the USA. He also teaches Soviet and Post-Soviet Politics and his publications include *Political Marketing and the Aestheticization of Political Identities* (Prager Press, 1997).

**Dr Hartmut Ihne** studied Philosophy, German Literature, Political Science and Electrical Engineering at different universities. He holds an M.A. (Bonn) and Ph.D. (Berne) in Philosophy. After working as academic collaborator in the German Bundestag (development politics) and as Co-Director of the minority rights project at the University of Berne, he has been the Executive Director of the International Academic Forum Bonn (IWB) at the University of Bonn for the last six years.

**Dr Michael Jochem** has held the position of Senior Manager / Chief of Staff, Corporate Issues & Messages, Daimler Financial Services AG, since 1999. From 1995-1999 he was Special Counsel to *Bundespräsident* Roman Herzog. Prior to that he was a Research Fellow in International Relations at both Harvard University and Cambridge, Ma., USA, having completed his Masters and Doctorate in International Relations, Economics, and Psychology, at the University of Bonn. He has published on German and American foreign policy issues, as well as transatlantic relations, for the office of the President of the Federal Republic of Germany.
PROFESSOR FIROZ KADERALI is a Professor of Communication Systems at the University of Hagen, Germany. He is the Director of the Research Institute for Telecommunications (FTK), a joint Institute of the University of Hagen and the University of Wuppertal. His research interests include teaching with new media, IT-Security and network protocols and optimisation. He is one of the founders of the virtual university in Hagen.

PROFESSOR MICHEL KAPLAN is a Professor of Communication Systems at the University of Hagen, Germany. He is the Director of the Research Institute for Telecommunications (FTK – Forschungsinstitut für Telekommunikation), a joint Institute of the University of Hagen and the University of Wuppertal. His research interests include teaching with new media, IT-Security and network protocols and optimization. He is one of the founders of the virtual university in Hagen.

DR ANTHONY KENNY was tutor in philosophy, and later Master, at Balliol College Oxford, for twenty four years. From 1989-1999 he was Warden of Rhodes House, responsible for the Rhodes Scholarship Programme. From 1999-2001 he was in charge of the Development Office of Oxford University and retired in 2001 as Pro-Vice-Chancellor for Development.

PROFESSOR DR WOLFRAM KINZIG studied Protestant Theology and Latin at the Universities of Heidelberg, Lausanne, Oxford (Christ Church) and Cambridge (Trinity College). He gained a doctorate in Protestant Theology from the University of Heidelberg in 1985 and a Habilitation in Church History in 1991. From 1988-92 he was a Research Fellow at Peterhouse, Cambridge; from 1992-95 Senior Research Fellow, King’s College, Cambridge; 1992-96 Privatdozent and Heisenberg Fellow, University of Heidelberg and from 1996 onwards, Professor of Church History, Evangelisch-Theologisches Seminar, University of Bonn. He is presently Dean of the Faculty of Evangelical Theology, University of Bonn.

MR WOLFRAM KLINZER is President and Director of Baklin Ltd., an investment advisory company based on the concept of sustainability, culture and wealth for high-net-worth individuals, entrepreneurs, family trusts and foundations. He is also President of Global Talents Foundation (a non-profit organisation) as well as a member of the board of the Institute for Traditional Chinese Medicine Basel Ltd. And of Accelerator Ltd., an investment company. He completed 2 years’ study at the St Gallen University, leaving to start a venture capital company in Warsaw, Poland. After returning to Switzerland he worked on the development of the division of sustainable financial services and planning for a major European All-Finance Group.

DR DARIUSZ KOLODZIEJCZYK graduated from Warsaw University and is now a Professor in the Institute of History at Warsaw University. His general research field is Ottoman history, Early Modern and Modern history (special focus on the Eastern Europe and the Middle East, recently the Crimea and post-Soviet Central Asia as well), social and cultural problems in the multi-ethnic and multi-religious societies.

MR JACK LANG was most recently Minister of National Education in France from March 2000 until May 2002, though he has held the office of Minister of Culture more than six times during his career in the French Socialist party. He has been Mayor of Blois (Loire-et-Cher) since 1989, and was the National Assembly Deputy for Loire-et-Cher and Chairman of the Foreign Affairs Committee in 1997. He has been awarded honorary Doctorates from the University of Nottingham and the Royal College of Art. He is also a Chevalier of the Légion d’honneur.

DR LESZEK KOSINSKI was born and educated in Poland. In the 1950s, he was a researcher at the Institute of Town Planning, Institute of Geography, Polish Academy of Sciences, Warsaw. In the 1960s Dr Kosinski taught at various US universities before settling in Canada. From 1969-94 he was a Professor of the University of Alberta, Edmonton. Since 1994 he has been a Fellow of the Royal Society of Canada and Secretary-General of International Social Science Council. His research interests have been urban issues, migration, human aspects of global environmental change. He has written and edited some thirty books and 150 papers.

MRS LINDA LÖWE has a Masters in English Literature, and is an assistant at the International Academic Forum Bonn (IWB). She has worked in the fields of academic administration and public relations, as well as in translation and editing. An American, she has studied in the US, Paris and Heidelberg, and spent 18 years living and working in Zimbabwe. She will be coordinating the Europaeum at the University of Bonn.

PROFESSOR ZDZISLAW MACH is Professor of Sociology, Social Anthropology and European Studies, holding the post of Director of the Centre for European Studies since 1993. From 1993-99 he served as Dean of the Faculty of Philosophy, Jagiellonian University, Krakow, and Head of Social Anthropology Section of the Institute of Sociology since 1997. He is a Permanent Visiting Professor at the Central European University, Warsaw, having held visiting professorships and fellowships at many university institutions including: Oxford; Paul Valery, Montpellier III; University College Dublin; European University Institute, Florence; Chicago; Netherlands Institute for Advanced Studies; and Edinburgh.

BERNHARD MAIER (b. 1963) is Privatdozent for Religious Studies at the University of Bonn. His main fields of research are the religious history of pre-Christian and Christian Europe and the impact of Islam on European civilization. His publications include a ‘Lexikon der keltischen Religion und Kultur’ (also in English and in Japanese), ‘Die Kelten’ (also in English), ‘Die Religion der Kelten’, ‘Die Religion der Germanen’ and ‘Koran-Lexikon’.

PROFESSOR JÜRGEN MLYNEK has served as President of Humbolt University, Berlin, since 2000. He studied Physics at the Technical University of Hannover and the Ecole Polytechnique, Paris. From 1986-90, he held the position of Assistant Professor, Swiss Federal Institute of Technology (ETH), Zurich. From 1996-2000, Vice-President of the Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft. His main fields of expertise include experimental quantum optics and atomic physics: in 1987 he was awarded the Physik-Preis, German Physical Society; in 1992, the Gottfried-Wilhelm-Leibniz-Preis and in 1996 the Max-Born Prize and Medal.

MR DOMINIQUE MOISI is the Deputy Director of IFRI (Institut Français des Relations Internationales). He is a regular columnist for the Financial Times and Ouest France, and his articles are reprinted in major newspapers throughout Europe. Mr. Moisi’s latest book, Les Cartes de la France à l’heure de mondialisation, is a dialogue with Hubert Vedrine, the French Foreign Minister (Fayard, 2000). This book is translated in American by Philip H. Gordon under the title “France in an Age of Globalization” (Spring 2001). He also co-wrote a book Le nouveau continent with Jacques Rupnik (1991). Mr. Moisi was trained as a political scientist at the Institut d’Études Politique in Paris, where he obtained his doctorate, and at Harvard University, where he was a Sachs Scholar.

JAVIER MONTERO is Associate Professor in the Department of Statistics and Operational Research at the Faculty of Mathematics, Complutense University of Madrid, Spain. He holds a Ph.D. in Mathematics from Complutense University since 1982. He is author of more than 30 research papers in refereed journals and more than 30 papers as book chapters. Since 1995 he is Vicedean for Research and International Relations at the Faculty of Mathematics, Complutense University of Madrid, and since then he has been the local Socrates coordinator for Mathematics. During this period of time he has been in charge of the ERASMUS office at the Faculty of Mathematics, Complutense University of Madrid.

LORD CLAUS MOSER KCB, CBE, FBA was born in Berlin in 1922 and came to England in 1936. He took his degree at the London School of Economics in 1943 and returned there after demobilisation to teach statistics, remaining as a full-time academic from 1957-67; from 1961-70 he was Professor of Social Statistics. He served three Prime Ministers as Head of the Government Statistical Service until 1978, and then joined N M Rothschild & Sons as Vice Chairman. He was Warden of Wadham College, Oxford from 1984-93 and is Pro Vice Chancellor of The Open University of Israel and a former Chancellor of Keele University. He joined the Board of Directors of the Royal Opera House in 1964 and served as Chairman of the Board from 1974-1987. Lord Moser is Chairman of the British Museum Development Trust and speaks in the House of Lords on the arts and education matters.

PROFESSOR CHRISTA MÜLLER is Vice-Rector for Planning and Financial Affairs at the University of Bonn, having gained her PhD in pharmaceutical chemistry in 1988 at the University of Tübingen. After a spell at the NIH (USA) as a postdoctoral fellow she was appointed Associate Professor at Würzburg University in 1984, and full Professor at Bonn University in 1998.

MR BEN OKRI is a Nigerian writer resident in London. He has been the recipient of many awards, including the Booker Prize, for The Famished Road (1991), and the Paris Review Aga Khan prize for fiction. He is visiting writer-in-residence at Trinity College, Cambridge. His influences were African, classical, and European myths, and his father's library of the western classics. Noting many strong
similarities between these diverse cultural traditions, Okri developed a worldview that combines African and European traditions. His reading also inspired him to begin writing while he was still in secondary school. Later he failed to get a place at a Nigerian university, so he took a job at a paint store and started publishing his writing in Nigerian women's journals and evening papers. At the age of eighteen, he had completed his first novel, Flowers and Shadows, and moved to England, where he attended the University of Essex.

**MR JOHN O' LEARY** is the editor of The Times Higher Education Supplement, a post he took up in June 2002. Previously, he spent eight years as the Education Editor of The Times, having joined the paper in 1990 as Higher Education Correspondent. A graduate of Sheffield University, he began his career on the Evening Chronicle, in Newcastle upon Tyne, and worked on the THES throughout the 1980s, latterly as deputy editor. He also edits The Times Good University Guide.

**HON. MARCELLO PERA**, President of the Italian Senate, was elected to the Senate in 1996, and re-elected in the 2001 General Election on the Casa delle libertà list before being elected President on 30 May. His academic interests are in Physics, Epistemology, and Philosophical, Historical and Social Perspectives on Science. He has also served as Professor of Theoretic Philosophy, University of Catania, 1989-92, and Professor Philosophy of Science, University of Pisa, 1992.

**DR WIM VAN PETEGEM** is part-time senior researcher at the Institute for Innovative Learning at the Catholic University of Leuven and part-time lecturer at the Katholieke Hogeschool Leuven, Department of Economics. After gaining a doctorate at Leuven, he went on to conduct post-doctoral research at the University of Alberta, Edmonton, Canada, after which he returned to Leuven as a post-doctoral Fellow in the Division of Biomechanics and Engineering Design, working in the field of rehabilitation engineering. From late 1996-1998, he was Senior Researcher at the University of Leuven, involved in research on the introduction of ICT in education. From September 1998, he was Assistant Professor at the Science and Technology Department at the Open University of the Netherlands, involved in research on web-based learning and in education on ICT and management, returning to Leuven in 2000.

**MR MARKUS PINS** received his Masters Degree in Political Theory from the London School of Economics and Political Science, worked for the German President of Parliament and is now Key Account Manager with guideguide AG, Rolandsenk-London. He is responsible for partnerships with public-sector institutions.

**AVI PRIMOR** is Vice President of the Tel-Aviv University, and Chairman of the Israel-European Forum Tel-Aviv University. He is also Member of the Executive Board of the German Foundation for the compensation of forced laborers in World War II; President of the Israeli German Chamber of Industry and Commerce; Chairman of the Supervisory Board of the 'Koteret' School of Journalism, Tel Aviv; and an adviser to the Peres Center for Peace and Ambassador to the Federal Republic of Germany. He studied at Hebrew University of Jerusalem, City College, New-York and the D.E.A. Sorbonne, Paris. He had a distinguished career in the diplomatic service since 1963 serving as Ambassador, as Minister-Counselor in Paris and as Director of the Department of International Organizations (UN), Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Director of the Africa Department, Ambassador to the European Union, Brussels, plus Belgium and Luxembourg. Among his publications are "...mit Ausnahme Deutschlands". Berlin, Ullstein Verlag, (1977), Europa, Israel und der Nahe Osten, (1998), and Le Triangle des Passions, (2000).

**MARY ROBINSON** is the Executive Director of the Ethical Globalisation Initiative. She served as United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights from 1997 to 2002 and as President of Ireland from 1990-1997. Before her election as President in 1990, Mrs. Robinson served as Senator, holding that office for 20 years. In 1969 she became the youngest Reid Professor of Constitutional Law at Trinity College, Dublin. She was called to the bar in 1967, becoming a Senior Counsel in 1980, and a member of the English Bar (Middle Temple) in 1973. Educated at Trinity College, Mrs. Robinson also holds law degrees from the King's Inns in Dublin and from Harvard University.

**DR MAURITS VAN ROOIJEN FRSA**, a specialist in the origins of 'green town planning', was appointed in 1999 vice-president (international) of Leiden University and director of Leiden University Worldwide Programmes, which incorporates the Leiden University School of Management. LUWP offers mainly postgraduate programmes, e.g. the Leiden-Oxford Leadership Programme supported by the Europeum (www.leiden.edu). He combines his Leiden position with an appointment as vice-president for international strategy and development at the University of Westminster, London.

**PROFESSOR LENKA ROVNÁ** holds the Jean Monnet Chair and is Vice Dean of the Department of West European Studies, Faculty of Social Sciences, Charles University, Prague. She was the President of the Czech European Community Studies Association 1991-95.
MS MARIE-BÉATRICE RUGGERI holds the has been Head of the Training and Regional Deployment Service for the Department of Education in MEDEF (Mouvement des Entreprises de France) since 1995. She is responsible for a team of 22 regional coordinators implementing local training policy. She has built up various observatories and competency-based business organisations. Prior to her post with MEDEF, she held both Presidency and Vice-Presidency of IPCO in France (Instance Paritaire de Coordination des Organismes paritaires collecteurs agréés régionaux), was Head of Development for the Department of Education of the Chamber of Commerce and Industry in Paris, and was Head of a specialist business school.

DR YONI RYAN is Associate Professor in Higher Education and Deputy Director of the Centre for Learning and Teaching Support at Monash University, Melbourne, Australia. She was operational manager and lead author for the major Australian government commissioned report, The Business of Borderless Education in 2001. Her current research interests include open, flexible and distance education issues, staff development, higher and further education policy, and technology and learning in developing countries.

CLAIRE SANDERS has worked for Times Higher Education Supplement for the last ten years and was news editor until 1999. She now writes analyses and covers a number of subjects including health education. She previously worked for New Society and the New Statesman as well as the BBC. Her degree was in history at King’s College, Cambridge.

MR MARC SCHATTENMANN studied Political Science, Constitutional Law, Philosophy and Political Economy at the Ludwig-Maximilians-University Munich and the Institut d’Études Politiques de Paris. From 1999 to 2000, he was a Visiting and Teaching Fellow at the Philosophy Department of Harvard University. Since October 2000, he has worked for the Professional School Project at the University of Erfurt.

DR REIMUND SCHEUERMANN has worked as a researcher in Economic and Administrative Law at Munster University and was a representative on the university’s governing council. Since 1971, he has held several positions at the Federal Ministry of Education and Research, including responsibility for distance learning, and is now Head of the Directorate on Higher Education.

PROFESSOR GÜNTER SCHÖDL is Professor of Central and East European History at Humboldt University, Berlin. He received his PhD in 1974, and worked at the universities of Erlangen-Nürnberg and Munich. He also carried out various research projects in Austria, Hungary and the former Yugoslavia. His main areas of research are Nationalism, Transformation Studies, and the History of Science.

PROFESSOR JÜRGEN SCHREIWER is Professor of Comparative Education and Head of the Comparative Education Centre of Humboldt University, Berlin. He served as Dean of Humboldt University’s School of Education and, from 1992 to 1996, as President of the Comparative Education Society in Europe. A former Visiting Professor at René Descartes Paris V University (in 1986 and 1995), as well as Waseda University, Tokyo (in 1993 and 2000), he was awarded the German-Japanese Research Award by the Japanese Society for the Promotion of Science, in 1999, and the Swedish Research Award from the Bank of Sweden Tercentenary Foundation in 2001.

GERD SCHULTE-HILLEN, born in 1940, is Chairman of the Supervisory Boards of both Gruner + Jahr AG and Bertelsmann AG and Vice-Chairman of both the Executive Board and the Board of Trustees of the Bertelsmann Foundation since 1 November 2000. Following an engineering degree and subsequent business management studies in Aachen, Germany, Gerd Schulte-Hillen joined Bertelsmann in 1969. In 1973, after several years working for Bertelsmann in Spain and Portugal, he was handed the reins of the Gruner + Jahr printing works in Itzehoe, Hamburg, which he managed until taking over as Chief Executive of Gruner + Jahr in 1981. Under his leadership Gruner + Jahr became Europe’s # 1 in magazine publishing and printing. In 1985 Schulte-Hillen was also appointed to the Managing Board of Bertelsmann AG, from 1987 to 2000 as its Vice-Chairman.

PROFESSOR SIR PETER SCOTT is the Vice-Chancellor of Kingston University in London, previously Vice-Chancellor for External Affairs at the University of Leeds. He has also held positions as a Professor of Education, Director of the Centre for Policy Studies in Education, and Editor of the Times Higher Education Supplement for sixteen years. His research interests include governance and management of universities and colleges, non-standard access to higher education and the links between further and higher education.
DR KOMLAVI FRANCISCO SEDDOH is the Director of UNESCO’s Division of Higher Education. He began his involvement with UNESCO in Dakar as Senior Programme Specialist for Higher Education in Africa in 1995. He has extensive experience of both higher education and policy, having been Minister for Education and Scientific Research in Togo from 1994-1995, and Rector of the University of Benin-Lomé between 1986 and 1995, following his appointment to a Chair in Geology at Benin-Lomé and lectureships in France. He is a member of the UNESCO Executive Board, and Chair of the Council of Rectors’ General Consultative Committee and the Committee of Specialists in Natural Sciences.

PROFESSOR JAN SOKOL is Dean of the Faculty of Humanities, Charles University, Prague. He was previously Minister of Education of the Czech Republic, and prior to that Professor of Philosophy and Philosophical Anthropology, Charles University. He is also Chairman of the Education Committee of the Czech UNESCO, Vice-chairman of the Board of IBE Geneva, Adviser to the Minister of Education, Member of the Scientific Councils at the Faculties of Social Sciences, Pedagogy and at the Center for Theoretical Studies, Charles University, and at the Masaryk University, Brno. He has served as an MP, Vice-Chairman of the Chamber of Nations, in the Federal Assembly of Czechoslovakia, speaker of the Civic Forum caucus, and leader of the Permanent delegation to the Council of Europe.

PROFESSOR GESINE SCHWAN, president of the Europa-Universitat Viadrina Frankfurt (Oder) since 1999, studied Classics, History, Philosophy and Political Science in Berlin, Freiburg and Breisgau, with research stays in Poland, receiving a PhD in Philosophy in 1970. She was Assistant Professor at the Department of Political Science, Freie Universität Berlin, from 1971, Full Professor from 1977 and Dean of the department from 1993-95. President of the German Society of Political Scientists from 1985-87, she also serves on the Commission for Fundamental Values of the SPD.

MS AURIOL STEVENS, Editor of the Times Higher Education Supplement, read Modern History at Somerville College, Oxford, and holds a diploma in Social Policy and Administration from the University of London. She was formerly the Director of the Universities Information Unit, Committee of Vice-Chancellors and Principals (UK). In addition, she has served in a wide range of voluntary posts, including membership of the Council for the Royal College of Art, and the Policy Studies Institute, and is a Member of the Executive Committee of Forum UK.

PROFESSOR JOSEF STINGL, M.D., PH.D. is Pro-Rector for International Relations at Charles University, Prague. He studied in the Medical faculty at Charles University. He was appointed lecturer at the Anatomical Institute of the Charles University Medical Faculty, first in Píseň, and then in Prague, becoming a Rector and then a Pro-Rector in 1993. His research interests are normal and clinical anatomy of the vascular and motor system, morphology of the micro-circulatory system. He has been honoured by the Ministry of Health and The Czechoslovak Anatomical Society for Research. He has made many overseas teaching visits and is a Member of The Czech Anatomical Society and European Association for Clinical Anatomy. He has been Pro-Dean of the Medical Faculty and Member of the Research Board.

MR R. SUDARSHAN is presently Advisor-Justice at the recently established UNDP Oslo Governance Centre. He has been working in the UNDP since 1991, and was Senior Economist and Head of the Public Policy Division, and the Human Development Resource Centre in UNDP-India, and was Governance Advisor, UNDP-Indonesia from for over two years before moving to Oslo. Previously, he worked with the Ford Foundation's South Asia Office in New Delhi, and was responsible for developing programmes in human rights, social justice, governance, and promotion of private philanthropy. Sudarshan was trained in economics at the Delhi School of Economics, and has a Master's degree in Politics from Oxford University, where he was a Rhodes Scholar. He held a research fellowship at St.John's College, Cambridge, from 1977 until 1983, where he worked on constitutional law and judicial review of economic legislation.

DR CAJA THIMM, born 1958. Studies at the universities of Heidelberg (PhD), Munich, San Francisco States and Berkeley (USA). Various teaching positions in Heidelberg, Darmstadt and Saarbrücken. Since 2001 professor at the university of Bonn and director of the Center of Communication and Media Studies. Publications e.g. in the fields of language and media communication, intergenerational communication, electronic democracy, offline and online corporate and business communications.

DR E.H. UWE THOMAS is presently State Secretary at the German Federal Ministry for Education and Research. He holds a diploma in Physics. From 1971-1972 he was a representative of the Chancellery in the interministerial working group for the reform of public administration. From 1973 to 1988 he was Deputy Director General at the Federal Ministry for Research and Technology. Then he became State Secretary and later Minister of Economics, Technology and Transport in the Government of Land Schleswig-Holstein until 1993. From 1997 to 1998 he was Managing Director of the
Christopher Tremewan is Pro Vice-Chancellor (International) of the University of Auckland and a professor of Southeast Asian politics. He was formerly the foundation director of the New Zealand Asia Institute. He has degrees in Social Anthropology, Political Science and Public Administration from the universities of Auckland, Canterbury and Harvard respectively. His research interests include social regulation in Singapore, Asian values and human rights, internationalisation and diversity, national growth strategies and the politicisation of ethnicity. He was elected Senior Associate Member of St Antony’s College, Oxford, in 1991-92 where he wrote and lectured. His most recent book is The Political Economy of Social Control in Singapore (reprinted 1996). He played a leading role in a national process to review New Zealand’s economic growth strategies and its social equity (see www.knowledgewave.org.nz) He has held senior positions in international organisations based in Tokyo, Singapore and Hong Kong.

Professor Peter Tschopp is Director of Geneva’s Graduate Institute of International Studies, having been appointed in 1998. After receiving his MA and PhD in Economics from the University of Geneva, he spent a year at Yale University as a post-doctoral Fellow. He has been Professor of Political Economy at the University of Geneva for almost twenty years, where he also held the positions of Deputy Rector, Director of the Political Economy Department, and Dean of the Faculty of Economic and Social Sciences. He was Member of the National Council (Swiss Parliament) from 1991 until 1999. He is also President of the Vivamos Mejor Foundation, dealing with about twenty development projects in Central America.

Alexander von Ungern-Sternberg runs an investment banking boutique, Euro-IB Ltd. based in London, which specializes in cross-boarder transactions involving the UK and Germany. He is also the Finance Director of GuideGuide AG, based near Bonn, which supplies e-publishing and e-learning software in Germany. Alex spent most of his career in banking, as Group Treasurer of Deutsche Bank, Frankfurt, Board Member of Investment Banking in Rabobank International, Utrecht and Barclays Bank, London, as Deputy Chief Executive, Markets Division. He studied Modern History and Economics at St John’s College, Oxford, and qualified as a UK chartered accountant with Price Waterhouse.

Dr Robert Vanderplank worked for the British Council in Morocco before completing his doctorate at Edinburgh University. He has taught at the University of Helsinki, the University of Newcastle-upon-Tyne, and Heriot-Watt University, where he also coordinated some thirty Erasmus/Socrates exchanges between the School of Languages and European institutions. He has been Director of the Language Centre at Oxford since 1996, where he is also a Fellow of Kellogg College. His main research interests are second language maintenance, learner autonomy, and educational technology and language learning. He has written extensively on the value and uses of television in foreign language learning. He is a founder member of the Modern Languages Systematic Review Group.

Mr Daniel Vitry is presently the Minister-Delegate for international relations in France. Before 1997, he was Vice Chancellor of the Universities of Paris. He is the director of the Centre National des Œuvres Universitaires et Scolaires.

Dr Christina von Fürstenberg is an epistemologist and also holds degrees in agronomy and managerial sciences. She taught for 10 years at the French universities of Angers, Nanterre, Assas, and at the École d'Architecture de Paris, La Défense. She implemented development projects in Southern Chile for 3 years, joined the UNESCO task force for the Rio Earth Summit in 1991 and became a staff member in the Sector for Social and Human Sciences in September 1992. She worked on the development of the interdisciplinary UNITWIN/ UNESCO. She chairs a programme of social sciences and sustainable development. At present, she is responsible for the Section Policies and International Cooperation in the Social Sciences.

Brigitte Wagner-Halswick is the Honorary Irish Consul in Germany with jurisdiction for North Rhine-Westfalia, Rheinland-Pfalz and Saarland. She joined the pharmaceutical industry in the late 1960's, becoming Export Manager of ROWA Pharmaceuticals Ltd, Ireland, and in 1979, owner and managing director, currently with 100 staff, increasing turnover ten fold. In 1994, she set up ROWEX Ltd in Ireland, a healthcare products company. In 1999, she was elected Chairperson of The Ireland Fund of Germany, to support peace, culture, education and community development. She was accorded a civic reception in Bantry, Co Cork, in recognition of her outstanding contribution to the area.

Dr Daniel Warner, Deputy Director, The Graduate Institute of International Studies (HEI) Geneva. He studied at Amherst College, USA, and the HEI. He has lectured and published extensively on ethics,
refugees, US foreign policy, international law and international relations theory. Author, editor or co-editor of numerous books and articles. His work has been translated into French, German, Russian, Arabic and Persian. He has lectured at Oxford, Cambridge, Harvard, Yale, Moscow State University, Tokyo, Fudan (Shanghai), and Paris among other universities. Dr Warner is a frequent broadcaster and his editorials have appeared in the International Herald Tribune and the Financial Times. He was honoured for his book An Ethic of Responsibility in International Relations. He has served as an advisor to the ILO, UNHCR and NATO and the Swiss government. He established the Program for the Study of International Organization(s) (PSIO) at the HEI.

LORD (GEORGE) WEIDENFELD was Vice-Chairman of the University of Oxford Campaign from 1992-94, and since 1994 has been Vice-President of the Oxford University Development Programme, and is especially involved with the Europæum network of postgraduate Institutes of European Affairs. He is Chairman of Weidenfeld and Nicolson Publishers and Chairman of the Board of Governors, Ben Gurion University of the Negev, and lately president of the Weidenfeld Institute of Strategic Dialogue which incorporates the Club of Three, and various other international dialogue programmes.

DR STEPHANIE WILDE completed her doctorate in the field of Comparative Education at the Department of Educational Studies, Oxford University. She is currently undertaking a post-doctoral research study into citizenship and intercultural education in secondary schools in Germany, funded by the Humboldt Foundation.

MS KAREN WYLIE currently works as a research assistant for the Observatory on Borderless Higher Education, which is a new initiatives of the Association of Commonwealth Universities and Universities UK. The aim of the Observatory is to track international developments in e-learning and other forms of transnational provision, as well as monitor new providers of higher education. She has a background in Secondary Education and was employed by the International Programs Office at the University of Alberta in Edmonton, Canada, prior to joining the Observatory.

MR RICHARD YELLAND has been Head of the Programme on Institutional Management in Higher Education (IMHE) of the OECD (Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development) since April 1998. From January 1997 to March 1998 Richard was seconded to the University of Adelaide. He joined OECD in 1986 from the then Department of Education and Science in the United Kingdom where he held a range of posts in educational policy and administration. At OECD he has been Head of the Programme of Educational Building since 1989 and combines this responsibility with that for IMHE. He is a member of the Advisory Board of the UNESCO Centre for European Higher Education (CEPES).
Appendix 3: The Europaeum

As the pace of European integration accelerates, decision-makers, opinion-formers, politicians and citizens in European countries increasingly need to ‘think European’, to transcend national perspectives and empathise with a European perspective on national and international cultures.

To meet that challenge, 10 leading European university institutions have jointly set up an association designed to serve as an 'international university without walls', in which future scholars and leaders of our new Europe will have an opportunity to share common learning and confront common concerns together, from a formative age and throughout their active lives.

The Europaeum exists to foster collaborative research and teaching, to provide opportunities for scholars, leaders, academics and graduates, to stage conferences, summer schools and colloquia, and to enable leading figures from the worlds of business, politics and culture to take part in transnational and interdisciplinary dialogue with the world of scholarship. Recent themed programmes have been on The Future of European Universities; A Transatlantic Dialogue; Culture, Humanities and New Technology; and Islam-in-Europe.

The association operates flexibly, responsibly and simply – with a minimum of bureaucracy and complexity. Small internal grants promote the mission of the association. All events aim to include professors from three or more partner institutions, while remaining open and ready to work alongside any other bodies or experts. The Europaeum now encompasses all those in Social Sciences and the Humanities, and more recently, experts in Science History and Science Policy.

Longer-term aims encompass jointly-offered teaching programmes, developing capacity for policy-related work, an internet-based knowledge centre promoting international academic collaboration, and new linked scholarship and visiting professorship schemes.

Above all the Europaeum aims to add to the sum knowledge about – and for – the new Europe, to help prepare the future citizens and leaders of – and for – Europe, ensure that all partner universities are fully engaged in both explaining and making Europe's future, and to leave all those involved in the Europaeum with an enlarged 'sense of Europe'.

The members of the Europaeum are:

- The University of Oxford;
- Universiteit Leiden;
- Università di Bologna;
- Rheinische Friedrich-Wilhelms-Universität, Bonn;
- The Graduate Institute of International and Development Studies, Geneva;
- Université de Paris I Panthéon-Sorbonne;
- Univerzita Karlova V Praze;
- Universidad Complutense, Madrid;
- Helsingin Yliopisto, Helsinki;
- and Uniwersytet Jagiellonski, Krakow.

Representatives from all these universities took part in the Inquiry.
Appendix 4: Daimler Services AG

The Europaeum’s *Future of European Universities* Project was generously supported by the former DaimlerChrysler AG Financial Services, led by Dr Klaus Mangold, a firm which provided Daimler and Chrysler dealers and customers with tailor-made leasing and financing solutions. In autumn 2007, the company began operating under its new name, Daimler Financial Services AG.

In this, the company was following its parent company, which was renamed Daimler AG following a negotiated the split between the Daimler and Chrysler conglomerates in May 2007, after almost 10 years of partnership, when Chrysler was acquired by Cerberus Capital Management in the US.

Daimler Financial Services provides tailor-made leasing and financing solutions to promote the vehicle sales of the Daimler Group’s brands worldwide. With a comprehensive product portfolio including financing, leasing, insurance concepts and fleet-management services, Daimler Financial Services managed a contract volume of €59.1 billion in 2007.

Operating in more than 40 countries, the company remains perhaps the most international captive and the world’s largest commercial vehicle financial services provider. The firm is also one of the world’s leading international multi-brand fleet management companies. More than a third of new Daimler vehicles worldwide are financed and leased by the firm. Working in close cooperation with the vehicle brands, the company aims to strengthen customer loyalty and supports the sale of trucks, vans and buses from the Daimler Group — the world’s market leader for commercial vehicles.

All in all, the company’s portfolio is composed of about 2.2 million leased and financed vehicles, using traditional financing and leasing, but also comprehensive service contracts — including insurance, maintenance and repair packages — for all passenger car and truck models from Daimler.

Every fourth truck, van and bus manufactured by Daimler has been put on the road with the help of financing products from Daimler Financial Services.
Appendix 5: Hosting Universities

Humboldt-Universität zu Berlin: December 2001, Borderless Education: Bridging Europe

Humboldt-Universität zu Berlin is Berlin's oldest university, founded in 1810 by the liberal Prussian educational reformer and linguist Wilhelm von Humboldt, whose university model has strongly influenced other European and Western universities. From 1828 it was known as the Frederick William University (Friedrich-Wilhelms-Universität), later also as the Universität unter den Linden. In 1949, it changed its name to Humboldt-Universität in honour of its founder.

The university has been home to many of Germany's greatest thinkers of the past two centuries, among them the subjective idealist philosopher Johann Gottlieb Fichte, the theologian Friedrich Schleiermacher, the absolute idealist philosopher G.W.F. Hegel, the Romantic legal theorist Savigny, the pessimist philosopher Arthur Schopenhauer, the objective idealist philosopher Friedrich Schelling, and famous physicists Albert Einstein and Max Planck. Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels attended the university, as did poet Heinrich Heine, Otto von Bismarck, Communist Party of Germany founder Karl Liebknecht, African American pan africanist W. E. B. Du Bois and European unifier Robert Schuman, as well as the influential surgeon Johann Friedrich Dieffenbach in the early half of the 1800s. The university is home to 29 Nobel Prize winners.


University of Paris I Panthéon-Sorbonne is one of the 13 universities in Paris. It incorporates forty thousand students in 14 teaching and research departments (Unités de Formation et de Recherche) and 5 Institutes, which offer top-level degree courses in law, political science, economics, management and the humanities.

Paris I is at the centre of a rich network of international relations stretching across the five continents and continues to play a major role in the training of researchers, academics, judges, lawyers, managers and French civil servants.

At the crossroads of tradition and modernity, Paris I is at the forefront of research and teaching in the fields of European studies, international relations, management and communications. It aims to be a major pole of research and learning in Europe in the 21st century.

Friedrich-Wilhelms-Universität Bonn: June 2003, New Partnerships: Opportunities And Risks

Rheinische Friedrich-Wilhelms-Universität Bonn was founded in 1818 by Kaiser Friedrich Wilhelm III, although it was preceded by an Academy established in 1777. It is a public research university and is nowadays one of the largest universities in Germany.

The University of Bonn offers a large number of undergraduate and graduate programs in a range of subjects. Its library holds more than two million volumes. The University has more than 500 professors and 27,000 students. Among its notable alumni and faculty are six Nobel Laureates, one Fields Medalists, Pope Benedict XVI, Karl Marx, Friedrich Nietzsche, and Joseph Schumpeter.
Appendix 6: Demonstrations and Reports

I. The Observatory on
Higher Education

Karen Wiley
Research Assistant, Association of Commonwealth Universities

The Observatory on Higher Education is a joint initiative between the Association of Commonwealth Universities and Universities UK. The Observatory has been set up to track international developments in e-learning and other forms of trans-national education. It arose out of a report sponsored by Universities UK and the Higher Education Funding Council, UK, which concluded that there should be some kind of tracking mechanism to follow developments in the area of e-learning. There is such a large volume of information being churned out that it would be impossible for each institution to keep track of all this information. The Observatory aims to provide a service that analyses all this information, thereby saving universities time.

The aim of the Observatory is to be an efficient central information service. It attempts to gather information and store it collectively in a place that is easily accessible. The primary aim is to save members time and money. Members include senior administrators, managers from universities in the UK or Commonwealth or others interested in obtaining this kind of information. The Observatory wants to be of strategic value, and bring relevant issues to the forefront, so that universities can consider which issues to focus on, how these issues are relevant to their institutions and how then to proceed.

The Observatory hopes to compliment the activities of others. There are other observatories looking at similar issues, but we make sure that we do not duplicate the information. There are Observatories in the USA, but we want to concentrate on the Commonwealth, and not limit ourselves to the UK, as well as take a more global perspective. We also want to recognise the diversity of the membership, because there is such a range of countries within the Commonwealth: the needs of the institutions are going to vary drastically. We want to cater for those considering e-learning strategies or trans-national education for the first time as well as more developed institutions that have already got strategic plans in place and just need more information.

Our major outputs are going to be monthly reports of 12-15 pages that address one particular issue of interest with regard to e-learning or borderless higher education. These are going to be commissioned from international experts, outside of the Observatory. They will be in-depth, accessible and concise.

The first issue is going to be a general introduction into 'Market Forces in Higher Education'. Our second issue is going to be 'Early Indications of Success and Failure in International E-learning Initiatives in Higher Education.' Other topics might also be quality, teaching and learning, widening access, partnerships, funding and management issues.

In addition to our in-depth monthly reports, we are also going to have monthly briefings. These are to be shorter reports and are to be produced in-house. They are meant to be read in entirety on receipt and will be sent via email. We are going to examine a variety of issues but on a smaller scale than the in-depth 12-15-page reports. First, we are going to look at wireless technologies. Other topics might be institutional profiles, such as Thomson learning, or management issues, such as change management. We can also do national profiles of other countries to examine what they are doing, in terms of e-learning and borderless education. We might also look at technology and blended learning, as well as issues of pedagogy.

Another product of the Observatory is a database, which will include information from a variety of sources. It might include information from general presses as well as specialist ones. It will have academic articles, books, policy reports, evaluations and statistics - all information that is relevant to borderless higher education. Topics which may be included in the database are: markets, finance, quality regulation, pedagogy, technology, management and access. We hope to have a variety of information and we want this database to be searchable on-line by anyone who subscribes to the Observatory. Basically we subscribe so you don’t have to.

We also want to provide consultancy services. We might look at market studies. We can answer questions such as: Are your key local, national and international markets demanding greater online provision? Where are there places for you to move into the market? We might do institutional audits: How is your institution doing in terms of borderless education? What technology does your institution use and what is the value of those technologies? We might do user surveys as well: Are students satisfied with available online resources? What are they demanding, and what could you provide that could satisfy the students? Finally, we could conduct evaluations of impact of the new technology on teaching and learning.

These are the services we plan to provide within the next year. But we hope to provide other
services in future as well, and as the Observatory develops we hope to pursue these future avenues. We would like to do benchmarking so institutions can determine how well they are doing compared to other institutions globally. We would also like to be able to do market research looking at perceptions of online learning versus face to face learning in different countries and see how different institutions and countries are regarded.

The Observatory will be funded by charging subscriptions. At the outset we are going to be a free service. The Observatory has not been officially launched yet, but it will be in January 2002. For the first 6 months it will be free to anyone who wishes to access our site, but after that it will be via subscription as we want to be self-funding in the longer term. The core products we mentioned will be free until the end of July 2002. We want to keep the subscription as low as possible, taking into account the diversity of our membership, and differing income levels. We intend to have tiered subscription rates, so that countries less able to come up with the subscription will not be excluded.

II. Distance Learning Programmes

Firoz Kaderali
Professor of Electrical Engineering, Fern University, Hagen

Hagen University is 25 years old. In Germany it is an integral part of the regular public higher education system, a small university of 80 Professors, 420 academic staff, 1,700 courses, and 58,000 students. Our students are older than normal students. 80% are in employment. 40% already have an academic degree. We use the new media as tools for teaching and have different ways of using these, e.g. supervision assistance, "coaching" (i.e. tutoring), social contacts supported via the network and so on.

Basically there are three things you can do with new media if you have an integral approach. Firstly you need some highly developed type of administration, which we call the electronic platform. Ours has been available as open-source software since April. The English version became available in February 2002. Secondly, major content. Thirdly, tutoring communication, which is very diverse in nature and very relevant for the future.

To the platforms. Currently we have two, one at the Computer Science Department and one in the Electrical and Information department. These are research projects from which we started teaching in actual practice some five years ago. We have an assignment system, which supports at present approximately 3,000 students. On the whole 18,000 students use it in Hagen University. We are now looking developing the secondary generation platform for 2003, basically developing our own platform. One of the platforms being offered is the online platform in the campus source initiative, which is open-source, a flexible e-learning platform, available free of charge. As with other open-source software, any developments to the software remain the property of the community.

At present, we have 8,700 lectures, of which 215 are now online, taken by 18,500 students. We have demo versions in different faculties, we have different kinds of online teaching exercises and practicals, in which 2,600 students participated last year. We have 10 online practicals for electrical engineering and computer science via the network. We have some Internet-based seminars, field systems which students can work from outside via the Internet. We have corporate teamwork courses, and an environment for subject-related communication and counselling. We also have preparations for examination and study centres where students can go so they cannot cheat. We have four new degree programmes: Bachelor of Science in Computer Science, Bachelor of Science in Information and Communication Technology, Bachelor of Science in Mathematics, and Bachelor of Science in Mathematics and Metallurgy, which are all going to be offered online.

III. The Europaeum Knowledge Centre

Terence Johnson and Paul Flather
The Europaeum

The future of education and expansion of knowledge: as we know more, it becomes increasingly difficult to find a large number of people in the same place who know the same field very well. We have an increasing requirement of mobility, to be in contact with academics/researchers who are in the same field, because we are able to specialise. Also, we can use the Internet in place of some face-to-face meetings, and when we do have to fly, we can use it to make more use of the time we are together.

The idea of lifelong sharing, with people in lifelong learning also helping with further development of courses.

Another concern is the difficulties of new media, as they tend to limit control over who has access to information, and the difficulty in controlling versions of information. Now that the Internet is 10 years old, some information is also 10 years old. This is why we want to build the Europaeum Knowledge Centre, as a structured community where people can have their own research groups, tutor groups, form informal groups within the community. Rather than deciding structure and course content, we want to
build a platform which people can use in a variety of ways. To add to the data, I think it is very important for both the students and academics to be able to make their own annotations to documents online and make annotations to show the author of the document, suggestions, perhaps translation of difficult terms, and commentary on the document.

With our platform we hope to provide a common gateway, which brings together a lot of academic information across the universities because we have a huge quantity of information already, spread between a lot of different systems. For example, there are four different systems for online presentations of journals, and it would be nice to search them all at once and at the same time make sure the network is secure. We would also have to make sure that there is always a back up of information and make sure those things that are important to us do not disappear, even if we do.

There are different ways we want people to be able to contribute: publishing their own documents, as well as annotating and commenting on other people's documents. Creating hyper links, which have a meaning, so that you can look at a document and see there are links to it which takes you to the common tree (e.g. abstracts, mathematical proof and disproof) makes it a much richer source of information. To do this we formed a partnership with Hyperwave, a company which came out of the Technical University Grants, the service platform they invented was originally built in 1989 and has been commercially developed for 10 years. We are bringing this back from the growing industry of “knowledge management” in the commercial world, to apply some of the things which can be learnt back in the academic community where they belong. Because Hyperwave is a company that comes from academic roots, they are very favourable to the continuing use of the software for academic purposes; and it is eminently suitable for that. The basis is for it to have a database, so that all XML and HTML data is broken down and stored in a way that is very searchable and we can customise the way the system serves it back up to individual people's needs. We can create personalised portals for everybody to have their own page, for research group, university and personal things. Within this there is again a platform for online learning.

Looking forward to the future we would like very much to give access to people online from anywhere. We are getting to the point where personal digital assistants and mobile phones will become good enough to allow you to access your reading list whilst going to the library, and to spend more time on research and less time searching for the information.

IV. Knowledge Tools for Law

Stefan Breidenbach
European University Viadrina Frankfurt/Oder

I am talking about Knowledge Tools in Law, which is a method for the visual representation of law, and it takes more than 10 minutes to really explain it, but let me try:

As a lawyer and law professor, working in Europe is a challenge because we don’t have only national law. We expect from our future colleagues that they are able to navigate in other jurisdictions and they know something about other national laws. We expect that they have knowledge of the nightmarish complexity that European Law is adding to this problem. My question is: do you really think that traditional legal education can transfer all this knowledge in the same time we used to teach our national system some 10-20 years ago? E-learning can theoretically putting the learner in the centre, allowing them to design their personal qualification independently, and making documents quickly available and so on: is that really the solution?

My second point is: do you personally believe that the transfer of knowledge is possible by looking at a 17” screen? Have you ever seen educational TV and been bored by it? Do you really want to read tons of material on a screen and not on paper? The advantages seem to be that you can combine several windows on the screen, combining video, text and audio. But if you have only two applications open on your computer screen, experiments show that the attention left for one window is only a quarter of the attention available. Just because multi-media delivery is available, is it necessarily a cure for our disease?

To keep up with law, we have to transfer huge quantities of increasingly complex knowledge, and this knowledge is changing every day. It is necessary to assess the quality of e-learning and I believe we should assess e-learning. But in view of the challenges I just mentioned, perhaps we should also assess the quality of classroom learning.

We believe in our hearts that a teacher is precious and necessary, because there is not just knowledge to be transferred, but it has to be accompanied by skills that cannot be developed without a teacher's presence. If MIT is giving all the materials free on the Internet, is that really a move to prevent other people from producing learning material? I don't think so. Rather, they trust in the quality of their teaching in their classroom.

We have developed a method to transfer legal knowledge four times faster than using normal classroom or books. We use a visual grammar which represents complex regulations in kind of a cognitive map, showing how lawyers think when
they answer a legal question. This visual map, that we have refined with our students, is pure knowledge: not reflection, not argumentation.

Simply because our eyes are so good at taking in complex information, these tools go far beyond the usual teaching experience. Several governments in Europe have used these tools to disseminate new law developments.

We have developed two projects: a European Law School and a European School of Governors.

V. An Approach to Linking Universities

Alexander von Ungern-Sternberg
Managing Director, GuideGuide AG Ltd

I shall focus on the principles of e-learning and, more importantly, the principles of e-publishing, which is an easier phase to introduce and will bring more visible, immediate benefits for a larger community. It is such a huge project that one risks being drowned by its size; some projects work better if you start with small steps and build it up gradually.

I have therefore identified three key questions:

* What is the purpose and future role of European universities?
* Are there any necessary changes for the universities?
* What concrete measures are needed to retain their world-class reputation?

I will focus principally on the third, although after what we heard yesterday about the financial constraints of starting e-learning, it may be that a project undertaken by the Europeum as a whole could produce more visible benefits than individual efforts, because the whole is clearly greater than the sum of its parts.

One thing both e-learning and e-publishing have in common is that they can make teaching material more widely available, not only to the students within each university, but to students at the other universities within the Europeum or, if we follow Mary Robinson, even to students in completely different parts of the world.

It is undoubtedly true that the Internet has vastly improved communication between staff and students. This is a huge benefit, especially in the so-called mass universities that we have in Germany and other countries. There is also much better access to unstructured information. However, in academic life, as in commercial life, we all have a problem that with this instant access: you get the information very easily and can copy it without really understanding it.

Having nearly limitless information is somehow seductive. However, having a mass of highly unstructured information often means a lot of it is useless. You only find this out after the event, once

The only thing I can say now is the concept combines Internet-based effective knowledge acquisition with a virtual knowledge community using these structures, and the most precious tools we have: excellent teachers in dialogue. We need the new media to transfer this information because the knowledge is changing so quickly. But I must stress that the visual tools are only effective when delivered by good teachers.

you have wasted a lot of time trying to find the right information. That is a real problem, because once you have wasted so much time trying to get at the right information, you often have neither the inclination nor the time to analyse the information you really need.

Instant access can also replace personal contact and discussion. I am aware that the Europeum did not receive universal approval to set up an e-learning course, because people did not want to deprive students of the opportunity to experience another culture and study in another environment. E-learning can de-personalise the learning process and that is not a desirable objective.

So, what the Internet offers, at best, is breadth of knowledge, possibly at the expense of depth. At worst, it offers an uncoordinated information overload.

But there are things you can do about these problems and we need to talk a little bit more about finding solutions. Being online offers great possibilities for academics. It could provide professors with a much greater reach for their lectures. How about putting on the Internet structured reading lists that are updated regularly, advance notice of important lectures and the texts of lectures? What about student chat rooms to create communities of interested students within and between universities?

But the next point is of practical relevance, especially within the context of the Europeum. With so much information and communication happening, how can you maintain the teaching standards and academic profile you have worked hard to achieve? The key to dealing with this reputational issue is transparency. If we have student feedback on Internet courses, it will be a huge motivational force. We have discovered in the modern world that transparency creates a huge pressure to provide reliable information, if only because one does not want to be embarrassed. It is also a very effective management tool for the heads of courses, who can see the response their courses are getting. In this case it helps that the Internet is somewhat anonymous, because people are more willing to say rude things on the Internet than they are face to face.

If universities or disciplines want to make their information more available, they must spend time managing the content, in order to overcome the
problem of the unstructured chaotic information structure we have at the moment, fulfilling Professor Moser's requirement that we should look at improving the teaching quality as a whole: one of the aspects of that is clearly more structured access to information. Of course, usage must be monitored. There are various methods for that, such as keeping track of the number of clicks or time spent online. Even at an automated assembly line there are people sitting at the beginning and end checking everything is going according to plan. This is just as important for the Internet.

Let us now talk very briefly about the software requirements. E-publishing or e-learning software must be a database content management system that enables you to manage and change a huge amount of data on a continuous basis. It is extremely important that it be user-friendly, both for the students who use it and for the lecturers who manage it. The key is to use the medium to create more personal contact, not less. To do this, you need a truly excellent system, as you will never get mass usage if people do not understand and enjoy using your facilities.

Being both sophisticated and user-friendly requires quite a complicated software solution. Therefore, to gain acceptance, it is important that a single national or preferably pan-European standard is created. There is a real case to be made for the Europaeum to look at this or create a committee to define the requirements and create one platform for its members - as leading universities, they may be able to create a de facto European operating platform as others follow their lead. If, and it is a big if, these respective universities then agree to manage the system, it could be done on a rotational basis to share the work. There would need to be an editor for inter-university information in order to keep the information up to date, but the costs could again be shared among the members. Creating such a platform could also help with realising some of the other objectives that Professor Moser and Mary Robinson mentioned, by providing and opportunity to establish a world-class reputation while achieving significant cost savings for each university.

E-learning can work as an addition, not a replacement, to the normal university experience, but only if it is well structured and well managed. This is the challenge and theopportunity for both the Europaeum, and for e-learning and e-publishing as a whole. In particular, the Europaeum can perform a unique role in continuing and creating a sense of community: a more "collegiate atmosphere," which in the more anonymous world of mass universities is a desirable objective.
Appendix 7: Policy Reports – Summary Conclusions

The Europaeum commissioned four policy reports for the Paris Conference. Below, we present executive summaries from the reports. All are available online at www.europaeum.org/fou.

A. Opening up Social Science Data in Europe

Leszek A. Kosinski
International Social Science Council, Paris

In discussing empirical bases for the social sciences in the recently released World Social Science Report, Richard Rockwell argued very convincingly that at the present time:

“...inductive, observation-based social science research... dominates in the universities and research centres of the west and is rising in importance elsewhere” (Rockwell 1999: 157).

This type of research orientation cannot exist without empirical data either derived from existing data sources or obtained in the process of scientific inquiry. Not surprisingly, the recent growth of various data bases, the application of newly developed technologies and, last, but not least, increasing interest in the use (and misuse) of data as reflected in scholarly literature, all point to the importance of data for social science research, both theoretical and applied.

In this paper an attempt will be made to examine the existence and availability of social science data in Europe, and the problems of accessibility to existing data sources and data banks.

Recommendations

There is no doubt that the trend to greater use of massive data will continue and challenges for archivists and users alike will only become more complex. R. T Campbell identified three issues, which in his mind are relevant to the question of more effective use of data (Campbell 2001: 3260):

- The research community should pay more attention to comparability and replicability.
- There is still much to be done to develop efficient and effective electronic documentation and metadata.
- Secondly, access for qualified researchers to data needs to be streamlined. One of the stumbling blocks here is the concern with privacy and the need to prevent disclosure.

- Thirdly, and most importantly, with increasing availability of data sets related to the same question, a better way of using multiple data sets, including relevant macro-data, has to be found.

In other words, the challenges require different approaches as they relate to different types of problems. The first concern is with creation of data sets and methodology of surveys which would contribute to better comparability and replicability over a period of time. The second concern deals with matching different data sets. Both these concerns must be addressed by the scholarly community including survey promoters, researchers and archivists. The third challenge has wider ramifications, involving legal and financial communities and even the public at large. Increasing concern with privacy and intellectual rights as well as potential financial rewards will have to be addressed in a way acceptable to all parties involved.

At the present time, the tendency is to restrict rather than open access to data. There are various reasons behind this trend:

- Fear of losing one’s monopoly over data (not unusual among researchers)
- The fear of disclosure and its legal consequences
- The desire to recover the cost of acquiring, storing and making data available leads to increasing the fees
- The complexity of procedures introduced by data archives which discourage potential users
- The preference for well-established and known researchers which makes life difficult for newcomers.

In order to address these problems a new approach is needed. Researchers have to be encouraged and, indeed rewarded for generating data that can be of wider use and for depositing the data set in the archives. This can be partly achieved by agreeing on widely acceptable rules of the game, perhaps in the form of a code of access as well as code of usage of data. On the other hand, data archives must be interested in making access easier by streamlining procedures, reducing accessibility restrictions and reducing the fees, at least for some users. This in turn will require subsidization from other sources, most likely public.

New theoretical perspectives created need for new data and this can be satisfied by new data generating projects and the ever-increasing computer capabilities. At the same time new databases themselves may stimulate new or modified theoretical perspectives. Research infrastructure of the social sciences will continue
to expand as new developments in data management and analysis will provide new tools and methods for researchers (Miller, 2001: 7834).

Will this lead to a better and more relevant social science? Only time will tell but the research community must be aware that producing more efficient tools should not be seen as a substitute for critical and creative thinking.

B. The Place of Language in Universities

Rosalind Greenstein
Université Paris I (Panthéon-Sorbonne)

Borderless (higher) education is a fine concept but what does it mean, what are its objectives and how should they be achieved? In order to try and answer these questions it is first of all necessary to identify different types of border, the order being of no relevance here. Traditionally, they may be:

- Geographical, i.e. borders that separate countries.
- Spatial, i.e. physical distances between prospective students and places of learning. These borders include geographical ones but also exist within countries.
- Temporal, in the sense that the acquisition of knowledge may be synchronous with its dissemination, as in the presence of students at a lecture or tutorial, or asynchronous, as in the reading of written materials, the use of recorded materials, etc.
- Functional, i.e. the borders that outline the different objectives of university education, from the point of view of the institution, the teaching staff, the students, society. These objectives may be utilitarian, vocational, a question of personal fulfilment, a question of providing an educated population, a way to advance knowledge, a way to train people for the future, a way to respond to market needs, etc. and they often overlap. Financial, i.e. those borders that separate well-endowed universities from those less fortunate, richer students from the less well-off, people who can afford to study from those who cannot.
- Generational, i.e. borders between those who undertake university studies at a more traditional age (today, more or less straight from school, sometimes after a gap year) and those who either go to university for the first time a number of years later or go back to university, having already been there at an earlier stage, i.e. lifelong learners.

- Psychological, i.e. between those who adapt easily to university life and take full advantage of their studies with little or no difficulty and those who find it harder to adapt.
- Linguistic and cultural, the two elements being intimately connected. Though several countries may well share a common language, the United Kingdom and the Republic of Ireland, for example, or Germany and Austria, or France, Belgium and Switzerland, the cultural differences may be such that the notion of border would not be inappropriate. At the same time, cultural similarities exist despite linguistic differences.

Today, however, many of these borders are becoming blurred, notably through the development of Information and Communication Technologies (ICT). This process, which began with the Open University and more traditional distance learning, in different forms, is now accelerating not only in quantitative terms but also in qualitative ones. Students and teachers no longer have to be physically present but can communicate on-line in real time, thus breaking down the notions of spatial and temporal borders, for example. This offers the possibility of increased access, thus broadening the potential student population in terms of number and background, enabling people to study full time at a distance, to work and study part-time, to reconcile university with other commitments. It facilitates initial learning and enables the notion of lifelong learning to become a reality.

But as a corollary, new borders are appearing, in the form of machines and technology which come between the different users. Consequently, students and teachers need to be computer literate; they also have to rely on a solid technological infrastructure and backup when things go wrong. Moreover, much information on the Internet is available mainly or only in English, or at least an international form of English, the new lingua franca of the technological age. Although these changes do increase access to learning and knowledge for many, they may also close the doors to others who have neither the money nor the computing or language skills to use these technologies, thus broadening the economic, digital and linguistic divide and increasing the risk of social exclusion (see section 8.2.2). Similarly, as physical distances are breaking down, thus bringing people closer together, at least virtually, cultural and linguistic distances risk pulling people apart, unless they are prepared and acquire the competences necessary to overcome them.

Turning now to the other side of the question, what are the different objectives of borderless higher education? It would be a truism to say that it is a question of breaking down the various borders, and impossible to break down all those
mentioned above. But what is necessary is to rethink the borders, see how they change our expectations and, conversely, look at how our expectations and needs inform the way we see the borders. Perhaps the one general objective would be to break down the different barriers between individuals and peoples of different countries, languages, cultures or generations, so as to encourage greater understanding and tolerance, to enable people to benefit from each other’s experience and view of the world, thus combating xenophobia and transforming globalisation from something that is endured by most to something that is enriched by all, both individually and collectively. This is a very lofty ideal and goes far beyond the confines of higher education, but although fewer people attend university than do not, university as a seat of learning, as one of the places in society where values are developed, strengthened and passed on, where the boundaries of knowledge are pushed out, has a seminal role to play in the achievement of this ideal.

In more concrete terms, how can the borderless university be achieved? Does it mean taking the university to the student, through greater use of Information and Communication Technologies (ICT), thus reducing or erasing the obstacles of the spatial and temporal borders? This is however a two-way process and can either make university available to those who traditionally do not or cannot attend by taking it into their homes or, on the contrary, send back home those who traditionally study at university. It is, therefore, a double-edged weapon because however good it may be to increase access to university and learning, the attendant risk is to isolate people from each other by forgetting the social and community element of academic exchange, the cut and thrust of face-to-face discussion, the informality of chance meetings and unplanned activities that, by definition, cannot exist when people have to log on at the same time. There are certain things that ICT (and libraries, for that matter) cannot replace, as a German Erasmus student studying law in Paris so aptly pointed out: “I could have read the books back home in Germany, but attending the classes taught by the professors who wrote them and, more importantly, taking part in student discussions during tutorials were irreplaceable and by far the most enriching aspect of the experience”. The question of ICT and language will be discussed in more detail later on in the report.

Does the borderless university mean that just one language should be used? This can be seen in both positive and negative terms. Having one common language, presumably English, could be cost-effective in that it could be taught as a core subject to everyone, and only those who wish to do so would learn other languages. In terms of numbers, too, more people will be able to communicate if they have the same foreign (or in some cases, native) language than if there is an exponential number of combinations. But what about language diversity? What about the relationship between language and culture? What about the fact that using a language as a means of access to information has little or nothing to do with knowledge and understanding of the country and of the people for whom it is their native tongue? What about the fact that one’s view of the world is intimately connected to the language and culture one is brought up in? If only one language is used, is imposed, to what extent will the community created by the borderless university be a world unto its own, cut off from the countries, cultures and languages of origin, as is already the case with what is known familiarly as Eurospeak or Eurobabble, a tongue that only those working in Brussels really understand?

It is clear that several inter-related issues are at stake here. The first is the place of ICT in education, the second the choice between a *lingua franca* and a plurilingual and pluricultural education, i.e. a choice between a form of efficiency and an attempt to preserve language and cultural diversity. The third is the question of physical mobility, i.e. of students actually going to other countries to study. The fourth is what I would call intellectual mobility, i.e. the ability to function in another language with its own way of thinking, which is essential whether the student is physically mobile or in front of a computer screen at home. If the global aims of education in general, and the borderless university in particular, are personal development, employability, greater tolerance and understanding of others, what policy decisions have to be made, remembering of course that whatever is decided it will have a cost?

**Recommendations**

The more languages a person learns, the more each language can fertilise the others. In the name of short-term efficiency many promote the study of English, to the detriment of language diversity. A way to reconcile the two would be to offer English and a wide choice of a second language, to similar levels.

Investment needs to be made in two major areas: teachers and a solid ICT infrastructure that is cheap for the user and easily accessible. In a borderless university more teachers are needed rather than fewer, to help students use ICT intelligently and wisely whatever the language and to prepare the students to work in foreign languages, whether at home or abroad.

**Language Teaching**

The general approach to language teaching should be that of plurilingualism. This means that
the four skills (oral and written comprehension and oral and written expression) do not necessarily have to be of the same standard and that a student may well have highly developed passive skills in one language, reasonably developed active and passive skills in a second and survival level in a third. As and when the need arises, the relevant skill can be developed.

There should be greater focus on LSP (Languages for Special Purposes). Students who have done badly at languages at school don’t want to find themselves doing the same thing over and over again and failing over and over again. Learning language as a means to understand and work in their field of study is more motivating and more efficient than learning language in the abstract. When the incorrect use of lexis or grammar not only makes communication difficult or impossible but, even worse, gives a totally different (or wrong) message, the student will make the necessary effort. In other words, at university level the foreign language should be seen as a tool to do other things rather than just as something to be studied for itself. (Of course, a student specialising in languages and/or training for a career as a translator or interpreter will systematically combine the two).

In order to develop and promote plurilingual and pluricultural competence, more combined degrees involving two or more countries should be introduced, along the lines, for example, of the combined degrees in law offered by the Université Paris I (Panthéon-Sorbonne) and different partners, depending on the option. An equal number of students from Paris I and the partner university (King’s College, London; Cologne; Complutense, Madrid, etc.) spend the first two years together in the partner university, the last two years in Paris. They graduate with two law degrees, one from each country, have access to the Bar exams of the two, and have attained excellent levels of linguistic and cultural proficiency.

Student mobility

An effort should be made to promote greater awareness among faculty and administrative staff of the presence and specific needs of foreign students and the contribution they make to university life. This involves, among other things, rethinking assessment and grading criteria to allow for language difficulties and cultural differences, problems of method (at least at the beginning), gaps in background knowledge (students who have studied in the host country are assumed to have this knowledge). It is also an opportunity to relativise the cultural values underpinning our society and to understand that there is not necessarily just one way of looking at things.

When a student arrives in the host country, much more attention should be paid to the student’s immediate needs. Induction courses of some kind would be useful (and more efficient and more economical than doing the same in the original countries). They must be practical and could include the following:

- intensive language training and support for those who need it, in the field of study
- training in specific techniques such as note-taking in the foreign language
- a short course in method, e.g. how to write a dissertation in law, how to present a scientific experiment, how to give an oral paper.

Although local students may also

- have problems of method, general methods classes for all students (local and foreign) is not the solution, since foreign students have specific difficulties that need to be addressed.
- a detailed explanation of course requirements, methods of assessment, the university system of which this particular degree course is a part
- specific help, preferably from volunteer students from the host country, in finding accommodation, carrying out the various formalities (opening a bank account, registering with a doctor, filling out different university forms, etc.)

In terms of housing, although student halls of residence are an excellent way of bringing people together, it would be better to have as broad a mix as possible of ‘native’ and foreign students rather than have specific halls for foreigners. If possible, the accommodation office of a university should pay particular attention to students from abroad and include flat sharing and bedsits with the local population among the offers.

Erasmus students (and other foreign students) should be part of mainstream university life, rather than follow courses designed specifically for them, with little or no contact with local students. In terms of language, this results in non-native speakers only communicating among themselves, thus reinforcing mistakes (some of which may be serious) and cutting them off from the general population. Even if they are registered in general classes, they are not always treated the same way and can find themselves excluded. Culturally speaking, the result is often very enriching but more in terms of tourism than in terms of getting to know the country one has chosen to study in and the people who live there. However laudable this may be, it is not perhaps the main aim of student mobility.

With the exception of universities in countries whose languages are less widely used and less taught (Denmark, Finland, the Netherlands, for instance), it would be better to offer degree courses to foreigners in the language of the country rather than in English, as seems to be a worrying trend today. This does not mean there should be no visiting professors (whose only medium of
expression is English) and that no course should ever be given in a language other than that of the country, but this is true for classes for all students and not just foreign ones.

**Evaluation**

Although the Common European Framework of Reference for Languages provides a comprehensive, transparent, coherent and flexible system to refer to in terms of teaching, learning and assessment objectives and accreditation, and although it is right to enable each country to develop and introduce such teaching and assessment schemes for different languages (including its own), this is not necessarily the best or most efficient way of defending languages, and in particular lesser used and less taught ones. Currently, many resources are devoted to the setting up of assessment and accreditation, to the detriment of actual teaching and learning. Would it not be more efficient if each country were to develop and expand its own scheme(s) for its own language (DELF and DALF in France, for example) and train teachers and testers in other countries?

**Conclusion**

The borderless university is but one facet of an open, tolerant and peaceful society and student mobility is only one part of the picture. Plurilingual and pluricultural competence should be encouraged not only for immediate or utilitarian purposes (academic, economic, business, etc) but also with a view to personal development and enrichment. I hope this report is a useful contribution to the debate.

---

**C. Borderless Education After the Dot.com Crash**

**Yoni Ryan**

*Monash University, Melbourne*

The term ‘borderless education’ encompasses a wide range of activities, from online. Since many of these activities emanate from the new providers of post-secondary education and programs, offshore campuses, technology-assisted teaching, and franchising of curricula, training, often for-profit institutions or commercial arms of non-profit universities, borderless education segues into ‘the business of education’\(^1\). That brings the activities of institutions supporting e-learning, whether vendors of learning management platforms or publishers of digital content material, into our purview as well.

These new providers were and are perceived as ‘clear and present dangers’ to research universities. Three years ago, business analysts such as Morgan Keegan\(^2\) were predicting billion dollar education and training markets for global players in education, on the premise that employers would demand qualifications to validate the skills of their workforce, that employees would embrace lifelong learning to ensure a competitive edge in continued employment, and that the digital revolution would make learning accessible to an eager global student body. The relatively cheap entry costs of online start-ups in a climate when capital raising in the dot.com euphoria was easy, allowed the proliferation of small, undercapitalised commercial firms, and home-grown projects in many universities.

There was a widespread perception that the demand for ‘content’ (especially in continuing professional education) would benefit prestigious research universities especially, since ‘brand names’ like Oxford, Harvard and Berlin could ‘leverage’ their knowledge expertise for teaching. The prevailing ideological climate favoured — indeed demanded — a new entrepreneurialism in public universities, initially in research partnerships with industry, but increasingly in education and training for the needs of the Knowledge Economy. Public private partnerships would fund university expansion, drive administrative efficiencies and teaching productivity, via the new technologies. State and national governments provided seed funding for virtual learning networks. Non-government agencies such as UNESCO, the World Bank, and the EU announced multimillion-dollar grants to support public-good virtual and distance projects.

But three years after the e-education bubble of 1997-1999, it is apparent that much of the euphoria about the commercial potential of e-education was hype. The year 2000 saw spectacular crashes in technology industries, and the beginning of a long decline in telecommunications and media companies, hardware and software manufacturers, and e-business firms, culminating in the 2002 collapse of firms such as WorldCom, and the difficulties of media giants such as Vivendi Universal. These industries are of course the very sectors underpinning e-education activities.

The convergence of these factors – the potential of technologies for global research and education, an ideological climate in which public funding for tertiary education is declining\(^3\), and the emergence of education as a tradeable good/service beyond the local campus – have forced us to reassess the nature of university education itself, in the present project, and in like projects such as Brown University’s ‘Futures Project’\(^4\), although I am not sure this present body would find much joy in the ‘Third Way’ promoted by the Brown team,
especially in relation to wholesale moves to performance-based funding in state-designated areas.

In such an environment, it is critical that universities understand ‘the business of borderless education’. The Observatory on borderless higher education provides a monitoring service in this area, and the present paper updates my earlier report for the Observatory, considers what university leaders might learn from the successes and failures of the dot.com boom, and concludes with some recommendations of particular relevance to learning networks such as Europaeum.

**Recommendations**

What then are research intensive universities committed to developing a learning network to do? From the evidence of the last few years, it would appear that loose networks of like-minded universities such as Europaeum provide the basis for more formalized consortia. These consortia are more likely to succeed where they are regional rather than global.

It also seems clear that cross-border collaboration in research, and currency in research, are enormous beneficiaries of the new technologies. Private funding and supranational agencies such as the European Commission have fostered borderless research, particularly in health, engineering and IT. It may be, as Perraton has argued, that research networks are likely to be a more achievable and productive use of the technologies for development aid than teaching activities.

But the real benefits of new technologies in universities will not be realised until we harness their educative powers. That means, I think, less emphasis on supplying the technical infrastructure – the lesson the World Bank learned from the AVU case – and more on the pedagogical and systems issues.

In the European context, it means progressing the Sorbonne, Bologna and Prague agreements to pursue mutual recognition of programs and subjects to encourage physical and virtual ‘mobility’ of students. This is the lesson of credit transfer we can learn from UoP, especially as more national governments introduce or increase tuition fees, and our students become more conscious of the costs of their education. There is a real danger that the cross-cultural benefits of student exchanges and inter-institutional enrolment will be lost unless we can do more to ‘harmonise’ programs and policy and funding settings.

In the tradition of public good within universities, it should also mean developing standards and protocols to enable the sharing of teaching resources with organisations such as the AVU, and universities in the developing world.

Realising the potential of borderless education means more collaboration in devising a core curriculum of subjects acceptable to all members, and subjects which are supported – not replaced – by e-learning opportunities and digital learning materials whose development costs can be amortised among the universities. Thus the universities will have learned the lessons of high development costs that Cardean University learned to its detriment, and the lesson that purely online providers have learned to their cost: that with some exceptions, students – even postgraduate students who were predicted to flock to online courses – prefer what is called the ‘hybrid’ or ‘blended’ approach, a mix of face-to-face, online, print and other material delivery modes. This is certainly the lesson of the Fuqua program.

It means a heavy investment in the professional development of academic and general staff in appropriate application of new technologies, and the pedagogical independent learning among students. It means careful monitoring of student attitudes and readiness for less ‘dependent’ learning. It means raising the awareness of all university staff that the nature of the institution is changing yet again, in response to the social, economic and technical forces that swirl about us all.

Finally, in the light of our theme, ‘New Times, New Responsibilities’, it seems to me that a learning network such as this has an old responsibility in a climate where society is induced to view the world through the prism of ‘the market’ and ‘market values’. The revelations of unethical behaviour and the drive for short term returns that have rocked the business world over the past year make this an opportune time for universities to reassert and reaffirm the values of a disinterested scholarship which sits outside the market. In a community of scholars, this means ensuring the integrity of our processes and our people in research and teaching, as emblematic of our continuing responsibility to act in the public good. This does not absolve us from the necessity of observing market forces as they impinge on universities, but it does require us to demonstrate the value of the long-term perspective in an institution charged with conserving knowledge approaches that networked learning supports, such as constructivist learning.
D. Higher Education Reforms in Eastern Europe 1989-2002

Voldemar Tomusk
Higher Education Support Program, Open Society Institute, Budapest

This report offers an attempt to identify the main directions of higher education reforms in the formerly state-socialist countries in Eastern Europe since 1989. Based on various countries’ reform efforts the report identifies the main causes of slowing down and eventually reversing the initial reform initiatives. It goes on to draw a number of recommendations for possible cooperation between higher education systems that once stood on different sides of the iron curtain between East and West.

The evidence on which this report is based from various internationally published scholarly papers on higher education reform and related topics as well as unpublished reports and internationally inaccessible locally published materials. The report also relies on the personal experience of its author who has been involved in East European higher education since 1988 - starting as a senior lecturer, later as a researcher and government official, and since 1995 at the international level as a program manager of the Open Society Institute, Budapest.

While acknowledging significant differences between the countries covered with this report an attempt is made here to identify the general directions of the changes since 1989 and identify the forces on which the traditional (formerly state-socialist) higher education has relied re-establishing its legitimacy as the producer the symbols of knowledge and competence for significantly changed societies. While the level of political freedom varies by countries and there are significant differences between the countries’ economic development/recession since 1989, this report argues that the relatively low level of the societies’ welfare in general being combined with the resistance of previously established social institutions has produced reform environments that are rather similar throughout the region.

Although the situation in East European higher education remains difficult, author’s hope offering this report is that it would contribute towards the Europaeum’s objectives of encouraging and promoting more realistic cooperation project than so far - projects that consider the complexity of the situation in the region as well as the possible threats. Currently many projects involving presenting highly ambitious system-wide reform goals, in reality play the role as social aid schemes for impoverished universities and faculty members. The report also suggests that instead of blind copying of the recent trends in Western Europe or United States more serious attention to local developments and needs would lead to better results.

Recommendations for future co-operation

Developers of future co-operation initiatives with East European universities should be aware that no significant improvement in the content and quality of East European higher education as a whole has taken place since 1989. While islands of excellence are appearing in certain areas, such positive changes are usually related to the initiative of small teams of committed innovators or even single individuals who quite often achieve good results fighting against the general logic of the transformation of post-state socialist higher education. Therefore direct co-operation with innovative groups and individuals should be given a preference over large-scale co-operation projects between universities. Far too often the projects of the latter type include elements of political empowerment of mediocre if not incompetent and conservative academics and administrators, include unnecessary elements of academic tourism and follow the old principle of distribution ‘to everybody according to their needs’, meaning that projects include elements that are not related to its goals but the needs or wishes of influential individuals.

It is critically important that when a suitable co-operation partner is identified it is considered in every respect as an equal partner. This, on the one hand assumes that there in place a selection process rigorous enough to make sure that the partner represents the necessary level of academic excellence, but also that it is genuinely interested in the substantive aspects of co-operation. On the other hand, it is also important that the western party is not prejudiced against its partners on cultural or any other grounds. Given the somewhat disappointing history of a rather mixed population of western scholars and practitioners providing their services in Eastern Europe as consultants and experts, it is critically important that the future co-operation projects are not used by western partners primarily as tools for generating funds for their own purposes.

While higher education all over Europe is increasingly dominated by the market forces, it is essential for achieving the right balance in East European higher education that there will be islands where high standards of academic excellence overweight the value of short term market success - being it made from admitting growing numbers of fee paying students or launching executive MBA programs. For the development of the region it is crucial that there is a certain number of
intellectuals to carry on the critical and cultural missions.

The most disappointing experience so far as related to the post-state socialist higher education comes from the field of university management. In this regard the recommendation of the author of the current report would be to avoid that area. The practices so far indicate that the leaders of East European universities are not in a position to disclose the everyday decision making processes, the variety of funding schemes and political negotiations with the state agencies as well as within the universities. While there is a serious need to collect data and build knowledge base on university management in Eastern Europe, as long as universities’ very survival in under a threat and inconsistencies in national legislation and governance practices continue there is a little chance that the situation could be improved with foreign support.

So far significant amount foreign support has been spent on study visits, conferences, seminars and other ‘exchange of experience’ type of activities. Such activities, although being pleasant for the participants, have only limited impact on the actual outcomes of university core activities – teaching and learning. It would be highly desirable for the co-operation between West and East European higher education to move from the phase of general awareness building to working together – research projects where both parties are involved as equal partners and joint courses or even degree programs which are developed by Eastern and Western Universities together and where teaching is provided by the faculty from different countries / universities. Here, one should add that when talking about higher education at the level of the highest academic excellence, it is not enough if a student from an East European university submits a paper by e-mail to a faculty member in another country. It is a strong view of the author of the current report that in days when the amount of fast-food kind of education over Internet is growing, the most rewarding and expensive element of high quality higher education – seminars with outstanding scholars - is unavailable for the largest majority of the students.

The concept of interdisciplinary studies appears with an increasing frequency in East European higher education reform documents. Some of that aspires to catch-up with recent ideas of innovative thinkers like Gibbons, Limoges, Nowotny and colleagues (1994) and their ‘Mode 2’ knowledge production. Obvious problem related to such initiatives is the missing disciplines. Subsequently the interdisciplinary studies constitute a mixture of rather exotic marginal fields of study, often lacking a connection to the traditions of sociology, psychology, economics or political science. Some of the results may resemble the well-known scandal over the Sokal Hoax (Lingua Franca 2000). One way to introduce interdisciplinary in East European higher education would be to offer interdisciplinary summer schools for students, prepared by international and delivered to international body of students. Such in initiative may also constitute a starting point for possible credit transfer between East and West European Universities.

Looking from the perspective of the needs of East European higher education for support, one of the highest-ranking issues is the so-called Bologna process. While many countries in the region belong among the original signatories of the Bologna declaration, the main focus of East European countries seems to be political rather than educational. Moreover, in some countries related reform processes seem to be driven by universities’ interests to teach as many students as possible for as long periods as possible. With this the actual intention of the declaration to introduce short-cycle higher education in Continental Europe is being lost. But even more importantly, East European universities need assistance to attribute a meaning to Bachelor and Master level studies in their particular cultural and economic contexts. In some countries successful introduction of a new structure of degrees would also necessitate changes in other parts of legislation, for example the labour law as discussed above. Without concerted efforts by all parties involved, this reform will never be able instead of success stories produce any real improvement.
Appendix 8: Student Group Contributions

The following are contributions by members of the Europaeum FEU Inquiry Study Group, members of which participated fully in all three of the international expert conferences.

**ICT and Stakeholders: a New Challenge for European Universities**

Andrea Montovani
University of Bologna

The massive invasion of ICT (Information and Communication Technology) has substantially changed the way people communicate, think and act. In any university students should learn how to communicate, how to think, and, finally, how to act. Given this evident and strong link, ICT plays a fundamental role in the transmission of information between the academic staff and the "student world". Another consideration is that public funding of the educational system is decreasing and private bodies are more and more concerned with financing universities. In many cases these donors are private firms and they support the educational system in order to produce a receptive and educated staff. But firms are nowadays highly involved in the ICT revolution.

The interplay between universities and private firms finds a powerful connection in the common interest represented by the correct exploitation of ICT advantages. However, this could lead to a possible reduction of the independence of academic institutions when financed by private firms.

I personally think that a correct use of technological facilities, computers *in primis*, can have a freedom-enhancing effect in such relationship. It is in fact a reciprocal gain for both parts to educate students (i.e. future workers and managers) to fully exploit the possibilities arising from the ICT revolution, without losing the ability to critically analyse the reality. Nobel-prize-winning economist Herbert Simon said that "a wealth of information creates a poverty of attention." Educational institutions must use ICT to stimulate attention through a proper use of information, because information overload could become a problem if people make incorrect use of these new facilities.

Nonetheless, public funding of Higher Education institutions should not decrease further. The provision of a high standard of education has to reenter into the agenda of every European government. The interplay between inequality and growth, and the role of education finance, has recently emerged as a leading theme. In this case I need to "talk as an economist" by saying that human capital represents in fact one of the main sources of growth for every nation. Highly educated people are able not only to run business in a more efficient way, but also to discover new possibilities appearing in the market. Furthermore, the new ICT scenario requires people to cope with highly sophisticated instruments and only a proper educational system can provide the appropriate background.

The University system has to play a fundamental role in joining the private incentives for firms and the public interest of preparing people to the ICT challenge.

---

**The Impact of Student Fees**

Catherine Button
Magdalen College, University of Oxford

It is often said that "money makes the world go round." When one looks to the challenges facing universities in the first quarter of the twenty-first century, it quickly becomes clear that money is a recurring and universal theme. Money enters almost every debate connected with higher education, even those that may appear more esoteric, such as debates concerned with the purpose and defining characteristics of university education. Money is also implicated when one asks how European universities are to respond to the changes to university education wrought by globalisation. Globalisation has had a profound effect on Europe's universities; it has spawned an international industry in tertiary education, with more than 1.6 million students studying outside their home countries at any one time. Mobility has also affected academics, with many working outside of their 'home' countries and even working in a number of countries over the course of their professional lives. This contribution to the students' discussion will take up the intersection between these two aspects of globalisation (academic mobility and international students) and funding. It will offer a perspective grounded in the

"The importance of human capital for growth was stressed by many economists (see for example Uzawa, 1983; Lucas, 1988; Azariadis and Drezner, 1990; de la Croix and Michel, 2002)"
experience of international students at British universities.

Recently, the Vice-Chancellors of Britain’s universities told the government that they needed an extra £9.94 billion over the next three years. That figure is not simply a wishful stab in the dark, but represents the real sum needed to keep Britain’s universities running following years of under-investment. Given the government’s early rejection of the Vice-Chancellors’ bid, where will they get the money? One place source that the universities will doubtless seek to exploit to make up the shortfall is international students. Where ‘home’ students pay only £1,100 per year for their university education, foreign students pay anything up to £20,000 for certain courses at top universities. A more typical figure at Oxford is £9,000, which represents the fees payable by a graduate student in law. With international students constituting a vital source of income, it is important that British universities continue to attract them. In this sector of university education, each university must promote itself overseas and must present the “educational package” it offers students in an attractive light. That package comprises everything from the university’s facilities and accommodation services, to its reputation and alumni networks. Students are not just buying an education, they are buying an experience and entrance to a club that membership of a particular university represents. The university’s international reputation is critical in attracting students. The reputation of some universities is so historically entrenched that it will only respond slowly to shifts in resources, but, for others, the loss of a key professor can make what was a promising department suddenly seem less attractive both to international students and to other academics. In other words, staff mobility intersects with student mobility, and, like student mobility, staff quality and mobility is heavily influenced by money.

It is now true that, in most fields, top graduates are being asked to make enormous financial sacrifices to take on academic careers

The international reputation of British universities is at risk because funding shortages mean that academic salaries in British universities are generally woeful when compared with the cost of living. Starting salaries for academics (who have usually spent many years training at university and have a PhD) are below starting salaries for secondary school teachers. Over the last twenty years, while average salaries for full-time employees have increased by 44%, academic salaries have increased by only 5%, losing much of their purchasing power in the process. While some of the brightest and the best will always become academics for the love of their subjects, it is now true that, in most fields, top graduates are being asked to make enormous financial sacrifices to take on academic careers; becoming an academic should not mean taking a vow of poverty. If academics do not leave (or never join) the profession because of poor pay, they frequently devote significant amounts of time to private, money-making ventures, with obvious consequences for their academic work. With a political commitment to have 50% of young people between 18 and 30 university-educated by 2010, British universities need more academics and they need to pay them more.

Universities have recognised the potential of the international student market as a revenue source for some time. It seems, though, that in order to uphold standards and remain internationally competitive, local undergraduate education is also set to move further into the market place. There are, at present, proposals suggesting that universities be allowed to charge local undergraduates “top-up” fees which would allow the more prestigious universities to trade on their popularity in order to raise money. Do we want universities to emulate businesses, which focus on a profitable niche, or do universities have broader responsibilities which mean that their activities and priorities should not be dictated by what the ‘market’ in education will bear? The possibilities of de-regulating the fees charged by British universities also throws the fate of less prestigious universities into doubt.

What will become of those universities whose market appeal is limited and who cannot attract that group of students with funds? There are concerns that a two-tier system of university education will emerge, with elite universities attracting the best students and staff, and other universities having to rely on ever more meagre government funding to educate an increasing number of students. Still, the concern that a two-tier system will emerge if universities are allowed to charge top-up fees presupposes that university education in Britain is, at present, unified. It is not. In the 1960s, a Labour government introduced the division between polytechnics (which focused on teaching, not research) and universities. Since that division was eradicated in 1992 by a Tory (conservative) government, the title of “university” is more widely applied. Although a lot more people are “university-educated” now, the real divisions between the polytechnics and the universities have not been eradicated; they have only been recast as divisions between the old and the new universities. This shifting in labelling and plans to increase the number of students at university raise questions about what a university
academic information, as well as access to job search facilities and electronic notice boards. It is here that many universities fall short.

The availability of administrative information on the university's website is a good way to improve transparency at university. It is a means of ensuring that all students obtain the same information on the many possibilities offered by the university such as additional courses, conferences, scholarships, and so on. This is the kind of bureaucratic information that students often find difficult to obtain because they do not know whom to ask.

**Students are willing, even eager, to contribute to their department's online resources but do not know how to do so**

Besides administrative information, students also need to find proper academic information on their university's website; that is to say, information linked to their areas of study. It is therefore very important that each department have its own web pages to provide students with outlines of courses, reading lists, past exam papers, latest publication of articles and books as well as conference announcements in their own area of study. This would allow both graduate and undergraduate students to keep in touch with the latest developments in their disciplines. Additionally, this could whet the intellectual appetites of current and prospective students by presenting them with a lively view of certain subjects, including the latest developments on those subjects.

Of course, all students' and professors' email addresses should be available on the university's website. This can prove very useful for students if they need to contact their teachers or want to exchange information or advice with students preparing the same degree.

In terms of what comes after university, students would like a career services element to the website. A well-developed career services page, listing job and/or internship offers and allowing students to make their CVs available on-line to companies would be heavily utilized.

The presence of electronic noticeboards on the site lends a powerful interactive component to the aforementioned administrative, academic and career elements. The principle of electronic noticeboards is simple: it consists of a webpage which students, teachers and administrative staff can access via a password. This type of forum facilitates the exchange of news, proposals, questions and advice and can save students, faculty and administrators time by asking and answering questions publicly in one location.

Lastly, it should be noted that the existence of all of the above in a university website does not in itself make the website comprehensive - the site must also be well maintained and updated frequently. Website neglect can be the source of many student complaints, therefore care should be taken to ensure that website management resources are commensurate with the amount of information resources offered on-line.

**Computer training**

Nowadays, the overwhelming majority of students entering university know how to use a computer and how to access the Internet. Nonetheless, basic modules on the use of ICTs should be made available for those students who need or wish to improve their computer skills.

More advanced computer training should be made available as well, especially for those preparing a doctorate. The use of word processors or other software (such as PowerPoint or Excel) is now a requirement for post-graduate students wishing to type their own theses. Some might regard such training as superficial but it would save a great deal of time for many doctoral students, sparing them from having to fumble through their computer's arcane potentialities.

Ideally, there should also be optional courses on how to design a website. More often than not, students are willing, even eager, to contribute to their department's online resources but do not know how to do so.

**Courses on how to search for information with ICTs**

When universities as we know them today originated in the Middle Ages, academics and students were expected to possess an encyclopaedic knowledge of the world. Now, in the 21st century academics and students are expected to know how to find information in the ever-increasing mass of knowledge.

This implies that they would benefit from courses on how to search for information with ICTs. Two elements in particular should be considered: sessions on how to use the electronic resources of the library and on how to search for information on the Internet.

In their first weeks at university, students should be compelled to attend sessions on how to use the library's digital catalogue and electronic resources. Usually, such sessions are not compulsory and students think they do not need them. But students should be made aware that their university's library is going to be one of their principal sources of knowledge during their university years. It is unfortunate that students do not realise at first that it is essential for them to know how to use the library's electronic catalogue and other electronic resources.
It would also be wise to develop the concept of courses on how to search for information on the Internet. The Internet is for students a marvellous way to access knowledge. At the click of a mouse, nearly any information is accessible on the Net. This is very useful to prepare exercises, papers, oral presentations, dissertations or theses. But the wonderful possibilities of the Internet are still not fully exploited by all students.

What the students need to know is how to make the best use of the Internet, and especially how not to waste time when searching for information. Students should be educated on how best to search for information on the Net: where to look and how. Specifically, on which sites, and with which web searches or web crawlers. They should know how to formulate their inquiries and be acquainted with more complex techniques such as Boolean research. Such courses are essential for navigating efficiently in the myriad sites, pages and documents available on the Internet, and universities should consider making them compulsory. Advanced sessions on how to search for specialised information would also be useful, especially in certain disciplines. For example, law students need to know how to access various databases to obtain legal documents.

This also implies that students should know how to quote electronic sources, by using international norms, and that academics should accept reference to electronic sources more widely.

Electronic networks between universities, research centres and students

ICT should not only be used within each university but also between universities. Exchanges between universities have always existed, even in the early stages of universities. Whereas it took several days a few centuries ago for academics to send documents one to another, exchanges now occur in seconds with e-mail. How this would have enthralled the early university academics! The Web represents a powerful means of facilitating exchanges between students, teachers and researchers from different universities around the world. In that they provide an irreplaceable framework for deeper cooperation and greatly facilitate the sharing of mutual experiences ICTs should be encouraged at university.

Electronic networks prevent waste and allow material and intellectual resources to be exploited more efficiently

For example, it is vital that students, teachers and researchers evolving in the same areas of knowledge be able to exchange ideas and to know about the latest developments in their areas of specialisation. This prevents situations in which researchers or post-graduate students work separately on the same type of projects. Information-sharing can also provide opportunities for students preparing a doctorate to exchange ideas, points of view and experiences with other students. It can be very motivating indeed to feel that, all along the many years required to complete a doctorate, the advancement of one’s research does interest other people. To sum up, electronic networks prevent the waste of time and money and allow material and intellectual resources to be exploited more efficiently.

One question remains: who should be in charge of creating electronic networks? It seems that academics are best placed to set up such networks because they already have contacts with colleagues from various universities, but governments could also play a role through the promotion of certain research programmes.

Respecting netiquette

Although ICTs should be promoted at university, they must not become a nuisance. One cannot but advise a reasoned use of e-mails. The main danger concerning the use of e-mails is the development of e-mail pollution or “spam”, which occurs when someone (or everyone, as it often seems) sends an e-mail for any reason, whatever its importance. Students should be made aware that they have to send e-mail only for relevant reasons. For example, not anyone on the university’s e-mail list wants to buy your used car!

Another idea to promote good netiquette would be the development of courses on how to use information. Related to netiquette is the problem of plagiarism from online sources. With so many websites, it is far less easy for a teacher to notice plagiarism than it was a decade ago when the principal sources of information were books and periodicals. In order to avoid plagiarism, some teachers have already abandoned the idea of having students writing essays at home. They prefer students to write their papers during the courses, after having prepared them at home. The consequences of plagiarism, which according to many teachers is the plague caused by ICTs, should be made explicit to students. Academics would be wise to encourage reflection on intellectual property as well as wider reflection on the use of ICTs.

E-learning

Distance learning should not become the norm—the human aspect of university studies is too important. Studying at university is much more than deepening one’s knowledge. It implies interaction between teachers and students and among students themselves. For instance, it is
much more difficult for a teacher to transmit his/her passion about a subject via e-mails than through lively tutorials.

E-learning should nevertheless be more widely available. Distance learning is undoubtedly highly necessary for students who cannot attend a traditional classroom course, such as those who work, suffer from an illness or live abroad. It should also be possible for a student to register, with permission, for a course offered electronically by another university. This kind of e-learning implies one-off agreements between universities. Such a scheme is difficult to implement because it requires the administration and the teachers, who are already very busy, to sort out the conditions of the agreement. But this type of e-learning could be advantageous for students in order to specialise in the areas which interest them most.

Some forms of e-learning can also complement traditional methods of learning. For example, it can be useful for undergraduate students to test themselves by means of multiple-choice questionnaires before taking an exam. This avenue could be explored.

How to finance the use of ICTs at university?

There is no doubt that the use of ICTs is very expensive for universities. The acquisition, installation and maintenance of computers is costly, and so is the design and maintenance of websites. The library’s electronic catalogue and the acquisition of rights to use databases represent a whole other cost structure.

A useful way to reduce costs linked to the use of ICTs is to require the help of students and teachers. Students are willing to contribute to the improvement of their lives at university. They often look forward to being more involved in the activities of the university, and many of them would agree to spend a few hours explaining to students how to use a computer, how to create web pages and so on. To begin with, student representatives could be in charge of circulating a list of all students’ e-mail addresses at the beginning of each term.

ICT is not always a financial burden for universities: it can in fact help reduce administrative costs

Another idea would be to have private sponsors. Sponsors can pay for the design of the university’s website in exchange for the presence of their brands on the home page, and they can also provide computers. The sponsoring of higher education is already implemented in Anglo-Saxon countries but is totally alien to other cultural areas. In order to bypass their reluctance for sponsorship, some universities could perhaps select sponsors with an interest in knowledge (e.g. publishers).

It is also important to recall that the use of ICT is not always a financial burden for universities. It can in fact help reduce administrative costs. Thanks to the existence of a website, one can suppose that the administrative staff have to answer fewer phone calls and can devote their time to more productive tasks. ICTs can also simplify many administrative tasks, such as registration.

Throughout this paper, various proposals have been made. It would be impossible to implement them all, but at least they show which aspects of the use of ICTs students are eager to see developed.

It has been demonstrated here that the use of ICTs at university is essential. A university which does not use them risks lagging behind the other universities in terms of attractiveness towards not only students, but also towards teachers and researchers.

Nevertheless, if ICTs are necessary at university, their use should not be seen as a panacea. The aim is not to have students spending their whole day sitting in front of a computer screen. ICTs are an effective way to improve the lives of students, teachers, researchers and administrators: their use at university is not an end but a valuable means.

Higher Education

Adela Popsilachova
Charles University, Prague

The question of higher education and the distribution of its costs concerns mostly the question of who profits from the education of students. We can speak about higher education as about the public good only insofar as we are able to find demonstrable positive effects that individual education has on society as whole, and the individual is not able to charge society for reaping that benefit. If we want to consider higher education as a pure public good, it would also be necessary to prove that higher education has a positive effect only on society and brings no benefit to the individual student.

On the other side, when we find that higher education has positive effects only on the individual and no positive effects on the society, we can say that it is a pure personal good. So finally we have three different possibilities. Higher education can be considered as a pure personal, pure public or mixed good according to that who benefits from it. In the case of mixed good, we
must then distinguish if it is more public or personal. Our result is very important for the decisions about scholarships. Because, in fairness, most tuition fees should be paid by the primary beneficiary of higher education. So let’s see now what are the possible benefits to students on the one hand, and society on the other.

First let us think about the student’s possible benefits. In the first place, there is the expectation of future higher revenue. It has been proven that nearly all over the world, people with higher education have higher income on average, but this is surely not the only motivation for study. There are many students that study just because they enjoy studying the subject and they do not think much about the future salary. In that case, they benefit in the form of pleasure from studying.

Now let us see what can be the benefit to society. In the first place it is probably the higher tax revenue from higher salaries that result from higher education. Then, people usually mention the argument that higher education leads to the political and social stability in the society. On the other hand, it is not unusual to find educated people in radical political movements. So the relationship between higher education and political stability is not so clear as it looks and, if it exists, it is very difficult to measure. It seems the most obvious benefit to society is in the form of higher tax revenues.

Clearly, higher education is neither pure public good nor pure personal good. Now we have to judge who gains most from it. If society, then most of the costs should be covered by the central government. If the individual, then most of the costs should be covered by the student.

In my opinion, it is students who benefit from education in the first place. The student decides whether to study or not, and s/he should cover at least part of the costs of the studies. Society has its benefit from the education of the student only in the case when student plans to study to earn a higher salary. Students profit from the studies anytime, and can simply enjoy the studies, or can think about the studies as an investment in a higher salary. If students are supposed to pay for their tuition, they usually tend to think of their studies as an investment. So the approach from which the society profits is enforced by reasonable fees. If there are no fees, students are not forced to think about education as an investment and they tend more to enjoy the studies. In that case society has less benefit from the education of the individuals and pays more for it. So in my opinion reasonable tuition fees paid by students is the optimal solution.
Appendix 9: The Europaeum IT Survey

The following survey was carried out using an electronic survey of students and staff involving all ten Europaeum partner universities, plus Oxford Brookes University, 2002-3, with some 500 respondents, supported by a series of in-depth interviews.

**Europaeum Survey of ICT Usage in European Universities**

**Dr Paul Flather**  
Fellow, Mansfield College, Oxford

**Dr Richard Huggins**  
Lecturer in politics, Oxford Brookes University

The Europaeum conducted a survey on Information and Communications Technologies (ICT) usage amongst students and staff. Given that this is a key area of change, we decided to take a look at it ourselves through a survey.

The first finding is that usage is high, which is good news: more than eighty percent of students own their own computer. Some people might consider that amazing, others might say it is not high enough. However, an important finding, which universities need to build into their planning, is that students still use the technology primarily for entertainment.

There is an interesting division in academics' attitudes, which came through in the discussions and in some of the statements. Some are sceptics who still feel concerned about using ICT. This is not necessarily related to their age: it might be related to their subject - there are certainly very few sceptics in science.

There were also interesting comments about the range of facilities. The average student is far more literate in computer terms than the average academic; because of this and their pre-university experience, they come to universities wanting slightly better facilities than they find. This may always be always the case: everybody wants more and better in almost every walk of life. Nevertheless, it is tough for universities to have to try to keep up and keep ahead.

**We are not equipping academics to make best use of the technology to deliver what the students want**

The staff, particularly the enthusiasts and those with moderate computer skills, want to use ICT more, but are not necessarily aware of the full range of technology available. I think this is a major failing of universities. We are not equipping academics to make best use of the technology to deliver what the students want. 47 percent of the people surveyed want to use ICT more but a lot of them do not quite know how to.

We think a crucial message to the administrators of our universities is to be aware of patchy provision. It is patchy not only between universities, and we understand that because all universities are in different positions, but also between disciplines within universities. Some of the patchiness may be related to demand; if certain professors do not know what they can have, they do not demand it and then, of course, the university administrators do not provide it.

Perhaps the most interesting finding is about plagiarism. A large majority of both students and staff agree that increased ICT use has led to a huge increase in plagiarism, which is difficult to detect.

So, the responses were very honest. We made the survey so anonymous we could not even find out some of the basic information we wanted to categorise it by institution and gender. However, we did get very honest, self-critical statements, which perhaps need more thought.

**Virtual is the shape of things to come**

In recent years, the penetration of so-called Information and Communications Technologies (ICTs) – advanced, interactive and high-speed digital technologies, the Internet, the World Wide Web – have become an essential part of our society and work, not least higher education. We are in a “digital society.”

Work and social patterns have been transformed. So too, teaching and learning. Teaching no longer needs to be constrained by such factors as time and place. Moreover, student expectations are such that they want – even prefer – to study flexibly. Thus, in an increasingly global and consumerist culture, university education also becomes subject to “the forces of global flows, of capital, knowledge and information” (Gilbert, 1996).

These shifts in the organisation of society, institutions and practices, coupled with technological innovation, has lead to increasing demands on, and expectations of, higher education. Widening participation, life-long learning, continuing professional development and enhanced skills acquisition are all becoming part of the university landscape, presenting significant challenges especially to the form of teaching and learning in what might once have been called “traditional” universities.

Indeed, for many (see for example: Gilbert, 1996; English and Yazdani, 1999; Rada, 2001) “Virtual is the shape of things to come.” It is
against this background, as universities adapt and come to terms with challenges of new technologies – adjusting the very form and function of teaching and learning, aiming to offer education of significant, qualitative difference in terms of content, delivery and access – that the Europaeum set out to do a survey of current attitudes to ICT and their usage in their partner universities as part of its Future of European Universities Project, sponsored by Daimler Financial Services AG.

The Europaeum Survey

In this survey we wanted to examine the current experiences of the use of ICTs by academic staff and students from across a range of leading European universities. Data and responses for this survey were generated in two ways. First, we designed a web-based questionnaire focused on a range of key issues that had emerged from recent writing on the topic. This was made available to a range of staff and students in all participating universities. The survey took about 10 minutes to complete, and in all 800 replies were received by January 2003.

Students and staff from the following took part:
- The University of Oxford
- Universiteit Leiden
- Rheinische Friedrich-Wilhelms-Universität Bonn
- Università degli studi di Bologna
- Institut Universitaire des Hautes Etudes Internationales, Geneva
- Université Paris I Panthéon-Sorbonne
- Univerzita Karlova V Praze (Prague)
- Oxford Brookes University

In addition, a number of face-to-face interviews were conducted with a cross-section of students and staff from across all participating universities. These two data sources produced a revealing snapshot of attitudes to, and use of, ICTs by staff and students in our range of European Universities. However, we continue to collect responses and will do so until the end of the year.

This interim report summarises key findings. Overall, it appears both students and staff are alert to the opportunities provided by ICTs, including the increased ease of communication, access, speed and scope of information retrieval, plus improved processing, distribution and flexibility of access to learning materials. However, academic staff in particular noted the potential of reduced contact time with students, larger student cohorts, and student and staff at sea in an ocean of emails, electronic materials and time demands. Significantly, few staff or student respondents felt that their university was in the process of developing ICT facilities sufficiently to meet the needs and expectations of students, staff or external bodies such as business, government or professional bodies. All these responses are summarised and discussed below. Responses from both staff and students are grouped under four main themes: Access, Usage, Training and Development, and Plagiarism.

Summary of Student Responses

(i) Access

Students do not consider the importance of ICT in their choice of either university or course of study. Even though 65% of respondents reported that they were aware of the importance of ICT skills before coming to university, 58% did not consider access to or the development of ICT skills as relevant when choosing their university. 69% did not consider this a relevant consideration when choosing a subject to study, and 61% did not consider this relevant to their choice of course.

Nevertheless, access to ICTs and interest in the use of ICTs remains high. More than four out of five of the student respondents have their own computers. Students also often have network access from home as well as college: 75% have internet and domestic email access and 46% have access to the campus intranet from home; only 21% reported no Internet access from home at all. Intranet access figures suggest a potential digital divide within universities, which may be worth monitoring, although all surveyed universities provide online access to facilities on site.

(ii) Usage

In terms of usage, the respondents appear to readily use email for communication with staff and fellow students (77%), friends (83%), and university administrative staff (59%). Aspects of the use of new technology they clearly value: citing references, in interview, ease of communication, submission and return of assignments by email, and ease of retrieval of documents and other material.

Students emphasized this latter point strongly: it makes life easier. For example it means fewer trips to the library – you just reserve a book on-line and get email from the library when it is ready for collection.

Levels of student access to the university on campus intranet are also high, with only 14% reporting they never accessed this system and one in three accessing it on a daily basis.

Students report that they spend little actual time retrieving or downloading information from their university’s intranet, though they appreciate knowing materials can be at hand online.

Rather than lacking engagement, students appear to spend more time using the Internet for personal or entertainment activities than formal academic work. Some 42% use the network for such purposes for four hours, or more, a week. This compares with 91% of students who use the
(iii) Training and Development

The survey does confirm that students are indeed generally Internet-literate and are happy to use this technology for communication and information retrieval (as well as entertainment). However, there is a real difference in the level of Internet and computer usage for leisure and coursework, which will need further exploration.

Students themselves conceive of ICT skills as critical for success in both study and after university. How then do they rate the provision in universities, and the use of such technology by teaching staff? Overall students appear to feel that the extent and quality of provision could be better, with just 8% describing the quality of ICT used for teaching purposes at their university as "excellent," and 21% as "good." So, more than two out of three feel there is room for improvement, and some say considerable improvement.

In terms of the use of ICT in individual course teaching, only 3% describe it as "excellent," and 21% as "good." One in three students report that lecturers use online resources in their classes and 96% of these found this helpful; one in four students reported that lecturers use course-specific web pages to support their class-based learning, and 98% of these respondents liked receiving information in this way. One in four students reported that lecturers used an electronic course guide to support class-based learning and, again, over 95% found this helpful and positive. Students appear to value the increased use of diverse and different teaching methods.

One student reported: "It seems that when teachers are using Power Point in their teaching, that they are using more examples from real-life. This makes the lecture or seminar usually livelier and more interesting."

Overall students clearly appear to want to see more use of ICT in their courses although a significant number (19%) remain unsure. This suggests some concern that the benefits of improved communication may also lead to less direct contact with staff, with remote or distance learning replacing some traditional teaching methods.

More than four out of five students (84%) reported that ICTs have or are not being developed enough in universities, as shown in this quote: "My university is not a technically focused university. There [is] not enough access to facilities... [Students] have to buy their own computers. And there is not enough support provided."

(iv) Plagiarism

Students appear divided over the contribution that the increased usage of ICTs may make to the critical and intellectual abilities of students. Less than one out of ten (8%) respondents strongly agreed that ICTs encouraged independent learning, whilst 9% also disagree with this statement. The technology is merely a mediator.

As one student put it: "It doesn’t make any difference when it comes to originality."

This raises another issue, in terms of how teaching itself needs to change in the face of increased access, provision and use of learning materials, and that there is no substitute for teachers ensuring critical engagement in the pedagogic issues involved in the application of ICTs.

A significant number of students (40%) either strongly or partly agree that the use of ICT encourages plagiarism, raising again issues about how ICTs can affect, and undermine, academic integrity.

As one undergraduate put it: "Of course, no one admits it. But it is very easy to find essays and articles from other people on the Net, and because there is so much out there I think it can be very difficult for teachers to trace plagiarism."

Summary of Staff Responses

(i) Access

Ownership of computers by staff is high (95%), as might be expected. Staff are more frequently networked at home than students, 83% possessing access to email from home and 52% having direct access to the university campus intranet at home. Academic staff strongly welcome the ease and speed of communication that networking brings: 91% report that they use email to communicate with academic colleagues, 86% with administrative staff, 78% with students, and 78% with friends. One out of two staff members report regularly accessing the campus intranet, and only 10% claim that they never access this part of the network.

(ii) Usage

Reviewing these findings, it is possible to note three types of ICT users - the enthusiasts who embrace the new technologies; the pragmatists who see the value for both students and staff and feel reasonably comfortable with increasing use; and the sceptics who still harbour lack of enthusiasm, and even antipathy, to them. Thus, the ICT enthusiasts (12%) claim to spend three or more hours a week publishing on-line course materials while the majority of staff (58%) spend
one hour or less undertaking this activity. Overall, the actual time invested in producing on-line learning materials appears relatively low, with 63% saying they spend one hour or less on producing course materials, lecture handouts and so on in an on-line form. Thus, academics appear to be using ICTs predominantly for communication between themselves, other staff and students.

A significant number are happy to use PowerPoint presentations and online materials via laptops and networked PCs in the classroom, but few would go anywhere close to this lecturer who reports: "All my lectures are given from a laptop. I download illustrations from the Internet. There are hundreds of movies on the Internet to illustrate what you want to show and teach. For example, the flow of blood through the human body."

Staff identify the advantages of using ICTs in teaching and learning, predominantly, as ease of access to materials; ease of information location, retrieval and distribution; and ease of communication between staff and students. Interviewees also mentioned the increased elegance of presentation that ICTs offer for lecturing staff, the easier incorporation of visual materials, and the sheer volume of resources now readily available to staff and students.

Overall, staff appear more positive about the quality of ICT facilities available for teaching purposes at their university than students do, with 59% reporting these facilities to be satisfactory or better. However, some also expressed concerns that increasing use of new technologies brings in their wake an information overload and inequality in standards.

As one lecturer put it: "I also see some huge disadvantages: now it is easy to get anything published. More and more material is put on the Net and it is getting more difficult to find the good ones – you will just get lost in the jungle of information out there."

(iii) Training and Development

Some 7% of staff reported that ICT facilities available for teaching purposes were “non-existent” and 14% described their facilities as poor. 4% assessed the integration of ICT into their course as excellent, 22% as good, and 36% as satisfactory. Some report no integration at all (16%), while a further 21% report poor integration of ICTs into their courses. Examining this question in more detail, we find that 19% regularly used online resources in their lectures, 31% sometimes did, and 33% did not. Some respondents cited a lack of equipment as a barrier to using online resources in lectures while a significant number, the sceptics again (17%), expressed an interest in knowing more about the potential benefits of using ICTs in this way. The 14% (enthusiasts) report that they always use course-specific web pages to support class-based teaching, 24% did often, 31% rarely; and 31% (the sceptics) not at all. Again 14% report that they always use electronic course guides to support class-based teaching and learning, 19% often did so, 16% rarely and a majority (51%) never did do.

47% want to use more ICTs in their teaching, while only 11% stated that they did not want to do so. Staff generally feel that the use of ICT could be more developed in their university with only 12% disagreeing or partly disagreeing.

Here are two staff comments: “There is no interest and no investment in ICT. Staffs have no understanding of the potential possibilities.” Or: “It seems all right. But I am not at all in favour of this technology and I use it very little. I prefer to send letters than emails.”

There is clearly uncertainty about the extent of potential benefits and benchmarks.

For the future, staff expectations are (not surprisingly) very mixed. Some envisage “virtual environments of all kinds,” “increased flexibility and access,” “greater involvement of students,” and “distance learning revolutionised by virtual seminars” in which student learning is deepened, broadened and globalised. Others are less sanguine, suggesting that the main shift will be “less direct contact between staff and students,” “lazier students,” “poorer standard of debate on ideas,” and deteriorating language skills.

Some clearly fear a collapse of traditional boundaries between staff and students. Staff report that email use by students encourages an expectation of immediacy that was, until recently, unusual, as conveyed in these statements: “Teachers are getting more and more unnecessary emails from students. They are very informal and about things that you would think twice about before calling your teacher or writing a letter. And the students expect a reply straight away. It is very annoying.

"Students often email me making long and detailed requests for references or supporting statements for job applications. The email will arrive at 10.00am detailing these demands and conclude: 'I can come and get the reference anytime I am downstairs in the common room now – shall I come up in five minutes?'"

In addition to such immediacy, email use also appears to encourage a familiarity that staff can find problematic. Students, according to staff, appear less inhibited in terms of the nature of communication with staff.

One colleague commented, “Students now readily email me in a form that they would text their boyfriend or girlfriend. It's over-familiar, over-intrusive and, frankly, unintelligible.”

Staff also report that students will be much more demanding and “pushy” in email
communication than in other forms of staff-student contact.

Students now ask more questions directly of faculty staff that, not long ago, they would have found answers for themselves. This will often involve silly, irritating little things like “is a book in the library?” “Do I have to read more than the course textbook?” “When is the library open?” or even “Where is the library?”

All this may also, of course, reflect deeper current societal changes in attitude towards deference and the student-lecturer relationship.

(iv) Plagiarism

Academics seem less sure about the qualitative impact of ICT use on the critical, creative and intellectual abilities of students, with 40% reporting that they are not sure if ICTs encourage originality in student work, and 29% believe they don’t.

One member of staff commented: “It is very hard to say. Good students will do what is necessary. Maybe it will help students in the middle. But I really don’t know.”

Staff have concerns that ICT use encourages plagiarism, with 65% agreeing that the use of ICTs encourages plagiarism, and only 13% disagreeing and 22% not sure. In the words of one lecturer: “I think it is getting worse. Students are not as likely to plagiarise from books (they think it is more likely that the teacher has read the book than an article on the Internet). I am often suspicious.”

Conclusions

As would be expected, this survey suggests that academic staff and students are alert to the potential and importance of ICTs in university teaching and learning. However, there appear to be significant differences between staff and students attitudes. Academic staff seem more interested in new technologies for what have been termed “passive,” content oriented ways, sometimes little more than electronic presentations of traditional materials and activities. Students, on the other hand, are more interested in the “active” potential of new technologies in terms of communication and processing.

The survey also reveals, as we might expect, that ICTs have made a significant impact, with student expectations of provision and availability rising, probably faster than institutions are able to meet. While academic staff appear hesitant about both the impact and full range of advantages of ICTs, students appear increasingly familiar with the application of ICTs to everyday social life, and are increasingly expectant of similar applications in education – posing a real challenge for universities. This is a significant finding for all universities to note.

The survey also reveals a significant minority of staff who are still sceptic about such technology in higher education. This group – perhaps one in seven – contrasts strongly with the one in five enthusiasts who are keen to pioneer best ways on using new technology in their work, and a middle group who are mostly comfortable with the benefits of email communication, document storage, and presentational benefits.

Both staff and students are also very well disposed, as you would expect, to the increased ease of communication between these two groups and embrace this development as positive. But this enthusiasm is tempered by concerns that this could come at the cost of reduced interaction between staff and students, which could qualitatively reduce the learning experience. The effacing of traditional boundaries between staff and students brings a kind of democratisation of the relationship between staff and students, but also seems to engender tensions for staff, some of whom clearly fear for the survival of more traditional roles, functions and powers of academic staff.

Concerns expressed by both staff and students about the impact of ICTs on possible originality in student work – including a rise in plagiarism – and intellectual endeavour and the relationship between ease of Internet access and plagiarism, would seem of particular note. These issues pose questions for the qualitative experience of, and output from, university study and courses. This survey suggests these issues are likely to become more central to debates about the future of ICT use.

As one lecturer commented: “The Europeaum should encourage the less-developed member universities to use more technology. They could help to generate some training, for example, and make them aware of the possibilities.”

It confirms that overall ICT use is patchy in terms of integration into different courses, staff attitudes to its value and use, and in terms of software and hardware available to both staff and students. Take-up, use and attitude remain varied amongst staff and, in some cases, underdeveloped.

Overall, such a survey can – and does - only claim to provide a snapshot of current attitudes of usage and expectations of ICTs in universities. It prepares the ground for a more critical and deeper analysis of some of the issues raised and implied – including the extent and manner ICTs should best be used in teaching and learning, and to obtain the best pedagogic and intellectual use of such technology.

As one lecturer put it during our interviews: “I think there is too much tendency to think all ICT development is good, often without questioning what we are going to gain from it.”
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“There are no insurmountable boundaries or frameworks that imprison us or prevent us from understanding one another. Dialogue is possible. One must simply want it and push oneself to achieve it. Our students want it and achieve it.”
– The Hon. Professor Marcello Pera, President of the Italian Senate

“Universities now need to produce students that are obviously well trained, that are international and mobile, but who are also critical thinkers.”
– Herr Gerd Schulte-Hillen, then Chairman of the Supervisory Board of Bertelsmann

“We are more than our functions. We are more than the jobs that we do.”
– Ben Okri, distinguished writer

“I believe the fears that European universities are lagging behind are exaggerated. I believe European universities are at least as capable of meeting the challenges as those from the US or Australia.”
– Professor Sir Peter Scott, Vice-Chancellor of Kingston University

“Universities today – more than ever – have a critical role in advocacy, which is essential to modern democratic life.”
– Dr Avi Primor, Vice-President at Tel-Aviv University

“You’re comfortable; you have the resources. You must reach out particularly to the South, particularly to the less developed universities. Make fresh partnerships.”
– Mary Robinson, former UN Commissioner for Refugees

“If the schools get it wrong, or are ill-equipped, or under-funded, or do not attract the right level of teachers because of lack of prestige, then it makes the work of universities very much more difficult.”
– Lord (Claus) Moser, Government education advisor and a former Warden of Wadham College, Oxford