IAU, founded in 1950, is the global association of higher education institutions and university associations. It has member institutions and organisations from some 130 countries that come together for reflection and action on common concerns. IAU partners with UNESCO and other international, regional and national bodies active in higher education. It is committed to building a worldwide higher education community.
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EDITORIAL

WELCOME TO THE FIRST ISSUE OF THE 2009 VOLUME OF IAU HORIZONS. Among other firsts, this issue offers a brief report on the first meeting of the IAU Administrative Board as chaired by the new President. It also introduces a new look for IAU Horizons, which is accompanied by a new rhythm of production as we move to bigger issues three times per year.

In the wider world, however, 2009 opened to the tragic resurgence of violence in Gaza, a sad setback for those who work for peace in the region; a setback whose aftermath will take years of rebuilding. IAU has communicated with the universities in Gaza, joining other organizations, including the PEACE programme, in offering to mobilize all IAU Members to assist in the rebuilding.

Also, in these first weeks of the year, billions of hopeful eyes around the world are directed at the new US President and his Administration, wishing that a new era of American politics brings peace, security and solutions to diverse plights, including the economic crisis.

Indeed, the deepening economic crisis around the world has come to take over our collective consciousness, raising questions about the sustainability of the dominant model of development and the need for global oversight and management.

It would not be surprising, given the disastrous developments in the global economy to see a resurgence of the adage ‘small is beautiful’. Yet, this issue of IAU Horizons examines a contrary trend – mergers of universities and other higher education institutions into bigger, potentially more powerful, efficient and competitive entities, expected to cope better with the demands of changing times.

Offering a series of glimpses of fairly different experiences with mergers – top down imposed as well as those created by a bottom-up dynamic, we hope to be helpful to those institutions that may be contemplating or facing future mergers. As you read these short articles, you will notice the common strands of “do’s and don’ts” that emerge. The essential elements of time, leadership, a clear vision of the end goal, buy-in by stakeholders, transparency and frequent and open communications are among the key aspects for successful mergers. As well, the reasons for taking on such a complex and usually difficult process are outlined by the authors having worked in contexts as different as Sweden, China, France, South Africa and Latin America.

Given that this trend to bring institutions of higher education together into larger units is taking place in many parts of the world, all we can provide is a very partial and selective snapshot; readers should feel free to share their experiences with mergers in similarly brief papers. We would be ready to publish your viewpoint or experience on the IAU website.

In addition to the focus on mergers, this issue of IAU Horizons brings a message from the IAU president, introduces the IAU Executive Committee, provides a telegraphic summary of the very rich and lively ‘roundtable’ discussion the Board members had about critical issues higher education faces around the globe. As promised in the past issue, showcasing successfully completed LEADHER projects, undertaken with a grant from the Programme has become a regular feature as are reports on key IAU activities and upcoming IAU events. Most importantly, IAU Horizons also offers a tribune for the membership to share information in the standard section “News from Members”.

The editorial team and I hope that you like the new look. Perhaps it will inspire you to contribute news about your institution, articles on mergers or suggestions for future topics IAU Horizons may consider addressing.

Eva Egron-Polak
Secretary-General
IT IS MY PLEASURE TO WISH YOU, on behalf of the International Association of Universities, a happy, healthy and productive year as 2009 gets underway. As you could read in the previous issue of IAU Horizons and in other IAU documents and messages, the Association has embarked on a new four year term with an Administrative Board that has been considerably renewed during the elections in July 2008.

The newly-elected Board met for the first time in Paris in early December with almost a full Board attendance. Several Deputy Board members and one of the IAU Honorary Presidents participated as well.

Having served as a Board Member and as Vice-President of the Association, I was able to observe and contribute to the life of the IAU over the past eight years. This Association is unique and I am deeply committed to the development of its full potential by building on what has already been achieved by my predecessors so far.

I am convinced of the importance of the Association’s work, and I am certain that in the following years, due to the seriousness of the economic situation, the increasing tensions among peoples and continuous degradation of the quality of life for so many on our planet, our societies and thus our Higher Education Institutions will be facing unprecedented challenges. IAU’s commitment to work together with its Members, to raise awareness of these challenges and our shared responsibilities, to act is more important than ever.

The years to come will be tough and I hope to count on many for advice and collaboration. I am therefore particularly pleased to announce the unanimous agreement of the Board with regard to the new IAU Vice Presidents, who, together with the Secretary General of the Association form the Executive Committee that will assist me in leading the Association:

- Prof. Dzulkifli, Vice-Chancellor, University Sains Malaysia, Malaysia: 1st Vice President
- Prof. Calzolari, Rector, University of Bologna, Italy, Treasurer, IAU
- Dr. Green, Vice-President, American Council on Education, USA
- Prof. Mugenda, Vice-Chancellor, Kenyatta University, Kenya

The Executive Committee is thus representative of the different regions of the world and of both categories of IAU Members. I am particularly pleased to underline the fact that the Committee is also completely gender-balanced. Membership in two IAU Standing Committees was established as well, namely the Finance Committee which is chaired by the Treasurer, Prof. Calzolari (Italy) and the Membership Development Committee, chaired by Prof. Metin Baydar (Turkey).

Issues, projects and activities

In reviewing the Association’s past activities, on-going projects and proposed new initiatives for the coming four years, the Board and I noted with satisfaction that the association continues to stand for what is important in higher education. IAU and its Member universities and other Institutions of Higher Education around the world ideally stand for openness, academic freedom, equity, excellence, tolerance, inclusion and diversity, innovation and capacity building, creativity, social engagement, critical thinking and many other essential values. However, in a world where competition for limited funds is increasing and where ranking initiatives tend to shape agendas, ongoing vigilance with regard to such ideals is necessary. Indeed, access to higher education is still denied to too many, equity remains a goal rather than reality too often and gaps tend to be widening in many spheres, including in the knowledge society.

Yet, challenges of global proportions are upon us - the UN Millennium Development Goals must be met, Education for All needs to advance and Climate Change dangers addressed.
The Association must remain active in the area of Access and Success to Higher Education, in work related to Sustainable Development and intercultural learning and dialogue. It will pursue its research on Internationalization of Higher Education and on the contributions that Higher Education makes to secure expansion and quality of other levels of education.

Several Task Forces are being created to assist in the development and implementation of projects in these priority areas of IAU’s work. As in the past, each group is chaired by one of the Board Members and, so far, the following have been confirmed:

- Internationalization of Higher Education: Chair - Dr. Green, ACE, USA;
- Sustainable Development: Chair - Prof. Asashima, Tokyo University, Japan;
- HE and linkages with Education for All: Chair of Reference Group - Prof. Mugenda, Kenyatta University, Kenya;
- Access to Higher Education: Chair - Prof. Fernos, Interamerican University of Puerto Rico, USA.

News and updates on these and other groups will be regularly posted online on the IAU website and specialised WebPages.

**Membership**

Let me return to the issue of membership. The Association must pursue several goals simultaneously in this area: provide services and activities of interest to current members while developing effective strategies to attract new members and bring back those universities who once were members. The global platform and perspective provided by IAU are a necessity now more than ever and the Association needs to grow to be a representative voice of Higher Education globally as well as to further South/South, South/North and East/West collaboration.

IAU is an Association that is committed to building capacity and working together to achieve shared goals - to meet both local and global needs. I will try to do my best to contribute to the pursuit of these goals and to safeguard the values which IAU promotes and for which it stands.

Juan Ramón de la Fuente
IAU President 2008-2012

---

The IAU Administrative Board members 2008-2012

Front row – from left to right: M. GREEN, Vice-President, American Council on Education; J. TOBIAS, Rector, University of Salvador, Argentina; M. SCROUARDOON, Chancellor, Tabriz University, Iran; J. de la FUENTE, IAU President, former Rector, National Autonomous University of Mexico; M. EGRON-POLAK, Secretary-General and Executive Director*; A. DZULKIFLI, Vice-Chancellor, University Sains-Malaysia; I. OLOYEDE, Vice-Chancellor, University of Ilorin, Nigeria; O. MUGENDA, Vice-Chancellor, Kenyatta University, Kenya; M. FERNOS, President, Interamerican University of Puerto Rico, USA.

Second row – from left to right: I. DEVYLDER, Programme Officer*; P. KOTTECHA, CEO, Southern African Regional Universities Association; A. BLASH, Rector, University of Kalmar, Sweden; C. TAGOE, Vice-Chancellor, University of Ghana; D. SHERI, Senior Research and Policy Analyst*; R. HUDSON, Programme Officer*.

Third row – from left to right: N. KIS, Vice-Rector, Corvinus University of Budapest, Hungary; J. THORENS, former Rector, Université de Genève, Switzerland; M. ASASHIMA, Managing Director & Executive Vice-President, University of Tokyo, Japan; P. POL, Vice-President, Université Paris 1 – Val de Marne, France; M. BAYDAR, Rector, Suleyman Demirel University, Turkey; A. PUMPITS, Rector, Mykolas Romeris University, Lithuania; C. OBERLIN, Office Manager*; J. NOLITE, International Relations, UNAM, Mexico.

Back row – from left to right: J. ZHU, Vice-President, Zhejiang University, China; I. TURMAINE, Director, Information Centre and Communication Services*; J. Hodder, President, The College of The Bahamas; H. VANT-LANG, Senior Programme Manager*; Hüseyin Gül, International Relations Coordinator, Suleyman Demirel University, Turkey; W. MOURSSE, President, Notre Dame University-Louaize, Lebanon; E. HARB, International Relations, Notre Dame University-Louaize, Lebanon.

* IAU Secretariat, Paris, France
THE IAU BOARD, AS ELECTED IN UTRECHT LAST JULY met for the first time in Paris, France, on 5 and 6 December 2008. Each attending Board Member was invited to introduce him/herself and to present their views on the main challenges facing higher education in their country and beyond. They were also invited to speak about what they felt IAU’s priority themes could/should be in the future.

Not surprisingly, issues of autonomy, the current global financial crisis, access to higher education, the rise of the private higher education sector and the new accreditation and quality assurance challenges relating to the rapid expansion and changes in higher education, were among the most important topics mentioned.

Coming from different regions, Board Members’ preoccupations, requiring more national and international attention were as follows:

AFRICA
In Africa, access to higher education and equity were one of the main issues underlined. Prof. Mugenda, Vice-Chancellor of Kenyatta University in Kenya, indeed indicated that the problem of access to higher education (HE) was crucial in her region. She stated that “More than 60% of people who qualify to attend university in Kenya cannot get a place, as availability is lacking.” This view was shared by Dr. Kotecha, CEO, Southern African Regional Universities Association (SARUA) who indicated that in South Africa, there is a clear need to both increase access to HE, and develop new initiatives to raise awareness of, and funding for HE in the country. Prof Mugenda went onto to argue in favor of the further development of e-learning facilities and strategies in order to increase access to HE, and suggested that IAU could develop a policy statement on quality assurance in online education.

Prof. Tagoe, Vice-Chancellor of the University of Ghana, drew attention to the ‘explosion’ in the numbers of private higher education institutions in West Africa and an increasingly significant problem of a shortage of academics. He felt that the lack of capacity and career opportunities in Africa were forcing academics to undertake their PhD study away from the continent, and furthermore, to stay out of Africa upon its completion. Along with Prof Mugenda, they argued that African governments need to put processes in place to better address these critical issues.

AMERICAS
Prof. Fernos, President of the Interamerican University of Puerto Rico, USA also identified the issue of access as being a top priority, especially in the context of the current global economic crisis. “In the USA, many universities are dependent upon tuition fees and since many families are loosing their jobs, their sons and daughters are unlikely to be able to go to university”, he said. This point was further elaborated by Dr. Green, Vice-President of the American Council on Education (ACE), USA who said that “The dark side of the current financial crisis is the intense and growing global competition higher education institutions will have to face”. She also agreed with the President, Prof. de la Fuente, when she said that the “HE sector should explore what role it can play in bringing about solutions to the current economic crisis”.

Dr. Hodder, President of the College of the Bahamas, expressed a sense of profound concern with the current financial crisis especially when coupled with other signs of a deeply troubled world. She called for the HE sector, including IAU, to move from a debate about how these difficulties impact on the sector, towards actively seeking solutions on how HE can positively affect the world. She felt that this would in fact strengthen the values on which the Association was built 60 years ago, in the aftermath of World War II, when, similarly as today, international and intercultural cooperation and understanding were most needed.

Prof. de la Fuente, IAU President and Former Rector, National Autonomous University of Mexico, added that one of the central issues being debated in his part of the world was how catalytically the Bologna Process was changing higher education around the world. The President also suggested the creation of a Task Force for the organization of a high level debate on the impact of the financial crisis on HE. It was felt that such an effort could lead to a list of good practices in reducing HEIs costs without impacting on research and development, and facilitate better involvement of HE in the discussion of proposals for tackling the crisis with governmental policy makers.

ASIA AND PACIFIC
Prof. Dzulkifli, Vice-Chancellor, University Sains-Malaysia, Malaysia said that given the current economic crisis and the resulting budget cuts being made, the sector will need to work harder to reinforce its sustainability – to ensure that students will continue to receive the highest level of education in the future. IAU, he felt, could become an information center for HEIs around the world to
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MERGERS IN HIGHER EDUCATION

Merger of universities – A Swedish bottom-up initiative

by Agneta Ch. Bladh*

Swedish context

The Swedish Higher Education system was thoroughly reorganised thirty years ago. All tertiary education institutions were covered under the same formal umbrella, and several new institutions were established. These new institutions grew, especially during the 1990’s, as a result of an enormous expansion in student numbers. Some were later transformed into universities, and some were awarded Ph.D. granting-rights in specific areas. Among these institutions were Blekinge Institute of Technology, the University of Kalmar and Växjö University.

The rapid expansion of the higher education sector in Sweden, in conjunction with a funding system that is highly dependent on student preferences, led to

University of Geneva for example, the Swiss parliament has recently approved giving the university increased autonomy*. Prof. Bladh, Rector, University of Kalmar, Sweden, expressed her agreement and also underlined that “the consequences of greater institutional autonomy for academic freedom has to be considered as the relations to external actors have intensified”. In Sweden, a recent proposal from a governmental commission has put greater institutional autonomy on the agenda.

Prof. Bladh also spoke about how large scale *reform and restructuring of programmes* is being implemented everywhere in the world, not only in Europe; she was particularly interested in maintaining a broader perspective on these changes. Prof. Pol, Vice-President, Université Paris Est–Val de Marne, France, indicated that HE reform is underway in France too, with much emphasis in France being placed on the new law on autonomy and on *mergers and the development of strategic alliances* (read more about the creation of Research Poles, the so-called French PRES on page 12).

Prof. Baydar, Rector, Suleyman Demirel University, Turkey urged both HE and the IAU to focus on the future and debate the *future role of universities*. As newly-appointed Chair of the Membership Development Committee, he also offered to strengthen IAU membership amongst institutions in Turkey.

Prof. Pumputis, Rector Mykolas Romeris University, Lithuania, underlined the importance of *international debates*, such as those organized by IAU, on the present and future of higher education and the positive impacts that this has had on higher education both in his country and on his own university.

Prof. Sorouraddin, Former Chancellor, Tabriz University, Iran underlined the importance of HE for and in developing countries. He stressed that "it is not only necessary, but vital for both personal and also national development". He felt that in developing countries, *competition* for access to university places is about five times higher than in the developed world. "This needs attention; e-learning could be a good solution to the problem [...] providing access to higher education to a greater number of students” he said. Finally, he argued that much more should be done to *promote IAU* at the global level. Indeed, Prof. Asashima, Managing Director and Executive Vice-President, University of Tokyo, Japan, drew attention to the vital role that IAU could play as a *platform for exchanging information* and strengthening regional and international networks in this global era of HE reform. He felt that new *fundraising strategies* should be initiated to facilitate this, and to promote IAU.

EUROPE

Amongst participating Board Members from Europe, *institutional autonomy* and *major HE reforms* featured most importantly in their comments. Prof. Thorens, Former Rector, University of Geneva and IAU Honorary President, indicated that “there is a strong move towards greater institutional autonomy across the globe. At the
a growing competition for students among all HEIs. Furthermore, about half of all research funding to HEIs in Sweden is indirect and based on a quality assessment procedure operated by research-funding organisations. As such there is also strong competition for research funding.

**Collaboration leading to institutional merger**

Blekinge Institute of Technology whose research focused on engineering sciences, the University of Kalmar whose research focused on natural sciences and Växjö University with research focused on humanities and social sciences, who were all located in the same region of the country, independently made similar assessments of the competitive situation for students and research funds. As such, the three institutions decided to form a three-year alliance (2006-2008) with the objectives of strengthening the quality of undergraduate training, increasing research funding and making management more effective. The prerequisites for collaboration were very much in place since the research orientation of the institutions was complementary. In undergraduate training however, the institutions were in competition, as they were all offering similar programs and degrees.

An initial key aim of the alliance was to decide upon how the collaboration should be formed in the future. Several joint committees presented their proposals, and some formal obstacles surfaced. Two of these were: the impossibility of awarding joint degrees and the issues associated with the institutions having common faculty boards.

However, after a thorough internal analysis at each institution, principal-oriented decisions about the future were made. Two institutions – the University of Kalmar and Växjö University – decided to merge. The third, Blekinge Institute of Technology, decided to continue as an independent institution.

In June 2008, two and a half years after initiating the alliance, the Swedish government received a joint application from the two merging institutions, to form the **Linnaeus University** in January 2010. Three months later, the Swedish government granted the establishment of this new university.

The two merging institutions have agreed to carry out preparations for the new university themselves. To date, a merger organisation has been initiated, supported by a website, a steering group has been launched, and a strategy group as well as a group of deans have met on several occasions.

Faculty from both institutions who are involved in similar educational programs and research, have met to form common curricula and research programs. Furthermore, in the beginning of 2009, a group will propose an organisational structure for the new university in terms of departments and faculty boards, and a further group is organising the new administrative structure. In December 2008 the Swedish government will decide upon the temporary decision-making framework for the new university, awaiting its start-up in January 2010.

**Lessons learned**

In Sweden, the government encouraged the bottom-up approach, thereby giving the institutions involved the mandate to take the lead in the step by step decision making process. We have seen that there are several advantages with a bottom-up approach. These include ownership by the Institution – its administration and staff – of the time schedule and the process itself up to a merger decision (and to a certain extent, even thereafter), and inside control of the communication process. We also saw that an open and trustful relationship between the leaders of the institutions, as well as leadership continuity, is crucial during a bottom-up led process. For example, when Blekinge Institute of Technology changed its leadership during the second year of the alliance, they withdrew their participation.

The journey leading to a decision to merge involves both internal and external issues. Internally, the faculty and students must embrace the vision behind the merger, and externally, local and regional partners, proud of a nearby young university, must also embrace the vision for the future. We have seen that a dual-campus university is of great assistance to receiving this support.

We have seen that there are certain prerequisites for bottom-up led merger processes to be successful. For example:

1) There must be a shared vision of the future and the possibilities for change.
2) Unchanged leadership during the process is advantageous.
3) There needs to be mutual confidence between the institutional leaders involved.
4) There has to be a broad level of support for the merger inside the institutions, including from students.
5) Support from local and regional political levels and the regional business sector facilitates the process.
6) The name of the new institution is crucial. A new name, acknowledged by all stakeholders at an early stage, is highly recommended.

At present the merger process described is just at the point where ‘the bottom meets the top’. We are currently awaiting government directives, before moving towards accomplishing the Linnaeus University.
Institutional Mergers in Chinese Higher Education: An Arranged Marriage?

by Rui Yang*

Institutional merger is a form of radical organizational change. Merger in higher education refers to a range of arrangements whereby two or more participating higher education institutions combine to form a single new organization. It has been an important phenomenon in the development of higher education and is becoming increasingly common across many higher education systems worldwide. Like the situation in many countries, the Chinese government uses mergers to address problems of institutional fragmentation, lack of financial and academic viability, and low efficiency and quality, and to build larger and more comprehensive universities (Harman, 2002). It has played important roles either in initiating or encouraging mergers by providing powerful incentives for merger so as to rationalize its higher education system.

Mergers in Chinese higher education started in provincial institutions in 1992 under a state-planning program. From 1993 to 1997, hundreds of institutions were involved including an increasing number of the prestigious ones. The peak came in the late 1990s when the Chinese government accelerated its use of policy leverage to promote higher education mergers. From 1999 to 2001, 40 mergers were completed in which 104 institutions were reorganized into 40. This involved nearly all types of institutions from the most prestigious Peking and Tsinghua Universities to small local colleges at the bottom of the hierarchy of the system. Many of the mergers have in part been involuntary in the sense that institutions chose to merge because of pressures caused by the changes in government policies and in some cases because of government imposition. Individual institutions had to respond to the changes in government policies. By March 2004, 1,021 institutions had been involved, with 382 new institutions created, whilst only two institutions were involved in a merger in Tibet, and 95 in Jiangsu.

Three national higher education policies contributed particularly to the merger wave. The first was Project 211, which aimed to select 100 institutions and/or academic fields on which investment was to focus to achieve excellence by international standards. The second was China’s reform of its national government structure in 1998, which led to a transfer of jurisdiction over many institutions from various ministries, either to the Ministry of Education (MOE) or to provincial or local governments. Most institutions tried desperately to be included in the elite group under the MOE. One of their major strategies was to merge with other institutions to enlarge their size in order to be favored by the MOE. The third policy was China’s quest for world-class universities, which involved nearly all of the most elite universities in the merger process.

From the government’s viewpoint, merging several complementary institutions to form a new and comprehensive university gathered the strengths of different institutions and at the same time avoided unnecessary duplication and thus seemed to be a more cost-effective way to reach the world-class university objective. Higher education institutions had to respond to these changes in government policy, either to survive or to grow. Given the context of Chinese higher education in the 1990s, the more comprehensive institutions had a better chance to protect and to increase their flows of funds than the relatively vulnerable specialized institutions. Many smaller institutions therefore chose to merge with other institutions to enhance their chance of survival. Larger institutions also joined the merger process in order to diversify and to cover as many subject fields as possible, trying to bring in more resources from the government. For the top-tier universities, the world-class initiative provided a golden opportunity to seek extra funding from the government to help them achieve academic excellence.

Mergers have profoundly altered the contours and landmarks of China’s higher education. Although the storm has subsided since 2001, it seems that governments and higher education institutions will continue to use mergers as a means to cope with the tensions and challenges that have given rise to mergers. Meanwhile, the debate about university mergers in China has been going on for nearly two decades. Within the course of this time, many merger proposals were made and debated. Indeed, there have been strong criticisms. Some Chinese scholars have even called such large mergers an ‘arranged marriage.’ Despite the notorious fact that most universities in China were too narrowly focused, the actual merger practice has been controversial and divisive, especially because most mergers have failed to live up to their potential. There were too many vested interests, and various problems arose ranging from funding, political control,
choice of disciplines, the merged campus's location, to the uncertainty about a new leadership. The question of whether it will help to raise the quality of education remains.
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### M&A: Markets and Academy
by Julio Durand*

The acronym ‘M&A’ is well known in the corporate world, and is omnipresent in our turbulent times of global financial crisis. Mergers and Acquisitions imply strategic decisions: to survive or disappear, grow or restructure, compete or collaborate, and so on. Do these realities have any connection with university life? Probably much more than the traditional ‘ivory tower’ vision will admit.

In many countries like Finland, the Netherlands or France, the State is the main promoter of mergers amongst universities and other kinds of higher education institutions. In Latin America the question is much more related to the growing privatization of the higher education sector. Numerous studies published by IESALC-UNESCO over the last decade recount the explosion in the number of private institutions as an answer to the mounting demand for higher education from an avid young population, as well as the rise in the numbers of ‘non traditional’ students.

Following the dictates of multilateral institutions like the World Bank, the State abandons control of numerous sectors. In many LA countries, this originates the process of privatization – and sometimes commercialization – of higher education. There are a lot of serious and prestigious private institutions in the region, with admirable academic aspirations, but I would like to scrutinize some recent developments to force and open discussion.

Mexico could be seen as a model case. It is possible to ‘buy’ universities as this advertisement posted on the web states: “I am interested in buying universities with less than 1000 students” (Cf. http://bexatec.itesm.mx/forums/showthread.php?p=6232, visited: 1/01/2009). In 2004 Sylvan Learning, Inc., now Laureate Education, Inc., bought Universidad del Valle de México (UVM). Being a foreign investment, the acquisition had to be authorized by a regulatory agency. Finally, the company informed the NASDAQ authorities of the operation, and a payment of US$ 49.9 million was made for an 80 % stake in the company that operates the university.

Apparently, in Mexico and other LA countries, the mechanism in use is a juridical fiction to overcome the accepted principle that universities must be non profit organizations (or foundations or civil associations). The practice is to create a commercial company that functions as ‘operator’ of the university. Managers then publicly state that there is no interference with the academic dimension of the university. This shows a very weak conception of the nature and functioning of an educational institution (“Apetito de EU por universidades”, by Sergio Otálora, 17/06/2004. www2.eluniversal.com.mx/pls/impreso/noticia.html?id_nota=112141&tabla=Nacion visited: 1/01/2009).

During recent years, the regional press has mentioned many acquisitions of Chilean universities (Universidad Andrés Bello, Universidad San Sebastián, etc.). One headline reads: “Gonzalo Vial Jr. buys Universidad Aconcagua and merges it with U. Rancagua”. Indeed it is easy to find references to similar ‘educational businessmen’ or commercial firms that invest in the highly profitable activity of higher education (Diario financiero, 9/01/08. Cfr. http://frgoa.usc.es/drupal/node/38338, visited: 4/01/09).

But sometimes business does not prosper, and the changing nature of markets shakes the sustainability of an academic institution leaving behind a lot of damaged people, broken promises, and forced mergers. This was the case of Unikuljis, a private university in Bolivia which closed in 2006, having been unable to compete with the other 15 institutions in its region. Likewise, in Argentina the bankruptcy of a bank originated the financial crisis that later led to the closing of Universidad Hebrea Argentina Bar Ilán. The 800 students of the institution had to find a new university willing to receive them (“Dejan sin aulas a 800 alumnos”, Raquel San Martín, *La Nación*, 13/04/00. Visited: 4/01/09, www.lanacion.com.ar/nota.asp?nota_id=12839).

To consider the merger of universities as mere commercial operations or administrative decisions could

---

*M Full Professor and Director, School of Education, Universidad Austral, Buenos Aires, Argentina (UDurand@austral.edu.ar).
be a dangerous simplification. Different traditions and organizational cultures can clash and generate conflict if participation mechanisms and extended consultations are not established. The creation in Buenos Aires of the IUNA (National Institute of Fine Arts) to group together many small independent academies was a good expression of this difficulty.

This list could be longer, but it is sufficient to show the complexity which results from the growing expansion of the market logic as the rationale or main criteria directing the higher education system in Latin American countries. Nevertheless, several questions remain: Is the intervention of the state in university mergers and acquisitions necessary? Can the universities have ‘owners’ and be sold as a private property? Is it admissible to distinguish between academic community and ‘commercial operator’? Is it possible to recognize the legitimacy of for-profit purpose of the owners of private higher education institutions?

The explicit reference to this kind of operations in the legislation of higher education in Latin American countries is scarce. There are some examples however. The Peruvian law (n. 23.733, art. 5th) determines that the merging of universities, as well as the creation or suppression of institutions must be approved by a law passed by the Congress.

It seems careless to leave decisions over the rights of different stakeholders in an educational community under the sole logic of commercial analysis. These processes can increase the risk of losing institutional diversity and to lead to a concentration in the programs being offered by the institutions. Students are not ‘customers’ and do not have to be treated as mere consumers of a private service. Professors cannot be considered only as a workforce.

If we conceive higher education as a public good aimed at building a more just and inclusive society, it is easy to understand the need to find appropriate mechanisms to balance free private initiatives, develop quality assurance and promote respect to all the members of the academic community.

To consider the merger of universities as mere commercial operations or administrative decisions could be a dangerous simplification.

Three’s a crowd – an Australian university merger

by Rhonda Hawkins*

As part of sector-wide reforms in Australian higher education the University of Western Sydney was established in 1989 as a multi-campus federation of three colleges of advanced education. Its legislative charter reflected strong community aspirations for a University located in Western Sydney, a region spanning 9000 square kilometres.

The constituent ‘Members’ (the former colleges) operated much as they had always done and with legislative authority to manage their own affairs with minimal influence or accountability to the University ‘headquarters’. As a result, the management and leadership of the University were characterised, in the main, by formulaic planning and resourcing, maintaining the status quo, and inevitably looking inwards. It became obvious that change was needed – as far back as 1995 the cracks in the federation were clear. The staff working together across the institution was becoming more entrenched and it was often easier to work with another university than with colleagues within UWS. In 1998 a new Vice-Chancellor came with a mandate to address the inter-institutional divides so that University could realise its purpose in the region. For the first time staff could question what we did, how we did it and why we had not done more as a collective institution.

The approach of the time was encapsulated by Burton Clark (Creating Entrepreneurial Universities: Organizational Pathways of Transformation, IAU Issues in Higher Education, IAU Palgrave 1998) who wrote that: “with complexity and uncertainty now endemic, no one knows with any degree of confidence what the twenty-first century holds in store for universities. How then to proceed? One answer stands out: step by step, learn by experimenting. We need widespread experimentation that tests ways to move into the future.”

The process started modestly in 1998 with discussions of sharing services and a vision for the University as a whole. A group of 28 projects under the rubric of Agenda 2000 was developed and staff commenced the first conversations about how they might work better together.

* Deputy Vice-Chancellor - Corporate Strategy and Services, University of Western Sydney, Australia
The ringing response was that our structure and operation really didn’t make sense and were built on boundaries and interests of another time. It was clear that the University was not reaping any benefits from its overall size and particular strengths in the new Australian higher education sector that comprised fewer but larger institutions. If UWS was to compete and prosper in that environment it had to change.

In late 1999, the Board of Trustees approved the Vice-Chancellor’s proposal for change, entitled “Shape of the Future”, in which the members would merge to form a unified multi-campus University with one administration and one academic structure. It outlined:

1) A blueprint for the unified UWS;

2) The principles underpinning the new UWS; and

3) The implementation process.

In 1998 UWS was considered an institution at financial risk. And although the merger yielded $10M annual savings the rationale was not only financial. By 1999 it was also not the result of Government reforms. It was because the federated structure no longer made sense and was inimical to purposeful and unifying strategy, to creativity and collaboration and to the efficiencies needed to underpin the University’s future growth.

In the academic structure there were 56 academic units which had often been in competition with each other and had not come together effectively for either teaching or research development.

Given the intensity of academic staff feelings about their disciplines, the University believed it was important that they develop the academic groupings that would be implemented in the merger. This was to be a balanced “bottom up” and management-guided process. This led to 22 schools being nested within four colleges. In 2008 this has been further refined to 17 schools and three colleges.

Although fledgling, the schools immediately engaged in the urgent task of unpacking and remaking the multiplicity of courses into a coherent and integrated academic program. This resulted in the reduction of available subjects from 3,808 to 1,787.

The process sapped much of the goodwill and energy of staff who were tired of the pace and complexity of change. The changes and associated deadlines were relentless and many staff felt they had lost familiar networks of friendship, information sharing and collegiality. These together are the social fabric of an institution and the feelings of loss for some were keenly felt.

In 2008, more than eight years since the merger was first approved, UWS is a more settled institution. It is increasingly successful with demonstrable improvement trends in almost all performance indicators. The impact of the merger on the University's success and reputation is immeasurable. There is no doubt that our capacity to deal with and withstand the ever changing national policy and funding landscape is directly attributable to this structural reform.

What did we learn? Our response to this question is still evolving, but some lessons are clear:

1) There must be a well argued rationale and plan for the merger. People will support what is happening if it has been explained and they see a sense of purpose and a process to achieve what is planned.

2) Communication at all levels, both often and truthfully is vital. To engage staff, students and the community, all need to know what is planned and what is happening – and the messages must be regular, honest and open.

3) Change leaders are critical to implementing major structural or cultural change. Real progress was only made once the new raft of senior managers was in place.

4) Resources must be invested to bring about change – this may be dedicated project management or releasing staff to concentrate on the merger. When this doesn’t happen, those involved will be caught between their operational roles and trying to bring about a new structure. This is not sustainable.

5) It is vital to ensure that there is a robust and well communicated change process. A well constructed process will remove issues of bias, lack of transparency, concerns about the impact of change and provides a focal point for feedback and for concerns to be raised.

6) Structural change is one element of a merger. Equally important is cultural change. Any structure can be made to work if those involved wish to do so. Conversely, the best structure will falter without support. Cultural change takes time – measured in years not months.

Change is ubiquitous – structural change will occur quite quickly in organisational terms, but cultural change and the capacity of the University to embrace the new institutional form will take longer, and requires a well argued, persistent and purposeful agenda for change. The University’s experience shows that approaching change in an evidence-based way, being open to possibilities and aware of the impact on people, will lead to a merger achieving its objectives.
Institutional Mergers in South Africa
by Martin Hall*

The concept of institutional mergers has particular resonance in South Africa. Between 2000, when a national commission reported on the state of the country’s public higher education system, and 2006, the previous set of thirty-six universities and technical colleges was merged and amalgamated under legislative imperative to create the present system of twenty-three universities, universities of technology and comprehensive universities (combinations of the previous universities and technical colleges). As would be expected, this process of national restructuring through mergers was controversial and often contested. It is still unclear what gains have been made, and at what overall price. Given this history, it is unlikely that any South African university will opt for a voluntary merger for strategic reasons in the near future, despite the fact that the imperatives of teaching and research could make such developments advantageous.

Despite the controversy accompanying the merger process, there was no doubt that something had to be done about the higher education system inherited by the first democratic government in 1994. By the end of the 1980s, South Africa had one of the most peculiar higher education systems in the world: notionally four parallel systems segregated by race; governance that ranged from autonomous “white” universities to “bush colleges” reserved for black students that were extensions of government departments. Student participation rates were racialized and highly uneven. A racialized system of land ownership and residential areas had generated fragmented, inefficient campuses with inequities of access and quality of provision, and little possibility for alignment with national skills development, research and innovation or economic development strategies. There was little apparent way in which this system could be reformed incrementally, and the National Plan for Higher Education of 2000 was a bold proposal for comprehensive restructuring through the devices of mergers and incorporations.

With the hindsight of the best part of a decade, it is becoming clearer what has worked, and what has not, and what some of the lasting benefits and consequences may be. Firstly, the key governance challenges have proved to be the integration of key systems: information and communication technologies, human resource and personnel systems, academic programme structures and student fee systems. Since many of the specific institutions required to merge had been unequally resourced, these systems were themselves unequal and often incompatible. This has led to sharp increases in operating costs, as merger solutions settled on highest common denominators in areas such as operating costs and staff salaries. There was also contested student fee increases and chronic under-funding by the state, particularly with regard to capital funding. As a result, the merger experience has in almost all cases been traumatic and demanding.

Secondly, and despite the presentation of the merger process as predominantly a policy and technical challenge, there have been key political issues at both the national level and within newly-created institutions. In several cases, final merger decisions were political settlements.

This has resulted in several mergers that have little educational or research value, and others that may unravel in concert with South Africa’s currently-changing political landscape. At the institutional level, several new universities opted for federal-type solutions and segmented language policies that, now, are being contested as continuation of apartheid divisions, while others have opted to force-feed new institutional cultures, which may prove more enduring in the long run.

Thirdly, and more positively, the post-2000 merger process has resulted in the creation of several new and large urban universities that are making impressive strides in some areas of teaching and research and that may disturb the hubris of the oldest institutions that were largely untouched by the merger processes.

Given the complexity of this recent set of experiences, it seems unlikely that any South African university will opt for a voluntary, strategic merger in the near future. This may be unfortunate. The key challenges for South African Higher Education are increasing student participation (still low in comparison to other middle income countries and exacerbated by extreme inequalities in household income and wealth) and becoming more internationally competitive in research, innovation and high-level qualifications. These two challenges are difficult to reconcile in individual institutions, and the newly-merged institutions are becoming increasingly differentiated in terms of research outputs, graduation rates and quality, and student fees. Given this, it could make good strategic sense for universities to increase their effectiveness by scaling up through mergers either for increased social inclusion or for improved research outputs. But given recent history, it seems unlikely that such proposals would go down well on South Africa’s often beleaguered campuses.
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In several cases, final merger decisions were political settlements.
Where we come from
In Flanders two organizations were created to represent the Flemish higher education institutions: the Flemish Interuniversity Council (VLIR) and the Flemish Council of University Colleges (VLHORA). They operate as the official think tanks and advisory bodies of universities and university colleges, and advise the Flemish government concerning all policy aspects involving higher education. Obviously, these two organizations are characterized by an overlap in their activities and objectives. Nevertheless, up until now, they were operating rather independently of one another.

VLIR was founded in 1976 to improve the relations and cooperation between Flemish universities. VLHORA was created more recently, in 1996, with a similar mission for the university colleges. Right from the start these institutions have defended the interests of higher education institutes, and because of their efficiency, the organizations soon became indispensable advisory bodies in the Flemish education area.

As from 2004, universities and university colleges started collaborating by means of a new cooperating structure, called an association. In essence, this involved a university and several university colleges combining their forces on key matters such as long term strategy and quality assurance. Core business issues, such as education and research policy became a shared concern of universities and university colleges.

This organizational reform in Flemish higher education enhanced a similar cooperation for the umbrella organizations. Along with this reform a growing pressure emanates from the Ministry of Education for VLIR and VLHORA to obtain a more coherent response. Today, steps are being taken towards a closer cooperation. In the coming years an institutional merger might be the result of these efforts.

To merge or not to merge
The Flemish higher education area has changed dramatically over the past few years and will continually face a climate of transformation in the years to come. In 2006-2007, an integration team and a joint office were set up to cluster the two organizations into one umbrella structure in a gradual and systematic manner by 2013. By then the development of the bachelor-master structure and the so called ‘academisation’ process (Making academic education in university colleges more research oriented and providing students with clear-cut research competences) should be completed.

The advantages of such a move are self-evident. Both umbrella organizations attract highly qualified personnel that show similar profiles and share comparable interests and experiences. Allocating these staff members within a joint organization would lead to an aggregate potential in human capital that exceeds the sum of the resources in the individual organizations. It also allows for a shift from parallel activities to a synergy in planning of activities. This will certainly prove to be a huge advantage, because the organizations will be able to focus on priority issues, whilst also being able to broaden their scope of activities.

An integrated umbrella organization would cover the complete range of professional and academic programs emanating from the three angles of higher education (bachelor/master/PhD). When it comes to research, it would represent a continuum ranging from fundamental to applied and project related research, including the knowledge transfer that is inherent to those activities. The stronger external impact this would bring forth is undeniable. The integration process should not detract from the individual values of the partners and allow the development of their achievements and qualities into the new organisation.

What have we learnt today?
VLIR and VLHORA are officially recognized as the advisory bodies on higher education policy and as such, they have a large responsibility. The Ministry of Education is convinced that a merger of both umbrella organizations will result in a highly increased efficiency throughout Flemish higher education.

The Flemish university college/university council will foster an extensive cooperation between all Flemish institutions of higher education. This cooperation will apply to all aspects of higher education: education, research, quality assurance, regulation, coordination, student services and so on. The new organization will continue to take on its

* Secretary-General VLHORA; **General Director VLIR; *** President VLHORA, Belgium

Educational mergers in Flanders
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advisory function, and the ultimate goal is to have the members better tuned to each other. This mechanism will eventually create better operating conditions for all institutions of higher education.

In order to make the amalgamation work, there are several key factors that need to be taken into consideration. The most important one is establishing a climate of recognition of the overall added value that a merger will bring forth. Furthermore, a stronger consensus is needed between all stakeholders: government, universities and university colleges can no longer justify a non-coherent approach to the challenges within the Flemish and European higher education areas.

**Excellence Initiative – Germany**

The ‘Excellence Initiative’ is a German state and federal government approved initiative that aims to make Germany a more internationally attractive and competitive research location. Run jointly by the German Research Foundation (DFG – Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft) and the German Science Council, the two bodies will disburse a total of 1.9 billion Euros between 2006 and 2011, for the following three lines of the initiative:

- Graduate schools to promote young scientists – by conducting structured research training that integrates “non university research institutions”;
- Clusters of Excellence which aim to promote top-level research – by enhancing “scientific networking and cooperation among research institutions in the region (non-university research institutes, industry)”;
- Institutional strategies to promote top-level university research – by “strengthening individual departments and structures” and developing “new institutions and measures”.

Such funding policies have impacted on universities’ structural development in the country and following funding decisions announced in October 2006 and October 2007, Germany now counts 39 Graduate Schools, 37 clusters of excellence and 9 institutional strategies to promote top level university research funding.

The Excellence Initiative also facilitated the foundation of the Karlsruhe Institute of Technology (KIT), through the merger of Karlsruhe University and the Research Centre Karlsruhe, for example. KIT is modelled on the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, USA (MIT).

See: www.dfg.de/en/research_funding/coordinated_programmes/excellence_initiative

**Reform in France: the creation of the French Higher Education Research and Teaching Poles, called ‘PRES’ – New Cooperation Areas in a Changing French Higher Education Landscape**

Established within the framework of the 2006 Law on Research, 12 PRES, distributed throughout the country have, to date, been approved by the French Ministry of Higher Education and Research.

All PRES have the same general goal: improve the readability and international attractiveness of French higher education by bringing together higher education research and teaching at university, ‘grande école’ and research organization levels. Hence, for example, the PRES Université Paris-Est, which is now structured as a public institute for scientific cooperation and is based in two different sites east of Paris: Créteil and the Cité Descartes in Marne la Vallée. Amongst its founding members are two universities (Paris 12-Val de Marne and Marne la Vallée), two Schools of Engineering (École des Ponts et Chaussées and ESEIEE, the Central Laboratory of the Ponts et Chaussées) and three associate members.

The main competencies of these new poles are centred on doctoral education and research (co-signing of publications, setting up of joint doctoral schools and colleges, joint doctoral degrees) and on actions for sharing and collaborative services (partnership development and research improvement, international development, professional development).

The delegation of responsibilities to the new poles is coupled with a transfer of human and financial resources from Member institutions, new financing policies for research, mostly through the creation of foundations all aimed at enhancing economic efficiency, organizational autonomy, academic and scientific excellence. All the PRES are driven by a dynamic of competition that has characterized higher education globally over the last decade.

For more information, please visit the website of the French Ministry of Higher Education (http://media.education.gouv.fr/file/92/8/6928.pdf) or contact Patricia Pol, Vice-President, Université Paris 12 – Val de Marne, France (patricia.pol@univ-paris-est.fr)
IAU has launched the 3rd Global Survey on Internationalization of Higher Education. This survey will once again collect data to allow IAU to monitor and analyze policies, practices, trends and developments in the field of internationalization of higher education by soliciting information from both Higher Education Institutions (HEIs) and all National Associations of Universities around the world.

HEI leaders, faculty members, researchers and students as well as policy makers and education planners are increasingly interested in internationalization approaches, models and issues related to risks, benefits and challenges as they look into the future.

The 3rd Global Survey follows on two others which were conducted by IAU in 2003 and 2005, respectively. The 2005 Global Survey collected responses from HEIs in 95 countries, and led to a report entitled ‘Internationalization of Higher Education: New Directions, New Challenges’ that was authored by Dr. Jane Knight and widely disseminated. Highlights from this Survey are available on the IAU internationalization WebPages.

With this edition of the Survey, IAU aims to increase the overall response rate substantially and maintain the large number of countries from which completed questionnaires were submitted in 2005. This would enable IAU to present an even more authoritative insight on what is taking place globally with regard to internationalization strategies and activities as well as how HEIs are organizing themselves to accomplish their goals. The information IAU expects to collect will be useful to policy makers at institutions and in government as they develop internationalization strategies, and to scholars who are studying internationalization trends. The 3rd Global Survey is also designed to include similar topics and questions to those of the previous two surveys, allowing for unique longitudinal comparisons of the changing nature of internationalization of Higher Education.

The elaboration of the 2009 questionnaires has benefited from in-depth input from an IAU Task Force of international experts, chaired by Dr. Green (ACE and IAU VP) and the advice from a group of pilot universities which tested the institutional questionnaire. The feedback provided served to improve and finalize the questionnaires.

To increase response rates, respondents are able to complete the survey either online or in print format and, in the case of the Institutional Questionnaire, they can do so in their choice of five major languages, namely English, French, Spanish, Chinese or Arabic! The questionnaire designed for associations is available in English and French.

As in the 2005 survey, IAU is inviting all of its Member institutions to participate. In addition, a further 5400 other Higher Education Institutions in a geographically representative sample will also be asked to complete the Survey. All of the 120 or so National Associations of Universities are asked to complete the questionnaire designed for them.

IAU is uniquely placed to conduct a global survey of this kind. The results will produce valuable information on how internationalization of higher education is changing HEIs around the world, and how this process is changing over time. The quality of the survey results however, depend upon the input of those surveyed. We therefore hope that everyone who has been asked to complete the questionnaire will do so.

To read more about IAU’s past activities in this area – Policy Statements and past reports as well as for more information on the current survey, please visit the IAU WebPages on internationalization or contact Mr. Ross Hudson, Programme Officer at: Hudson.iau@unesco.org
The IAU LEADHER Programme
Deadline 3rd Competition: 15 May 2009

LAUNCHED FOR THE FIRST TIME IN MAY 2007 with the aim of building on the wealth of diversity that the Association’s 600 members represent, the Leadership Development for Higher Education Reform Programme (LEADHER) offers opportunities to senior HEI managers to engage in North-South or South-South collaboration for the reform of their institutions by learning from each other. This is a unique service offered to IAU Members which have the possibility to apply for modest grants to support these learning partnerships.

The second competition, which ended in November, 2008, yielded various partnership proposals from IAU Members institutions. The Selection Committee was appointed in December, during the IAU 73rd Board Meeting and assessed all proposals. Two international collaboration projects between IAU Member institutions have been approved. Priority was given to projects involving South-South or North-South cooperation. Learning visits will take institutional representatives to their partner institutions in other countries starting in the summer of 2009. The reform areas covered in the projects include research planning, management and dissemination; the internationalization of higher education; the introduction of sustainable development into the curriculum and campus management (greening).

The third competition for the LEADHER programme is once again open to IAU Members in good standing. Detailed information on the programme, reform areas that are covered and Guidelines for submitting a proposal are available online. The deadline for the submission of project proposals is 15 May, 2009.

For clarification or assistance, please contact Isabelle Devylder @ devylder.iau@unesco.org

One LEADHER Project in the spotlight
“Skills and Career Center-Pathway to the Labour Market”
Project between Albert-Ludwigs-University Freiburg (Germany) and Damascus University (Syria)

The LEADHER project “Skills and Career Center-Pathway to the Labour Market” aimed at establishing evidence that a Skills and Career Center at Damascus University would contribute to the ability of students and graduates to develop career planning and managing skills to pursue a career on the labour market. The experience from Europe and other countries have shown that such centers are instrumental for students to bridge the gap between the university and the labour market. Currently, there are no such centers at Syrian Universities, which could develop personal skills and competences and support the employment of graduates.

Labour markets are changing and the supply and demand of university graduates do not synchronize easily. There is no question that the change to an open market economy in Syria will influence the required employment qualifications drastically. At present, a good percentage of graduates from the higher education system were able to find a job working in areas not related to their educational speciality. Matching the profiles of graduates with the actual and future labour market needs, identified as a strategic outcome of the LEADHER project “Skills and Career Centers – Pathway to the Labour Market”, is, therefore, considered to be a milestone for the economic development in Syria. In this context, not only underemployment, but also gender equality in employment are serious issues. The increasing number of female students at higher education has not been followed-up by a similar employment impact.

The main objectives of the reciprocal learning visits undertaken at Albert-Ludwigs-University Freiburg (Germany) and Damascus University (Syria) were to organize joint workshops at both institutions to discuss conceptual, transferable and training components for the development of the Skills and Career Centre at Damascus University.
The first learning visit took place at the University of Freiburg. A four member team from Damascus University (vice-president for academic affairs, director of international relations and two senior administrators) studied for one week the Skills and Career Center at Freiburg and discussed possible strategic options for Syria. The University of Freiburg is well known in Germany for its Career Center. In 2007, it received the German award for one of the best and most effective career centers of German Universities from the Association of German Sciences. During the learning visit, the discussion addressed questions such as, how to organize the career and skills services at central and faculty levels, how to involve teachers in the activities, how to create the understanding and knowledge of students to enhance their employability and what measures were needed to develop this.

At the end of this learning visit, it became clear that the Career Centre at Damascus University should begin with two strategic lines at the same time. Firstly, the Centre should offer services in recruiting, guidance, information and training for students in order to impact on students' abilities to access the labour market. Secondly, it should carry out a needs assessment on a small to medium scale in order to confirm and fine-tune the required career services during the first years of establishment.

The second learning visit took place at Damascus University and included the Director of the Career Centre and the Vice-President for International Relations of Freiburg University. The main objective of this learning visit was to work out an operational plan for the start-up phase of the Career Center. The joint team agreed on strategic options to be offered for students and graduates at Damascus University as well as on the scope of the needs assessment to be carried out with students, university staff and employers. Special attention was given to a UNDP supported project “Career Management Centre” to be established at Damascus University starting its operation at the end of 2008. The project shall play the role of a learning lab for the entire University of Damascus to become more labour market oriented. In fact, the LEADHER project paved the pathway for the UNDP project by discussing the operational plan for the start-up phase with regard to the establishment of career skills courses, a data base and web-based career information, a counselling/guidance service for students and networking with the labour market through regular job fairs.

Executive summary, extracted from the LEADHER Activity Report submitted to IAU by both institutions. For further information, please contact: Dr. Thomas Teuscher, Damascus University, Syria (t.teuscher@gmx.de), Michael Borchardt, University of Freiburg, Germany (michael.borchardt@uni-freiburg.de).

New UNEP-IAU Project on Sustainable Lifestyles

A new research project aiming at analyzing student perspectives on Sustainable Lifestyles will be launched in February. The Project, coordinated by the United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP) with the support of the Swedish Ministry of the Environment, is developed in partnership with the International Association of Universities (IAU).

The Global Survey on Sustainable Lifestyles is an ambitious initiative meant to explore how sustainable lifestyles, a challenge for present and future generations, are perceived, envisaged and shaped by young adults from different cultures and backgrounds around the world.

UNEP, the voice for the environment within the United Nations system, is supporting the international agenda on sustainable consumption and production (SCP) through this initiative. The project is part of its activities in the framework of the ‘Marrakech Process’, a global multi-stakeholder platform aimed at promoting the shift towards SCP (http://esa.un.org/marrakechprocess/index.shtml). The Marrakech Process allows cooperation among governments and stakeholders, the development of SCP tools and methodologies as well as of concrete activities such as this Global Survey on Sustainable Lifestyles.

In a context of considerable environmental changes, in particular climate change, and of socio-economic challenges, it has become clear that locally and globally, communities urgently need to adopt more sustainable lifestyles. Universities and Higher Education Institutions have a great role to play in this process. Bringing together higher education institutions and organizations from around the world IAU was therefore more than willing to partner with UNEP on the Global Survey on Sustainable Lifestyles. A selection of 50 IAU Member institutions has been invited to participate in this project. Information on the Survey is available online at: www.unep.fr/gssl. Further information at: vantland.iau@unesco.org
UPCOMING IAU CONFERENCES
Special event for Leaders of Associations and Networks!

IAU 3rd Global Meeting of Associations of Universities (GMA III)
Guadalajara, Mexico – 20-22 April 2009

Associations, Networks, Alliances:
Making Sense of the Emerging Global Higher Education Landscape

With this third edition of the GMA, the IAU hopes to structure a debate and reflection about the reasons for and the impact of the steady growth of various higher education groups and organizations around the world. Association and network leaders will be invited to consider what unique responsibilities may fall to associations at various levels: national, regional and international. As well, since most associations, at all levels are confronted with an increasingly diverse and demanding membership, the GMA will address possible responses to the issue of membership diversity.

IAU holds the Global Meetings of Associations every two years and they are organized exclusively for leaders of national, regional and international associations. The GMA offers a unique opportunity for leaders of IAU Member Organizations as well as non Member associations to meet as a relatively small group of peers to exchange ideas, practices and to network.

This edition of the Global Meeting is co-organized by IAU and the Asociación Nacional de Universidades e Instituciones de Educación Superior (ANUIES) of Mexico and hosted by the University of Guadalajara. The Programme includes Prof. Juan Ramón de la Fuente, President of IAU, Prof. Bernard Cerquiglini, Rector of the Agence universitaire de la Francophonie (AUF), Ms Lesley Wilson, Secretary-General of the European University Association (EUA), Dr. Madeleine Green, Vice-President of the American Council on Education (ACE), Prof. Goolam Mohamedbhai, Secretary-General of the Association of African Universities (AAU) and many others. The background paper on the theme of the conference is being prepared by Prof. Kris Olds, University of Wisconsin-Madison.

The GMA participants will also have the opportunity to remain in Guadalajara and attend the international Hemispheric Conference starting in the evening of April 22. It is being organized by three regional organizations of higher education focusing on the Americas – IOHE, CONAHEC and HACU. The Conference will focus on: An Inter-American Higher Education Collaboration: Working together to Shape the Future of our Communities. Reduced registration fees are offered to those who take part in both events.

IAU Annual Conference 2009 on: “The Role of Higher Education in Promoting Intercultural Dialogue and Understanding”
Host: Notre Dame University – Louaize, Beirut, Lebanon.
Dates: 5-6 November 2009

Host: Mykolas Romeris University, Vilnius, Lithuania.
Dates: 25-26 June 2010

14th IAU General Conference 2012
Host: Interamerican University of Puerto Rico, San Jose Puerto Rico, USA, theme and date will be announced soon
IAU will actively contribute to the following international higher education Conferences:

UNESCO World Conference on Higher Education + 10 (2009)
The UNESCO’s World Conference on Higher Education (WCHE) 2009 or WCHE +10 will take place from 5 to 8 July, 2009, in Paris, France. Entitled ‘The New Dynamics of Higher Education’, it has among its objectives to examine the evolution of higher education and research over the past decade, discuss current demands and challenges and, most importantly, define new priorities for action. IAU is involved in the preparations for the conference. The IAU Secretary-General is a member of the conference Planning Committee. The following three sub-themes will structure the conference: internationalisation, regionalisation and globalisation; Equity, access and quality; Learning, research and innovation; in addition to a particular focus on Africa. As well, IAU has been represented at each of the Preparatory Regional Conferences held by UNESCO so far, and there are plans for IAU staff or Board members to attend those still to be held before the July Conference. Furthermore, IAU is the main external partner invited by UNESCO to contribute to the preparation of the sub theme entitled ‘Equity, Access and Quality’.
For further information: www.unesco.org

IAU is co-organising a Session on University Rankings that will form part of the 1st World Social Science Forum, organised by the International Social Science Council (ISSC). This special Session on rankings will take place in Bergen, Norway, on Tuesday 11 May 2009. Further information on the WSSF is available online at: www.rockkan.uib.no/wssf/

The Observatory on Global Higher Education (OBHE): 2009 Global Forum on Cross-Border Higher Education
Kuala Lumpur (KL), Malaysia, 21-24 October 2009

With IAU as one of the main sponsor organizations, The Observatory on Borderless Higher Education will host its 2009 Global Forum entitled ‘Global Connections – Local Impacts: Best Practices, Models and Policies for Cross-Border Higher Education’, in Malaysia in October. Organized in conjunction with the University of Nottingham-Malaysia and the Malaysia Ministry of Higher Education, the Forum promises to be a highly engaging professional venue for global colleagues to exchange ideas, strategies, and best practices about internationalization and cross-border higher education. The Forum will draw on wide participation from international experts in the field of Cross Boarder Higher Education. A call for papers and other information on the Forum is available at: www.obhe.ac.uk/the_obhe_global_forum__malaysia/welcome

IAU is one of the sponsors the World Universities Congress organized by Çanakkale Onsekiz Mart University, an IAU Member in Turkey. The Conference will focus on “What should be the new aims and responsibilities of universities within the framework of global issues?” and will take place on 20/24 October 2010. www.comu.edu.tr/english/

IAU COLLABORATION AND NETWORKING

Over the past few months, IAU participated in a number of international conferences addressing themes related to work carried out by the Association:


On 17 September 2008, in Brussels, Belgium, the IAU’s Senior Research and Policy Analyst met with representatives of the European University Association (EUA)/Council for Doctoral Education (CDE). Discussions centered on possible future collaborative activities between the IAU and the CDE. The CDE, whose members are universities, is a relatively new unit within the EUA. Its mission is to contribute to the development, advancement and improvement of research as well as doctoral education. It commissions research and analysis, convenes conferences for its members, undertakes training seminars, provides policy analysis and disseminates information of good practices. See: www.eua.be/events2/eua-council-for-doctoral-education/

Marking the 20th Anniversary of the signing of the Magna Charta Universitatum in 1988 by more than 350 university rectors and presidents, the Magna Charta Observatory held its annual signing ceremony and conference from 18-20 September 2008, in Bologna, Italy. Several IAU Administrative Board members and the Secretary General were on hand to debate issues of academic freedom and institutional autonomy, reflect on the continued validity of this statement of university values and principles and examine how well it may fit non-European contexts. On this occasion, the Observatory also published an Essay by Prof. Jon Torfi Jonsson entitled: ‘Inventing Tomorrow’s University: Who will take the lead?’ and invited the IAU Secretary-General, as well as Martina Vokasovic, Director, Centre for Educational Policy, Belgrade, to comment on it.
IAU participated in the conference on the *Enhancement and Dissemination of Information, Research and Knowledge on Higher Education* which was organised by one of IAU’s Members, the Babes-Bolyai University of Cluj-Napoca, and the UNESCO European Centre for Higher Education (CEPES). Taking place in Cluj, Romania, from 25-27 September 2008, the conference brought together academic editors and the press. The main conclusion of the conference was that the media and higher education institutions should both learn to work together more effectively and more often. See: http://conference.ubbcluj.ro/hej/programme/programme.php

IAU took part in the first day of the Committee on International Non-Governmental Organizations of the UNESCO Executive Board (2-3 October 2008) which was devoted to a presentation of the **United Nations reform and the partnership of NGOs with UN agencies and UNESCO** in particular in this framework. The major principles governing the “Delivery as One” Initiative were presented, and discussion focused on how to include the civil society in the cooperation between UN agencies at the country level – in particular for the programming activities. The second day focused on *Human Rights in an Era of Globalization – Strengthening Partnerships* where the importance of the participation of higher education in these fields was stressed several times by participants. See: http://portal.unesco.org/en/ev.php-URL_ID=32906&URL_DO=DO_TOPIC&URL_SECTION=201.html

The **12th North American Higher Education Conference**, organized by the Consortium of North American Higher Education Collaboration (CONAHEC), and co-convened by IAU amongst others, took place in Monterrey, Mexico on the 8-10 October 2008. Hosted by the Universidad Autónoma de Nuevo Leon, the conference’s theme was **Higher Education Collaboration: Local Responses in a Global Context**. An important transversal theme of the conference was internationalization of higher education, and IAU made a presentation summarizing the findings of its 2005 Global Survey of Internationalization of HE, and gave an overview of the 3rd Global Survey. This plenary session also saw presentations from two IAU Member Organizations the American Council of Education (ACE), and the Association of Universities and Colleges of Canada (AUCC), both of which are represented on the IAU Task Force on internationalization and have assisted in the elaboration of the 3rd Survey questionnaire (www.conahec.org/conahec/index.jsp)

On 15 and 16 October 2008, IAU took part in the meeting of the Ubuntu Committee of Peers for Regional Centres of Expertise (RCEs) on Sustainable Development. The Committee reviews applications for new RCEs from around the world and discusses strategies on how to strengthen this growing network of formal, non-formal and informal education organisations, which is mobilised to deliver education for sustainable development (ESD) to local and regional communities. The network of RCEs worldwide is building the Global Learning Space for Sustainable Development. RCEs aspire to achieve the goals of the UN Decade of Education for Sustainable Development (DESD, 2005-2014) by incorporating its global objectives in the local communities in which they operate. Several IAU Members participate actively in RCEs working in their vicinity. For further information, please go to: www.ias.unu.edu/sub_page.aspx?catID=108&ddID=182

Invited by the OECD, the IAU Secretary-General took part in a **two-week team visit to Egypt** in October organized to conduct a joint OECD/WB review of **Egyptian higher education**. The review was called for by the Minister of Higher Education of Egypt who wished to find out if Egypt is on the right track in its higher education reforms. The international team named by both the OECD and the WB visited more than 30 HEIs and met twice with senior representatives of other Ministries and government agencies, including the Minister of Higher Education and The Prime Minister. Every meeting organized with higher education institutions included separate sessions with students, faculty members and leadership, respectively. The draft report will first be discussed with Egyptian representatives of the Ministry of Higher Education before it is presented in a public forum sometime in April (www.oecd.org/infobycountry/0,2981,en_2649_201185_1_70390_1__1_1_00.html)

IAU took part in the **First ASEM Rectors’ Conference** which took place at the Free University of Berlin, Germany from 27-29 October, 2008. Following upon the ASEM Conference of Ministers Responsible for Education, held in Berlin in May 2008, it brought together some 100 university leaders from Asia and Europe to **discuss on strategic university cooperation in and between both regions**. The participants welcomed the Ministers’ decision to set up a strategic Asia-Europe education partnership for the 21st century and recommended the creation of an ASEM University Platform to discuss higher education policies and collaboration issues. IAU is a partner in several...
programmes managed by the Asia-Europe-Foundation (ASEF), one of the organizers of the Conference.

IAU contributed to the debates during the 3rd Meeting of the Decade for Education on Sustainable Development (DESD) Reference Group, which took place on 5 and 6 November 2008 at UNESCO Headquarters. The Meeting included a one-day joint session with the DESD Monitoring and Evaluation Expert Group (MEEG) to discuss the draft global Monitoring and Evaluation Report on the DESD and the upcoming World Conference on ESD which will take place in Berlin, Germany, from 31 March to 2 April. This World Conference is expected to help advance the global agenda on ESD. Given the mounting challenges facing sustainable development, such as climate change, food insecurity, energy crisis and now also the deep economic crisis, there is a need to reinforce educational responses through ESD. In this connection, possible strategic directions for the Reference Group for the second half of the Decade were discussed.
For further information, please go to: www.unesco.org/education/desd/

IAU was invited to attend as an observer, at the most recent Governing Board meeting of the Institutional Management in Higher Education Programme (IMHE) of the OECD, held in Paris on 6 and 7 November 2008. Of particular interest for the IAU was the discussion of the initiative entitled ‘Assessing Higher Education Learning Outcomes’ (AHELO). The AHELO feasibility study will test the idea of comparing learning outcomes in higher education, much like the PISA comparisons of learning in secondary education. IAU has accepted the OECD’s invitation to be part of the Stakeholders’ Advisory Group for this project.
See: www.oecd.org/edu/ahelo

The opening statement for the Comparison of Education Systems: A European Model? Conference (13-14 November 2008) by Valerie Pécresse, Minister of Higher Education and Research in France, set the stage for the Conference by calling for a ‘Brussels Ranking of Universities’ as a European alternative to other global, often much criticized rankings. Indeed the European Commission representatives announced that a tender for a feasibility study to develop such a ranking, also called mapping, would soon be issued. Building on from previously or simultaneously taken steps to collect comparable information on HEIs in Europe and classify them in a multidimensional typology, EU hopes to see a multidimensional ranking that would help boost mobility of students and add transparency to the overall European Higher Education Area. Several participants, especially but not exclusively student representatives voiced serious concerns about the idea. The European University Association (EUA) Secretary-General cautioned that the activities related to building a culture of quality were far from completed and ran the risk of being supplanted by what the Minister of Education of France, Xavier Darcos, later called the ‘culture of comparison’, an essential step, according to him, to improving the quality and attractiveness of education.

IAU attended the “Global Research Seminar: Sharing Research Agendas” organised by the UNESCO Forum on Higher Education, Research and Knowledge on 28-29 November 2008. The Seminar focused on the Methodologies for the study of knowledge systems; Case studies on knowledge systems – Higher education and universities; Case studies on knowledge systems – Mapping, analyzing and measuring research capacities and human resources; Dimensions on Knowledge Systems (Policies, governance, infrastructure, human resources, research output, cooperation/agreements, and tensions/dynamics) and as usual brought together an interesting panel of expert researchers in the respective fields. The networking opportunities offered by the Forum sessions are invaluable, however the future of the Forum is being debated and new directions are envisaged.
Amongst others, in 2009 IAU participates in the following Conferences and other events:

7-10 February, 2009, Washington, USA

Continuing the tradition of several years, the ACE invited all IAU Members to attend the ACE Annual Meeting as well as the President and Secretary General. Prof. de la Fuente chaired a session on the Bologna Process. Increasing the number of IAU members in the USA continues to be a high priority for the Association and the ACE meetings offer both interesting and discussions and a strong networking venue.

See: http://aceannualmeeting.org/program_collective_foresight.cfm

World Conference on Education for Sustainable Development: Moving into the second half of the UNDESD
31 March – 2 April 2009, Bonn, Germany

The IAU Senior Programme Manager will take part in the WCESD and participate in the debates that are to take stock of progress over the past five years and plan for the second half of the United Nations Decade on Education for Sustainable Development.


AAU 12th General Conference
4-9 May 2009, Abuja, Nigeria

The AAU 12th General Conference will be hosted by the University of Abuja and the University of Ilorin, Nigeria, whose Vice Chancellor is a Deputy Board Member of IAU. The overall theme being addressed by AAU is: Sustainable Development in Africa: The Role of Higher Education. In light of IAU’s long-standing commitment to higher education’s contribution to education and research for sustainable development and our partnership with AAU in various activities, the IAU will attend this important conference.

See: http://gc.aau.org/index.htm

Suleyman Demirel University
12 June 2009, Isparta Turkey

Marking the end of the 2008-09 academic year, the University will hold a panel discussion on ‘Mobility As A Key to Access and Success in Higher Education’. IAU has agreed to take part in this panel and to work with the Rector of the University, IAU Board Member and Chair of the Membership Development Committee on a strategy to attract new institutions to join IAU.

See: www.sdu.edu.kz

NAFSA 2009 Annual Conference and Expo
24-29 May 2009, Los Angeles, USA

The IAU Director, Information and Communication will attend NAFSA 2009 Annual Conference and Expo in Los Angeles, US, from 24 to 29 May 2009. She will chair and intervene at the session on the Diversification of higher education worldwide: Would typologies help? with Mariam Assefa, World Education Services, and Rajika Bhandari, Institute of International Education as co-presenters. NAFSA is a Member organization promoting international education, whose annual conferences drain thousands of international educators from all over the world.

www.nafsa.org/annual_conference/call_for_workshop_and

21st Annual European Association for International Education (EAIE) Conference
16-19 September 2009, Madrid, Spain

The results of the IAU 3rd Global Survey on Internationalization of Higher Education will provide IAU with new insights into the state of internationalization at universities around the world. Together with members of the Task Force on Internationalization, IAU has proposed a session at the EAIE conference to report on the latest findings.

See: www.eaie.org/Madrid/
**New IAU Members**

IAU is pleased to welcome the following new Members who joined the Association since October 2008:

- **Eqrem Çabej University of Gjirokstra**, Albania
  [Website](http://www.uogj.edu.al)

- **National University of La Rioja**, Argentina
  [Website](http://www.unirioja.es)

- **Ghent University**, Belgium
  [Website](http://www.ugent.be)

- **University of Sciences and Technology of Benin**, Benin
  [Website](http://www.ustb.org)

- **China University of Petroleum**, Beijing, China
  [Website](http://http://department1.cup.edu.cn/~waisb)

- **Koya University**, Irak
  [Website](http://www.koyauniversity.org)

- **Ritsumeikan Asia Pacific University**, Japan
  [Website](http://www.apu.ac.jp)

- **East-Kazakhstan State Technical University named after D. Serikbayev**, Kazakhstan
  [Website](http://www.do.ektu.kz)

IAU is pleased to welcome the following Institution back to Membership:

- **City University of Hong-Kong**, China
  [Website](http://www.cityu.edu.hk)

**News from Members**

New University of Hong Kong Publication: the International Journal of Continuing Education and Lifelong Learning

The University of Hong Kong’s Centre for Research in Continuing Education and Lifelong Learning within the School of Professional and Continuing Education has launched the International Journal of Continuing Education and Lifelong Learning (IJCELL). The IJCELL is a peer-reviewed journal that provides a platform for reporting innovative work and research in continuing education and lifelong learning, especially research that includes the interaction of theory, practice and technology. Contributions are welcomed from anyone involved in the rapidly evolving field of continuing education and lifelong learning: policy makers, academics, teachers, administrators, postgraduates, software designers, among others. In addition to major articles, IJCELL includes book reviews and research notes. The journal is intended to be a vehicle bridging East and West in continuing education and lifelong learning research. It is published twice a year in November and May, and the inaugural issue of IJCELL is now on sale. An Online Subscription Form is available at: https://w3.hkuspace.hku.hk/eform/cell/form_eng.php.
New EUA President: Prof. Jean-Marc Rapp
IAU congratulates Prof. Jean-Marc Rapp, Former Rector of the University of Lausanne and Former President of the Rectors’ Conference of the Swiss Universities (CRUS) on his recent election as President of the European University Association (EUA). He has been an EUA board member since 2005 and EUA Vice-President as of September 2007.

AUCC announces new President
The IAU congratulates Paul Davidson for his nomination as new President and CEO of The Association of Universities and Colleges of Canada (AUCC) Mr Davidson was previously the Executive Director of the World University Service of Canada (WUSC), a leading international development organization linked to Canadian universities and colleges. For more information please contact: Leslie Cole, Communications Officer, on lcole@aucc.ca.

The Association of African Universities (AAU) launches the African Higher Education Excellence Award
The Association of African Universities (AAU) launched the AAU African Higher Education Excellence Award for Distinguished Contribution to Higher Education and Research in Africa. The aim of this award is to recognise a dedicated academic, who has inspired his or her peers by producing internationally acclaimed research, helping to build good and stimulating teaching and learning conditions in African educational institutions, and providing outstanding institutional leadership and social responsiveness. The AAU hopes the Award will also help raise public awareness and hence increase the involvement by civil society, the public and the emerging private sector in higher education issues. The Award will be given to the Laureate during the 12th General AAU Conference on 4-9 May 2009 in Abuja, Nigeria, entitled “Sustainable Development in Africa: The Role of Higher Education”.
For more information: www.aau.org

News from the IAU Secretariat
IAU has wished farewell and most happy retirement to Ms. Elzbieta Karwat who left the secretariat at the end of 2008 after serving as IAU’s Documentation Centre Manager for more than twenty years. The IAU Senior Policy and Research Analyst, Dr. Dana Sheikh will be leaving IAU at the end of her contract on March 31, 2009. Ms. Ellie Montazeri, the Secretary General’s executive assistant left IAU in December to move with her family to Singapore and IAU was pleased to offer this position to Ms. Elodie Boisfer who had already worked in the Secretariat for several months. Finally, in January 2009, Ms. Lucy van de Wiel, who recently graduated at the University of Amsterdam in the Netherlands, joined IAU for a six months internship. She receives a scholarship from the Leonardo da Vinci-Programme.

IAU PUBLICATIONS

The International Handbook of Universities turns 50!
Published for the first time in 1959, the International Handbook of Universities (IHU) provided a response to the growing demand for authoritative information about higher education institutions. 50 years later, it continues to provide this service to the world higher education community. IHU has grown considerably over the years in both the quantity and quality of entries. All information contained in the Handbook is validated at the national and institutional levels.

In 2008, IAU reference publications were revamped and the 2009 edition of the International Handbook of Universities was upgraded to:

- include higher education institutions that offer at least post-graduate degrees and/or four-year professional diplomas;
- briefly describe the higher education system in each country;
- offer a list of regional and international higher education organizations;
- provide a single user license for online access to the contents of the 2 volume print directory and additional data ;
- to an annual publication and, consequently, replace the World List of Universities and Other Institutions of Higher Education;
- be published in alternation with the CD-ROM entitled the World Higher Education Database (WHED). The Handbook will be released in August; the WHED in January each year, thus making it possible for IAU to provide even more up-to-date information.
IAU Members benefit from a free copy of the WHED CD-ROM and a 50% discount on the Handbook.

The current edition (20th) – published in late 2008 – provides detailed data on over 12,000 higher education institutions worldwide and a brief description of the higher education system of 183 countries.

*Higher Education Policy (HEP), Vol. 21.4, December 2008 entitled Realizing the Global University: Comparative Perspectives and Critical Reflections*

brings together a selection of papers from an international symposium ‘Realising the Global University’, funded and organised in 2007 by the Worldwide Universities Network. With papers looking at policies and measures adopted in China, Hong Kong and Singapore amongst others, and a case study from the University of Toronto, the papers demonstrate that, while the concept of the ‘world-class’ university is deeply contested, similar strategies and practices have been adopted by universities, not only in the West but also in the East, as they respond to intensified pressures imposed on universities worldwide to compete in global rankings.

*Digitalization of HEP*

During 2009, the Association’s publisher, Palgrave Macmillan Ltd, will digitize volumes 1-8 of Higher Education Policy, the IAU quarterly research journal, thus ensuring online availability of the entire Journal archive from the first issue onwards. More recent volumes, starting with number 9 (1996), are already available online at: www.palgrave-journals.com/hep/archive/index.html

**IAU/ Palgrave Research Essay Prize – 2009 Competition**

30 June 2009, is the deadline for submission of articles for the 2009 edition of the IAU/Palgrave Research Essay Prize. The aim of this Prize is to promote research in the field of higher education policy by recognizing outstanding work on a particular research theme. The 2009 Prize will focus on issues linked to the new IAU Policy Statement entitled: Equitable Access, Success and Quality in Higher Education, adopted at the Association’s 13th General Conference (Utrecht, The Netherlands, July 2008). The research-based essays may take the form of an analytical case study, an analysis of trends, provide an overview or discussion of relevant policies or offer the results of impact assessment. They may also look at important partnerships forged, showcase good-practice or evaluate relevant funding policies or approaches. The IAU/Palgrave Research Essay Prize, valued at £1,000, is awarded to the most outstanding essay received from a researcher/scholar working in an IAU Member institution/organization. The winning essay is also published in the IAU journal Higher Education Policy. More information available online on IAU Home page.

**The IAU E-Bulletin**

Would you like to be kept informed on IAU activities and to be updated monthly on what happens in the world of Higher Education? A simple click gets you a free subscription.

The E-Bulletin is:

- a communication tool on the activities and services proposed by IAU;
- an information tool to disseminate worldwide higher education news as available online.

To subscribe to IAU home page or directly to: www.unesco.org/iau/iau_e_bulletin.html.
**NEW PUBLICATIONS**

**Financially Sustainable Universities: Towards a full costing in European Universities**  
*European Universities Association (EUA), 2008, ISBN-9789078997085*

Based on an in-depth, Europe-wide study, the report explains that the first step for universities in addressing these challenges is to identify the full costs of their activities for both internal and external purposes. Moving to full costing is thus essential to reinforce their financial sustainability. The report calls on national governments to recognise the importance of granting autonomy to universities and to assist in the implementation of full costing. The authors also recommend that European funding schemes be further simplified and the funding rules be better aligned with universities’ needs, thus enabling the universities to strengthen their contribution to the European Higher Education and Research Areas.

**On the Ground Overseas: U.S. Degree Programs and Branch Campuses Abroad**  

Drawing on a roundtable of U.S. campus leaders who have established degree programs or campuses abroad, this publication outlines the lessons learned from their experiences. It also provides descriptions of ten U.S. programs and branch campuses around the world. See: www.acenet.edu/bookstore.

**Beyond 2010: Priorities and Challenges for Higher Education in the Next Decade**  

This book is a collection of articles based on presentations and papers prepared for the ACA Conference in Tallinn in June this year.

The book attempts to look into the hot issues facing Higher Education in the next few years, and what current challenges will persist into the next decade. These questions are tackled through scrutiny of a variety of themes that it is felt will not lose their centrality at the end of this decade, including student mobility, alternative delivery of international education, funding of higher education, and the impact of labour market changes on higher education. The book can be obtained via the publishers’ website at http://www.lemmens.de/verlag/buecher.html.

**Education, Science and public policy: Ideas for an Education Revolution**  

With contributions from a wide range of leaders from government and education in Australia, the book’s nine chapters catalogue the state of the Australian nation in education, training and university research, and tackle various questions including: ‘Is the nation ready for the challenges of the global knowledge economy and the emerging centre’s around the world?’ and ‘What are the key problems and where are the policy solutions?’ For more information see: www.mup.com.au/page/106

*Oxford University Press, UNESCO 2008, ISBN 9780199544196*

According to this report, the failure of governments across the world to tackle deep and persistent inequalities in education is consigning millions of children to lives of poverty and diminished opportunity. The annual UNESCO report provides a detailed assessment of progress towards key education goals, including early childhood development, universal primary education,
gender equality, literacy and good quality education. While noting encouraging gains in some of the world's poorest countries, it warns that without drastic action many targets will be missed – in some cases by spectacular margins. For further information see: www.unesco.org/en/education/efareport/reports/2009-governance

Higher Education to 2030: Volume 1 Demography, Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD)
Centre for Educational Research and Innovation, 2008, ISBN 9789264040656

This book is the first volume in the Higher Education to 2030 series, which takes a forward-looking approach to analysing the impact of various contemporary trends on tertiary education systems. Drawing on trend data and projections, this book takes an in-depth look at the impact of demographic changes on student enrolment, educational attainment, academic staff and policy choices. Particular attention is given to how access policies determine the demographics of tertiary education, notably by examining access to higher education for disabled and migrant students. The book can be obtained at the OECD bookshop at www.oecdbookshop.org

A Voice for Earth: American Writers Respond to the Earth Charter
Edited by Peter Blaze Corcoran and A. James Wohlpart, Brandon P. Hollingshead, Editorial Assistant, Forewords by Homero Aridjis and Terry Tempest Williams, Afterword by Kamla Chowdhry, 2008, ISBN 0820332119

A Voice for Earth is a collection of poems, essays, and stories that together give a voice to the ethical principles outlined in the Earth Charter. The Earth Charter was adopted in the year 2000 with the mission of addressing the economic, social, political, spiritual, and environmental problems confronting the world in the twenty-first century. Part 1 “Imagination into Principle,” comprises Steven C. Rockefeller’s behind-the-scenes summary of how the language for the Earth Charter was drafted. In part 2, “Principle into Imagination,” ten writers breathe life into its concepts with their own original work. In part 3, “Imagination and Principle into a New Ethic” Leonardo Boff offers a new paradigm created through reflecting on the concept of care in the Earth Charter.

Higher Education in Africa: The International Dimension
Damtew Teferra and Jane Knight, eds., published jointly by the Centre for International Higher Education, Boston College and the Association of African Universities, 2008, ISBN 97899988589409

The first of its kind, this book documents and analyzes the international dimension of higher education in Africa based on 11-country case studies and several chapters on relevant historical and contemporary themes. It identifies trends, developments, and challenges related to the international dimension of higher education at the institutional, national, and regional levels. It explores the opportunities and probes the risks while it responds to the growing need for information and analysis of internationalization of higher education in Africa. More on the book, including the Table of Contents, is available at www.bc.edu/bc_org/avp/soe/ciche/inhea/HEAfIntbook.htm
OPEN FORUM

SWEDESD: NEW ESD CENTRE OPEN IN SWEDEN
by Frans Lenglet*

On 3 and 4 October, 2008, Swedish and international experts and practitioners in the field of education for sustainable development (ESD), representing universities, civil society organizations, national governments and international organisations, from 15 countries – including IAU – attended the first event organized by the recently established Swedish International Centre of Education for Sustainable Development (SWEDESD) at Gotland University, Visby, Sweden. By tapping into the wealth of expertise, experience, insights and networks represented by the participants, the purpose of the conference was to elicit ideas and recommendations for what SWEDESD could or should do, how the Centre should relate to other significant national and international initiatives, institutions and networks, and how SWEDESD should operate in order to address the many ESD challenges and opportunities.

SWEDESD is financed by the Swedish International Development Agency (SIDA) for an initial period of 5 years. Its purpose is to facilitate and support education and learning in the field of sustainable development, especially in and with developing countries – it should result in learning connected with serious commitment to sustainable development.

SWEDESD: the Director’s vision for what the Centre could become

The Centre would be an international “meeting place”. Physically – in Gotland and in the locations of its SIDA-country partners. Virtually – through a cutting edge internet platform for exchanging experience and practice, for research, learning, debate, advice and advocacy. With, in and through Sweden-based and international networks, the Centre would work with institutions, organisations and persons in the Global South determined to master their own development processes within a sustainability framework. The Centre would not repeat or duplicate what others are doing well. Instead, it would be scrutinizing existing paradigms and seeking new ones, using the tools of scientific and critical inquiry. It would also explore the power of non-traditional learning methods, as can be found in music, theatre, the plastic arts, video, etc.

In his closing remarks, the SWEDESD Director underlined the “heritage” on which SWEDESD would build: the fascinating ESD policy and practice of the last 30 years, the rich humanistic tradition of emancipatory education and the intellectual tradition of interdisciplinary action research. In this critical time there is now a great opportunity for ESD practitioners, research and policy makers the world over – and therefore also for SWEDESD itself – to become “messengers of hope” rather than remaining “prophets of doom”. If the Conference itself was any indication, SWEDESD’s activities will have a strong process orientation. They will be participatory and inclusive and will invite to creativity, critical reflection and scholarship. They will privilege local practices and experiences that can inform and be informed by global sustainability perspectives.

More information at: http://mainweb.hgo.se/ext/swedesd.nsf

* Director SWEDESD, Gotland University, Visby, Sweden (frans.lenglet@hgo.se)
The United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP), in cooperation with UNESCO, the Horn of Africa Regional Environment Centre and Network (HoA-RECN), the Association of African Universities (AAU) and the Southern African Development Cooperation-Regional Environmental Education Programme (SADC-REEP) organized the 1st MESA International Conference with the theme “Environment, Development and Climate Change: Universities Responding?”

The conference was held from 24 to 28 November 2008 in Nairobi, Kenya and provided a forum for South North/South South dialogue, exchange, engagement and collaboration on challenges and best practice on implementing ESD in higher education institutions. This included sharing knowledge on the UN Decade of Education for Sustainable Development, as well as on issues related to environment, development, climate change, and strengthening the voice and contribution of universities in the South to dealing with the challenges of these issues. The conference also sought to promote expansion and dialogue between Africa’s 11 Regional Centres of Expertise in ESD, and wider sub-regional and regional networking and knowledge exchange.

For more information, please go to: www.unep.org/training/features/mic.asp

The Institute for Higher Education Policy in the United States has launched an online global resource centre pulling together information on university rankings systems worldwide. The IHEP Ranking Systems Clearinghouse, it says, “provides a road map of the complex ranking landscape for more than 30 countries”, and includes links to national and international rankings systems and a collection of thousands of rankings-related publications.

A full report is available on the University World News site: www.universityworldnews.com

The European Commission, under the auspices of the Czech Presidency of the European Union, has recently launched the second phase of the Erasmus Mundus Programme (2009-2013).

The Erasmus Mundus Programme is a mobility and cooperation programme in the field of higher education, which aims to promote the quality and attractiveness of European Union (EU) higher education, as well as enhancing dialogue, understanding and cooperation amongst people in the EU and across the world.

A launch event, along with an information day, took place in Brussels from the 16 to 18 February 2009, and was attended by IAU. The event targeted above all potential participants, and focused on the new elements included in this second phase of the Erasmus Mundus Programme (EMII). This included information about the three new action lines: Action 1 – Joint Programmes; Action 2 – Partnerships; Action 3 – Promotion Projects.

### March 2009

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Event Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>30-02 April</td>
<td>INQAHE – Abu Dhabi, United Arab Emirates New Approaches to Quality Assurance in the Changing World of Higher Education</td>
<td><a href="http://www.caa.ae/conference/DesktopDefault.aspx">www.caa.ae/conference/DesktopDefault.aspx</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31-02 April</td>
<td>Bonn, Germany World Conference on Education for Sustainable Development Moving into the Second Half of the UN Decade</td>
<td><a href="http://www.esd-world-conference-2009.org">www.esd-world-conference-2009.org</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### April 2009

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Event Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>02-05</td>
<td>University of Belgrade – Belgrade, Serbia World University Presidents’ Summit: Current Trends in Higher Education</td>
<td><a href="http://www.wups2009.com">www.wups2009.com</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### May 2009

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Event Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>04-09</td>
<td>AAU – Abuja, Nigeria Sustainable Development in Africa: The Role of Higher Education</td>
<td><a href="http://www.aau.org/">www.aau.org/</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-12</td>
<td>ISSC – Bergen, Norway 1st World Social Science Forum –The changing world and the challenges it presents to social science</td>
<td><a href="http://www.rokkan.uib.no/wssf/">www.rokkan.uib.no/wssf/</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13-14</td>
<td>ACA – Warsaw, Poland Academic Cooperation Association (ACA) Annual Conference: Innovation through Internationalisation</td>
<td><a href="http://www.aca-secretariat.be">www.aca-secretariat.be</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24-29</td>
<td>NAfSA 2009 Annual Conference and Expo – Los Angeles, USA Fostering Global Engagement through International Education</td>
<td><a href="http://www.nafsa.org/annual_conference/call_for_workshop_and">www.nafsa.org/annual_conference/call_for_workshop_and</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Month</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Event</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 2009</td>
<td>05-06</td>
<td>IAU – Notre Dame University-Louaize, Beirut, Lebanon</td>
<td>IAU Annual Conference: The role of higher education in promoting inter-cultural dialogue and understanding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 2010</td>
<td>20-24</td>
<td>Çanakkale Onsekiz Mart University – Cannakkale, Turkey</td>
<td>World Universities’ Congress: What should be the new aims and responsibilities of universities within the framework of global issues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>Interamerican University, USA</td>
<td>IAU 14th general Conference</td>
<td>Date and theme to be confirmed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>