



EURASIAN
HIGHER EDUCATION
LEADERS' FORUM

11-12 June 2014, Astana, Kazakhstan

SUCCESSFUL UNIVERSITIES:
WHAT ARE THEY AND HOW TO BUILD ONE?

CONFERENCE PROCEEDINGS

UDC 378
LBC 74.58
E68

Editors: Aida Sagintayeva and Kairat Kurakbayev,
Nazarbayev University Graduate School of Education

E68 EURASIAN HIGHER EDUCATION LEADERS' FORUM 2014,
CONFERENCE PROCEEDINGS. – Astana, IndigoPrint Llp., 2014, 90 p.

ISBN 978-601-80467-4-2

UDC 378
LBC 74.58

ISBN 978-601-80467-4-2 © Nazarbayev University Graduate School of Education, 2014

CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	5
CONFERENCE STEERING COMMITTEE MEMBERS	6
CONTRIBUTORS	7
 OPENING SESSION	
DEVELOPMENT OF HIGHER EDUCATION IN KAZAKHSTAN	8
Gulshara Abdykalikova	
TOWARDS UNDERSTANDING THE ROLE OF UNIVERSITY IN SOCIETY	10
Aslan Sarinzhypov	
WHAT IS ‘A SUCCESSFUL UNIVERSITY’?	14
Lynne Parmenter, Murat Orunkhanov and Kairat Kurakbayev	
 PANEL SESSION 1: WHAT IS ‘A SUCCESSFUL UNIVERSITY’?	
THE QUEST FOR A WORLD CLASS UNIVERSITY: DEFINING THE GOAL FOR AN EMERGING ECONOMY	23
Alan Ruby	
THE IMPORTANCE OF LOCAL AND INTERNATIONAL ENGAGEMENT IN BUILDING A “SUCCESSFUL” UNIVERSITY	27
Jane Knight	
IN SEARCH OF CRITERIA AND FACTORS OF SUCCESS FOR A REGIONAL UNIVERSITY	32
Amantai Nurmagambetov	
DIVERSITY AND INTEGRITY IN THE SUCCESSFUL UNIVERSITY	35
Humphrey Tonkin	
WHAT MAKES A UNIVERSITY SUCCESSFUL FROM THE PERSPECTIVE OF TEACHING AND STUDENT LEARNING?	40
Jan Vermunt	
 PANEL SESSION 2: HOW TO BUILD A SUCCESSFUL UNIVERSITY: START FROM A NEW INSTITUTION OR BUILD FROM THE EXISTING ONE?	
SUCCESSFUL UNIVERSITIES	43
Simon Jones	
HOW TO BUILD ‘A SUCCESSFUL UNIVERSITY’?	49
Mary Canning	

PANEL SESSION 3: STUDENTS' PERSPECTIVES ON A SUCCESSFUL UNIVERSITY

WHAT DOES A SUCCESSFUL UNIVERSITY LOOK LIKE? – THE STUDENTS' VIEW.....	50
Rok Primožič	
A STRATEGIC, LAYERED APPROACH TO EVIDENTIALLY IMPROVING STUDENTS' EXPERIENCES AND OUTCOMES WITHIN 'A SUCCESSFUL UNIVERSITY'	54
Liz Winter	
PROMOTING STUDENT MOBILITY IN A GLOBAL AGE	59
Angela Yiu	

PANEL SESSION 4: FACULTY'S PERSPECTIVES ON A SUCCESSFUL UNIVERSITY

THE ROLE OF FACULTY IN CREATING A SUCCESSFUL UNIVERSITY	62
Loretta O'Donnell	
CONTEMPORARY CHALLENGES OF HIGHER EDUCATION AND FACULTY'S ROLE IN THE FORMATION OF A SUCCESSFUL UNIVERSITY	66
Fatima Zhakypova	
THE ROLE OF FACULTY AT SUCCESSFUL UNIVERSITIES	70
Matthew Hartley	
HIGHER EDUCATION EXPERIENCES IN KYRGYZSTAN: CASE OF OSH STATE UNIVERSITY	72
Kanybek Issakov	
ACADEMIC LEADERSHIP: A MISSING LINK IN HIGHER EDUCATION GOVERNANCE IN TIMES OF CHANGE?	75
Aida Sagintayeva	
FACULTY'S PERSPECTIVE ON SUCCESSFUL UNIVERSITY: PERSPECTIVE FROM A REGIONAL UNIVERSITY	81
Beibit Mamrayev	

PANEL SESSION 5: SUCCESSFUL RESEARCH UNIVERSITIES

SUCCESSFUL RESEARCH UNIVERSITIES: GLOBAL CHALLENGES AND LOCAL PERSPECTIVES	82
Zhexenbek Adilov	
SUCCESSFUL RESEARCH UNIVERSITIES: DEVELOPMENT FACTORS	83
Zhumakhan Myrkhalyskov	

CONCLUDING REMARKS	87
Humphrey Tonkin	

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Nazarbayev University Graduate School of Education is delighted to present the publication of the third annual Eurasian Higher Education Leaders' Forum. The conference proceedings present papers written by distinguished local and international contributors that attended the Forum in 2014. The papers are grounded in theoretical argument and empirical research and written to provide debate and discussion among policy makers, faculty, students, and staff.

Around 350 speakers and delegates and participants from more than 15 countries attended the Forum in 2014. Attendees discussed global trends in higher education and presented their understandings and interpretations of a successful academic institution. The Forum has been divided into five plenary sessions: 1) What is 'a Successful University'? 2) How to Build a Successful University: Start from a New Institution or Build from the Existing One? 3) Students' Perspectives on a Successful University; 4) Faculty's Perspectives on a Successful University; 5) Successful Research Universities.

The Forum aims to develop an international dialogue between higher education leaders, policy makers, researchers and practitioners from different parts of the world. We believe this dialogue should be at the heart of collaboration both on individual and institutional levels. This collection of papers offers both local and global perspectives on the future of higher education, showcasing the breadth and depth of opinions.

We hope that the annual Forum and its conference proceedings will serve as a valuable resource for higher education leaders, faculty members and policy makers. We invite everyone who is interested in reflecting on the continuities and changes in education development and taking strategic actions to improve their national and local educational environments.

Information about the annual Eurasian Higher Education Leaders' Forum is available on our website at www.ehelf.nu.edu.kz.

We are indebted to our speakers and authors as well as members of the Steering Committee, for their contributions and unstinting support. This collection of papers is a project of the Nazarbayev University Graduate School of Education.

Aida Sagintayeva and Kairat Kurakbayev,
Nazarbayev University Graduate School of Education,
Astana, Kazakhstan
October 2014

CONFERENCE STEERING COMMITTEE MEMBERS

CHAIR

Shigeo Katsu, President, Nazarbayev University.

MEMBERS

Kadisha Dairova, Vice-President for Student Affairs, International Cooperation, Government Relations, Nazarbayev University.

Zakir Jumakulov, Junior Researcher, Nazarbayev University Graduate School of Education.

Loretta O'Donnell, Vice-Provost for Academic Affairs, Nazarbayev University.

Timothy Reagan, Dean, Nazarbayev University Graduate School of Education.

Aida Sagintayeva, Chief Executive Director, Nazarbayev University Graduate School of Education.

Dennis de Tray, Advisor to the President, Nazarbayev University.

Janet Turarbekova, Director, Department of Communications and Marketing, Nazarbayev University.

CONTRIBUTORS

WELCOMING SPEECHES

Gulshara Abdykalikova is Deputy Prime Minister of the Republic of Kazakhstan.

Aslan Sarinzhypov is Minister of Education and Science of the Republic of Kazakhstan.

PAPERS

Zhexenbek Adilov is Professor and Rector at Satpayev Kazakhstan National Technical University, Kazakhstan.

Mary Canning is a higher education policy expert and member of the Higher Education Authority, Ireland.

Matthew Hartley is Professor and Chair of Higher Education Division, University of Pennsylvania Graduate School of Education, PA, USA.

Kanybek Issakov is Rector at Osh State University, Kyrgyz Republic.

Simon Jones is Provost at Nazarbayev University, Kazakhstan.

Jane Knight is Adjunct Professor at the Ontario Institute for Studies in Education, University of Toronto, Canada.

Kairat Kurakbayev is Director of the Research Institute of Nazarbayev University Graduate School of Education, Kazakhstan.

Beibit Mamrayev is Professor and Rector at Dosmukhamedov Atyrau State University, Kazakhstan.

Zhumakhan Myrkhalykov is Professor and Rector at Auezov South Kazakhstan State University, Kazakhstan.

Amantai Nurmagambetov is Professor and Rector at Zhubanov Aktobe Regional State University, Kazakhstan.

Loretta O'Donnell is Vice Provost for Academic Affairs at Nazarbayev University, Kazakhstan.

Murat Orunkhanov is Professor and a senior researcher at the Research Institute of Nazarbayev University Graduate School of Education, Kazakhstan.

Lynne Parmenter is Associate Dean for Academic Affairs at Nazarbayev University Graduate School of Education, Kazakhstan.

Rok Primožič is the Chairperson of European Students' Union, Belgium.

Alan Ruby is a senior fellow at the University of Pennsylvania Graduate School of Education, PA, USA.

Aida Sagintayeva is Chief Executive Director at Nazarbayev University Graduate School of Education, Kazakhstan.

Humphrey Tonkin is Professor of the Humanities and President Emeritus at the University of Hartford, USA.

Jan Vermunt is Professor of Education and Deputy Head of Faculty of Education at the University of Cambridge, UK.

Liz Winter is a university lecturer at the Faculty of Education at the University of Cambridge, UK.

Angela Yiu is Vice President for Academic Exchange at Sophia University, Japan.

Fatima Zhakypova is Executive Director of the Graduate School of Public Policy at Nazarbayev University and a national education expert, Kazakhstan.

DEVELOPMENT OF HIGHER EDUCATION IN KAZAKHSTAN

Gulshara Abdykalikova

Dear ladies and gentlemen, I am pleased to welcome you to the Eurasian Higher Education Leaders' Forum. Symbolically, the tradition of holding a forum was born at Nazarbayev University settings, which is envisioned to be a flagship of higher education in Kazakhstan. When creating Nazarbayev University, an in-depth analysis of top universities' achievements around the world was studied; many of these institutions have now become partners of the University and for the past four years since its foundation, the University set an example of collaboration and partnership of outstanding scholars in the country.

In the Strategy "Kazakhstan – 2050" the Head of the State set a task to enter top 30 most developed countries of the world. Human capital development will definitely be a condition for achieving that goal. Only with high human potential, alternative ways of economic and socially oriented growth will be developed. With the present challenges a highly educated person is capable to cope with necessary knowledge and skills. Universities, as generators of knowledge, play an important role in building human capital and sustainable development of the country. Nowadays universities are assigned a primary role to develop a healthy competition for top tiers in different ranking systems by attracting best professors and professional managers of the academic process. However, it is worth-noting that it takes many years to develop a successful university's image. The credit of building a successful university goes to all the parties involved including top management, faculty members, students and graduates. The most important element of the whole teaching-and-learning process is surely the quality of education. Today, in this brief speech, I would like to highlight three important aspects of the development of Kazakhstan's higher education.

First aspect is based on the preparation of competitive human resources. Knowledge is usually regarded as a global productive force. However, in the world we are living today acquiring knowledge will not suffice. Throughout the world, the emphasis is placed on improving not only knowledge, but also some practical skills. Skilled workforce of new generation should be able to think creatively, generate ideas independently, able to work in a team and use advanced information and communication technologies, as well as be ready for new challenges. In Kazakhstan's case, such a platform in the country is meant to be Nazarbayev University, a major national project to establish the first research university in Kazakhstan at the international level.

The second priority is the creation and development of an intellectual and innovative cluster. This aspiration led us to realize practical integration of education, science and innovation. The cluster shall provide favorable conditions for researchers and entrepreneurs. Also, the cluster will contribute to the market dissemination of research findings. Nazarbayev University is working on the development of a science park which will be in turn a high-tech industrial area; it is planned to be created in the near future. The park will provide formation for corporate centres, research institutes and large high-tech companies that will work closely with research centers and schools of Nazarbayev University.

Today at Nazarbayev University 45 research projects are implemented in the following areas: renewable energy, environment, computer technology, biochemistry, robotics and physics. We will be able to save and further accelerate the pace of development if a strong link is set between science and business in local academic institutions of the nation. This will allow us to implement effectively innovations in enterprises and to produce new products of service.

Institutional accountability is surely important as universities serve for the purpose of developing knowledge. As Harvard President Faust noted in her presidential commencement speech of 2014, "the essence of a university [is] that among society's institutions, it is uniquely

accountable to the past and to the future” (Faust, 2014). Academic institutions are accountable for the past as they keep knowledge that is accumulated over the years here. Universities are accountable for the future as they develop research and pave the way for new discoveries that have an impact on the future’s development.

Today we see that the improvement of living standards does not depend on the accumulation of capital and technological development of the country. It is obvious that what causes the gap between the developed and less developed countries is not only a lack of available resources, but also knowledge production. Growth of national economy depends on how fast this gap is reduced. These findings are explained in Joseph Stiglitz’s book *“Creating a Learning Society”*. Therefore, the success of our well-being in the long run depends on the extent we are ready to be flexible to master new knowledge and to improve our performance. This is a great responsibility of our universities. Therefore, nowadays universities need to be prepared for the challenges of our time and quickly adapt to external factors that can be considered both as a threat and opportunity for further development. Universities need to be more active in research activities in partnership with international peers than ever before.

Dear guests and participants of the Forum, This event is meant to be a dialogic platform for leaders of higher education. I believe that today both international and local experts will have a good opportunity to express their opinions on all tricky questions that are the focus of higher education community and society at large. I hope that holding this Forum in the capital of Kazakhstan will continue to remain our good tradition. I wish all participants a fruitful and pleasant stay in our capital of Astana. Thank you for your attention.

References

Faust, D. (2014). Commencement Speech. Office of the President, Harvard University. Retrieved from: <http://www.harvard.edu/president/speech/2014/2014-commencement-speech>

National Address of the President of the Republic of Kazakhstan (2014). Kazakhstan’s Way – 2050: common aim, common interests, common future. Retrieved from: http://strategy2050.kz/en/page/message_text20141//

Stiglitz, J. E. (2012). Creating a learning society. *The London School of Economics and Political Science. The Amartya Sen Lecture*.

TOWARDS UNDERSTANDING THE ROLE OF UNIVERSITY IN SOCIETY

Aslan Sarinzhipov

Good morning, dear guests and colleagues!

I am glad to welcome you to the today's session of the Eurasian Higher Education Leader's Forum. I am very pleased to be here today primarily as the Associate Professor of Nazarbayev University Graduate School of Education. I meet students and deliver classes here on a regular basis. Therefore, I was asked to give the speech today both as Professor and Minister and I hope that my speech from the point of the professor's view will not raise contradictions to what the Minister may state. Second, I am happy to take part in this Eurasian Higher Education Leader's Forum as it is gaining momentum.

Today we witness many changes around the world. I believe most of us follow mass media and see events happening worldwide. We see Kazakhstan as the platform where Europe meets Asia, the East meets the West, and the North meets the South. Here, we can freely discuss the questions of education, because we all realise the importance of education not only for the economy, but also for society at large. In my today's speech, I will talk about the role of the universities in society. When I watch TV, I see what is happening in the world, I see youngsters who have to fend for themselves literally at the streets. Some of them are the students of universities and colleges, some are those who failed to enter colleges, and I think that at some point this is the responsibility of higher education institutions (HEIs), educational organizations and the academic system in general. Therefore, we need to keep in mind about this role and this serious responsibility we have.

The third Forum is dedicated to the discussion of the role and the missions of modern universities and to the understanding of what it is like being a successful university. I think that before highlighting this question we need to refer to the history higher education and look at some things from the new perspective. On a historical basis of the university's mission there exists a debatable argument, which says that a higher education institution is one of the most important organizations created by the humankind and proved by the time. There is a common assumption that states that such universities as Cambridge and Oxford are the most ancient universities – they were established 700-800 years ago. In fact, the first universities – medrese or madrasa - were created in Asia inspired by the ideas of the Antiquity, where lecturers not only practiced theology and religion, but also conducted research in natural sciences. This later transmitted to Europe, where they later inspired the ideas of the Enlightenment to launch the first universities, which at first existed as the theocratic space discussing the questions raised before big authoritative religious organizations. Later universities became concentrated on the intellectual culture resulted from the discussions of the representatives of various knowledge, who through their identity and the way of living became the embodiment of what their students wanted to emulate. This environment, in which the students were placed, has formed the general model of the university.

Representation of the university as of the research institution appeared in the 19th century in the epoch of the active development of new ideas. The Industrial Revolution developed the necessity of empirical research in laboratories, so that the results would have been proved before transferring to the practice, thus, the new technologies emerged. Here, new theories and ideas of academic freedom took place, having at the same time the responsibility in front of the needs of the government and society. The university's purpose was seen as of such an organization that is responsible for the culture of the nation.

Universities, at least in Westerners' understanding, were the fellowships of independent professors, who had the opportunity to think freely and express their ideas. It is necessary to state that in the US, as we know, one of the most important steps was the creation of land-grant universities by the US government who launched the special law in order to advance undeveloped areas, and this led to the establishment of the whole system of universities in the US. Furthermore, in post-war Europe higher education became widespread when the countries realized that winning the competitiveness and confrontation is predetermined by new technologies and new knowledge. After the war, higher education in the US became widespread, but as you know, it was the same during the Soviet times, when many large-scale universities were established, and those institutions did not only become the core place for training future specialists, but also for generating new knowledge, new technologies.

If we turn to the history of our region, generally speaking, we were the planned economy, and from ideological considerations, the government had the monopoly for ideology. This monopoly for ideology was implemented through the state system of education. That is, in primary, secondary and higher education the government played the first and foremost role. Thus, the priority was given to the government when it came to all issues related to the content and programme of higher education, i.e. authoritative structures, ministries implemented this monopoly. Basically, what we face today is that many of post-Soviet countries shift to marketing track because we see this conflict coming out between the state's control and the labor market, and this is one of the biggest challenges that we have today in this region. We will keep on working on this issue in order to change our system of education in accordance with the principle of developing a competitive economy.

During 19-20th centuries many prominent philosophers, sociologists and other scholars researched the significant questions of the universities' development. As I noted earlier, massification of higher education both in Europe and Asia becomes more widespread and universities become publicly accessible. The higher education loses its elitist nature. As we know, the US has the GI Bill regulation as the government tried to give some kind of employment to people coming back from the war. There was a massive launch of universities accessible to ex-soldiers. This led to the fact that much of governments' budget was spent on higher education, and higher education became widespread. Something similar was happening in the Soviet Union.

As for the modern challenges and present days, the 21st century, as experts state, will be the century of education, science and innovation. The university itself will transfer into a crucial factor of successful development of education, science and innovation. According to the current scholarship, the difference between developed and developing countries only by one third depends on economy and its structure, the rest two thirds define the difference between the level and quality of education. The modern development of education requires clear understanding of the most important challenges, which get not only local but also more global shapes. I assume that in the new century globalization of higher education, massification of higher education become the realms of higher education.

Today we face the processes of formation of global economy and global community, both economic and social. Globalization means the rise of interconnectedness of all countries of the world, creation of single labor market, products, capital including the market of knowledge. In this regard, the education cannot be built entirely on a national basis. How modern universities should react about this challenge? I suppose that answering this question should lay the foundation of the strategy of both national system of education and leading universities.

Second, higher education is the way for expanding the rights and opportunities of the people in our society. The understanding of this fact became so widespread, that countries compete with each other in creating institutions and organizations that would facilitate the production of such

knowledge. One more important factor of the development of the contemporary world is that the world and the apportionment of forces change. The leading positions of competitiveness in economy and production are being occupied by Asian countries. According to one of the World Bank's reports, by 2012 the number of university entrants in China became equal with the number of entrants in the USA. If in the USA the higher education serves for the approximate number of 300 million people, the same situation exists in China – it also serves for about 300 million people.

In China, there is a billion of people who are still waiting to get access to higher education. Currently, the US is still leading by absolute values in the investment in higher education and science, but sometime in the near future China and US are going to break even and at some point China will even outrun America. China will be likely to serve as a generator for new knowledge and technologies. These are the realities that we face, and which we have to consider when developing our strategies.

For the government, the issue of financing and providing resources for higher education is of paramount importance. Currently, a big discussion about the future of the education is taking place in the US. While doing my Ed.D. degree there, I was amazed at the intense discussion and debate on higher education issues. If you read different news resources, you will learn that people are talking about the crisis of the higher education in the US, although traditionally, it is considered to be one of the leading countries in this field. It is due to losing the leadership in OECD rankings and moving 3-4 positions down the ranking. This is causing resentment and a negative reaction within the society: among professors, students, parents and employers. If you look at the numbers, the higher education cost increased abruptly within the last 20 years for students. This is due to cutting the funding and abandoning the field of higher education by the government within the last 10 years. But these funds were substituted by private funds of the students. As a result, the higher education coverage of the population started decreasing compared to other countries. That is, the increase in the cost of higher education decreased its accessibility to people, and this is a big phenomenon and a big discussion topic in the US.

Last year the debt in student loans has reached the record level of one trillion US dollars. These are record numbers. The increase of the cost of higher education has surpassed the cost increase of healthcare. We also need to pay attention to this matter, we need to look at the role of the government and the role of the society in financing the higher education, and understand how important these issues are for the development of the society.

Now, if we look into the future to the university of the 21st century, here, we talk about whether the mission of the higher education institution will go through changes. Within the last 50 years, the purpose of the university system has changed. Based on public polls, 80% of the youth enter higher education; they seek the knowledge, which can be later put in their pockets in terms of profits when they start their practical activity. That is, the knowledge has to generate profits. This is the way how the students of the present days think. Many consumers and producers of education services justify their activity in terms of this paradigm. However, the university should probably practice such an activity which is not practiced by any other organizations in society. It should answer the questions of students regarding who they want to be today, who they want to become tomorrow, how to live, how does the human civilization develops, and where we hope to end up. That is, it is not a simple commercial factory grinding out the knowledge – it is the factory producing the elite and forming the society of tomorrow.

Good universities are based on the meritocracy of people who possess capacity and who invested in one's own development. The academic life teaches us that the outstanding knowledge is produced by the community of equal and independent people, who try to convince each other about the unique righteousness of their achievements. And the successful university produces the people who do not only set the highest standards in their professional careers, but

those who follow highest moral and ethical principles as well. And the leading universities of the world state that scientific achievements result from successful personal development. High research activity has high ethical principles, and this is the tradition reserved by the leading world universities. That is, the university cannot cultivate new talents and develop the abilities of youngsters in a comprehensive way, unless it possesses a high intellectual capacity of those dedicated for implementing new goals; and if professors and researchers of this university do not preach these high moral values, ideals and ethical principles.

In this regard, it is necessary to state that modern higher education should not only provide skills, competences and technological knowledge, but they also should assign the knowledge of their culture, sensitize young people to problems of the modern civilization in general, teach how to be tolerant and open for everything new. By developing its own potential, the university promotes the development and self-development of the students and ultimately the development of the whole society. Therefore, I think that the successful university is not the one, which only produces the specialists or professionals in a particular field. I would like to conclude my speech by reiterating my point that successful university is the one, which, first and foremost, prepares the future citizens of society. In other words, successful institutions form the society of the future.

Thank you very much indeed for your time and attention!

WHAT IS 'A SUCCESSFUL UNIVERSITY'?

Lynne Parmenter, Murat Orunkhanov and Kairat Kurakbayev

Introduction

The aim of this paper is to provide a basis for discussion and debate on definitions, characteristics and criteria of measurement of a successful university. While the core mission of universities indisputably remains teaching and research (Shattock 2010), universities in the 21st century are increasingly called on to assume expanded roles as key players in knowledge societies and the knowledge economy. As universities take on these diverse roles, it becomes more difficult to agree on definitions and characteristics of success, and on valid and reliable criteria for measuring how successful they are. While this issue of defining success and its characteristics is implicit in many studies of various aspects of higher education, there is surprisingly little literature directly addressing the issue in a comprehensive and systematic way. As Shattock (2010: 7) has observed, "we feel instinctively we can recognise successful universities when we see them", but it can be challenging to provide justification and evidence for these judgements. This is especially true as universities seek to locate themselves within global systems, where global measures of certain aspects of success overshadow any other definitions or characteristics of success.

So what is a successful university? This paper does not provide a mapping of the literature on the topic, although this would be a useful exercise. Neither does it set out to provide a fixed definition of a successful university, as this is likely to be an impossible task. Instead, it explores characteristics and, where applicable, measures of success in higher education in terms of its main areas of activity, namely, research, teaching, student experience, knowledge economy, and social responsibility. For each area, there is discussion of what success in the area involves, together with some discussion of the criteria that are or can be used to evaluate success in this area, where applicable. Examples from different countries are also provided in each section.

While the five areas – research, teaching, student experience, knowledge economy, social responsibility – are treated separately in this paper, they evidently overlap in practice, such that success in one area is often closely connected to success in another. The interconnections between success in different areas need to be explored in depth, but this is beyond the scope of this paper.

Research

What does it mean to be a successful research university?

The most obvious answer, and the aspect of successful universities that has been most widely debated, is that it means achieving a place in world-class university rankings, or a high rating in national research assessments such as the Research Excellence Framework (REF) in the UK or the Performance Based Research Fund (PBRF) Quality Evaluation in New Zealand. At the global level, there is already a significant body of literature on world-class universities (e.g. Salmi 2009, Hazelkorn 2011), and the arguments will not be rehearsed again in detail in this paper. However, it is important to note that most of the world university rankings are very heavily dominated by research indicators, and that the aspiration to become a world-class university or to climb the ranks or retain a place has become such a firmly established part of the "successful research university" mindset that it is now prominent in university mission and vision statements (or, less frequently, national policies and targets) in, perhaps, the majority of countries in the world, from

Iceland to Indonesia¹. Kazakhstan shares this vision, with the State Programme for Education Development 2011-2020 including the goal of having world-class universities by 2020.

Becoming a successful research university as measured by global rankings usually entails close attention to the criteria for such rankings, based mainly on research achievements and output. Thus, to take the example mentioned above, the University of Iceland policy urges an increase of publications in high-impact journals and tying promotions to publication in such journals (University of Iceland 2011).

At the same time, being a successful research university means more than just a ranking in the Times Higher, Shanghai Jiao Tong or QS rankings. It also means active involvement in global research networks and partnerships. More and more research universities are participating in global networks such as the Coimbra Group, the International Alliance of Research Universities, Universitas 21, the League of European Research Universities, and the Worldwide University Network. Such networks facilitate international research collaboration. According to Thomson Reuters' data base, nearly half of all influential research publications are published by international teams. Therefore, international collaboration is becoming a premise of success in research and innovation. The purpose of such networks and teams is not only to provide opportunities for research collaboration and interaction, but also, explicitly in some cases, to influence research policy. The function and power of these networks has not yet been thoroughly studied, but it is likely that they will become increasingly important, in the same way as other aspects of globalisation networks (Castells 2000; Ball 2012). Partnerships are equally important, and are an essential element of research university profiles in all parts of the world, although few universities work in such close strategic partnership with multiple international universities as Nazarbayev University.

Being a successful research university also requires the appointment and retention of high-quality, highly productive researchers, and researcher development through postgraduate research degrees. This creates a competitive market for researchers, which operates at a global level. Indeed, it is explicitly stated in the Times Higher Education World University Rankings 2013-14 explanation of methodology that "the top universities compete for the best faculty from around the globe", and 2.5% of the score is given for the ratio of international to national staff (Times Higher Education, undated). Any well-known ranking system considers research capacity as a fundamental indicator of a university. It may be characterised by various criteria such as Nobel Prize winners or the number of publications in reputed journals. The association of university success with a certain number of Nobel prizes or other respected awards is arguable, of course, but such indicators do clearly indicate the presence of well-established research traditions which create conditions for a qualitative growth of research capacity and research output. In turn, university research resources are a *sine qua non* of new knowledge and new technology. Therefore, a successful university should be the cornerstone of research and technology initiatives in the region.

Finally, it goes without saying that the capacity to obtain funding for and carry out high-quality research is essential to being a successful research university. While this is an obvious statement, it can actually be quite complex, in that it requires efficient systems and professional staff with the expertise to support research grant identification and applications, plus administration of grants and management of research support, collaboration and reporting procedures. It also requires conditions for successful research, from the ethos of the university to the securing

1 University of Iceland Vision and Strategy: "In 2006, the University of Iceland set itself the ambitious long-term goal to become one of the 100 leading universities in the world." http://english.hi.is/university/vision_and_strategy; Universitas Indonesia Goals: "UI's roadmap to be a world class university is an integrative and comprehensive approach covering internal strength and global competition analysis." <http://www.ui.ac.id/en/profile/page/goals>

of time, equipment and research resources. Weiler, Guri-Rosenblit & Sawyerr (2008: 16) list the ingredients of research capacity as (1) capable researchers, (2) time, (3) infrastructure, (4) research climates, (5) funding, (6) structural conditions, (7) research ethics and (8) critical perspectives.

Networks, high-quality researchers and researcher development, and capacity to obtain funding for and implement research are all contributing factors to success in global rankings, and all these characteristics are part of what it means to be a successful research university, though this is by no means a complete list.

Teaching

What does it mean to be a successful teaching university?

Defining characteristics of a successful research university is relatively straightforward, as the indicators of success are, to a large extent, agreed. While almost all universities aspire to excellence in teaching, defining what it means to be a successful teaching university is slightly more difficult, although attempts have been made to standardise measures in this area. “Successful teaching” is dependent on assumptions about the role of the teacher, the education process, and the aims of learning.

In Europe and beyond, the Bologna Process and concomitant prevalence of learning outcomes based university education have done much to standardise some of these assumptions or, from an alternative perspective, impose a certain view of “successful teaching and learning” on universities with diverse expectations and practices in this area (Moutsios 2013: 39). The growing influence of publishers producing textbooks based on a European idea of successful teaching and international education providers explicitly or implicitly promoting a specific view of “successful” teaching and learning adds to the standardisation. Kazakhstan, for example, is heavily influenced in both respects. However, there is still substantial cultural variance in assumptions about what successful teaching is, and there is no global model of indicators of successful higher education teaching, such as exists for research in the form of global university rankings.

At transnational level, initiatives associated with the implementation of the Bologna Process provide an example of an attempt to define characteristics of (one view of) successful teaching, although all such initiatives are mediated through national and local lenses, and end results may bear little resemblance to original intentions. This is normative, but at national level in some countries, substantial effort has been invested in developing methods of empirically evaluating successful university teaching. For example, the Key Information Set (KIS) data in the UK provides open access information on student satisfaction with courses, methods of teaching and methods of assessment, percentage of the course taught in Welsh (where applicable) and so on (Unistats, undated). Anyone can access this government website, select courses they want to compare, and find out information such as:

- the percentage of students in the courses who agree that “staff are good at explaining things”;
- the percentage who agree that “the criteria used in marking have been clear in advance”;
- the percentage of time in the course spent on lectures and seminars each year;
- the percentage of assessment done by coursework, written examinations or practical exams each year.

The stated aim of providing KIS data is to help students identify what and where they would like to study, but the data obviously influence perceptions of what counts as successful teaching, and create a hierarchy of universities and courses according to whether they comply effectively with this model of teaching and assessment. In the UK, the standard definition of “successful

teaching” is bolstered by the Higher Education Academy, a national organisation that accredits qualifications in higher education teaching and learning provided by institutions for their staff, provides professional recognition for successful higher education teaching through a fellowship system, runs workshops and seminars related to higher education teaching and learning, provides grants for research and implementation projects related to successful teaching, organises postgraduate student surveys, and works to influence policy (Higher Education Academy, undated). This is just one example of how various initiatives within a higher education system serve to define successful teaching, then provide professional development and recognition and resources to standardise the definition and its implementation, through leveraging resources and influence. What remains debatable is the extent to which this particular view of successful teaching is culture-specific, and the extent to which it would be valid and useful across diverse cultures and societies.

Student Experience

What does it mean to be a successful university in terms of student experience?

This is closely connected to the previous section, and the same caveats about cultural diversity in assumptions and interpretations of what constitutes a successful university in terms of student experience apply. At the same time, university education is not just about successful teaching, and other factors play a major part in student experience for many students. Ways of capturing the success or otherwise of the student experience are still underdeveloped, although the KIS data referred to in the previous section do attempt to measure this in part through items on personal development (e.g. “My communication skills have improved.”), and through statistics on employment/further study destinations and on average salaries six months after the end of the course. Such data, while useful, cannot possibly capture the richness and depth of successful student experience, and the use and development of such indicators is an area that requires much more study (Grebennikov & Shah 2013).

However, a large number of studies have been done on student perceptions of their university experience, and in addition to the academic learning experience, four areas in particular, categorised here as transition, extra-curricular engagement, environmental factors and personal attitudes/qualities, seem to contribute to a successful student experience.

The first category is transition. For a variety of reasons, many students experience “personal, cultural and political dislocation” (Testa & Egan 2014: 229) when they begin university. For example, working class students adapting to a middle class academic culture have to learn to negotiate new societal and cultural norms, often having to reassess their family/community values and become able to live in two worlds (Lehmann 2014). The same often applies to students of minority ethnic groups, mature students, students with disabilities and so on. Many students navigate the transition process smoothly and have very successful student experiences, but this is not true for all students. Another major transition issue is language. For students in many countries, starting university means switching to English as a medium of instruction, and this can be a major barrier to successful student experience for some students (Evans & Morrison 2011). Universities that facilitate successful student experience tend to be highly aware of transition issues, and provide support in dealing with them.

The second category in successful student experience is extra-curricular engagement. This takes many forms, and can obviously have a negative as well as positive impact on academic progress and success. In a study of students’ extra-curricular activities and their contribution to employability in one university in the UK, for example, Thompson et al (2013) found that the majority of students are actively engaged in a range of extra-curricular activities, but that these were not necessarily contributing to academic success or employability. The question of whether extra-curricular activities need to contribute to academic success or employability

to be regarded as part of a successful student experience remains open. Increasingly, extra-curricular engagement takes place not just through organised activities, but through social media networks, and it has been argued that course/activity-related engagement on Facebook and other social networking sites helps students to work through identity politics and role conflict associated with being a student (Selwyn 2009).

The third category is environmental factors. This refers both to physical facilities and to services. In terms of physical facilities, a study on student perceptions of academic buildings in Malaysia revealed the following themes: comfort, health and safety, access and quality of facilities, space provision and adequacy, participation and inclusiveness, and interaction. The study found that the features most emphasised by students as important were thermal conditions, internet access, furniture, duration of access, refreshment facilities, and availability of discussion rooms (Muhammad, Sapri & Sipan 2014). Similar studies on student perceptions of services have been conducted, and improving easy access to all services is recognised as being important for the student experience (Buultjens & Robinson 2011).

The fourth and final category is personal attitudes and qualities. For example, in the study mentioned above on transition to English as a medium of instruction in Hong Kong, Evans & Morrison (2011) found that the main factors ensuring successful student transition and experience were strong motivation, hard work, effective learning strategies and supportive peer networks. While it can be argued that universities can do little to influence factors such as motivation and willingness to work hard, some studies have found that self-efficacy, which affects motivation and learning, can be enhanced by educational programmes, contributing to both academic and personal successful student experience (van Dinther, Dochy & Segers 2011).

Creating a successful university in terms of successful student experience thus requires attention to myriad factors apart from the teaching and learning process, from building design and services through facilitation of extra-curricular activities and networks, to personal support for all individuals.

Business/knowledge Economy

What does it mean to be a successful university in terms of engagement with business and the knowledge economy?

As Altbach (2009: 9) points out, there is now “universal recognition that higher education is a central element in the knowledge economy”. Successful engagement of higher education in the knowledge economy can take diverse forms, from co-operation with local businesses and industries at various levels, to direct profit-making enterprises.

At the curriculum level, successful engagement with the knowledge economy can manifest itself through curriculum content, general skills taught across the curriculum, or programme design. In many – but not all – areas of study, there is an increased emphasis on aligning curriculum content with the requirements of employers or professional bodies. This is particularly true for subjects that prepare students for particular careers, such as nursing, teaching, engineering or accounting. Regardless of subject, most universities promote the development of skills required in the knowledge economy into the curriculum, for example, critical thinking, creativity, collaboration, cultural competence, information literacy and ICT skills. More specifically, internships have long been part of university curricula in many places, but effective use of internships to strengthen synergy of university and the workplace in innovation and collaborative initiatives is a key concern of universities aiming to be successful in terms of engagement with the knowledge economy.

On a wider level, the phenomenon ‘successful university’ is part and parcel of the contribution of a higher education institution to the country’s economy. To date, this characteristic is even more important as the economic growth of countries depends on knowledge and new

technologies. From this perspective, a university can be deemed successful when it contributes to the country's economy at local, regional or national level. Undoubtedly, solutions to regional challenges – be they socio-economic or technological – will be more successful if these issues are subject to comprehensive research and if decisions are substantiated by evidence.

Unquestionably, another fundamental feature of a successful university is its attractiveness for industry and business. Two aspects in this regard are worth noting specifically, the relevance of research innovation and recommendations for businesses as well as a demand for highly competent and qualified graduates for the industry. The contribution of business to implementation of research initiatives and proper R&D can be an indicator of demand of science technology. The highest hallmark of such demand is surely industrial implementation of a particular scientific concept. Again, it makes sense here to mention the extent and relativity of success. Even though there are no internationally patented innovations in Kazakhstan, for example, industry-demanded developments of technologies are in full force and significant progress is being made on the way towards research commercialisation. The discussed foundations being built to develop innovative technologies aimed at addressing industry issues in the region are a good sign of quite a high level of university success.

While universities have a long-established role in preparing students for the knowledge economy, their direct participation in the knowledge economy as commercial partners generally rests on much shallower foundations. For universities in many countries, financial autonomy in their own internal operations is still quite a novel concept, let alone managing the switch to being part of the neoliberal market economy. As Yusuf (2008: 1168) observes, “while universities have a large hand in producing the human capital so vital for the functioning and growth of a knowledge-intensive economy, the evidence on their direct contribution to commercially viable technologies is much patchier”. Increasingly, however, universities are taking an active role in this respect, not only through the sale of education (through high fees for international students or online education courses, for example), but also through commercial research and innovation projects, science parks and spin-out ventures, and the like (Wright et al. 2006).

Creating a successful university in terms of successful engagement with the knowledge economy thus involves careful attention to the education of students who will be key members of that knowledge economy, along with initiatives to ensure the success of the university itself as a key organisation within the knowledge economy, as a knowledge producer or knowledge broker.

Social Responsibility

What does it mean to be a successful university in terms of social responsibility?

Balancing the neoliberal economic imperative, the social role of universities has also been emphasised in recent decades. As Herrera (2008: 295) states:

The social responsibility of universities is what links scientific, technological, humanistic and artistic knowledge produced in the context of its application to local, national and global needs. Its primary objective is to promote the social utility of knowledge, thus contributing to improved quality of life.

The contribution of higher education and its research findings to improved quality of life in national context is not new, but the role of universities in promoting global social equity and improvement of quality of life at the global scale is still under-researched but developing momentum. The social responsibility of higher education institutions is diverse and wide-ranging, but three aspects will be briefly discussed in this section, namely, inclusion and widening participation, social responsibility and citizenship, and local, national and global development.

Inclusion and widening participation have risen on the agenda of many universities as the social responsibility arm of the massification of higher education. Increasingly, universities are

required to make their universities accessible to a much wider audience than the traditional elite universities and, by so doing, achieve wider dissemination of the “social utility of knowledge” mentioned above. Accessibility and inclusion include physical accessibility through building design and services and through mode of delivery and timetabling, financial accessibility through scholarship and loan schemes and so on, and social/cultural accessibility through measures to ensure that the university welcomes and meets the needs of diverse students. Having said that, inclusion is not achieved merely through widening participation and ensuring diversity, as success in inclusion as social responsibility requires much deeper structural and cultural transformations in all policies and activities of the university. As Tienda (2013:470) argues, “enrollment of a diverse student body is but a pragmatic first step toward the broader social goal of inclusion”.

Another aspect of a successful socially responsible university is its role in educating students as active citizens of their communities, nation and the world. In most universities, the dynamism, creativity and enthusiasm of a substantial number of people who tend to have fewer constraints on their time and energy than many others in society represents a significant opportunity for mobilisation to really change communities and societies for the better. Increasingly, this is being applied not only at local level, but also at global level, with more and more universities incorporating “global citizenship” into their visions, missions and graduate attributes, and increasing attention in the academic literature to what this means theoretically and in practice (e.g. Stearns 2009, Thanosawan & Laws 2013).

Connected to this, for universities in many parts of the world, successful social responsibility means responsibility to society to produce graduates who make a direct contribution to local and/or national development. The mission statement of the National University of Lesotho is one which is mirrored by universities all over the world:

NUL’s mission is to promote national advancement through innovative teaching, learning, research and professional services, producing high calibre and responsible graduates able to serve their communities with diligence².

The idea that “accumulation of human capital through education can improve the individual incomes that can in turn leverage the economic growth of a nation” (Oh, Choi & Choi 2013: 190) is a key element of human capital theory, of course, justifying the mission of universities to contribute to the economic development of their countries. The degree to which national governments try to plan and control this process varies. A point to be noted is the discussion of social responsibility and national development is that universities contribute to national development in many more ways than simply producing well-functioning cogs for the national economic machine. For example, although it is much more difficult to measure results, successful social responsibility for national development also includes education of future leaders capable of ethical questioning and decision-making, creation of inclusive and equitable cultures that facilitate development for everyone in society, and promotion of human development based on a capabilities approach (Sen 2009, Nussbaum 2011).

As Unterhalter & Carpentier (2010: 2) argue, “Higher education has the potential to reduce or increase inequalities depending on the form of policies institutions, governments, inter-government organisations and transnational associations implement”. A university that is successful in terms of social responsibility reduces inequalities within its own institution, and actively exerts social responsibility to promote equitable development at local, national and global levels.

2 National University of Lesotho mission statement. <http://www.nul.ls/>

Conclusion

To summarise, there is no single definition of a successful university. A successful university can be successful in many different ways. It can be a successful research university, featuring high in the world university rankings. It can be a successful teaching university, providing education that will serve students well for the rest of their lives. It can be successful from the point of view of student experience, changing the lives of its students in many different ways. It can be successful in terms of its engagement with industry and the knowledge economy, driving forward innovation. It can be successful in terms of social responsibility, playing a leading role in improving communities and societies at local, national or global levels. It can be successful in several of these spheres at the same time, or in other ways not discussed in this paper. Success depends on its own mission, and on the needs and priorities of the context in which it is situated. The university can be called successful if it achieves ambitious goals to become one of the best universities in the world. In order to attain this ambitious goal universities take a number of steps which ensure their success firstly on the institutional, regional and consequently national and global levels. This, in its turn, suggests that university success is a dynamic phenomenon and its characteristics are quite relative.

This discussion paper is intended as a starting point to debate the notion of a successful university, and a conclusion in the normal sense is thus probably not appropriate, as the paper marks the beginning rather than end of a collaborative exploration of the idea of the “successful university”. This being the case, we would like to conclude the paper by offering a quote from Altbach (2011: 2), referring back to the definition of successful research universities as “world class”:

All universities cannot be world class in the sense of competing for the top positions in the global rankings and league tables. But they can be world class in serving in the best way possible their particular mission, regions, or country. ... In this sense, all universities can be world class if they are provided with wise leadership and the resources to their mission.

References

- Altbach, P.G. (2009). Higher Education: An emerging field of research and policy. In R. Bassett & Maldonado-Maldonado (eds.) (2009) *International Organisations and Higher Education Policy: Thinking globally, acting locally?* New York: Routledge.
- Altbach, P. G. (2011). Introduction. In Altbach, P.G. (ed.) (2011) *Leadership for World-Class Universities: Challenges for developing countries*. New York: Routledge.
- Ball, S. (2012). *Global Education Inc.: New policy networks and the neo-liberal imaginary*. London: Routledge.
- Buultjens, M. & Robinson, P. (2011). Enhancing aspects of the higher education student experience, *Journal of Higher Education Policy and Management*, 33:4, 337-346.
- Castells, M. (2000). *The Rise of the Network Society* (2nd ed.). Oxford: Blackwell.
- Evans, S. & Morrison, B. (2011). Meeting the challenges of English-medium higher education: The first-year experience in Hong Kong. *English for Specific Purposes*, 10, 198-208.
- Grebennikov, L. & Shah, M. (2013). Student voice: using qualitative feedback from students to enhance their university experience, *Teaching in Higher Education*, 18:6, 606-618.
- Hazelkorn, E. (2011). *Rankings and the Reshaping of Higher Education: The Battle for World-Class Excellence*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Herrera, A. (2008). The social responsibility of universities in Latin America. In Global University Network for Innovation (ed.) *Higher Education in the World 3: Higher Education: New challenges and emerging roles for human and social development*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

- Higher Education Academy (undated) The Higher Education Academy. <http://www.heacademy.ac.uk/> (accessed 24 April 2014).
- Lehmann, W. (2014). Habitus Transformation and Hidden Injuries: Successful Working-class University Students, 87: 1, 1-15.
- Moutsios, S. (2013). The de-Europeanisation of the university under the Bologna Process. *Thesis Eleven*, 119:1, 22-46.
- Muhammad, S., Sapri, M. & Sipan, I. (2014). Academic Buildings and Their Influence on Students' Wellbeing in Higher Education Institutions. *Social Indicators Research*, 115: 3, 1159–1178
- Nussbaum, M. (2011). *Creating Capabilities: The human development approach*. Cambridge, MA: The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press.
- Oh, H., Choi, Y. & Choi, M. (2013). Comparative analysis of OECD member countries' competitive advantage in National Human Resource Development system. *Asia Pacific Education Review*, 14:2, 189-208.
- Salmi, J. (2009). *The Challenge of Establishing World-Class Universities*. Washington DC: the World Bank.
- Selwyn, N. (2009). Faceworking: exploring students' education-related use of Facebook, *Learning, Media and Technology*, 34:2, 157-174.
- Sen, A. (2009). *The Idea of Justice*. London: Penguin Books.
- Shattock, M. (2010). *Managing Successful Universities (2nd ed.)*. Maidenhead: Open University Press.
- Stearns, P. (2009). *Educating Global Citizens in Colleges and Universities: Challenges and opportunities*. New York: Routledge.
- Testa, D. & Egan, R. (2014). Finding voice: the higher education experiences of students from diverse backgrounds. *Teaching in Higher Education*, 19:3, 229–241.
- Thanosawan, P. & Laws, K. (2013) Global citizenship: differing perceptions within two Thai higher education institutions, *Journal of Higher Education Policy and Management*, 35:3, 293-304.
- Thompson, L., Clark, G., Walker, M. & Whyatt, D. (2013). 'It's just like an extra string to your bow': Exploring higher education students' perceptions and experiences of extracurricular activity and employability. *Active Learning in Higher Education*, 14: 2, 135-147.
- Tienda, M. (2013). Diversity ≠ Inclusion: Promoting Integration in Higher Education. *Educational Researcher*, 42:9, 467-475.
- Times Higher Education (undated). World University Rankings 2013-14 Methodology. http://english.hi.is/university/vision_and_strategy (accessed 19 April 2014).
- Unistats (undated). The official website for comparing UK higher education course data. <http://unistats.direct.gov.uk/> (accessed 24 April 2014).
- University of Iceland. (2011). Policy of the University of Iceland. http://english.hi.is/university/vision_and_strategy (accessed 19 April 2014).
- Unterhalter, E. & Carpentier, V. (2010). *Global Inequalities and Higher Education: Whose interests are you serving?* Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Van Dinther, M., Dochy, F. & Segers, M. (2009). Factors affecting students' self-efficacy in higher education, *Educational Research Review*, 6:2, 95-108.
- Weiler, H., Guri-Rosenblit, S. & Sawyerr, A. (2008). Summary Report. In H. Vessuri & U. Teichler (eds.) *Universities as Centres of Research and Knowledge Creation: An endangered species?* Rotterdam/Taipei: Sense Publishers
- Wright, M., Lockett, A., Clarysse, B. & Binks, M. (2006). University spin-out companies and venture capital. *Research Policy*, 35:4, 48-501.
- Yusuf, S. (2008). Intermediating knowledge exchange between universities and Businesses. *Research Policy*, 37:8, 1167-1174.

THE QUEST FOR A WORLD CLASS UNIVERSITY: DEFINING THE GOAL FOR AN EMERGING ECONOMY

Alan Ruby

In the past ten to fifteen years policy makers, scholars, development advisers, industry chief executives and academic leaders have all been grappling with how to create, develop and maintain a university that is recognised as one of the best in the world. Motivations for this pursuit revolve around increasing economic competitiveness and diversity, being part of the global scientific community, national prestige or pride and talent creation and retention. The development of national and global ranking schemes has added a semblance of objectivity to assessing institutional performance and fostered an "interest in the performance of the top 100 universities and in creating pathways to a 'world class university'" (Hazelkorn 2014, 248-249).

This quest for greatness, like the traditional Knightly quests, has its challenges. The most immediate problem is what to look for, how to define the goal. Like most normative tasks, setting public policy standards is heavily influenced by context. And as Wildavsky observed 40 years ago normative theories "must actually guide the making of governmental decisions" if they are to be more than academic exercises (1992, 183.)

As will be apparent in this brief survey much of the scholarship and government action about world class universities is heavily influenced by models and practices in developed economies.

Well established universities can serve as benchmarks or lodestars for aspirant institutions but emulating Cambridge or Harvard is not a formula for more guidance is needed for success. A clearly defined goal and a framework of policies and processes are more likely to form an "enabling environment" which will produce a good university that is "sustained and effective" (Thindwa 2001).

Defining "World Class University"

There is no shortage of attempts to establish a goal of creating a world class university and there is considerable variation between definitions. The first obvious difference is in the naming of the goal.

Some refer to "flagship universities" (Bunting, Cloote & Schalkwyk, 2014; Douglas, 2014, & Yonezawa, 2007), others use the term internationally recognised research universities (Mohrman, Ma & Baker, 2008; Levin, 2010; Saaid, 2014, & Rosovsky, 2014), while Simon Marginson (2012) uses "super brands" to refer to the top six universities in the Times Higher Education rankings. The majority use "world class university" (Atlbach 2005; Altbach & Balan 2007; Shattock 2003 & 2010; Krishnan 2005; Deem, Mook & Lucas 2008; Ngok & Guo 2008; Salmi 2009; Shin 2009; Rhee 2011; Yang & Welch 2012).

While there are real differences and shades of meaning and nuance in the choice of term the shared core of meaning of all these variants is "a university commonly held to be one of the best in the world". In doing so they cede legitimacy to those, like Baty and Morse the current architects of the Times Higher and the US News and World Report's rankings, who see reputation as a major element in the chosen term.

The next most obvious difference is in the stated principal purposes of world class universities. Politicians and national policy makers have tended to offer broad aspirational statements. For example Jiang Zemin, as premier of China, wanted to invest in building first-class universities which would "train high-level creative talent, turn out high-standard, original research results and make outstanding contributions to society". (Ngok & Guo 2008, 548). The German federal government's excellence initiative emphasised the importance of research as the dominant benchmark of an institution's reputation (Kehm 2006 & 2009). Similarly the Korean Government's three world class university funding programmes have concentrated on providing additional

resources for research (Byun, Jon, & Kim 2013; Shin, 2009). Japan's attempts to develop world class universities have also prioritised research (Yonezawa, 2007).

While teaching is often lauded as an element of a great university it is seldom, if ever, cited as the primary goal of a world-class university initiative. Despite the relatively narrow focus set for many world class universities most definitions of what makes a great university tend to be broad. Some like Salmi (2009) offer a small number of generalities: "high concentration of talent", "abundant resources" and operating environment that encourages "innovation" and managerial independence. These are some "generic but informative traits" (Douglas 2014, 4) but they offer little guidance to institutional leaders other than hire well and raise money; advice that might be given to the leaders of a start-up enterprise in any field.

Those who study the management and operation of higher education institutions tend to be more granular. They specify principles and processes that distinguish outstanding organisations. These can be lengthy checklists of fifteen to twenty items ranging from financial diversity (Alden and Linn 2004) to institutional research capacity (Douglas 2014, 19). Or they can be sets of principles or axioms embedded in national models like Japan's Imperial universities (Yonezawa 2007) or the research university of the USA. Rosovsky (2014), the Harvard dean emeritus and scholar, sets out six elements for a top research university:

- Shared governance with a collegial administrative style
- Academic freedom
- Merit selection of students and faculty
- Significant human contact – "real as opposed to virtual encounters between student and teachers" (5)
- Preservation and transmission of culture as one of its missions; and
- Non-profit status (6)

By his own admission, Rosovsky's list is shaped by "American exceptionalism" and the history of the public research universities. It is also shaped by contemporaneous concerns like the rapid rise of large scale online or virtual courses and the growth in the size and influence of the for profit providers. Rosovsky's list is also interesting because of its omissions. There is no direct reference to money, income or endowment. Nor is there any reference to infrastructure like laboratories or libraries. Both omissions may be products of a Harvard environment of abundance and comfort but are striking for those from institutions with less.

These longer lists can also be too specific and cover too wide a sweep of issues for effective implementation. Alden and Linn's (2004) list, ranges from reputation to financial security and stresses the international character of highly regarded universities. It also tends to favour well established, older institutions.

For a new university in a developing economy a more focused list that concentrates on core elements of operating principles, policy settings and resource priorities seems more useful. This is especially so when the institution is to pursue a distinctive mission and priorities that are dis-similar to the norm for public universities. This need for a sharply delineated set of key performance measures that guide decision making and resource allocation is heightened when the organisation is a start-up and not the product of a merger of existing schools or the upgrading of established institutions with fixed procedures and stable culture. The performance measures should ensure that attention is paid to the variables that determine academic and institutional excellence.

It may make more sense to look at:

- The steps that have been taken to establish a high quality student intake at undergraduate and graduate levels;

- The policies and practices that attract, retain and reward high quality leaders, faculty and staff;
- The financial stability and future of the university;
- The relationships between university, industry, secondary schools and its academic partners and competitors;
- The funding and policy arrangements to encourage research and excellence in teaching;
- Destinations and quality of graduates.

Only the last of these is an outcome and amenable to measurement. The others are processes or enabling conditions that produce an environment likely to result in learning and scholarship. Assessing these processes and policies requires judgments, hopefully with reference to data or to the practices of other institutions or the standards set by quality assurance and accrediting agencies.

But combined these six elements give us a framework to guide the development of a world class university. They offer sufficient detail to inform resource allocation and set priorities without prescribing a particular model or specifying an institutional mission or purpose. They concentrate in part on activities at the institutional level like recruiting students and faculty. But they also point to the network of relationships that need to be effectively managed and the importance of financial stability and certainty. Finally this short list includes an element of accountability – the destinations and successes of graduates.

In sum these six elements cover the cultural, political, financial and organisational norms that support the creation, operation, sustainability and effectiveness of and institution of higher education. How they are applied will vary from nation to nation but they do offer a framework for action.

References

- Altbach, P.G. (2005). A World-Class Country without World-Class Higher Education: India's 21st Century Dilemma. *International Higher Education*. 43, Summer.
- Altbach, P.G. and J. Balan. (Eds) (2007). *World class Universities Worldwide: Transforming Research Universities in Asia and Latin America*. Johns Hopkins University Press, Baltimore.
- Alden, J. and G. Lin (2004). "Benchmarking the Characteristics of a World-Class University: Developing an International Strategy at University Level". London: The UK Higher Education Leadership Foundation.
- American Association of State Colleges and Universities (AASCU) (2002). *Stepping Forward as Stewards of Place: a Guide for Leading Public Engagement at state Colleges and Universities*. AASCU, Washington, D.C. www.aascu.org
- Bunting I., Cloete N. & Van Schalkwyk, F. (2014). *An Empirical Overview of Eight Flagship Universities in Africa: 2001–2011*. A report of the Higher Education Research and Advocacy Network in Africa (HERANA). Cape Town: Centre for Higher Education Transformation.
- Byun, K., Jon., J.-E. & Kim, D. (2013). Quest for building world-class universities in South Korea: outcomes and consequences. *Higher Education*. 63:645-659.
- Chan-Tiberghlen, J. (2010). Academic Capitalism in Japan: National University Incorporation and Special Zones for Structural reform in Zajda, J. & Geo-Jala, M.A., (eds). *The Politics of Education Reforms, Globalization, Comparative education and policy research* 9, Springer Science +Business Media
- Deem, R., Mok, K.H., & Lucas, L. (2008). Transforming Higher Education in Whose Image: exploring the concept of 'World-Class' University in Europe and Asia. *Higher Education Policy*. 21: 83-97.

- Douglas, J.A. (2014). Profiling the Flagship University Model: An Exploratory Proposal for Changing the Paradigm from Ranking to Relevancy. Research and Occasional paper series: CSHE.5.14. University of California, Berkeley. <http://cshe.berkeley.edu/>
- Hazelnorn, E. (2014). Striving for "World Class Excellence": Rankings and emerging Societies. In Araya, P. & Marber, P., (eds) Higher Education in the Global Age: Policy, Practice and Promise in Emerging Societies. Routledge, New York pp 246-270.
- Horta, H. (2009). Global and National Prominent Universities: Internationalization, Competiveness and the Role of the State. Higher Education. 58(3) pp 387-405.
- Kehm, B. (2006). "The German "Initiative for Excellence" and the Issue of Ranking". International Higher Education. The Boston Center for International Higher Education. Number 44 Summer.
- Kehm, B. (2009). "Germany: the Quest for World Class". International Higher Education. The Boston Center for International Higher Education. Number 57, Fall.
- Krishnan, R.T. (2005). Building World Class Universities. Economic and Political Weekly. 40, (17). 23-25 April. pp1681-1683.
- Levin, R.C. (2010). Top of the Class. Foreign Policy 89(3), May/June.
- Marginson, S. University Rankings, Government and Social Order: Managing the field of higher education according to the logic of performative present-as-future in Simons, M., Olssen, M. & Peters, M., (eds.) Re-reading Education Policies: studying the policy agenda of the 21st Century. Rotterdam: Sense Publishers
- Ngok, K., & Guo, W. (2008). The Quest for World Class Universities in China: critical reflections. Policy Futures in Education. 6(5). pp545-557.
- Rhee, B.S. (2011). A World Class research University on the Periphery: The Pohang University of Science and Technology, the Republic of Korea. In Altbach, P.G. & Salmi, J. (eds.) The Road to Academic Excellence: the making of world class research universities (pp101-128). The World Bank, Washington, D.C.
- Rosovsky, H. (2014). Research Universities: American exceptionalism? International Higher Education. 76 pp 4-6. A longer version is in The CarnegieWeb site <http://higheredreporter.carnegie.org>
- Saaied, A.H.M. (2014). Research Universities to Propel Malaysia into a Developed Nation www.bernana.com.my/v7/fe/newsfatruaes
- Salmi, J. (2009). The Challenge of Establishing World-Class Universities. Directions in development. Washington, D.C.: the World Bank. Also available at <http://portal.unesco.org/education/en/files/55825/12017990845Salmi.pdf/Salmi.pdf>
- Shin, J.C. (2009). Building world-class research university: The Brain Korea 21 Project, Higher Education, 58:669-688.
- Thindawa, J. (2001). Enabling Environment for Civil Society in CDD projects. Washington D.C., World Bank <http://www.worldbank.org/participation/enablingenvironment/EnablingenvironmentCEDD.pdf>
- Wildavsky, A. (1992). Political Implications of Budgetary Reform. Public Administration Review, 52(6) pp183-190.
- Yang, R., & Welch, A. (2012). A world -class university in China? The case of Tsinghua. Higher Education 63:645-666.
- Yonezawa, A. (2007). Japanese Flagship Universities at a Crossroads. Higher Education, 54(4) pp 483- 499.

THE IMPORTANCE OF LOCAL AND INTERNATIONAL ENGAGEMENT IN BUILDING A “SUCCESSFUL” UNIVERSITY

Jane Knight

The notion of a 'successful university' is both comprehensive and evasive. A 'successful university' means different things to students, faculty, academic leaders, citizens, decision makers across various disciplines, sectors and countries around the world. Often success is in the eye of the beholder – or perhaps more importantly – stakeholder. Those who attempt to define, measure, and predict success need to be mindful of Einstein's famous 1902 quote – “Not everything that can be counted counts, and not everything that counts can be counted.”

Capacity Building vs Status Building

Globalisation has had an enormous impact – both positive and negative. In response to globalisation there is an increased emphasis on competitiveness and higher education institutions have become preoccupied with being 1) internationally recognised and branded; 2) highly ranked in national/global league tables; or 3) categorised as a 'world class' institution. This preoccupation has more to do with “status building” rather than “capacity building”. This paper argues, however, that in the end it is capacity building which is critical to the development of a successful university not status building. Status building is more closely linked to public relations and marketing which is often situational and temporary.

Engagement vs Recognition

Within the framework of capacity building for a successful university, this discussion looks at the importance of local and international *engagement*. Engagement is seen as more closely linked to capacity building while *recognition* is associated more with status building and branding. Engagement can be described as 'participation in a two way relationship which offers mutual benefits'. Engagement differs distinctly from recognition given that it places great importance on *participation*, while recognition relies more on *perception*. Both participation and perception involve different actors and stakeholders but it is participation and engagement which is fundamental to building capacity and becoming a successful university. On the other hand, perception by different stakeholders can differ significantly from group to group, sector to sector, or country to country and is often reactive and inconsistent. Perception does not make or determine a successful university; in the best case scenario perception can acknowledge a successful university. To be recognised as a successful university, an enormous amount of effort has to be invested in building the institution to meet its articulated goals and priorities. Local and international engagement is a key component to building and improving the institution.

Three Primary Roles of a University

The idea of a university is built on three primary pillars or functions. These include 1) the teaching and learning process, 2) research and innovation, and 3) service to the community, country, region and society at large. These are interdependent functions and thus, efforts to build a successful university involve being attentive to all three areas. Clearly this involves a diversity of aspects ranging from the quality of teaching, the student experience, expertise of teaching and research staff, research partnerships, local and international engagement, quality assurance, strategic planning, adequate funding, sound management and the list goes on and closely aligned with all three pillars is the notion of local and international engagement. Important to note is that these aspects of the university are not mutually exclusive, in fact they can be related, but more importantly they can be at odds with one another. This paper addresses the importance of strategies for being actively engaged both locally and internationally.

Growth in Number and Diversity of Actors

It is important to examine the different levels and types of actors involved in promoting, providing, and sometimes regulating the local and international engagement of higher education. Table 1 illustrates the diversity of actors with whom universities are engaged. The categories of actors can be further analysed by examining the actors' their missions and activities – policymaking, regulating, funding, programming, teaching, research, service, advocacy, networking and others. It is important to note that actors often fulfil more than one role and that these categories are therefore not mutually exclusive.

Table 1. Actors and their Roles in International Engagement of Higher Education

Different Levels of Actors and Interaction	Different Types of Actors	Different Roles of Actors
Local	Government departments or agencies	Policymaking
Subnational	Non (or semi-)governmental organisations	Regulating
National	Professional associations	Education
Bilateral	Foundations	Research
Sub regional	Public/private educational institutions and providers	Advocacy
Regional	Private research centres	Funding
Interregional	Private industry and commercial entities	Networking
International		Research

Source: Knight (2014)

The number of actors means that a diversity of rationales and subsequent activities are involved in local and international engagement of higher education institutions. The multiplicity of motives and the fact that they are changing is what contributes to the complexity and changing nature of successful engagement of successful universities.

Local Engagement

What is meant by local engagement? Many aspects are involved. First it is important to note that local involves the immediate community/region or the country at large. It builds on respect of local cultures, values, norms, context and priorities. It contributes to building the health and well-being of communities and their citizens, social and cultural services, environmental sustainability, and economic development. Keeping this in mind, local engagement means using diverse strategies to set up different types of partnerships with local, regional and national higher education institutions as well as governmental, non-governmental and private entities. The partnerships can relate to universities roles of teaching/learning, research and knowledge production and service, or it can involve broader level activities of advocacy, policymaking and standard setting.

One size does not fit all when it comes to university engagement with the local community. A 'cookie cutter approach' or standardised approach does not lead to building a successful university. It is necessary for the university to assess its priorities, needs and strengths and align them with the local context and conditions. Too often, in the current era of branding and profile, there is a temptation to align with the requirements of the league table rather than with the local, national and regional environment in which the university is working.

While both local and international engagement is of primary importance, more attention is given to international engagement, collaboration and partnerships in this paper.

International Engagement

International engagement is about developing productive relationships with other higher education institutions around the world, governmental and non-governmental organisations, think tanks, as well as the private sector and voluntary bodies. The diversity of actors and potential partners as identified in Table 1 indicates the breadth of opportunities. It is tempting for universities to be reactive to the plethora of international opportunities available to them. A key characteristic of a successful university is that it has a clear statement of priorities and goals and knows when and how international partnerships are appropriate and valuable. A successful university is proactive and strategic in identifying and prioritising its international partnerships, it is not reactive to the myriad of opportunities that present themselves.

A current and unsettling trend of universities is to collaborate only with universities that are ranked at the same level or higher in the world league tables. This is understandable to a degree but successful partnerships are often based on partners bringing very different but complementary interests and strengths to the relationship. In other words, there is something to learn from each or all partners and capacity building is the overriding goal not status building.

Higher education international collaboration and engagement has been around for centuries but the number and types of strategies for international engagement and partnerships have multiplied in the last two decades. Traditionally the international dimension of higher education institutions focused on bilateral student and scholar exchanges for teaching and research purposes. While this continues, there are exciting new developments in international engagement which include international research networks; collaborative education programmes; education hubs; mobility of students and staff; binational universities; multi-lateral policy dialogues; public/private innovation initiatives; among others.

Three Generations of International Academic Mobility

Worth noting are the three generations of academic mobility through international partnerships because it is no longer just the students who are moving. While students and scholars constitute the first generation of education mobility, academic programmes, institutions, alternative providers, and policies are also crossing borders. In fact, there has been an unprecedented growth in branch campuses, twinning programmes and double/joint degree programmes in the last two decades. More recently the third generation of academic mobility has emerged with the development of education hubs, zones, and cities. Table 2 highlights the three generations of academic partnerships based on mobility.

Education hubs are the most recent development and constitute the third wave of cross-border education initiatives and illustrate the importance of universities' international engagement with the diversity of actors listed in Table 1. Education hubs build on and can include first and second generation cross-border activities, but they represent a wider and more strategic configuration of actors and activities. An education hub is a concerted and planned effort by a country (or zone, city) to build a critical mass of local and international actors (i.e., universities, research and development centres, private industry) to strengthen its efforts to build the higher education sector, expand the talent pool for the labour market, or contribute to the knowledge economy.

Table 2. Three Generations of International Academic Mobility (Knight 2014)

	Primary Focus	Description
First Generation	Student/people mobility Movement of students to foreign country for education purposes and scholars for research and teaching purposes	full degree programme or for short term study re- search, field work, internships research exchange, collaborative projects, PhD su- pervision, co-curricular design and delivery
Second Generation	Programme and provider mobility Movement of programmes or institutions/companies across jurisdictional borders for delivery of education to local and regional students	Programme Mobility Twinning Franchised Articulated/ Validated Joint/Double Award Online/Distance/MOOCs Provider Mobility <i>Branch Campus</i> <i>Virtual University</i> <i>Binational Universities</i> <i>Independent Institutions</i>
Third Generation	Education Hubs Countries attract foreign students, researchers, workers, Higher education programmes and providers, R and D companies for education, training, knowledge production, innovation purposes	Student Hub – students, programme, providers move to foreign country for education purposes Talent Hub – students, worker move to foreign country for education and training and employment purposes Knowledge/Innovation Hub – education researchers, scholars, HEIs, R&D centres move to foreign country to produce knowledge and innovation

In 2012, there are only a handful of countries around the world which are seriously trying to develop themselves as an education hub. These include Hong Kong, Singapore, Malaysia, United Arab Emirates, Qatar, and Botswana (Knight 2014). In all of these hubs local and foreign universities play a critical role. The question pertinent to this discussion is whether the involved higher education institutions would be labelled successful universities. The answer echoes back to the first paragraph in this paper which points out that the definition of a successful university is both comprehensive and evasive and is the eye of the beholder and stakeholder. Those countries which have invested in the development of education hubs have clearly tried to recruit ‘successful universities’ in order to increase the attractiveness of the hubs but there is not only one model or concept of a successful university.

Different rationales, actors and activities characterise education hubs. Some countries see hubs as a means to build a critical mass of foreign students and providers to generate income as well as modernise and internationalise their domestic higher sector. Others want to be a hub in order to train foreign and local students and employees to be part of a skilled labour force. And other countries focus on attracting foreign students and workers, institutions and companies to build a vibrant research, knowledge and innovation sector to lead them towards a knowledge-based economy. In order to capture the differences among hub approaches and allow for a more nuanced understanding and exploration of education hubs, three categories of hubs have been identified and briefly described in Table 2. The three types of education hubs are student, talent and knowledge/innovation and therefore, the role and nature of the involved universities will depend on the type and purpose of the hub. Again, this demonstrates and emphasises that there is not one model of a successful university. It depends on how the university helps to meet the needs and priorities of its local, national, or international context and this varies significantly across countries and regions. However, a common characteristic of a successful university is that it is not “an ivory tower” but is actively and productively engaged and contributing to the community, country and society at large.

This paper has argued that 'capacity building' is more critical to developing a successful university than 'status building' or achieving a high rank in a global or regional league table. Secondly, capacity building involves 'local and international engagement' through productive partnerships at home and abroad and is fundamental to helping a successful university assume its role and responsibilities to society.

Three generations of international mobility and partnerships, including the current development of education hubs, are used as examples of engagement with a diversity of actors. Thirdly, it raises questions about the long-term implications and unintended consequences of placing undue importance on 'international recognition' over "international engagement" as expressed in today's preoccupation with international branding and league tables. Of course, they are not mutually exclusive but the appropriate balance is critical.

*This opinion piece is based on a presentation made at the 2014 Eurasian Higher Education Leaders' Forum and builds on the following work of the author.

References

Knight, J. (2014). *International Education Hubs: Student, Talent, Knowledge/Innovation Models*. Dordrecht: Springer.

IN SEARCH OF CRITERIA AND FACTORS OF SUCCESS FOR A REGIONAL UNIVERSITY

Amantai Nurmagambetov

President Nursultan Nazarbayev defined success of universities as follows (2012): “(...) it is, first of all, those universities that have the status of autonomy, academic freedom and focus on research activities.” At present, the only autonomous university in Kazakhstan is Nazarbayev University. National universities have a certain degree of academic freedom. Regional universities also have specific features that are remote from the centre of decision-making, limited in human resources and facilities, etc. In this regard, let us try to answer the following questions: what are some criteria for determining the success of a university in a region, and what factors determine the success of a regional university?

Criteria for success for a university are very diverse. It may be criteria for evaluating research and educational activities, student leisure, the ratio of teachers and students, number of academic degrees obtained by faculty, etc. Those can also be global and/or domestic rankings criteria offered by the rankings agencies.

The society has been permanently forming various kinds of needs that require trained professionals. The need for specialists in various fields is constantly evolving and changing, which imposes additional requirements to the higher education system. Therefore, in this system, as in any other, there is the “input” that claims on the environment, and where the system must respond. Bearers of these requirements are students and their parents. At the output of the education system, graduates enter the labor market, i.e. universities graduate already more or less trained specialists through which the society generates the existing knowledge and builds the capacity required for further development of the society.

I believe, in relation to the education system, it is necessary to continuously monitor and analyze information about the output of university graduates in the labor market. In any system, including educational one, information analysis coming at the “output” stage of the system, resulting in its return to the “input”, allows to adjust the stability of the system. However, the educational system is very inertial; it is very difficult to disrupt it. It is also difficult to restore it. Therefore, it is very important to choose the right strategy, since the feedback that restores balance and stability in the system of higher education cannot occur earlier than four or six years, which is the period for graduates entering the higher education system and going out of it right to the labor market (Nurmagambetov, 2002).

It is proposed to measure the success of a university as an element of market relations. In this regard, let us address the method of Parsons open systems analysis and represent the university as an open system (1997). At the entrance, we have the flow of applicants, and we have graduates going to the labor market at the output.

The stability or success of this system is determined by a feedback loop, which is the main mechanism for regulating the university’s activities and satisfying the needs of the region labor force. Thus, the integral indicator of the success for a regional university is employability, which is the main criterion. It should be noted that this criterion is difficult to apply for national universities – their graduates are not localized in one region.

Let me now address some institutional success factors. For this, we use Jamil Salmi’s (2009) approach who determines the success of world-class universities on the basis of the following factors: “a high concentration of talent (of faculty and students), an abundance of resources to create favorable conditions for learning and advancing research, and effective management structure at an institution that promotes a strategic vision, innovation and flexibility.” The question arising is how this formula is applicable for the success of a regional university?

The question of high concentration of talented faculty in a region is very limited. As for talented students, the selection is carried out on the basis of the results of Unified National Testing¹, and the testing system is not within the competence and control of the university. Much has been said about the involvement of private investors, or the establishment of an endowment fund. However, these mechanisms are not developed in our country yet.

Those activities performed by the collegial governance body represented by Boards of Trustees or Supervisory Boards have not proved to be effective yet. But does this mean that a regional university cannot be successful? What factors influence the success of a regional university? What is the way out of this situation? I think it is necessary to pay attention to the following factors:

- increasing of public funding in the development of regional universities from the national budget is of primary importance;
- engaging local government leaders and employers in the management of a regional university is essential;
- reaching a new level of public-private partnerships (PPP) in higher education is a must. I consider it necessary to provide a solid legislative framework in terms of tax incentives for patrons of education, as well as other forms of moral encouragement without which the PPP in education cannot be widespread;
- providing a clear understanding of the university's development strategy by all the stakeholders including faculty and students is essential. Innovation and continuous improvement require creation of a particular culture with stakeholders involved in this process;
- developing an institutional strategy for internationalization of higher education is important. Attracting international professors and students can improve the academic level of students and enrich their experience through intercultural communication;
- designing English-medium academic programmes will allow to develop a more effective collaboration with international professors and scholar and take advantage of their expertise;
- limiting the range of academic programmes for a regional institution focusing only on those specialties that are demanded in the given region. Expanding specialties and thus the student contingent in the pursuit of increasing financial resources greatly affects the quality of education and yet results in falling reputation of the university in the region;
- creating an educational cluster of universities in the region, eliminating duplication of specialties. This will avoid unnecessary competition, parallel training and unprofitable small groups. As a result, each institution can be successful in its field.

To sum up, we see that the success of a regional Kazakhstani university depends on many factors. These factors can be significantly enhanced and expanded. But the main factors seem to be found in support from the state; clear understanding of the university's strategy by the university team; the university's involvement in solving the problems of the region; and working closely with the internal and external stakeholders.

¹ A high-stakes assessment test in Kazakhstan which serves a dual function: a school-leaving exam and a test to enter higher education.

References

- Nazarbayev, N.A. (2012). Speech of the President of Kazakhstan to the Students of Nazarbayev University. Retrieved from: http://akorda.kz/ru/page/page_vystuplenie-prezidenta-kazakhstana-pered-studentami-nazarbaev-universiteta_1346990218
- Nurmagambetov, A.A. (2002). *Educational policy of the Republic of Kazakhstan in the context of the transformation of the higher education system*: Almaty: PD Domino.
- Parsons, T. (1997). *The system of modern societies* / Trans. from English. LA Sedov. Moscow: Aspect Press.
- Salmi, J. (2009). *The Challenge of Establishing World-Class Universities*. Washington D.C.: the World Bank.

DIVERSITY AND INTEGRITY IN THE SUCCESSFUL UNIVERSITY

Humphrey Tonkin

The Importance of Difference

Let us deal with some of the fundamentals right at the start. Success can mean many different things to many people. Is a university successful if it serves the national interest? Is it successful if it facilitates the international mobility of people and ideas? Is it successful if it educates students effectively? Is it successful if it plays a positive role in the community? Is it successful if it doesn't lose money? Is it successful if the Times Higher Education Supplement or Shanghai Jiao Tong University declares it to be successful? Everything depends on our point of view.

It may be easier to recognize lack of success, namely an institution that has little impact on its surroundings, little sense of its direction and purpose, limited vision, and little dynamism. We know when things are wrong, but are less sure when they are right.

If it is hard to assess success, it is almost as hard to define a university. Universities come in many shapes and sizes. They have different histories, a different mix of students and disciplines, different goals and aspirations.

We are gathered to discuss what makes a successful university. This agenda may imply that there is more agreement on these matters than I think there is; it may also mean that we are in danger of identifying a single model, a single institutional profile, for all to follow. Efforts at consensus building sometimes have the opposite effect: by developing a particular orthodoxy, they push alternative ideas into heterodoxy. Arguably, one of the most important roles that universities play in modern society is that they offer a location in which many heterodoxies can flourish and ideas can be tested – where freedom to think freely and to try out ideas is especially protected, and where a particular kind of intellectual risk-taking (which leads to innovation) is possible.

One thing is certain: it makes little sense to build institutions of higher education that are all the same, or even aspire to be the same. Yet many of the measures that we use to define success, because they are comparative, tend to force all institutions into the same mold. Recently I was talking with the woman conductor of a prominent American symphony orchestra. "I would not have become a conductor if I had not attended a women's college," she declared. Women's education may have a place in certain contexts and societies, including American society. By the same token, there are many institutions that put particular stress on the nurturing of the talent of those who have not had the opportunity to learn how to succeed in our competitive society because they are too poor or too marginalized to succeed on their own. There are plenty of highly successful tertiary-level institutions who are advancing knowledge in this way – not with those born to be leaders (those at the top of the socioeconomic ladder) but with the leaders who must be made, and the followers who must be encouraged to think for themselves. Some years ago, I presided over a university that took particular pride in teaching mathematics to students with so-called math anxiety. Its professors focused on this issue to an almost religious degree: to them, teaching mathematics was a calling, and understanding mathematics was a gateway to intellectual freedom. In truth, they were not wrong, and what they did for students surely had a major impact on those students' careers and everyone they came into contact with. But such educational leadership would not have made a dent in the university rankings that we are so familiar with.

This last point is important. We certainly need leading scholars are major innovators, but we also need a flexible, well educated workforce able to handle the technologies of today. A nation that produces only brilliant Ph.D.'s and fails to pay attention to undergraduate education will have difficulty maintaining its economic base – and also its political resources. A democratic

system requires a broadly well-educated electorate, among other things because these are the people who will vote to keep higher education alive and pass this legacy on to the next generation.

Strengthening Higher Education in a Changing Environment

There is hardly a nation in the world that is not currently engaged in strengthening and expanding its higher education system. It is doing so, first and foremost, to compete against others, or at the very least not to fall behind. Higher education is the key to building a knowledge-based society, to developing human capital, and to creating a vibrant economy. Yet less attention is given to factors less immediately economic. At gatherings like this one, and also in parliamentary chambers, we hear less about how universities contribute to the quality of life – except in economic terms – less about how university systems should be strengthened to augment the rule of law, or to assure full participation in the cultural life of the community, or to nurture artists and thinkers. Economic prosperity is vitally important, but so are intellectual and cultural prosperity. Life is not just about financial profit and loss, or just about earning power. Because economic prosperity is easier to measure, all too easily it takes priority over these other concerns. It is not mere sentimentality to demand of universities more than economic prosperity. There are huge opportunity costs in articulating the goals of higher education in purely economic terms.

While universities are elements in national higher education systems, they are also nodes in a worldwide scientific and cultural network. Paradoxically, they flourish best by cooperating with their competition. There has always been a tension, and divided loyalties, between professors' commitment to their institutions and their commitment to their disciplines, or between their pursuit of truth and their employment. One of the great challenges facing all higher education leaders is balancing those two commitments and translating them in educational terms.

To a degree never before experienced, we are today witnessing a great convergence of technical and scientific knowledge, aided by ease of communication of a kind that is enfranchising institutions that previously were marginal or non-existent: electronics overcomes distance, augments libraries, disperses teaching and learning. At the same time we are suffering from a fragmentation of common values outside the university that threatens the wellbeing of those within, and is itself a sign that we must do more to offer national and international leadership not just in science and technology, not just in the world of ideas, but also in the world of values. Again, a paradox: one of the major functions of a university is to pay attention to its own surrounding community – to what is unique about that community. Without the preservation of diversity we cannot have meaningful commonality and community. Globalization must be accompanied by localization: what has made companies like Microsoft and Google so successful has been their ability to adapt to local languages and local behaviors even as they expand across the globe.

But, I should add, we cannot imagine that the massive changes going on in our various societies will have no effect on the institution of the university itself. If other things are changing, and if the world is full of uncertainties concerning the shape of the future, we too are changing, and we are doing so with no clear sense of direction. It is common in the United States today to suggest that higher education is going through a period of crisis. Some of this crisis atmosphere is caused by drastic cuts in funding: the state is unwilling to invest enough money to sustain the system as it now is. Some of it is caused by equally alarming increases in the cost of providing higher education. By-products of these contrary pressures (falling income and rising costs) are twofold: huge increases in student debt, and instability in the professoriate, as adjuncts and teaching assistants are hired to do much of the teaching at lower levels of compensation. But a source of still greater uncertainty is the revolution in communication that we are currently experiencing. More and more education goes on line, MOOCs proliferate, classroom education

changes, and libraries transform themselves into data and learning centers. We simply do not know what the educational products and processes will be ten or twenty years from now, nor how higher education will be packaged. So, even as our politicians want to be able to boast of world-class universities in their countries and regions, the very institutions themselves may look quite different a couple of decades from now, and the criteria for world-class status quite transformed.

Rankings and the Threat to Diversity

In the balance between local responsibilities and global responsibilities the tension between orthodoxy and heterodoxy plays out in sometimes troublesome ways. In the race to establish world-class universities, we have succumbed to superficial definitions and a confusion in the relationship between globalization and localization. To compete in global rankings, for example, because of the way the ratings are set up, a university must be of a certain size, must be adequately (not to say generously) resourced, must focus on graduate studies even if it has a core of undergraduate studies, must contain a generous number of international students and faculty, and must speak English. Some of these criteria may well be a mark of quality; others less so. The emphasis on graduate study, for example, means that rankings tell us little or nothing about the quality of undergraduate teaching and learning. Indeed, a recent OECD comparative assessment of adult competencies tells us that the United States, apparently the world's leader in university education, fares badly in comparison with other developed countries.

Arguably, the last in my list of criteria, speaking English, which is essentially an accident of heritage and not an indicator of inherent quality, is the most decisive. The Academic Ranking of World Universities (Shanghai Jiaotong), the Thomson-Reuters Times Higher Education World University Ranking, and the QS World University Rankings, along with most other such measures, favor English-speaking universities overwhelmingly. This supposed superiority may simply be because the universe of English-speaking universities is large and hence such universities tend to do well in studies of reputation.

Language and Rankings

With regard to language, we are in real danger of confusing cause and effect. There is no question that the English language has become the lingua franca of the engines of globalism and of the world of technology and science. The universities of those countries for which it is the native language, or a widely used adopted language, rise to the top. Do they do so because they have easier access to the international network (in which case their success, even if it may seem unfair, is success none the less) or do they do so because their presence in an English-speaking environment makes them better known by a wider number of people, and therefore gives them higher status? To put it in other terms, do English-speaking institutions maintain their superiority essentially by gaming a system that handicaps everyone else?

Universities that speak widely diffused languages, like German or Spanish or French, tend not to flourish in such rankings. This apparently depressed condition may in some ways be a sign of strength: they are sustained by linguistic platforms that are self-sufficient to a degree that, say, the linguistic platforms of the Scandinavian countries are not. Thus they are more dependent on English. Many established disciplines have a rich literature (original and translated) in such languages as German, Spanish and French, and so they have less need to use the linguistic resources that are enjoyed by English speakers. It is the very self-sufficiency of these countries that makes them invisible and inaudible to speakers of English (who are increasingly monolingual).

The German higher education system, for example, is not organized according to the star system that obtains in many other countries, notably the United States. Resources are spread more evenly, as is talent. While concentrations of talent may constitute a net positive, its

dispersion may be a positive too. As for the French system, while it is widely believed, both by the French and by others, to lack the flexibility and nimbleness of some other systems, it is not apparent that merely joining institutions together in alliances and mergers (the desire of the moment, advanced by the Law of July 22, 2013) will do anything other than make French institutions look more like institutions in other countries and therefore more eligible for a place in the rankings. It may actually detract from the overall quality of France's leading institutions, the *grandes écoles*. Here, too, we may not be dealing with questions of quality so much as with questions of historical accident and the simple fact that the university rankings favor a particular type of university over other types.

This is not to say that there are no values that raise these leading institutions above others. Money is certainly a factor, as the huge resources of American universities make clear; but also technology transfer, citation, and the like may be authentic measures of quality. However, here again language is a major factor. Numbers of citation indexes accept material only in English, and numbers of abstract services collect only abstracts in English. So the citations of scholars working in major European languages other than English appear less often in the indexes, thereby depressing their ratings.

Conclusion

Thus, we can conclude that recent years have put pressure on universities to conform to single, measurable patterns, some of which are less valuable as indicators than others. In part, this pressure has come not so much from within as from those who hold the purse strings – particularly national policymakers. Hardly surprisingly, they want value for the public money they invest. Universities have done a poor job of demonstrating how their missions vary and ought to do so, and policymakers have done a poor job in assessing professorial output, often valuing conformity over originality, and linguistic unity over linguistic pluralism. It is easier to develop common metrics, producing an air of false objectivity, than to assess institutional success individually.

There is much more to be said about these issues than time permits, and others will certainly take up this theme. Let me conclude then, by asking what criteria of success we should pay attention to. In addition to solvency and good management (which are necessities rather than successes in themselves), six criteria strike me as particularly important:

- **Diversity.** Every university serves several publics – young people, the worldwide scientific and intellectual community, civil society in all its manifestations, and, to a greater or lesser degree, the needs of the state. The relative importance of these publics will vary, but a university that pursues only one of its various public missions at the expense of all others cannot be fully effective. Furthermore, universities have traditionally been great social levelers by bringing together talent from different socioeconomic backgrounds. This process is important both politically and economically.
- **Clarity and responsibility.** Every university must be well organized and operated, with power shared among faculty, students, and administrators, clearly delineated for each constituency. The faculty role should be more than mere execution of others' agendas: there must be room for original thought and action.
- **Distinctiveness.** Not all universities are the same. Each country's universities are derived from differing goals and priorities, and different public missions. A good university will have its own mission, its own strategy, and mechanisms for maintaining consensus around both mission and strategy. Mere comparability across regional or national boundaries is not a criterion of success, nor should we allow our politicians and policymakers to believe that it is.

- **Integrity.** Every university must exercise integrity in its evaluation and credentialing of students. The value of its programmes depends on it.
- **Autonomy.** Every university, if it is to pursue and expound knowledge effectively, must enjoy a measure of autonomy. If we treat it like a branch of government, it will not foster the innovation that we expect from successful universities. Autonomy in turn implies academic freedom.
- **Advancing knowledge.** Every university must make a positive difference to the knowledge and skills of its students, and have a positive impact on the growth and organization of knowledge and the well-being of society in general – nationally and internationally.

The biggest problem, we have to conclude, lies in defining success. Success is not quantitative but qualitative. For example, a successful faculty is not one that publishes a lot, but one that contributes assertively to the advancement of knowledge; not one that teaches a lot, but one that teaches well. Nor should a university be judged on reputation and popularity: the pursuit of university ratings may have made some universities better, but it has made too many the same. The measures that we use continue to fall well short of the ideal.

WHAT MAKES A UNIVERSITY SUCCESSFUL FROM THE PERSPECTIVE OF TEACHING AND STUDENT LEARNING?

Jan Vermunt

In this contribution I would like to focus on the quality of student learning at university, the pedagogy and quality of university teaching, and the relationship between those two components of a successful university. The pedagogy and quality of university teaching are mostly taken for granted. The dominant view is that good researchers are good teachers almost by definition, a view with which I profoundly disagree.

A universal aim of university education is to develop skills of critical, analytical and independent thinking in students, and to enable them to apply these skills to solve problems in their field of expertise. However, universities differ greatly in the degree to which they achieve this aim and in what kind of learning they foster in students. For example, at the University of Cambridge we place a strong emphasis on students' critical engagement with the literature. In our Masters programmes we have an enrolment of students from all over the world, and many of them have learned previously only to a limited degree to critically engage with scientific resources.

Moreover, students should become able to continue acquiring, producing and utilizing new knowledge after their graduation for the rest of their professional lives. Acquiring new knowledge refers to, among other things, preparing for the lifelong learning society that the Minister of Education was referring to in his speech at this conference. Producing new knowledge means being research active and contributing to the production and dissemination of new knowledge. Utilizing new knowledge refers to graduates being able to apply the knowledge they have acquired to solve problems in their domain of expertise.

To achieve these aims, successful universities challenge their students to realise high quality learning processes. Traditional didactic lecturing methods have their limitations in this respect. In these traditional approaches to teaching, lecturers typically transfer knowledge to the students, explain the subject matter, determine what study material the students should study, and test the extent to which the students have mastered the prescribed subject matter. These ways of teaching stimulate students to adopt reproductive approaches to learning (Trigwell & Prosser, 2004). Instead, we need approaches to teaching that foster high quality learning processes, which are characterised by active, deep, engaged, self-regulated and collaborative student learning experiences.

- *Active vs passive learning*: students are actively creating their own knowledge instead of passively absorbing the knowledge of others to be able to reproduce these on a test;
- *Deep vs surface learning*: students are thinking about relations between theories, concepts, phenomena, theory and practice, they try to structure separate elements of the subject matter into a whole, analyse complex material in detail, critically engage with the literature, instead of trying to memorise and rehearse the most important parts to be able to reproduce these on an exam;
- *Engaged vs instrumentally motivated*: students are intrinsically motivated, personally interested, eager to know, instead of extrinsically motivated, certificate oriented, having to know;
- *Self-regulated vs externally regulated learning*: students steer their own learning, are self-determined, read 'around' the prescribed material, versus let their learning be regulated by external sources, follow the teachers' directions, study mainly what the teachers find important;

- *Collaborative vs individual learning*: students work together, share ideas, discuss viewpoints, view fellow students as collaborators they can learn from, versus learn only individually, work alone, digest the study material on their own, view other students as competitors.

Research on student learning in higher education has shown that students do not automatically engage in high quality learning. In a series of studies with university students, Vermunt and Vermetten (2004) found four patterns in student learning: meaning directed learning, application directed learning, reproduction directed learning, and undirected learning. Only the first two patterns can be regarded as representing high quality learning. For a more elaborate discussion of patterns in student learning see the recently published book 'Learning patterns in higher education' (Gijbels, Donche, Richardson & Vermunt, 2014).

Nowadays at many successful universities in the world approaches to teaching are being developed aimed at fostering this kind of high quality learning. Examples of these innovative approaches are assignment-based, problem-based, and research-based university teaching (see for a more elaborate discussion Baeten, Kyndt, Struyven & Dochy, 2010). In *assignment-based teaching*, guided self-study is the main learning concept. Compared to traditional teaching, there are less lectures, more assignments for self-study and more hours spent working in small groups. Students work independently on assignments made and set by the staff. Usually, students are provided with detailed guidelines as to how to do the assignments. In *problem-based learning*, students work in small groups (10-15 students) to understand, explain and solve problems derived from professional practice. The problem-based way of working is systematically structured generally into seven steps, the 'seven-jump': (1) clarifying terms and concepts not readily understood; (2) defining the problem; (3) analysing the problem; (4) summarising the various explanations of the problem into a coherent model; (5) formulating learning objectives; (6) individual study activities outside the group; and (7) report and synthesise the newly acquired information. A staff member (the tutor) guides the learning and collaborative process in the group, but does not explain the subject matter. In *research-based or project-based learning*, students work in smaller groups (2-5 students) and acquire their knowledge through research activities and projects, supervised by a staff member. Students write a research proposal in which the research problem, goals, activities, resources to be used, the projects outcomes aimed at, and the way of supervision are described. This proposal is discussed with the supervisors, and based on their comments students revise the proposal before starting their actual work. Further supervision is often tailor-made (Vermunt, 2007).

These innovations in university teaching have profound implications for teachers, curriculum design and staff development. Teachers need to develop new teaching expertise. For example, in more *traditional teaching* teachers should mainly be able to explain the subject matter well, to regulate their students' learning and to motivate them to learn. However, in *assignment based teaching*, skills like designing challenging assignments, giving educative feedback, coaching students, and getting and maintaining students to work are important for successful teaching. In *problem based learning*, teachers fulfil quite different roles such as tutor, skills trainer and assessor, problem designer, and block coordinator. *Research-based learning* assumes that teachers can supervise project groups, coach the cooperation within groups and deal with free rider behaviour of students. In all these student-centred approaches to teaching teachers must be able to fulfil roles like diagnostician, challenger, model, activator, monitor, reflector and evaluator of students' learning processes.

There are some important implications for curriculum design as well. The curriculum should be designed in such a way that it prepares students for lifelong, self-regulated, collaborative and work-based learning. Moreover, it should consistently foster high quality student learning. The teaching methods should change in response to students' increasing metacognitive and

self-regulatory skills, and the complexity of the problems dealt with should increase gradually and systematically.

Finally, there are important implications for staff development from this perspective of teaching and student learning on what makes a university successful. First, there is the need for an explicit staff development programme to enable staff members to fulfil a variety of pedagogical roles that match the chosen approach to teaching, increasing in complexity (e.g. from tutor to course manager). Embedded in this programme should be a set of qualifications that describe different levels of expertise in university teaching (e.g. basic teaching qualification and senior teaching qualification). This programme and its qualifications should play an important role in periodic staff reviews and staff promotion policy, next to research achievement indicators.

References

- Baeten, M., Kyndt, E., Struyven, K., & Dochy, F. (2010). Using student-centred learning environments to stimulate deep approaches to learning: Factors encouraging or discouraging their effectiveness. *Educational Research Review*, 5(3), 243-260.
- Gijbels, D., Donche, V., Richardson, J.T.E., & Vermunt, J.D. (Eds.) (2014), *Learning patterns in higher education: Dimensions and research perspectives*. New York: Routledge.
- Trigwell, K., & Prosser, M. (2004). Development and use of the approaches to teaching inventory. *Educational Psychology Review*, 16(4), 409-424.
- Vermunt, J.D. (2007). The power of teaching-learning environments to influence student learning. *British Journal of Educational Psychology Monograph Series II*, 4, 73-90.
- Vermunt, J.D., & Vermetten, Y.J. (2004). Patterns in student learning: relationships between learning strategies, conceptions of learning, and learning orientations. *Educational Psychology Review*, 16(4), 359-384.

SUCCESSFUL UNIVERSITIES

Simon Jones

Preamble

Who does not like success? Who would want institutions integral to progressive societies not to succeed? Governments, faculty, students and their families all engage in the process with enthusiasm, good-will and in certain cases adequate funding. Why then is it so difficult to achieve? Are there barriers to entry, particularities or happenstance? Is it like the movie or music industries where repeating a formula rarely delivers? Or is a university like an eco-system, where only a carefully nurtured and self-propelling environment of sufficient diversity can produce intellectual leviathans and the krill to sustain them?

My own view is it is hard to predict which universities will be successful in the future; however it is certainly easier to identify those factors which will result in problematic progress. Due diligence mitigates failure but warrants no Elysion. To rephrase the opening lines of Anna Karenina¹ 'All successful universities are alike; each unsuccessful university is unsuccessful in its own way'.

This paper addresses some of the characteristics of successful universities the author has been involved in over the last 25 years across 3 continents. The perspective is personal, oriented to the STEM-based institutions I have largely engaged with and reflects my own instincts for invention, innovation and wealth-creation being the load-bearing structures of contemporary institutions.

The paper considers firstly the environment within which a university operates and the impact of different student bodies. University branding and the impact disruptive technologies are addressed, followed by the requirements for success in terms of faculty, leadership and finance. It ends with a discussion of the role of valorisation in making a 21st century university a success.

Environment

Whether one considers the monastic and Anglo-Catholic development in the UK of Oxford and Cambridge or their Victorian equivalent Imperial College – the articulation of industrial might as inquiry – or the United States with its land grant institutions harnessing natural resource to nation-building or the Soviet Universities of Lomonosov, Lavrentiev and Sobolev expressing unity of labour and intellect, Universities are defined by their environment.

Any multi-purpose institution exists as a result of a specific environment within which it is inculcated, absorbs and adsorbs. Of course this is not a position of unanimity (Douglass, 2014). However, it seems to me uncontroversial that a successful university is defined by its environment more than the environment is defined by the University.

A western, liberal democracy does not seem to be a prerequisite for success: consider the National University of Singapore, Tsinghua University in China or KAUST in Saudi Arabia. It seems perfectly possible to create impactful and efficient universities in very different societies from their coalescents. Whatever the merits of liberal democratic constitutions, their absence does not inhibit excellence in education.

An international flavour does seem essential. Firstly established talent is scarce; secondly globalisation has commoditised the intellectual world, with researchers, facilities, intellectual property and investment all mobile and seeking the better home for their instincts. Furthermore

¹ Lev Tolstoy. 'Anna Karenina' 1873-1877.

from an educational viewpoint, studying and living with people who have a very different perspective from your own is often one of the more lasting effects of attending university.

When I arrived in Kazakhstan, media interviewers spoke to me on the assumption that academic freedom meant electives. Some of my fellow faculty members believed that academic freedom means the right to teach anything and to research anything. Both are mistaken and in being so risk the loss of the most valuable meaning of academic freedom, that is to say, the right of an institution to plot its own intellectual trajectory without undue interference from outside bodies. That is the freedom that enables success and that is the freedom faculty, administration, leadership and stakeholders need stolidly to uphold.

A research university is not an infrastructure project: it is a talent project (Lemann, 2014). You grow it not build it. Of course, talent requires infrastructure to perform but the acquisition and nurturing of talent is by far the hardest act.

A successful research university procures convergence of curiosity; the challenge of leadership is its enablement. The problem is not in plans, people or methods; it's in mindset. Trying to build things that really need to be grown just will not work; no matter how you manage them.

For a university being developed with a largely imported work-force, the challenge of connecting local money to expatriate researcher looms large. In many such countries the lack of confidence that the money will address problems pertaining to legitimate local needs inhibits the creation of academic activity.

Students

Successful universities deliver students who have successful lives before and after graduation. There are many different types of students. The challenge is in distinguishing their needs and enabling experiences.

Universities such as Nazarbayev University have an unashamedly elitist approach. It is hard to be admitted. The programmes are specifically designed to stretch able students, there is little provision for remediation and there are extra graduation requirements including dual language certification and military service (for men). We make this work through small class sizes (typical faculty/student ratio of 9:1), careful pre-selection in our foundation year and an approach that aims to quickly identify those who might not succeed. It's perfectly possible to be a successful university with a different student body. Resources need to be deployed and matched to cohort profile and career aspiration.

Branding

Institutional branding is a 21st century topic for sure. Consumers of higher education understand it well and institutions need to speak the language their stakeholders understand.

Nazarbayev University has taken a specific approach to its branding. It has rejected the Academic City model approach of Qatar, it has declined the branch campus model (e.g. New York University in Abu Dhabi) and forsworn the 'American University of Someplace' approach. It is taken the courageous decision to define a new brand, a university fit for the challenges of the 21st Century, resolutely international in outlook, yet grounded in the needs of the Kazakh nation and the aspirations of its people.

This undoubtedly offers the higher reward as we demonstrate the confidence of the nation and its capacity to deliver. Higher reward is sometimes associated with higher risk.

Disruption

There is a palpable sense that the transformative power of internet, mobile communications and ubiquitous computing may impact higher education the way it has other well-established businesses. The world of video lectures, MOOCs and open courseware seems more caravanserai

than Samarkand. It is a pointing finger for sure, but let us look at where it is pointing, not at the finger. It speaks to a world of diverse content and where the editorial role is more important than the authorial. A world where text becomes subservient to video and where discourse is preferred over individual insight. The truth is still out there but it more likely to be our collectively-mediated truth rather than yours.

Faculty

Without great Faculty you will not have a great University. While necessary this is not sufficient. While quality of faculty is crucial, it cannot be over-ruling. Universities with strong faculty governance sometimes have difficulty coping with changing landscapes as faculty interest and institutional well-being can seem coterminous despite the lamentations of other stakeholders.

As the landscape seems to be reforming quicker and the demands on universities diversifying, there must be some questions raised as the suitability of a 19th Century model of leadership for a 21st Century world.

When asked what is needed to create a successful university, faculty will sometimes reply along the lines of 'give us low teaching loads, plenty of research money and complete freedom to research whatever we like'. They have got the first two right at least. However, the insistence that if they are guided in any way to direct their activities or express anything other than velleity towards stakeholders (for whom accountability is second nature), their response is often vigorous and sometimes instructive.

Seen in the context of the increasing challenges of knowledge generation in a globally-completive landscape and where the easy stuff has already been discovered, universities (especially small, start-ups) will struggle to achieve internationally competitive, yet locally-relevant impact without a determined focus on relatively few research areas. Gaining this agreement has often proven elusive.

Successful universities require the careful focus of research activities and the systematic inculcation of global educative values if they are to address world problems and deliver citizens of that same world.

Successful universities have the nurturing of our next generation of talent as their great responsibility. Teaching students is not the counterpoint of research disdain but an intrinsic part of our culture and values. Many research universities in their relentless search for ranking, put in peril this fundamental value of our human-centred institutions. Those who wish only to research need research institutes to embody endeavour. Those who wish to dedicate their efforts to instruction need institutions embracing pedagogics. Those who wish the title of Professor are obligated to consider teaching and research as Frank Sinatra viewed love and marriage².

The distinctive part of the student experience at an elite research university is being taught by people who have not just mastered the subject but defined the very subject itself. While this is increasingly at peril in 2014, the reward for faculty is extra-ordinarily talented graduate students who have the formation and intellectual capacity to pioneer new insights. In contrast, emerging institutions such as Pohang University of Science and Technology³ in Korea, established 25 years ago and which is now well in the top 100 Universities provide an interesting exemplar. Its insistence on high-quality undergraduate teaching and small class sizes (faculty/student ratios of circa 6:1) demonstrates quite clearly the mutually reinforcing effect of a persistent commitment to both teaching and research.

² 'You can't have one without the other', Love and Marriage, Cahn/Heusen 1956.

³ <http://www.postech.ac.kr/>

Leadership

Perhaps unfairly, university leadership has been described as embodying impotency. Indeed, it has been said that in the traditional faculty-led model of universities, the role of leadership is to hand out certificates and pour drinks for sponsors. Things have changed because things have needed to change. Millennials no longer see entering university as privilege, it is a consumer purchase. It is weighed and judged in much the same way as other purchases by fluent and nuanced interpreters of sign, symbol brand and value. For faculty, a life of careful contemplation has been replaced by the archons and institutors of tenure, impact, h-index, quality audits, outreach and inclusion. For financial officers, a regular governmental allocation has been sometimes augmented (but more usually replaced) by endowment, fees and valorisation.

Mark Field, former CEO of Ford, once famously remarked⁴ 'Culture eats Strategy for Breakfast'. While its appetite cannot be foresworn, the consequences of a poor diet are conspicuous. In an environment as subject to cogent critique and dissent like perhaps no other modern enterprise, the importance of strategy as searchlight is constitutive.

The challenge with most university strategies is homogeneity. To a tome they present the same approach, the same issues of excellence, engagement with industry and community and the klaxons of impact and IP. Diversity appears absent across university strategies.

Leadership of universities is acutely difficult. Business leaders find the independent and querulous culture difficult to align with strategic and operational plans. Senior academics face skill set insufficiencies for an organisation with annual turnovers of hundreds of millions of dollars. Political appointees wax and wane in influence as power shifts. Increasingly effective leadership requires a well-defined and integrated teamset, covering cheerleaders in the community, academic excellence, efficient organisational management and commercial acumen. It is important to let those who know what they are doing, do what they know.

US universities, with their mixture of Chancellor, President, Provost and CFO, get close to the idealised skill mix. Certainly European universities with an often-elected Rector and Deans seem singularly ill-equipped for the challenges of our Century.

Finances

Research universities need money. Money does not suffice, effective use of that resource determines future success. A report⁵ pointed out that in terms of research outputs the top 40 institutions of the world were often buttressed by significant endowments. In places 40-80 were a number of newer universities who seemed capable of producing a highly-rated research output for significantly less resource than established ones.

While this review was intriguing in nature and may well be a pointing finger, it is not conclusively a smoking gun. Newer universities may have more up to date and efficient infrastructure it is true, they may make more specific demands on faculty, they may also have a management structure more suited to the needs of consumer-led 21st century. However it may be that legacy issues of departments past their prime, inhibit productivity.

Whatever the reasons, over a longer-term those institutions which deliver most citations for their cents, are gradually going to dominate the rankings. It's a question of when not whether.

Being in favour of the inevitable is an accepted strategy for surviving and hopefully prospering. How then should a successful university (a) acquire resources (b) allocate resources and (c) utilise the subsequential outputs most effectively in order to compete?

⁴ Mark Ford 2006, attributed by him to Peter Drucker but no reference to this is found in Drucker's work.

⁵ <http://www.timeshighereducation.co.uk/world-university-rankings/2013-14/world-ranking/analysis/upward-mobility>

While most universities will claim to possess some form of academic freedom and/or institutional autonomy, rare is the institution free from government financial support. As 18-year olds rapidly discover, you are not entirely autonomous when someone else pays all your bills.

A diverse funding base is essential to a successful university. The three main sources of funding are (a) Foundation, (b) Fees, (c) Research and Exploitation. Over dependence on any one of these three, leaves an institution vulnerable to encroachment on its institutional autonomy.

Only through a diverse funding base can an institution have the freedom to demonstrate it knows what is best for itself. Once this is achieved the challenge moves onto demonstrate the value it delivers from that.

Valorisation

As someone who has been an investor in start-ups and advised many governments on extracting value from inventions I can confirm that universities overvalue their IP in the short term and undervalue it in the long term. A single patent is rarely a powerful tool, defensive patenting can render it innocuous. However over years if a university holds a portfolio of related and reinforcing patents, that in itself can represent a significant asset against which resource can be obtained.

A commonly held misconception is that the key to deriving value from university work above and beyond publication is to implement the system found in the United States of America (the West-Side Story theory⁶) while there is much to admire in that approach, imitation is rarely persuasive or appealing, rather it should be seen as inspiration.

Value creation exists within an ecosystem of capital, business support, IP policies, law and taxation. Any utilization strategy incognisant of that seems unlikely to flourish. Indeed a recent paper by the UK think tank Demos demonstrates how the US-pioneered science park approach, rarely results in success (Nightingale and Coad, 2014).

Successful universities are powerhouses of economic development; they are cause and consequence of prosperity. They do this through their established role of formation. However, it is in the generation and exploitation of intellectual property via license and start-up that some believe employment is created. However reality seems different. The UK spends \$12M per year on supporting small innovative firms. There's no Google yet though. Even in the USA, MIT makes more money from T-shirt sales than licensing.

One may believe that capturing value through IP is easy and that inventions emerge fully formed from universities. The reality is different. University spinouts do not understand markets and do not have the resources to develop products. Do not judge universities by their short-term commercialisation of their IP; some will be found wanting.

University science parks are services to the community and reflect universities trying to signal research prestige (Monck, 1988). What universities can do and do well is to provide high-quality manpower, provide a place where high-tech firms like to be based, offer access to shared facilities and thereby create a cluster effect which sparks new value chains.

Summary

In the space allocated to me, I have attempted to deliver a wide-ranging and engaging overview of key issues pertaining to the delivery of a successful university. A supportive political setting, diverse funding, nuanced leadership and outstanding faculty are certainly essential to success. Supporting all this is the collective self-confidence to proclaim the values of a

⁶ *'I like to be in America!, O.K. by me in America!, Ev'rything free in America', 'America' from West Side Story, Librettist Arthur Laurents, 1957.*

university, traditional values they may be but they need to be set in a modern context to be appreciated.

Persistence is in the end, the underpinning value of successful universities. After all as Thomas Edison said, 'the three great essentials to achieve anything are (a) hard work, (b) stick-to-itiveness and (c) common sense'.

I am confident that given the current policies of Kazakhstan and the commitment of the people of this nation that Nazarbayev University and indeed other Kazakhstani universities will succeed but for certain it will take time and much effort.

References

- Douglass, J.A. (2014). Profiling the flagship university model: an exploratory proposal for changing the paradigm from ranking to relevancy. CSHE.5.14. Retrieved from: <http://cshe.berkeley.edu/>
- Lemann, N. (2014). The Soul of the Research University'. Chronicle of Education. Retrieved from: <http://chronicle.com/article/The-Soul-of-the-Research/146155/>
- Monck, C. S. (1988). Science parks and the growth of high technology firms. Croom Helm, in association with Peat Marwick, McLintock.
- Nightingale, P. and A. Coad. (2014). The Myth of the Science Park Economy'. Demos Quarterly. Retrieved from: <http://quarterly.demos.co.uk>

HOW TO BUILD 'A SUCCESSFUL UNIVERSITY'?

Mary Canning

There is no one successful formula for building a successful university. However, based on extensive observation of internationally acclaimed institutions, it is possible to state that all successful universities have at least these features in common:

- dynamic leadership from the Rector (President);
- transparent and supportive governance from a strong Board;
- an engaged and enthusiastic senior management team;
- a policy environment that enables full institutional autonomy while ensuring accountability for the expenditure of public funds.

In a successful university, the Rector leads the Board and the academic community in the development of a clear mission statement and detailed strategic plan which together ensure that the institution's particular profile and distinctive strengths are developed and maintained.

The Rector has the required human resource tools to attract, recruit and retain excellent academic staff to deliver on the institution's strategic goals.

The university's Strategic Plan sets out a vision and ambitious goals for:

- The distinctive education offered to students;
- The quality and impact of research and scholarship;
- The strong links and collaboration between research and teaching;
- The diversity and inclusiveness of the student body and the quality of student experience;
- The global scope of the university's teaching and research;
- The university's effective engagement with enterprise, the community, civil society and the state;
- The university's commitment to excellence, innovation and collegiality;
- The university's collaborative contribution to the national system of higher education and to the economic, social and cultural life of the region and of the nation.

The Strategic Plan specifies objectives that will develop the University's capacity to:

- offer students an outstanding university education which challenges and supports all students to achieve their full potential, and prepares students for life, work and citizenship, and for complexity, diversity and change;
- set a timeline to be recognised as the clear national leader in a number of thematic areas of research that address the major societal challenges of the 21st century;
- strengthen the university's engagement with all stakeholders through sustained strategic partnerships with enterprises, communities, civil society and public bodies at regional and national level;
- open new opportunities for research and learning;
- create an internal culture of quality assurance whereby every dean and department head takes responsibility for the excellence of all aspects of teaching and learning within their own discipline;
- enable the achievement of these strategic objectives through a focus on excellent campus services and infrastructure and on sound governance and management.

The President with the Academic Council and other senior office holders develops an implementation plan and agrees a set of detailed key performance indicators to measure the progress of the University towards meeting its goals.

WHAT DOES A SUCCESSFUL UNIVERSITY LOOK LIKE? – THE STUDENTS' VIEW

Rok Primožič

Describing how a successful university from the student's perspective looks like is not an easy job. There is not a common agreement among students on what a university should look like and what it should offer. Even the idea of a university is diverse – while you could claim that we have something that we could call the European idea of a university that has spread around the world, the discussion about the role of universities in society are still on-going.

From the very beginning of the idea of universities, there were different ideas about what forms a university and what are the main groups within. In the early beginning, in the 11th century, we had the University of Bologna, which was an association of students, who even had the power to hire and fire their professors. On the other hand, the case in Paris was that the university was seen as the association of teachers and students. You can imagine that the students would not mind to keeping the old Bologna university idea, but the Paris was the one that prevailed. For a long time a university was a place where the professors and academic staff were the decision-makers. From 1999 on, we have the Bologna process, which has highlighted the idea of the multiple stakeholders having a common interest for higher education and where student participation was emphasised.

Higher education landscape was changing through history, and the idea of a university had been changing as well. However, I would dare to claim that the changes were much faster in the last 30-50 years. The massification of higher education has led to an expansion of universities and a big rise in the number of students, as well as to increased diversity of universities, which is still continuing. The Humboldtian idea of a research university seems to be changing as well, as the learning and teaching aspects are being more emphasised and the question of course is what the university of the future will look like. With more students, and with more diverse students, coming from different backgrounds, part-time students, mature students etc., the expectations of what a university should be have also changed. While access to higher education is still an issue in most countries around the world, the notion that higher education and universities are only reserved for the elites is changing. Beside the changes in higher education, the technological development in the last 20 years was very fast. The Internet revolution, together with new communication tools and social media, as well as MOOCs, blended-learning etc. has already had big effects on universities, and it is only starting.

So putting all these things together and trying to assess what students want and what they perceive a successful university is can be a very difficult question. But nevertheless, I think I have managed to identify four points that could be the most important, while still taking into account they are not the only pre-requisites for a successful university.

These are the four points:

- a successful university fulfils full range of purposes;
- a successful university offers quality education;
- a successful university puts students in the centre of the system and embraces student-centred learning;
- a successful university engages students and includes them in the university governance and decision-making processes.

Full Range of Purposes

Firstly, a successful university needs to make sure it fulfils full range of purposes, which include preparing students for life as active citizens in a democratic society; preparing students for their future careers and enabling their personal development; creating and maintaining a broad, advanced knowledge base and stimulating research and innovation (London Communique, 2007).

With the financial crisis, with the increasing discussion about the skills of graduates and the word that seems to be impossible to avoid lately, employability, the focus of the discussion about the role of universities has shifted towards the commodified and instrumentalised view on universities – to understanding universities as a tool for economic growth and as a tool to increase the competitiveness of the country. We have gotten to a point where for some countries, education is seen as an export. There are different examples of this in the world, starting from USA and Australia, though a more European example would be the discourse of some of the universities in the United Kingdom, whose representatives are talking about exporting education, attracting foreign students (that have to pay full tuition fees, going so far as more than 15.000 pounds per year), marketing education etc. The rankings and league tables have also not helped, and competition rather than cooperation is the new directive for many of the universities and higher education systems.

That has led to different responses from governments and universities. Governments, which are in most countries still the predominant funder of the higher education, are demanding more efficiency, better performance and more applicable research. This can lead to more “employable” courses, and to a level where higher education is almost a training and not education anymore. The discussions in higher education policy nowadays focus a lot on the idea of employability, which is usually understood in a very narrow sense and measured as employment rates, which is a problematic indicator for several reasons, starting with the fact that these rates don't reflect the success of the university, but rather the socio-economic situation of a country. Greece for example has almost 60% youth unemployment, but that is not a problem that was caused by higher education – it is a problem of the Greek economy and these rates in no way reflect the quality or success of the education.

There are also other arguments that call for a broader approach to education – one of them for example that we have no idea what will happen on the labour market. The top 10 in demand jobs in 2010 didn't exist in 2004, and universities should be preparing students for jobs that don't yet exist, using technologies that haven't been invented in order to solve the problems that we don't know are problems yet.

That will not happen with the education systems that treat students as customers or that produces graduates as if university is a factory. Even in the discussions at various conferences about higher education, universities are often said to “produce graduates,” while I would strongly argue that this formulation needs to be changed to say that universities educate, inspire, form graduates. This might sound like a linguistic matter, but it is an important one as understanding university as a conveyor belt is not what we would wish for.

One of ESU's core principles and beliefs is that education needs to serve multiple purposes, and critical thinking and active citizenship are among the most important. When we are talking about education as a product to be sold, and when we are discussing students as clients, we are negating these aspects and we are missing the point of education. Education is there to transform people's mind, it is there to inspire us, it is there to help us develop a critical approach to the world rather than conforming to the norms, it has a central role with social development and democratic empowerment. Education has the potential to dramatically improve life quality for both the participant and for all of society – social and financial status, improvement in general health conditions, acknowledgement of and attempts to tear down inequalities.

To add to this – In ESU, we strongly believe that being a student is more than just learning and collecting knowledge; it is about personal and collective development, creating a better society and a better future. And a successful university should reflect that.

Quality Education

There is a general agreement that a successful university should offer quality education. While that is clear, we come to the usual question of what is quality, and for this session more important, what is quality from the side of the students?

ESU has asked that question in a project, co-funded by the European Commission, called Quest for Quality for students. While there are of course still different opinions on the topic, and the answers range from the academic issues to employability/employment and student support services, we have managed to identify some concepts that could explain how quality is perceived by students.

For students, quality is essentially an experience or process of how their expectations are met in higher education. Students' core expectations relate to the teaching content and learning process while conditional expectations are concerned with the environment and conditions that are thought to be necessary to realise their core expectations, i.e. services, facilities and system structures for studying, as well as the academic environment and culture (Galan Palomares et al., 2013).

So, the relevant aspects that should be considered in order to understand how quality is perceived are the following:

- An adequate curricula (organised in learning outcomes);
- The learning and teaching process (student-centred learning);
- The learning environment (responding to student' needs) and
- The resources and facilities (including student support services).

Additionally, a good quality education in the view of the students is characterised by removing all obstacles to access, facilitating progress and completion; implementing student-centred approach to learning and fairly assessing students, braced by adequate student support service; ensuring links between learning, teaching and research activities; individual social and civic training for responsible and active citizens; mobility opportunities; academic freedom; and one where students are considered as full members of the academic community and competent constructive partners.

Student-centred Learning (SCL)

A successful university from the students' perspective puts the students in the centre and enables them control over their leaning. If I were to describe the student-centred learning in a couple of points: SCL is about the reliance on active rather than passive learning, an emphasis on deep learning and understanding, increased responsibility and accountability on the part of students, an increased sense of autonomy of the learner, an interdependence between teacher and learner, mutual respect within the learner-teacher relationship (Attard, A. et al., 2011).

One of the main points of SCL is what is actually in the name – that students are in charge of their own learning process, which is adapted to different needs and interests of students, as well as to different learning styles. Students should, to a reasonable amount, have a choice to choose their courses and to learn different things. They should be involved already in the preparation of the course, in the design of course and curricula, as well as in the evaluation. To do this, teachers should be offered an additional support and should have opportunities for pedagogical training.

Student Participation

The last point might be the most important of all – a successful university includes students in the management of the institutions as equal partners to the academic and non-academic staff. Students need to be seen as an integral part of the academic community. There are however still very different views on what is the role and position of the students inside a university, and that also has to be addressed.

In a public debate, one often hears about students as clients, or even worse, customers. This assumption seems to be reasons as the idea that clients who pay for a service have stronger rights to complain about a service paid for and not quite delivered.

I'll try to shortly point out why that is problematic. For one, it is difficult to accept that clients have stronger rights to express criticism than members of a community. The point of democracy is precisely the opposite: the weight of your vote and the strength of your voice are independent of the size of your purse.

Secondly, however, what seems like an innocent semantic shift betrays fundamentally different realities. Clients are interested only in the end product that they buy, and this may be consistent with the "outcomes orientation," "efficiency goals" or "performance based funding" mantras that are common nowadays in various policy documents. Clients have no interest in the internal workings of providers. If a provider delivers what clients want at a reasonable price, they will stay. If not, they will move elsewhere. If students are clients, why should they care about our higher education systems and institutions? (Bergan, 2011)

In order to avoid such a scenario, and if we want to reach the full potential of the university, students needs to be included in the decision-making processes, they need to feel ownership of the university and their voices need to be both heard and respected. The word partnership is what I would say is the most important for any good and successful university.

Conclusion

There is a lot more that is necessary for a successful university: for example, ensuring proper financing would be a very basic condition. I also did not discuss about research or about institutional autonomy and academic freedom, which are also building blocs of a successful university. As the whole list would take much more than the space I was allocated for this article, I have focused on what I would perceive as the most important points of all – the ones that are crucial to ensure that a university truly is a community of teachers and students.

This can also be put in one final sentence: A successful university is one where, in the words of the famous Pink Floyd, students are not just another brick in the wall.

References

Attard, A., Di Iorio, E., Geven, K., Santa, R. (2011). Student-Centered Learning. Toolkit for students, staff and higher education institutions. Retrieved on August 20, 2014, from <http://www.esu-online.org/resources/6068/Student-Centred-Learning-Toolkit>

Bergan, S. (2011). Why education and why students' participation?. In Ufert, K. (eds.), No student left out. The do's & don'ts of student participation in higher education decision-making. Retrieved on August 20, 2014, from <http://www.esu-online.org/news/article/6068/475/>

European Students' Union. (2013). *Policy paper on public responsibility, governance and financing of higher education*. Retrieved August 20, 2014, from <http://esu-online.org/news/article/6064/2013-Policy-paper-on-public-responsibility-governance-and-financing-of-higher-education>

European Students' Union. (2013). *Policy paper on quality of higher education*. Retrieved August 20, 2014, from <http://esu-online.org/news/article/6064/2013-Policy-paper-on-quality-of-higher-education>.

Galan Palomares, F., Todorovski, B., Kazoka, A., Saarela, H. (2013). *Quest for Quality for Students: A Student Quality Concept*. Brussels: European Students' Union.

London communique. (2007). *Towards the European Higher Education Area: responding to challenges in a globalised world*. Communique of the Conference of Ministers responsible for higher education in London on May 18, 2007. Retrieved on August 20, 2014, from http://www.ehea.info/Uploads/Declarations/London_Communique18May2007.pdf

A STRATEGIC, LAYERED APPROACH TO EVIDENTIALLY IMPROVING STUDENTS' EXPERIENCES AND OUTCOMES WITHIN 'A SUCCESSFUL UNIVERSITY'

Liz Winter

This paper discusses how different strata of a university need to pay heed to the student experience with data garnered, as appropriate, from all levels of sample: international; national; institutional; departmental and course by course. The strata represent those at the top that form policies on teaching across the institution, heads of departments, academic staff and all those involved in helping students learn. It is argued that the student experience provides a bottom-up perspective on the reputation, values and ultimate success of a university in making active and future change in individuals. Finally, it discusses the balance between central systems of improving the student experience versus more devolved schemes such as promoting professionalism through Action Research initiatives for academic staff. Overall, it recommends an empirical approach to research which does not exclude teaching practitioners.

Although there is no one historical text I can quote, those who founded the oldest colleges of the University of Cambridge in the 13th Century probably wished to create an environment where intellectual thought and intellectual discipline could flourish: where academic study was rewarded in a community of scholarly others; and to produce alumni who would sustain and develop the main national educational system of the time, the Catholic Church. Giving a nod to its origins but also modernity, Peterhouse, the oldest college within the University of Cambridge, currently distills their ethos as below⁷:

Throughout, Peterhouse has remained a place where, rooted in tradition and security, new ideas, and successive generations of the brightest young people, have evolved, grown, and taken wing. It has been and is somewhere that values the bold, the characterful and the committed above the commonplace, the familiar and the mundane.

Within universities, two things generally occur: teaching and research. These dual processes both attempt to advance the current state towards an improved end-state. They do this by either applying a process of change or, at least, providing evidentially based reflections and suggestions which are likely to prompt improvement in the future. In the context of research, active change refers to an intervention and future change refers to a recommendation. The very important discussion of the vital factors behind creating a thriving research operation and an ethos of research quality extends beyond the focus of this paper. That said, it needs to be noted how numbers of citations in research publications and Nobel award winners are part of the criteria of what is seen to make a successful university. This is taken to the point that research activities and research influence are seen as worthy of separate assessment in indices such as the Times Higher Education (THE) World University Rankings. Here, research influence is equally weighted with teaching and research⁸. This then leaves the main focus of this paper, what universities do for their students, as only contributing 30% towards the overall rating of a university. Based on this, it would seem students play a minor role in what is globally seen to make a 'world-class' university. Whether this has consequences in the relative priorities of research and teaching for both individuals and the institutions is discussed at length by Giroux (2010) describing 'bare pedagogy' as the response to the commodification of universities. He suggests the marketization of higher education has prioritised glory seeking which has impacted on teaching future generations to think freely and their perception of learning as a process in its own right. Additionally, it has diminished the role of higher education in making a social contribution through narrowing its students' expectations and values.

⁷ <http://www.pet.cam.ac.uk/welcome-peterhouse/about-college>

⁸ <http://www.timeshighereducation.co.uk/world-university-rankings/2013-14/world-ranking/methodology>

These days, most of those aspiring to have a world-class university base it upon a template design that blends teaching and research. Often this follows the lines of an idealised North American model (Ramirez & Christensen, 2013). The two facets of teaching and research are intended to inform each other in forging an academic mindset and the authority that comes from applying theory to practice. Yet, despite the importance of domain-specific research, few universities include an educational research strategy within the wider research ethos for their own and all their teaching staff's betterment (Mercer, 2007). Some examples of institutional educational research do exist but these generally sit within a bespoke office covering all fields of study or as schools of education that do not necessarily conduct insider research. One such example of this is at Penn State University where individual departments are able to call upon the services of the 'Office of Planning and Institutional Assessment'¹, for advice upon improvement. This generally results in a top-down, albeit monitored, solution in response to an identified problem. It tends to be a reactive model rather than an inquiry model. The actual responsibility for teaching improvement critically then becomes separate to the practitioner and in response to a well-described and established problem.

This runs counter to the considerations of Schön (1987) and others who emphasise that experts have a part to play in rationalising the teaching process but do not hold an exclusive right to develop theories of how best to teach in a particular domain or set of circumstances. Although much of the current literature and debate around the best way to apportion responsibility for solving educational problems centres on schooling (McKernan, 1991), I would argue that such organisational decisions or policies on who researches and solves problems of learning are highly, if not extremely, relevant to universities. The technical nature and level of domain-specific knowledge required to teach at universities means outside educational experts are potentially less well-positioned than in lower levels of education to provide solutions to those for whom the learning process matters most: the stakeholders of faculty staff and the students in their classes. Furthermore, the relative maturity of university students and their own investment in the process of learning through a student-centred approach as dictated by programmes compliant to the Bologna Process² means they should be well equipped to contribute to the process of identifying and suggesting solutions to problems of learning. Ironically, according to Buckingham (1926), who was one of the first to write on the topic of making education more scientific, the duality of research and teaching which was a cornerstone of higher education should be used as a model for schooling. Hence taking a policy of practitioner teachers researching their own problems takes the idea back to its origins and is well overdue.

Furthermore, separating out responsibility for improvement of teaching to external units or experts seems substantially adrift from the ideas of Action Research prevalent in most educational texts. Here every teacher is empowered to be a reflective practitioner and agent of change in their own right whilst simultaneously engaging students and others in the process of cyclical inquiry, analysis and sustained improvements in teaching and learning. Action Research has a long history in the social sciences as a development of applying the principles of research within the physical sciences to social processes (Masters, 1995). Theorists and those upon whom the basis for it began (e.g. Bain (1979), Boone (1904) and Buckingham (1926) Lippitt and Radke (1946), Lewin (1947), Corey (1953), Stenhouse (1975), all cited in McKernan, (1991)), seeing ones teaching as a personally developed and professional activity motivates teachers to work towards collaboratively optimising the learning of each and every one of their students. In effect, externalising quality enhancement and research activities to inform upon enhancement rather than stemming from within practitioners could be seen as a reduction in the expected professionalism of teachers (Pine, 2009). Many teachers may ensure they meet standards but then leave anything else up to the 'expert' others and never see the bigger picture of student

¹ <http://www.psu.edu/president/pia/>

² <http://www.ehea.info/article-details.aspx?ArticleId=5>

data instead forming their opinion on performance only from any received feedback from their own course evaluations.

Returning to the remit of university teaching to prompt active change, this translates to the level of benefit students receive from their courses. Future change is less measurable and refers to less definite or less quantifiable qualities that affect a student's future. These are often referred to as 'soft skills' within a lifelong learning paradigm (Gibb, 2013) which present difficulties in terms of assessment both at the time (Chamorro-Premuzic, Artech, Bremner, Greven., & Furnham, 2010) and in the longer term (van de Werfhorst, 2014). Although soft skills are arguably the most important gain from higher education, teaching at a university should not rely upon future change but also check its actuality. It is relatively straightforward to check the passing over of knowledge alongside determining levels of understanding and application of this knowledge by means of examination. However, checking what students have actually learnt or feel they have learnt is another matter.

The fundamental question then becomes: How do universities know they are optimally affecting students in a worthwhile way? Essentially this is by consensus. Stakeholders at all levels need to be assured that a university is operating successfully. Perspectives extend across the full range of those involved from: maintaining international credibility (e.g. being seen to conform to the Bologna Process or position in an international league table); national reputation (national qualifications and external respect for the value of a nation's education); institutional image (reputation and attractiveness to new students, staff, research funders and investors); departmental (a stable, happy environment that fosters an ethos of supported learning and personal development); and, finally, what individual students and groups of students report of their experiences. As far as the students are concerned, all other levels matter too but education affects individuals and it is they who study, think and collect experience into a meaningful whole. Of course much of what students experience is through contact with teaching staff. Hence, the paramount effect on experience is the relationship students hold with their primary interface of the institution, faculty members. By inference it is whether these individuals take the students' learning and experiences seriously that matters most. It therefore follows that fundamental to this, is not to disallow the practitioners to have theories of their own on how best to effectively teach their students the knowledge, skills and competences they expect from their courses.

With regard to the second place effective teaching may hold relative to research, many universities prioritise innovation and science to the neglect of the humanities and 'softer' social sciences or feel it is uncomfortably outside their own main line of expertise (Frank & Meyer, 2007). Others simply do not have a history of embracing such, as the case of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology (MIT), the topmost performer³ in the QS 2013 World University Rankings. Indeed, there is no need for 'world-class' universities to have breadth of coverage in disciplines as discussed by many with regards to the impossibility of comparing one university with another in a league table format. This leads to a considerable number of universities not possessing in-house educational expertise to engage with pedagogic practices despite teaching effectively being 30% of their core business. Awakening to this fact, MIT are currently debating⁴ whether indeed they should create a School of Education as a social good or as an institutional resource in its own right. As said previously, even universities that do offer research into educational leadership, pedagogic practices or other educational matters do not necessarily draw upon internal expertise to base an improvement strategy but leave it to consultants or those not embedded in a school of education. Understandably, there is somewhat of a conflict of interest

³ <http://www.topuniversities.com/university-rankings/world-university-rankings/2013#sorting=rank+region=+country=+faculty=+stars=false+search>

⁴ <http://web.mit.edu/fnl/volume/262/saraydarian.html>

for these external agents to recommend devolving improvements in teaching to the actual practitioners through Action Research schemes.

As with any inquiry project, it is wise to use a variety of tools to collect data, in this case students' reported experiences. These range from large international and national surveys such as the world rankings previously mentioned through to module-by-module, topic by topic feedback forms and individual students' case studies. From the perspective of a student, large surveys operate as the external face of an institution so tend to be instrumental in an initial choice of university (HEFCE, 2013) and in potentially the reputation attached to their qualification for a later career (QSIU, 2014). For example, two large-scale national undergraduate surveys, the UK National Student Survey (NSS, 2014) and the US National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE, 2014), differ in their stated aims and so provide good contrast in terms of what large scale surveys may offer. However, despite these two examples both coming from Western cultures, they reflect differences in student expectations from USA to UK which serves to remind how what constitutes an acceptable student experience has a cultural aspect. Several have argued this is a more general problem with Westernisation of the higher education landscape but as Koch (2014) argues in the cases of Kazakhstan and Saudi Arabia, often this Westernisation is tempered under local conditions that mould university outcomes towards national values and aims.

Asides from the scale of the survey, the methodologies and methods behind student surveys are also important in representing the full picture. Attempts by Grebennikov and Shah (2013) to examine the topic of methodology through analysis of qualitative reports on best and worst aspects of courses, end with an automated means to include this type of data alongside the more-easily handled quantitative data. Comparing what quantitative and qualitative approaches to collecting student experience data may afford in the capture of student voice are discussed using this particular example of data analysis; towards providing ideas on more integrated methods of inquiry.

This paper concludes with a small scale research study (Mellanby, Zimdars & Cortina-Borja, 2013), published in an educational research journal, which examined how an individual institution (Oxford University, in this case) can initiate collection of its own research data to monitor students' experiences. In particular, this institutional case study examines the effect of assessment practices and tutorial practices upon gender and end degree performance. This last piece links student experience to student performance and, in its detail, perhaps gives the best overall insight into how students perceive their institution and what effect this might have on their personal success.

All the above leads to the conclusion of this paper which is that a blend of macro, micro and purposeful garnering of research data on students' opinions are the best combination of quality assurance activities an institution can have. It is proposed that continual course improvement through engaging in meaningful self-critique creates a culture of care and enhancement. Reflective practice within an institution benefits not only individuals but also the institution itself; through its overall reputation being based upon the fostering of an open, academic ethos that identifies, researches, debates and solves problems with full recognition of the professional role that teachers are expected to employ. If students recognise they are valued and part of a caring, academic environment that encourages them to flourish and give voice; that, surely, is a successful university. If teaching staff are supported to be more professionally active in their teaching and a research strategy is in place to conduct insider-led improvements, ownership of the teaching and learning process at all levels in the university can be nurtured. Most importantly, it is research of the practitioners by the practitioners that needs most support since it is in the class that the real stories of success or failure for students are sited and it is in the class that the best ways forward need to be mutually agreed upon.

References

- Buckingham, B. R. (1926). *Research for Teachers*. New York: Silver Burdett.
- Chamorro-Premuzic, T., Arteché, A., Bremner, A., Greven, C., & Furnham, A. (2010). Soft skills in higher education: Importance and improvement ratings as a function of individual differences and academic performance. *Educational Psychology*, 30, 221–241.
- Corey, S.M. (1953). *Action research to improve school practices*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Frank, D., & Meyer, J. (2007). University expansion and the knowledge society. *Theory and Society*, 36, 287–311.
- Gibb, S. (2013). Soft skills assessment: theory development and the research agenda, *International journal of lifelong education*, 33(4), 455 – 471.
- Giroux, H. A. (2010). Bare pedagogy and the scourge of Neoliberalism: Rethinking Higher Education as a democratic public sphere, *The Educational Forum*, 74(3), 184-196
- Grebennikov, L., & Shah, M. (2013). Student voice: Using qualitative feedback from students to enhance their university experience. *Teaching In Higher Education*, 18(6), 606-618.
- HEFCE (2013). *Higher Education Funding for England: National Student Survey*. Retrieved 14th April 2014 from <https://www.hefce.ac.uk/whatwedo/lt/publicinfo/nationalstudentsurvey/>
- Koch, N. (2014). The shifting geopolitics of higher education: Inter/nationalizing elite universities in Kazakhstan, Saudi Arabia, and beyond, *Geoforum*, 56, 46-54.
- Lewin, K. (1946). Action research and minority problems, *Journal of Social Issues*, 2, 34-46.
- Masters, J. (1995). 'The History of Action Research' in I. Hughes (ed) *Action Research Electronic Reader*, The University of Sydney, online: <http://www.behs.cchs.usyd.edu.au/arow/Reader/rmasters.htm> (download date 27.07.2014)
- McKernan, J., (1991). *Curriculum Action Research. A Handbook of Methods and Resources for the Reflective Practitioner* London: Kogan Page
- Mellanby, J.J., Zimdars, A.A., & Cortina-Borja, M. M. (2013). Sex differences in degree performance at the University of Oxford. *Learning And Individual Differences*, 26, 103-111.
- Mercer, J. (2007). The challenges of insider research in educational institutions: wielding a double-edged sword and resolving delicate dilemmas, *Oxford Review of Education*, 33 (1), 1-17.
- NSS (2014). *The National Student Survey*. Retrieved 1st April 2014 from <http://www.thestudentsurvey.com/>
- NSSE (2014). *National Survey of Student Engagement: Survey Instrument*. Retrieved 14th April 2014 from http://nsse.iub.edu/html/survey_instruments.cfm
- Pine, G.J. (2009). *Teacher action research: building knowledge democracies*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- QSIU (2014). *Quacquarelli Symonds Intelligence Unit: Employer reputation*. Retrieved 14th April 2014 from <http://www.iu.qs.com/university-rankings/rankings-indicators/methodology-employer-reputation/>
- Ramirez, F. O., & Christensen, T. (2013). The formalization of the university: Rules, roots, and routes. *Higher Education*, 65(6), 695-708.
- Schön, D. (1987). *Educating the Reflective Practitioner*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Stenhouse, L. (1981). What counts as research. *British Journal of Educational Studies*, 29, 113.
- van de Werfhorst, H. G. (2014). Changing societies and four tasks of schooling: Challenges for strongly differentiated educational systems, *International Review of Education*, 60(1), 123-144

PROMOTING STUDENT MOBILITY IN A GLOBAL AGE

Angela Yiu

I served as the Vice President for Academic Exchange at Sophia University in Tokyo, Japan from March 2011 to March 2014. My job was to promote research and global education. Based on my experience, I would like to share what I consider key elements in building a successful university.

In this competitive age of global education, a successful integrated university should be fully engaged in both research and education in both the humanities and the sciences. This will provide a broad and balanced undergraduate curriculum as well as an advanced research environment for graduate and postgraduate education and research.

I will focus on the various aspects of undergraduate and graduate education, faculty, research environment, innovative education, and international academic and student exchanges.

Undergraduate education: For both the humanities and sciences, basic undergraduate education should emphasise a liberal arts curriculum that encourages students to read extensively and think deeply and critically about issues in the humanities, social sciences, natural sciences, and economics. Students should be engaged in critical thinking and trained to articulate their ideas in public speaking and writing.

Graduate education should provide close interaction between faculty and students, and a good access to research materials. Good library and lab facilities should have top priorities. International symposia and seminars will provide opportunities for graduate students to interact with scholars from the rest of the world. Both undergraduate and graduate courses should provide clear syllabi.

Faculty: a good balance of international faculty and a healthy ratio of male and female faculty are extremely important. Faculty members should be actively engaged in research and education and maintain a consistent good record of publication as well as high performance in education. The number of classes per semester should allow time for research, and adequate research funding should be provided. International recruitment is a must to maintain a high global standard. Faculty should be encouraged to be active participants of international conferences and regular evaluation of their research and teaching performance is necessary for quality control.

A good research environment is necessary to attract leading and strong scholars to the university. A strong faculty with high research profile will also attract highly qualified students, both undergraduates and graduates, to the university. Without high quality research output, a university will attract mediocre students and scholars at best, and will not survive the competitive environment in global education.

Innovative education: faculty should be encouraged to devise innovative ways to improve the classroom. Provide regular funding to encourage design in innovation education both within and outside the classroom.

International academic and student exchanges: academic exchange includes faculty exchange, symposia and conferences, joint research and projects, funding for inviting international faculty, the construction of dual degree, joint degree, and various creative collaborative programmes among universities all over the world. Student exchange involves a network of exchange partners for students to study abroad both short-term and long-term without increased financial burden. This entails financial support for both students going overseas and coming in on exchange programmes, and a network of support for these students both at home and abroad.

I would like to elaborate a little more on my experience on international student exchange. I was the executive director of two major governmental projects in promoting international

student mobility. One was the “Global 30 Project” (academic year 2009-2013) and the other one is “Reinventing Japan Project” (academic year 2014). Global 30 focuses on creating academic programmes to attract international students to study in Japan, and Reinventing Japan focuses on a two-way exchange between Japan and certain target countries, which in our case was Southeast Asian countries.

For Global 30 we created several English degree programmes to attract international students. These include undergraduate degrees in “Green Science” and “Green Engineering” in the Faculty of Science and Technology as well as a graduate degree in Global Environmental Studies in the Graduate School of Environmental Studies. These English programmes were built upon our decades of experience of offering a full-fledged undergraduate degree entirely in English in the Faculty of Liberal Arts as well as a graduate degree in the Graduate Programme in Global Studies. In addition to the degree programmes, we also consolidated our language programmes into the Centre for Language Education and Research, which currently offers 18 languages. We also enhanced various support systems to enable student mobility, including staff support and financial aid.

The Reinventing Japan Project was designed to promote student mobility between Japan and Southeast Asia. We developed partnership with six universities in three Southeast Asian countries: Thailand, Indonesia, and the Philippines. The programme lasts for one semester with an option for participating in fieldwork in the summer, and focuses on the global issues of environmental studies and human development.

The key elements to student mobility hinge upon the educational preparation and support system both for students going abroad and coming in. For both types of students, funding is the key issue, and that depends largely on government policy and support, since individual university will not be able to come up with enormous capital to fund all the students. If there is adequate funding to stimulate student mobility, then the following issues should be taken into consideration in planning for student mobility.

For Students Going Abroad:

- Language preparation is a must. In addition to that, courses that stimulate students to think about the history, culture, literature, art, etc. of the target country or region in relation to the home country will contribute to better understanding;
- Creating partnership with universities in strategic areas to promote peace and understanding will facilitate student mobility. It is often safer and more affordable for students to go abroad on an exchange programme with a partner university than just going to an unaffiliated university;
- Provide courses to stimulate students’ intellectual curiosity. Always remember that students have to WANT to go abroad for any student mobility programme to be successful, and the reason they desire to go abroad is not just financial or utilitarian. Encountering an inspiring teacher, an overseas student, or taking a stimulating course about world literature, politics, etc. will make them intellectually curious about studying abroad. So do not underestimate the “soft persuasion” of intellectual stimulation in cultivating global-minded students.;
- Encourage students to go to places where they can serve and promote peace and understanding. Service learning is a great motivation for students to go abroad and connect with other people in less privileged part of the world. It is also a great way for a country to build mutually friendly and peaceful relationship with other countries.

For Incoming Students:

- Provide a good support system for international students. These include staff support, academic support, language support, housing, counselling, security, and above all, FRIENDSHIP;
- Have a rich and substantial list of courses for students to take. Since international students come different linguistic background, one way to create a common ground is to create courses in English, which by far is the common second language for most countries and regions;
- Integration with local students is a key point in genuine global interaction and understanding;
- Accreditation of courses is important in order for students to transfer credits to their home institute.

Even though the list can go on forever, I will limit it to a few key points each. The issues of matching calendar, accreditation, creation of short programmes, etc. are crucial to a successful student mobility scheme. Finally, I would like to encourage universities interested in promoting student mobility to visit the websites of NAFSA: Association of International Educators and European Association of International Education.

THE ROLE OF FACULTY IN CREATING A SUCCESSFUL UNIVERSITY

Loretta O'Donnell

Introduction

A successful university, especially a world-class research university, requires at least three elements working interdependently: talent, governance and resources (Altbach, 2011:3). The focus of this paper is on the first element. Academic talent is an essential condition for success. This talent is more successful when it is enhanced and liberated through well-designed management systems. The role of the faculty in successful universities cannot be discussed without understanding the role of students. Primožić (2014) observes that students want to be educated, inspired and informed. They see themselves as students, not as clients. He notes that students seek empowerment and mobility opportunities, and require deep and active learning. Students seek increased accountability and autonomy, while also requiring mutual respect and a sense of equal partnership.

From the perspective of employers, the most important graduate attribute is a “willingness to learn” (Green, 2014). This leads to the question: how can universities provide underpinning systems which create environments conducive to the diverse requirements of faculty, students and employers?

Context

Well-designed human resource systems of recruitment, selection, remuneration, training and career planning create conditions for long term organisational success. When they are internally consistent and consistent with strategy, these management systems can also serve to develop leadership capability throughout entire institutions (Collins and Porras, 1994). Unlike corporations, which can measure success in cumulative share price, research universities require a range of qualitative and quantitative output measures. These include indicators such as: accreditation, international and regional rankings, research grants, research impact measures, teaching and learning metrics, financial audits, graduate outcomes, numbers of student applications, especially at the graduate level, preferred employer status and level of philanthropic activity, among many other measures.

While these are useful measures, they are not the purpose of the university. In measuring success, it is important to not fall into the trap of measuring what we *can* measure, rather than what we *should* measure (Ulrich, 1999). Not only do we need to be aware of the tangible and intangible outputs which constitute success, we need to consider the tangible and intangible inputs which are likely to create conditions where success is possible. Bassi and McMurrer (2007) found that specific management systems indicate future financial success in listed companies. Conversely, inconsistencies between rewards, remuneration and performance management systems have been implicated in the downfall of major institutions (Royal and O'Donnell, 2013). One key role of institutional leadership is to create strong systems which allow systematic feedback to develop stability, and also allow openness to changing conditions (Collins and Porras, 1994).

Implications for Research-intensive Universities

What are the lessons for research-intensive universities? Can universities design management systems which liberate intellectual talent? In contemporary universities, demands on faculty are high. There is forensic scrutiny of all aspects of teaching, learning, research and service. Contemporary universities require faculty to act in socially responsible ways, conducive to the “higher calling” of life as an intellectual (Zhakypova, 2014). At the same time, faculty are the

creative engine of universities. Like the students they teach, they require an environment which is conducive to growth and development and which is also adaptive to change. Hilltrop (1999) and Youndt and Snell (2005) found that an appropriate configuration of management systems is needed to create intellectual capital. This is consistent with Hartley (2014) who asserts that academic faculty should "be restless, be optimistic and not be satisfied". Sagintayeva (2014) argues that university management should fundamentally act as enablers, providing continuous improvement for professional development, while both students and faculty may take the role of reformers. Similarly, Mamrayev (2014) observes that faculty can do their best work when they have the appropriate tangible and intangible resources.

Systems to Liberate Talent

Within this context, developing strong management systems is a necessary but not sufficient condition for creating a strong and successful university. Systems work well when grounded in clear and explicit values. Management systems do not work in isolation. The former Chief Executive Office of Visa, Dee Hock, noted that: "An organisation's success has enormously more to do with clarity of shared purpose, common principles and strength of belief in them, than to assets, expertise, operating ability, or management competence, important as they may be" (Hock, 1996). Hock derived the term "chaordic", from the combination of "chaos" and "order", to describe an organisation which has stability and yet is adaptive to changing conditions. Contemporary universities need both characteristics to succeed – order is necessary for the measured and robust research and teaching activities which build a strong institution. Yet, a research university has to always be open to innovation, change and fresh perspectives. This kind of ambidexterity is simple in theory, and yet can be complex to implement (MacCormick and Parker, 2010).

Researchers have tried to simplify this task. O'Reilly and Pfeffer (2000) highlight effective management systems which tend to create high performing institutions. These systems include management practices such as: employment security; selective hiring; self-managed teams; decentralised decision making and extensive sharing of financial and performance information. Mayo's (2001) "human capital" perspective of successful organisations incorporates more than individual capability and commitment, knowledge and experience. It also includes collaborations between people, and their networks both inside and outside the organisation. He distinguishes between human capital, which is what people take home with them, and structural capital – what they leave behind. Youndt and Snell (2004) classify human capital as individual employees' knowledge, skills and expertise; while social capital is knowledge resources embedded within networks of relationships and organisational capital is institutionalised knowledge and experience, manifested in databases, routines, patterns and manuals.

These views are distilled by Hock, cited in Waldrop (1996): "Hire and promote first on the basis of integrity; second, motivation; third, capacity; fourth, understanding; fifth, knowledge; and last and not least, experience. Without integrity, motivation is dangerous; without motivation, capacity is impotent; without capacity, understanding is limited; without understanding, knowledge is meaningless; without knowledge, experience is blind. Experience is easy to provide and quickly put to good use by people with all the other qualities." Hock's approach assumes that organisations are communities, based on the sum of the beliefs, character, judgments, acts and efforts of those who are drawn to them. This view has some similarity to the role of universities as communities which serve communities.

In support of this overall view, Bassi et al (2001) analysed essential elements to optimise talent. They found specific themes to be associated with future organisational success:

- **Leadership Practices:** Managers' and leaders' communication, performance feedback, supervisory skills, demonstration of key organisational values, efforts and ability to instil confidence;
- **Learning Capacity:** The organisation's overall ability to learn, change, innovate, and continually improve;
- **Knowledge Accessibility:** The extent of the organisation's "collaborativeness" and capacity for making knowledge and ideas widely available to employees;
- **Workforce Optimisation:** essential processes for getting work done, providing good working conditions, establishing accountability, and making good hiring choices;
- **Employee Engagement:** capacity to engage, retain, and optimise the value of its employees hinges on how well jobs are designed, how employees' time is used, and the commitment that is shown to employees.

Additionally, research-intensive universities balance the concepts of the "mechanistic" and the "organic" forms identified by Burns and Stalker (1961). Mechanistic systems are suitable for stable conditions and organic systems are appropriate for conditions which give rise to fresh problems and unforeseen requirements. Universities need to succeed in both forms, and so research universities are required to consciously develop a repertoire of management systems which move along a continuum from loosely to tightly defined roles, from informal arrangements to clear hierarchies, from informal to formal processes of communication and from consultative to directive leadership styles.

Attributes of Measurement Systems

Measurement systems require specific characteristics to be effective. Attributes of measurement systems should be that they are: credible, descriptive, predictive, detailed, actionable and cost-effective, (Bassi and McMurrer, 2007). Mayo (2001) suggests that human capital measures should be 'roughly right' rather than 'precisely wrong', simple to understand and clearly defined.

As universities develop and grow over time, their management systems need to mature and stabilise. In the entrepreneurial stage of a research university, management systems are necessarily based on constant change. As the institution matures, as the university moves to more divisional or functional organisational forms, systems require more stability. However, even stable systems need to remain open to change, and to be embedded in open systems, being open to feedback. As Collins (2009) found, complacency is not consistent with organisational success.

Conclusion

In measuring the success of research universities, it is useful to consider tangible and intangible inputs to that success. Ideally, intellectual talent is liberated through well-designed, internally consistent, management systems. These systems should embed ambidexterity, through appropriate levels of stability and openness to change.

References

- Altbach, P. G. and J. Salmi (Eds) (2011) *The Road to Academic Excellence: The Making of World-Class Research Universities*. Washington D.C.: the World Bank.
- Bassi, L. & McMurrer, D. (2007), "Maximizing Your Returns on People", *Harvard Business Review*, March.
- Bassi, L.J., Lev, B., Low, J., McMurrer, D. P. and Sissfield, G.A. (2001), Measuring Corporate Investments in Human Capital, in *The New Relationship: Human Capital in the American Corporation*, M. M. Blair & T. A. Kochan, eds., Brookings Institute, New York, pp. 334-382.
- Burns, T. and Stalker, G.M. (1961), *The Management of Innovation*, London, Tavistock.
- Collins, J. (2009) "How the mighty fall...and why some companies never give in", Jim Collins, New York.
- Collins J. and Porras J. I. (1994) *Built to Last: Successful Habits of Visionary Companies*, Harper Business.
- Green, S. (2014) "Bridging the Gap between Nazarbayev University Graduates' Expectations and Kazakhstan-Employment Realities", Address to Academic Council, Nazarbayev University, September 24.
- Hartley, M. (2014) "Faculty's Perspective on a Successful University", Eurasian Higher Education Leaders Forum: What is a Successful University? Collection of Abstracts. Astana: Nazarbayev University Graduate School of Education.
- Hilltop, J-M. (1999) "The Quest for the Best: Human Resource Practices to Attract and Retain Talent", *European Management Journal*, Volume 17, Issue 4, August 1999, Pages 422-430
- Hock, D. (2001) "Conversation with Dee Hock", *IHRIM Journal*, Vol. V, No. 1. January, 2001.
- MacCormick, J. and Parker, S. (2010) "A multiple climates approach to understanding business unit effectiveness", *Human Relations*, November, Vol. 63, No. 11, pp. 1771-1806.
- Mamrayev, B. (2014) "Faculty's Perspective on a Successful University", Eurasian Higher Education Leaders Forum: What is a Successful University? Collection of Abstracts. Astana: Nazarbayev University Graduate School of Education.
- Mayo, A. (2001). *Human Value of the Enterprise*. London: Nicholas Brealey Publishing.
- O'Reilly, C. A. and J Pfeffer. (2000). *Hidden Value: How Great Companies Achieve Extraordinary Results with Ordinary People*. Boston: Harvard Business School Press.
- Primožić R. (2014) "Students' Perspectives on a Successful University", Eurasian Higher Education Leaders Forum: What is a Successful University? Collection of Abstracts. Astana: Nazarbayev University Graduate School of Education.
- Royal, C. and O'Donnell, L. (2013) ESG: From negative screening to human capital analysis, in Young, S. and Gates, S. (Eds) *Institutional Investors' Power to Change Corporate Behavior: International Perspectives (Critical Studies on Corporate Responsibility, Governance and Sustainability*, Volume 5), Emerald Group Publishing Limited, pp. 339-366.
- Sagintayeva, A. (2014) "Faculty's Perspective on a Successful University", Eurasian Higher Education Leaders Forum: What is a Successful University? Collection of Abstracts. Astana: Nazarbayev University Graduate School of Education.
- Ulrich, D. (1999), Measuring Human Resources: an Overview of Practice and a Prescription for Results, Chapter 24 in *Strategic Human Resource Management*, Schuler, R.S. and S.E. Jackson, Blackwell Business, Oxford, pp. 462-482
- Waldrop, M. Mitchell (1996) "Dee Hock on Management", *Fast Company*, October 31, 1996.
- Youndt, M.A. and Snell, S.A. (2004), Human Resource Configurations, intellectual capital and organisational performance, *Journal of Managerial Issues*, 16 (3), pp 337-360.
- Zhakypova, F. (2014) "Modern Challenges and Faculty's Role in the Formation of a Successful University", Eurasian Higher Education Leaders Forum: What is a Successful University? Collection of Abstracts. Astana: Nazarbayev University Graduate School of Education.

CONTEMPORARY CHALLENGES OF HIGHER EDUCATION AND FACULTY'S ROLE IN THE FORMATION OF A SUCCESSFUL UNIVERSITY

Fatima Zhakypova

Many governments and academic bodies headed by their administrations are working on a solution for the question of building a successful university. There is no doubt that today the role and mission of the university undergoes a substantial amount of transformation as a result of challenges they have to face. And only those universities that will adequately react to these challenges become successful to greater or lesser degree.

At the same time, despite rapidly changing world, we should not be losing touch with beginnings, with those academic values and traditions that have been laid at the foundation of the first universities in the history of humanity. At least, the mission of the universities that aspire to success and leadership has to organically combine traditions and modernity.

What makes a successful university? At the panel of the opening session, Lynne Parmenter and her colleagues from the Nazarbayev University Graduate School of Education noted that there are five main components of a successful university. Moreover, some speakers used the formula of a successful university developed by Jamil Salmi (2009). Some speakers talked about the importance of reconsidering the existing interpretations of a successful university. But they all agreed that talented faculty members, who ensure high academic standards and quality of education, are the foundation of a successful university.

Therefore, undoubtedly, the talented faculty hold one of the key roles in building a successful university. Thus, it is only natural to ask: What faculty member is able to contribute to building a successful university?

In my presentation I will address three main points:

- How and in which historical contexts the teaching profession was created? What are its historical roots?
- To what extent does a modern university faculty fit the historical role at the core of this profession?
- How does the faculty's mission need to change in present conditions and what should be a successful faculty of a successful university?

The long history of the university since its establishment to this day demonstrates that it is one of the most important institutions that has stood the test of time. As the human society changed, the university changed, too. In the history of the university there were times of crisis and there were short periods of its exclusive role when ideas, promoted by university, became decisive for the future. But on the whole, all changes that the university went through were accompanied with an expansion of knowledge it stored. Hence, we may claim that the purpose of the university remained unchanged at all times. This was the place where the new knowledge was generated, place where the truth was born.

The first universities were established by those professors, who played the role of the critical mind, historical and moral consciousness and society's change. In the era of first universities, famous professors became centres of educational development. Thousands of people gathered in a city visited by a renowned scholar. At the end of the 11th century, because of the Roman Law scholar Irnerius, a law school was established in Bologna, which has later become the University of Bologna.

From the history of the University of Bologna we also know that glosses of Azzone Azo enjoyed great authority. His teaching attracted to Bologna vast numbers of students. At times, he had to give his lectures at a square as the number of students, according to sources of those times, reached ten thousands. Faculty's responsibilities at that time included two main aspects.

First of all, the intellectual one. A professor was a scholar, who engaged in science, which was simultaneously absolute and complete. Their task was to give students the knowledge that was the closest to the truth. Thanks to this, they could not only earn fame and respect of his contemporaries, admiration and gratitude of his students, but also means of existence.

From this point of view, the faculty were meant to solve tasks not only of intellectual, but also of a moral kind. A professor should not be reproached for the way they lived or their ethical position, and this aspect of his or her life was given particular attention when they took a test to obtain a license. The earnestness of their behaviour honoured the science they represented.

The professor was aware of their public accountability. Doctrinal errors were particularly dangerous. Therefore, we can argue that the faculty of the first universities were academic aristocracy. This epoch has set foundation of the high image and social status of the faculty.

According to the Recommendations concerning the Status of Higher-Education Teaching Personnel (General conference of UNESCO, the Preamble – Paris, as of November 11, 1997), “teaching in the field of higher education is a highly skilled profession, a form of service to society (...)”. At the same time, such factors as the increasing interest of the mankind to obtaining higher education, globalisation and intensity of economic, social and political processes in this new century demand advancing professional teacher self-development.

University cannot nourish new talent and develop young people's versatile skills in case if it does not have intellectual potential. Unquestionably, outstanding knowledge is generated in the academic community which focuses on the solution of the problems experienced by the society. However, more often than not, we witness the fact that most advanced achievements of research slip away to the field of basic research, research centres and industrial companies. For example, out of eleven research achievements in the field of physics published by the Chinese Academy of Sciences only four research achievements belong to higher education institutions.

Can this serve as evidence for increasing tendency that leads to a certain devaluation of the faculty's role:

- as a key figure in the university;
- as a researcher generating new knowledge and passing it to the next generations.

Also, is it appropriate to assume that nowadays the prevailing role is assigned to university administration and, above all, to the middle management? Perhaps, it is justified by both objective and subjective reasons. Traditional university management, sometimes limited funding of higher education, intensive development of alternative sources of education (Internet, media, centres for professional development) to a great extent facilitate devaluation of the faculty's role. It is quite fair that in these circumstances the role of the university management is being enhanced. Development of anticipatory strategy of the university, creation of modern campuses, ensuring financial stability and attracting new investments, and, on the whole, development of competitive advantages and high image of the university – all of these is possible only for exemplary managers.

And, perhaps, this is why building a successful university to an increasing extent becomes the task of governments and universities' top-managers. Strategic programmes are being developed and discussed during meetings of ministers and at high-level conferences. Enormous amounts of financial resources are allocated for these purposes. With this, building successful universities becomes states' competitive advantage.

What is the faculty's role in this process? Perhaps, it lies in faculty's high expectations of implementation of their rights? In demands for creating certain conditions for their work and research?

Indeed, faculty's rights have to be respected to the full extent. These rights are enshrined both at the university level, national legislation, and at the international level. The already

mentioned ILO/UNESCO Recommendations fully reflect rights and freedoms of the higher education institutions' faculty. I will address only the main ones:

- access to the higher education academic profession should be based solely on appropriate academic qualifications, competence and experience and be equal for all members of society without any discrimination;
- faculty members, like all other groups and individuals, should enjoy those internationally recognized civil, political, social and cultural rights applicable to all citizens;
- the maintaining of the above international standards should be upheld in the interest of higher education internationally and within the country. Therefore, the principle of academic freedom should be scrupulously observed;
- faculty members of higher education institutions have a right to teach without any interference, subject to accepted professional principles including professional responsibility and intellectual rigour with regard to standards and methods of teaching;
- higher-education teaching personnel should play a leading role in determining the curriculum;
- faculty members have a right to conduct research without any interference or any suppression in accordance with their professional responsibility and subject to nationally and internationally recognised professional principles of intellectual rigour, scientific inquiry and research ethics.

At the same time, while it might be controversial, we often witness how faculty members in their work are not always guided by the newest trends in education. Utilising modern educational technologies is also not always encouraged. Research results do not fully contribute to making progress and solving the most pressing issues of the modern society.

In certain cases, demands for expanding academic freedom occur at the minimum level of awareness of professional responsibility. I dare say that all this sometimes is common to faculty members and does not contribute to preserving their historical role of pioneers and servants of truth.

Moving on to the concluding part of my presentation, I would like to go back to these questions. So, what faculty member is capable of becoming a key figure of a successful university? Should the faculty's mission change in the present conditions?

There cannot be a definitive answer to these questions. But still, in defining what makes a faculty successful, we must rely on those challenges that now face universities. And these challenges clearly point towards the importance of rethinking the mission and role of the faculty in a modern society.

Most likely, we need to go back to the cradle of teaching profession, to its global definition: "teaching in higher education is a form of public service". Perhaps, not all colleagues will agree with me, but still, when we talk about a successful university, I believe it is important to evaluate the extent to which duties and responsibilities, which, just as rights, have historically been a foundation of the teaching profession, are being fully implemented. I will refer to some of them:

- Teaching, research and scholarship should be conducted in full accordance with ethical and professional standards and should respond to contemporary problems facing society;
- With their work, faculty members must preserve the historical and cultural heritage of the world;
- Profound knowledge and specific skills must be maintained through vigorous training and research throughout their lives;

- Faculty members should seek to achieve the highest possible standards in their professional work, since their status largely depends on themselves and the quality of their achievements.

To undertake such appropriate duties as are required for the collegial governance of institutions of higher education and of professional bodies. Faculty members should contribute to the public accountability of universities.

To conclude my presentation, universities that do not produce existential knowledge cannot claim to success, competitiveness and leadership. The academic life teaches us how profound knowledge is produced by a community of equal people, who, while choosing a profession, must be honest to themselves and to future professional expectations.

I can assume that certain points of my presentation may not have found an absolute support from all the panel speakers. However, the value of the Forum is that it allows for discussion and search for the most accurate answers to the fundamental question of our session.

References

Salmi, J. (2009). The Challenge of Establishing World Class Universities.
Washington, DC: World Bank.

Recommendation concerning the Status of Higher-Education Teaching Personnel. (1997).
Retrieved from: http://portal.unesco.org/en/ev.php-URL_ID=13144&URL_DO=DO_TOPIC&URL_SECTION=201.html

THE ROLE OF FACULTY AT SUCCESSFUL UNIVERSITIES

Matthew Hartley

Kazakhstan's higher education reforms are beginning to give its universities more autonomy in order to spur greater innovation. The State Programme for Education Development 2011-2020 outlines an ambitious project that already has granted far more control over the curriculum to institutions and proposed other key changes such as the institution of boards of trustees as a means of oversight and accountability. However, more autonomy does not magically produce innovation. People have to produce the change. Autonomy *allows* people to act, but people have to grab that opportunity.

So how are people at universities in Kazakhstan making sense of this shift towards greater autonomy? That question has been a focus of research that a group of colleagues from the University of Pennsylvania and Nazarbayev University have undertaken together over the past three years. Collectively we have visited 27 universities in eight cities in Kazakhstan. What follows are a few observations about what we have learned about the role faculty play in creating more innovative institutions.

First, although reforms are beginning to push for change, the management of universities in Kazakhstan is still primarily based on complying with Ministry requirements. The Ministry hires and fires rectors of all public institutions, except the National Universities, whose leaders are appointed by President Nazarbayev. The Ministry sets institutional budgets for public institutions. As one rector told us, "Our budget is completely determined by the Ministry and we have no right to open certain funds or move money for strategic purposes." The Ministry continues to control 30% of the undergraduate curriculum. Overall it is a system that produces a lot of bureaucracy. As one senior administrator put it, "Too often 'support' from the Ministry comes in the form of red tape."

The benefit of a centralised system is that it establishes shared expectations across the system and it is a means of monitoring compliance. The downside is that it can hinder innovation. For example, in the U.S. most universities have a similar list of academic majors but they can also create new ones. There are majors today in the fields of nanotechnology, biotechnology, web-based marketing that did not exist a decade or two ago. These majors were created because there was a demand for them and because faculty members saw that there were new branches of knowledge that needed to be developed into a systematic field of study. And institutions that created these programmes first often had a competitive advantage. In the U.S., the decision to create a new major is made at the *institutional level* and often at the level of the academic division. In Kazakhstan the Ministry has a list of accepted majors. One university we visited wanted to create a major in fashion design. And there were job opportunities for graduates in this area. But the institution could only offer a general major in "design." This meant they could not distinguish themselves from other institutions through the power of their ideas. A consortium of rectors is trying to change this policy. Rector Kozhakhmetov from the Academy of Business who is part of this group recently said: "The choice of majors does not always match the demands in the market. Most majors should last for five to seven years and then be updated or eliminated. What we see now is that universities teach the same thing for decades. Autonomy will allow each university to work in these issues independently¹." This is an exciting idea but that sort of commitment to ongoing curricular and programmatic innovation will only be possible if the faculty provide intellectual leadership.

At some institutions in Kazakhstan, faculty members are innovating by working with local civic and business leaders. Some institutions have drawn on the expertise from their boards of trustees. Board members and division heads and faculty members come together to

1 <http://dknews.kz/avtonomiya-vuzov-sokratit-chislo-nevostrebovannykh-specialistov.htm>

discuss the skills graduates should have and whether the curriculum is providing those skills. These partnerships have produced new opportunities for students to get experience through internships and summer jobs. They allow students to develop experience on equipment that the university often can't afford. This work also requires faculty leadership. It's the responsibility of faculty members to think carefully about what students should learn. The university is not just a job training organisation. Its job is to teach skills that will prepare students for jobs in the future, some of which do not exist yet. Students need to learn to think critically, to question how things are done, they need to learn how to work in teams, and to develop the skills to become leaders. This dialogue between industry representatives and faculty is healthy because it requires faculty to explain the choices they have made. It also requires them to make sure that these partnerships do not just do what is good for industry in the short run, but that they are part of an education that will help students succeed in the long-run.

To create institutions that are globally competitive, Kazakhstan's universities will have to establish environments that empower faculty. This means tackling difficult problems like the high teaching loads. It means creating systems for recognising and rewarding new ideas, which we have seen on some campuses. This will require a system where institutions can make their own decisions (and take their own risks) without getting permission from the Ministry. Of course, to earn this right, institutions will need to be transparent. Many institutions have already opened themselves up to external review through accreditation.

But the best universities in the world are ones where leadership is an *institutional quality* – something that happens at all levels. There was a major study in the U.S. done by researchers at the University of Indiana about student success, and researchers found that institutions that were most successful had a culture of what they called “positive restlessness” – people at these institutions were optimistic but never quite satisfied (Kuh et al., 2005). They were always looking for ways to improve the learning experiences of students. The task ahead is to create environments where people across the university can work for themselves – where they can dream about new programmes and new possibilities and have the support to make them happen. Institutions need to give individuals the autonomy to act. This is the kind of leadership development that will be required for Kazakhstan to move forward into its bright future.

References

Kuh, George, Kinzie, Jillian, Shuh, John H., & Whitt, Elizabeth J. (2005). *Student Success in College: Creating Conditions that Matter*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

HIGHER EDUCATION EXPERIENCES IN KYRGYZSTAN: CASE OF OSH STATE UNIVERSITY

Kanybek Issakov

In this article, I describe some key aspects of higher education reforms and what have been the Osh State University's experiences in relation to these reforms.

Long Proud History

Osh State University (former Osh State Pedagogical Institute) is among the oldest higher education institutions in Kyrgyzstan and we celebrated 75-year anniversary this year. Osh State University (OSU) is also the largest higher education institution in the south of the country. OSU has always been one of the leading higher education institutions in Kyrgyzstan, and it serves students from all parts of the country. Many of OSU graduates work and study abroad, and many of them had worked and work in key government and public positions in the country. Nowadays, OSU enrolls around 27,000 students including over 1500 students from abroad.

There have been many reforms in the field of higher education since the breakup of the USSR, and OSU also goes hand in hand with all those reforms. The reforms are related to making university a high quality education centre where faculty would engage in effective teaching and research, while students get quality education.

Fair and Transparent Admission

I want to comment on the admission processes at OSU. Higher education was free during the USSR and most students were eligible for state stipends. However, there were very few higher education institutions and only 15% of secondary school graduates were able to attend higher education institutions. After the fall of the USSR, the number of higher education institutions in Kyrgyzstan increased from 10 to 50. However, there were many issues with corruption and nepotism during university admission procedure in the past.

Nowadays, we enrol students on the basis of National Scholarship Test. Unfortunately, many universities were criticised for not being very transparent about how they admit the students when they apply based on the National Scholarship Tests. In this field, we were the first to adopt the improved and modified technology of admission procedure. The whole process of applicants' admission to OSU is now broadcasted on-line in the Internet and via the website of OSU live in the real time. Thus, parents and applicants can follow their admission process on-line from the screens which are placed for public viewing in front of the OSU building. We hope that this builds trust in higher education institutions as a place which is not corrupt, but fair and transparent.

Internalisation

A very important initiative for OSU is related to its internalisation and assessing the quality of university education by an independent accreditation to replace the previous system of centralised licensing, attestation and accreditation. In 2012, OSU was among the first to achieve international accreditation of one its specialisations "Economics" with the help of Association EdNet².

In addition, with the fall of the USSR, higher education institutions in Kyrgyzstan got opportunity to establish direct links and partnerships with international universities. These

² EdNet Agency on Quality Assurance and Accreditation of higher education institutions of Kyrgyzstan was established with the Tempus project "Central Asian Network for Quality Assurance and Accreditation".

collaborations are very important for us as we can compare our education programmes and learn from each other. Both students and professors of OSU benefit from these partnerships by participating in exchange programmes, joint research and education courses with some of the leading institutions abroad. But we also would like to further work in this area.

We are also mindful about what criteria which are relevant for assessment quality of education. Therefore, we should carefully and purposefully study and adapt the elements of the international accreditation, and all the activities of the university should be available for the society's viewing and inputs. Only then international experts can assess and evaluate the quality of education at particular universities objectively. Consequently, higher education institutions would have reputation and prestige not only because of the state status but also due to internal and external assessments. When a university is trusted and recognised internationally, then students of that university may get opportunity to continue their education in any university of the world. Graduates who get quality education at a university, can find a job in any part of the world. Their diplomas will be recognised internationally.

To align our education standards with international standards, we are working on improving material and resources bases of the university. Computerisation, connecting OSU campuses to the Internet, providing access to electronic libraries are some of our priority areas.

Following Bologna Principles

Nowadays, Osh State University is a cohesive and holistic structure of education institution, and it includes its own kindergarten and school. While re-structuring the education system in accordance with Bologna principles, we also adopted the three-level international masters and PhD programmes, and in this way, we can be more meaningfully integrated to international academia. Our diplomas can be recognised abroad in the future and quality of education that we provide at OSU will further improve. While fully integrating with the international academia, we strongly believe that we should not forget our origin and core values. We should instil in our students our traditional values which our ancestors protected since its ancient history and passed from generation to generation. Owing to these values, we know that our people survived through harsh history.

Currently, there are active discussions in Kyrgyzstan about shifting towards masters and PhD degree system. We are starting our PhD programmes and we are searching for ways for further improvement. We mostly participate in joint projects with international universities which have rich experience in this direction. Thus, we have started joint projects with the University of Milan, Goteborg University and Tartu University, and we signed agreements on preparing of PhDs. According to these agreements, one thesis supervisor is assigned from our university and another co-supervisor from the partner university abroad. Nowadays, eight PhD candidates are conducting research under their supervision.

Retaining Traditional Values

We are now working hard on internalisation of higher education and meeting international standards. However, we should never forget who we are and what are our traditional values and long history. We want to find a right path of development by taking all valuable and useful from the international education and adapting them to our Kyrgyz context. It would be incorrect and unsustainable if they try to copy everything from abroad without deep analysis of who we are and which ideas are good and can work in Kyrgyzstan. Thus, we are working on introducing credit technology of education to further integrate OSU with the world education space, and we are confident that it also helps us improve our education system.

Role of Faculty in OSU

The leadership of OSU strongly believe that all professors of OSU should be active and participatory members of the university's life and they should have a voice in the future direction and growth of the University. We are pleased that every faculty member of OSU actively participates in the life of the university. They seek to work creatively and we always encourage them.

It is important to establish intellectual elite at higher education institutions. In this regard, it is extremely important to coach and prepare young leaders, and by identifying honest young professionals with leadership skills to trust and assign them to key decision making positions. We have unwritten rules and we are actively pursuing it by encouraging and assigning young professionals under 35 years old to the key positions such as Dean of the department, director of institute, and so on. The reason for this is that we want to capitalise on their youthful energy as well as creativity capacities. These young people always have new initiatives, new ideas, and they think unorthodoxly and in new ways.

It is always necessary to maintain and improve the capacity of professors at higher education institutions, so that highly intellectual and professional people could educate younger generation of students. Students apply to universities with their high expectations and hopes and our challenge is to meet their expectations. So, if the student acquires knowledge and skills which can be useful after 10-20 years, and if the student is pleased with the quality of education they are getting, then we can say that the university is offering good quality education. By aspiring to achieve new things, we need to get rid of some old stereotypes and standards, and adopt new models.

Future Opportunities and Employment of OSU Graduates

This expansion of higher education has not, however, been paired with a bustling job market. Unfortunately, a very large number of university graduates join the long list of unemployed youth in the country. In this regard, OSU has been working on the unemployment issue. By establishing a career centre and working closely with employers and by asking their needs and requirements, the University aims to prepare its graduates not only to get jobs, but also become active citizens of the society and contribute to the nation's social and economic development.

In addition, I would like to comment that community's trust in higher education institution has deteriorated since the collapse of the USSR. We are now working on re-building that trust between the university and society by establishing our image as an open and transparent university.

ACADEMIC LEADERSHIP: A MISSING LINK IN HIGHER EDUCATION GOVERNANCE IN TIMES OF CHANGE?

Aida Sagintayeva

Much ink has been shed on academic leadership in higher education. Over the recent years, due to sweeping organisational changes, the field of leadership has gained much emphasis. Despite different theories and types of leadership, the fact remains that little is known about the phenomenon of 'leadership' especially when we attempt to figure out the meaning of academic leadership in a particular social context (Altbach, 2011). In present times of ever-changing relationships between the academic institution and its environment, academic leaders experience uncertainty and have to cope with rapid learning. In this vein, Altbach is adamant that "people who are called upon to lead universities in the twenty-first century face a difficult task for which they are, in general, unprepared" (2011: 1). The purpose of this paper is twofold. I will briefly unpack the essence of academic leadership with consideration of the operating context and internal environment of an academic institution. Though, given the narrow scope of the paper, I make no attempt to list the content of the leadership phenomenon that abound in the current scholarship today. I will then outline context-sensitive opportunities and challenges for academic leadership to develop on campuses of post-Soviet universities with the case of Kazakhstan. The paper is based on empirical research findings drawn from the long-term international study on higher education governance and management initiated by Nazarbayev University Graduate School of Education in partnership with the University of Pennsylvania's Graduate School of Education in 2012. The data is drawn from the field research done in 2013 that involved in-depth one-to-one interviews and focus groups with university rectors, deans, vice deans, chairs of academic departments, faculty members and students in Kazakhstan's public universities.

Introduction

Many scholars have addressed the issue of academic leadership (Johnstone, 2011; Middlehurst, 1999; Scott et al. 2008). Despite the fact that there are different theories of leadership, one thing remains clear. There is much to be gained if academic institutions would study patterns of their institutional leadership and the organisational culture within it (Schein, 1985; Kezar & Eckel, 2002). As more drastic changes emerge on campuses, most stakeholders would naturally wonder what makes an effective higher education leader that is capable to lead those transformational changes today. Based on my professional experience and academic literature, leaders of higher education institutions are those who have the capacity to lead the change, inspire faculty members and have a strategic vision for their institution (Birnbaum, 1992; Johnstone, 2011). Following in the footsteps of Robert Birnbaum, I believe that "leadership involves moving others towards a shaped perception of reality, towards a common understanding of where the organization is and whether it should be going, and toward an increased commitment to those ends" (1992:16). Having a team that has shared understanding of the strategic goals of the academic institution is only one element of effective leadership. Given the rapid reform movements in the higher education sector, a capacity to cope with changes and uncertainties has become one of the most valuable professional attributes of a contemporary higher education leader.

Scott et al. (2008: 44) based on the long-term empirical research with surveying 513 higher education leaders (a combination of pro vice chancellors, deputy vice-chancellors, deans and heads of schools, associate deans and heads of programmes) from 20 of Australia's 38 public universities, state that it is clarifying strategies, managing continuous changes and dealing with slow administrative processes that serve as the main influence shaping academic leadership.

The authors conclude that “institutional change capacity and responsiveness emerge as the most influential cluster of factors in shaping leadership” (ibid., 2008).

In another case of research on higher education leadership, done by *the Chronicle of Higher Education* in the US, the findings of an extensive survey of 350 presidents of four-year colleges reveal that despite the fact that innovative ideas for reforming higher education are being tested and delivered with measurable results by researchers, professors and entrepreneurs and college presidents, much of that work remains unfamiliar to many leaders and as a result detached from their conversations and strategy for the future (Selingo, 2014: 12). At the same time, two-thirds of university presidents say that the pace of change is too slow (ibid., 2014). These findings show that the transfer of ideas to actual actions on the part of university leadership hindered by the context-sensitive culture of change management complicates the process of effective leadership.

Thus far, the issue of developing academic leadership has become one of the priorities at higher education institutions around the world and deserves to be the subject of educational research in its own right.

Why the Question of Academic Leadership is so Important?

Managing changes in times of uncertainty is a complex process that requires different skills and qualities of effective leadership. In the higher education context, university leaders have to act as the interface between their local campus community and the environment. Surely, higher education leaders are nowadays expected to lead and be proactive not only inside the institution but also outside. As Johnstone (2011: 185) states:

“the most-effective higher education leadership would feature the ability to influence faculty as well as the ability to influence significant politicians – in combination with the authority to effect the desired changes”

This is especially true for the leadership of academic institutions experiencing transformational changes and transitions as is the case of post-Soviet states. The changing context of the state – university relationships has emphasised the issue of higher education leadership. In times of economic austerity measures, national and global competition (Marginson, 2006) higher education leaders have been hard pressed *to realise full potential against high standards*. As many governments developed an official discourse of New Public Management (NPM) with strong elements of marketisation, managerialism and performativity, many higher education reforms have been initiated by the state rather than academic institutions. Given the trend of quality control and performance measurement, academic leadership has gradually become inhibited and thus neglected. On a similar note, Christensen (2011: 507) is adamant that

“the university reform processes, like the overall NPM reform processes, have comparatively often been rather top-down, with the political-administrative leadership controlling the processes, in some cases supported by parliaments, the business community or regional/local government.”

As part of global higher education reforms in much of the world, there has been a tendency for decentralisation, delegation of responsibility from public authorities to higher education institutions. Many governments and university leaders are now puzzled with finding right ways of striking a balance between centralised control and institutional autonomy. Given the social context and the established pattern of state-university relationships, it is unwise to consider that higher education institutions could mechanically become independent with their academic leaders being responsible for communicating directions and visions of where those universities are going. As Dill (2001: 30) points out:

“One approach adopted by a number of countries and US states recognizes that not all universities are prepared for the full assumption of authority and responsibility (...). This is particularly the case in those countries where universities have traditionally been shielded from market forces by government policy and/or where educational ministries previously implemented many policies now being delegated to the university level.”

For instance, in Kazakhstan's case, the ministerial initiative to introduce the system of electing university rectors among their academic communities is another move towards reducing control from the government and delegating responsibilities to universities. It is envisioned that university leaders will be in charge of long-term strategic initiatives on their campuses and be accountable for the institutional development. As Johnstone (2011: 177) points out:

“more effective higher education leadership also requires better governmental policies that give people in leadership positions the freedom to make difficult decisions, the support in the face of the inevitable push back from elements in the academy against these changes, and the resources needed to implement the new policies”

Another important aspect of academic leadership is middle management of the university. With the increasing rhetoric of institutional autonomy, middle-level managers including deans, associate deans, chairs and heads of faculties and programmes also need professional autonomy that would provide enough room for their leadership in team-based settings and thus become transmitters of organisational wisdom. Distributed leadership is a new perspective of higher education management. Professionals that recognise the importance of distributed leadership are likely to develop patterns of effective middle management on their own campuses.

Faculty involvement in institutional governance is another important aspect to consider in the discussion of academic leadership. The issue of faculty involvement directly refers to the debate about shared governance. From my professional experience of both teaching and administering public universities, I can state that faculty members are not always willing to take leadership roles and play a part in administrative decision-making processes. It is true that most academics express their deep commitment to teaching and research rather than administering and playing key roles in institutional decision-making. Entrenched academic conservatism and lack of enthusiasm to change the institutional culture usually hinder the professoriate's leadership capacity. Given this circumstance, research literature on higher education leadership confirms that decision-making power of the academic councils and boards are not really effective and the voice of the university administration remains domineering (Johnstone, 2011; Willis, 2011).

The Context

One would agree that the situation with the academic institutions of the former Soviet Union is rather complex compared to established higher education institutions of Western Europe and North America as the former had to go through difficult experiences and hard times in the transition stage towards market economy and the era of new public management. The higher education sector in post-Soviet countries has experienced a considerable period of change over the last two decades. Understandably, post-Soviet states had to focus on education as one of the main pillars for socio-economic development of their nations. Higher education leaders have been expected to be responsive to drastic changes related to the marketization of education.

In Kazakhstan's case, the Ministry of Education and Science has provided a legislative framework for the higher education to function. A stage-by-stage strategic plan to transition towards institutional autonomy, introduction of mechanisms to select university rectors and the introduction of board of trustees as a constituency of shared governance constitute current official policy discourse of decentralisation of higher education. It is obvious that the rhetoric of policy initiatives play the part of *'policy out'* expressed in the wording of the official decrees,

orders and laws (Offe 1984: 186, in Ball, 1998: 127). With the rapid reform movement, there is good reason to ask if the reform movement makes sense to higher education leaders and how academic leaders, including rectors, vice-rectors, deans and heads of departments develop ownership of the reforms on their campuses.

Context matters in developing patterns of effective higher education leadership. As Middlehurst (2004: 277) states:

“an important missing element of the discussion is the part played by leaders, managers (and indeed governors) in making change happen and ensuring its sustainability. The people who carry the responsibilities, individually and collectively, have to address the structural and cultural inhibitors of change.”

Therefore, the research question I pose here is ‘what are the context-sensitive opportunities and challenges for academic leadership to develop in Kazakhstan’s higher education universities?’. We held four one-to-one interviews with university rectors, nine one-to-one interviews with vice-rectors, 19 focus group interviews with deans and faculty members.

What the Data Tells us

Within the limited scope of the paper, this section will briefly discuss four main concerns that are likely to be typical of higher education leadership in post-Soviet states taking the case of Kazakhstan.

Transitioning from Followship to Leadership in Higher Education Institutions

In the context of decentralisation and institutional autonomy, the data analysis has shown that there is much concern about the institutional transition from following official policies to becoming a leader with a capacity to engage with academic entrepreneurship and innovation on campus. When asked a question ‘How would things change if your university were given institutional self-governance?’, many deans noted the risk of falling back on the habit of following externally assigned orders and commands that are typically issued by the central ministry. One respondent of the deans’ focus group said the following:

“we need an iron hand of the commander control in order for us to see the targets. Someone to follow, the one who knows what to do. Who are we to blame if something goes wrong on our campus? I am not sure that all the institutions are ready to take a role of leadership of their university at their own pace.” (Deans, focus group, University B, June, 2013)

The data has shown that the university leadership has grown habituated towards the post-Soviet tradition of central control from the top which serves as a good example of path dependency in higher education. As Christensen (2011: 506) states:

“Path-dependency means that the cultural roots that a public organization develops in its early years will heavily influence it during its later trajectory and development (...). The notion of cultural compatibility is important for understanding how reforms are handled in public organizations. A reform that is rather compatible with the basic cultural norms and values in an organization would be implemented rather easily, while a reform that is confrontational would be more likely to be bounced back, modified or only partly implemented”

Higher education leadership is likely to experience the struggle between the entrenched perceptions of seeing academic institutions and their management as followers and the new policy initiative of demonstrating their leadership capacities.

Cultivating the Emergence of Leadership within the University

Academic institutions are expected to develop institutionally relevant patterns of academic leadership on their campuses. It is worth noting that higher education leadership is about to

experience succession crisis. To date, the median age of university leaders is 59. There should be an effective system of developing and training prospective higher education leaders in order to provide a proper mechanism of succession.

A proper system of electing rectors, based on the legislative framework, is likely to enable the university administration to come up with effective mechanisms of electing rectors, vice-rectors and deans. When asked a question 'From your viewpoint, does your institution provide opportunities to develop strong academic leadership on campus?' one faculty member of the focus group said:

"Much depends on the leader, be it a Chair or Rector. To have a closer relationship within the university and different units, we should have a right to elect a rector. So, broadly speaking, we will need to announce the position across the country. I'm not talking about the quality of our current rector or [our] former head. I'm talking about the ways to make their work and our own development more effective. So, in this scenario, the Rector should be accountable to us and we are to him. If we propose something and vote, we are also responsible for this. So, this is the key question." (Faculty members, focus group B, University B, June, 2013)

Distributed leadership

The data has shown that there are elements of distributed leadership within academic departments of universities. However, we have learnt that when the matter comes to institutional decision making, it is mostly established administrators that would be in charge. One junior faculty member of the focus group said:

"We have an academic council. We do not participate in any council; mostly it is administrators who are involved in councils." (Junior faculty members, focus group C, University B, June, 2013)

Given the shared responsibility for strategic management, university leaders are likely to gradually learn to delegate responsibilities and look for opportunities and mechanisms to provide room for distributed leadership to develop. Effective higher education leadership would include allocation of responsibilities and delegation of institutional decision making to other constituencies alongside the hierarchy of university management. As Ameijde et al. (2009: 777) point out:

Instead of focusing on the development of the leadership capabilities of an organization's designated leaders, focus would shift to investing not only in developing leadership skills of the workforce as a whole, but also to facilitating the conditions conducive for the emergence of successful distributed leadership and the formation of informal networks of expertise.

Faculty Involvement in Academic Leadership

Similar to the point made above, most respondents believed that faculty members should have a say in university management. One interview participant said: "in general, shared governance is the ideal scheme for the university. Everyone has the right to participate in decision-making." (Chair A, University C, June, 2014). With the globally acknowledged fact that the academic work has a declining status and the public accountability of the university is increasing, we have asked faculty members questions about their attitudes towards leadership positions at their university settings. One faculty member said:

"Faculty members' academic leadership I believe, academic staff are supposed to be involved in teaching and research whereas administrative work needs to be done by other people, managers, for example. That is, academic staff's main activities should be teaching and research. Not like we have it now, where everyone is doing everything." (Faculty members, focus group C, University D, June 2013)

Faculty involvement in institutional decision-making could be an effective instrument only if the professoriate is really engaged with the university's strategic development and expresses genuine concern to have a say in the leadership matters. Some faculty members are not seeing their roles of decision makers on the administration level. Surely, there should be a well-developed structure for the faculty to develop their initiatives especially in the matters of academe and research.

Thus far, based on the brief data analysis of interviews among university leaders, the paper argues that the transition towards the development of academic leadership is a complex context-sensitive process. In the next decade or so, academic institutions will have to develop capacities to lead changes on their own campuses and develop their roles beyond the followship of externally designed initiatives. Both the state and the higher education leadership are likely to understand that change does not happen on its own but needs to be led by professionals and effective leaders both within and beyond universities.

References

- Altbach, P.G. (2011). (ed) *Leadership for World-class Universities: Challenges for Developing Countries*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Van Ameijde, J. D., Nelson, P. C., Billsberry, J., & Van Meurs, N. (2009). *Improving leadership in higher education institutions: A distributed perspective*. *Higher Education*, 58(6), 763-779.
- Ball, S. J. (1998). Big policies/small world: An introduction to international perspectives in education policy.
- Birnbaum, R. (1992). *How Academic Leadership Works: Understanding Success and Failure in the College Presidency*. New York, NY: Wiley.
- Christensen, T. (2011). University governance reforms: potential problems of more autonomy?. *Higher Education*, 62(4), 503-517.
- Dill, D. D. (2001). The regulation of public research universities: changes in academic competition and implications for university autonomy and accountability. *Higher Education Policy*, 14(1), 21-35.
- Johnstone, D. N. (2011). "The Challenges of University Leadership in the Developing World." In *Leadership for World-Class Universities: Challenges for Developing Countries*, edited by P. G. Altbach, 176–186. New York: Routledge.
- Kezar, A. J., & Eckel, P. D. (2002). The effect of institutional culture on change strategies in higher education: Universal principles or culturally responsive concepts? *The Journal of Higher Education*, 73(4), 435-460.
- Marginson, S. (2006). Dynamics of national and global competition in higher education. *Higher education*, 52(1), 1-39.
- Middlehurst, R. (1999). New realities for leadership and governance in higher education?. *Tertiary Education & Management*, 5(4), 307-329.
- Schein, E. H. (1985). *Organisational culture and leadership: A dynamic view*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Scott, G., Coates, H., & M. Anderson (2008). Sydney: University of Western Sydney and Australian Council for Educational Research.
- Selingo, J. (2014). *The Innovative University: What College Presidents Think about Change in American Higher Education*. Chronicle of Highe Education.
- Willis, J. (2011). Faculty involvement in institutional governance: a literature review. *Journal of the Professoriate*, 6(1).

FACULTY'S PERSPECTIVE ON SUCCESSFUL UNIVERSITY: PERSPECTIVE FROM A REGIONAL UNIVERSITY

Beibit Mamrayev

The faculty members of Kazakhstan had to deliver their duties and service in a continuous process of changes in the system of higher education for the last quarter of the century. Transition from the Soviet model to the current one could not escape pains in consciousness of the senior generation and a brain-drain of skilled faculty members from higher education institutions. Now, experiencing the third decade of independence, there still exists a problem in determining the model of higher education and creation of competitive universities capable of satisfying the needs of the country in faculty of various kinds and profiles.

What is a successful university for faculties? This question does not provide unanimity of views, and it is confirmed by numerous discussions at departments and academic councils of universities. The difference in views almost directly correlates with age groups of faculty members. It is common that a number of faculty members passed an age threshold of 60 with many of them supporting good traditions of Soviet education, the advantages of that old system which is understandable. The age group of 35-55-year-olds has adjusted to the credit system of teaching quite well, but normally meaning only its formal procedures. However, there are some university teachers within this group who have found more value with the system that focuses on personalization of learning, as well as the dependence of the total assessment in a subject from continuous work by both a student and teacher during the whole semester. Finally, the youngest faculty group of 25-35 years of age is the most unstable, since understanding the importance of their work they have quite modest remuneration for it. The general will for all shall be a higher salary, high-quality students as well decent material and living conditions for teaching.

Consequently, the contour of a successful university is drawn in the eyes of academic departments and schools of the institution, i.e. a place where students have a high level of academic experience and preparedness, proper conditions for quality teaching and learning (well-equipped classrooms with an essential IT structure, a convenient location, infrastructure, faculty members' decent remuneration, high prestige of higher education institution).

Given the proper working conditions for faculty staff, faculty members are expected to make their contribution, introduce a personal initiative in the formation and development of a successful university. Development of new curricula, its adaptation to regional needs as well as labour market, awareness of the teaching mission in university, generation of innovations in education while maintaining traditions of higher education institutions is, undoubtedly, the most important task for the faculty today. But the solution of this task requires enthusiasm to work in the new direction. Management of any higher education institution will not be able to make it successful if there is resistance or a passive role of the faculty staff.

University top management, in turn, has to provide a high level of financial stimulation for the faculty staff (it is a point in which efforts of all groups of teachers and higher education institution management are combined under the new conditions). It is necessary to develop a new corporate ethics assuming a combination of efforts of all faculty members while maintaining their individuality, existence of productivity skills of research and analytical work.

In the current scholarship, there are statements that schools do not provide a necessary level of education for lifelong learning. This is only partly true, as a strong faculty team, rigorous hiring process, sufficient funding of academic and research works, transparent control of the current progress could enable to provide quality education of a prospective successful professional that will be in demand among employers.

SUCCESSFUL RESEARCH UNIVERSITIES: GLOBAL CHALLENGES AND LOCAL PERSPECTIVES

Zhexenbek Adilov

President Nursultan Nazarbayev has clearly defined tasks for the higher education system. These are to stimulate universities to attain research status; to activate collaboration of science and business by creating industry/university cooperative research centres; and to develop the triad of education, research, and innovation by focussing on green economy, exploration, accumulation, production and use of alternative energy sources.

It is within this scope the University conducts its research and innovation work. Technological demands of the global economy rapidly change the character of engineering education, requiring modern engineers to have a comparatively wider amount of knowledge rather than specialising in narrow technological and engineering degrees as before.

It is difficult to talk about more or less successful approaches; nowadays, success depends on how much investment one can attract to research. Scholars' publications also matter as well as a number of other indicators. Therefore, anyone can easily determine the level of success of one's approach depending on whether the university attracts money for research, whether it is funded well enough to finance research teams and train new members, and whether the perspective is there for a research school that is represented by the university.

Considering the fact that education and science have become the primary condition for social and economic development and main factor for country's rise to world's leading positions, I will talk about key directions of modernisation of Kazakhstan legislation in the sphere of education and innovations within the framework of implementation of "Strategy-2050," which were clearly defined in the President Nursultan Nazarbayev's addresses: "[W]e should improve legislation on venture financing, intellectual property protection, research and innovation support, as well as commercialisation of research." In this context, I will discuss issues in legislation regarding research and innovations.

References

National Address of the President of the Republic of Kazakhstan (2014). Kazakhstan's Way – 2050: common aim, common interests, common future.
Retrieved from: http://strategy2050.kz/en/page/message_text20141//

SUCCESSFUL RESEARCH UNIVERSITIES: DEVELOPMENT FACTORS

Zhumakhan Myrkhalykov

Republic of Kazakhstan is a young and dynamic state in which education and science are one of the main priorities of the state policy. President Nursultan Nazarbayev initiated the project “Intellectual Nation 2020”, which aims to ensure the development of Kazakhstan’s education through the integration of education, science and innovations.

In this context, the concept of the development of research universities best meets the needs of the domestic demands of the Kazakh society. A mission on higher education of the country is to become more competitive for the creation of a skilled, efficient and flexible workforce, as well as the creation, application and dissemination of new ideas and technologies.

The world’s research universities models suggest two ways of developing them. The first one is the creation of an entirely new research university that has been realised in our country by establishing the Nazarbayev University. The second one is to support the leading universities and creation of favourable conditions for them to make a qualitative breakthrough. Currently, the second approach is also being developed through a competitive selection of programmes for the development of national and leading regional universities.

Internationally recognised researcher in the field of higher education Jamil Salmi (2009) identifies three factors of a successful research university:

- a high concentration of talents (faculty and students);
- significant resources, creating conditions for a creative learning environment and pursuance of cutting-edge research;
- management system that encourages the development of leadership skills, strategic vision, innovation and flexibility.

At the same time, the academic traditions of Kazakhstan’s higher education and the rapidly increasing demands to modern universities cause the emergence of new key factors in the development of research universities.

Management and Leadership

Management and leadership with the support on the faculty core is the central factor of the success of a research university. In Kazakhstan’s higher education sector, we are moving towards greater academic freedom and collegiality of management. At the moment, we have considerable independence in the development of innovative educational programmes, with an emphasis on interdisciplinary character. Many universities improve the management system through the establishment of Supervisory Boards. It is necessary to focus on two points. First of all, for successful functioning of the university it is necessary to involve in the decision-making process (management) those, who teach and are engaged in research work, i.e. the academic community. Second, the role of the rector of the university is changing. We proceed from the understanding the rector as a famous scholar to the rector who combines executive talent and possesses competencies of strategic financial planning and management.

Excellent Teachers and Students

Search of the best teachers is an important part of our work. To do this, in the HEIs Competition Committees are working, a system of motivation of teachers is being created. However we still have to create an open creative environment contributing to scientific research. In terms of concentration of talented students, there are also important tasks in front of us the solution of which we expect in the regulatory competences of the state.

Academic Programmes

Academic programmes of a research university are a unique product. They are developed through an interdisciplinary approach with the active use of the research potential of the HEI. Internationalization orientation, academic mobility provision and double diploma programmes development should be attributed to the peculiarities of educational policy.

The main aim of academic programmes development is the use of competence approach. Though the questions concerning competences and qualifications are settled to a larger degree, the debates about the balance of interests of employers and comprehensive university education continue.

The increased capacity to build the degree programmes determines the difficult choice for a HEI to determine the priorities of training. On the one hand, the employers prefer the readiness of graduates to work in a team, their communication abilities and preparedness to make independent decisions as main competences. On the other hand, the modern university is interested in involving students into research and in developing their critical thinking; therefore it strives to the strengthening of the research component. This is especially true for Master's programmes.

Modern Master's degree programmes require the balance between practice and research-orientation. Largely, this balance is provided through identification of academic knowledge for the first and second cycle, and also through the development of Master's programmes, taking into account the future employability of students. With this in mind, Kazakhstan has adopted two types of Master's programme – professional and research-and-teaching.

Specialism-based Master's programme implements academic programmes of postgraduate education in training human resources (including managerial ones), top-managers for economy branches, medicine, law, art, services and business, that have in-depth professional training.

Research-based and teaching-oriented Master's programmes implement professional study programmes to train scientific and pedagogical human resources for the higher education system and research area, having in-depth scientific – pedagogical training.

In the first case the graduates realise themselves as managers of production, in the second case they implement teaching and research activity. At this the content of programmes and teaching methods differ seriously.

The study of employers' requirements in regard to the postgraduates' preparation level found the following abilities to be priority-oriented ones: ability to apply knowledge in practice, ability to study, work in a team, ability to analyse and synthesise, ability to adapt to new conditions.

The priorities whereas of the academic environment in training of future researchers are given to such competences as basic knowledge in science, ability to analyse and synthesise, ability to generate new ideas, a high level of professional knowledge, skills to conduct research.

As result one can note certain disparities in the requirements to the future specialist, which requires the development of different profiles of Master's programmes.

In this case it is extremely important, that the graduate of Master's programme of research profile in the end is not only a researcher, but also a specialist who must orient his or her research at solving urgent problems of production.

Support for Research Excellence

Concentration of research on priority areas of the economy development and promising areas of science, support of international publications and international research groups. In industry, the major problem is the lack of engineers and designers on a range of modern high-tech areas of production. Not enough specialists in the organisation of innovation activity, science and techno-economic expertise, evaluation and use of intellectual property, commercialisation of scientific research and in many other specialties.

For a comprehensive solution of these problems we propose concept of integration of science and education, which should reflect:

- innovation educational programmes, programmes dual-diploma education;
- creation of a multilevel system of training and retraining for the scientific and innovative entrepreneurship.

Innovative initiatives will help to launch such mechanisms of integration as the creation of educational and scientific and industrial consortia. The basis of their work is the introduction at the enterprise of scientific and technological developments, created by the departments and laboratories. In this case simultaneously, the target training of specialists of production and teaching of students takes place. Ultimately, the real integration of education, science and industry should become one of the major factors in the development of Kazakhstan.

Kazakhstan has actively considered various approaches to the management of science and education in conditions of intensive development of economy and society. Development of Kazakhstan in innovative ways will lead to fundamental changes not only in science but also in training. One way is to create a network of research universities.

University Funding

Diversification of funding sources and search for new channels is an important part of universities management. Initial financial support of research universities will be implemented through the provision of targeted transfers for development programmes of the HEI. However, it is necessary to focus on the development of entrepreneurial culture, aimed at the commercialisation of research results.

Infrastructure

Innovative infrastructure is the final and unifying element of a research university. For successful activity the HEI needs structures, connecting it with the environment. First of all, these are the structures of innovative nature providing transfer of university research results into real business environment, as well as support for research projects monitoring and turning them into commercial offers.

Research university is not only an educational institution, but also a certain concept. We go along this road, creating a special "spirit" of a research university, unity of the management team, collective and students.

The University functions as the integrative system of a research-focused and educational complex with the goal for preparing highly skilled, creative-thinking staff able to generate advanced knowledge, constantly improve themselves and increase the intellectual capital for the innovation economy.

The programme of a research university stipulates the following:

- ensuring participation of researchers and faculty members in the creation of high technologies, new innovative projects and productions;

- creating conditions for an innovative orientation of training personnel and improvement of personnel policy, considering age and qualifying features of scientific and pedagogical structure;
- promoting students' and teachers' mobility in the light of the Bologna Process;
- providing language improvement courses for researchers and faculty staff with a view of development of social, communication and language competences;
- expanding partner links with international organisations for creation of the international research initiatives and consortia, implementation of joint research in the field of fundamental and applied research;
- introducing achievements of international schools of sciences and the best scientific and methodical experience for bringing up intellectual elite of the country;
- upgrading management system of innovative activity of the university, directed on ensuring its dynamic development and financial stability.

Taking into account requirements of the international standards of quality in Kazakhstan, primary steps to establish a model of Research University are taken. The special attention is given to creation of national assessment system of quality of education. Ideas of the Bologna Process affected the development of mechanisms of external and internal assessment of higher education institutions. The national assessment system of quality of education is modernised, criteria and procedures of certification of higher education institutions are improved. Representatives of business structures were involved in carrying out procedure of accreditation of higher education institutions, association of employers, public organisations and other institutes of civil society were also involved. Activities of agencies for the international accreditation of educational programmes extend. International accreditation stimulates academic institutions to develop internal mechanisms of quality assurance adequate to the given organisational environment. Gradually local higher education institutions develop mechanisms of corporate governance that includes strategic planning and forecasting, marketing of the market of educational services, effective management of human resources.

References

Salmi, J. (2009). *The Challenge of Establishing World-Class Universities*. Washington DC: the World Bank.

CONCLUDING REMARKS

Humphrey Tonkin

This Higher Education Leaders' Forum has been extraordinarily informative and stimulating. For those of us coming from other countries and visiting Nazarbayev University for the first time, it has been educational in the best sense. Particularly memorable for me have been the following:

- The introductory discussion paper prepared for us by Lynne Parmenter, Murat Orunkhanov and Kairat Kurakbayev, which provided a superb overview of the issues facing successful universities.
- The comments of Aslan Sarinzhapov, Minister of Education and Science, which were particularly impressive in their emphasis on the role of higher education not only as a driver of the economy but as a place where ethics and morality are valued, culture and tolerance are preserved, and an openness to everything new is fostered.
- The remarks of Rok Primožić, with his eloquent definition of the student perspective – a topic that was given commendable centrality in the Forum.

Several of us offered definitions of the successful university in our opening remarks. I will not attempt to summarise them here, but will simply note a few truths that emerged in the course of our discussions:

- No university is fully successful on all fronts: it is bound to be successful at some things and not at others – and much depends on what we choose to measure and how we measure it.
- A university is most likely to be successful at *some* things if it decides what it wants to be and then creates structures to bring that about, and meaningful metrics to measure its progress (as Mary Canning pointed out, measuring success is not easy). We must find the right mission and then focus on that mission. This was surely the message of Les Ebdon when he suggested that a university should “find its own uniqueness.”
- Those structures hold stresses and strains in places – but the stresses and strains will always be there. Each actor has different goals: students, faculty, and administrators. In well-planned institutions they can be made to support one another, but their goals *should* be different. Creative tension is not a bad thing. Nor, by the way, is accountability to outside agencies (starting with the public itself), though such accountability must be accompanied by adequate autonomy.
- Of course, students, faculty and administrators are not the only actors whose concerns must be taken into consideration. Universities must respond to, and help shape, the public education system at the level of elementary and secondary education. They must take note of changes in the larger world and acquaint their constituencies with these changes, even as their own innovations are shared with the larger world (as Jane Knight suggested, balancing the global and the local is particularly important). They must work with politicians and government officials – who are all too eager to assess their progress against criteria of varying quality, such as university ranking systems.
- The race to succeed in university rankings leads to distortion of goals as all institutions seek to resemble the leaders regardless of the value or desirability of doing so. Rankings make decisions easy for policymakers but they may not measure the right things, a point made emphatically by Mary Canning in her remarks, even if some speakers suggested that rankings may not work very well but they are all we

have. In my view, we should speak out against the false certainty that some of their measurements imply. I might add that rankings that rely in part on asking people about their opinion of universities are really nothing more than that: by turning them into numbers, we make them look scientific. They are not. Nor are universities football teams, even if occasionally, at least in the United States, people think they are. Perhaps the worst part about rankings is that if we do well in them we are inclined to see that as a mark of our cleverness. It may be no more than the fact that we speak English, or have lots of money, or have a good reputation (a product of speaking English and having lots of money...). What matters is the vision, not the money, and innovation, not publish-or-perish.

- Perhaps a still bigger challenge is the profound change currently going on in communication, including education. What universities will look like twenty years from now is quite unclear. They may be organised quite differently, may use delivery systems quite different from those currently in place, and may award degrees differently. Wise planners will try to create open systems that allow for new ways of doing things in the university of the future, though, as Zhexenbek Adilov rightly pointed out, it is difficult to work in an environment in which lack of autonomy offers the university little opportunity to be creative: universities are not government departments, but change agents. The same, I might add, could be said of faculty: as several people pointed out, notably Matthew Hartley and Beibit Mamrayev, we need a new breed of faculty, able to stimulate change and with the independence to do so.

Loretta O'Donnell, in a memorable phrase, suggested that the role of administration should be “developing systems to liberate human capital” and Jennifer Francis spoke of the “mediating, leading” role of the university administrator. Assylbek Kozhakhmetov reminded us that a university is “a producer of public goods.” The result of attention to such qualities, Aida Sagintayeva suggested, would be “realising full potential against high standards” – an admirable way of expressing what success might look like in higher education and a good message to carry away.



Nazarbayev University (NU) is a brand-new academic institution located in Astana, the capital of Kazakhstan. The University was founded in 2009 with the personal initiative of President Nursultan Nazarbayev to prepare the next generation of leading researchers and professionals.

To achieve quality education and research, the University is collaborating with the leading universities and institutions in developing its schools and centres among which are University of Cambridge, University of Pennsylvania, University College London, Duke University, University of Wisconsin-Madison, National University of Singapore and University of Pittsburgh.

Currently, there are seven schools at Nazarbayev University:

Graduate School of Business	www.gsb.nu.edu.kz
Graduate School of Education	www.gse.nu.edu.kz
Graduate School of Public Policy	www.gspp.nu.edu.kz
School of Engineering	www.seng.nu.edu.kz
School of Medicine	www.nusom.edu.kz
School of Humanities and Social Sciences	www.shss.nu.edu.kz
School of Science and Technology	www.sst.nu.edu.kz



www.nu.edu.kz