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Chad Gaffield is a distinguished university professor of history and university research chair in digital scholarship at the University of Ottawa (Canada). An expert on the sociocultural history of 19th- and 20th-century Canada, Gaffield’s research includes studies of university transformation and longitudinal analysis of the impact of university experience on graduates. A fellow of the Royal Society of Canada, he received the RSC’s 2004 J.B. Tyrrell Historical. From 2006 to 2014, Gaffield served as president and CEO of the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada (SSHRC).

Nadja Gmelch is head of projects at the Catalan Association of Public Universities (ACUP), in charge of, among others, the Commission of Social Responsibility of Universities. She has experience in the fields of global higher education, especially in university development cooperation, as well as in social impact of higher education and the contribution of higher education to sustainable and human development. She is currently mainly working on the role of higher education institutions and the Sustainable Development Goals, Responsible Research and Innovation (RRI) and Education for Sustainable Development (ESD). She holds a degree in international business and cultural studies (University of Passau) and a master’s in European development cooperation policies (Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona).

John Goddard is emeritus professor of regional development studies at Newcastle University, UK, where he is leading a programme of policy orientated research on the civic university viewed from both internal and external perspectives. This builds on his experience as deputy vice-chancellor of the university where he was responsible for leading the university’s external engagement. His book The University and the City will be complemented by a forthcoming book The Civic University: The Policy and Leadership Challenges. John advises the European Commission on universities and development.

Francesc Xavier Grau Vidal is a professor of fluid mechanics in the Department of Mechanical Engineering at Universitat Rovira i Virgili (Tarragona, Spain). He holds a PhD (1986) and a Licence Degree (1981) in Industrial Chemistry, both from the University of Barcelona. His research interests focus on the physics, modelling and control of heat, mass and momentum transfer in industrial flows and in the environment. He is the author of more than 100 research papers and the supervisor of 11 PhD theses. He has been a researcher at the Institute of Fluid Mechanics of the INP-Toulouse (France), at the NASA-Ames Center for Turbulence Research (USA), and at the Department of Mechanical Engineering of Stanford University (USA). He has taken an active part in setting up programmes to educate and inform the general public on scientific issues, and has been involved in university-society and industry-society relations, including coordinating the Dow-Tarragona Community Advisory Panel. Between 1993 and 2000, he was director of the Department of Mechanical Engineering at URV, and from 2000 to 2006 served successively as vice-rector for infrastructure and ICT, vice-rector for academic affairs and personnel, and vice-rector for scientific policy. He was the rector of University Rovira i Virgili from June 2006 until June 2014; within this period he acted as president of the Association of Catalan Public Universities (October 2011-January 2013) and was a member of the board (2010-2014) and first vice-president (2013-2014) of the Spanish Rectors’ Conference (CRUE).

Budd L. Hall is the co-chair of the UNESCO Chair in Community-Based Research and Social Responsibility in Higher Education. He is a professor...
of community development in the School of Public Administration and the secretary of the Global Alliance on Community-Engaged Research. He is the founding director of the Office of Community Based Research and former dean of education at the University of Victoria. He holds an honourable doctorate from St. Francis Xavier University and has been working on issues of knowledge and democracy since 1970, when he was working in Tanzania. He has published five books in recent years on issues of community based research and engagement. He is also a poet.

-Ira Harkavy is associate vice-president and founding director of the Barbara and Edward Netter Center for Community Partnerships, University of Pennsylvania. Harkavy helped to develop academically-based community service courses and participatory action research projects in Penn’s local community of West Philadelphia. Harkavy has written and lectured widely on the history and current practice of urban university-community-school partnerships and strategies for integrating the university missions of research, teaching, learning and service.

-Matthew Hartley is associate dean and professor at the University of Pennsylvania Graduate School of Education. His research focuses on academic governance and the social and democratic purposes of higher education. He is also the executive director of the Alliance for Higher Education and Democracy (AHEAD). Hartley serves on the editorial boards of Educational Researcher, the Review of Higher Education, and the Journal of Higher Education Outreach and Engagement.

-Ellen Hazelkorn is policy advisor to the Higher Education Authority (HEA), and emeritus professor and director of the Higher Education Policy Research Unit (HEPRU), Dublin Institute of Technology (Ireland). She is president of the European Higher Education Society (EAIR) and sits on the advisory board and management committee. She is also an international researcher with ESRC/HEFCE Centre for Global Higher Education (CGHE), UCL Institute for Education, London. She advises and reviews for governments, international organizations and universities, and has over 20 years’ experience as vice-president of research and enterprise, and dean of the graduate research school, and vice-president and founding dean of the faculty of applied arts, DIT. Her books include Rankings and the Reshaping of Higher Education: The Battle for World-Class Excellence (Palgrave 2015), Editor, Global Rankings and the Geo-Politics of Higher Education (Routledge, 2016); co-author: The Civic University: Meeting the Leadership and Management Challenges (Edward Elgar, 2016) and The Impact and Future of Arts and Humanities Research (Palgrave Macmillan, 2016).

-Arab Hoballah holds an MSc in economic tools and prospective analysis, an MSc in law and international relations and a PhD in economic development from the University of Paris. He supports the mainstreaming of resource efficiency and sustainable consumption and production policies, particularly through responsible industry and cities management, and has successfully launched initiatives and partnerships across sectors (e.g. buildings, tourism).

-Anna James is currently a research assistant on the Traditions of Popular Education Research Project, University of the Western Cape. She has an MSc degree in climate change and sustainable development (University of Cape Town) with a dissertation exploring the experience of skills development for sustainable urban housing. She has published in the South African Geographical Journal on contest-ed urban-environmental decision-making through discourse analysis of the media. Recently, she has explored the use of street theatre as a tool for popular education. She is working towards a PhD in experiential and collective learning.
- **Barbara Lethem Ibrahim** is founding director of the John D. Gerhart Center for Philanthropy and Civic Engagement (2006-2014) at the American University in Cairo, and currently advisor to the president, AUC. She previously served as the MENA regional director for the International Population Council and a programme officer in the Cairo Office of the Ford Foundation. She holds an MA from the American University of Beirut and a PhD in sociology from Indiana University. Her publications address philanthropy in the Arab region, youth activism in Egypt, gender and adolescence, and challenges to civil society and philanthropy in the Arab transitions. She currently serves on the board of directors of Worldwide Initiatives for Grantmaker Support (WINGS) and the International Center for Not for Profit Law. She received the Lifetime Achievement Award of the Association of Middle East Women's Studies in 2009.

- **Jouni Kekäle** works as director of human resources at the University of Eastern Finland. He also acts as a part-time professor and advisor to the rector. He is a docent in administrative sciences, especially higher education studies, at the University of Tampere, and a docent in psychology, especially higher education studies, at the University of Eastern Finland. His main research interests are academic leadership, quality, disciplinary, and organizational cultures in higher education as well as the changing operational environment for the higher education sector. He has participated in numerous local, national and international development projects in the field of higher education.

- **Denise Kirkpatrick** is deputy vice-chancellor and vice-president (academic) at Western Sydney University. She is a highly-regarded academic and educational leader in the fields of distance, open and e-learning and quality assurance. She has worked as an academic, senior executive and higher education consultant in Australia, the UK, Africa and South East Asia.

- **Juan-Luis Klein** is a full professor at the University of Quebec at Montreal and the director of the Centre de Recherche sur les Innovations Sociales (CRISES). He assumes several duties in editorial committees of scientific journals and is the director of the Collection Géographie Contemporaine at the Presses de l'Université du Québec. He is currently co-president of a non-governmental organization for knowledge transfer in social innovation, social economy and territorial development called Territoires Innovants en Économie Sociale et Solidaire (TIESS).

- **Elizabeth Larrea de Granados** is a member of the High Education Council of Ecuador, and sub-secretary of higher education, magister and PhD in education.

- **Betty Leask** is pro vice-chancellor for teaching and learning at La Trobe University in Melbourne, Australia. She is a leading international scholar in the field of internationalization of the curriculum in higher education. She has published widely in this area over the last 20 years and is currently the editor in chief of the *Journal of Studies in International Education*.

- **Itziar de Lecuona** holds a PhD in law and an MA in bioethics and law. She is a member of the UNESCO Chair in Bioethics at the University of Barcelona and assistant director of the Bioethics and Law Observatory at the University of Barcelona. Moreover, she is a member of the Catalan government’s consolidated research group ‘Bioethics, Law and Society’. She also has experience as director of the master’s in food, ethics and law and coordinator of the master’s in bioethics and law at the University of Barcelona. She forms part of the Catalan Bioethics Committee; the Research Ethics Committee at Hospital Clínic de Barcelona and the Bioethics Commission at the University of Barcelona. She is a member of the Expert Group on Research Integrity and the Working Group on Ethics in Horizon 2020,
League of European Research Universities (LERU). She is part of the Ethical, Legal and Social Board of the European Institute of Innovation and Technology, Health Division (EIT Health), Knowledge and Innovation Communities (KICs); and member of the European Advisory Committee, 5th World Research Integrity Conference (Amsterdam 2017). Finally, she is a visiting researcher of the Bioethics Programme at UNESCO Headquarters (Paris) and of the University of Bologna, CIRSFID Research Center.

- **Denise Leite** has master’s and doctoral degrees in human sciences from UFRGS, internships in Exeter and Edinburgh, UK and postdoctoral studies at CES University of Coimbra. She is invited professor on the graduate programme on education at UFRGS, Brazil and visiting professor on the graduate programme on education at UNEMAT, Brazil; a senior researcher, level 1A CNPq (National Research Council); member of the Research Study Group Innovation & Evaluation (CNPq-UFRGS). She is in charge of inter-institutional and international research projects on innovation, evaluation and collaborative research networks. She is currently GUNi/UNESCO secretary for Latin America and Caribbean.

- **Walter Lepore** is a doctoral candidate in the School of Public Administration at the University of Victoria. In May 2014, he joined the UNESCO Chair in Community-Based Research and Social Responsibility in Higher Education. He is the coordinator of the Next Gen project which is aimed at increasing access to high quality training in community-based research within higher education institutions and civil society organizations in the Global South.

- **Vincent Lomotey** is deputy registrar at KNUST with vast administrative experience in academic and student affairs. He champions the Development Research Uptake in Sub-Saharan Africa (DRUSSA) programme at the university and has facilitated many projects and programmes in research uptake and utilization. He holds a diploma in education and a bachelor's degree in physics from the University of Cape Coast, Ghana, a master's degree in science education from the University of Bristol, UK and is currently a PhD candidate at the University of Stellenbosch, South Africa.

- **Jack Makau** is a programme officer of Shack Dwellers International. He currently manages the technical and professional support for the Kenyan movement of slum residents known as Mumungano wa Wanavijiji. This function includes the development and maintenance of relationships with universities, local and national government agencies as well as development partners.

- **Jorge M. Martínez** is an economist for Universidad Autónoma de Guadalajara (Mexico) specialized in foreign trade and in political marketing. He began his professional life as deputy manager of the Centro de Estudios Económicos del Sector Privado de León, Guanajuato. Later, he joined the public sector in the Centro de Información Guanajuato as head of special projects development and coordination of indicators of government. He has collaborated with various national and local election campaigns. In Spain, he studied a master's in government and public administration at the Instituto Universitario Ortega y Gasset and the doctoral programme in government and public administration. Since June 2007 he has been deputy director of the UNESCO Chair on Higher Education Policy and Management at the Polytechnic University of Madrid.

- **Federico Mayor Zaragoza** was chair of biochemistry and biology at the University of Granada (1963-1973) and the Autonomous University of Madrid (1973-2004). He was also the rector of the University of Granada (1968-1970). His professional life includes: promoter of the Span-

- Francisco Michavila is a professor of applied mathematics of the Universidad Politécnica de Madrid (UPM), director of the UNESCO Chair in Higher Education Policy and Management, honorary rector of the Universitat Jaume I and director of the INCREA Chair. In 1991 he was appointed first rector of the Universitat Jaume I of Castelló de la Plana (1991-1993). Two years later he was appointed secretary general of the Council of Universities. In November 2009, the University of Las Palmas de Gran Canaria awarded him the doctorate honoris causa.

- Mircea Miclea is professor and director of the Centre for Applied Cognitive Psychology, at Babeș-Bolyai University in Cluj-Napoca, Romania. He served as the general chancellor of the university from 2001–2004. In 2001, he was named the UNESCO Chair on Higher Education Management and Governance. In 2006, he was appointed as president of the Presidential Commission for Analysis and Elaboration of Policies in Education and Research.

- Anand Mohan studied geosciences and spent 23 years as an active researcher and academician at Banaras Hindu University, Varanasi, before accepting a pivotal role as administrator at Dayalbagh Educational Institute, Agra. Mohan has received several prestigious awards and National Academy Fellowships. His current interests include disaster management, consciousness studies and value-based ethical practices in addition to his passion for geology.

- Carlos Iván Moreno earned his BA in finance at the University of Guadalajara. He also holds a master’s degree in public administration from the University of New Mexico (USA) and a PhD in public policy from the University of Illinois-Chicago. He was a doctoral fellow at the Harris School of Public Policy at the University of Chicago and the Kellogg School of Management at Northwestern University. His research interests are related to comparative higher education policy, institutional change and power and politics in organizations. He is currently a professor of organizational studies in the Public Policy Department and vice-provost for international affairs at the University of Guadalajara.

- Josep Joan Moreso is a professor of legal philosophy at Universitat Pompeu Fabra, and adjunct professor at Universidad Diego Portales (Chile). He holds a law degree and PhD in law (UAB 1983, 1988). With more of 200 publications in his field, he is co-director of the collection 'Filosofía y derecho' by Marcial Pons Publisher, as well as editor of the following Journals: Ratio Juris, Doxa, Law, Ethics and Philosophy, Analisi e Diritto. He was invested Doctor Honoris Causa in Valparaiso University (Chile), and Antenor Orrego University (Trujillo, Peru). He was rector of the UPF from 2005 to 2013. Since 2013, he has been the president of the university quality assurance agency AQU Catalunya.

- Claudia Neubauer is co-founder and director of Fondation Sciences Citoyennes, a non-profit organization aiming at democratizing sciences and technologies so that they serve the common good and a socially and ecologically more just world. She holds a PhD in human genetics and a master's in scientific journalism. She has been
working on issues such as scientific citizenship, national and European research systems, expertise and research capacities of civil society organizations. Since 2014, she has worked as a programme officer on research, innovation, economy and energy for the Swiss Foundation Charles Léopold Mayer.

- Peter A. Okebukola is a professor of science and computer education at the Lagos State University, Nigeria. He was concurrently chairman of the council of four Nigerian universities. He is currently the chairman of the council of Crawford University and chairman of the board of trustees of Caleb University. He was executive secretary of the National Universities Commission. He is the president of the Global University Network for Innovation (GUNi-Africa) and the current chairman of the advisory council of the CHEA International Quality Group (CIQG).

- Luis Enrique Orozco Silva is a doctor in philosophy from the University of Lovaina, Belgium. Permanent professor of the University of Los Andes and coordinator of the area of management and public policies of the faculty of administration of the same university. He is the director of the UNESCO Chair in Higher Education for Latin America and member of the academic committee of IESALC/UNESCO. He was coordinator of the National Council of Accreditation, member of the institutional board of the National Commission of Quality Assurance in Higher Education (CONACES) and the doctorate and master's room of the same body in the National Ministry of Education. He was also academic vice-rector (1989-1996) and dean of the faculty of philosophy and arts (1989-1996) of the University of Los Andes. He has advised different national and international higher education institutions. He is the author of many articles in specialized journals and books in the fields of philosophy of science, ethics and higher education, among which the latest are: La Educación Superior, problema global y respuesta nacional (2001); Dinámicas de transformación de la Educación Superior (2003); Políticas de Educación Superior en Iberoamérica 2009-2013; La Educación Superior. Retos y perspectivas (2014).

- Sheela Patel is the founding director of SPARC, an NGO that works with social movement of the urban poor in India through the National Slum Dwellers’ Federation and Mahila Milan. She is also the chair of the board of Shack Dwellers’ International, a transnational global movement of community federations of the urban poor across Asia, Africa and Latin America.

- Andrew Petter is president and vice-chancellor of the Simon Fraser University, and professor in its School of Public Policy. From 1991 to 2001, he served in the Province of British Columbia’s Legislative Assembly and held numerous cabinet portfolios, including Advanced Education. Since he became president of SFU in 2010, he has overseen the implementation of a strategic vision that seeks to distinguish SFU as Canada’s engaged university defined by its dynamic integration of innovative education, cutting edge research, and far-reaching community engagement.

- Nelson Piedra is currently the knowledge management director of UTPL (Ecuador) and acts as principal researcher in the Data Sciences and Web Advanced Technologies group, department of computer sciences and electronics. He also serves as a director of the Smart Land Initiative. He holds a doctorate in software and systems from the Polytechnic University of Madrid (Spain). His research focuses in the areas of semantic web, data integration/interoperability, open linked data and machine learning.

- Nandita Pradhan Bhatt is a development professional and has been associated with the sector for more than 19 years. She is currently a programme
manager in PRIA's gender unit. She is the coordinator of the organization’s Making Workplaces Safe programme which has its focus on increasing awareness and institutional accountability on the prevention and redressal of sexual harassment in both the informal and formal workplaces. As part of her work, she is also supporting PRIA’s programme on ending violence against women and girls in educational institutions and public spaces through youth-led initiatives in more than 15 locations across the country.

- **Jaana Puukka** is an analyst of the OECD programme on Institutional Management in Higher Education (IMHE). She has experience in higher education and regional development in Finland as a ministerial and local government adviser, programme manager, practitioner and evaluator. She has management experience from both the university and polytechnic sector and has worked in university internationalization, PR and communication and stakeholder management. In addition, she has worked in the corporate sector in the pharmaceutical industry. Before joining OECD, she was the regional development manager of Turku University of Applied Sciences, at that time the biggest professionally oriented HEI in Finland. She has been involved in various university evaluations and has worked for the Finnish Ministry of Education to review university master’s programmes.

- **Sally Randles** is a professor of sustainability and innovation at Manchester Metropolitan University in the UK. She holds associate fellow roles at the Institute of Innovation Research at the University of Manchester and at the Centre for Organization Research and Design, Arizona State University and is scientist in charge of the EU Marie Curie ‘Innovation 4 Sustainability’ network for the Academy of Business in Society, Brussels. She is interested in the historical and institutional origins and contemporary transformations of actors’ interpretations, practice and governance of ‘responsibility’ in a range of research and innovation contexts.

- **Dzulkifli Abdul Razak** is the current president of the International Association of Universities (IAU), a UNESCO-based organization, located in Paris. Currently, he is the chairperson of the Islamic Science University Malaysia (USIM). He is an honorary professor at the University of Nottingham; and held the chair of Islamic Leadership at USIM from 2014-16. He also chairs the steering council of the Right Livelihood College Global Secretariat based in the University of Bonn, Germany. He was the 5th vice-chancellor of Universiti Sains Malaysia (USM) from 2000 to 2011.

- **Liam Roberts** is programme officer at the Association of Commonwealth Universities (ACU). As well as contributing to the ACU’s Beyond 2015 campaign between 2013 and 2015, Liam also helps coordinate the Development Research Uptake in sub-Saharan Africa (DRUSSA) programme, led by the ACU in conjunction with international partners. He maintains a strong interest in public engagement, research communication and impact evaluation.

- **Núria Saladié** is the project manager of H2020 project Higher Education Institutions and Responsible Research and Innovation (HEIRRI). She has been working since 2013 as a research assistant with the FP7 European projects PLACES, KiiCS and NERRI at the Studies Center on Science, Communication and Society from Universitat Pompeu Fabra (SCS-UPF). She has a degree in journalism from Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona and a master's degree in science communication from Universitat Pompeu Fabra.

- **Jamil Salmi** is a global tertiary education expert providing policy advice and consulting services to governments, universities, multilateral banks and bilateral donor agencies. He is an emeritus
professor of higher education at Diego Portales University in Chile. Salmi wrote the first World Bank policy paper on higher education in 1994 and was the principal author of the World Bank’s 2002 Tertiary Education Strategy entitled ‘Constructing Knowledge Societies: New Challenges for Tertiary Education’. In the past 23 years, Salmi has worked on tertiary education reform and strategic planning in more than 90 countries. His 2011 book, co-edited with Professor Phil Altbach, is entitled 'The Road to Academic Excellence: the Making of World-Class Research Universities'.

- **Katya Salmi** is a human rights researcher and an adjunct sociology lecturer at the American University in Washington DC. In the past few years, she has worked on migration, gender equality, race relations, and higher education. She was recently commissioned by Verso Books to write a report on emerging trends in race literature in the United Kingdom. She received a master’s degree in human rights from UCL and completed her PhD in sociology at the University of Sussex (United Kingdom). She worked for two years at Human Rights Watch as a research fellow on refugees and migrants issues.

- **Wafa Singh**, India’s research coordinator of the UNESCO Chair in CBR has been engaged in numerous national/international projects under the higher education theme. She has represented the Chair at international forums such as the 2nd Asia Engage Conference in Bali and CUEXpo in Ottawa, Canada. Having secured a master’s degree in water resources management, she has also been an independent researcher working on various consultancy projects.

- **Morshidi Sirat** is a professor at the School of Humanities of Universiti Sains Malaysia. He has served as the director of the National Higher Education Research Institute (IPPTN), as deputy director-general, department of higher education (public sector), and as director-general of higher education/registrar general of the private institutions of higher education in Malaysia. Currently, Morshidi is the founding director of the Commonwealth Tertiary Education Facility in Malaysia. He publishes widely on Malaysia’s higher education policy and is very active in research and consultancy work for the ADB, the World Bank, and UNESCO APEID Bangkok.

- **Juan Pablo Suárez** is currently the vice-principal for research at UTPL (Ecuador) and acting as principal researcher in the Microbial Systems Ecology and Evolution (MS2E) group, department of biological sciences, UTPL. He holds a doctorate in natural sciences from the University of Tuebingen (Germany). His investigations are related to plant-microbial interactions.

- **Sharifah Hapsah Syed Hasan Shahabudin** is an emeritus professor at the Universiti Kebangsaan of Malaysia (UKM) and currently advisor and member of the governing board of the Albukhary International University (AiU), Malaysia. Former vice-chancellor, she combined her social activist work for gender equality to strengthen community engagement projects in UKM. She promotes knowledge and technology transfer for wealth creation and social wellbeing by nurturing a culture of innovation and entrepreneurship in research, teaching and service. She is responsible for the quality assurance framework of higher education in Malaysia and is credited for developing the code of university good governance in public universities.

- **Alfred Tan** is an entrepreneur, an IP attorney, an engineer, a research scientist, an inventor and a university senior administrator all in one. He started his career in academia before embarking to successfully lead his own technology start-up. He then returned to academia to further his career as a well-published professor in engineer-
ing and technology, both in Hong Kong and Australia. Alfred Tan has a number of patents to his name. He is also a senior member of IEEE and a member of Engineers Australia. He is also a registered Australian trademarks attorney and an often-referenced patent consultant. He is also a certified patent valuation analyst and consults for venture capital firms.

- **Rajesh Tandon** is a doctor and internationally acclaimed leader and practitioner of participatory research and development. He founded the Society for Participatory Research in Asia (PRIA), a voluntary organization providing support to grassroots initiatives in South Asia, and continues to be chief functionary since 1982. In 2012, he was appointed co-chair of the UNESCO Chair on Community Based Research and Social Responsibility in Higher Education. The UNESCO Chair grows out of and supports UNESCO’s global lead to play ‘a key role in assisting countries to build knowledge societies’. Tandon has authored more than 100 articles, a dozen books and numerous training manuals on democratic governance, civic engagement, civil society, governance and management of NGOs, participatory research and people-centred development.

- **Nieves Tapia** is founder and director of the Latin American Center for Service-learning (CLAYSS), an NGO based in Buenos Aires. She organized and directed Argentina’s Ministry of Education’s first National Service-learning Programmes (1997-2010). Founding member of the board of the International Association for Research on Service-learning and Community Engagement (IARSLCE), she has served as a jury member for Argentina’s Presidential Awards for service-learning and for the MacJannet International Prize for University Engagement. She has been honoured as Argentina’s ‘Youth of the Year’ (1985), Eisenhower Fellow (1988), National Service Fellow (1993), and Alec Dickson Servant Leader Award (2001). Tapia has published numerous books and articles in Spanish, English, Portuguese and Italian.

- **Crystal Tremblay** is a doctor and research associate with the Office of Community University Engagement at the University of Victoria and research director of the UNESCO Chair in Community-based Research and Social Responsibility in Higher Education. She is involved in numerous research projects in Canada and globally on issues relating to water governance, citizenship, livelihood enhancement, and institutional transformation. She specializes in using participatory arts-based methods for engagement that promote knowledge co-creation and democracy.

- **Stevie Upton** is a research associate in the City Region Exchange, Cardiff University, UK, where her research interests include the policy and practice of higher education impact and engagement. She has previously researched and taught in the Institute of Higher Education, University of Georgia, USA, and in 2012 was seconded to the UK’s Arts and Humanities Research Council to advise on researcher engagement with policymakers.

- **Raúl Valdés** is a senior programme specialist at the UNESCO Institute for Lifelong Learning and programme manager of the UNESCO Global Network of Learning Cities. Raúl holds an MBA and a PhD in education. For over twelve years, he has been working in international organizations in the field of lifelong learning and adult learning and education. He has led various research and advocacy projects such as the *Conceptual Evolution and Policy Developments in Lifelong Learning* (editor, with J. Yang, 2011), and *Unlocking the Potential of Urban Communities. Case Studies of Twelve Learning Cities* (editor, with N. Longworth and others).
- Josep M. Vilalta is executive secretary of the Catalan Association of Public Universities (ACUP), formed by the eight public universities in Catalonia (Spain). He is also executive director of the Global University Network for Innovation (GUNi). He has over 25 years of experience in the public management area, holding some positions in the government of Catalonia, in universities and also collaborating actively with other countries and international institutions like the European Union, the OECD, UNESCO, European Association of Universities and International Association of Universities. His main areas are public policies, public management, higher education policies and research and innovation policies and management. He has published more than 60 articles, chapters of books, reports and books in the following areas: university leadership, management and public policies, organization, management and university funding, university policies and governance, research management and policy, knowledge management and innovation.

- Shirley Walters is an emeritus professor and former professor of adult and continuing education and founding director of both the Centre for Adult and Continuing Education and Division for Lifelong Learning, University of Western Cape. Her contributions to adult education internationally have been recognized through various awards. She has been appointed to serve on various national structures, including as chair of the South African Qualifications Authority. She is currently on the Ministerial Oversight Committee on Transformation in the South African Public Universities. She is coordinating research into traditions of popular education, which is supported by the National Institute of Humanities and Social Sciences.

- Chang Da Wan is a senior lecturer at the National Higher Education Research Institute (IPPTN), Universiti Sains Malaysia. His main interests include higher education policy and economics. He has been involved in a number of research and consultancy projects with UNESCO Bangkok ERI-Net, OECD, Commonwealth Tertiary Education Facility (CTEF), Asia Pacific Higher Education Research Partnership (APHERP) Research Cluster, Bait al-Amanah, and the Ministry of Higher Education Malaysia.

- Joann Weeks is associate director of the University of Pennsylvania’s Netter Center for Community Partnerships, focusing on its regional, national and international programmes. She directs the national adaptation of the Netter Center’s university-assisted community school programme, as well as its training and technical assistance activities.

- Hans de Wit is director of the Center for International Higher Education at Boston College, USA. He has a long career as a scholar and practitioner in the field of internationalization of higher education, advising the European Commission, the European Parliament, the World Bank and the European Consortium for Accreditation, among others. He has published several books, articles and commentaries on internationalization of higher education and he was the founding editor of the Journal of Studies in International Education.

- David Wolff is director of the Community University Partnership Programme at the University of Brighton and was the original member of staff when the programme was established in 2003. Prior to this, David worked in the community and voluntary sector in the fields of homelessness, advice and information services, project management and in the use of technology in community sectors. He has occupied roles as a service delivery worker, manager, director and consultant.
GUNi presentation

GUNi is an international network created in 1999 by UNESCO, the United Nations University (UNU) and the Universitat Politècnica de Catalunya – Barcelona Tech (UPC). It was founded after the 1998 World Conference on Higher Education to give continuity to and facilitate the implementation of its main decisions. Since 2014, the Catalan Association of Public Universities (ACUP) has hosts its secretariat and presidency.

GUNi currently gathers 208 members from 78 countries among the UNESCO chairs in higher education, higher education institutions, research centres and networks related to higher education and other UNESCO chairs and UNITWIN networks established within the UNESCO/UNITWIN programme involved in innovation and the social commitment of higher education.

GUNi has offices with regional representatives in Africa, the Arab states, Asia and the Pacific, Latin America and the Caribbean, Europe and North America.

GUNi’s mission is to strengthen higher education’s role in society, contributing to the renewal of the visions, missions and policies of the main issues of higher education across the world under a vision of public service, relevance and social responsibility.

At the beginning of this century, there is a strong need to establish new bases for a sustainable global society that, taking into account environmental limits, re-examine the dynamics of global economic, political, human, social and cultural models, as well as their local manifestations. We are currently experiencing a crisis of civilization, in which we must facilitate the transition towards a paradigm shift aimed at rebuilding society, with the collective desire and responsibility of attaining a better world for future generations. There is a requirement to reconsider what the social contribution of higher education should be.

GUNi encourages higher education institutions to redefine their role, embrace this process of transformation and strengthen their critical stance within society.

GUNi’s goals are to:

» Encourage higher education institutions to reorient their roles to broaden their social value and contribution and strengthen their critical stance within society.

» Help bridge the gap between developed and developing countries in the field of higher education, fostering capacity-building and international cooperation.

» Promote the exchange of resources, innovative ideas and experiences in emerging higher education issues, while allowing for collective reflection and coproduction of knowledge on innovation, relevance and social responsibility.

GUNi carries out the following main activities:

» Higher Education in the World Report

The report is a collective work published as part of the GUNi series on the social commitment of universities. It is the result of a global and regional analysis of higher education in the world, with a specific subject chosen for each edition. The report reflects on the key issues and challenges facing higher education and its institutions in the 21st century.
» Conferences, Seminars and Workshops

GUNi promotes international events on higher education that address innovative proposals and ideas. The events have a global projection focused on different issues, such as the social commitment of universities and education’s commitment to sustainability.

» Networking projects

GUNi reinforces and expands its network by encouraging the dynamic involvement of a wide range of actors in higher education in its activities. It fosters cooperation between them and promotes debate and the creation and exchange of knowledge on higher education worldwide through both on-site and online activities. The website and the monthly newsletter are cornerstones of the accomplishment of this objective, along with GUNi’s participation in different European projects funded in the framework of Horizon 2020.

» International Summer School on Higher Education and Research Leadership

In June, GUNi promotes a variety of activities in Barcelona. The aim of the International Summer School on Higher Education and Research Leadership is sharing the common factor of fostering the policies and management of higher education and research on an international scale. The International Summer School, promoted by the GUNi in partnership with different Catalan and international institutions, aims to become an annual meeting point for anyone with an interest in the world of higher education in its broadest sense: not just university institutions and their managerial boards, but also governments and public agencies, stakeholders and international institutions.
UNESCO’S INTRODUCTION

The role of Higher Education Institutions today

P. J. Wells
Chief, Higher Education, UNESCO

Perhaps never before in recent history has the role of higher education been so intricately tied to the economic, social and environmental fabric of the modern world. The demands from all stakeholders for quality, robust and diverse systems of higher education to take an active responsibility in addressing the challenges of the world's pressing issues is likewise unprecedented. This pressure for global engagement emanates from an equally diverse group of stakeholders: from policymakers, students, parents, academics, social and environmental groups, to lobbyists, inter-governmental, regional and national bodies.

As the world in which we live has become increasingly complex and the challenges we face become more interconnected, so has the need for harnessing collective responses to complex solutions – solutions that affect and connect us individually, nationally, regionally and globally. The seventeen Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) adopted at the United Nations in New York in 2015 clearly set out an agenda to address these complexities. The enormity of the tasks ahead faced by all UN member states is unparalleled, with commitments to realize sustainability policies for human development, natural resource protection, peace and security, cultural and education resources. From safe drinking water, to universal healthcare, and reducing the effects of climate change, to establishing universal access to quality education, the demands are immense and all encompassing.

The need for higher education institutions (HEIs) to rise to these challenges through innovative study programmes and creative, collaborative research agendas is now paramount. The role of HEIs in developing the critical thinking needed in young minds and researchers to find solutions to the problems facing our world can no longer be undertaken in isolation, but must be approached in ways that cross both institutional and disciplinary boundaries as well as regional and international parameters. Scientific research addressing measures to reduce, for example, climate change needs to be accompanied by social science programmes that embed Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR) into entrepreneurialism education which can then cascade into responsible enterprise practices; global citizenship education must educate individuals to take personal responsibility for actions to reduce their impact on the planet's ecosystems and natural resources; teacher education programmes must equip the next generation(s) of educators to teach social responsibility to learners from an early age; and HEIs must provide the Continuing Professional Development (CPD) and lifelong-learning opportunities to up-skill and re-skill professionals – be they educators, policymakers, entrepreneurs or public sector workers – to take a collective stance to protect the world’s resources and support global development issues.

Similarly, research aimed at eradicating endemic diseases that paralyse the world’s poorest communities must be accompanied by education programmes that teach healthy lifestyles and safe practices for personal wellbeing; the world's tangible and intangible heritage can only be preserved by developing new conservation techniques accompanied by policies and practices that can ensure the sustainability of the world's most at-risk cultural markers. Higher education institutions, their programmes and researchers...
are best placed to lead the world in the international pursuit of this aim.

The massification of and increasing access to higher education for previously underrepresented groups has created a unique opportunity to tap into the creative and innovative solutions the world now needs. This more inclusive and diverse approach to addressing the critical issues of our time has created not only the potential for greater engagement with millions more would-be agents of change, but also a greater sense of a shared responsibility for the future world we want to live in and to leave for successive generations.

The globalization and internationalization of the university creates an unrivalled invitation for learners, scholars and researchers to pool their collective creativity, knowledge and experiences for change. The growing number of networks of higher education institutions and collaborative research projects has proven to be the cornerstone for accelerating the move from fact finding to solution building. This, the sixth edition of *Higher Education in the World – Towards a Socially Responsible University – Balancing the global with the local*, is a timely reminder of the need for the higher education sector to not only engage in the traditional pillars of higher learning and research but to do so in a way that is both reflective of, and responsive to, the present realities of today’s world challenges as communicated in the Education 2030 Agenda and each of the seventeen SDGs.

As part of the growing family of UNESCO Chairs and the UNITWIN programme, the GUNi network is a testament to the power of collective thinking for realizing the future we need and the future we want. Now in its 17th year, UNESCO applauds the dedication and visionary leadership of the GUNi Network members in pioneering a new era of the *Glocal university*: that is, higher education institutions and systems that strive to address the demands of the local community within the context of an ever expanding global reality for the good of all humanity.
GLOBAL UNIVERSITY NETWORK FOR INNOVATION

UNU'S INTRODUCTION

Harnessing Research for Social Responsibility

David M. Malone
Rector, United Nations University
United Nations Under-Secretary-General

The United Nations University’s vision of promoting social responsibility in higher education, both locally and globally, is reflected in its three main functions which are to act as: (a) an interdisciplinary research institution that focuses on pressing global problems of human survival, development and welfare; (b) a think-tank tasked with translating research outputs into policy-relevant recommendations for the UN system and UN Member States; and, (c) a postgraduate training and capacity-development organization, with a particular focus on building capacities in developing countries.

For over forty years, the university has been committed to promoting the growth of vigorous academic and scientific communities in the Global North and South, often serving as a bridge between the two. While the 2030 Sustainable Development agenda will certainly help focus the efforts of governments on bringing about meaningful development outcomes, the success of those efforts will rely in large part on the willingness of governments and academic institutions to accept solutions emerging from a broader group of development thinkers. Increasingly, these thinkers hail from dynamic higher education institutions in the Global South.

Policy solutions that draw on developing thinking from the Global South are a hallmark of the United Nations University (UNU) and distinguish it from other actors in the field. As of 2015, just over 50 per cent of the university’s research was conducted primarily in developing countries. While this work is carried out by a global workforce, 42 per cent of UNU personnel are developing country nationals. In Ghana, the United Nations University Institute for Natural Resources in Africa (UNU-INRA) collaborates with the Africa Climate Policy Centre (ACPC) of the United Nations Economic Commission for Africa (UNECA) on studying how climate change will affect agriculture, trade and food security in the Economic Community of West African States (ECOWAS) region. In Mozambique, the United Nations University World Institute for Development Economics Research (UNU-WIDER) collaborates with the Ministry of Economics and Finance and the University Eduardo Mondlane in addressing development challenges. It has supported efforts to build local data collection and analysis capacities which will facilitate policymaking and eventually help monitor the country’s progress towards the 2030 Sustainable Development Goals.

UNU’s capacity-building programmes and other academic exchanges further stimulate and facilitate international academic cooperation and seek the broadest possible participation of young scholars, women and students from developing countries. More than half of the UNU’s research projects undertaken in 2015 incorporated a capacity-development component.

These capacity-development activities extend beyond the provision of academic training courses. Through the concept of ‘integrated capacity development’, UNU has sought to make training an integral part of its research projects and policy studies. Indeed, in recent years, UNU has redoubled its efforts to connect young leaders from the Global South to policy-communities abroad so that they might exchange ideas with new scientific peers and policy leaders in their field, returning to their communities with enriched research experiences. This has been the case for young
scholars that have participated in the United Nations University International Courses held in Tokyo, Japan, but also through fellowship programmes such as that of the Iceland-based United Nations University Geothermal Programme, which boasts close to 121 former fellows from developing countries.

The university’s promotion of social responsibility can also be glimpsed in its thematic orientation. Rather than pursuing the advancement of knowledge in independent disciplinary silos, UNU’s network of research institutes and programmes set out to address specific social or development challenges. When these efforts come together, the results are notable. This is perhaps best exemplified in the area of migration, where the UNU Migration Network has brought together research expertise on migration in the interrelated areas of migration and development, migration and the environment, forced migration, migration and culture, migration and health, as well as migration, governance and policy.

The United Nations University occupies a unique position in the constellation of higher education institutions – its mission and purpose are rooted in the very idea of social responsibility. Looking forward, the university will continue to strive to build more inclusive academic communities and serve as a vector between academic forums and policymaking ones, in the hope that these will serve as catalysts for innovative thinking on issues of global importance.
Catalan Association of Public Universities’ Introduction

Sergi Bonet
GUNi President

The Global University Network for Innovation (GUNi) is an international network created in 1999 by UNESCO, the United Nations University (UNU) and the Universitat Politècnica de Catalunya-Barcelona Tech (UPC). The GUNi presidency and secretariat has been held by the Catalan Association of Public Universities (ACUP) since 2015.

GUNi was founded shortly after the first UNESCO World Conference on Higher Education (WCHE) and played a significant role in the second UNESCO World Conference on Higher Education, following its mandate for further reflection and action frameworks to facilitate the exchange of value between higher education and society.

GUNi’s mission is to strengthen the role of higher education in society and contribute to a renewal of the visions, missions and policies of higher education across the world from the perspective of public service, relevance and social responsibility.

Higher Education in the World is a collective work published as part of the GUNi series on the social commitment of universities. It is the result of global and regional analysis, with a specific subject chosen for each edition. The report reflects on key issues and challenges that higher education faces in the twenty-first century.

The new edition analyses the dual responsibilities of universities at local and global levels. It explores the potential conflicts and intrinsic difficulties in addressing both the local demands of society based on the race for global competitiveness, and local and global demands to contribute to a more equitable and sustainable society on all levels.

Universities have always been key institutions for social development. Today, in the context of an increasingly knowledge-based society and economy, their role is strengthened and extended: universities have become critical to the social, economic, cultural and technological development of societies. At the same time, they have become key institutions that can meet the global challenges facing humanity and the planet, which are described in the UN Sustainable Development Goals 2030. Through their main missions (training, scientific research, knowledge transfer and social commitment), universities at the start of the twenty-first century are dedicated to building more prosperous, fair societies with a greater emphasis on responsible, critical knowledge. It is from this perspective that GUNi shall continue to act, forming partnerships worldwide to promote reflection on higher education and the advancement of societies in a global context.
About the report

The Global University Network for Innovation presents the 6th Higher Education in the World (HEIW) Report, entitled 'Towards a Socially Responsible University: Balancing the Global with the Local' in an online fully open-access version, together with a synthesis in paper format.

For the first time, the HEIW Report offers fully open access. The five former editions presented 30% of the content in open access format, while access to the whole report was only available in the paid version. With this new format, GUNi aims to make the report content available for everybody, regardless of economic reach. Making the entire edition available for free online will allow everyone interested to consult it. It will become a useful tool for anyone interested in the interrelated topics of socially responsible universities and local and global demands and impact. First and foremost, GUNi’s goals are to facilitate the exchange of ideas, to feed debate and to disseminate expert insights into the chosen topic. Thus, GUNi is proud to be able to deliver, for the first time, the complete document in a fully open-access online edition.

Alongside this accomplishment, GUNi is publishing an HEIW 6 Report synthesis in paper edition. This edition comprises a selection of the authors’ most relevant ideas included in the report. It is a concise introduction that highlights the main themes of the report and gives a broad overview of policies and how to improve them and the most important paths to follow in the near future. The synthesis is also a taste of the deeper and wider content available in the full report. Most of the material in this publication has been written specifically for this version. The synthesis is designed to be a tool for policymakers.
1. Editors' Introduction

Towards a Socially Responsible Higher Education Institution: Balancing the Global with the Local

Francesc Xavier Grau, Cristina Escrigas, John Goddard, Budd Hall, Ellen Hazelkorn and Rajesh Tandon

Introduction

Higher Education in the World is a collective work published as part of the GUNi Series on the social commitment of universities. The present document frames the 6th Higher Education in the World Report (HEIW6) around a comprehensive analysis of the global and local engagement of higher education institutions (HEIs).

Towards a Socially Responsible Higher Education Institution: Balancing the Global with the Local aims to analyse the dual responsibilities of universities at local and global level, exploring the potential conflicts, and intrinsic difficulties, in addressing both the local demands of society based on the race for global competitiveness and the local and global demands to contribute to a more equitable and sustainable society (at local and global levels).
Background

Clearly, the old economic model is breaking down. In too many places, growth has stalled. Jobs are lagging. Gaps are growing between rich and poor, and we see alarming scarcities of food, fuel and the natural resources on which civilization depends. [...] Slowly, we have come to realize that we have entered a new era. Some even call it a new geological epoch, where human activity is fundamentally altering the Earth's dynamics.

We recognize that we cannot continue to burn and consume our way to prosperity. Yet we have not embraced the obvious solution – the only possible solution [...]: to set a new course towards a future that balances the economic, social and environmental dimensions of prosperity and human wellbeing.

To secure our world for future generations we need [...] a transformative agenda for change – to set in motion a conceptual revolution in how we think about creating dynamic yet sustainable growth for the 21st century.


All regions and countries can benefit from progress towards a knowledge-based economy, which does not depend heavily on material resources, places less of a burden on ecosystems and is more sustainable than other economic models. By shifting to a knowledge-based economy, societies can move from the age of scarcity to the age of abundance. Knowledge does not deplete with use but rather increases as it is shared among people. Through technological innovation, we can help usher in a more sustainable future.

To generate progress, countries must invest in education, science and technology. I hope that your Conference will explore ways to set the stage for leveraging the value of the knowledge-based economy to promote development in Saudi Arabia, across the region and around the world.


These two statements come from the same high dignitary, the one with the highest level of global responsibilities, but one could find many similar sentiments expressed by government, business and community leaders from around the world. These declarations have been chosen to represent global and local approaches to the challenges of individual societies and the world at large. These two approaches are interconnected and synergistic; Ban Ki-moon is not sending contradictory messages. However, the resulting action, if driven from only one of these perspectives, could, in fact, lead to results that are at odds with the overall objectives.

HEIs can be identified as key players from both perspectives and, thus, **have the singular responsibility of helping to provide appropriate and adequate responses to both legitimate needs and interests:** i) to contribute to overcoming the global challenges of the world, which are very well summarized by the UN Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs), and ii) to contribute to the social, cultural and economic development and international competitiveness of their societies. This duality is the focus of the present report, HEIW6.
Institutions and higher education systems are exploring, somewhat cautiously, the concepts of global and local, of impact and engagement, of social innovation and responsible research and innovation. This reaction arises from different interpretations of what is being asked of higher education, as well as diverse understandings about the ways in which HEIs can and should respond to the changed environment. Context is important, as differences arise about what the concepts mean and their implications.

For instance, a group of top-ranked universities, sometimes called ‘world-class’ universities, have attempted to define ‘The Ten Characteristics of Contemporary Research Universities’. The Hefei statement (October 2013) was drafted by the American Association of Universities (AAU), the European League of Research Universities (LERU), the Group of Eight and Chinese 9 Universities, drawing on their own experience and position in the global rankings. Other highly ranked universities gathered together in Vienna to identify themselves as ‘global universities’, concerned about their regional impact.

At the same time, other HEI associations and networks around the globe have taken up this theme, but in a more inclusive way, organizing seminars, conferences and campaigns, for example: on the Post-2015 Agenda and the role of universities (The Association of Commonwealth Universities 2014 campaign – The world beyond 2015: is higher education ready?); on social innovation (International Association of Universities 6th Global Meeting of Associations, Montreal, May 2015 – Social innovation: challenges and perspectives for higher education); on the civic roles and social responsibilities of higher education (GUNi2013 Conference: ‘Let’s build transformative knowledge to drive social change’, or 2014 Talloires Network Leaders Conference, and the subsequent Call to Action); on regional engagement and doctoral education (European Association of Universities, Council for Doctoral Education Workshop, January 2015); and on regional competitiveness and the role of European universities (international seminar organized by ACUP-GUNi in Barcelona).

Responding to these different developments, HEIW6 discusses these tensions, and re-interrogates the characteristics of the contemporary HEI. What accounts for the changing role of the university, the increasing demands on and for higher education, and the processes of massification and globalization? To what extent is the experience of so-called world-class universities casting a shadow internationally on higher education, with positive and perverse implications? To what extent are the demands that higher education acts as the engine of the economy and of social change also reshaping higher education? How are these different aspects reconciled, and/or are they resolvable?

Finding sustainable solutions to the problems of health and demographic change, food security, secure and clean water, green and efficient energy sources, climate change, and inclusive and secure communities requires the active participation of everyone. Global societal challenges have both a local and a global dimension. Although they have had a strong impact in the so-called Global South, global challenges have also had local impact, even in developed countries. Yet it is developed countries that have mostly caused the current impacts on the environment. Moreover, the transition and sustainability of the green economy is a collective matter, based on new perceptions and practices.
of production and consumption worldwide. This is the meaning of globality, where global forces and trends are reflected in local realities, and local activity conforms to a global interconnected picture that affects the entire world. The nature of globalization is a confluence of economic, ecological, cultural and social forces that manifest themselves differently in different localities. Every HEI, as with all other institutions, exists both in locally specific cultural, political and organizational contexts and is simultaneously affected by global forces. This impact and growing global consciousness gives rise to a consistent demand for a balanced approach to engagement with the world outside of higher education that is both locally relevant and globally responsive. The dilemma for HEIs is to find a balance between, on the one hand, local realities and aspirations understood within a global context and calling for a different role for HEIs, and on the other, the strong demands that come from political and economic actors seeking to increase their own regional/national global competitiveness.

Thus, the main premise for HEIW6 can be broken down into three main elements.

First, there is a need to find a balance in the context of a renewed social contract between HEIs and their respective societies, taking into account the dual nature of local and global engagement, and the balance across short-, medium- and longer-term impacts and benefits. While higher education has multiple roles in society (e.g. educating people, producing codified knowledge, problem-solving and providing public space), its greatest contribution is ‘replenishing the intellectual pool every year with new graduate students’.1

Second, HEIs are a space of multiple and sometimes conflicting demands from the broader community and civil society, from political jurisdictions and policymakers, from students, from academic staff and from market interests. As a sector, higher education faces the challenge of establishing a renewed and revitalized strategic framework, taking into account this diversity within the context of the global public good as defined by the UN. In fact, globalization has strongly emphasized the strategic positioning of HEIs to enhance the competitiveness of nations and regions, an objective that leads to direct pressure from many universities’ stakeholders, while global responsibility is raised only lightly in international forums and global institutions, such as the UN and its institutions, which have little direct influence.

The third component of the premise is that the natural focus of action of HEIs in response to local demands – to contribute to the competitiveness strategy of nations/regions – can lead to a winners-and-losers scenario (zero-sum competitive game), with the possibility of a somewhat negative impact on global issues. HEIs with a clear vision of their local and global engagement can make this potential conflict explicit and work with external partners to seek to resolve it. The way forward will be found through an integrated vision of the future of all humanity, both locally and elsewhere, and not limiting engagement to contributions to economic growth as the major goal of HEIs.

Under these propositions, HEIW6 explores tensions and experiences, challenges and opportunities, limitations and restrictions, and analyses the key elements that enable HEIs to adequately fulfil their

---

1 Gordon Moore, Chairman Emeritus, Intel
local and global public good responsibilities. This involves the identification of relatively independent principal components (decomposition of the issue into a set of themes), and their analysis from complementary global and local perspectives by more than 30 experts from around the world. This complementarity and search for compatibility constitutes one of the main characteristics of HEIW6. In their contributions, the experts also bring a corresponding set of good practices that help to establish the final HEIW6 recommendations.

HEIW6 focuses on providing practical examples of structures and processes so that higher education leaders and the wider academy, policymakers and decision-takers, and societal stakeholders will support a process of organizational development in a manner that enables HEIs to better respond to the various challenges and expectations relating to this dual level of engagement from a policy and institutional perspective. The final objective is to provide a comprehensive analysis of the characteristics of this global and local engagement, and to produce a set of recommendations to strengthen the contribution of HEIs and systems to both local and global demands and requirements. To do so, the duality has been decomposed and analysed from different perspectives and by different actors, to identify the challenges to be overcome and the mechanisms by which this can be achieved.

The specific aims of HEIW6 are:

a) To explore the potential conflict, or intrinsic challenges, both in addressing societal demands based on the race for global competitiveness and in contributing to a more equitable and sustainable society at local and global level;

b) To analyse the dual responsibilities of HEIs at local and global level and how to serve and deal with both at the same time.

Moreover, it:

c) Reflects on how glocal engagement should be included in teaching, learning, research and institutional activities, governance and leadership;

d) Describes and analyses the current concept of university social engagement and social responsibility at both levels – global and regional;

e) Identifies how the different social actors are involved in glocal engagement practices, and how they interact with HEIs;

f) Illustrates how HEIs have linked with society at local and global levels, identifying and presenting the different experiences, mechanisms and structures, and best practices on glocal engagement from around the world;
g) **Provides recommendations** on how HEIs and systems could successfully sustain this dual level of engagement in practice;

h) **Proposes steps for advancing the contribution** of higher education to achieve effective and compatible local and global engagement, helping to advance societies and building a more just, equitable and sustainable society.

The report is structured into ten chapters, which are described below. Each of these chapters has involved the participation of at least two experts, who have analysed the corresponding topic, identified good practices and made recommendations addressed to policymakers, academic leaders and academia. Each of the articles from the experts is independent and stands on its own, offering a rich panorama of analysis, conclusions and recommendations. The reader is invited to go to these original articles for a deeper analysis of each of the topics.

**THE ORGANIZATION OF HEIW6**

**World Context and Implications for Higher Education Systems and Institutions**

The world and all of its societies are subject to a process of continuous change and have evolved and transformed very quickly in the past few decades into a globalized arena. HEIs and systems are facing one of the most exciting times, since globalization implies the possibility of taking advantage of significant opportunities. Nevertheless, globalization also brings challenges for the future. For instance, there is the challenge of how to serve the common good, in an era when what is 'common' and what is 'good' are difficult to define (Escrigas, 2008).

Debates about challenges in higher education are mostly related to internationalization, access, technologies, autonomy and governance, quality and recognition, funding, new providers and diversification of institutions (in terms of their nature and the forms of provision), among others. In this context, **social responsibility** emerges as the need to reconsider the social relevance of universities in light of the encounter of the local with the global, regarding priorities, demands, impacts and knowledge needs in the context of globalization. The competitiveness of nations – as the only way to achieve progress – should be balanced with inclusive social development and sustainability of the entire global population. Given the criticality of knowledge-intensive economic growth, globalization has been a driving force, but so has the national pursuit for a greater share of the global market. **Higher education plays a key role in shaping national competitiveness.** Today, it is one of the most internationalized sectors.

At the same time, there is an emerging demand regarding the role of knowledge, education and research in overcoming pressing global problems. Despite the fact that these problems are rarely explicit in the urgent daily demands faced by HEIs, they are gaining space as societies and their leaders become aware of the local impact of such global issues as sustainability, climate change and poverty (which affect the Global South more, but which have an increasing impact in the North).
The adoption of the Post-2015 Agenda will generate many new demands that can only be met through cooperative and concerted efforts requiring the commitment and actions of a wide array of local and global actors. In his synthesis report on the Post-2015 Agenda, UN Secretary General Ban Ki-moon explicitly mentions the following needs: new sources and modes of financing, progress indicators and measures, sensitivity to both local circumstances and global targets, an authentic revolution in data, and the mobilization of technology, science and innovation (including a proposed global ‘Technology Bank’ and capacity-building mechanisms). HEIs are explicitly called on to play a role in this context, mainly through teaching and research. What role are HEIs and systems playing in the local and global spheres? Are these roles balanced and/or compatible? Is it possible to serve different levels of global and local needs, given the current structures and institutional dynamics? What are the implications of glocality for teaching/learning and research? Are HEIs aware of the various impacts that their activities generate at different levels? Are HEIs and their communities aware of the UN Global Agenda and its priorities for the near future? Are they aware of how this Global Agenda would require changes in current roles and institutional dynamics? Is there anything HEIs could do in this regard?

1. Changing the Role of Higher Education Institutions in the Light of Globalization; Trends and Challenges

The role of HEIs in today’s world is vast, complex and vital. In contemporary complex societies a wide range of challenges and possibilities are emerging with political, economic and social implications.

The role of HEIs has been seen to change over time, from preservers of culturally revered forms of knowledge, through producers of skilled labour associated with a workforce-planning approach, to a more recent perception as agents of social change and development.

As centres of training and the production as well as transmission of knowledge, HEIs are well positioned to link the local and the global, as well as business and government. This should give institutions considerable access to, and influence over, change processes in many societies, and may enhance their potential to contribute to social transformation. They are therefore called on to play a fundamental role in building society.

What we call society can apply more broadly to a sense of communal responsibility at a local, regional and global level. Today, local needs require local proposals in global frameworks, and global challenges require local solutions that have to be locally acceptable. However, global solutions can come from local levels, and vice versa.

This approach implies redefining multiple and simultaneous spaces that could all be called ‘community’ at multiple levels. This is especially relevant for HEIs, irrespective of where they are located. We must assume that these diverse levels of communities are interdependent and that no real and sustainable solutions to pressing problems will be reached if we do not work on them all simultaneously. Redefining the role of knowledge distribution and creation in this framework is crucial for achieving higher levels of wellbeing worldwide.
2. Reframing the Curriculum for the 21st Century

In this global era, being prepared as a citizen who will interact with society through a professional activity implies a complex vision of reality that demands inter- and trans-disciplinary education. It also implies the need for content, skills and values, such as sustainable development as a collective social process to be learned; a need for common recognition and understanding of, and respect for, different cultures to promote intercultural relationships and support diversity; and a comprehension of global and local dynamics and the ability to interact with them simultaneously in any professional activity.

New approaches to learning based on dialogical, co-learning, participatory and problem-oriented methods are probably required to support these new pedagogical achievements. Disciplinary studies that fail to make connections or links with real-world and real-time challenges and problems appear unlikely to support useful learning in the future. New, critical and reflexive learning systems need to be designed to meet the challenges of the new modernity. Learning by doing is now seen as a vital tool for understanding sustainability, among other emerging concepts.

Higher education is responsible for training professionals such as engineers, doctors and architects, in the course of their careers, to attain positions of great responsibility and power in society. The decisions of professionals trained in universities can make a decisive contribution to the way societies develop. This decision-making can take place through approaches that can be more or less constructive for the global progress of humankind and societies, in both developed and developing countries. Higher education, therefore, plays a decisive and fundamental role in terms of teaching the content, values and skills it incorporates.

It is appropriate to encourage a model that educates global citizens – builders of inclusive, just and fair social systems, with ethical criteria – to enable them to understand reality from a holistic perspective and prepare to act with patterns of trust and collaboration. Higher education should prepare students to gain a critical consciousness of the world they inhabit, and help them to better anticipate, articulate and animate alternative processes to build better societies.

It is important to adopt a knowledge-democracy framework, including drawing on previously excluded knowledge from other sectors, sources and backgrounds. It is also important to explore engaged teaching that emphasizes both experiential learning at the local and international levels and a dramatic broadening of the base of theoretical materials, taking into account intellectual contributions from the entire globe.

Internationalization is probably one of the strongest drivers of change in relation to the curriculum, along with employability issues. There is also an increasing demand for higher education, primarily in developing countries, and a parallel demand for talent everywhere, especially in developed countries.

Nowadays, curricula respond mainly to the need for specialization, but this can and must be compatible with the education of global citizens, who are being educated at the highest level and who thus have the highest responsibility towards society. Ways have to be found in which super-specialization
– the expansion of knowledge that is required today – can coexist in the curriculum with content relating to global citizenship.

Through curricula, higher education should go beyond educating professionals, to educate citizens in ethical awareness and civic commitment, citizens who know how to contribute to the common good through their professional practice. It is educating for glocality, sustainability, democracy, citizenship, intercultural relations, peace building and a deep understanding of social, human and life dynamics.

3. Global Knowledge and Responsible Research

The existence of globally and locally engaged HEIs could imply changes in research activity, both in terms of the content and purposes and in terms of the ways in which the research itself is performed.

At the local level, current demands create pressure for economic growth and socioeconomic development at country and regional level. In the global sphere, there is a call for HEIs to engage with the generation of knowledge related to the pressing global issues described in the SDGs.

The changing role of HEIs is reflected in the re-orientation and (changing) purpose of research. There has been a shift towards research focused on business innovation, and the subsequent adoption of principles of responsible research and innovation (RRI) by the European Union that seek to strengthen community research partnership approaches, structures, methods and more. This is both a response to and a driver of change in the research process and practice towards more open models of innovation.

In November 2014, at an international conference on 'Science, Innovation and Society, Achieving Responsible Research and Innovation', the Rome Declaration on Responsible Research and Innovation (RRI) in Europe defined RRI as 'the ongoing process of aligning research and innovation to the values, needs and expectations of society'. It also stated that 'RRI requires that all stakeholders including civil society are responsive to each other and take shared responsibility for the processes and outcomes of research and innovation'.

Moreover, public investment in science requires a vast social and political constituency sharing the values of science, educated and engaged in its processes, and able to recognize its contributions to knowledge, to society and to economic progress. Responses to local and regional research needs have gained most of the attention in recent decades. Correspondingly, in the past few decades HEIs worldwide have designed structures to foster mostly local research demands, in a process of growing engagement with the local and national productive sector.

However, the need to engage research on pressing global issues is also growing. Linking research agendas to collective challenges such as climate change and sustainability could have a great impact on the shared future and, at the same time, make evident connections between academic activity and the big societal needs. Another challenge for HEIs is to provide other social actors with access
to research. Participative action research and ‘Science Shop’ experiences in universities worldwide could be one direction to follow, along with interdisciplinary research, participatory research, action research and collaborative research initiatives.

Several global initiatives and the emergence of international research networks (for example, The Science and Technology Alliance for Global Sustainability and ‘Future Earth’) make possible interdisciplinary research consortia to co-create knowledge to help overcome these large, pressing problems. At the same time, a more interdisciplinary approach to social problems is emerging at the city level, where it is difficult to separate the economic and social spheres.

4. Institutional Governance, Organization and Management

No matter how diverse HEIs from around the world are, they share common elements: they all have faculty and staff who play a central role, they all have students, and they all have a network of community, political and societal and economic partners. Governance models differ significantly from jurisdiction to jurisdiction. In some cases faculty is a key driver, while in other systems, the balance between internal and external accountabilities differs. In all cases, faculty is the real asset of a university. Students are another important voice; since the Prague Communiqué in 2001, as part of the evolution of the European Higher Education Area (EHEA), ‘students are [considered] full members of the academic community’. Thus, whatever strategic vision and mission the institution adopts, it should involve and be developed by its faculty and students. So, behind it there is essentially a governance and management issue: how faculty assumes, shares and, finally ‘owns’ its institutional mission.

If HEIs and systems have to play a transformative role for society in changing times, they must be able to transform themselves first. Adapting and creating appropriate structures, procedures, recognition systems and governance at all levels is key for addressing new challenges. As mentioned in the background section, there are challenges for HEIs, especially in the way in which they are organized, which can lead to miscommunication within the institution and to conflicting agendas and priorities.

Institutions in a world in transition need governance mechanisms for an effective shared mission that takes into account how to serve both local and global needs and demands, through real engagement at all levels. This contribution is related to, and should address the need for, an explicit shared strategy: shared goals in relation to serving society, and the mechanisms, structures and financing that would be needed to achieve them under real conditions, including embedding engagement with society into teaching and research, rather than treating it as a third and, by definition, inferior mission.

Inclusion of external stakeholders is increasingly essential in the governance of any public institution, including HEIs. Thus, this analysis should include a focus on multi-stakeholder relations and skilful navigation through competing expectations and demands. The contributions to HEIW6, therefore, introduce case studies from institutions that are already leading the way.
What is the role of leadership and management? Are there organizational and structural issues to help develop locally/globally engaged institutions? How can this institutional engagement be made compatible with the preservation and assurance of academic freedom?

5. Glocal Higher Education Institutions’ Engagement and Ethical Implications

Higher education can be focused on training professionals as valued neutral technicians or on educating citizens capable of using their professional skills for the benefit of all society. To move from the former approach to the latter requires a deep sense of citizenship as an active way to contribute to a wide range of collective goals. The need for change is reflected in the Communiqué of the 2009 UNESCO World Conference on Higher Education (UNESCO, 2009):

Higher education institutions [...] should increase their interdisciplinary focus and promote critical thinking and active citizenship. This would contribute to sustainable development, peace, wellbeing and the realization of human rights [...] Higher education must not only give solid skills for the present and future world but must also contribute to the education of ethical citizens committed to the construction of peace, the defence of human rights and the values of democracy.

Can every institution be a force for social, cultural and economic development and revitalization? Even in cases where an entire HEI is unable to focus on the public good, individual researchers, instructors and directors of research institutes can make an impact. Universities should be institutions for the public good, spaces for learning and re-affirming ethics in life and work. Professional education requires learning and practice of ethics. What are the challenges and limitations? What are the keys to success? What is the role of leadership? What is the need for organizational change? In being a driver of economic growth, are there contradictions or conflicts with higher education’s role as a purveyor of knowledge for pressing global problems? To what extent does this role constitute the progressive penetration of the ‘market’ into fields of inquiry (as Slaughter says, ‘academic capitalism’) and the undermining of knowledge as a ‘public good’?

As already highlighted in HEIW5, there is a tacit agreement on what it is relevant to do and to know in order to live, develop and prosper in contemporary societies. Looking at reality, it is relevant to ask: what knowledge do we emphasize in our education systems as the most useful, and useful for what purpose? Are we preparing people to understand and to live in contemporary society? Are we preparing people who are able to use their professional practice to actively participate in the positive transformation of our societies? What ethics and values do we transmit in the current educational processes?

To imagine a different world, we need to consider what knowledge is needed and generated, for what kind of society. Transformative and democratic approaches to knowledge democracy include this analysis of epistemology. We need to go deeper into the ways in which ethics and values should be addressed, recognizing their inherent existence and questioning the idea of an absolute truth, dealing openly with complexity and uncertainty.
Other ethical questions have to focus on the analysis of the implications of the advance of knowledge. On a global scale, only a small percentage of all of the resources invested in science and technology is allocated to the analysis of its ethical, environmental and social implications. A first step is recognizing that science, technology and education are topics of research that require urgent attention, in order to close the gap between scientific production of knowledge and reflections on the impacts of this production (Jassanoff, 2008).

As Jassanoff (2008) points out, technologies clearly incorporate design choices that reflect prior cultural assumptions about what it is desirable or possible to achieve in society. To meet the challenges head on, universities will need to develop a fuller, more historically informed sense of their own institutional missions, not only as incubators for the production of new scientific knowledge and technological know-how, but also as sites of capacity building for social analysis, critical reflection and democratic citizenship.

Proposing individual and collective responsibility in professional decision-making within new global ethical paradigms is a subject on which to reflect. The ethical dimension must be introduced into all disciplines as something inherent to the use of knowledge. This requires that the use of knowledge and the impacts of that knowledge are not separated. Higher education systems are mostly focused on the academic content of a disciplinary approach. Little relevance has been given to the impact of the fragmented comprehension of reality that is inherent in our education system. Today we know that reality is complex, that any phenomenon, problem or situation we live with or create is multi-dimensional. However, we are educating people outside of this understanding, predominantly looking at the profit capacity of their studies.

Another key issue on which to reflect is that globalization imposes a damaging cultural uniformity. The cultivation and dissemination of individual identities and values must be closely linked to the local, regional and national community, in order to prepare citizens who can commit themselves to the world’s problems and who can appreciate and value cultural diversity as a source of enrichment and world heritage.

Regarding the local and global dilemma, according to Delors (1996), ‘people need gradually to become world citizens without losing their roots and while continuing to play an active part in the life of their nation and their local community’. A key dynamic for higher education is the integration of the local and the global in which we are all present. Globalization challenges the current world structures and brings a post-cosmopolitan citizenship (Dobson and Bell, 2006) equipped with a social consciousness (Goldberg, 2009), which will act and participate with its agency, and together with other people, social stakeholders and organizations, in the construction of a new world order by developing partnerships for solving problems and creating things for the appropriate scales and communities.
6. Incentivizing Institutions, Faculty and Students

Adequate governance without adequate recognition systems and structures could fail in its achievements if the shared institutional mission and vision implies changes in current internal dynamics and accepted routines. Recognition systems and structures that are not linked to a shared strategy and goals could fail to guarantee the expected results in terms of social impact. Nevertheless, academic pressures drive academic behaviour. There is a huge amount of literature about the academic profession, and the academy is not an innocent victim, but an active part both in driving changes and in opposing them. Academic tribes create their own rules of engagement that are not necessarily in harmony with the glocal vision.

It has to be recognized that the current selection processes, career promotion, etc., emphasize a particular aspect of the activity of faculty: that of disciplinary research. Without diminishing the importance of disciplinary research in defining the impact of a particular academic, it is important to identify the mechanisms that encourage engaged scholarship, and make it possible for academic activity to have social impact, both locally and globally. Likewise, the curriculum should support and facilitate a philosophy that embeds active engagement as a core principle in learning and research. These mechanisms underpin a distinct institutional mission, strategy and system that allow flexible, multiple ways for individual academics and students to embed social responsibility, in addition to teaching and research activity.

Furthermore, in this report the concept of engagement is understood beyond the limited understandings of a third mission, an outreach mandate, a public engagement function, or an academic enterprise, towards an ‘engaged’ or ‘civic’ university, where the previously separate functions of teaching, research and engagement are transformed in a space capable of innovation, of co-creation of knowledge, of visibility for alternative ways of living, of the development of a deeper trans-disciplinary comprehension of reality and its dynamics, and of support for an inclusive form of active citizenship at both the local and global level (HEIW5, 2014).

This new comprehension of the way that teaching, learning and research could be developed, within a mature view of the concept of engagement, must integrate changes in internal organization, structures, dynamics, incentives and recognition systems that allow academia to advance new ways of developing its core academic mission.

On the other hand, these transformations imply the complicity and probably the full involvement of local, national and supranational structures of higher education governance and policy bodies. Likewise, policies to support these changes are already emerging within the academic world in terms of how to recognize excellence in community-based research (CBR), and engaged scholarship is advancing. As examples, the Community Campus Partnerships for Health network, operating in both the USA and Canada, has produced a kit that offers support for academics wishing to provide evidence of the quality of their CBR when going forward for merit reviews or promotion. The Research Assessment Exercise in the UK now requires scholars to document the ‘impact’ of their research, with the result that innovative practice on how to do that is emerging. New journals, many of them open access, are
emerging within the field of community-university engaged scholarship, and we see this expanding dramatically as the years go by. The **National Co-ordinating Committee for Public Engagement in the UK** is a good example of a national structure that is raising these matters effectively at a national level.

Recent years have seen the emergence of concepts such as engaged scholarship (Boyer, 1990), the engaged university (Watson et al., 2011), Community Based Research (Strand et al., 2003a, 2003b), community-university research partnerships (Hall et al., 2011), public engagement in higher education (NCCPE, 2010), and others. All are related to new considerations of the creation and use of knowledge in society, broadening the idea of its social impact (HEIW5).

Engagement with society necessarily entails struggles for change and transformation altering the current dynamics, structures and power relations. The challenge for HEIs is how to support community-university engagement to ensure a positive internal response for faculty and students.

New approaches to knowledge mobilization and transfer are needed between institutions and their communities at local and global levels. Greater coordination is desirable between governments, civil society, educative institutions and the private sector in order to achieve this transformation (HEIW5). Furthermore, these alliances and partnerships have to be forged with the constellation of social actors, for teaching and research activities, and also linked with technological and social innovation. **This represents a new range of relations at diverse levels, involving diverse actors and for diverse types of intervention**, to better answer current challenges in the creation and dissemination of knowledge. To incentivize and support such initiatives, **HEIs should establish specific structures and mechanisms under new rules**. As has been done in the recent past to foster enterprise engagement, the challenge now is to design interfaces that are multi-faceted in their composition, scope and functions.

### 7. Mutual Learning and Empowering Support: the Role of Networks in Achieving Glocal Engagement

Organizations such as ACUP, GUNi, UNESCO Chairs and Talloires, and national networks such as NCCPE and Community-Based Research Canada, etc., provide support and communications networks to accelerate the pace of change in the engaged higher education sector. Over 5,000 universities in over 100 countries are represented through the existing networks. **How can these networks share, facilitate and mutually support a shared vision of their role with singular and specific manifestations worldwide?** Is this approach an effective one for moving forward changes in HEIs and systems?

As stated in the previous GUNi Report, numerous national, regional, sectorial and global networks have emerged over recent years with an overall objective of building the movement of community-university engagement for the purpose of being better able to contribute to meeting the critical issues of our times. **These networks have several goals: building the institutional capacity for engagement,**
building capacity among community groups, developing knowledge systems, policy development and advocacy, and providing opportunities for collaboration. The constellation of community-university engagement networks provides a kind of circulation system for ideas, good practices, policy language and simply inspiration. However, the coverage of networks is uneven, in terms of both global distribution and sectorial focus (HEIW5, 2014).

Global, regional and national networks are well positioned to facilitate conversations on several key issues, as global engagement of HEIs takes place. Furthermore, it is a moment for broad collaboration among key players. How, then, can the existing and related networks collaborate and pursue common actions? Is this an opportunity to advance? Under which conditions and rules? Are transnational and North-South interchanges interesting in this regard? Which recommendations can be made to these networks to help them to better play their role? Are these common issues to be proposed, or are they specific and not generalizable?

Furthermore, networking could be established among diverse social actors to facilitate a renewed view of the local and global engagement role of HEIs. Several emerging initiatives, such as the European Commission's sponsorship of networks supporting RRI, are examples. National research councils, ministries of higher education, municipal and state or provincial governments, civil society, non-governmental organizations (NGOs), business and industry are all called on to work together in this approach. Do these partnerships have to be local, or can they even be mixed among local and global approaches and realities?

8. Impacts, Multi-faceted Accountabilities and Measurements

HEIs foster transformations in the local and the global community, and often these changes imply relevant social impacts at different levels that could and should be measured to gain a better understanding of the changing social role of HEIs in the new global system. In that sense, identifying and measuring the social impacts of universities allows more to be known about the real role of HEIs worldwide. In order to better understand this interchange of value, as well as the nature of commitment with both global and local challenges, it is worth making progress with the identification of indicators and measurement systems of HEIs' global activity impact.

Quality assessment in higher education is a well-established field. In addition, accreditation and ranking systems are well-known and are applied all around the globe to specify the quality and the relevance of HEIs. Nevertheless, it is not easy to evaluate higher education's impact in terms of the deep and transformative results that these institutions provide to society. HEIs’ activity implies multiple, diverse and simultaneous interactions that produce impacts in society that are not always immediate. That is why there has been a preference for measuring the processes and key quantitative variables as a way of approaching impact on society. On the other hand, economic impact and outputs of research activity have traditionally been easy to measure, and are also used as proxies for the impact of HEIs.
However, **impact is today defined under a systemic approach that goes beyond the univariate assessment of indicators**. Moreover, HEIs do not have impact only on their own, especially on social issues, and many interesting works on **collective impact approaches** have recently emerged. These approaches search for the commitment of a group of **key actors from different sectors to a common agenda for solving a specific social problem**. This is aligned with the community-university engagement practices that HEIs are called on to develop for local or global demands.

**9. Resourcing the Change Process, Making a Difference**

It was no accident that the 1st GUNi Report, ‘Higher Education in the World 2006: The financing of universities’, was dedicated to investigating the resources devoted to higher education. There is a huge amount of literature concerning the funding of universities and, as part of this, HEIW 2006 provides a worldwide panorama. However, the situation is somewhat different today. After the global economic and financial crisis, many nations have faced complex financial circumstances that affect all public services, particularly higher education and research.

The decision on priorities and on the allocation of resources, which are always scarce, constitutes the final message and evidence of any policy. To undertake any new policy there is a need to allocate or reallocate resources, regardless of their relative availability. But the economic implications of new change processes are particularly difficult for HEIs in developing countries, which lack internal resources, even sometimes those required to develop national objectives for higher education.

The process of renewal and/or development of HEIs requires more than motivation and competence. It requires basic and even specific resources that allow the change process to be initiated. It entails giving time to senior leadership to work on the renewal process and lead it from the front. It also necessitates that the process of renewal is adequately resourced in order for effective changes to happen.

Hence, innovative and creative ways of mobilizing resources for renewal have to be found. This section of HEIW6 addresses the problems of finding such resources, especially in developing countries. The competition among HEIs for public and private resources can affect their autonomy. This may also be the case for individual professors and their academic freedom. Are resources devoted to increasingly expensive research activities competing with resources devoted to the teaching mission? Economic resources are essential, but are nothing without human capital. How can the process of brain-drain taking place around the world be dealt with?

**Conclusion**

Like many other organizations today, universities are under intense pressure. Many focus merely on survival, and attempt to respond to the massive increase in demand, the decreasing role of the state and the increasing role of the market, the diversification of providers, the multiplicity of funding sources, the challenges of internationalization and cross-border education, the need to internalize processes of quality assurance and how these processes are related to accreditation processes, the emergence
of rankings and their effect on public policies, and so on. This may explain why universities are not as involved as they should be in facing global issues.

The only possible approach is to be fully engaged. Universities need to be key institutions at the regional level. They must seek to contribute to the development of immediate society through teaching, research and knowledge transfer, and involve themselves in establishing regional strategy in conjunction with local authorities, social agents and civic representatives. But they must also aspire to be globally engaged institutions that educate open-minded, critical and aware citizens, and whose research activity helps to define global lines of action leading to a fair and sustainable world. Everything they do matters!

This is precisely what the 6th GUNi Report on Higher Education in the World deals with: the mechanisms that enable universities to have local impact and, simultaneously, to play the leading role in global issues that the global society needs and expects.
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Globalization, Trends and Drivers of Change
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Abstract

For the first time in history, thanks to digital technology, human beings are able to express themselves freely and participate: from passive spectators to actors. They know what is happening on planet Earth as a whole, and are thus becoming world citizens. And, above all, women, the cornerstone of the new era, are able to progressively take part in the decision-making process.

In this context, universities will not only efficiently contribute to being, to knowing, to doing, to living all together and to undertaking, but they will also be at the forefront of the general mobilization needed to pave the way for the transition from a culture of force to a culture of word. In order to develop exclusively human capacities (thinking, imagining, discovering, anticipating, innovating...) the philosophical, humanist and artistic dimensions of higher education are crucial, while always bearing in mind the need for a dignified life (food, water, health) and sustainable development for all.

To face the main challenges of our times – social inequality, extreme poverty, environmental deterioration, immigration, global citizenship – and make the transition from a culture of war to a culture of peace feasible, the world needs higher education of excellence that makes human beings free and responsible in order to reverse present trends. This article points out the main characteristics of globalization and the drivers of change that will have a global impact on society and higher education in the years to come.
Introductory remarks: the future is to be invented

Each human being is unique and capable of creativity. This is the great hope for humanity. Until recently, individuals were seen merely as specks in the trajectory of a mankind dominated by absolute masculine power, in which people were invisible, anonymous, silent, fearful, submissive... But now, for the first time in history, humankind has a global conscience, is able to contemplate planet Earth as a whole, in all of its dimensions, and has realized that the future is yet to be written.

Confined both territorially and intellectually, the world’s inhabitants have always lived and died in extremely limited spaces. And they have lived in fear, without referents, without the capacity for comparison.

The first phrase in the UN Charter, written in 1945, was extremely lucid in articulating, then and today, the synthesis of how to face the most pressing challenges: ‘We the Peoples’. It does not mention states or governments, but rather ‘Peoples’ – peoples who have decided to ‘save the succeeding generations from the scourge of war’. This means that they assume that supreme commitment – so often evoked by President Nelson Mandela – to future generations. It is the duty of each generation to take the next one into account. And, once and for all, to enable peace to prevail over war, and words to prevail over force. From the beginning of time, national powers have always followed that perverse adage: ‘If you want peace, prepare for war’. And thus, at the end of World War I the Republican Party prevented the United States from joining the League of Nations which President Wilson had created to implement his ‘Covenant for Permanent Peace’.

To enable peace to prevail over war, and words to prevail over force.

President Roosevelt’s magnificent plan at the end of World War II placed ‘the Peoples’ at the forefront of history. Moreover, the Constitution of UNESCO, as the United Nations’ intellectual institution, proclaimed that an educated people must be free and responsible, and that they should be guided by the democratic principles of justice, equality and intellectual and moral solidarity. But these ideals, as well as those of the free flow of ideas by word and image were all too soon ignored and forgotten by the great powers, which invariably had security as their supreme concern.

Three years later, in 1948, the Universal Declaration of Human Rights was adopted by the United Nations General Assembly, asking all member states ‘to publicize the text of the Declaration and to cause it to be disseminated, displayed, read and expounded principally in schools and other educational institutions, without distinction based on the political status of countries or territories’. The Preamble reads:

Whereas recognition of the inherent dignity and of the ‘equal and inalienable rights of all members of the human family’ is the foundation of justice and peace in the world... the advent of a world in which human
beings shall enjoy freedom of speech and belief and ‘freedom from fear and want’ has been proclaimed as the highest aspiration of the common people...

In its article 26 the Declaration states that ‘higher education shall be equally accessible to all on the basis of merit’. The reference at this point is to adult citizens, and obligatory or compulsory provisions are excluded. The basis is merit, with respect to all members of the academic community, both professors and students – the merit, dedication, effort and imagination required in order to be fully ‘free and responsible’.

The second paragraph of Article 26 reads:

Education shall be directed to the ‘full development of the human personality and to the strengthening of respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms’. It shall promote understanding, tolerance and friendship among all nations, racial or religious groups, and shall further the activities of the United Nations for the maintenance of peace.

The excerpts from the Universal Declaration quoted above are especially pertinent at this time when it is quite possible to find rather biased definitions being offered by institutions that specialize in other areas, such as economics, and which should not be interfering in education to promote their own interests.

In the late 1940s and early 1950s the buzzwords were 'sharing' and 'international cooperation'. Sharing what we have with others and distributing wealth appropriately were the essence of those 'democratic principles' that had to be observed in order to put an end to an era of absolute power. 'Union makes strength', and it was necessary for all countries to unite (United Nations) to achieve the overall and proportional development that would enable peaceful coexistence at the national and international levels. I recall incessant deliberations about the nature of 'development': it should be integral, that is, not limited to merely economic aspects but instead, and most importantly, include social and cultural factors; it should be endogenous; it should be sustainable, according to the definition put forward by the committee chaired by Gro Harlem Brundtland; and in the late 1980s – at the behest of UNICEF’s Assistant Administrator, Richard Jolly – development should above all be human (Development with a Human Face).

There are some other crucial references to be taken into account: in December 1993 after a very important meeting held in Montreal, Canada, the World Plan of Action on Education for Human Rights and Democracy¹ was adopted. I would like to emphasize to whom it was addressed:

The World Plan of Action is addressed, among others, to:

individuals, families, groups and communities, educators, teaching institutions and their boards, students, young people, the media, employers and unions, popular movements, political parties, parliamentarians, public officials, national and international non-governmental organizations, all multilateral and intergovernmental organizations, the United Nations Organization, in particular its Centre for Human Rights, specialized institutions of the United Nations System, in particular UNESCO, and States.

¹ http://www.unesco.org/webworld/peace_library/UNESCO/HRIGHTS/342-353.HTM
Two years later the World Summit on Social Development was held in Copenhagen to celebrate the 50th anniversary of the United Nations, together with the summit in Beijing on ‘Women and Development’² and the ‘Declaration of Tolerance’³ by the General Conference of UNESCO. Approval and implementation of the eight commitments should have been widespread, but, regrettfully, this was not the case in a neoliberal context.

Particularly relevant is the Declaration and Programme of Action on a Culture of Peace adopted by the General Assembly of the United Nations in September 1999.⁴ Its article 1 states that:

A culture of peace is a set of values, attitudes, traditions and modes of behaviour and ways of life based, among others, on:

» Respect for life, ending of violence and promotion and practice of non-violence through education, dialogue and cooperation;

» Full respect for and promotion of all human rights and fundamental freedoms;

» Commitment to peaceful settlement of conflicts;

» Efforts to meet the developmental and environmental needs of present and future generations;

» Respect for and promotion of the right to development;

» Respect for and promotion of equal rights and opportunities for women and men;

» Respect for and promotion of the rights of everyone to freedom of expression, opinion and information;

» Adherence to the principles of freedom, justice, democracy, tolerance, solidarity, cooperation, pluralism, cultural diversity, dialogue and understanding at all levels of society and among nations...

In order to put these aims into practice, the measures to be adopted in regard to such matters as education, development, freedom of expression and gender equality are provided in the programme. The ‘new beginning’ as proclaimed in the Earth Charter⁵ would be the transition from a culture of oppression, violence and war to a culture of encounter, dialogue, conciliation and peace. ‘The transition from force to words’ is the main goal of humanity at present. Such immense funding is devoted to military expenditure and armament when the majority of humanity is living in extreme poverty.

² http://www.un.org/womenwatch/daw/beijing/fwcwn.html
⁴ http://www.un-documents.net/a53r243a.htm
⁵ http://www.unesco.org/education/tlsf/mods/theme_a/img/02_earthcharter.pdf
I would also like to mention the Alliance of Civilizations UN Programme. The report of the High Level Group was presented to the UN Secretary General on 13 November 2006. Its main fields of action are in education, youth, migration and media.

Here again, the importance and urgency of using these highly relevant documents as guidance for everyday behaviour is clear. Also crucial is the inspirational role of the scientists, political leaders, philosophers, teachers and others who have provided timely warnings for humanity and guidance for action. Taking just the 20th century into account, some particularly relevant figures include Wilson, Roosevelt, Kennedy ('There is no challenge beyond the reach of the creative capacity of humanity'), Gorbachev and Mandela, among others. The crucial role played by these figures will be highlighted later in this article.

In addition, I consider it important to highlight the intellectual leadership of Aurelio Peccei, the founder of the Club of Rome, which published *The Limits to Growth* (Meadows et al., 1972), following the publication of *The Chasm Ahead* (Peccei, 1969), three years earlier. Peccei was particularly skilled in his ability to foresee the future, advocating a position of permanent watchfulness in order to anticipate and prevent calamity.

Also of note are scientists like Albert Einstein ('only imagination is more important than knowledge'), Bernardo Houssay ('there is no applied science if there is no science to apply'), Hans Krebs ('research is to see what others can see and to think what nobody has thought') and Severo Ochoa ('knowledge to avoid or reduce human suffering'), as well as philosophers such as Edgar Morin, who enlightened us with his wise educational directives (Morin, 1999).

In the early 1990s I commissioned European Community President Jacques Delors to produce the report *Higher Education in the Twenty-first Century*, which was drafted by a committee of prominent professors at all levels, as well as educators, sociologists, artists and philosophers, among others. The report defined the four principal pillars of the educational process: learning to know; learning to do; learning to be; and learning to live together. Among these four, I would like to underscore the principle of 'learning to be'. A century ago Francisco Giner de los Ríos affirmed that 'education is the capacity to sensibly manage one's own life'; indeed, we might say, learning to use the distinctive and infinite powers of the human species: thought, imagination, foresight, creativity. To the Delors Committee's pillars I added 'learning to undertake', since – and I have mentioned this many times – I remember that after a long stay at the Biochemistry Department at Oxford University, whose county coat of arms reads 'Sapere aude' (dare to know), when I returned to Spain I thought that while daring to know, one must also know how to dare, since risk without knowledge is dangerous but knowledge without risk is useless. Learn to dare, learn to undertake, to innovate, remembering those mountaineers who once said, 'we did it because we didn't know it was impossible'.

It is time to reflect and to act accordingly. We must ensure that education is available for all throughout life, while always mindful of the social and physical environment in which it operates.

6 http://www.unaoc.org/
7 http://unesdoc.unesco.org/images/0011/001166/116618m.pdf
Globalization and present trends

At the end of the Cold War, when many important events were taking place – for instance, the end of apartheid, the fall of the Soviet Union, the success of various peace processes – the neoliberalism imposed by the US Republican Party, with the support of UK, led to a system based on market laws, the marginalization of the United Nations System and the weakening of the Nation State. This lack of solidarity on a global level formed the basis of the present social disparities.

In fact, the debates in the UN at the time concerning the nature of development were already being overshadowed by the arms race of the super powers, raising the stakes to stratospheric levels. I recall with horror the ‘star wars’ in which the United States and the Soviet Union were then engaged. ‘Star wars!’, while most of the rest of the world were engaged in ‘star-vation’, as I saw it written in large letters in a New York street. International cooperation became exploitation; subsidies and loans were granted under draconian conditions; the nation state was progressively weakened in favour of large multinational corporations. At the same time it was the educational institutions, research centres and universities that kept the flame of human progress and ethical values alive.

To endow the current inhabitants of the Earth with the strength they require, now that they may finally cease to be invisible or anonymous, and to provide the stimuli to enable them to work tirelessly for equal human dignity and world governance, encompassing all human beings and not only a privileged few, it is essential to keep in mind the episodes that I have experienced or witnessed, either personally or from the perspective of the university: the Ku Klux Klan and racial segregation in the United States; the lack of freedom and excesses of power in the Soviet Union; apartheid in South Africa; the abominable practices of ‘Operation Condor’ in Latin America; the economic and technological colonialism imposed without hesitation in so many countries in Africa; the craving for domination of the Republican Party led by Ronald Reagan and seconded by UK Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher, who replaced the United Nations with groups of plutocrats, and democratic principles with the rules of the marketplace. Although it would appear unthinkable, based solely on their wealth and military power, both leaders intended that a handful of six, seven or eight countries should govern the other more than 180 countries existing at that time. Unthinkable, but true.

However, the unexpected happened. The unexpected is our hope. The unexpected is the best that can be expected of human beings endowed with creativity. Suddenly, a dark-skinned prisoner called Nelson Mandela appeared after 27 years of incarceration without seeking revenge. On the contrary, he emerged with open arms, and, in complicity with another great figure, President Frederik de Klerk, in a few months he ushered in the downfall of apartheid to become the first black president of South Africa, marking the course of a new beginning in that country and in the African continent as a whole.

Also unexpectedly, thanks to Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev’s radical change in the manner of exercising power, and with the symbolic breach of the Berlin Wall, the vast Soviet empire fell, while its members formed the Commonwealth of Independent States and could thus commence their long march towards building regimes based on public liberties and pluralism.
A system that was based on equality, but which had forsaken liberty, had finally fallen. But the alternative, based on liberty but forsaking equality, failed to learn its lesson. Just the opposite, it intensified and imposed rules and standards of conduct on the West in a very peculiar manner.

Nevertheless, in the late 1980s everything pointed to peace. For example, following the end of the Cold War and the racist regime in South Africa, thanks to initiatives supported by UN Secretary General Javier Pérez de Cuellar, in a few years peace finally came to Mozambique with the wise intervention of President Joaquim Chissano and the Community of Saint Egidio; the civil conflict in El Salvador was resolved at Chapultepec; and the peace process was renewed in Guatemala. Indeed, the late 1980s witnessed a popular demand for peace, a demand that was ignored by those who thought that the moment had come to achieve their dreams of dominance.

The West, and particularly Europe, is experiencing the collapse of a system based on an economy of speculation and the delocalization of production – which, above all, has converted China into a huge communist capitalist – and war, whose tragic balance may be summarized by the more than 3 billion dollars that are invested daily in military spending and weapons while at the same time at least 20,000 people die of hunger and neglect, the majority of whom are children under five years of age.

“...But now, with a global conscience, the growing participation of women in decision-making processes and the new digital technologies, it is possible to initiate the great transitions capable of transforming this era of change into a change of era.

However, beyond the confusion gripping Europe, the effects of emerging citizen power are being felt. Latin America, Africa and a few Arab and Asian countries – including India, both qualitatively and quantitatively – are taking a new course and applying original models.

Only twenty years ago it was unimaginable that institutions using socially responsible policies could decisively influence the attitudes and lives of the majority of people. But now, with a global conscience, the growing participation of women in decision-making processes and the new digital technologies, it is possible to initiate the great transitions capable of transforming this era of change into a change of era.

Thanks to digital technology, for the first time in history human beings are able to express themselves freely and participate in events – moving from passive spectators to actors. They are no longer silent, obedient and fearful. They know what is happening on planet Earth as a whole and are becoming world citizens. Above all, women, who form the cornerstone of the new era, are able to progressively take part in decision-making. After a secular male absolute power, every human being, with the distinctive capacity for creativity, will contribute to inventing the future – a future in which humanity will be guided by democratic principles, as enshrined in UNESCO’s Constitution, the only context in which human rights can be fully exercised.
Drivers of change

Citizen participation has always been very weak and the voice of the people, generally barely audible, was neither listened to nor heard. In contrast, today there are many who are capable of making the transition from subjects to citizens, becoming visible, identifiable, bold and unbound. The fundamental mission of universities is to pave the way for this new era, the era of the people.

Higher education means being fully – and at a higher level – free and responsible, as so masterfully defined in Article 1 of the UNESCO Constitution. Free and responsible! This means empowering people who act on their own reflections and not on the dictates of others; who are aware of their rights and obligations; and who fully apply democratic principles at the personal, local, regional and global levels, which is the only context in which human rights may be freely exercised.

During the 1990s, as Director General of UNESCO, I had the opportunity of organizing global conferences on higher education, which provided me with first-hand knowledge of the sector's essential characteristics and those that must be maintained as our principal reference: the values that are common to all universities in the world. This process culminated in the World Conference on Higher Education held in Paris in 1998, the conclusions of which are still entirely applicable as models for the foremost academic institutions at the dawn of this new century and millennium.

It was underscored that ‘it is essential that we all be autonomous, while being interrelated and interactive’, so that universities may play their role as intellectual, academic, scientific and cultural leaders, enabling them to achieve universal recognition and to implement human rights within a genuinely democratic framework.

In effect, universities must tirelessly promote justice, gender equality, sustainability and democracy. The adequate provision of and investment in lifelong higher education that is accessible to all citizens from the age of emancipation is, as it was so lucidly defined in the Declaration of the Regional Conference on Higher Education in Latin America and the Caribbean, ‘an irreplaceable element for social progress, the generation of wealth, the strengthening of cultural identities, social cohesion, the struggle against poverty and hunger, the prevention of climate change and the energy crisis, as well as for fostering a culture of peace’.

Concerning universities as a vital process, point C.6 of the Declaration of the 2008 Regional Conference on Higher Education is quite significant:

Moving towards the goal of generalized, lifelong higher education requires demanding and providing new content for principles of active teaching, according to which learners are individually and collectively the principal protagonists. Active, permanent, and high-level teaching is only possible if it is closely and inno-

---

8 [http://www.unesco.org/education/educprog/wche/declaration_eng.htm](http://www.unesco.org/education/educprog/wche/declaration_eng.htm)
9 [https://www.iau-hesd.net/sites/default/files/documents/declarationcres_ingles.pdf](https://www.iau-hesd.net/sites/default/files/documents/declarationcres_ingles.pdf)
10 Ibid.
Universities must tirelessly promote justice, gender equality, sustainability and democracy.

In order to achieve a socially responsible university, among the major questions to be addressed, I would like to highlight the following:

1. The policies and perspectives of higher education for a socially responsible university.

2. The educational and teaching challenges in training highly-qualified professionals who are committed to society. Universities should demonstrate socially responsible management of the environment, energy and sustainable development.

3. The use of information technologies to support the social mission of universities.

4. Improvement of the training of educational and health professionals as an expression of socially responsible universities.

5. Food security: the responsibility of universities towards society within the contemporary context.

At this point I believe it would be interesting to examine what were considered the great challenges facing higher education 25 years ago and the solutions that were proposed at that time, looking at some of the points that I addressed and the recommendations made at the Europe-Latin America University Conference held in 1987 in Buenos Aires:

- The genuine wealth of a country has its expression in its capacity for creativity, innovation, and in its capacity to respond to challenges both personally and collectively.

- The unwavering reason for the university's existence is to bring culture to all citizens.

- New dimensions and change require an attitude of permanent learning.

- Universities can and must play a fundamental role in providing an accurate analysis of the present and in predicting the future.

- The quality of its teaching staff is the indisputable essence of a university.
If you really believe that higher education institutions are the motors of society on whose actions future progress depends, then new national priorities must be established so that education and science receive the financial and social support that they so urgently need.

With few exceptions, universities have not fulfilled their role as catalysts for social change.

The only requirement for choosing teachers should be their qualifications. And as for students, access to higher education should not be based on their families’ economic standing, but rather on their duly accredited efforts and abilities.

We cannot expect universities to be rebuilt or renewed in a context that is anachronistic and indifferent to any change.

Transformation of our universities can only be achieved with the necessary daring and lucid political, social and economic changes. It is in stimulating and supporting that transformation where universities can play a fundamental role.

Universities must become permanent centres for higher learning, and institutions capable of mobilizing all of their intellectual potential.

If universities lead the never-ending rebellion against ignorance, and if they still have the strength required to implement the previously mentioned transformations, then universities will be the life blood of all educational activities.

Sonia Bahri rightly quoted from the World Conference on Higher Education, UNESCO 2009:11 ‘new dynamics [this was the title of the 2009 WCHE] are transforming’ higher education functions to ‘lead society in generating global knowledge to address global challenges’ and promote ‘critical thinking and active citizenship’ which ‘would contribute to sustainable development, peace, wellbeing and the realization of human rights’. And she added that:

...At both the national and the subregional levels, universities will need to work in synergy and build bridges between the other stakeholders of the public space: policymakers, whose decisions must draw upon research findings, civil society, industry and the media, and not forgetting local populations. This synergy must ensure complementary and sharing for the sake of greater impact.

Yes, higher education is at the forefront of the priorities that scientists must urgently address in close cooperation at the global level.12

---

» Food. Food production using agriculture, aquaculture and biotechnology and the preservation and suitable distribution of food, promoting as far as possible the local raising of crops and livestock are key to development.

» Water. The appropriate use and management of water resources, agriculture adequately supported by technology, water production through desalination, etc. are essential aspects for ensuring the welfare of all of the Earth’s inhabitants.

» Health. This will undoubtedly become the most important field of scientific research in the next few years, given its increasing focus on the individual. Much progress has been made, but, given that each life is a wonder that must be nurtured with the utmost care, in-depth studies are required in such fields as genetics, epigenetics, autoimmune symptomatology and neurological deterioration due to age. All of these are areas that deserve special attention. Prevention is undoubtedly the top priority, but it is very difficult to find popular support for these areas since they are essentially invisible.

» Environment. For the first time mankind is living in an age in which human activity has a global impact. This is called the ‘anthropocene’ age in reference to the fact that today human beings, given the fantastic development of their creative imaginations, are able to modify parameters that not long ago were beyond their reach. It is now vital that specialists in areas such as energy sources, recapturing carbon dioxide and other greenhouse gases and forecasting the effects of the partial melting of polar icecaps (particularly in the Arctic) should focus their research on adopting measures capable of at least containing or lessening the present rate of environmental deterioration.

» The recent Paris Agreement (12/12/15) is a very important step forward that must now be implemented under the supervision and coordination of the UN System. This is a process in which universities and scientific institutions must play a central role, as its success requires intergenerational solidarity.

» Rapid and coordinated action to reduce the impact of natural disasters (wind, water, fire) is another of the measures demanded by the world’s citizens, alarmed by the immense amounts of money devoted to military spending, while the aid needed to rehabilitate areas devastated by earthquakes or tsunamis and to return the victims to normality is always too little and comes too late.

» Education. As is the case with health, water and food, education is a social component of the right to dignity in life – and thus there should be no limitations on access to education at any age. Through learning and studying, human beings are empowered to act on their own reflections, rather than under the influence of ideological or religious dogmas or the dictates of others.

» Peace. In the transition away from a secular culture of war, oppression and violence, the perverse adage ‘if you want peace, prepare for war’, must now be replaced by ‘if you want peace, work to build it each day in your daily lives’. Here again, to achieve a re-founded United Nations and competent world governance, scientists must endeavour to contribute to the development of mechanisms capable of rapidly resolving the inevitable conflicts, using appropriate and modern materials, without threatening life as a whole, as is currently the case with nuclear weapons.
In view of the foregoing, the following recommendations are the great objectives that universities should pursue, using all of their influence and capacity for mobilization, both in the classroom and in cyberspace:

1. A re-founding of the United Nations System, making ‘We, the Peoples’ a reality in a General Assembly – as is already the case in the International Labour Organization, that relic of the League of Nations – in which 50% of the delegates would be representatives from the member countries and 50% from civil society. This would be augmented by a Security Council in which veto rights would be replaced by weighted votes and the addition of an Environmental Council and a Socioeconomic Council.

   This has all been well planned: it is now a matter of ensuring that they (especially the Republican Party in the United States) realize that the time for silence and a passive citizenry in the world is over. It is essential to return to the concept of a ‘United Nations’ so that all of us, together, may achieve the great transformations previously mentioned, with particular emphasis on the ‘power of the word’ to demand equal dignity for all human beings.

2. Nuclear disarmament. It is madness for the world to continue under the sword of Damocles represented by nuclear weapons. No excuses can be made concerning reasons of security since nuclear weapons contradict all the norms of a civilized society. Thus, the use of these weapons must cease immediately. If the great majority of the world’s universities were to demand that we usher in a post-nuclear era in situations of conflict, this would be a giant step towards creating that other world which we all desire.

3. Strengthening genuine democracy is the only context in which it is possible to implement human rights to achieve socially responsible universities in the short term. In this respect, universities should familiarize themselves with and contribute to the project for a Universal Declaration on Democracy,13 drafted with contributions from Karel Vasak, Juan Antonio Carrillo Salcedo, Mario Soares and others who have distinguished themselves for their knowledge in this field. The institutional support of higher education for this document would be particularly important in order to achieve its consideration and approval by the United Nations. In addition to covering ethical, social and cultural factors, this Declaration also includes economic and international aspects.

In terms of organization, there are already multiple associations of higher education institutions at the global and regional levels. But especially now that new digital technologies are bringing us even closer together, despite any physical distance, it would be wonderful if we could collaborate so that higher education institutions become not only places for lifelong learning (especially important given our present rates of longevity), but can also take action to support or reject options that would ultimately and rapidly usher in the previously mentioned transformations, including fulfilling our obligations to future generations, both from a social perspective as well as with respect to protecting the environment. In that regard, it is also interesting to consider the World University Consortium, a proj-

13 http://www.fund-culturadepaz.org/democracia_eng.php
ect of the World Academy of Art and Science\textsuperscript{14} whose members include the International Association of University Presidents and the Inter-Uni-versity Center.

In my opinion, one of the current activities related to the World Academy of Art and Science that is particularly relevant is the \textit{‘new paradigm’, which seeks to formulate alternatives to the present neo-liberal system} and in which the Green Cross Foundation, the Club of Rome and the Culture of Peace Foundation, among others, are now participating.

I emphasize that \textbf{at this moment in time there is the risk of reaching points of no return}, particularly in terms of social and environment issues. This represents an essential concern because certain measures cannot be postponed. For this reason, the following Joint Declaration\textsuperscript{15} has been launched:

\begin{quote}
We, individuals and institutions that are profoundly concerned about the Earth’s present state, particularly by potentially irreversible social and environmental processes, and about the lack of an effective, democratic multilateral entity respected by all that is essential for world governance at this extraordinarily complex and changing time,

\textbf{Urge you}

to adhere to this joint declaration in order to contribute to the rapid adoption of the following measures:

\textbf{Environment}

The current tendencies, resulting from a deplorable economic system based solely on making fast profits, must be urgently reversed to avoid reaching a point of no return. Both President Obama ‘we are the first generation to feel the effect of climate change and the last generation who can do something about it’, – as well as Pope Francis – ‘(…) intergenerational solidarity is not optional, but rather a basic question of justice, since the world we have received also belongs to those who will follow us’, have with wisdom and leadership warned of the immediate actions that must be taken concerning climate change. We must invent the future. The distinctive creative capacity of human beings is our hope. As Amin Maalouf has highlighted, ‘unprecedented situations require unprecedented solutions’.

We live in a crucial moment in the history of mankind in which both population growth and the nature of our activities influence the habitability of the earth (anthropocene).

All other interests must be subordinated to an in-depth understanding of reality. The scientific community, guided by the democratic principles so clearly set forth in the UNESCO Constitution, should counsel political leaders (at the international, regional, national and municipal levels) concerning the actions to be taken, not only in their role as advisors, but also to provide foresight. Knowledge to foresee, foresight to prevent.

It is clear that accurate diagnoses have already been made, but they have not led to what is really important: the right and timely treatment.

\textsuperscript{14} http://www.worldacademy.org/home-demo/index.html
\textsuperscript{15} https://jointdeclaration.wordpress.com/
Communications media and social networks must constantly strive to achieve a resounding outcry, a sense of solidarity and responsibility, adopting personal and collective resolutions at all levels – including radical changes in institutions – capable of halting the current decline before it is too late.

Social inequality and extreme poverty

[As I have already emphasized above,] it is humanly intolerable that each day thousands of people die of hunger and neglect, the majority of them children between the ages of one and five, while at the same time 3 billion dollars are invested in weapons and military spending. This is particularly true when, as is currently the case, funds for sustainable human development have been unduly and wrongfully reduced. The lack of solidarity of the wealthiest towards the poor has reached limits that can no longer be tolerated. For the transition from an anti-ecological economy of speculation, delocalization of production and war to a knowledge-based economy for global, sustainable and human development, and from a culture of imposition, violence and war to a culture of dialogue, conciliation, alliances and peace, we must immediately abolish plutocratic groups (G7, G8, G20) and re-establish ethical values as the basis for our daily behaviour.

Elimination of the nuclear threat and disarmament for development

The nuclear threat continues to pose an unbelievably sinister and ethically untenable danger. Well-regulated disarmament for development would not only guarantee international security, but would also provide the necessary funds for global development and the implementation of the United Nations' priorities (food, water, health, environment, lifelong education for all, scientific research and innovation, and peace).

For these so relevant and urgent reasons

We propose

Calling an extraordinary session of the United Nations General Assembly to adopt the necessary urgent social and environmental measures and, moreover, to establish the guidelines for the re-founding of a democratic multilateral system [as suggested above in the objectives that universities should pursue]...

In view of the poor progress made toward fulfilling the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) and, given the present lack of solidarity, increased social inequality and subordination to the dictates of commercial consortia, no one believes that the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) to be adopted in September will actually be implemented [without the leadership of a multilateral democratic system].

The solution is an inclusive participative democracy in which all aspects of the economy are subordinated to social justice.

Jose Luis Sampedro left a fantastic legacy to young people: ‘You will have to change both ship and course’.
Now ‘the Peoples’ can raise their voices and actively participate. But it is up to the scientific, academic, artistic and intellectual communities to mobilize them, to be at the forefront in the movement towards a better world. As the Earth Charter,\textsuperscript{16} one of the most lucid documents from recent decades, states:

We stand at a critical moment in the Earth’s history, a time when humanity must choose its future. As the world becomes increasingly interdependent and fragile, the future at once holds great peril and great promise. To move forward we must recognize that in the midst of a magnificent diversity of cultures and life forms we are one human family and one Earth community with a common destiny. We must join together to bring forth a sustainable global society founded on respect for nature, universal human rights, economic justice, and a culture of peace...

We must realize that when basic needs have been met, human development is primarily about being more, not having more. We have the knowledge and technology to provide for all and to reduce our impact on the environment. The emergence of a global civil society is creating new opportunities to build a democratic and humane world.

Now that the voice of the people can be heard, we must ensure that everyone understands that implementing human rights benefits all of us equally. It must be universally accepted that accumulating immense fortunes adds nothing to an already comfortable life. I like to repeat a simple observation that I read one day in a small chapel in the south of France: ‘Les linceuls n’ont pas de poches’ (‘funeral shrouds have no pockets’). Whether we are born into wealth or poverty, death is the great equalizer. Thus, it is essential that universities, aware of the emergency the world is facing, become protagonists in the radical changes that cannot be postponed, and achieve now what in 1945 was impossible: cooperation and working together, in a context of democratic principles, towards peaceful coexistence marked by social justice and the conditions inherent in a dignified life for all human beings.

References
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3. The Report in a Nutshell

This paper edition of the HEIW 6 Report is a reduced version of the open content full version available from the GUNi website www.guninet-work.org. In this section the key messages of all the authors of the HEIW 6 Report are presented and organized by main topic of discussion.

Part I. The Context

World Context and Implications For Higher Education Systems And Institutions

Global Pressing Problems and the Sustainable Development Goals

Claudia Neubauer (Germany) and Matthieu Calame (France)

» When calling for another and better world we have to be aware that there are deep political divergences between smooth rhetoric with business as usual and a bit of 'greening', and the call for a radical upheaval in our economic, legal and social systems.

» The special responsibility of higher education institutions (HEIs) lies in the fact that they are preparing future generations of scientists, educators, managers, politicians, philosophers, engineers and artists who we will rely on to build a more socially just world that does not destroy its ecological livelihood. The SDGs should be used as a unique opportunity to reinforce and intensify the sustainability dynamics in HEIs worldwide.

» The basic barrier to effectively eradicating poverty is the fact that the SDGs do not state that the current economic system is unable to fight poverty and hunger since it inherently produces them.
Taking the case of health, in addition to classical approaches to collaboration models, participatory health research can also be a relevant approach.

Action research (or participatory or community-based research), by mingling academic knowledge with local, traditional and professional knowledge, is a powerful tool for finding practical and practicable solutions.

A growing number of economists, ecologists, civil society organizations and local initiatives are criticizing the unlimited growth ideology of the GDP, and are delivering evidence that due to limited natural resources and the limited capacity of natural systems to recover, it will simply be impossible to realize growth over the long term.

Together, dynamics of bottom-up changes thanks to multiple local initiatives that come out of their niches, and dynamics of a profoundly reshaped socioeconomic thinking should contribute to developing a common project of systemic change.

The growth of the consumer society is historically a very young phenomenon, having emerged just a few generations ago. Today, facing its numerous cataclysmic consequences, we must collectively overcome the ideological lock-in situation. Instead of viewing the transition to a more just and safe world as a constraint, we can seize it as an opportunity that should bring benefits to all men and women, even if it requires the richest, who make up an important part of the populations of industrialized nations, to renounce a certain degree of consumption and comfort.

---

**Education: Key to Reaching the Sustainable Development Goals**

*Arab Hoballah (Lebanon), Garrette Clark (USA) and Khairoon Abbas (Tanzania)*

The Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) acknowledge education as critical in addressing global challenges and this theme runs through several goals in addition to SDG4 on education.

Experts say that the SDG Generation needs to make the SDGs a reality and it requires knowledge, skills and competencies and partnerships to do so.

HE systems and institutions can serve local and national governments by proactively ensuring that the SDGs are included in local agendas, proposing changes to education, and conducting research and civic engagement with communities on sustainable development.

Higher education can support policymaking by generating the specialized knowledge needed to create development policies and producing the new leaders needed in this SDG era.

HEIs are indispensible because they build the capacities needed for policy, planning, management, implementation and monitoring of the SDGs at all levels.

In contributing to the SDGs, HE systems and institutions should conduct transversal curricula and research reviews and refinements to ensure mainstreaming of sustainable development issues, and to include new values and practices for economic development that enhance social equity while reducing environmental risks.
» SDG4 on education implies the need for HE systems and institutions to be adaptable, particularly through continuing education (e.g. Massive Open Online Courses) and by becoming more inclusive, open and accessible to all.

» Strengthening cooperation among HEIs is instrumental for a continuous exchange of information, knowledge and approaches to nurture the SDG Generation and establish experience-based models for the institutional strengthening of HEIs.

» HE systems and institutions must be ready to meet the demands of SDG policymaking by providing relevant intellectual guidance, training and capacity-building, developing research and networking opportunities as well as communication and awareness on sustainable development.

» HE systems and institutions can lead the way by reforming and ensuring that their mandates and curricula are well-aligned with sustainable development.

» For maximum results, HE systems and institutions should build stronger networks and partnerships with actors engaged in the SDGs. Existing frameworks such as the Global Action Programme on Education for Sustainable Development and the 10YFP programmes on Sustainable Consumption and Production can support HE systems and institutions.

» SDG implementation requires increasing efficiencies and radical transformations through innovation across institutional levels, including HE systems and institutions.

Juxtaposing Economic Progress With Sustainability in Mind: Issues and way Forward for Universities

Dzul Razak, Chang Da Wan and Morshidi Sirat (Malaysia)

» Humaniversity is a concept grounded in human dignity, knowledge, moderation and wisdom with the aim of a higher purpose for education to nurture the whole person. This concept advocates the role of humanity as the ultimate goal towards sustainability for the benefit of humankind based on ‘a sense of humility and obligation and a genuine commitment to human solidarity and multicultural recognition’ (Campbell, 2015: 168).

» STREAM stands for Science, Technology, Religion (Spirituality), Ethics, Arts and Management (Governance). STREAM is a broader and transdisciplinary concept that provides a more holistic platform for education to address the need for sustainable development focused on the whole person. STREAM is not merely an extension of STEM; the concept advocates a convergence of knowledge to address complex societal issues as compared to the existing conventional silo style curriculum and approaches to education.

» Waqf is a voluntary and irrevocable Islamic endowment concept which is the foundation of free public education. It is managed by an independent Islamic financial institution or Islamic administrative entity with the specific objective of disposition for public good. This financing model has enabled the sustainability of the world’s oldest surviving university (more than 1200 years). Fundamentally, the Waqf concept can be seen as an alternative and more sustainable
model to the existing ways in which higher education institutions are driven by business models under the ambit of neoliberalism, commoditization and marketization.

The Strategic Positioning of Cities in 21st Century Challenges: The Civic University and the City

John Goddard (United Kingdom)

» Universities are quintessential urban institutions and should have relationships with the myriad of other institutions and communities that also inhabit the city, notably businesses and public bodies like local authorities responsible for the place in the round and the wellbeing of its citizens and representatives of civil society.

» Universities should act as 'urban anchor institutions' and a source of stability in local economies, buffering against the worst effects of periodic downturns, particularly in weaker economies.

» Being anchored in a particular location should raise normative questions for the university about the requirement for academic practice to be of relevance to the place in which academics live and work as citizens.

» How the city innovates in the way business is conducted and services are delivered should be key to its future development. The shift from a linear model of research and innovation to a co-production model which highlights the important role of users, service, open and social innovation should influence the way the university operates.

» There is growing public expectation that universities should contribute through responsible research and innovation to the major challenges facing society, such as health, demographic change and wellbeing; smart, green and integrated transport; and inclusive, innovative and secure societies. Each has an explicit or implicit urban dimension.

» According to the European Union ‘there is a need for a new narrative drawing on a broad-based innovation strategy encompassing both technological and non-technological innovation at all levels of European society, and with a stronger focus on the citizen and responsible and sustainable business – a quadruple helix and place-based approach to science, research and innovation.’

» Developing a quadruple helix approach can lead to tensions between the external civic role of the university (the demand side for knowledge and skills) and the internal processes of institutional governance and management (focused on the supply side) and where the latter is heavily influenced by the higher education policy environment which is its principle driver.

» National higher or federal education systems do not usually have an explicit concern with city development. Higher education is now a global business and a key driver for many universities is position in national and international league tables. These are heavily weighted in favour of recognition for research with its very straightforward metrics of scientific excellence reflected in citations. These pay little regard to contributions to civil society where the metrics are much more complex.
In resolving these tensions universities could choose to adopt a new normative model of the civic university that combines what it is good at (scientific excellence) with what it is good for (working with civil society). It would integrate teaching, research and engagement with the outside world so that each enhances the other.

Research would have socioeconomic impact designed in from the start and teaching would have strong involvement with civil society with the long-term objective of widening participation in higher education. Most importantly, there would be a soft, flexible boundary between the institution and society.

Realizing the potential of the civic university will not only depend on what the university does but also on the capacity of its city partners in the public, private and community sectors. Where there is weak city leadership, ineffective partnerships and lack of a shared vision, the university should take a role in the 'leadership of place' and over the long term help other public and private institutions in the city and beyond to build their capacity to absorb knowledge generated within the academy, to co-produce knowledge and articulate knowledge demands.

The aim should be to both anchor the university in the city and the city in the university.
Part II. Global Issues

1. Changing the Role of Higher Education Institutions in the Light of Globalization; Trends and Challenges

Local and Global Engagement: Balancing Needs at Global, National and Local Level

Janna Puukka (Finland)

» The policy context in Europe and worldwide increasingly emphasizes the role of higher education institutions in local development due to their capacity to develop skills, innovation and entrepreneurship.

» The UN, World Bank, European Commission and other groups are calling for universities to play a greater role in resolving global challenges such as poverty, food scarcity, climate change, energy and water security.

» Becoming a locally and globally engaged university can be a challenging journey; higher education institutions are often slow to change and there may be barriers out of their control.

» Traditional solutions, research projects and isolated community projects will not be enough. Higher education institutions need to genuinely engage with the community and develop user-driven and financially sustainable solutions that bring concrete changes that the global community and people need.

» Higher education institutions should reflect on how the engagement can relate to their core missions – teaching, research and service – and how they can address both local and global challenges.

» Local and global engagement can bring higher education institutions new resources, a stronger and more attractive brand and relevant study programmes or research activities, but there are also risks – for instance a dilution of capacity, distraction from the pursuit of other objectives, or ethical issues linked to collaboration.

» While universities should do their duty as institutions that promote peace and understanding, in practice university defence-related research develops weapons which are sold to governments and armed groups across the world.

» Widening higher education opportunities to refugees and migrants is important for global humanitarian reasons and because skilled workers and universities play an important role in rebuilding their home countries after the conflict.

» Reasons for the radicalization of youth with higher education studies in fields such as engineering may lie in frustrated personal aspirations, but also in the ‘culture of disengagement’ of their learning experience.
Investment in frugal innovation and related skills can bring incremental improvements to the lives of the poorest populations and develop entrepreneurial and civic skills at both ends.

An engaged higher education institution is an agile and nimble organization which enables engagement and responds to new needs. It needs new policies to support its new local and global role.

Social Innovation, Universities and the Quest for Social Transformation

*Juan Luis Klein (Chile)*

The Centre de Recherché sur les Innovations Sociales (CRISES) defines social innovation as new social, organizational and institutional arrangements or new products or services with an explicit social mandate that resulted, voluntarily or not, from an action initiated by an individual or a group of individuals to respond to an aspiration, meet a need, bring a solution to a problem or benefit from an opportunity of action to change social relations, transform a framework of action, or propose new cultural orientations.

The question we try to answer is: Can the involvement of universities in social innovation contribute to the development of a new model of society? A paradigm shift is therefore required.

Universities are part of a normative and cognitive framework. They validate institutional governance by establishing the values and myths that render them legitimate.

Universities moreover have a major role in establishing the epistemological framework within which development activities are embedded.

The view that we defend here is that universities, through their bodies of research and knowledge production, can contribute to building a cognitive framework that enables alternatives that already exist, but that are either ignored or discredited, to be recognized.

We have shown the need for an epistemological change that promotes social innovation and social transformation.

In this way, the university can contribute to building a more democratic, fairer society in which the recognition of knowledge is not determined by competitive ends, performance and productivity but by improvement in the quality of the life and work of communities and citizens. This requires continuous attention to new aspirations that emerge in society.

Meeting this challenge – which comprises the challenge facing universities at the dawn of the 21st century – will require a new epistemological outlook that links theory and practice on the one hand and research and education on the other.
2. Reframing the Curriculum for the 21st Century

Preparing Global Citizenry, Implications for the Curriculum

José Juan Moreso and Martí Casadesús (Spain)

» Global citizenship can be considered as a four dimensional ideal: political, ethical, economic and cultural. These dimensions are not isolated, but form an articulated network.

» There is a need to build new global and democratic institutions able to give meaning to our local and constitutive practices.

» Global citizenship can only be enduring if it is established on a basis that respects and honours human rights.

» Competitive markets are blind to issues of distributive justice, such as inequality and poverty, to environmental issues and other questions passed on to future generations.

» There are new opportunities for cross-fertilization processes, to learn from the traditions and values of others and to understand other heritages.

» There is conclusive evidence that shows it is possible to combine the best technological education with an excellent grounding in humanities and social sciences.

» One option for guaranteeing a place for humanities in the curriculum is to introduce a sufficient number of cross-curricular subjects into all undergraduate programmes and make a significant number of them compulsory for all students. The governing bodies of Catalan universities should consider the introduction of these resources and new methodologies in all their programmes.

» An example of a degree course that adopts some of the crucial issues of the 2030 Global Agenda approved by all United Nations members is the Joint Master's Programme in Women, Gender and Citizenship. This master's course provides credit of 90 ECTS, and involves nine universities in Catalonia. The introduction of this kind of joint master's could be promoted by the Catalan government in order to strengthen this crucial function in the Catalan university system.

» There is plenty of room to increase this number because the majority of Catalan university students do not take part in any exchange programmes, and every effort should be made to bring this figure up to 50%.

» The process must be monitored to guarantee success and to measure the advances achieved. Universities and governments should identify obstacles in order to reduce these and succeed in developing global citizens.
Preparing Glocal Citizenry, Implications for the Curriculum

Emmanuel Jean François (USA)

Curriculum reframing must:

» Account for a planetary citizenship, prioritizing quality and sustainable wellbeing over competition for wealth accumulation. In other words, curricula to train graduates in glocal citizenship should include skills, knowledge, attitudes and comprehension linked to outcomes that account for the purposes of internationalization, education for glocal citizenship and sustainable development.

» Acknowledge, challenge and develop paradigm changes to address issues of power, privilege, exclusion/marginalization, oppression and social justice that are still negatively impacting the lives of individuals across national borders.

» Articulate what competencies are required for graduates to be efficient and effective in a glocal community.

» Account for professional development and resources that will equip and empower educators and staff to facilitate the internationalization of curriculum and campus operations for glocal citizenry and sustainable development.

» Describe and map measurable/documentable learning pathways through which students will be educated for glocal citizenship. This will allow measurable/documentable learning attributes to be mapped and linked to specific knowledge, skills, and attitudes, as well as identify learning outcomes to assess graduates' competencies.

» Engage and integrate glocal stakeholders (i.e. employers, activists, policymakers, local leaders, scholars, staff, students and parents) in reframing and implementing teaching and learning for glocal citizenship. Engaging and integrating glocal stakeholders means that they participate in analysing, planning and implementing revised curricula that are adequate for educating graduates who are glocal citizens.

» Include collaborative involvement of internal and external stakeholders in an action plan for evaluation and continuing quality improvement of education for glocal sustainability.

» Develop authentic assessment tools that undergo glocal validation to assess the extent to which graduates master learning attributes related to glocal citizenship.

» Design and model innovative frameworks for employment opportunities that empower graduates to enjoy quality lives while contributing their knowledge and skills to sustainable development.

» Create space to celebrate milestones and key achievements in education for glocal citizenship and sustainable development. This will help develop and nurture learning colleges and universities that account for failures, validated glocal best practices, accountability for student learning, and celebration of the career and leadership achievements of graduates in sectors driving sustainable development in local and global contexts.
Redesigning the Curriculum for the 21st Century

Ahmed Bawa (South Africa)

» Although we are cognizant of the UN's Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) as a recognized framework for human development, higher education still remains an area of great contestation as we search for 21st century meanings for its role in society.

» The first step is to think of institutions as being intensely student-centred and then ask how we might galvanize their resources to optimize the intellectual, social and emotional development of students.

» The second step is to think of universities as being engaged in and geared towards addressing the challenges of local communities, industry, government, non-governmental organizations, etc.

» The curriculum is substantively the way in which institutions of higher learning define themselves and their sociopolitical project.

» Successful access has at its heart the complex matter of epistemic access especially where there has been significant and rapid change in the demographics of student bodies in complex societies with multiple coexisting knowledge systems.

» Linked to the issue of successful access is the idea that graduates should have a fair chance of a fulfilling, gainful life in the economy. This should be a matter of curriculum design from the outset rather than a post-facto management of tensions between the curriculum and the labour market.

» As the composition of the student body becomes more representative of young people from underserved communities, learning through community engagement brings into play the particular strengths of these students, their intricate knowledge of the languages and contexts in which that learning occurs.

» The MOOC phenomenon will help us understand what can and cannot be achieved through technology.

» Much is now known about the use of big data and analytics in improving student success-rates.

» The labour market is likely to change dramatically between now and 2035, with some work categories being transformed or even abolished.

» Successful set designers are likely to be the intellectual convolution of literary experts, architects, engineers, psychologists, artists, etc. What kind of academic system/structure would best support an education at the intersection of knowledge domains?

» Each university must ensure that it has an integrated IT strategy that evokes integrated learning and teaching experiences for students and their teachers.

» National higher education systems must explore the development of 5-10 year social compacts on the role of universities and colleges in societies.
Reimagining the Curriculum for the 21st Century

Hans de Witt and Betty Leask (USA)

Higher education institutions (HEIs) have an important role to play in ensuring a sustainable future for the world, while also meeting their obligations and responsibilities to local communities. Internationalization has the potential to make a meaningful contribution to society by improving the quality of education and life for all. Approaches to internationalization that focus on ‘doing international things’ such as mobility programmes for a minority of students, or solely on profit rather than on internationalized education for all students, are insufficient to achieve these goals.

To ensure universities meet their responsibility to contribute to the creation of dynamic and sustainable local and global communities in the 21st century we must reimagine the curriculum. Internationalization of the curriculum is a process that includes consideration of the content of the curriculum as well as the learning outcomes, assessment tasks, teaching methods and support services of a programme of study. This process has the potential to create new pathways for human development and wellbeing. If we combine the ideal of developing students' compassionate imagination with an education that 'liberates' students' minds, we create new possibilities for the future through the internationalization of the curriculum.

In the last decade, approaches to internationalizing the curriculum focused on the development of graduates as global citizens have emerged. However, the full potential of this approach will only be realized if we develop a more inclusive understanding of knowledge in universities. The development of responsible global citizens requires curriculum content that engages with multiple and global sources of knowledge in which students explore how knowledge is produced, distributed, exchanged and utilized globally. Universities seeking to do this will need to engage faculty members in the process of internationalizing the curriculum and support them to reimagine the curriculum and develop responsible global citizens.

Curriculum, Higher Education, and the Public Good

Budd L. Hall (Canada), Walter Lepore (Argentina) and Nandita Bhatt (India)

A tension that this report is exploring is the relationship between the seemingly oppositional pulls to respond to the increasing calls for universities to become more active players in their communities and regions while at the same time responding to being pulled in global directions by the phenomena of global competition as most commonly experienced by the higher education ranking systems. The argument in this chapter is that the global and the local are not oppositional aspirations.

The phrase ‘locally relevant and internationally significant’ captures a spirit in which excellence and engagement are synergistic partners with international quality and visibility.
In those areas of higher education where one finds a majority of the students in the sciences, humanities, social sciences, fine arts and so forth, there are no regulatory bodies associated with the content. The curricula are organized through disciplines.

While inter-disciplinary or problem-focused academic programmes have increased in numbers over the years, the disciplines remain firmly in control of the canon in the vast majority of universities.

While it is true that universities around the world are for the most part teaching from the dominant Western canon, what some would call a colonial knowledge framework, there are changes occurring within the disciplines and there are even new disciplines arising. These have sprung up as part of a complex interactive global discourse among academics, public intellectuals, social movement activists, political voices and others.

Central university support of engaged learning, community-based experiential learning, and similar names has certainly encouraged curricular innovation. Engaged learning, responding to the grand challenges of our times, taking action on deep issues such as reconciliation between indigenous peoples and others, and positive efforts towards decolonizing the curriculum have an impact because they are not discipline specific.

Community-based research emphasizes the co-construction of knowledge between academics and those outside of the academy, research partnerships where community members as well as academics are mutually acknowledged as knowledge makers.

3. Global Knowledge and Responsible Research

The role of Research in Shaping Local and Global Engagement

Paul Benneworth (The Netherlands)

University research offers a substantial knowledge resource that can contribute towards achieving the UN’s Sustainable Development Goals.

Using university knowledge to address the UN SDGs requires going beyond simplistic models of universities as knowledge producers to understanding how universities receive, interpret and respond to local community signals.

Universities are under pressure to do more than just demonstrate their social responsibility in teaching and research and to develop specific activities to help address the current grand challenges.

Universities often become involved in solutions that mitigate and displace particular solutions that benefit powerful entrenched interests rather than contributing to wider processes of societal transition.
A key challenge for universities in supporting the global societal transition is therefore in helping create new kinds of social structure and organizational form as well as new technological innovations to solve these problems.

Universities therefore need to become better at hearing the voices of the problem-owners affected by local manifestations of these global solutions in planning, executing and transmitting their research activities.

The key university agents in hearing these voices are engaged scholars who understand how to both work with and on the problems of excluded communities and to use this to enrich their own research and teaching activities within various university contexts.

There are already many exciting models that exist which can be used to support and expand the involvement of societal problem-owners in scientific decision-making and thereby improve the usefulness of the resultant solutions.

Pressure on universities to demonstrate their societal relevance is pushing them towards embracing strategic, high-level, structural approaches to community engagement that risk crowding out the voice of the marginalized problem-owners.

Any university wanting to be engaged must ‘first do their engaged staff no harm’, i.e. resist the impulse to make structural changes, strategic declarations and global networks and instead increase their engaged scholars’ internal influence, recognition and capacity.

**Mechanisms for Higher Education Institutions to Develop Responsible Research and Innovation**

*Enric Banda (Spain)*

Certainly, RRI will keep fostering local competitiveness, but it will also affect global demands through its contribution to solving global challenges.

The social impact and relevance (on top of excellence) of the research carried out by HEIs will probably be on the first page of their accountability.

In terms of implementing RRI in research institutions, including HEIs, there are two fundamental elements involved: (1) providing the framework conditions and policies for the adoption and implementation of RRI practices; and (2) contributing to the development of a culture where the values supporting RRI are an intrinsic part of the research and innovation process, with an emphasis on the next generation of researchers.

RRI should be included in curricula and mentoring practices to reinforce the values of striving for a better world that underpin this approach.

HEIs must position the concept of RRI in the core of their strategies in a clear and explicit way.
» Research carried out by HEIs will need to establish a clear strategy whose final objectives reach beyond obtaining good results in terms of bibliometry, impact factor and other indicators set for HEIs to be better placed in different rankings.

» Implementation of RRI will need to define indicators that can monitor its development by the institution involved.

» Although RRI seems to be more developed in Europe, it should be implemented worldwide and move forwards towards becoming a truly global issue.

» RRI should be seen as a process in which joint efforts by all stakeholders, including public engagement, can lead to a more sustainable and balanced world.

» RRI goals and tools, as we know them in advanced economies, cannot be directly implemented in places where the culture with regards to R&I may be very different and may require an ‘à la carte’ mode.

» HEIs should play the role of agents of change in their inevitable and essential mission as dynamic and networked institutions where talent is identified and trained with the ultimate goal of building a better world through the globalization of RRI.

A New Social Contract, de-facto Responsible Innovation, and Institutional Change: the Case of Arizona State University (ASU)

Sally Randles (United Kingdom)

» At the heart of the Arizona State University (ASU) case is a fundamental, and yet shifting and contested discourse about the role of the publicly funded university in society. The chapter introduces six institutionalized stylizations of de-facto responsible innovation (narratives), each characterized by a different institutional logic, different actors, and different practices of de-facto responsible innovation. They are: republic of science, technological progress, weighing risks and harms as well as benefits of new and emerging technologies, the citizen firm, moral globalization, and research and innovation with/for society.

» Although all six narratives coexist in the HE sector and other organizational settings, the chapter argues that universities today are characterized by sharp opposition between Narrative A and Narrative F. Narrative A (republic of science) is deeply institutionalized and represents a social contract between science and society with its origins in the seventeenth century, when science inhabited an autonomous and self-regulated sphere, unencumbered by ‘interference’ from the state or wider society. Narrative F (research and innovation with/for society), in contrast, represents a fundamentally different social contract between HE and society articulated as the mobilization of research and innovation in the service of society, redesigning the organization, reward system and academic performance criteria to address societal challenges and problems.
The case demonstrates how the transformation of ASU from Narrative A to Narrative F has come about, constructing a theoretical framework called the Normative Business Model (NBM) to do so. The ASU transformation is described, in terms of change-process, through the four cornerstones of the NBM i.e.: normative orientations, (de) institutionalization processes, the role of institutional entrepreneurs from the senior leadership team to the mid-level 'ambi-dextrous principle investigator' and governance and financial instruments and protocols.

4. Institutional Governance, Organization and Management

Institutional Governance for a Shared Glocal Engagement Mission

Peter Eckel (USA)

If they are not intentional about governing the glocal university well, which includes putting the right processes and structures in place but also adopting the necessary mindset and perspective, governing bodies will fall short of their responsibilities and risk becoming a burden rather than a strategic asset for their universities.

Because universities tend not to have sufficient financial resources to pursue everything they would like to, they need to make choices among competing priorities, thus highlighting the need for increasingly effective governance. The importance of governance is growing and it is evolving at the same time that 1) universities are changing, and 2) the environments in which they operate shift. These threads create a dynamic situation calling for more intentional and effective governance. The work of boards is and should be complex. Boards need to understand and appreciate the diversity of their work across the three dimensions of accountability, strategy and leadership. The key questions governing bodies should address include:

Are board members well versed in global trends and issues as well as local ones? Do they have a firm understanding of trends in both of these contexts to do the work of governance?

Does the board have the knowledge and ability to engage in meaningful discussions about local as well as global issues?

To what extent is meeting time used well to focus on the most important issues (and not simply the urgent ones)? How intentionally are meeting agendas crafted to ensure that they have the right issues and are allocated appropriate amounts of time?

To what extent is the board confident that its work adds value to the university? To what extent does the work of the board matter? And how does the board know this?

Boards many need to develop new structures or revise their current ones to accommodate glocal issues. The demands do not suggest they can simply modify their current approaches.
Regardless of structure and board capacity, the primary question that boards in a glocal context must continually address is, put simply: For what purpose are we governing this university as the world is changing?

Institutional Governance for a Shared Glocal Engagement Mission

Sharifah Hapsah Syed Hasan Shahabudin (Malaysia)

The unprecedented global demand for higher education offers both challenges and opportunities for HEIs to be competitive and to collaborate and become globally relevant.

The growth of social entrepreneurship is creating opportunities for finding sustainable solutions for millions of people and their families to be educated, earn a living and increase their standards of living in a safe and ecologically balanced environment (Yunus, 2010).

Facilitative government policies for integrating education and research with industries and venture capital form the platform for deeper global partnerships which create greater collaborative potential for new products and markets.

The goals to deepen involvement and impact locally by responding to competitiveness and, at the same time, contributing to societal challenges globally are not mutually exclusive, rather they are potentiating.

A glocal mission for the global good has greater chance of success when it is also viewed as an opportunity to explore ways to generate revenue from global sources such as students, philanthropists, industry and global collaborations as well as the opportunity to tap into the global pool of academic talent.

The governance for a glocal mission is built on its strengths in local engagement and is reflected in the way the HEI extends its education and research competencies to engage with global issues of equal relevance.

Each HEI will evolve its own institutional model according to its mission, set of objectives, principles, values and capacity for glocal engagement and the clarity of the roles of different stakeholders. It is not one glove that fits all.
5. Glocal Higher Education Institutions’ Engagement and Ethical Implications

Global Challenges and Value-based Quality Education for Holistic Development in Higher Learning Institutions

Anand Mohan and Sanjay Bhushan (India)

» The most valuable thing about a university is its atmosphere, something in its life and embedded in the culture that permeates the character and influences everything in later years. The essential part of university education is evolved, innovated and fostered by its teachers who create the spirit of the place.

» Consistent with systems philosophy, holistic education involves understanding knowledge by examining its value interactions with other epistemological constituents that maintain the wellbeing of any civilization and its ecological and cosmological existence.

» By making values a central part of the curriculum and learning process, we can produce enriched teacher-student outcomes in terms of intellectual depth, communicative competence, capacities for innovative thinking and, most importantly, socially and environmentally responsive citizens giving a fuller response to global challenges.

» The global society requires educational reform that aims at excellence but not at the cost of relevance, which inculcates the dignity of labour, encourages creative work, is multidisciplinary and prepares students for the increasingly techno-social systems of tomorrow without uprooting them from their heritage and cultural moorings.

» With the objective of auditing values-based education practices, active research is required to prepare a ‘Values and quality index framework’ that can holistically estimate the effectiveness of educational programmes based on promoting the physical, intellectual, emotional, ethical and spiritual integration of individuals with their surroundings.

» Learning processes are of paramount significance to evolve a link between values and quality parameters through a common measure signifying the interface of educational objectives and their linkages with the holistic development of individuals capable of resolving the value crisis.

» Focused learning leads to attentive classroom activity, with students working purposefully, improved student attendance and outcomes that are a testimony to good workplace practices.

» Embedded in the Dayalbagh Educational Institute’s educational framework, cultural and literary activities with games and sport channel the students’ energy and develop a high level of self-reliance and leadership qualities, as well as nurturing the spirit of team work. Comparative study of religion ingrains an attitude of religious tolerance and secularism in a world of discord. The various core courses and work-based training provide a background of humanities as essential to retaining a human touch and to tempering the harshness of a mechanical world.
The Social Distribution of Knowledge: University Ethical Commitment to the Intelligent Management of the Territory - SmartLand

Santiago Acosta, Nelson Piedra and Juan Pablo Suárez (Ecuador)

» In the Latin-American context, universities face the challenge of generating knowledge and transferring it to society in order to achieve a social distribution of that knowledge.

» The SmartLand initiative fosters the acquisition of knowledge in the field of biodiversity and an understanding of human interactions within a territory.

» SmartLand is about the ‘intelligent’ management of interactions between people and territories.

» This approach allows the university to have a bearing on the immediate context for the purpose of improving the quality of life of the population.

» Creating an intelligent city or territory is more about people than technology.

» The citizen should be the centre of attention.

» Some of the contemporary challenges in research focus on the development and maintenance of habitable, sustainable and resilient territories.

» ‘Intelligent’ territorial management refers to the promotion of a wise and informed use of biodiversity to achieve sustainability, as well as ethical and equitable sharing of benefits arising from the use or exploitation of biodiversity resources.

» For Universidad Técnica Particular de Loja, the territory in the southern region of Ecuador urgently requires an initiative with an approach based on SmartLand.

» Long-term digital preservation combined with the principle of open access to data and metadata from research and public institutions offer broad opportunities to the scientific community and society in general.

» The initiative does not urge a development model for the population located in the area encompassed by SmartLand.

» The initiative offers data for local and national decision-makers to embark on specific improvement projects.

» The database is also open to the future in the sense that it is an ongoing undertaking.
The Role of Universities in Local and Global Engagement

Bjorn Asheim (Norway)

» It is often claimed that a trade-off between promoting competitiveness and solving societal challenges exists. However, there is no such fundamental contradiction. On the contrary, responsible, sustainable and healthy economic growth is a precondition for dealing with global challenges.

» Universities play a key role in contributing to achieving competitiveness and solving societal challenges through research and supplying human capital.

» However, to generate social benefits from universities, organizational and institutional innovations are required (i.e. the formation of new organizations as well as the way organizations, e.g. universities, are run).

» Sweden is a good example of a successful high-tech country with, on the one hand, rapid economic growth and a competitive, resilient economy and on the other hand, a well-functioning welfare state with a very good track record of dealing with societal challenges locally, nationally and internationally.

» All societal challenges are interdisciplinary and cannot be solved by a traditional disciplinary approach. Thus, the institutional innovation of promoting interdisciplinarity at universities is of strategic importance for engaging universities in contributing to solving local and global societal challenges.

» Moreover, research has shown that there is no contradiction between world-leading, excellent research and third mission tasks. In taking on developmental roles, universities interact constructively with broader societal structures and, thus, promote economic development more directly and contribute to solving global challenges.

» The crucial question is what kind of agencies, institutions and network dynamics enable and promote the transformation of scientific research into socially useful innovation.

» The innovation system approach offers, as demonstrated by Swedish innovation policy, an efficient framework for turning research into innovation that promotes economic growth and societal development. It places innovation at the centre of economic growth and represents a shift from a linear view on innovation, mainly understood as conventional science and technology policies, to a policy approach that views innovation as an interactive learning process in which many different actors take part.
6. Incentivizing Institutions, Faculty and Students

Recognizing Excellence in Engaged Teaching and Scholarship: The University of Pennsylvania’s experience

Ira Harkavy, Matthew Hartley, Rita A. Hodges and Joann Weeks (USA)

» Engaged democratic research and teaching focused on a university’s local community is, in short, a powerful institutional advancement strategy.

» Simply put, higher education institutions understand more fully than ever that it is in their enlightened self-interest to be civically engaged with their local schools and communities.

» The dead hand of tradition, in our judgment, continues to function as a primary obstacle to the radical transformation of colleges and universities into engaged, democratic, civic institutions.

» Colleges and universities need to significantly decrease the fragmentation of disciplines, over-specialization, and division between and among the arts and sciences and the professions, since these departmental and disciplinary divisions have increased the isolation of higher education from society itself.

» A related issue is that institutions compete with one another through rankings (especially the influential US News and World Report rankings). Rankings also rely on measures that offer a narrow conception of faculty work (e.g. number of publications and grant dollars).

» In effect, we are updating John Dewey and advocating the following proposition: Democracy must begin at home, and its home is the engaged neighbourly college or university and its local community partners.

» Local engagement work moved from being primarily a means to help Penn revitalize its local environment, to becoming a way for it to achieve eminence as a research university.

» Academically Based Community Service (ABCS) courses integrate research, teaching, learning and service around action-oriented, community problem-solving. Penn students work on improving local schools, spurring economic development on a neighbourhood scale, and building strong community organizations. At the same time, they reflect on their service experience and its larger implications (e.g. why poverty, racism and crime exist).

» The Netter Center has developed several strategies to recognize and incentivize the involvement of Penn faculty in local community engagement.

» We argue specifically that every university should democratically work with its neighbours to solve universal problems (including ending poverty and hunger, improving schooling and healthcare, and promoting inclusive economic growth) as they are manifested in its local community. And to produce optimal learning and genuine large-scale progressive social change, national and global networks need to be developed that connect universities engaged in this work.
The International Consortium for Higher Education, Civic Responsibility, and Democracy, as well as GUNi and the Talloires Network can be viewed, in our judgment, as positive responses to Francis Bacon's proposal that higher educational institutions collaborate across cultures and national boundaries to advance learning and human welfare.

Forging Solidarity 'Glocally': Engaging Institutions, Faculty, Students

Shirley Walters and Anna James (South Africa)

- ‘Forging solidarity’ rather than ‘social responsibility’?
- Universities are either helping to extend inequalities or lessening them – they are part of the problem or of alternative solutions.
- Explore alternative frameworks to encourage commitment, rather than compliance, to achieve social and environmental justice.
- Rankings are not neutral instruments – they are not value-free.
- On what basis is an African university ranked ‘good’ or ‘bad’? What is the point of ranking African universities? Who benefits?
- What should constitute an alternative measurement practice where environmental and social justice, collaboration and feminist politics are starting points?
- Engaging across African contexts to create ‘common knowledge’ through deeply democratic processes is a start to rethinking ‘social responsibility’.
- Despite the slipperiness of the concept of transformation, a broad meaning-making frame is emerging with an inclusive narrative of progress and equality in mind.
- The idea of the barometer is to develop a template for integrated transformation planning and execution, to generate comparable reports across the sector, as well as make it possible to share ideas, good practices, learning and strategies.
- We need tools to know when higher education is being transformative and when it is being reproductive.
- There are scholar-activists, both students and staff, who are consciously building a ‘decolonizing solidarity’.
- The general tendency or trend of colonial education is: the higher one climbs up the ladder, the greater the distance between the climber and those holding up the ladder.
- The university itself is ‘a site of struggle’ where much is learnt about social, environmental and economic justice and these ways of being/thinking are embodied in students, workers and academics at their homes, in streets, workplaces, and communities.
Student, worker and academic formations want universities to emulate a new set of democratic relationships which are more egalitarian and just, and where students and workers feel they belong.

Students, academics and workers need to understand what transformation means, both in theory and practice, and how to bring it about.

Building 'common knowledge' works against compliance approaches to a barometer for measurement, but aims to engender commitment to transformation.

**Beyond Rhetoric. Some Obstacles for a Responsible Global University**

*Mircea Miclea (Romania)*

The modern university is discipline-centric, i.e. academic discipline is the organizing principle of academic life, in terms of research, teaching, administration and identity.

The main source of prestige and influence for any scholar is a function of his/her contributions to the expansion (through research) and dissemination (through teaching) of a specific discipline. As a consequence, academic researchers pay scant attention to practical problems for which this knowledge could be relevant.

The production and dissemination of knowledge according to the consecrated paradigm substantially prevails over the exploitation of knowledge for social or economic welfare.

In sum, academics who create solutions for the socioeconomic environment lose ground according to current scientometrics used by scientific communities. Current proxies used in scientometry (e.g. number of publications, citation index, h-index, impact factor) are very sensitive to any publication that serves the expansion and replication of academic discipline and are completely blind to relevant solutions for real life problems.

There are plenty of big contributions to small problems which, in the end, history counts as minor contributions; a tragic waste of brilliant minds on disciplinarily legitimate but otherwise irrelevant problems.

Real problems and the labour market do not care about the academic organization of knowledge. In order to efficiently solve professional problems we need to disarticulate our knowledge from academic disciplines and rearticulate it around occupational tasks, a process called the conditionalization of knowledge.

Our universities' unsatisfactory response to the external environment (local, national, global) is a consequence of their design, not a lack of will or understanding.

All actors should first try to have a shared understanding of the context and only then set up expectations and reactions.
When facing uncertainty, keeping the alternative of free inquiry open pays off. Excellent mind work should be recognized wherever it is, in the format it is expressed and rewarded accordingly.

7. Mutual Learning and Empowering Support: the Role of Networks in Achieving Glocal Engagement

Mutual Learning and Empowering Support: Networks and Balance between Local and Global Demands

Crystal Tremblay (Canada), Wafa Singh (India) and Walter Lepore (Argentina)

Knowledge generation and dissemination in universities and university action are needed to tackle global challenges, as outlined in the 2015 UN Sustainable Development Goals. Global and local networks are providing important spaces that encourage collaboration, trust, knowledge sharing, capacity building and innovation between HEIs and several different kinds of agents – including civil society, government, municipalities and the private sector.

Democratic knowledge partnerships, where community action is united with academic knowledge, have the potential for social transformation in ways that the narrow application of university scientific knowledge solutions cannot achieve. Knowledge creation for system innovation is increasingly becoming a process of engagement between researchers and other actors who have traditionally been outside the knowledge production system.

Trans-disciplinary cooperation among HEIs, entrepreneurs, civil society organizations and government – each with different interests, goals, and value judgments – is critical for developing new modes of production and effective responses to socio-ecological problems in the field of sustainable development. In this type of knowledge production, multiple engaged stakeholders bring together a great variety of skills and capabilities in order to create or construct knowledge, transgressing boundaries between disciplines and fields of expertise. Global, national and local actors need to be involved early in the process as co-developers of ideas and institutional structures that help knowledge-driven innovations to flourish.

As the international community focuses on defining the strategies to achieve sustainable development at the global and local levels, there is an opportunity to consider the role of higher education in advancing these shared development aims. In this context, networks for the global-local engagement of HEIs can be seen as local catalysts that give visibility to and strengthen local action, support funding opportunities and research partnerships, and aim to better connect academic work to community needs.

The interaction and communication between involved actors to make social learning possible can be organized through the institutionalization of stakeholder engagement in collaborative processes and the creation of partnerships between stakeholders, policymakers, researchers and scientists. This requires building long-term trust among partners to facilitate systemic practice, integrative ways of working and learning across and within diverse social groups.
University and Social Networks: from Theory to Action. GUNi and ACUP Practice at Global and Local Scale

Josep M. Vilalta, Àlicia Betts and Nadja Gmelch (Spain)

» The complexity and variability of the social and economic problems of the modern world often require multidisciplinary and multi-agent approaches. In this regard, there is a need, on both a local and global scale, for close and continued collaboration between the institutions of the Quadruple Helix: public institutions, universities, companies and the tertiary sector. In the case of Catalonia, strategic cooperation has been fostered both with local organizations (for example, via the CTI Platform with economic, social and institutional agents or in partnership with the biggest private foundation in Catalonia and Spain) and with international organizations (GUNi itself, which is promoted by UNESCO, the UNU and ACUP).

» Beyond the efforts and results of each of the institutions of higher education on a local and a global scale (reflected on an international scale in, for example, different university rankings), we believe that it is strategic to encourage inter-university collaboration and the sustenance of an ecosystem of complementary universities in a specific territory or country. In the case of Catalonia, we note the willingness among the public university members of ACUP to undertake frank, solid and profound cooperative projects in collaboration with the country’s Government, in order for Catalonia to become a leading university and research region of Southern Europe. In this regard, we believe in the need to create public policies that develop the right balance between inter-university competition and collaboration. This is the responsibility of both the universities themselves and the legislative and executive powers that create and fund them. In this respect, we recommend the establishment of systems and measures to assess the system as a whole, in addition to the rendering of accounts by individual university institutions.

» Universities and academic and scientific institutions are generally becoming key parts of the knowledge society and economy: this includes the creation of knowledge, its transfer and its dissemination, as well as innovation in the broadest sense. That is why there is a need for university, science and innovation policies to be strong and stable over time, and for them to receive sufficient basic public funding and be competitive on an international scale. However, it is also true that universities and academic centres in general have lost, in the modern-day information and knowledge society, their monopoly on knowledge, which is increasingly more accessible and widespread than ever due to communication technologies and so many different information platforms and instruments.

» The old adage of “think globally, act locally” is still fully applicable to collaboration networks between universities and between the different agents of the Quadruple Helix. There has never been such a need as there is now for this shared “local-global” outlook, and that means in the university and social arenas too.

» Collaboration networks such as those that we have described in this chapter, and others that might spring to mind, often suffer from a handicap that very much needs to be brought into consideration: the fact that they act at a distance from reality, taking refuge in a theoretical-conceptual space or in self-complacency and with little impact. From this perspective, we
believe that collaborative networks (such as ACUP on a local scale and GUNi on a global one) should always be agile, flexible organizations that are decidedly focused on creating value for the institutions that they are made up of and by extension for society as a whole. Explicit rendering of accounts and regular renewal of goals and projects are recommendations in order to achieve the necessary value added and proximity to the social, economic, cultural and technological reality that they face.

8. Impacts, Multi-faceted Accountabilities and Measurements

Impacts, Multi-faceted Accountabilities and Measurements. Making a Difference at Local and Global Levels

Stevie Upton (United Kingdom)

» From international rankings to national impact assessment mechanisms and local performance development reviews, academics are increasingly subject to evaluation of the wider benefits of their work. Yet precise attribution of the origin of an impact is always problematic. Research also indicates that outcomes-based monitoring and reward systems are liable to suffer from undue complexity, and to disincentivize at least some beneficial outcomes.

» Jeff Edmondson, managing director of Cincinnati-based StriveTogether, has argued that, for effective impact to be achieved it is a matter of 'moving from proving to improving'. At root this entails shifting from a judgemental to a developmental form of assessment. Turning attention away from outcomes places the focus instead on the engagement process, elements of which are seen as important ends in their own right and as significant indicators of likely impact.

» A number of interesting models for process-based assessment now exist. These range from the logic model approach – which provides a structure for planning unanticipated beneficiaries into the ongoing engagement process as and when they emerge – to the scorecard model – which clearly emphasizes the direct connection between inputs, activities and benefits.

» The ‘collective impact’ concept also holds promise for application in this field, both as a process-based approach to activity planning and evaluation, and as a method that takes problems that can be universal in reach, and addresses them through partnerships at a local level.

» It is ultimately clear that, in respect of the balance between local and global engagement agendas, it is not tension between global and local goals so much as the outcomes-based focus of evaluative mechanisms – and the skew that this often engenders towards global goals, at the expense of locally-beneficial activity – which is proving problematic.

» Accordingly, as governments implement their own systems for assessing research impact they should look beyond existing outcomes-based models. Given systems' significant interconnectedness, the potential cost for a national higher education system of instituting unilateral
change is high. Transnational higher education networks should therefore take the lead in generating debate and shaping the agenda on impact assessment.

Connecting with Communities vs. Racing for Rankings. Why Community Engagement is a Better Strategy than Seeking Higher Rankings

Andrew Petter (Canada)

» For all but the most prominent universities, a singular focus on pursuing higher rankings is likely to be a misguided distraction from tasks that could more meaningfully improve the institution and distinguish it from its competition.

» There are three main problems that make international rankings a poor mechanism for assessing, improving and differentiating all but the top few dozen universities in the world:

» Rankings are based on a basket of indicators that privilege the biggest, oldest and wealthiest universities;

» A university’s standing on the list depends not just on what it achieves, but also on the performance of every other university in its class; and

» Rankings do not provide a useful means for assessing the relative strength or relevance of a university in its local market.

» A more fruitful path to greatness lies in finding a single differentiator on which a university can rise above its competitors – a differentiator that is more likely to be found in the communities, or communities of interest, in which the institution has formed extraordinary connections, made exceptional contributions, or demonstrated unique expertise.

» Community engagement, then, emerges as a more productive way for an institution to develop and demonstrate its unique strengths.

» Even if a university cannot establish itself as the best globally in relation to some aspect of community engagement, the opportunity remains for it to establish itself as the best within its country or region.

» In sum, the most productive path to greatness for most universities does not lie in struggling for incremental improvements in esoteric and opaque rating systems.

» Rather, a reputation for accomplishment – and an opportunity for differentiation – more likely lies in demonstrating some aspect of educational excellence, research strength or other contribution that exceptionally benefits the communities that the university serves – thereby distinguishing it as authentically preeminent and worthy of attention in the wider world.
Quality Assurance in African Higher Education: Resolving the Blurry Lines Between Local and Global Relevance

Peter Okebukola (Nigeria)

» In an interconnected world, solving Africa’s problems relating to climate change, food security, national security, health security and other strands of human security challenges will limp to failure if not addressed within a global framework. However, if African universities are the bastion for finding solutions to such problems within the African setting, then the starting point should be the African context, followed by a scale up to global.

» The major developments in quality assurance in higher education in Africa are propelled by two drivers: the need to promote qualitative higher education in Africa and to foster African unity.

» Minimum curriculum standards which must be met or surpassed for accreditation to be conferred on a typical African university have both local and global content. Regardless of discipline, the curricula are not narrowed to local issues but broadened to fortify the graduates to offer service as national and global citizens. Also, the minimum standards are increasingly slanted to foster local and international collaboration.

» The third model of fostering local-global harmony within the diverse African higher education system is the establishment of a regional quality assurance framework. The development of a continental quality assurance and accreditation framework has been under way with the EU financing a study on a Pan-African Quality Assurance and Accreditation Framework (PAQAF). Inherent in the entire process is the encouragement of African universities to balance local with regional and global elements in the curriculum delivery mechanisms.

» Universities and national/regional funding bodies should preferentially fund research that targets solutions to global problems within the local context. Within this research framework, cross-national membership of research teams should be encouraged.

» The annual International Conference on Quality Assurance in Higher Education in Africa (ICQA-HEA) should include exhibitions of best practices in blending local with global activities in teaching, research and community engagement. Prizes should be awarded to top-winning entries.

» African nations should establish/strengthen legal frameworks to foster internationalization in governance, teaching, learning and research in higher education systems in the region.

9. Resourcing Change Process, Making a Difference
The Emerging University Integration of Local and Global Engagement: The Canadian Experience at Home and Abroad

Chad Gaffield (Canada)

» The increasing recognition of urgent global problems has been paralleled by new institutional rankings that have attracted widespread attention but that have implicitly fuelled the ambition
of universities to be seen as 'globally competitive' or 'world-class' in ways that do not encourage global problem-solving.

» New thinking about teaching, research and the larger society sees cross-campus and local connections not only as helping solve urgent global problems but also as leading to global recognition, international mobility and cross-border collaboration and impact.

» New thinking about higher education includes innovative responses to the three enduring questions of campus ambition: how to offer undergraduate and graduate education, how to advance knowledge and understanding of the past and present, and how to help make a better future.

» Increasing discipline-based interdisciplinarity has been complementing unprecedented efforts to connect campuses and communities within major research initiatives.

» The proliferation of new 'hybrid' academic programmes and research initiatives, ranging from digital humanities to biotechnology and neuroscience, reflects the new consensus that learning and advancing knowledge depend on both disciplinarity and interdisciplinarity as captured by the expression 'discipline-based interdisciplinarity'.

» The evidence suggests that years and years of thinking and working within dominant frameworks may prepare for incremental rather than transformative research contributions.

» Recommendation 1: that formal and informal support be given to enable community-university research collaborations based on the collective formulation of research questions, implementation of research activities, and sharing of research results.

» Recommendation 2: that formal and informal support be given to including all ways of knowing in research activities as illustrated by the move in western societies from research 'on and for' to 'by and with' indigenous peoples.

» Recommendation 3: that formal and informal support be given to enable and facilitate international research collaboration by removing administrative obstacles especially those linked to geopolitical boundaries for financial support.

» Recommendation 4: that formal and informal support be given to embracing the challenge and opportunities of digital technologies through increased research on their intended and unintended roles in both increasing and undermining universities' ability to help solve urgent global problems.

» Recommendation 5: that the criteria for measuring academic excellence embrace twenty-first century concepts of intellectual and societal outcomes and impact within a robust definition of knowledge mobilization across campus and beyond.
University Social Engagement: Current Trends in Latin America and the Caribbean at Global/Local Universities

Axel Didriksson (coordinator), Adrián Acosta, Eduardo Aponte, Elizabeth Larrea, Denise Leite, Luis Enrique Orozco and Carlos Iván Moreno

Introduction

The Global University Network for Innovation (GUNi) has participated very actively in the joint UNESCO Chairs whose subject of study is higher and university education in our region, with the UNESCO Institute for Higher Education in Latin America and the Caribbean (IESALC) having the most important networks and associations of universities, now with 53 affiliated HEIs.

In 2015, the University of Guadalajara’s rector Tonatiuh Bravo Padilla generously and with great vision agreed to host the regional sub-headquarters of GUNi, and since then the university has collaborated with GUNi’s work programme both globally and in Latin America and the Caribbean. The rector also made a commitment to collaborate in GUNi’s global reports, meetings and seminars, and in particular, with the representation of Dr. Francesc Xavier Grau, he offered to contribute with a special regional chapter for the 6th Higher Education in the World Report.

Also, in collaboration with another affiliated university, the Autonomous University of the State
of Mexico (UAEM), the rector offered to participate in the same projects and collaborate in the Spanish translation of the 6th Report.

With this fundamental support, the president and the regional secretary of GUNi for Latin America and the Caribbean proposed a work dynamic to fulfil the above tasks, and this was carried out through the following initiatives:

a) An analysis of the most important trends occurring in the region from the global/local perspective. Ten countries exhibiting changes and major innovations in the creation of new universities, mainly public, and the discussion of new national laws to redefine the course of their higher education systems were selected for study. These ten cases are (in alphabetical order): Argentina, Bolivia, Brazil, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Ecuador, Mexico, Peru and Puerto Rico. Taking into account the work of the UNESCO Chairs and the most representative researchers in each country, a group of experts was asked to develop a case study for each of the countries to provide the most up-to-date and homogeneous information. These experts also identified a set of variables and indicators that provide a reliable account of the current state of the issue in a critical and analytical way, related to the general references that GUNi was working on at an international level for its 6th Report. The experts who coordinated the country case studies were: Norberto Fernández Lamarra for Argentina; Guido de la Zerda for Bolivia; Denise Leite (regional secretary of GUNi) for Brazil; Francisco Javier Gil for Chile; Luis Enrique Orozco for Colombia; Henning Jensen for Costa Rica; Elizabeth Larrea for Ecuador; Adrián Acosta, Francisco Marquez and Axel Didriksson for Mexico; Ricardo Cuenca for Peru; and Eduardo Aponte for Puerto Rico.

b) These papers were delivered in early May, and were the central reference point for the development of the Latin American chapter involving a focal drafting group consisting of Adrián Acosta, Denise Leite, Elizabeth Larrea, Luis Enrique Orozco, Eduardo Aponte, Francisco Marquez and Axel Didriksson, with the support and hospitality of the University of Guadalajara.

c) The central content of this Latin American chapter, which is presented for the first time in an International GUNi Report (in the perspective of covering the vision of a region in particular), provides a comprehensive, critical and prospective overview of the exhaustion of the ‘classic’ university model that has existed for over one hundred years, and analyses the new components of change and innovation that are taking place, from the variables and indicators that show the emergence of a different scenario (in some countries, as indicated), but also in general in the region as a whole.

d) Therefore, the chapter addresses the change processes and intervention variables that are changing access to higher education, its permanence and the particularities of the academic paths of students and teachers; the construction of new interdisciplinary-type areas of knowledge, but also the extension of disciplines to study fields related to their context of implementation; the increased levels of access to master’s and doctoral studies; the great
growth of the participation of women in these studies; the active strengthening of current
rates of research and knowledge production; as well as the increase in groups of academic
work, cooperation programmes and internationalization, academic mobility, networks and
partnerships with emphasis on strengthening the process of horizontal integration, both in-
stitutional, sub-regional as well as local/global, in a context where, unfortunately, there is still
great inequity and inequality for large sectors of the population regarding their access to the
benefits of higher education.

e) Changes occurring in the field of quality assurance derived from the relevance and social re-
sponsibility of universities are addressed with special interest; the criticism of accreditation and
ranking institutions, the commodification of educational services, with institutions that grow
and multiply with a blatant intention to gain profit and without ethical or social responsibility;
but also where highly relevant initiatives are presented to promote affirmative action to guar-
antee access to higher education for historically marginalized populations such as indigenous,
black and Asian people, and other disadvantaged groups with low socioeconomic levels.

f) Highlighted in this regional panorama, there is a very important and far-reaching national
and public policy debate on the reconfiguration of higher education systems in the form of
national or organic laws which have positioned massive student and teachers' movements
and redefined terms and concepts of new legislative bills that are impacting the traditional
components of the basic functions of university life, in an environment of tension that is
not over yet.

g) Exceptionally, the emergence of new public universities is addressed. These universities
are introducing new organizational structures and governance, new curricula, new profiles
of entry and exit, a new connection between teaching and research seeking closer links
with society and constructing an endogenous model of social production of knowledge,
which has placed social innovation at the centre of its activities.

h) Within this context of redefining state policies on higher education, the chapter discusses the
criteria for allocating financial resources and their regulation and implementation in strategic
areas, emphasising, above all, that this reallocation should contemplate a multi-year basis and
reinforce the public good and social responsibility of universities. The debate continues, but
efforts have been made in different countries pointing to the growing importance of these
components of enforcement.

i) Finally, in this regional chapter, emphasis is placed on building a vital strategy at the heart
of a new social and educational agenda focused on the new components of the future that
articulate a different definition of the social responsibility of universities regarding the pro-
duction of new knowledge, the democratization of learning and curriculum flexibility. All
this should occur within the universities' local/global relationship with internationalization
that does not benefit only some minorities, but with a perspective involving the construc-
tion of a new university model (to ensure their longstanding historical, cultural and social
function) that seeks to transform itself into a platform for learning, new knowledge and innovation. This could happen if a collective strategy for overall prosperity and good living is implemented, with universities being responsible for overcoming their patronage and old practices that are harmful to their mission, by focusing on working to learn for themselves and for all, and by offering innovative and socially useful knowledge for future generations in a scenario of a sustainable future, justice, equality and equity for all.

**Regional context**

During the last three decades, significant changes have occurred in contemporary university models. Through their substantive functions of teaching, research and dissemination of culture – and many other areas related to organization and institutional and international management, knowledge transfer, student and academic mobility, etc. – the relevance of universities' work in terms of social responsibility has been revealed as they have sought to highlight their 'entrepreneurship', ability to generate innovation, market-oriented research, privatization or commercialization, organization of multinational consortia, proliferation of 'online' or virtual classes and programmes, the impact and development of new technologies and the emergence of new universities, some of which have begun to be built and are just starting to develop in the new century.

The main reflections of this work focus on: the process of differentiation and institutional emergency of local and global responses, but above all the emergence of new universities with a few years of existence, their characteristics, social and economic profile, variety of options and careers and academic innovation.

From this perspective, referenced research on higher education indicates that traditional university models, both public and private, have already begun to fade and to take on new nuances and characteristics, redefining the traditional boundaries assumed by both (not all public universities are good, nor are all private schools bad, since in both there are niches of relevance and academic mediocrity, without taking into account that huge conglomerates of schools and institutions with strictly profit-focused aims prevail in many countries in Latin America and the Caribbean, representing a true educational and social fraud), because they began to face new challenges regarding their social and economic role in a new organization and management of knowledge and learning, in the role of their main actors to achieve closer links with the world of work, and in placing economic innovation and social responsibility at the centre of institutional activities.

**The terms of the debate on change in higher education in latin America and the Caribbean**

In recent decades, the university systems in the region have undergone major processes of change in their relations with the state, economy and society. For our countries, this is translated into a sequence of crises which led to decades of backwardness and a contraction of responsibilities and government efforts to address the very uneven problems of education as a whole, and to the proliferation of market mechanisms for the regulation of academic organization, and the reproduction of gaps in knowledge, learning and the development of modern science and technology.
From the late twentieth century and into the first decade of the twenty-first century, a trend can be observed in which HEIs faced similar changes to those present in other countries around the world, including:

a) During the 1980s and 1990s, reforms in higher education centred on state deregulation, institutional decentralization and fragmentation of the types and quality of institutions, especially due to the increase in private and commercial supply and economistic approaches to demand.

b) Mechanisms, bodies and instruments of assessment, accreditation and control of university systems were generalized in all possible areas of their tasks and actors, with programmes, sectors, individuals and institutions, both inside and outside the secretariats or ministries of higher education, seeking to influence quality levels by means of measuring their outputs and outcomes. Also, new schemes of internationalization, influenced by the Bologna agreement (the Tuning programme, for example), reached a low impact level, along with the expansion and influence of ‘transnational suppliers’ of academic programmes presented online and new diversified funding schemes.

c) We sought to boost institutional changes and academic management to favour segments and niches of knowledge production and market-oriented research. However, little progress was made in the implementation of substantive reforms in the organization of research and graduate programmes.

d) Demand began to outstrip the offer of educational programmes, unfavourably impacting public universities, which were oversubscribed, and gradually leading to an increase in the number of higher technical institutes. However, this did not result in any significant advance in overcoming gaps in inequality, lack of education, desertion, abandonment and marginalization of traditionally excluded sectors.

e) Recurrence to promoting both administrative and governmental reforms and decisions, but also to creating new careers and areas of knowledge, research and development, encouragement for publications, growth in the number of graduate programmes and some ‘good practices’ (always cancelled out by ‘bad practices’ as a result of the reproduction of bureaucratic and political mechanisms).

f) Institutional references of international model implementation: the European Union and Bologna; recommendations derived from projects with bodies such

---

1 ‘Communication of 2006, to meet the modernization agenda for universities: education, research and innovation (EC, 2006), it insists on the same goals and suggests new measures related to training, research and innovation to overcome the deficiencies of European universities. In particular, universities assume higher levels of responsibility for their financial viability being more innovative, proactive and diversifying funding sources, establishing strong links with business and society in general ... After 2010, we can say that most of the objectives have not been achieved’. Javier Vidal and Maria Jose Vieira. ‘Government, autonomy and decision-making at the University’. Bordon, Journal of Education. Monograph Number, Government and Governance at the University: the emerging debate. January-March, Vol. 66, No. 1, Madrid, 2014, p. 19.
as UNESCO, the World Bank and the Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD); the promotion of ‘world-class university’ models in countries in the Asian Pacific, Australia and the Arab world; what was expressed in discussions about national laws in Colombia, Argentina, Brazil, Ecuador, Venezuela, Costa Rica, Chile, or by initiatives in the sub-regional integration processes in Central America (CSUCA), Caribbean (UNICA), Southern Cone (AUGM), ALBA and UNASUR, more recently.

g) Systems of extraordinary salaries for academic groups, as parallel systems to the development of the institutional ladder based on merit, research results, or teaching support.

h) The public good versus the idea that higher education is part of a global service ‘enterprise’.

From the above perspectives, the conditions for developing a sector producing knowledge, new learning and new institutional profiles were still constrained and often appeared as secondary and marginalized until the end of the previous century under traits of ‘reproductivism’ such as the following:

- Little legitimacy of scientific work, where scientific knowledge is not fully valued or sponsored;

- A reduced social learning platform, so that the development of skills, abilities, skills, competencies and values related to the production and transfer of knowledge is not promoted or planned, and it is very poorly promoted compared with what happens in other parts of the world;

- A case of interest in the productive sector to develop an endogenous capacity in science and technology; “With exports concentrated on natural resources, and relatively small and highly protected manufactured markets, there was no encouragement or need to innovate for a long time. Our lifestyles and consumption patterns tried to imitate the industrialized countries. It was always easier to import turnkey technology technology. Even after trade liberalization, multinationals promote almost all R&D programmes in developed countries”.2 This lack of coordination, which fails to be expressed in national innovation systems, appears as one of the most important obstacles to the development of knowledge;

- A lack of clarity in strategies for science, technology and higher education development. With the gradual withdrawal of the state from financing higher education, science and technology, it was thought that this would entail an increase in

---

the supply of investment from the private sector, which did not happen; a perm-
nent brain drain, which weakens local efforts and delivers physical and human re-
sources for the development of knowledge in other countries, but without a logic of ‘reverse’ and the smooth transfer of this knowledge by organizing a relationship of positive cooperation to overcome existing gaps, imbalances and asymmetries.

Within this framework of trends and changes, of fractures and inequalities, the traditional idea of a public hegemonic model university – with the emphasis on responsibility for ‘professionalizing’ and the idea that its main task is to expand and ensure wider access to this level, and with reference to management and organization schemes based on co-governance, institutional autonomy, state subsidies and the mastery of a curriculum of liberal and disciplinary court – stopped being the predominant ‘model' in the region. Instead, there began the era of emerging universities, the creation of headquar-
ters and sub-headquarters of important universities, and the creation of many new, innovative or entrepreneurial bills.

Criticism of such a ‘reproductionist’ model argued that it maintained outdated curricula, as well as repetitive and superfluous teaching practices, or that the state did not need to provide all the re-
sources for public universities, but instead should encourage the diversification of the private sector, investment in new information and communication technologies that would redefine the processes of teaching and traditional organization, thereby creating a search for ‘higher modernity’ driven by the evaluation and accreditation of institutions or programmes, or by being a reference in local or inter-
national rankings.

For universities and higher education institutions in the region, these movements diversified and frag-
mented the dominant old-style ‘Napoleonic’ professionalizing model of colleges, but the biggest chal-
lenge was to find ways of modernization by means of accreditation agencies and evaluation councils. While the Chilean case stands out in the analysis of the constant organizational and content changes during the current period, especially in an attempt to conceal the differences between public and pri-
ivate, in other countries the process of structural changes also began to gain notoriety from the debate on the ‘differentiation' of university systems.

However, in countries where they reached no defined priorities to promote changes in universities or centres of scientific innovation, or for the explicit and intentional development of technologies, or other prospects of interest from various governments; or when society does not demand this to be done, nor are local governments interested or aware of the true, long and systematic effort required to deploy a model based on the production and transfer of learning and knowledge, the only thing that could be foreseen was an inertia where the hard work appeared, often marginal, of groups of academ-
ics or institutions that were able to grant some importance to resources for specific research projects or often as part of the tenacity of groups or individuals with a greater vision and height.

When the state has neither a structured and innovative view nor any interest in experimenting or promoting the implementation of an alternative model of education, science and technology, what works is a policy of allowing people to do what they will and letting things happen, which favours the
commercialization and privatization of schools and universities. In the conditions of an underdeveloped country, in which education and science remain on the fringe of social and economic life (where unemployment or brain drain predominate, low investment in research becomes more common and quality higher education remains only for the elite) it becomes impossible to achieve new development with justice and equity.

That is why we have witnessed a social response during this century, voiced by an emerging group of various actors who are expressing the need for a major transformation of both public and private universities. Some examples of these multitudinous demonstrations include the Chilean (2011-2014), the Puerto Rican (2011-2012), the Colombian (2011), and the Mexican (2011-2012) student movements, which represent a qualitative shift in the way this sector has made its demands regarding regulations and policies, or the dominant trend in the academic field of the traditional agenda of debate on public and private, with demonstrations that have transcended the institutional level to the national and have had great media and social impact.

From other perspectives, in the case of Chile, Ecuador, Brazil, Mexico and Venezuela, and even in the Central American and Caribbean conglomerate, the debate about a new agenda for the entire higher education system has also taken a great interest in university communities and even beyond the scope of other sectors of society and national politics. In the case of Ecuador, for example, the Organic Law on Higher Education was approved (LOES, 2010) thanks to strong university mobilization, leading to the redefinition of overall public policy on higher education in that country. In Brazil, affirmative action programmes for minorities and traditionally marginal sectors have been tested and implemented, and there has been important development in post-graduates (especially at the doctoral level) and scientific research. For further reference, opposite paths have been taken in Chile and Argentina, where there are cases in which there has been a significant differential treatment of the meaning of public good and responsibility of the state towards the public and private interest. Other cases have occurred in Colombia, Bolivia, Peru or Costa Rica, as documented below.

Among these experiences and reforms, some academic innovation schemes, concepts, policies and programmes that facilitate a new wave of change in higher education in the region have been presented. They are based on the discussion of what is known as a new transformation agenda, in view of the involvement of universities in the context of what is happening in the character and orientation of their governments.

Fortunately, there are many, and in several cases emblematic examples that represent the effort to transcend traditional university models from different options. In this chapter, given the length of this work, we have selected some of the most significant cases (in alphabetical order):

- **Argentina**: Perhaps the country that has focused most attention on the creation of new state-subsidized public universities, and that has defended and legislated around the concept of public good. In just a few years, this has been reflected

---

in the creation of nine national universities, both within and outside Greater Buenos Aires, including the expansion of subsites of the emblematic University of Buenos Aires (UBA), with 12 regional centres (in areas of high deprivation), and the remaining centres within the country. It is worth noting that they are the forerunners of a new decentralization scheme, especially in the provinces of Cordoba, San Luis, Entre Rios, among others.

- **Brazil:** 18 new universities and HEIs are being promoted under a scheme of state innovation and responsibility. These include the University for Latin American Integration (UNILA) and the Afro-Brazilian University, with structures and academic offerings as well as strategic direction for this country, fundamental to disrupting the vision of the traditional university that transcends its own references. Furthermore, from 2011, under the government of President Ignacio (Lula) da Silva, there was an outstanding increase in the number of public universities (60), with emphasis on the creation of state institutions without devaluing federal ones, such as those mentioned. This fact is particularly important as traditionally in Brazil there was a predominance of private offer.

- **Colombia:** Also with the goal of expanding coverage levels, in a country with a high concentration of private universities, Regional Higher Education Centres (CERES) have been promoted with a public-private form of organization and financing, as well as under a hybrid model combining the classroom with virtual education located in areas of low coverage by traditional HEIs or large private universities. By 2012, the country already had 176 of these centres, with more than 30,000 students enrolled. Since 2014, Colombia no longer has a predominantly private system of higher education, and now the public sector accounts for slightly more than 50% of enrolment.

- **Ecuador:** Following the enactment of the Organic Law for Higher Education (LOES), major changes in the higher education system have been promoted by the Ministry of Higher Education, Science and Technology (SENESCYT). Four new flagship universities have been created, the National University of Education (UNAE), the Amazon Regional University (IKIAM), the University of the Arts (UNIARTES) and the Experimental Research Technological University (YACHAY), all of which are now operating. With regards to promoting a transformation model, Dr. Rene Ramirez, Ecuador’s Secretary of Higher Education, Science and Technology said in 2010: “Since 2008, in Ecuador the government has led publicly challenged criticism and proposals for Ecuadorian universities, thus initiating a process of unprecedented transformation in the higher education sector since the return to democracy in 1979”.

- **Mexico:** Although for decades the Mexican state did not contribute to the creation of new federal universities, a number of ‘dual’ federal-state financial insti-
Institutions have been set up, including the Autonomous University of Mexico City and the University of the Ciénega in Michoacan, as alternative models promoted and sponsored by their local governments. At the level of public policy, the last two Mexican governments have promoted the creation of state-owned HEIs of an intermediate type and funded through a hybrid system (federal-state-private), known as technological universities, polytechnics, state technological institutes or intercultural universities. Also, the most important federal and autonomous universities have promoted the creation of alternate venues, such as sub-campuses or extensions, as is the case of the UNAM, IPN, University of Guadalajara, and others. It is also worth mentioning the creation of the National Open and Distance University, which is undergoing a restructuring to expand its coverage and quality levels. The outlook for 2018 is to create 69 universities of an intermediate type (technical), 30 new campuses as an extension of consolidated universities, and four federal universities; although it is still unclear what kind of organizational model will be applied. It is anticipated, however, as has already occurred in the creation of the abovementioned intermediate institutions, that their funding models will be a mix of public and private funds.

- **Paraguay**: Traditionally, this country only had one university. However, by the end of the last century, seven universities had been created in the country to respond to the growing demand for higher education. This, in turn, led to remarkable growth in the private university sector, as has also occurred in other countries in the region.

- **Peru**: Since the beginning of this century, 21 public universities have been created in this country, but the growth of private supply has also been constant. In 2012, a moratorium was decreed to suspend the growth of public institutions in order to rethink policies in the sector and redefine the regulatory framework for a new stage.

- **Uruguay**: As in Paraguay, the Dominican Republic, and other Caribbean and Central American countries, for decades there was only one university in Uruguay, which was considered 'the bastion of higher education' and the creator of sectoral policies, the iconic University of the Republic. With the new century, a new institution was created, the Technological University of Uruguay (2013), and there are discussions about creating a new public university in a country where, like Argentina and Cuba, there is a strong predominance of the public among the private.

- **Venezuela**: The Bolivarian Government of Venezuela, in a highly controversial move at university level concerning the relationship between quality and quantity, decided to boost the wide regionalization and creation of university and non-university campuses, so that by the beginning of this century it had 232
HEI campuses and extensions, of which 59 were located in the urban area of the city of Caracas. However, enrolment in private HEIs reached 77% of the total. To expand coverage levels, University Villages, Territorial Polytechnic Universities and 20 new universities were created throughout the country, all of them public, as part of a strategy that focused on the ‘universalization’ of the gross enrolment ratio (TBE). Of note among the new universities created are the Bolivarian University of Venezuela, the Film University and the University of the Armed Forces, which by 2010 had around half a million students enrolled. Between 2012 and 2013, five more state universities were created and in 2014 there were plans to create four new Territorial Universities in other states.

This overview of important changes, in some cases national, is undoubtedly incomplete, because it should include the three universities that are being developed in Bolivia, or many of the new headquarters of national universities, or joint integration projects that are foreshadowing a new scenario. These may include the impressive multinational efforts of the AUGM or UNASUR in higher education, science and technology – evidence that the region is entering a new period of institutional, academic and social construction and innovation that ties in with the idea of a ‘Latin American knowledge society’ or a ‘common space of knowledge’, in the perspective of an emphasis on the social good of studies and university research.

In this debate there have been important university events and new institutional formations, because despite the terrible circumstances that threaten our countries, in the cases addressed here significant changes and innovations to create new HEIs are being promoted, with a renewed interest in applying and qualifying the basis of research, the endogenous production of knowledge and its relationships with systems of scientific and technological innovation.

This is the debate that is presented in this paper, in a comparative, local and global presentation of the most relevant trends of change that are taking place in key countries in Latin America and the Caribbean.
The Role of UNESCO Chairs in Strengthening the Social Responsibility of Higher Education Institutions and their Local and Global Commitment

Francisco Michavila and Jorge M. Martínez (Spain)

Since its launch in 1992, the UNITWIN/UNESCO Chairs Programme has been a tool for cooperation between education institutions and for the creation of networks to enhance institutional capacities via collaborative work and knowledge exchange.

Through this research and higher education network, institutions from around the world pool their human and material resources to address pressing challenges and contribute to the sustainable development of their societies.

According to these objectives, the natural role of the UNITWIN networks/UNESCO Chairs can only be to act as a bridge between institutions, between institutions and the surrounding environment, and between approaches to issues in education, the natural and social sciences, culture and communication.

This article describes thoughts on this role gathered from a group of 17 UNESCO Chairs, brought together by the Global University Net-
work for Innovation (GUNi) in Barcelona. The opinions of members of this group were collected using two surveys.

In the first survey, UNESCO Chairs reported on local and global approaches in their missions, activities and respective educational institutions. They also described in detail how they collaborate to meet the Sustainable Development Goals through the formulation of good practices.

In the second survey, the UNESCO Chairs analysed their current performance as a bridge between the local and the global, assessed actions that promote a local approach, and evaluated the impact of their actions on the Sustainable Development Goals. They also analysed the potential scope of their actions and the limitations that they face.

Finally, a selection of specific actions that are considered good practices add to the descriptive analysis of UNESCO Chairs’ role in developing the social responsibility of higher education institutions (HEI), and their local and global approaches to problems and solutions.

Main activities through which the UNESCO Chairs act as a bridge between the local and the global

The group of UNESCO Chairs were asked what actions they undertake to act as a bridge between local and global approaches to problems. Answers were given from two perspectives: to what extent they currently carry out these activities, and to what extent they would like to carry them out.

The main activities that are being carried out by the Chairs can be grouped into the following categories:

» The creation of a holistic view of the issues.
» Being an interface between HEI and society.
» The diversification of approaches, methods and actions on issues.
» The development of cooperative actions in research.

All of the categories of activities received a rating above the average. On a scale of 1 to 5, the lowest average rating (3.5) was for ‘investigation of the application of both approaches in solving problems’.

There was a gap between the ratings for the level that the UNESCO Chairs would like to reach, and what was actually being achieved.

‘The development of cooperative actions in training’ was the category of activities that received the highest average rating, together with ‘being an interface between HEI and society’, followed by ‘catalyst of local changes based on global good practices’.
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The results can be interpreted as a self-assessment by the Chairs that identifies areas in which their efforts should be focused. The greatest difference between the desired and the actual situation was found in the activities of 'investigation of the application of both approaches in solving problems', 'the development of cooperative actions in training' and 'catalyst of local changes based on global good practices'.

![Figure 1: Main activities through which the UNESCO Chairs act as a bridge between the local and the global](source)

Source: Prepared by the authors based on responses provided by a group of UNESCO Chairs.

**The main approach taken in UNESCO Chair activities**

We cannot conclude from the answers to this question that one main approach was used by all the UNESCO Chairs that participated in the exercise. The distribution of frequencies shows a wide dispersion range of approaches.
Main UNESCO Chair activities with a local approach

UNESCO Chair activities that were focused on local issues were mainly carried out in the area of 'promotion of collaborative networks'. All of the Chairs confirmed that they carried out this kind of actions. Eight out of every ten Chairs stated that they were involved in the areas of 'development of diagnostics of local issues', 'implementation of scientific activities/projects' and 'introduction of matters on the social and political agenda'. Seven out of every ten Chairs mentioned 'acting as a forum between local stakeholders'.

At the other extreme are the activities that were undertaken by a low percentage of the Chairs. Less than half of the Chairs were involved in 'advisory, consultancy and transfer' activities. Exactly half stated that they carried
out activities designed for the ‘development of social engagement and transparency through the SR of HEI’. A total of 56% indicated that they carried out actions related to the ‘transfer of strategic approaches of education and social policies to local level’.

Aspects that limit the capacity of UNESCO Chairs to develop the role of facilitator between the local and the global, and how to avoid this dichotomy

The UNESCO Chairs considered that the following limit their capacity to develop the role of facilitator between the local and the global, in order of importance:

- The limited human, technical, material and financial resources of the UNESCO Chairs.
- A lack of platforms for sharing knowledge, the results of activities, etc.
- Inappropriate regulations.
- The gap between the purposes and aims of public and private institutions.
- Apathy and resistance to change.
- A lack of support for Chairs by the regional offices of UNESCO.
- The perceived low impact of their results on public policies.
- A lack of vision and long-term planning.
- The limited scope of action of Chairs in their respective higher education institutions.
- A lack of knowledge and understanding of local and global realities.

The role of UNESCO Chairs in the development of social responsibility in higher education institutions

The development of social responsibility in educational institutions is one of the functions of UNESCO Chairs to meet the aims for which they were established. The Chairs undertake tasks that strengthen social responsibility in their respective institutions.

Most Chairs contribute to social responsibility through the ‘representation of educational institutions in networks, agencies or social forums’.

In addition, efforts are made in the area of ‘agreements with educational institutions to implement activities proposed as part of the 2030 Agenda and social responsibility’, the ‘exchange of good practices and knowledge’, and the ‘proposal of ways to incorporate social responsibility into the activities of educational institutions’.

Another set of activities that are no less important were carried out by a lower percentage of Chairs: ‘the creation of spaces for dialogue and mediation on sustainable development’, ‘training and advice for
university managers on social responsibility and the 2030 Agenda', 'coordination of HEI actions in the field of social responsibility' and the 'development and proposal of regulations on social responsibility'.

The main impact of UNESCO Chairs on the Sustainable Development Goals

Finally, the Chairs were asked about the impact of their work on the Sustainable Development Goals, and to specify whether this impact was direct or indirect. The results show lower rates of response and distribution of the responses according to the impact of the UNESCO Chairs' activity.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goals</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
<th>Direct</th>
<th>Indirect</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Quality education</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender equality</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partnerships for the goals</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduced inequalities</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peace, justice and strong institutions</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decent work and economic growth</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industry, innovation and infrastructure</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No poverty</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sustainable cities and communities</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zero hunger</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>86%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clean water and sanitation</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>86%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good health and wellbeing</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affordable and clean energy</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsible production and consumption</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Climate action</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Life below water</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Life on land</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2. The main impact of UNESCO Chairs on the Sustainable Development Goals
Source: Prepared by the authors based on responses provided by a group of UNESCO Chairs.

UNESCO Chairs’ good practices in the development of social responsibility and compliance with the Sustainable Development Goals

The first case is that of the UNESCO Chair in Quality Management of Higher Education and Lifelong Learning, at the Lucian Blaga University of Sibiu. It relates to the way that a UNESCO Chair can act as a bridge between local and global perspectives of social problems:
Lucian Blaga University of Sibiu is a founding member of the ‘Academic Impact’ initiative, a United Nations-supported global initiative that aligns institutions of higher education committed to and engaged in actively supporting ten universally accepted principles in the areas of education, human rights, literacy, sustainability and conflict resolution. By promoting and supporting the 10 principles of education, Lucian Blaga University of Sibiu, through its UNESCO Chair, serves as a point of contact for ideas and proposals relevant to the United Nations, fosters direct engagement in all the programmes, projects and initiatives defined by the Millennium Goals and other United Nations objectives and helps the UN build stronger ties with other Romanian Higher Education Institutions along these lines of cooperation.

The activities carried out within the UNESCO Chair in Quality Management of Higher Education and Lifelong Learning represent many openings to current global phenomena supported by inter-governmental bodies such as the United Nations and UNESCO.

The other good practice included in this paper is that of the UNESCO Chair in Higher Education for Sustainable Development. It is an example of how Chairs can help to achieve the Sustainable Development Goals through their respective higher education institutions:

The Leuphana University of Lüneburg’s Sustainability Report documents the activities initiated to incorporate the sustainable development principle into the university’s daily operations. The report describes the 2005 and 2006 status and points to future fields of action and to the challenges still to be met.

The Sustainability Report investigates ways to improve the sustainability record and outlines the future development of the university. It includes both the operational/business side of the university as well as the core tasks of an institute of higher education – research, teaching and transfer.

Conclusions and recommendations to promote UNESCO Chairs’ role in the development of social responsibility and in the application of both local and global approaches to problems relating to the Sustainable Development Goals

The first conclusion drawn from the surveys of UNESCO Chairs is that these entities are fully aware of local and global approaches to social problems, and of how these approaches should be taken into account in their activities and tasks.

According to their responses, all of the Chairs have had experiences and undertaken activities in the global arena that can be transferred to the local environment. It is true that their activities appear to have a greater direct impact on the local environment, particularly with respect to acting as a bridge between education institutions and the social, political and economic sphere. However, the operation of global networks has enabled the Chairs to find out about and explore solutions to local problems, and to contribute their own experiences to other international environments.

The Chairs themselves establish which path to follow to improve their function as a bridge between the local and the global. Firstly, it is important to work on collaborative and cooperative activities in the area of training, in recognition of how intercultural and multicultural environments benefit learn-
ing processes and of the advantages of shared knowledge. Secondly, the Chairs’ function as a catalyst should be enhanced to bring solutions from the global sphere to local problems and to develop the use of both approaches to find practical solutions to social problems. This could be interpreted as a need to improve the transformation of ideas into action.

The challenge is to associate local decisions and actions with a global perspective and, likewise, to address the global from a local perspective. Therefore, we must promote the Chairs’ function as a bridge, and ensure that their tasks go beyond the local environment.

The UNESCO Chairs are aware of limitations that affect their ability to act as a bridge between the local and the global. Some of these limitations are within the area of influence of the Chairs and their related structures, and can therefore be dealt with directly. Others are outside of their scope and can only be responded to indirectly.

Directly, the UNESCO Chairs, the education institutions to which they are attached, and related regional, national and global structures could have an impact on the following aspects in particular:

» Increase the human, technical, material and financial resources of the UNESCO Chairs, which undertake an important task, with a broad vision and a wide scope, under difficult conditions.

» Promote platforms and networks for exchanging knowledge, the results of activities, good practices and other aspects relating to the way that other Chairs work or resolve similar issues.

» Increase the support offered to UNESCO Chairs by regional UNESCO offices, given the nature of these offices. Above all, enhance the visibility and impact of UNESCO Chairs’ activities on public policies.

» Increase the support of UNESCO Chairs and the prominence of their role in the educational institutions to which they are attached. The HEI should recognize the work of the Chairs and the importance of their function for the institution.

Work on the above points would promote the function of the UNESCO Chairs as a bridge, and help to make progress in the development of the Chairs’ social responsibility, and that of the educational institutions to which they are attached.
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Introduction

In the final third of the 20th century and at the beginning of the 21st century, we have witnessed the comprehensive globalization of almost all facets of the human occupation of our planet. Taking a longer perspective, we recognize that the university was one of the first global institutions, if not the first, since its inception with Taxila University in 600 BC, Nalanda University in AD 500, the Al Karaouine University in Fez, in AD 859, and Bologna University in AD 1088.

As emphasized at a European Universities Association Conference in Brno 10 years ago, globalization is linked to localization, the renewed importance of place and the emergence of regions as platforms for global competition. Hence, globalization, localization and universities necessarily have to come together. It is therefore not surprising to find discussions arising around the globe on the critical role of higher education, research and innovation in the strategic positioning of nations, regions and cities in this global competition. At the same time, universities and their role in the creation and dissemination of knowledge are critical in securing ‘the bold and transformative steps which are urgently needed to shift the world onto a sustainable and resilient path’, as stated in the UN Declaration ‘Transforming our world: the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development’, the most recent and globally shared expression of the current challenges for humanity.

Indeed, there is a dual perspective on global affairs: on the one side, there is competition between national and regional economic systems in developing their respective societies, and on the other, there is the global sustainability of the sum of all these developments. Higher education institutions (HEIs) can be identified as key players from both perspectives and, thus, have the singular responsibility of helping to provide appropriate and adequate responses to both legitimate needs and interests: i) to address the global challenges of the world, which are very well summarized by the UN Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs), and ii) to contribute to the social, cultural and economic development and international competitiveness of their societies. Universities compete on the global stage for students, faculty and research contracts, but are expected at the same time to contribute to the economic competitiveness of their localities and to sustainable and inclusive global and local development. As Chambers and Gopaul (2008) point out, ‘whether higher education is a public good or is for the public good remains secondary to the general sense that higher education plays a significant role in addressing complex social problems’. From this perspective, it becomes necessary to make explicit the dual engagement of universities: with the immediate needs of our local societies and with the global challenges of the world, of our global society. The study of this duality has been the objective of this
6th Higher Education in the World (HEIW) GUNi Report, ‘Towards a Socially Responsible Higher Education Institution: Balancing the Global with the Local’.

More than 30 experts from around the world have contributed to a dissection of the topic and the identification of good practices that can help academic leaders and policymakers to realize the highest purposes of education and research. The contributions follow the initial decomposition of the report into ten chapters, but each of them is independent and stands on its own, offering a rich panorama of analysis, conclusions and recommendations. The reader is invited to go to these original articles for a deeper analysis of each of the topics. The present, final chapter of the report is based on the contributions and provides a common and coherent set of general conclusions that propose directions of change or action for HEIs and systems, to help them to develop as locally and globally engaged.

World Context and Implications for Higher Education Systems and Institutions

Global indicators relating to health, education, life expectancy, gender equality, etc. unquestionably show that over the last 30 years, many people have experienced the greatest positive evolution in history. Despite this fact, increasing social instabilities, including deepening economic inequality, continuing violence against women, continuing exclusion of indigenous persons, increased lack of personal safety, and a growing number of extreme weather events providing evidence of climate change, have contributed to the development of a general sense of preoccupation and urgency about the sustainability of the present model of development. The SDGs approved by the UN in 2015 summarize the global challenges for humanity. As Hoballah et al. (2017) point out, the SDGs acknowledge the significance of education in addressing global challenges. More specifically, the combination of higher education and research provided by universities is included in one way or another in one third of the SDGs. The UN Secretary General, Ban Ki-moon, states that:

All regions and countries can benefit from progress toward a knowledge-based economy, which does not depend heavily on material resources, places less of a burden on ecosystems and is more sustainable than other economic models. By shifting to a knowledge-based economy, societies can move from the age of scarcity to the age of abundance. Knowledge does not deplete with use but rather increases as it is shared among people. Through technological innovation, we can help usher in a more sustainable future. To generate progress, countries must invest in education, science and technology.

This global state of affairs places universities at the heart of national and global strategies.

From the perspective of global challenges, Mayor Zaragoza (2017) insists on the immediate need for action, since the current state of affairs cannot continue. Regarding social issues, the disparities between the wealthiest and the poorest, and the lack of solidarity of the former towards the latter, have reached limits that can no longer be tolerated. Moreover, in relation to the environment, he states that we live in a crucial moment in the history of humankind in which both population growth and the nature of our activities influence the habitability of the earth. Both authors, Ban Ki-moon and Mayor
Zaragoza, identify the unique role of HEIs and higher education systems as potentially leading the way in this enormous task of ‘developing a sustainable and responsible pathway for our common home’.

Universities can play a vital role in helping to solve problems if they adopt the mission of a ‘civic university’ (Goddard et al., 2016). Walters and James (2017) point out that at present, universities are often acting contrary to the public good, helping to increase inequalities – for example, by celebrating policies of selectivity and neglecting their local or regional commitments – rather than lessening them. In other words, universities can either be part of the problem or be part of the solution. Despite the fact that some of the SDGs are focused on conflict-mitigating efforts rather than on social and human advancement, they are a good starting point for establishing concrete global objectives for HEIs. In this respect, and among many others, the specific responsibilities of HEIs would be:

» Adopting the mantle of the civic university – pursuing the ‘public good’ by aligning its interests with those of society, and working collaboratively with other HEIs to maximize their collective impact;

» Playing a proactive role in ensuring that the SDGs are included in local agendas, proposing changes to education, conducting research and engaging with local and global communities on sustainable development;

» Educating the SDG Generation needed to make the SDGs a reality, with the necessary knowledge, skills, competencies and partnerships, thereby helping to produce new SDG leaders;

» Building capacities for SDG policies, planning and management;

» Conducting transversal reviews and refinements of curricula to ensure the mainstreaming of SDG issues across curricula, and including new values and practices for economic development that enhance social equity while reducing environmental risk;

» Facilitating an in-depth understanding of reality;

» Widening and extending access to and successful participation in higher education by serving the needs of an increasingly diverse student cohort (from 18 to 100 years), by adopting new organizational structures and pedagogical approaches, including online, open and flexible learning that can help in forging the new SDG Generation.

1. Changing the Role of Higher Education Institutions in the Light of Globalization; Trends and Challenges

By the nature of their mission, HEIs have had always a core commitment to the cultural, social and economic development of their cities and regions, and will continue to have enormous potential to contribute to future changes. Nevertheless, the role of HEIs in the 21st century is continuing to evolve. Many HEIs are in the early stages of trying to forge an appropriate balance between their contribution to their local/regional community and pursuance of international goals. Following Puukka (2017), the extent to which an HEI is able to balance and develop these roles effectively depends on:
» Broader policy context and policymaking, the degree of institutional autonomy, and the system of funding, incentives, monitoring and evaluation;

» Local and national context, including the socioeconomic environment, demographic demands for higher education, changes in the labour market and other specific characteristics;

» Leadership and management capacity and capability at the institutional level, and the quality of decision-making.

HEIs have a role to play in ensuring national prosperity, as well as a broader responsibility to contribute to the creation of dynamic and sustainable global communities (De Wit and Leask, 2017) and, as highlighted by Hoballah et al. (2017), HEIs can influence and guide future decision-makers in all sectors.

In fact, universities have a huge responsibility since they contribute to the definition of what is ‘real’ and ‘right’ through teaching, research and all their other activities, and establish legitimacy of actions and actors (Klein, 2017). Universities are integral to socioeconomic, cultural and political communities. What they do matters (Walters and James, 2017).

Given the reality, and the limited incentives for locally and globally relevant action, HEIs have to explore ways to address global and local challenges through their core missions of teaching and research, under the framework of a strategic planning and a long-term institutional commitment to local and global development. The direct benefits for universities of addressing global and local challenges would be:

» Stronger future orientation;

» Review of the core values and the quality of activities;

» Development of critical world citizens with an understanding of cultures;

» Development of multi-disciplinary approaches and teams;

» Greater influence on policies from governments and international agencies.

Social transformations need innovative solutions. Universities can also contribute to building a cognitive framework that enables alternatives that already exist, but that are either ignored or discredited, to be recognized. The role of HEIs in social innovation requires, again, continuous attention on new aspirations that emerge in society.

As Klein (2017) points out, social innovation is primarily based on a collective learning process and, thus, has a strong local engagement character, despite the fact that it can perfectly address global issues. In order to have positive and long-lasting impact, social innovation has to shift its focus away from the resolution of specific local problems and towards a more holistic, comprehensive transformation. The university, as a global institution in a local setting, can contribute to such a shift by producing new knowledge through social experimentation and by disseminating it. The innovation model is be-
ing enriched with the growing participation of citizens, not only as users but also as participants in the co-production of knowledge through community engagement. The civic university can play a key role in bringing together business, government and civil society in quadruple helix partnerships.

2. Reframing the Curriculum for the 21st Century

De Wit and Leask (2017) assert that the curriculum is a key place in which to introduce emerging contents and create new pathways for human development and wellbeing; it can be the main instrument for the preparation of global citizens who are able to combine community engagement with scientific excellence. The curriculum should give space, if possible, to local or community needs, to the development of an eventual national agenda and to global/international trends and challenges.

In particular, the internationalization of curricula, which should engage with multiple and global sources of knowledge, is needed to educate responsible global citizens, but also to work and have a positive impact locally.

In addition to internationalization, following the recommendations of François (2017), curriculum reframing should:

» Include modules to acknowledge issues of power, privilege, exclusion/marginalization, oppression and social justice;

» Articulate competencies that will enable graduates to be efficient and effective in global and local communities;

» Engage and integrate global and local stakeholders, both in implementing teaching activities and in the quality assessment processes;

» Describe and map measurable/documentable learning pathways through which students will be educated for glocal citizenry;

» Design and model innovative frameworks for employment opportunities that empower graduates to enjoy quality lives while contributing their knowledge and skills to sustainable development.

Local and global challenges introduce many concrete pressures on the specific contents of a curriculum, including entrepreneurship, innovative approaches, creativity, environmental issues, gender issues and cultural diversity. The strategy should not be to design specific modules that will compete with curricular activities for a finite amount of course time. The response to these pressures and needs should be to treat them, where feasible, within the regular contents of a course. This surely also implies changes in pedagogical tools and techniques, leading to more emphasis on experiential learning and on more holistic and complex, but realistic and contextualized, problems.
3. Global Knowledge and Responsible Research

‘Knowledge is humanity’s greatest asset. It defines our nature, and it will shape our future’ (Breakthrough Prize). Unquestionably, the development of humanity has been, and will continue to be, shaped by the evolution of knowledge. A global community needs global knowledge, and the research and innovation activity that allows its advancement has to develop in a way that is fully conscious of community needs and expectations, at both local and global levels.

Debates about the nature of knowledge, the creation and co-creation of knowledge, the ownership of knowledge, the exclusion of knowledge, the colonization or de-colonization of knowledge, the racialization of knowledge and many other dimensions of knowledge have become lively and contentious discussions in recent years (Sousa Santos, 2007; Hall, 2011; Hall, Tandon and Tremblay, 2015; GUNi, 2014). Among the contributions to the newer thoughts about knowledge is the concept of responsible research and innovation (RRI) initiatives, which are being supported by the European Commission through its Horizon 2020 research programme.

As stated above, HEIs should play the role of agents of change and, in this sense, as Banda (2017) points out, the social impact and relevance of the research conducted in HEIs should become an important aspect of the accountability of higher education, alongside the requirement to reinforce values for a better world. RRI also has local and global impact: it is a key strategy to foster local competitiveness, relevance and social impact, but also affects global demands through its contribution to addressing global challenges.

RRI implies that societal actors (researchers and research students, citizens, policymakers, businesses, third-sector organizations, etc.) work together during the whole research and innovation process in order to better align both the process and its outcomes with the values, needs and expectations of society. As a term used particularly in Europe, RRI shares some of the aspirations of other knowledge discourses such as community-based research, participatory research, engaged scholarship and others. In that respect, the conclusions of the 5th HEIW Report, ‘Knowledge, Engagement and Higher Education: Contributing to Social Change’, are still current and valid.

» The practices and structures that allow community-university engagement are rich and evolving: the community-university engagement movement (for example, the Talloires Network), service-learning experiences, community-based research, engaged scholarship, community-university research partnership, co-production of knowledge, knowledge mobilization, knowledge exchange and translation, etc.

» Knowledge creation is no longer a monopoly of the academy. Hence, there is a need to recognize the capacities and processes of knowledge creation outside HEIs and research centres, in all fields. There is already a new movement taking place all around the world, and universities should not only be aware of it but also be directly involved. Some good examples are the Living Knowledge Network of Science Shops and many experiences of community-based research, with special focus on participatory research (Hall, Tandon and Tremblay, 2015).
Universities are the best place for genuine interdisciplinary research, which the resolution of complex problems requires, provided that they learn how to overcome the departmentalization of knowledge that specialization also demands. RRI can be seen as a process in which joint efforts by all stakeholders can help in extending the impact of new knowledge from the technological innovation to social innovation, evolving to a more fruitful quadruple helix relationship. The other knowledge discourses previously mentioned argue that a combination of academic knowledge and community/social/local knowledge are the critical elements in a new knowledge regime.

There is still a global challenge that deals with the responsibility of research policies: to act in such a way that the production and up-take of knowledge tends to balance all over the world. This is a necessary development that is in the opposite direction of the current trend. Fostering scientific collaboration through agreements between universities is still a powerful tool that can be used in synergy between regional/national development policies and research and innovation policies.

In any case, public research funding policies at any level – regional, national or supranational – are the final mechanism for promoting the inclusion of inclusive and collaborative research principles in the processes of:

» Setting out and defining the research agenda, including priority-setting;

» Conceiving new research projects, which should retain curiosity as a main driving force but increase the awareness of academics about the impact of their research;

» Investing in research in a way that supports research across all disciplines, nurtures talent across the researcher pipeline, promotes mobility and attracts international collaboration;

» Communicating the results to both the scientific community and society; in this respect, the movement for open access to science should be reinforced, and the public engaged as co-producers and users of research, not just the passive recipients of the results.

In a similar way, the national/supranational priorities for research should be checked against the SDGs, and aligned if possible. Public research funding policies are, again, the appropriate tool.

As Banda stresses, the recent agreement on how to tackle climate change may be a good example of both a collective and an individual commitment that can modify the course of nature for the benefit of society and future generations.

4. Institutional Governance, Organization and Management

The major assets of a university are the brains of its academic staff, the networks of knowledge, access to data and funding, and the support of students and society as the managers of the knowledge processes. Academics operate within the framework of what is universally known as academic freedom. Academic freedom guarantees that ‘Institutions of higher education are conducted for the common
good and not to further the interest of either the individual teacher or the institution as a whole. The common good depends upon the free search for truth and its free exposition.’ The quotation is taken from the 1940 Statement of Principles on Academic Freedom and Tenure of the American Association of University Professors. More explicitly, and recently, Magna Charta Universitatum defined academic freedom as ‘the foundation for the independent search for truth and a barrier against undue intervention for both government and interest groups’. Even though academic freedom is a more complex and nuanced practice than can be inferred from historic statements, it is still the common concept that should represent academic practice worldwide, although reality shows that it is not the case in many countries.

Before emphasizing the importance of the institutional governance system for HEIs, one has to recognize firstly, that any system to be enforced has to be based on academic freedom, and secondly, that academic freedom is far from being respected around the world, in a situation that is inherently part of the problem that higher education is facing globally. Universities are not like other entities; they are not part of the public administration, they are neither private companies, nor purely collegial organizations. They are a unique organization: universities and academic freedom lie at the core of society, worldwide.

This means that the first basic element in the definition of any kind of university engagement is that the governance system must enable academia to participate in defining the university’s mission. The overall commitment of universities should be explicit in their mission and vision, and understood and accepted by academic staff.

As Goddard and Vallance (2011) point out, the role of leadership is fundamental if bridges are to be built between university and civil society (see also Goddard et al. (2016)). Leadership has to be proactive on both sides, and has to be transformative and focused on the public good. However, the intrinsic characteristics of the academic community (its diversity, organizational structures, academic practices, use of jargon, etc.) can create obstacles and challenges to civic leaders and require universities to set up an internal strategy to promote, measure and recognize the participation of teaching staff in the social role of universities. Although the engagement of university leaders is a must, it is clearly insufficient if it is not embedded throughout the organization and assumed by academics individually.

The governance system should facilitate and encourage individual members of the academic staff to contribute to the university’s social responsibility in a variety of ways, above and beyond their regular teaching and research activities. The overall activity of the faculty should be measurable through an agreed procedure and, thus, acknowledgeable, in such a way that the so-called third mission of the university can be promoted collectively and recognized individually.

As Ellen Hazelkorn (2012) states, ‘[b]ecause academic norms and values can be a road-block to diversity, new forms of academic credentialism and assessment that recognize the diversity of research outputs and impacts as part of the “continuum” of scholarship should be adopted’. She cites as an example a Research and Academic Staff Commitment Agreement in force at the Universitat Rovira i Virgili (Grau, 2006) in which the commitment of the research and academic staff is considered as a whole, but flexibility is key to achieving individual and collective goals. Universities require research
and academic staff with different profiles, and their dedication to the three basic university activities should not necessarily be the same at any given moment in time, or at any given point in a particular person’s career. Evidently, approaches like this need an internal culture of accountability and a system by which academic activity can be measured and recognized.

From an internal and organizational perspective, universities may nowadays need new kinds of structures designed functionally to facilitate new partnerships in research and teaching and to establish better connections between the different institutional areas.

There is not a single or best model of governance, and the diversity around the world is enormous but, as is implicit above, governance systems should allow for the participation of the stakeholders’ voice as a way to facilitate the real social engagement of universities. In any case, HEIs work within a context: they are supported, encouraged and restricted depending on a specific policy environment. There is, then, an important role for governments in setting system-level objectives, and holding institutions to account, including in terms of social engagement.

5. Glocal Higher Education Institutions’ Engagement and Ethical Implications

Universities do not exist in isolation from society, nor from the communities in which they are located, as stated in the Talloires Declaration on the Civic Roles and Social Responsibilities of Higher Education. Engagement is defined by the process of sharing, through which a university gains as much as it contributes, increases its own relevance and becomes more successful at reflecting the character of its community. It also becomes more effective at drawing inspiration from civic sources and responding more quickly to meet direct and pressing challenges.

Thus, if the goal is excellence – greatness on a global scale – the path to success for most universities does not lie in a struggle for incremental improvements in rating systems, which are never a goal, but simply a tool. Rather, it lies in embracing one’s own community in the search for educational relevance, research innovation and community engagement that can allow each university to find its métier – that unique quality that distinguishes it as legitimately pre-eminent and worthy of attention in its own community and in the wider world (Petter, 2017).

The key lesson of recent years is the need to celebrate and support institutional diversity, recognizing that HEIs have different missions and roles in society, which collectively have the capacity and capability to make an impact. Following the contribution of Puukka (2017), developing a global and local engagement role for an HEI should focus on defining and strengthening its own mission and profile, and working closely with myriad stakeholders to identify its contribution to society and the economy. In this context, the following steps and actions should be considered by HEIs and their environment:

1. Institutional commitment
2. Needs assessment
3. Institutional capacity assessment
4. Institutional activity audit
5. Gap analysis
6. Target setting and role definition
7. Organizational development
8. Policy development
9. Policy implementation
10. Monitoring, evaluation and improvement

These steps are so logical that, in fact, they emphasize that developing a global and local engagement role for an HEI requires the same kind of approach and mindset that is needed to undertake any new institutional strategy.

The International Association of Universities (IAU) and the Magna Charta Observatory (MCO) have done a great job to correct a major deficit across the global higher education system: ‘there exists no international code or guidelines on ethical conduct for higher education institutions that articulates how, as institutions, they promote academic and scientific integrity and prevent academic dishonesty and unethical behaviour by actors and stakeholders that form the academic community’. In her contribution to this report, the IAU Executive Secretary, Eva Egron-Polack (2017) explains the IAU-MCO Guidelines for an Institutional Code of Ethics in Higher Education, which constitute the best definition so far of the ethical issues that can arise from the activity of HEIs, and are fully applicable to their responsibility towards the local and global societies.

As the guidelines establish: "It is necessary but insufficient for higher education institutions to elaborate and adopt an Institutional Code of Ethics. Higher education institutions need to go beyond declaring the values and principles they protect and promote by integrating these fully into their institutional strategies, curriculum, management processes and relations with outside stakeholders including international partner institutions, while continuously updating their Code and monitoring its application to ensure relevance and currency."

In that respect, and in addition to the above considerations concerning teaching and research activities, institutions and systems of higher education should also assess the extent to which they:

» Are part of the problem, because they are contributing either to widening the privilege gap in society or to reproducing the status quo, through student selection and entry criteria, curricula and/or research;

» Can help in supporting the decolonization of knowledge and revitalization of indigenous knowledge;
Contribute to the privatization of ownership, control, inequality in access and possession of knowledge;

Contribute either to the concentration of talent in the Global North through brain-drain processes or to the mobility and circulation of knowledge and talent.

6. Incentivizing Institutions, Faculty and Students

As stated above, the nature of universities is such that their overall commitment should be explicit and understood, shared and accepted by the faculty. As Harkavy et al. (2017) point out, HEIs understand more fully than ever that it is in their enlightened self-interest to be civically engaged, particularly with their local schools and communities. Local engagement is also becoming a way to achieve eminence as a research university. Based on the recommendations of Harkavy et al. (2017) to promote this approach worldwide, HEIs should proactively amend institutional norms by stimulating university-wide conversations on the role of engaged scholarship in realizing the university mission (again, the Research and Academic Staff Commitment Agreement described by Grau (2006) can be an operative example of how to develop it) and put in place policies that foster the outcomes of the university’s commitment. ‘Ultimately, what is required is the establishment of an overall socialization process that promotes engaged scholarship and sees it as a valuable act of scholarship and one that advances the institutional mission.’

Puukka (2017) also remarks that an engaged HEI encourages, promotes and rewards outreach, engagement and risk-sharing, which implies revisiting human resources policies and developing a stronger recognition and rewards policy for local and global engagement. In addition, the institution will need an enterprise policy that ensures that the staff’s entrepreneurial and consulting activities are permitted and balanced with academic responsibilities. HEIs can also create incentives for students or student unions for local and global engagement. These steps will be difficult to take if the national policy framework allows limited or no scope in human resources development or funding policies.

It is also interesting to note the concurrence with previously cited authors in the recommendation to establish university-wide centres that catalyse and coordinate community-university engagement, support faculty in this work and institutionalize engaged scholarship. The University of Pennsylvania’s Netter Center could be a good example.

Finally, the key aspect is to provide recognition and support for higher education-civic partnerships and to demonstrate community benefit. Institutional recognition and support might include course development grants, faculty-community partnership awards, thematically based faculty-led seminars, and support for participatory action research projects. Moreover, government, foundation and institutional funding should be awarded to faculty projects that work to solve real-world community problems (not merely describe them), and that do so in collaboration with local partners (again, the idea of quadruple helix collaboration).

As previously stated, recognition and incentives for student engagement should be incorporated in the curriculum design, which requires a credit-recognition system for this kind of activity.
One practical and well-established way to extend the understanding and impact of the international dimension of local civic engagement activities is through cross-border collaboration. Again, public policies should enhance this possibility.

7. Mutual Learning and Empowering Support: the Role of Networks in Achieving Glocal Engagement

The contribution of a single university, even of a single researcher, can constitute a breakthrough in a specific field of science and become a cornerstone for new knowledge development. However, it is likely that this process will be insufficient when dealing with cultural changes, such as those required for the development of dual glocal responsibility and engagement. Global partnership is crucial for ensuring the success of a shift towards socially responsible universities at global and local levels.

The motto ‘Locally engaged, globally relevant’ would be appropriate for many universities, especially those created during the past 50 years of expansion (democratization) of higher education (‘To be a great national university, we must be a great local university’, Shirley Strum Kenny, President, SUNY Stony Brook). Both objectives need alliances to reach the required/desired impact; in fact, nowadays alliances are necessary for most universities, by design, since the vast majority of universities cannot fulfil all their missions without developing real collaborative work with others. There is, then, a functional role developed by alliances and networks that extends the role of single HEIs and permits the fulfilment of the missions of each of its members. In this sense, networks can be characterized by the kind of direct benefits they provide to universities:

a) Helping them to draw up individual strategies that are consistent, and in some cases synergistic, with global needs, trends and/or standards;

b) Integrating a broader and stronger higher education structure that helps to preserve academic autonomy in defence of the public interest;

c) Supporting mutual learning, which fosters individual improvement and increases the ability of single institutions to adapt to changing demands;

d) Increasing knowledge mass, which means being able to reach the required critical mass in highly specialized fields that a single institution may not be able to achieve;

e) Providing better education through transnational and or transcultural experiences.

Furthermore, evidence shows that for many institutions the only practical way to move forward is to take a strategic approach to partnerships and engagement in combining global and local action. As Puukka (2017) points out, to address the dual challenge of globalization and localization there is a need to coordinate existing and new collaborative projects and to build long-term partnerships. The key to
a successful local and global engagement role for higher education institutions lies in the success of combining the local and global engagement as well as the ability to forge mutually beneficial partnerships. In order to take full advantage of these partnerships, universities and other higher education institutions need to become more open and entrepreneurial, socially engaged and civic-minded and strategic by identifying local and global challenges and opportunities and development at trajectories.

Harkavy et al. (2017) emphasize that collaboration inside and outside the academy is necessary to produce genuine knowledge that solves real-world problems and results in positive changes in the human condition. In this respect, they highlight the actions of global networks such as Talloires, GUNi, PASCAL International Observatory, the Living Knowledge Network, Asia Pacific University Community Engagement Network and others.

In short, then, alliances and networks are an important enabler for HEIs, helping them to develop their missions and, in particular, to advance effectively towards a higher education system that is both locally and globally engaged. In other words, collaboration is the best way to maximize capability beyond individual capacity (Hazelkorn, 2010: 70). University leaders and higher education and research policymakers should promote the identification of ‘systems of higher education’ as agents of the global system (increasing the systemness of higher education), and incentivize the participation of their own HEI or system in the different kinds of networks described above, which have a specific function within the local and global systems.

8. Impacts, Multi-faceted Accountabilities and Measurements

Today, more than ever, full accountability is an obligation for HEIs. As core institutions of society, and key to accomplishing its development objectives, HEIs have to demonstrate and to convince society of their positive impact and the value and relevance of the resources that society secures for them. Moreover, they should also be an example of a learning institution that has a strong commitment to continuous improvement on the use of resources.

‘You can’t improve what you can't measure.’ This has become commonplace, but it is intrinsically true. The idea has been stated in many different ways, probably most clearly by H. James Harrington: ‘Measurement is the first step that leads to control and eventually to improvement. If you can't measure something, you can’t understand it. If you can’t understand it, you can’t control it. If you can't control it, you can't improve it.’ Although research impact has been normalized in many scientific areas and dominates the measurement of the outputs of research activity of universities and other knowledge institutions, the impact of teaching is much more elusive, and the impact on society of the overall activity of a university can be even more so. Despite all the difficulties, universities and the knowledge community must make the effort to monitor the evolution of their impact on society and, more importantly, demonstrate and communicate their impact to the public and public authorities in a consistent and regular way. Moreover, following what is called the ‘Hawthorne effect’, the secondary but no less important effect of a culture of regular measurement is that it favours the involvement of the whole
university community because of the positive feeling produced by the fact that all activities can be valued and recognized.

However, it is vital that indicators are meaningful, are fit for purpose, and are not simply counting what is easy or available. Simply introducing indicators to capture impact is not necessarily an appropriate answer.¹ In this respect, initiatives such as the European Commission's European Indicators and Ranking Methodology for University Third Mission (E3M), summarized in the 'Green Paper. Fostering and Measuring “Third Mission” in Higher Education Institutions' (2012), should be encouraged because they attempt to conceptualize and systematize a set of indicators that enable third mission activities to be measured, regardless of the system finally adopted and also regardless of the unavoidable side-effects of a limited set of indicators, which end up by directly affecting the behaviour of the system.

In this respect, as Banda (2017) points out, there is a particular need to develop specific indicators to monitor the implementation of RRI. Wilsdon (2015, 134) promotes the concept of ‘responsible metrics as a way of framing appropriate uses of quantitative indicators in the governance, management and assessment of research.’² Upton (2017) remarks that, given the known complexities of attempting to balance local and global engagement agendas, it is clear that assessing them in parallel is also liable to be a complex task. Evaluative mechanisms have an outcomes-based focus: this engenders a skew towards global goals at the expense of locally beneficial activity, which is problematic.

As was signalled in section 6 above, Upton (2017) emphasizes the importance of treating the spectrum of scholarship and engagement activities undertaken within higher education in a more holistic manner. Treating the pursuit of societal engagement as part of the process of teaching and research, and not as an independently measurable outcome, is a more promising route to embedding impact at different levels.

A set of actions is apparent that would usefully advance our approach to impact assessment (see also the recommendations contained in Expert Group (2008)):

» As more countries begin to foreground ‘impact’ in their universities’ mission, there is a pressing need for further empirical research to test developmental and process-based evaluative mechanisms, such as those described by Upton (2017), in the higher education environment.

» In recognition of this range of possible mechanisms, as governments implement their own systems for assessing research impact they should look beyond existing outcomes-based models.

» Prior to any system-wide rollout, national trials should include developmental, and not only judgemental, forms of assessment.

» In such circumstances, policymakers and practitioners will need to show openness to new approaches. But given systems’ significant interconnectedness, the potential cost for a national higher education system of instituting unilateral change is high. Transnational higher educa-

¹ See http://www.hefce.ac.uk/pubs/reports/Year/2015/metric tide/Title,104463,en.html
² See http://www.hefce.ac.uk/media/HEFCE,2014/Content/Pubs/Independentresearch/2015/The,Metric,Tide/2015_metric_tide.pdf
tion networks should therefore take the lead in generating debate and shaping the agenda on impact assessment.

Ultimately, governments must be encouraged to consider whether the competitive drive to demonstrate impact serves to privilege certain research ends to the detriment of other, equally important ones. Indeed, the fact that rankings measure basic research in traditional scientific fields benefits elite research universities (Hazelkorn, 2009). There is also a global concern about the oversimplification effect of the generalized use of academic rankings, and about the choice of indicators, the methodology and the conceptualization of research (Hazelkorn, 2015). The potential danger lies not in the intrinsic information they provide – essentially a table that includes less than 5% of the world’s HEIs – but in the concentration of public attention on this select group of universities, which can negatively affect the development of the remaining higher education system. This is strictly a public policy responsibility. Higher education and research officials have to define the dimensions and the diversity of their own system and, in particular, their objectives and the policy for the allocation of public resources. In that respect, the accountability of HEIs and systems and the measurement of results and impacts become central elements of the strategy of a country, and, by extension, of the global society, if it includes a focus on global challenges.

9. Resourcing Change Process, Making a Difference

The 1st GUNi Report, ‘Higher Education in the World 2006: The financing of universities’ (HEIW 2006) focused on the resources devoted to higher education. In the report’s preamble, the GUNi President states:

Higher education as a quality public service with strong social commitment is a necessary condition for inclusive sustainable development of nations. Although history demonstrates this certainty over time and across the nations, higher education is at a crossroads. On the one hand, world development is led by the so-called knowledge society, and nations as well as individuals need to face it with quality higher education. This helps to explain the unprecedented expansion of higher education systems worldwide. But on the other hand, most countries and societies in the world have not been able to match this expansion with sufficient financial resources.

This idea is still valid today.

There is a huge amount of research concerning the funding of universities and, among it, HEIW 2006 provides a worldwide panorama that is still very descriptive and useful. Nevertheless, the situation is somewhat different today. After the global economic and financial crisis, many nations have faced complex financial circumstances that affect all public services and, in particular, higher education and research. Progressively more intense market pressures are threatening even the public character of higher education. As stated from the beginning, higher education and research play a central role in the development of nations and humanity as a whole. They have, and will continue to have, an essentially public interest. However, public funding in many countries of the Global North is not as generous
as it once was and in many more countries, in the Global South, has not developed in the way and to
the extent required. Hence, there is an increasing pressure on public resources that are always scarce.

The current report does not deal with funding and funding policies, but cannot avoid the fact that re-
sources are at the heart of any strategy to be developed. Moreover, specific resources for institutional
change are required so that universities can be supported to face their responsibilities at local and
global levels, as described in previous sections.

First, there is a need to establish a global reference framework for the economic dimensioning of the
public effort of higher education and research, in a similar way that many countries and transnational
political entities establish values of reference to define the objectives for investment in research and
development (R&D). For instance, OECD countries (which account for one-sixth of the global popu-
lation) devote, on average, 1.6% of their gross domestic product (GDP) to higher education, including
R&D in universities, with 1.1% being public resources and 0.5% private. Accordingly, monitoring glob-
al public and private investment in universities has become a regular activity of global organizations
like the UN, UNESCO and the World Bank. Only a well-funded system of higher education and devel-
opment of knowledge around the world can ensure sustainable development for all.

Economic resources are no more than a tool; indispensable, but a tool. The real resource required to
face local and global challenges is knowledge. In that respect, higher education and research policy-
makers should develop programmes to enhance local leadership and, in many countries, to attract and
retain talent.

Given the progressive scarcity of public resources, there is a global tendency to the ‘elitization’ of
knowledge: a growing inequity in accessing world-quality HEIs and a concentration of R&D resources
in a few highly specialized research centres outside universities. Both trends should be reversed, and
this is a responsibility shared between higher education and research policymakers and university
leaders. Social cohesion at the local and global levels is more than a utilitarian need to attain sustain-
able development; it is a key objective in itself. This requires that access to and participation in higher
education is based on personal merit and capacity and not on membership of a particular social class.
The specialization of knowledge and specific strategies of nations and their productive sectors may
eventually drive resources to be targeted in highly specialized research centres. However, if this is the
case, this should not be to the detriment of research in universities, as they have responsibility for
preserving and strengthening the breadth of knowledge across all disciplines, as well as playing a for-
mative role in ensuring the research pipelines necessary for the development of ongoing generations
of scientists. Curiosity continues to be the main progenitor of the production of global knowledge.

To guarantee this unique role of universities, their governance system has to ensure full public ac-
countability, both of public and private resources and of research results. In this respect, it is crucial to
develop a standardized system of data collection for each higher education system.

Finally, the main stakeholder of HEIs and higher education systems is the local society that creates,
supports and funds them. Consequently, HEIs have a key role in the strategic development of their
society. The requirement of efficiency also leads to the need to establish a system of alliances and sharing responsibilities with other social actors, while keeping the core responsibility of higher education in creating and disseminating knowledge under the principle of institutional autonomy.

Final remarks

Throughout this multi-secular history, universities have continuously evolved and adapted to their societies’ needs; therefore, the current period does not represent a major turning point. Nevertheless, in the last decade universities have certainly undergone fundamental changes: their overall mission has been redefined and they have been repositioned at the very centre of the social structure in which they are embedded, and held to high expectations by all stakeholders. The phenomenon is complex and multi-faceted, so it can be approached in many different ways, as reflected in the extensive literature that has been produced on the subject in recent years.

A variety of adjectives have been used to define the roles that universities should play and the challenges they face. The 5th GUNi report on higher education (GUNi, 2014), for example, spoke of ‘engaged universities’, whereas Goddard (2009) and Goddard et al. (2016) developed the idea of ‘civic universities’. Other terms that have been proposed in recent years are ‘entrepreneurial universities’ (Gibb, 2005), ‘innovative universities’ (Christensen and Eyring, 2011) and ‘globally competitive, locally engaged universities’ (OECD, 2007). More recently, Douglass (2014) has sought to refresh the concept of ‘flagship universities’.

The vast majority of the literature on this subject draws its inspiration from the fact that university activity – training professionals and community leaders, generating advanced knowledge, and transforming knowledge into new products and processes – plays a central role in economic development and the competitiveness of nations and regions. However, the 2014 GUNi report and other organizations, such as the Talloires Network, focus more on social commitment and the universities’ response to the major problems of humanity. Both of these approaches have emerged from the same phenomenon and the same need: the challenges posed by globalization to people, societies, nations and the world at large. Goddard et al. (2016) have explained the engagement agenda in terms of three broad perspectives or schools of thought – social justice, economic development and the public good – each of which has different implications for institutional governance, organization and focus.

The importance of local issues is perfectly illustrated by the new European regional policy, which requires applicants to develop a Regional Smart Specialization through Research and Innovation (RIS3) strategy if they want to have access to cohesion funds (structural and social action). The Europe 2020 Strategy highlights the key role that innovation plays in smart, sustainable and inclusive growth. Regions play a crucial role because they provide opportunities and an arena for interaction with companies, public authorities and civil society.
One of the ways in which society can rise to global and local challenges is for universities and other HEIs to develop knowledge that can then be used to create innovative products and provide public and private services. This process can involve specialists, not only in science and technology, but also in the humanities and social sciences. Universities have a range of mechanisms at their disposal to transform knowledge into development and wealth. These include providing counselling and services to small and medium-sized enterprises (SMEs), public administration and non-governmental organizations (NGOs), ensuring employment for graduates, incubating spin-offs in science and technology parks, setting up networks of research and business clusters, connecting research requests with research groups and students through Science Shops, meeting the needs of the qualification market for local/regional work, among others.

Today, the role played by a university in society is measured not only by its impact on higher education and research, but also by the extent to which it carries out what is simplistically referred to as the third mission: that is, the socioeconomic and cultural interaction between the university and the environment, which aims to improve the community. This interaction with society and the economy is as diverse as the diversity of HEIs. In any case, universities are already involved in shaping an environment that is conducive to generating knowledge and transforming it into economic value, productivity and competitiveness. In turn, this creates jobs and wealth and helps to lay the basis of a balanced, advanced, fair and sustainable society.

These different approaches do not always appear to be compatible. This may be the greatest challenge of all: universities – particularly those specializing in research – must at the same time be recognized as civic, entrepreneurial, innovative, flagship and globally competitive, and both locally and globally engaged. Ultimately, the onus is on higher education and research policymakers to design the appropriate environment of policies, public and private resources, data collection and accounting procedures and public information to make this possible.
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