Can national systems of Higher Education & Research learn from each other?

Vienna June 1st, 2017 Sijbolt Noorda President emeritus Universiteit van Amsterdam and VSNU (Dutch Research Universities Association) *lower* than average funding levels for research

lowest share of researchers in total population

average share of internationally co-authored publications (controlled for country size)

high research productivity (second only to Switzerland) with above average levels of impact

impressive record of EU research funding (both individual grants and project funding) and collaborations.

ERC grants since 2007, > 100



public research money is almost entirely spent *inside* universities

40% of research universities have a *focused* profile (technology, food & nutrition, law & economics)

the remaining 60% show a strong *focus* on health & life sciences

since the mid 80s *all* research programmes had to be *team* work (rather than individual projects) to qualify for funding and since the mid 90s all research is carried out and managed in intrauniversity institutes for research and training PhDs

little performance *variance* exists between universities

location advantages (open borders and short distances) facilitate collaborations.

a *very long* tradition of international values, mobility and collaborative connections abroad, so literally all researchers are well networked internationally

foreign recruitment helped by an attractive *mix* of *competitiveness* and *informality* in the workplace and the *absence* of regulations favouring national recruitment

a tradition of stimulating, innovative and entrepreneurial *leadership* in many research groups and institutes

a strong sense of inter-university collaboration at all levels.

since 1986 periodic peer review evaluations of all teaching programmes and performance had been the rule

only a third of all first year students entering Higher Education opt for universities rather than *hogescholen* (polytechnics) resulting in a relatively uniformly qualified and well prepared student population

in almost all cases *open* enrolment of all qualified incoming students is allowed (outside medicine few caps exist)

only two universities were founded on the basis of an explicit teaching & learning philosophy.

Registered students

academic year



Bron: VSNU/CBS, 1cHO2016 ; Prognosis 2025:Referentieraming 2016, OCW

Registered international students

Concerns students at the bachelor and master level on October 1st of the academic year.



Source: 1cHO2016, VSNU/CBS

Note: International students have been defined as students who have a non-Dutch passport and who are in the possession of a foreign high school degree.

Registered international students, EER and non-EER



Source: 1cijferHO2016, VSNU/CBS



total enrolment in universities for applied science (2016/2017)

approx 10% master 90% bachelor

institutes for teaching & learning were introduced by universities as the collaborative centres to design, operate and evaluate teaching programmes and learning performance

next to mono-disciplinary curricula quite a few *multi-disciplinary* curricula were introduced at bachelor level, and a good number of stand alone liberal arts & science colleges 2.0

all medical faculties introduced *integrated* curricula in which preclinical, clinical and research-led elements were combined right from the beginning more in general, curriculum re-design in view of research innovation and changing labour market demands is the rule; very few curricula remain unaltered for more than a decade

the Bologna three-cycle model was immediately seen as a positive help in terms of programme redesign and student choice basic teaching *qualifications* were required for incoming junior teachers at all levels (including supervision by colleagues)

transition support programmes were set up for incoming students while they are still in schools (and in some cases preparatory junior tutoring)

honours tracks were offered almost everywhere, both at bachelor and at master level

a national programme was initiated to stimulate bachelor level *research* activities

English language taught programmes were widely introduced (most masters are English language taught, some at bachelor level)

dual mode accreditation remained in place (both at institutional and at programme level)

decentralization began around 1985

- a new contract between universities and government (HOAK)
- leading to new law making underscoring university autonomy (including management) and accountability (quality evaluation of education and of research as a national peer reviewing process)
- academic council replaced by university association (employers role & quality assessment)

gradual implementation

- in a period of about 10 years all executive decision making was devolved to the local university boards (including appointments, capital investments and strategic planning)
- supervisory boards were established
- quality assessment became standard practice
- block grant funding based on a general formula, partly output based

continuous balancing act

- complexities of individual university developments in the hands of local leadership (priority setting, profiling, balancing etc)
- political responsibility for the overall system remained in place (including funding and access)
- frequently (planned) interventions challenge this balance (either finance driven or triggered by performance complaints)

Faculty





about 50% of block grant funding is bound by matching obligations

at the end of the day

- within the boundaries of the HE&R system (average level funding, low tuition fees) Dutch universities have considerable freedom for day-to-day decision making, both academically and managerially
- a three or four level governance, however, runs into trouble where and when these levels do not work into the same direction a the same speed; so at regular intervals we have to synchronize our watches and compare our road maps