

# *Cipes*- Center for Research in Higher Education Policies

## Governance of Polytechnic and Vocational Education: A Comparative Analysis of European Countries

**M<sup>a</sup> de Lourdes Machado  
José Brites Ferreira  
Rui Santiago**

**Lisbon Research and Policy Workshops on  
“Science, Technology and Social Change”  
15-16 October, 2007**



**NON UNIVERSITY HIGHER EDUCATION IN EUROPE**

**AUSTRIA - Elsa Hackl**

**BELGIUM - Jef C. Verhoeven**

**FINLAND - Jussi Välimaa and Marja-liisa Neuvonen-Rauhala**

**GERMANY - Matthias Klumpp and Ulrich Teichler**

**IRELAND - Patrick Clancy**

**NETHERLANDS - Jeroen Huisman**

**NORWAY - Svein Kyvik**

**PORTUGAL –José Brites Ferreira, Maria de Lourdes Machado and Rui Santiago**

**SPAIN - Josep Bricall and Marti Parellada**

**UNITED KINGDOM - John Brennan and Ruth Williams**

**EDITORS-James S. Taylor; José Brites Ferreira, Maria de Lourdes Machado and Rui Santiago**

**PUBLISHER- *Springer***



## OUTLINE OF THE PRESENTATION

- 1. Background of the Non-University Sector**
- 2. Brief Overview of Structural Models of Higher Education Systems**
- 3. Governance Structures and Organization of the Non-university Institutions**
- 4. What Lies Ahead?  
Questions and Challenges**
- 5. Final Thoughts**



## OBJECTIVES

- To present some conclusions of a comparative analysis of non-university higher education in select European countries.
- To highlight some challenges for the future of the sector.



# 1. BACKGROUND OF THE NON-UNIVERSITY SECTOR



## 1. BACKGROUND OF NON-UNIVERSITY SECTOR

Until 1960, higher education was the exclusive space of the universities. But the growth in the number of students in many countries in parallel with new economic and social exigencies and growing specialisation (horizontal and vertical) in the social division of work changed this situation.



## 1.BACKGROUND OF NON-UNIVERSITY SECTOR

### Expansion and Diversification of Higher Education Systems

In the sixties to meet the increasing demand for higher education:

- some countries expanded their universities (Italy, Spain and Sweden)
- in Western Europe, the reorganisation of higher education in most countries included the creation of a second institutional type. Different from traditional universities, the non-university sector was more oriented toward vocational educational programmes, and the preparation for a profession or for the qualifications required for a specific occupation.

**“During the post-World War II period, the most important single trend worldwide in higher education was undoubtedly the expansion of the system.”**

(Schugurensky, 2003)



## 1. BACKGROUND OF NON-UNIVERSITY SECTOR

According to Teichler (2002) “Moreover it is widely assumed that **higher education systems were under pressure of diversification** in recent decades due to the growth of enrolment rates, because the students became more heterogeneous in terms of motivations, competences and career prospects, and because governments were not willing to pay for an expansion of the research-oriented sector of higher education in tune with the rising student demand for higher education (Trow 1974; Clark 1976; Teichler 1998; Jallade 1991; Meek *et al.* 1996).”





## 1. BACKGROUND OF NON-UNIVERSITY SECTOR

“Starting in the sixties, non-university institutions have been founded that offer vocational and technical programmes at bachelor’s and sub-bachelor’s-level and similar programmes have been established within some traditional universities to meet the increasing demand for higher education and to educate and train the intermediate-level manpower requirements of advancing economies where tertiary-level qualifications were being required in an increasing number of jobs.”

Gürüz (2003)



## 1. BACKGROUND OF NON-UNIVERSITY SECTOR

“The decision to expand or create alternative institutions partly reflects a reaction against universities, which have been seen in many countries as too rigid, too academic in the pejorative occupational preparation, too elitist and inegalitarian, too unconcerned with the quality of teaching, too geographically remote for much of the population, and often too expensive.”

Grubb (2003)



## 1. BACKGROUND OF NON-UNIVERSITY SECTOR

### Four Major Conceptual Frameworks Explaining the Actual Developments

- **‘Expansion of higher education’ (Amaral et al., 2006; Teichler, 2004)**
- **‘Drift theories’ (Neave, 1996; Teichler, 2004)**
  - **‘academic drift’**
  - **‘vocational drift’**
- **‘Flexibilization’ (Teichler, 2004)**
- **‘Cyclical’ (Teichler, 2004)**



# 1. BACKGROUND OF NON-UNIVERSITY SECTOR

PERCENTAGES OF	STUDENTS	BY SECTOR (1ST YEAR)
Country	University Sector	Non-university sector
The Netherlands	25	75
Flanders (Belgium)	30	70
Finland	40	60
Ireland	45	55
Norway	45	55
Portugal	60	40
Germany	70	30
Austria	85	15



# 1. BACKGROUND OF NON-UNIVERSITY SECTOR

## Non-University Institutions:

- ✓ *Ammattikorkeakoulu* (Finland)
- ✓ *Fachhochschulen* (Austria, German)
- ✓ *Hogescholen* (The Netherlands)
- ✓ *Hogsckolen* (Norway)
- ✓ *Institutos Politécnicos* (Portugal)
- ✓ *Institutes of Technology* (Ireland)

## Outside of Europe:

*Colleges of Applied Arts and Technology* (Canada)

*Community Colleges* (U.S.)

*Tanki Daigaku, Took Senmon Gakko, Senshu Gakko Kotei* (Japan)

*Vocational Schools* (Turkey)

*Centros Universitários* (Brasil)



## 1. BACKGROUND OF NON-UNIVERSITY SECTOR

### Commonalities and Differentiations between Universities and Non- University Institutions

- legal framework,
- objectives of each sector,
- duration of study programmes/courses,
- careers of academic staff,
- access of students,
- autonomy of institutions,
- governance of institutions,
- non-existence of research programs, and
- creation of training programs that had been outside of higher education



## **2. BRIEF OVERVIEW OF STRUCTURAL MODELS OF HIGHER EDUCATION SYSTEMS**



## 2. STRUCTURAL MODELS OF HIGHER EDUCATION SYSTEMS

University-dominated Systems	Dual Systems	Binary Systems	Unified Systems
Italy	Austria	Netherlands Germany Belgium Sweden Norway Ireland Greece Portugal Denmark Finland Switzerland	United Kingdom Spain





## 2. STRUCTURAL MODELS OF HIGHER EDUCATION SYSTEMS

### Formal Systems Dimensions of Diversity

➤ **Hierarchical (Japan, U.S.)**

One or two institutions considered the leading ones  
Limited variety of institutional types

➤ **Binary (Portugal)**

Clear distinction between universities and polytechnics

➤ **Supplemented Binary (Australia)**

Universities and colleges supplement with a third sector (institutions for technical and further education)

➤ **Heterogeneous (France)**

Clearly segmented functional divisions such as an elite training sector (*Grandes Ecoles*), a vocationally oriented sector, the socializing sector and the academic sector

➤ **Clearly Distinct (Netherlands)**

Universities and non-universities sectors with little permeability

(Teichler, 2004)



## 2. STRUCTURAL MODELS OF HIGHER EDUCATION SYSTEMS

The **origin and evolution** of the non-university sector were **different** from one country to another. In the cases presented in our book, the option to the binary system has been maintained, except in the case of the UK, where, in the 90s, the polytechnics were upgraded to universities. The case of Spain is different. In fact, in Spain, the institutions of higher education consist only of universities.

In countries such as Belgium (Flanders), Germany, Ireland, Norway, The Netherlands and Portugal the binary system existed for decades. While the end of the binary system in the UK could have signalled other countries to follow the same path, in fact countries such as Austria and Finland opted for the binary system. In 2005 and 2006, Portugal introduced legislation in support of the binary system. However in Norway there is a possible trend towards unification.

There are several countries where the binary system has been very successful, such as Germany, Ireland, Norway and The Netherlands, where students enrolments have exceeded those of the universities.



## 2. STRUCTURAL MODELS OF HIGHER EDUCATION SYSTEMS

The countries that have experience with the binary system seem to continue with it. Recently, political decisions in countries such as Austria, **Finland**, Ireland and Portugal suggest that the binary option is being reinforced. In the case of Portugal, the implementation of the Bologna process is being used to reinforce the differences between the university and non-university sectors. This is most notable in the bachelors and masters degrees, with the professional emphasis in the polytechnics and the academic thrust in the universities.

This difference between professional and academic emphasis may not always be easy to defend or implement. First, there are institutions that offer the same professional and academic programs regardless of being universities or polytechnics (**Portugal**). Second, the market is influencing higher education institutions toward professional drift, with enrolments being a problem for both sectors (**Finland, Norway, Portugal**).



### **3. GOVERNANCE STRUCTURES AND ORGANIZATION OF THE NON-UNIVERSITY INSTITUTIONS**



### 3. GOVERNANCE STRUCTURES AND ORGANIZATION OF THE NON-UNIVERSITY INSTITUTIONS

#### LEGAL FRAMEWORK

THE LEGAL FRAMEWORK THAT REGULATES INSTITUTIONS IS DIFFERENT: LEGISLATORS HAVE DEFINED THE SECTOR USING DIFFERENT DEGREES OF SPECIFICITY.

IN SOME CASES, THE NATIONAL LAW PROVIDES MINIMAL PRINCIPLES AND A MINIMUM OF STRUCTURE (Finland and Austria).

IN OTHER CASES, AN OVERLY-EXTENSIVE FRAMEWORK REGULATES PRACTICALLY ALL THE ASPECTS REGARDING THE INSTITUTIONS (Portugal and Ireland).



### 3. GOVERNANCE STRUCTURES AND ORGANIZATION OF THE NON-UNIVERSITY INSTITUTIONS

#### GOVERNING BODIES

IT IS NOT EASY TO MAKE COMPARISONS BETWEEN THE DIFFERENT COUNTRIES AND INSTITUTIONS

THE CONTEXT OF EACH INSTITUTION CAN BE UNIQUE IN MANY ASPECTS, PARTICULARLY IN THE CULTURAL, LEGAL AND INSTITUTIONAL REALMS (e.g. the number of elements of governing bodies is fixed by law or, in other cases, this number depends on the application 'principles' fixed by law)



### 3. GOVERNANCE STRUCTURES AND ORGANIZATION OF THE NON-UNIVERSITY INSTITUTIONS

COUNTRIES	BODIES
Austria	<i>Supervisory Board Managing Director Rector</i>
Belgium-Flanders	<i>Board of Directors General Manager Directorate Negotiation Committee Council of Students</i>
Germany	<i>President Præsidium Senat</i>
Finland	<i>Governing Board Rector</i>
Ireland	<i>Governing Body Director Academic Council</i>
The Netherlands	<i>Supervisory Board Executive Board Participation Council Committee of Dispute</i>
Norway	<i>Board of Governors Rector</i>
Portugal	<i>Presidente Conselho Geral Conselho Administrativo</i>



### 3. GOVERNANCE STRUCTURES AND ORGANIZATION OF THE NON-UNIVERSITY INSTITUTIONS

#### ROLE OF THE STATE

THE RESPONDENTS HAVE CONSIDERED THE *HYBRID MODEL* THE MOST FREQUENT IN THE GOVERNANCE AND REGULATION OF THE SECTOR: conflict of state control elements with self-regulation elements.





### 3. GOVERNANCE STRUCTURES AND ORGANIZATION OF THE NON-UNIVERSITY INSTITUTIONS

Responses Concerning State Governance Models in European Countries under Study

	GE	AU	FL (B)	FI	NL	IR	NO	PT
State Control								X
State Supervision			X					X
Market Oriented								
Hybrid	X	X		X	X	X	X	



### 3. GOVERNANCE STRUCTURES AND ORGANIZATION OF THE NON-UNIVERSITY INSTITUTIONS

#### ROLE OF THE STAKEHOLDERS

THE PARTICIPATION OF EXTERNAL STAKEHOLDERS HAPPENS  
IN ALL CASES, EXCEPT IN ONE (Germany)

Cipes



*Cipes* Center for Research in Higher Education Policies

Lisbon Research and Policy Workshops

## 4. WHAT LIES AHEAD? QUESTIONS AND CHALLENGES



## 4. WHAT LIES AHEAD? QUESTIONS AND CHALLENGES

### Trends

- Europeanization
- Academic Capitalism
- Managerialism
- Organizational Stress
- Growing Collaboration
- Culture of Quality
- Cross-Border Student Mobility ‘Borderless Higher Education’

(Cunningham et al., 2000; Gürüz, 2003; Marginson, 2004; Neave, 2004; Skolnick & Davis, 2004)

“At the beginning of the 21st century, the landscape of tertiary education is quite different that it was even 10 years ago. Many more countries have established tertiary colleges and institutes; many have targeted them to high rates of growth. The roles of tertiary colleges and institutes have continued to evolve, though the search for identity is still a crucial issue.”

(Grubb, 2003: 5)



## 4. WHAT LIES AHEAD? QUESTIONS AND CHALLENGES

### Bologna Process

- ❑ A rationale for change in national systems
- ❑ Is mentioned frequently and with major relevance (Amaral *et. al*, 2006)
- ❑ The results of the Bologna Process cannot be predicted (Teichler, 2004)

“It remains to be seen what impact these changes have on the stratification of the higher education systems and with respect to the encouragement or discouragement of individual institutions to develop specific profiles and thus to contribute to horizontal diversity” (Teichler, 2002)

“The Bologna Process which involves now governments, higher education institutions, students, and international organizations has turned out to be the most effective lever for change that Europe has so far known in higher education for centuries” (Guri-Rosenblit & Sebkova, 2004)



## 4. WHAT LIES AHEAD? QUESTIONS AND CHALLENGES

### CHALLENGES OF THE INSTITUTIONS FACING IN THE FUTURE

- Bologna Process XXXXXXXX
- Consolidation XX
- Quality XXXXX
- Students Recruitment XXXX
- Research and Development XXXX
- Markets X
- Financing XXX
- Training Adequacy X
- External Relations and Development X
- Academic (Mission) Drift XXXX
- Cooperation and Internationalization XX
- Role of Academic Staff X
- Network Training XX
- Human Resources X

( Amaral et al., 2006)



## 4. WHAT LIES AHEAD? QUESTIONS AND CHALLENGES

### CONCERNS FOR THE FUTURE

THE CONCERN MENTIONED MORE FREQUENTLY AND WITH MAJOR EMPHASIS IS THE BOLOGNA PROCESS:

- THE ISSUE OF BACHELOR AND MASTER PROGRAMS
- QUESTIONING THE LEGITIMACY OF BINARY SYSTEM
- CONVERGENCE "VS" DIVERSITY



## **4. WHAT LIES AHEAD? QUESTIONS AND CHALLENGES**

The objectives of non-university institutions, even though different from the universities, did not impede their growing approximation to the universities, especially with regard to the organisation, length of degrees and the degrees awarded.

In many cases, the non-university sector is identified in international circles by names such as University of Applied Sciences or University College.





## 4. WHAT LIES AHEAD? QUESTIONS AND CHALLENGES

Several differentiations can be seen between universities and non-university institutions:

- The duration of studies was shorter in the non-university sector and oriented to specific professions, frequently not resulting in the awarding of any degree.
- Research was not present in the non-university sector and the careers and qualifications required to academic staff were also different from the university sector.
- The “academic drift” of non-university institutions has been accompanied by a countering “vocational/professional drift” of the universities.
- Academic careers are different in both sectors; however, the degrees of academic staff are more similar than in the past.
- In some cases, the legal framework of higher education institutions has been subject to changes, thus bringing the two sectors closer together.
- And, no less relevant, today universities and non-university institutions compete for the same students.



## 4. WHAT LIES AHEAD? QUESTIONS AND CHALLENGES

The dynamics of higher education have been defined by national policies. The Bologna process is creating new dynamics within the European framework that will facilitate the development of study programmes in transnational institutional networks. Programs such as these are a reality and could grow within and between sectors of higher education, depending on the legal framework of each country.

The implementation of the Bologna process suggests a growing convergence that can reduce the diversity both within and between national higher education systems. Bologna may also reinforce the position that the binary system in Europe reflects appropriate mission differentiation between the university and non-university systems. In this context, the question is whether the Bologna Process will be the catalyst to promote debates on academic drift versus mission focus, standardisation versus differentiation, and regulation versus autonomy. All of this begs the question of what the future holds?

Cipes



*Cipes* Center for Research in Higher Education Policies

Lisbon Research and Policy Workshops

## 5. FINAL THOUGHTS



## 5. FINAL THOUGHTS

- The European national systems evolved in different pathways.
- Different National Systems today.
- The question is if the Bologna Process will be the catalyst to promote debates regarding:
  - academic drift versus mission focus,
  - standardization versus differentiation,
  - and regulation versus autonomy.
- What does the future hold? Convergence or Diversity?



## 5. FINAL THOUGHTS

With the passage of higher education from elitism to massification, diversification assumed an important role and was considered a positive dynamic by several authors (Stadtman 1980; Birnbaum 1983; van Vught 1996).

There are several arguments in favour of diversity. Taylor (2003)

- increases the range of choices available to learners;
- makes higher education available to virtually everyone;
- matches education to the needs and abilities of individual students;
- enables institutions to select their own mission and confine their activities;
- responds to the pressures of a society (complex and diversified in itself), and
- becomes a precondition of college and university freedom and autonomy.



## 5. FINAL THOUGHTS

The history of the development of the non-university sector shows a growing approximation with that of the university sector, specifically in the areas of the legal framework, the duration of study programmes/courses, the qualifications of academic staff and the development of applied research.

Some of the reasons that justified the creation of the non-university sector – regional development, networking with economic and social activities, and experimental development and applied research – are today also present in some universities. This growing approximation between the two sectors has often been referred to as “academic drift”.



## 5. FINAL THOUGHTS

### Views of Future Development of HE Systems

#### Continuity Thesis

Continuity of the actual binary system predominant in our days in Europe

#### Convergence Thesis

- Higher education systems will be more uniform and less autonomous. (Bleiklie, 2004)

#### Upgrading Thesis

Upgrading of non-university institutions to universities:

- If a substantial variety emerges in the new structure of study programmes and degrees, one cannot expect strong pressures for convergence as far as the types of higher education institutions are concerned.
- If, however, the structure of study programme degrees becomes more similar across European countries, as they seem to be developing at the moment, the various countries might opt for an upgrading of the non-university higher education institutions to universities. (Teichler, Forthcoming)

#### Stratification Thesis

Systems more stratified: research universities, local or regional universities, polytechnics. (Amaral, 2007)



## 5. FINAL THOUGHTS

### Perspective

The future of higher education needs to be reached with quality and dignity by all the actors regarding the structure of the higher education system, the degrees and diplomas, the governance of institutions, autonomy and regulation, staff careers, funding mechanisms, research; and social equity and mobility. To do less is to abandon the fundamental charge to higher education to contribute efficiently, effectively and meaningfully to the advancement of social well-being and prosperity.

(Machado, Ferreira, Santiago & Taylor, Forthcoming)



Cipes



## **CIPES- Center for Research on Higher Education Policy**

**Lisbon Research and Policy Workshops**



**THANK YOU**  
**QUESTIONS and COMMENTS**

# **Cipes- Center for Research in Higher Education Policies**



## **Governance of Polytechnic and Vocational Education: A Comparative Analysis of European Countries**

**M<sup>a</sup> de Lourdes Machado  
José Brites Ferreira  
Rui Santiago**

**Lisbon Research and Policy Workshops on  
“Science, Technology and Social Change”  
15-16 October, 2007**