

## *Universitas 21*

### **Meeting No. 8 of the U21 Deans of Education Group**

**Thursday, April 6, 2006**

**1:00 to 6:00 pm**

**VENUE: Renaissance Parc 55 Hotel, San Francisco**

### **Participants**

Airini, Auckland  
Graeme Aitken, Auckland  
Adrian Ashman, Queensland  
David Clarke, Melbourne  
Jim Conroy, Glasgow  
Lynn McAlpine, McGill  
Roger Slee, McGill  
Gary Thomas, Birmingham  
Pat Thomson, Nottingham  
Rob Tierney, UBC  
Jane Usherwood, U21 Secretariat  
Gerry Postiglione, Hong Kong  
Lyn Yates, Melbourne

## **MEETING REPORT**

### **1. Welcome and Review Agenda: David Clarke**

### **2. U21 - the current state of play: Jane Usherwood - U21 Secretariat**

In a useful and extended review of recent U21 activity, Jane made the following points:

- 2.1 “Putting the academic agenda back at the centre of Universitas 21”  
Emphasis on U21 Global has distracted attention from the academic activities that provided one of the major motivations for establishing the U21 Network. A key aspect of Jane’s activities and that of the Secretariat are to re-establish the centrality of an academic agenda for U21. Distinctions were drawn between U21 LBG, U21Equity, U21Global, and U21Pegagogica. Reference to U21 for the remainder of the meeting tended to refer to “The Network.”
- 2.2 The Shanghai Declaration on Student Mobility  
Reference was made to the Shanghai Declaration (already circulated and attached to this report – dated April, 2005). The document represents a significant “in principle” support for the initiatives currently being undertaken by the U21 Deans of Education Group.

### 2.3 Achievements 2004-2005

- Students have been successfully recruited to a Global Issues Programme being run through UBC/Melbourne/Hong Kong/Auckland/Nottingham.
- A successful summer school was run in Lund on the topic of “sustainability” – further summer schools are planned: “Asia as Global Business” to be held in Hong Kong in 2006 and a 2007 summer school on Global Leadership.
- The inaugural U21 undergraduate research conference was held at the University of Virginia in 2005. Papers presented have been published in a special 3-volume issue of a local research publication. Further undergraduate research conferences are planned.
- Two new U21 Members: Korea University and Shanghai Jiao Tong University
- Two new networks/special interest groups: Museums and Collections, coordinated from Melbourne, and Systems Biology, coordinated from Nottingham. The issue of what to call such sub-networks within U21 (of which the Deans of Education group is one) was raised. There was general dissatisfaction with the title “Special Interest Groups”
- Professional Portability – mention was made that the group DDOGS (Deans and Directors of Graduate Studies) will be progressing two new funded projects – one to encourage postgraduate networking at conferences (US\$10,000 funding) and one to develop an online module in research ethics. The research ethics module is being developed by a committee of representatives from six institutions, chaired by Barbara Evans from Melbourne.

**ACTION: David to contact Barbara Evans regarding the Practice, Purpose and Progress of this working group.**

### 2.4 U21 Communications

The U21 Secretariat distributes an e-bulletin once a month. Examples of previous e-bulletins can be found at <http://www.universitas21.com/news/ebulletin.htm>  
An email from Clare Noakes to David (as a “Special Interest Group Coordinator”) sought text or photos for the U21 Newsletter – these must reach Clare by Wednesday, May 24.

Both quarterly newsletters and yearly reports are planned.

### 2.4 The U21 Network Structure

The structure of Universitas 21 was reviewed – the U21 Directors are the Vice-Chancellors of the participating universities; the U21 Managers serve as gate-keepers between U21 and their institutions. Their role includes the approval of project funding. The process for applying for funding can be found on the U21 website.

### 2.5 New Members of U21

Two additional institutions are likely to join U21 in the near future: University College Dublin and Tech de Monterrey (Mexico). In addition, suitable members are also being sought in India and the subcontinent and in Africa.

### 2.6 Visitor Status in Special Interest Groups

The possibility was discussed of including representatives from non-U21 institutions in meetings of Special Interest Groups. This was seen as legitimate and appropriate – particularly where the Visitor (or Affiliated Member?)

represented a centre of acknowledged international standing in the particular domain of the Special Interest Group. Among the examples cited were: The continuing interest of the School of Education at the University of Michigan in maintaining links and possible involvement with the U21 Deans of Education group; and, interest recently expressed by the Associate Dean (Research) from the University of Gothenburg.

#### 2.7 Berlin Declaration

U21 endorsement of the Berlin Declaration on Open-Access to Scholarly publications (see <http://www.zim.mpg.de/openaccess-berlin/>). At the time of this report, 152 organisations from all over the world have signed the Berlin Declaration.

#### 2.8 U21 Conferences

Internationalisation conference – Auckland, May, 2006

Diversity conference – Birmingham, September, 2006

E-learning conference – Guadalajara, December, 2006-04-10

#### 2.9 Secretariat Up-date

The new U21 Secretariat is in place.

A re-launch of the U21 website is planned. This relaunched website will include designated SIG space. Some discussion occurred regarding how the U21 Deans of Education group might make use of this. There was general dissatisfaction with the designation “Special Interest Group” but no acceptable alternatives were forthcoming.

#### 2.10 Clarification of Membership Conditions in U21 Network

Member institutions of U21 were discussed briefly – noting the withdrawal of the Universities of Michigan, Toronto and Freiburg.

It is possible to be a member of the U21 Network, without participating in U21 Global.

#### 2.11 Appreciation

The U21 Deans of Education group expressed its unanimous appreciation of Jane’s participation in the meeting and of the support provided by the U21 Secretariat in covering the venue and catering costs of the meeting.

### **3. Exchange within U21 Education**

Adrian Ashman opened the discussion of Exchange issues within U21 Education, and a lively and extended discussion followed in which the following points were addressed:

#### 3.1 Constraints on Student Exchange

Two key constraints were identified: Cost and competing work commitments for part-time postgraduate students.

#### 3.2 Standardised Webpage to Support Student Exchange

Adrian tabled a draft outline of a webpage that might be included in all U21 university’s websites, with the title “Studying Education at another Universitas 21 university” (attached). The draft document set out the sort of information likely to be of assistance to a student considering study at a different U21 institution. In several places on the document, information would need to be provided by each U21 university. The meeting strongly endorsed the document and expressed

appreciation for Professor Ashman's efforts in its development. It was felt that the document provided not just a useful addition to each university's (and the U21) website, but also served to set out succinctly the issues central to the process of facilitating student exchange.

The discussion is indicated in the following key points (as attributed):

- The meeting noted the continuing difficulties of the diversity of course structures and the lack of comparability of instructional units.
- Each U21 institution has a Student Mobility Co-ordinator/Advisor (Jane).
- Need to review and identify the benefits of student exchange (Rob)
- There can be lack of equity in the numbers of exchange students, with some institutions hosting many more students than they 'send out' – this has definite funding implications (Rob)
- Some (non-U21) institutions fund visiting students – could a U21 student mobility program make use of such institutions?
- Current marketing by U21 institutions appears to be intended to lure students from one U21 institution to another. Are such activities acting against student exchange initiatives?
- Any initiative by the U21 Education group should be aligned with current university global exchange initiatives (Lyn)
- Given the current climate of rationalisation of classes at both postgraduate and undergraduate level, U21 could be used to supplement local programs by increasing class sizes through the physical or virtual participation of students from other U21 institutions.

#### **4. Program Development: Pat Thomson/Graeme Aitken**

Pat Thomson provided a progress report on the joint initiative of the Universities of Nottingham and Auckland to develop a course that would offer students the possibility of study or research at an overseas institution.

As proposed, the course would take the form of a one-year-equivalent "top-up" for students already holding a Postgraduate Diploma in Education, leading to the award of a Masters degree. The emphasis of the proposed program would be on equipping a teacher to address the demands and needs of students from a variety of contexts. The structure would consist of a local module and a thesis. The local module would involve the 'excavation' of the local educational context, in anticipation of a research project to be undertaken at another U21 institution. In its present preliminary form, it is proposed that the local module be delivered in Summer intensive mode.

Airini thanked Pat for the development work undertaken by Nottingham and conveyed support for the basic model, with the possible additional inclusion of Early Childhood Education. This suggestion was received favourably by Nottingham. The following comments were made in relation to the proposed course:

- (i) Attractive to recent graduates in England, interested in the overseas component
- (ii) Will also be taken by graduates in England wanting to complete the course locally, due to the constraints of full-time work
- (iii) Consideration of flexible delivery options – could be delivered onsite in Malaysia or Auckland, for example.
- (iv) Strong and general support for the proposed course.

An outline of the proposed course could be ready in time for the September meeting of the U21 Deans of Education group. The course outline will be forwarded to David for dissemination to the group prior to this meeting. At the same time, a brief (one paragraph) proposal relating to fees would be forwarded to Jane Usherwood for consideration by the U21 Secretariat. The documentation to be prepared in time for the September meeting would include: The Course Outline; Relevant Regulations (including a tentative fee structure); Outline of a possible Parallel Research Program

**ACTION: NOTTINGHAM AND AUCKLAND**

It was proposed (and strongly supported by the meeting) that a research project be set-up in parallel with the implementation of the new course to study and evaluate student experience of the course.

**5. Student Exchange discussion (continued)**

Airini identified six specific benefits arising from student participation in Student Exchange:

- Confidence with diverse communities
- Transformation of practice
- Growth of postgraduate researchers
- Increased research outputs in Education
- An understanding of the significance of educational context from research
- Efficiencies of scale

Further points were made during the discussion, as follows:

- Education students are drawn disproportionately from groups with particular demographic characteristics (eg lower SES) (Jim)
- Need for on-going support following participation in the proposed Nottingham-Auckland program to support changes in practice (Lynn)
- The proposed research program to be undertaken in parallel with the Nottingham-Auckland course could be posted on the U21 Education SIG website as a forum for more general discussion and to invite expressions of interest.
- Circulate relevant readings related to the proposed course (Pat)
- Need for U21 financial support for development meetings related to the proposed course (Pat)
- Support should be provided for bi-lingual skills development as an integral part of courses such as that proposed (Gerry)

**6. Higher Degree Initiatives**

Jim Conroy opened the discussion by identifying issues that impacted on U21 delivery of higher degree programs:

- Fee structure
- Inter-institutional fee transfer
- Accreditation (not seen as a major issue)
- Proportion of student time spent in the other institution

Jim proposed that a U21 International Masters (MEd) or Doctoral (EdD or DEd) degree have the specific requirement that at least one module be undertaken at/from/through another U21 institution other than the home institution. This proposal was supported strongly by the meeting.

Jim further proposed:

- A modular taught program using on-line delivery

- A minimum class size of ten in aggregate across U21 institutions
- Options designed and delivered by U21 partners
- At least one module must be taken at or through another U21 institution
- Weekend intensive classes could supplement online delivery
- Inter-institutional research supervision

In order to draw upon the expertise distributed across the U21 network, the following steps were proposed:

- i) Obtain local institutional approval to proceed. The essential thrust of the initiative would be contained in the requirement that for designated masters or doctoral degrees “One course must be taken another U21 institution’s offerings, by whatever means” (onsite attendance, video conferencing, online delivery, and so on).
- ii) Establish a Working Group to develop the Model
- iii) Obtain information from the U21 Secretariat on possible fee structure(s) for the initiative.
- iv) Prepare and submit a proposal to the U21 Secretariat for the planning meeting.
- v) Obtain U21 and institutional support for a 4-day development seminar to generate the structure for the proposed initiative.

Jim expressed his willingness to host such a meeting in Glasgow for 3 or 4 days (eg after ECER in September, 2006) to develop a structure and a strategy. The meeting unanimously endorsed the proposal and participants agreed to take appropriate steps to put the above steps into effect.

**ACTION: MEETING**

## **7. Vocational Doctorates**

Pat posed the question: “What’s a professional doctorate?”

Rob replied that this needs scholarly presentation and discussion.

There was a general willingness to share relevant papers related to such degrees.

## **8. Forum for doctoral students: Lynn McAlpine**

Lynn made several very specific points:

- i) Any U21 initiative should complement existing local and international possibilities for doctoral students to communicate and meet. Some conferences, such as AERA, already incorporate mechanisms for the initiation of doctoral students into the research community. The European Association for Research into Learning and Instruction (EARLI) already organises the JURE (Junior University Researchers in Education) conference every year. Many institutions (eg Uni. Of Melb.) hold annual postgraduate research conferences, which provide an opportunity for students to report on their research in a supportive atmosphere. Some such conferences publish a selection of the conference papers in a locally refereed publication.
- ii) A survey should be undertaken of interest and perceived needs among U21 doctoral students.
- iii) Establish a working group of Doctoral students in Education from U21 institutions to work with Lynn developing and administering the survey. U21 representatives (Deans or their nominees) should email one nomination per institution to Lynn at [lynn.mcalpine@mcgill.ca](mailto:lynn.mcalpine@mcgill.ca).

**ACTION: MEETING**

### **9. Research-mapping database: Roger Slee**

Roger posed the question, “Why have a research data base?” and suggested that there were two central justifications:

- i) To facilitate networking
- ii) To support benchmarking

It was proposed that Roger explores U21 institution websites (or by any other means) and collects information about each university’s research strengths.

**ACTION: ROGER**

### **10. AERA Reception**

Investigate the possibility of a U21 AERA Reception. David to email Deans to obtain expressions of interest to host such a Reception at next year’s conference.

**ACTION: DAVID**

### **11. Next Meeting**

Timing of the next meeting would be determined subject to progress on actioning item 6 above.

Meeting Closed: 6 pm