

TERTIARY CAPACITY DEVELOPMENT AND SOCIETAL DEVELOPMENT:  
Reflections in relation to OECD/World Bank “Cross Border Higher Education for  
Development”(draft),  
World Bank/OECD/NUFFIC Seminar, 14-15 Sept. 2006, NUFFIC, The Hague, Neth.

*DRAFT*

Dr. J.B. (Hans) Opschoor,<sup>1</sup>  
Institute of Social Studies (The Hague) and Free University (Amsterdam),  
Netherlands’ UNESCO Commission, Working Group Sciences

Global society has entered, or is entering, a knowledge-based development phase. The world economy is changing as knowledge becomes a key source of wealth. As knowledge becomes more important, so too does higher education. One may distinguish four basic features of education. Looked at somewhat idealistically, apart from being a vehicle for allowing people to learn to *know* and to *do* things, education is – or should be – a vehicle for learning to *be* and to *live together* (UNESCO 1996). In the more prosaic terms of the World Bank/UNESCO Task Force (2000) higher education should aspire to several aims:

- furthering economic development by inducing income growth, training enlightened leaders, expanding choice and increasing relevant skills;
- allowing countries to generate new knowledge and to engage in scholarly and scientific commerce with other nations;
- promoting an open, meritocratic and civil society based on inclusive public values that embody liberal norms of social interaction, etc.

Indeed, ‘Tertiary education... is a critical pillar to human development world-wide’, as Mamphela Ramphela, Director of Human Development at the World Bank observed (World Bank 2002).

I mention these perspectives to underline that in the OECD/World Bank draft a relatively specific orientation is highlighted. It takes positions with respect to questions such as:  
- Could cross border education be a suitable model for developing countries to build capacity in tertiary education, and more generally, to accelerate economic development? (Chapter 1)

---

<sup>1</sup> This paper draws on: Molenaar, M. (2006): “Enkele Gedachten over Capaciteitsontwikkeling en de Internationalisering van Hoger Onderwijs”, , an as yet unpublished paper for Nationale Unesco Commissie, Werkgroep Wetenschappen, Den Haag, and earlier texts by myself: Opschoor J.B. (2004) “Knowledge Sharing in support of Human Development”. In: Max Spoor (ed.), Globalisation, Poverty and Conflict, Kluwer Academic Publishers 307–322; and Opschoor J.B. (2001). “The Future of International Education”. FION, UNESCO-IHE, Delft (unpubl).

- Can capacity building help developing countries to reduce poverty and stimulate economic growth? (Chapter 2)
- Do higher education services contribute to a country's economic growth and standards of living? (Chapter 3).

Though these positions reflect a widening set of societal objectives, they still seem to all have an economic focus. Yet, from an instrumental point alone, it already should be wider. The World Bank (2002) states,

higher education, through its role in empowering domestic constituencies, building institutions and nurturing favourable regulatory frameworks and governance structures, is vital to a country's efforts to increase social capital and to promote social cohesion, which is proving to be an important determinant of economic growth and development.

In fact, I would argue that the intrinsic values beyond the economic dimensions of development as mentioned above, should also be considered in any analysis of the societal significance of higher education. This is my first point and I will get back to it.

Let me add immediately, that given the boundaries within which the report remains, it does an admirable job of detailing the contributions of education, higher education (HE hereafter) within that, and cross-border higher education in particular, to economic development. It also points at a number of specifics, positive and negative, in relation to various forms of cross border higher education (IHE hereafter) and capacity development (CD), and rightly explores various aspects of regulatory approaches and strategies that national governments could deploy to ensure compatibility between development objectives and the evolution of HE-systems.

In short (I draw on the conclusions from the report's various chapters):

- Cross-border education can be an effective capacity development tool for the tertiary education systems as well as the economy, in developing countries. More specifically, it can assist in expanding access for domestic students, in enhancing the quality of tertiary education, and in increasing the variety and relevance of this – and thus improve the quality and quantity of its human and social resources. IHE may also present challenges in relation to quality, equity, or migration. Countries must consider how to use cross-border education in order to maximise benefits and minimise risks. Countries must consider how to use cross-border education in order to maximise benefits and minimise risks.
- Regulatory frameworks for IHE should aim to develop the above described circumstances so countries can benefit the most from IHE.
- Tertiary education in developing countries faces particular problems with quality that can impede capacity building, to do with ensuring minimum standards and improving the quality of tertiary education. Efforts to assure and improve the quality of tertiary education should endeavour to best use the limited resources available and produce concrete results not only in learning outcomes, but also in the operational effectiveness of the learning institutions themselves.
- Enhanced trade and investment in tertiary education services can help achieve development goals. Liberalisation, a strategy that is cautiously proposed here, requires sound regulation and effective institutions to address market failures and ensure public policy objectives. The report mentions explicitly areas such as: quality of service and

recognition of qualifications, equity and potential downsides stemming from students going overseas.

- Lastly, if appropriately designed, bound liberalisation under the GATS is said to be able to contribute to the advancement of national objectives. However, the Agreement can affect the regulatory conduct of governments in some areas of tertiary education and some of its provisions remain to be tested in practice. Tailor specific commitments to national policy objectives are called for.

I would like to address some of these points, and also deal with one or two others:

- the future of international higher education and the dynamics of knowledge gap;
- globalization, liberalization and HE
- capacity development for HE in developing countries
- research capabilities and development.

### *The Future of International, Development-Oriented Higher Education*

Over the coming decades the level of activity in higher education will continue to rise globally. This is certain to be the case in the developing countries. The driving forces behind this include population dynamics and the emergence of knowledge-based development and globalisation. The WB/OECD study discussed here shows ample and detailed support for these (and similar) observations.

Moreover, there is a growing awareness that the non-economic functions that higher education can perform, as outlined above, are increasingly and urgently needed (Opschoor 2004, IAC 2004). For instance, HE is recognized as a key force for modernization and development. IAC regards the culture and values of science as critical for the building of a global community (IAC 2004:30ff); reference is often made to the need to build a culture of academic freedom including freedom in expression.

HE is a growth sector but at the same time a sector in transition. Qualitatively, there are deep concerns over the impacts of large numbers of entrants and dwindling financial resources on the supply side. Quantitatively, the systems that provide higher education in developing countries will often be unable to meet rising and changing demands. Moreover, the education on offer has not always kept up-to-date with shifting frontiers; knowledge systems have not always been upgraded satisfactorily and sustainably; and facilities have run down (see, e.g. Opschoor 2001). These are deep problems juxtaposed against a need to ensure *quality, relevance* and *access* – the three criteria suggested by UNESCO (1998).

Disconcertingly, the gap between rich and poor countries, in terms of access to knowledge and potentials to generate it, is widening. This is illustrated by well-established indicators, including:

- The enrolment rates in higher education. In industrial countries these are much greater than in developing countries. The WB/OECD report has data showing that in 1980, 1990 and around 2000, participation rates in tertiary education in the relevant age cohort in the

OECD area rose from 20 via 30 to 45 %; in low income countries the corresponding figures were 4-4-8%; in lower middle income countries 15-17-24% and in upper middle income countries 15-19-32%. At best, the trends for these groups of countries show similar relative increase, but no convergence yet. The gap in HE-participation does not diminish, not even in quantitative terms.

- Per capita, industrial countries have ten times more research and development scientists than developing countries and are spending four times the percentage spent by developing countries on innovation (World Bank 1998; at the moment I have no more recent information). This latter gap exacerbates the knowledge gap profoundly: it reflects major asymmetries at the level of systems of knowledge generation. Here too one would like to also have data on the qualitative side, of course.

These gaps show up in stark contrasts in, e.g.: access to high-quality facilities, equipment and supplies, availability of well-trained teachers, links with the international scientific community and access to the global stock of knowledge. Without more and better higher education, developing countries will find it increasingly difficult to benefit from the global knowledge-based economy: countries that are only weakly connected to the global knowledge system will find themselves increasingly at a disadvantage (Task Force 2000). Unless major programmes are put in place to address these asymmetries, the gap will continue to widen.

Knowledge gaps show up in stark contrasts in a variety of characteristics of knowledge systems in the North and South. It has been suggested (Task Force 2000, UNESCO 1998) that these contrasts pose a sufficient argument for international cooperation between the North and South in higher education. The WB/OECD report shows data on trends in ODA- expenditure on education and higher education suggesting a higher share of tertiary education oriented expenditure (2001 versus 1995) within a falling share of ODA devoted to education (and a slowly dropping overall ODA flow). In line with this it is worth echoing IAC' belief "... that the overall level of all official development assistance should be increased and that the place of S&T capacity building should be secured among the priorities. Many existing programs for fellowships, training, and education can be expanded..." (IAC 2004:10).

The balance of this in terms of current levels of ODA for IHE is felt to be inadequate by far, in addressing the need for funds if the gaps are to be closed, and the study therefore is also looking at other sources of funding. It recognizes that domestic governmental budgets are inadequate and are likely to remain that; what is left open then is what might come in through FDI in HE and trade in educational services.

As a comment on the study in relation to the gaps mentioned here, I suggest that the report could have dwelled more on research and research-oriented capacity development. As it is, it relates to direct educational ('learning') aspects almost exclusively. In a 'first things first'-sentiment this may be understandable, but it is high time to get second thoughts here, and look at capabilities and capacities in the domain of knowledge and know how generation. That is – it so happens – *my* second point here. Already in 2000 World Bank/UNESCO (Task Force 2000) added *research capacity* to the list of items

that national governments are responsible for. Governments are to supplement what the private sector will provide: in basic sciences, in the humanities, and in the form of scholarships to increase participation of underrepresented groups.

### *Globalisation and Higher Education (1)*

The emergence of global markets, trade liberalisation, privatisation and rapid technological change affect demand on labour markets. Production and management systems must be flexible and adaptable, and the same goes for human skills. Higher education systems should aim to meet changes in demands for the human resources that they deliver. This suggests that lifelong learning and more varied educational packages in terms of intensity of delivery (e.g. evening classes) and place of delivery (e.g. distance learning) will have to be further developed and put on offer.

Several structural responses are already visible on the ground. For instance, the numbers of campuses is expanding (per country and often even per university). There is also steady growth in efforts to expand distance-learning facilities and their effective outreach. Universities are extending their teaching programmes beyond first degrees, to increasingly include master's programmes (and beyond). Graduate schools are emerging, and there are attempts at coordination to avoid duplication of costly efforts. There are exogenous initiatives to create centres and networks of excellence. Networks now link many southern faculties and departments with institutions in the North – links that are considered essential lifelines to the places where knowledge expands most rapidly.

The effects of globalisation point to the need for international higher education systems to radically change in many ways. There will be profound changes in modes of delivery. Distance learning through correspondence and, in future, via the Internet will to a large degree replace classical forms of delivery. Far more modularised programmes (with perhaps shorter, cumulative blocks) will emerge, with students studying at more than one location in the context of a particular degree, using credit accumulation and credit transfer systems.

Then there is the advent of outside providers. Cross-border tertiary education refers to situations where students, teachers, programmes, institutions/providers or course materials cross national borders; it can take several forms, such as students (and teachers) travelling to study (teach) in foreign countries, educational institutions partnering with foreign institutions to offer joint educational programmes or degrees, educational institutions operating abroad, and educational courses being supplied across borders through e-learning or distance learning; cross-border education is delivered under a variety of contractual arrangements: development aid, not-for-profit partnerships, and, increasingly, trade (OECD/WB 2006, par. 3). It stems from a variety of factors in importing and exporting countries: cultural motives (to promote understanding); a need for skilled workers in a knowledge based economy (brain gain); the desire to generate revenue for a higher education sector under financial stress; etc. On the receiving side, the coming of IHE may alleviate domestic resource scarcities.

It should be noted (and so the report does: par 66) that foreign programmes and institutions may in some cases adversely affect quality enhancement or access in the host country. Foreign operations may not maintain the quality of education provided at their home campuses, local providers may not be delivering programmes developed by international partners in an appropriate manner; “rogue” providers could disguise themselves as ‘foreign’ institutions and programmes and take advantage of the lack of transparency about tertiary education systems worldwide. Foreign programmes could also have a negative effect on the quality of domestic provision.

Commercial provision of cross-border higher education might have three adverse effects for developing countries (report, par 69): it may lack stability, raise quality and inequity issues (access). It may widen rather than close the gap between developed and emerging economies and the less developed countries if it is seen as a substitute rather than a complement to development assistance. Trade in tertiary education may only benefit developing countries that are already developed enough economically to attract a foreign supply of education. Most of the commercial provision of cross-border tertiary education occurs in emerging economies in Pacific Asia, the Middle-East and, to a lesser extent, Latin America.

Trade, the report suggests, provide developing countries with ownership and leadership on the education services they import. It represents an opportunity for developing countries because it allows them to build capacity much more rapidly than they could do with their limited domestic resources and/or with the help of development assistance. The upshot of all pros and cons of trade and/or aid is, that the report proposes that trade and aid are to be seen as complementary rather than as substitutes (par. 78).

In the context of the negotiations on the liberalisation of trade in services (GATS), proposals have been made to enhance access to education providers, especially of higher, adult education and vocational training.

The social costs of privatisation and liberalisation may be significant. They include losses of diversity. For instance, attention to “small” cultures and education in “small” languages will likely disappear. Existing (often good institutes) may lose their subsidies and incomes. Moreover, control over the quality and content of higher education will become more difficult. There is further a risk of “intellectual imperialism”. Price increases might prevent potential students with low incomes from entering the market. The quality of teachers may erode if institutions yield to pressure to minimise costs; there may also be a loss of criticality within the educational system. Such social costs must be weighed against any real or envisaged benefits.

At a more fundamental level, more may be at stake. In fact, when HE-services are provided in a market setting – and in that of international markets, investment and trade, then the provision of these services, both qualitatively, and quantitatively, are subjected to market forces, that is: demand as mediated by market power, or needs in the form of purchasing power, and considerations of costs and revenues. Put rhetorically but aptly,

“... it is value (not values) that becomes crucial” (Rikowski 202), and educational services shift from “...becoming public goods to private commodities” (ibid.). Market driven education may well focus on domains where students are willing and capable to pay based on expected private returns in the form of salaries, rather than intrinsic motives as mentioned earlier (Molenaar 2006). A second tendency is for economically strong economies and/or with high development potential may, in the process, attract more IHE and absorb relatively large shares of the capacities for funding and delivering (I)HE, at the expense of these resources flowing to where, in a development perspective, needs are higher (ibid.). Such tendencies would exacerbate the inequalities already visible in the data on the knowledge gap quoted above. Apart from the technical issues related to GATS-governed provision systems, there is this concern that the commodification of HE might erode the provision of public services.

The least one can conclude is that there will be a manifest role for states and governments in the provision of higher education, nationally and internationally. This in fact is the rationale for much of the WB/OECD report and I am happy with that focus. More precisely, I believe that we need to study much more than has been done, but in a spirit of open-mindedness, the various social benefits and costs, including their distributional aspects (as pointed at in the report) of the various modes of delivery and provision of services in tertiary education and knowledge generation. Globalisation will be with us – as it always has- and its liberal, neo-classically rooted forms are also likely to stay.

My third point is, that, given that, and given a justified and mounting concern (within institutions such as those involved in this research, but also UNDP, UNESCO etcetera, not to mention the NGO-world) over the adverse externalities and how these can be curbed, more research is necessary – not only in a multidisciplinary setting, but also in line with the multidimensional perspective that I have indicated at the beginning of this paper. We need to help find innovative and effective ways to enable governments to curb these.

In this context, some further thinking about GATS and its implications would seem cost-effective (to say the very least) and socially relevant. WB/OECD (par 93) rightly stress that developing countries utilising cross-border tertiary education to build capacity and complement domestic provision should develop policies facilitating:

- Participation of their nationals in cross-border education and co-operation between foreign providers and the domestic tertiary education sector.
- Relevance and quality of cross-border education.
- Actual value added from cross-border education to the domestic higher education sector.
- Limitation of possible brain drain.

In addition, together with the international institutions and donor community there is a need to reflect on a structural response to the gaps that fall when the satisfaction of the need for educational services were left to market forces. As we shall see, this links up with some specific suggestions on directions for capacity development.

## *Globalisation and Higher Education (2)*

But there is more: the impacts of globalization are not economic or institutional alone. Globalization poses its demands in terms of new cultural imperatives where a particular kind of modernity (“Western” modernity) is being replicated *also* in social and cultural domains (Kalb et al 2004b:2). Thus, globalization may have contributed to the erosion of knowledge systems in poor countries. The discourse of globalization ‘naturalizes’ polarizing economic processes as inevitable phenomena to which people and politics can only adapt (Jansen 2004:170). ‘Privatization, the commodification of knowledge, and the framing of the problems by international expertise networks may increase North-South inequalities’ (ibid.:185, 186). Powerful agents inject their values as well as their truths in shaping a knowledge base in developing countries - hence the notion of *cognitive justice* as a notion that puts different kinds of knowledge at the same footing (ibid:169) and that resists the prevailing situation of asymmetry and dominance in the more depository models of knowledge transfer.

Developing countries need their own knowledge generating systems (institutional capacities), based on their own values, and agendas, and having the capacity to find out what is most relevant to them. Amina Mama holds that cultural institutions are essential in enabling the collective reflection required to develop, reproduce and advance understandings of rights and duties as bases for modern forms of citizenship (Mama 2004). However, globalization erodes these. In the context of the global market, who will agree on the rights and duties of citizens? What new institutional architecture will ensure citizenry? Globalization, through structural adjustment programmes, has diminished the spaces for innovation in the periphery through ‘education reforms’ privileging natural science and technology and regards humanities and arts as ‘something of an indulgence’ (ibid.). Knowledge, social science based knowledge particularly, must be recognized as a cultural product and hence a function of social structures and historical context.

Van Damme (2002), a major contributor to the UNESCO-thinking about the role of education in the emerging ‘knowledge society’ points at the necessity of ‘situated knowledge’ or knowledge systems located in the various regions of the world. He emphasizes that this entails much more than the sharing of knowledge as a factor of production: tertiary education is to enhance social capital, competences related to nation-building, citizenship and international understanding, a capacity for solid ethical judgment and humanistic and cultural development. We are back again at the *scope* of education and science, beyond, or next to their economic functions.

And here comes my fourth point. Building up institutional capacities is necessary, not only in fields such as engineering or health but, according to IAC also in the social sciences: social science professionals are important for policy analysis and for developing an academic culture and building the appropriate institutions (IAC 2004:33); I would like to adhere the cultural sciences.

### *Capacity development*

Internationalisation of higher education may take many forms: local delivery of educational services by international providers (together with local partners, or on their own), e-learning or other forms of distance learning, the moving of staff and students from one country to another, foreign campuses, etc. People may move (staff and students), or, indeed (as OECD/WB observe), programmes and institutions.

A final approach to the internationalisation of higher education is the *capacity building* approach. The 'importing' country expects its domestic supply capacity to expand and the capacity of high quality higher education to rise. Capacity building involves learning and acquisition of skills and resources by individuals and organisations. At higher levels, it may involve sectors and networks in sectors, national societies and even the global level. Here we focus on the first three levels, especially that of institutions and networks: we concentrate on capacity development that strengthens organisations and networks of organizations by contributing to a durable provision of professional capacities (capabilities), and associated strengthening in organizational and institutional ways, of private and public organizations, usually building on an existing institutional foundation (Molenaar 2006; Opschoor 2001). By organizational strengthening I mean the enhancement of managerial capacities and skills in and of organizations; by institutional capacity development I mean the building up of capacity of the organization to develop, to negotiate with its regulatory and stakeholder environments, etc.

Capacity building implies a long rather than short term perspective, and thus represents a structural move away from traditional donor-led aid projects (WB/OECD 2006). This (I would argue) may be an improvement but it does not automatically ensure that the needs of the recipients are always met. That might not be the case if capacity development is left to market forces, or if ODA-funded capacity development is donor-led or supplier-led rather than geared towards well established needs.

Various forms of institutional capacity development in tertiary education have been identified. There is an apparent wish to establish centres of excellence at the postgraduate level at national higher education institutions, which would often operate regionally. In addition there is need for cooperation between countries that cannot set up complete higher education systems at the national level in setting up or encouraging regional centres. This wish is translating itself into a trend. However, newly established postgraduate programmes often cannot be maintained, especially in the poorer regions. Financial conditions are often to be blamed for this, but there is also a lack of effective management and, sadly, a lack of interest among potential employers in the "products" of such regional institutions. There is a need for more regional cooperation, most certainly in the less well-endowed areas, in order to achieve and sustain prestige more easily and cost-effectively than could be done at a national level.

Well-developed systems for research and knowledge generation continue to grow in importance. These allow developing countries to contribute to the global stock of

knowledge and engage in scholarly and scientific commerce with other nations – an indispensable form of internationalisation in our globalising knowledge society. Any academic institution in the North with special expertise may be attractive as a partner, but especially those that have shown a sincere interest in capacity development in the South based on needs expressed there.

My fifth point thus is, that capacity development goes beyond education per se or the capacity to deliver educational programmes: there are significant organisational and institutional dimensions to be taken into account.

*N-S IHE in future (1): Capacity Development as a specialism?*

Addressing the future of international higher education, United Nations University Rector Hans van Ginkel (2000) observed that there are important niches for top-level, highly specialised relatively small institutions with good brand names, as long as excellent quality is guaranteed. I would like to suggest that these might have to be explicitly mandated to operate in a development mode, in order not to be driven by entrepreneurial/commercial motives alone. Small-scale institutions dedicated in terms of both development orientation and substantive specialisation may have the flexibility required to meet the various challenges ahead more easily than institutions for which *international* tertiary education is only part of their activities and their concerns and whose “core business” is delivery in the wealthier segments of the education markets.

Institutes in the North have found niches that are not yet accessible to higher education institutions in the South. Given the relative scarcities of financial and human resources and the prevailing priorities within higher education in the North and the South, such niches may indeed, and for some time to come, arise more easily in the North. Such specialised institutes could work on the basis of substantive expertise or cutting-edge methodological advantages (e.g. in remote sensing techniques or modelling). From a development perspective, they should be ready to transfer the cores of these niches through institutional capacity development and, in the meantime, provide opportunities for human resource development at the level of individual students. Fellowship programmes and capacity development programmes thus seem relevant and should be maintained, if not expanded in real financial terms.

Institutions specialized in international education could become the vanguard through which a broader set of national and international actors in tertiary education (such as universities) become more effectively involved in development-oriented higher education. In particular, such specialised institutes could contribute to the “relevance” of any offer on the market for international partnerships in higher education, where both suppliers in combination can ensure its “quality”. If true partnerships are achieved, academic cooperation with a development orientation should by definition not crowd out southern institutions but rather involve them more intensively, even if capacity levels remain asymmetrical.

Although thinking about the nature and content of development and change in the various regions of the world is an activity best left largely to ‘local’ academic institutions, specialised OECD-based institutions may be well-suited to provide the comparative setting and the knowledge base for scholars from southern institutions to test and compare new knowledge and know-how. Such specialised institutes for international education have an advantage over other higher education providers in that their faculty is typically much more international and experienced in development processes. Their staff easily link considerations of academic quality with those of relevance or pertinence – something appreciated much less in northern universities than in their southern counterparts. Such institutes may also be more ready to make the shift towards delivery of education in the South together with southern partners (see below). They may also have a better understanding of, and sensitivity to, the regional specificity required in developing joint activities in teaching and research.

My sixth point thus is, that traditional providers of HE may not be necessarily the best suited ones to deliver IHE, especially in a development setting.

*N-S IHE in future (2): Partnering/networking as a strategy?*

There is a consistent and strong plea from higher education institutions in non-industrialised countries for long-lasting contacts with institutions in the OECD region. This long-term perspective not only ensures adequate time to develop activities, it also enables backstopping, quality control and maintenance in the implementation phases and beyond. IHE has to be ready for longer term involvement in twinning (or other network) arrangements in order to strengthen and build up institutions in the South for knowledge gathering, processing and disseminating. North-South partnerships in higher education can be justified if the institutes involved are centres of excellence in particular fields of study and if the northern partners serve as facilitators or conduits for the developing-country institutes, enhancing their access to and interaction with global knowledge centres.

North-South cooperation between institutes should, however, be based on genuine partnership. It should help to effectively strengthen institutional capacities in the South, promote resource sharing and the exchange of knowledge and reduce brain drain.

Such partnerships - to make my final, seventh, point - may go beyond the traditional bilateral construct of one (Northern) organization providing the knowledge and knowhow to a Southern partner in a particular area, in two ways:

- a) by developing into N-S-S, or even S-N-S-network configurations involving different partners including a ‘horizontal’ knowledge sharing between different partners in the South and beyond simplistic donor-recipient modes of delivery (e.g. Opschoor 2004).
- b) By involving partners beyond the straightforward educational and knowledge generation domains, e.g. through networking with professional organizations,

knowledge implementing organizations, etc, effectively combining the entire knowledge chain in particular sectors or subsectors (Molenaar 2006).

### *Conclusions*

In the above, and prompted (often: informed) by the draft WB/OECD report: “Cross Border Higher Education for Development” I have made a number of observations, starting from a particular (though not uncommon) perspective on higher education, and inspired by a host of descriptive and policy documents, plus experiences (personal and institutional) in the field of international higher education and capacity building for development.

I propose, for further consideration:

- 1) Higher education has value and functions beyond the economic dimensions of development as focused on in the report. These should also be considered in analyses of the societal significance of higher education and I higher education policies. These additional functions also raise questions in relation to the commodification or commercialization of higher educations.
- 2) Given their role in the dynamics underlying the international knowledge gap, the report could have dwelled more on research and research-oriented capacity development. As it is, it relates to direct educational (‘learning’) aspects almost exclusively. It is high time to also look at capabilities and capacities in the domain of knowledge and know how generation.
- 3) Given a mounting concern over possible adverse externalities of some forms of IHE provision and how these can be curbed, more research is necessary – not only in a multidisciplinary setting, but also in a multidimensional perspective. We need to help find innovative and effective ways to enable governments to curb these. In this context, further thinking about GATS and its implications is relevant. In addition, there is a need to reflect on a structural response to the gaps that fall when the satisfaction of the need for educational services were left to market forces.
- 4) In the broader perspective on HE and development implicit in point 1, building up institutional capacities is necessary, not only in fields such as engineering or health but, also in the social and cultural sciences.
- 5) Capacity development goes beyond education per se or the capacity to deliver educational programmes: there are significant organisational and institutional dimensions to be taken into account.
- 6) Traditional providers of HE may not be necessarily the best suited ones to deliver IHE through institutional capacity building, especially in a development setting. There may be

scope for bringing together skills, mandates and resources into organizational structures dedicated to HE-oriented development and with a sufficiently long-term orientation.

7) Capacity developing partnerships will go beyond the traditional bilateral construct of one (Northern) organization providing the knowledge and knowhow to a Southern partner in a particular area, by (a) developing into N-S-S, or even S-N-S-network configurations involving different partners, and (b) by involving other partners in particular knowledge chains or networks.

### *References:*

Damme, Dirk van (2002). Outlooks for the International Higher Education Community in Constructing the Global Knowledge Society. UNESCO; Global Forum workshop on Globalization and Higher Education, 17-18 Oct 2002; Paris.

Ginkel, J. van (2000) 'Opening address academic year 2000 at ITC', ITC, Enschede, 28 September.

IAC (InterAcademy Council) (2004). Inventing a Better Future: a strategy for building worldwide capacities in science and technology. IAC; Amsterdam, KNAW (Royal Netherlands Academy of Sciences).

IBRD (1994) *Higher Education: The Lessons of Experience*, Washington, D.C.: World Bank.

Jansen K (2004). "Unpacking and re-packing knowledge in development". In Kalb et al (2004): 163-190.

Kalb, D. (2004). "Time and contention in 'the great globalization debate)". In Kalb, D., W. Panters, H. Siebers (2004): 9-48.

Kalb, D., W. Panters, H. Siebers (2004a). Globalization and Development: Themes and concepts in current research. Kluwer Ac Publ, Dordrecht.

Mama, Amina (2004). Culture and Citizenship. Lecture at Society for International Development, Royal Institute for the Tropics, Amsterdam, 9<sup>th</sup> June 2004-11-01

Molenaar, M. (2006): "Enkele Gedachten over Capaciteitsontwikkeling en de Internationalisering van Hoger Onderwijs", Nationale Unesco Commissie, Werkgroep Wetenschappen, Den Haag,

Opschoor J.B. (2001). "The Future of International Education". FION, UNESCO-IHE, Delft.

Opschoor J.B. (2004) "Knowledge Sharing in support of Human Development". In: Max Spoor (ed.), Globalisation, Poverty and Conflict, Kluwer Academic Publishers 307-322;

Rikowski G. (2002). Globalisation and Education: Paper prepared for the House of Lords, Select Committee on Economic Affairs, Inquiry into the Global Economy, 22 Jan 2002.

Task Force on Higher Education and Society (2000) . Higher Education in Developing Countries: Peril and Promise. World Bank/UNESCO. World Bank, Washington DC, 2000.

UNESCO (International Commission on Education in the 21<sup>st</sup> Century), 1996. Learning: The Treasure Within. UNESCO Publ., Paris, 1996.

UNESCO 1998. World Conference on Higher Education. UNESCO Publ., Paris, 1998

Wende, M.C. van der (2002) 'Hoger onderwijs globaliter: Naar nieuwe kaders voor onderzoek en beleid'. Inaugural lecture UT, Enschede, 16 May.

World Bank (1998) *Knowledge for Development: World Development Report 1998/99*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

World Bank (2002) *Constructing Knowledge Societies: New Challenges for Tertiary Education*, Washington, D.C.: World Bank.