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WHO IS AHEAD?
The Finnish and Austrian Way towards University Lifelong Learning

Andrea Bernhard, University of Graz, Austria

Theoretical Background
European countries are confronted with major structural changes and have to adapt to new technologies, react to new demands in the labour market and take part in the globalisation process. In this context especially higher education is challenged to correspond to these changes and provide answers in a time of uncertainty and paradoxes. Universities on their own cannot cope with the development towards a knowledge-based society with all its needs and claims for increasing knowledge. Thus, academia goes together with the knowledge society where 'competition with other institutions and a loss of the monopoly of universities' prevails (virtual universities, corporate universities, media organisations, consortia, strategic alliances, private and public institutions) (Boer et al., 2002, p.43). This new mode of knowledge production (Gibbons et al. 1994; Nowotny et al. 2001) effects academic research and brings new opportunities.

Välimaa and Hoffman (2008) argue that a learning society has very much in common with a knowledge society because they emphasise 'the centrality of knowledge production and lifelong learning of the labour force and because the imperative of this ethos can be summed up by the phrase: learning how to learn' (p.279). This change of society into a knowledge society indicates traditional appreciations of a society which are altered especially in terms of the ageing of many societies. The following table shall provide an overview of these changes from a traditional towards a lifelong learning mode.

Table 1: The organization of higher education – from traditional to lifelong learning modes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Traditional mode</th>
<th>Lifelong learning mode</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Restricted access</td>
<td>Open access</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admission only with academic credentials</td>
<td>Assessment of prior learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For the young only</td>
<td>For young and adults</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selection for excellence</td>
<td>Learning opportunities for all</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate-centered</td>
<td>Wide range of programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full-time studies</td>
<td>Full-time and part-time learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campus/classroom based, on-site studies</td>
<td>Also off-campus/distance studies, self-learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linear studies with final examinations</td>
<td>Module-based curriculum, credit system</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discipline oriented, curriculum-centered organizational studies</td>
<td>Problem-solving and competence-oriented, student-centered organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degree studies</td>
<td>Degree and non-degree studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focus on initial higher education</td>
<td>Including continuing higher education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-diversified system of higher education</td>
<td>Diversified system of higher education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question: What university did you attend</td>
<td>Question: What did you learn at your university?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Schuetze/Slowey 2002, p.324 (adapted from S. Yamamoto 2001)

Different questions concerning employability and claims for a better study-work transition can be raised. These issues are closely linked to the lifelong learning paradigm which has an effect on the higher education sector because of the high number of older adults entering universities. In the
European context the Bologna process with all its implications can be seen as the main promoter to make tertiary education fit for the future. In the Bologna Declaration in 1999 one of the main goals is lifelong learning which means that prior learning assessment and recognition and the assessment of non-traditional qualifications are essential to facilitate lifelong learning opportunities and strategies. In the following conference (2001) and the Bologna Seminar in Prague (2001) it was even argued that lifelong learning should be fully integrated into regular higher education activities (Bergan 2003).

Within the university sector, lifelong learning is provided through University Continuing Education (UCE) and covers a wide range of activities (workshops, seminars, summer schools, courses, degree courses and other programs). These activities are meant to be flexible, innovative and in many cases interdisciplinary and organized on a part-time basis. The situation in two relatively small European countries, Austria and Finland, will be discussed in the following and shall exemplify different ways to cope with international developments and the need to develop University Lifelong Learning (ULLL). For giving an overview of both countries a historical as well as a present view on higher education incentives in lifelong learning will be given and some statistical data will be taken into account.

The Austrian response to Lifelong Learning

Over a long period lots of adult learning centers have been established. The 1890s can be seen as an academic turning point because the university became a major promoter of popular adult education. Next to the international development towards university expansion, popular adult education became more academic and scientific and ‘entered’ the universities right at the beginning of their democratization (Schlögl and Schneeberger 2003, p.9). Much later through the higher education reform in 1993 UCE has become a new weight and therefore management structures for UCE have been implemented within universities. In 1994 the Danube University Krems (DUK) was founded as a university for continuing education and offers solely post-graduate courses. Furthermore a network of professionals and vice-rectors involved in developing UCE has been established, the so-called Austrian University Continuing Education and Staff Development Network (AUCEN)1 in 1996 (Pellert and Cendon 2007, p.276). The next milestone was the University Act 2002 (UG 2002) which gave full autonomy to universities and therefore no separate approval by the incumbent Federal Ministry is needed to implement any kind of UCE. Later in 2007 Universities Austria (formerly Rectors’ Conference) have established an independent task force for UCE to develop basic conditions and promote further education at the political level in cooperation with AUCEN (BMWF 2008, pp.151f).

Since 2005 universities have enlarged their offerings in UCE in a qualitative and quantitative sense. Universities try to fulfill the goals and incentives of the Bologna process and to develop a national strategy for lifelong learning. Currently a comprehensive consultation process is going on to formulate an inclusive and coherent strategy for a complete scope of learning activities. However, all public universities have nominated one person responsible for UCE, ten universities have established independent centers for further education. Others have nominated administrators or staff units to coordinate these issues or introduced offerings in cooperation with external partners (BMWF 2008, pp.149f). In a national study Pellert and Cendon (2007) distinguish between different types of organizational strategies for UCE within universities with different aims. The organizational structures vary from central administrative departments within universities to decentralized departments or centers (p.309).

UCE offers a wide range of activities which can either be credited or not. Credited programmes can be university degree or non-degree courses as well as other programmes (specialist programmes of universities: ‘Universitätslehrgänge’ as university courses). For entering such programmes professional experience is relevant and therefore access is also given to people that do not meet the usual academic requirements to enter university. In recent years these programmes have increased rapidly from about 200 by the end of the 1990s to more than 600 programmes in 2007/08 (BMWF 2008, p.148). The following table shows the total number of students at public universities in relation to students in UCE in general, in university courses and simply at the continuing education university in Krems (table 2). Private universities are not integrated in the table as this sector only comprises 2% of the whole student population. Nevertheless private universities also provide university courses and the

---

1 AUCEN was an informal network of all universities in Austria till 2005 and is now organised as a formal association (www.aucen.ac.at).
percentage of students attending these programmes comprise nearly 10% of all students (ÖAR 2007). Another type of higher education institution, which is not included in the table, are the polytechnics. They strongly focus on employability of graduates and offers full- and part-time programmes. In 2007 97 of 240 academic programmes have been organised on a part-time basis. The proportion of part-time students in these programmes is more than 30% (FHR 2006). Since 2003 polytechnics can also offer courses for UCE which are already provided by seven institutions (Pellert and Cendon 2007, p.280).

Table 2: Students participating in UCE at public universities, 2002-2007 (Statistics Austria2 and uni: data3)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student numbers</th>
<th>2002</th>
<th>2003</th>
<th>2004</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students in university courses (% of all students)</td>
<td>8.380</td>
<td>8.663</td>
<td>9.746</td>
<td>10.001</td>
<td>10.769</td>
<td>12.014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students at the DUK</td>
<td>2.155</td>
<td>2.465</td>
<td>2.926</td>
<td>3.134</td>
<td>3.458</td>
<td>4.169</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students at public universities (in total)</td>
<td>199.450</td>
<td>206.229</td>
<td>210.080</td>
<td>217.651</td>
<td>224.063</td>
<td>233.046</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

According to Pechar and Pellert (2004) UCE is still quite rare in Austria because the traditional shape of students has to be changed to a new type of regular students (p.238). However, a positive development in UCE continues which can be seen in the slightly growing numbers in participants in adult education.

The Finnish response to Lifelong Learning

In the 19th century a vigorous Finnish nationalist ethos arose particularly in terms of culture and education. Colleges of adult education which supported specific occupations, mostly agriculture and forestry, as well as liberal adult education were established. Lifelong learning has become a social institution in Finland and those who are not participating are regarded as excluded (Parjanen and Tuomi 2003, p.56). There has been a drift of the population from the rural areas to the major cities which calls for efficient methods and organisations for distance learning in the regional structure of Finland. With the establishment of Summer Universities in the middle of the 20th century the opening up of the universities started ‘to redress the imbalance in the availability of university-level education between different regions and lay to the foundations of a regional university network’ (ibid., p.57). At the beginning of the 1970s universities’ own centres for continuing education have been founded. This change in structure has taken place with the support of ICT (use of telework) and the development of software and technological infrastructure of the virtual university and the Open University. Manninen and Engblom (2004) made a clear description about what is meant with adult education in the tertiary sector namely ‘only Continuing Education and Open University’ (p.123). They distinguish between three sectors of UCE:

- Open university: open to all age groups, no entrance requirements;
- University of third age: for retired people, part of Open University system;
- Continuing education: Short courses and long programmes, open learning centres, including labour market training for unemployed university graduates and professionals. (ibid., p.124)

Within the Development Plan for Education and Research for 1999 – 2003 (MINEDU 2004) a strategy for lifelong learning is defined as one of the main principles for educational development. It includes the planning of compatible degree structures and the possibility of individual learning paths. The strategy stresses that lifelong learning must be understood as an approach which steers education

---

2 Statistics Austria is the national information base (www.statistik.at).
3 uni: data is the datawarehouse for higher education statistics of the Federal Ministry of Science and Research (http://www.bmwf.gv.at/uni: data).
policy and other policy sectors involved in learning in order to offer opportunities for people to develop skills for continuous learning and to learn throughout their lives. Thus, providers of UCE are 20 universities, 29 polytechnics (since 1991) and the Finnish Open University. Nineteen universities (except the Academy of Fine Arts in Helsinki) are having an Open University department and offer further education in their specific field of study. Everyone can take part notwithstanding their age or educational background. By the end of the 1990s a common website was founded for a better networking of Open & Distance Learning Programmes and to attract more students with a virtual platform. In figure 1 the importance of the Open University is illustrated within university adult education.

Figure 1: Student participating in UCE, 1986-2008 (KOTA)

Although the participation in Open University instructions did not grow as expected the strong position as key player within the whole university adult education is still visible and is more or less in line with the growth of the number of degree students. Reasons for the strong decline of participants in university continuing education after 2000 are the improvement of the labour market situation (strong recession in the 1990s) and the reduction of financial support (Manninen and Engblom 2004). Though, within the Development Plan for Education and University Research 2003-2008 higher education is defined as part of adult education which gives the responsibility to the universities in terms of education of graduates but the extension in terms of access to Open University Programmes should be laid within the network for 'Liberal Adult Education Institutions' (MINEDU 2004, p.51; Zawacki-Richter and Reith 2007, p.173).

Adult and continuing education institutes can be found throughout the whole Finnish higher education infrastructure with over 300 affiliated activities and cooperating organisations existing. According to a World Bank Report (2003) Finland has developed a successful system for lifelong learning through strategic policies and offers numerous supportive measures to enhance education for all. Worth mentioning is the fact that in Finland the number of adults in UCE is higher than those in traditional degree courses (p.xxi). However, Finland continuously improves the level of education as 'the only way for a small country to survive' ideology that exists and ensures that Finland is among the best of the world (Parjanen and Tuomi 2003, p.57).

Comparison – Who is ahead?
At present the labour market, the ageing population as well as growth in the number of young people are challenging lifelong learning strategies and their ability to support employability and social cohesion (Kazamaki Ottersten 2004, p.157). In that sense both countries have been eager to compete with the global higher education market and their education systems have undergone reforms to

---

\(^4\) More information under: [http://www.avoinyliopisto.fi](http://www.avoinyliopisto.fi)

\(^5\) KOTA is the national university data base ([https://kotaplus.csc.fi](https://kotaplus.csc.fi)).
transform into a ULLL. The high proportion of students in higher education is revealing of the new learning society. On average across OECD countries 33% of the younger cohort has achieved a tertiary education, compared with 19% among the oldest cohort (figure 2). The expansion of tertiary education differs substantially among Austria and Finland. While Finland is above the OECD or EU19 average Austria is significantly below in terms of tertiary attainment (OECD 2008, pp.31-33).

Figure 2: Population that has attained at least tertiary education, 2006 (percentage, by age group) (OECD data)

Looking at the age distribution of students in higher education it is significant that the traditional age cohort of between 20 and 24-year-old students shifts towards older students. In Finland this tendency is even more distinctive (figure 3).

Figure 3: Enrolment of tertiary students in Finland and Austria by age, 2006 (OECD data)

Nevertheless, policies on lifelong learning and access to higher education are difficult to benchmark internationally, as a country’s history, economy and society is so unique. The figures above and the national descriptions show that Finland developed a systematic and comprehensive continuing education system at higher education institutions since the 1980s and is continuously improving further education as important sector within the whole higher education system. Finland has a quite open understanding of further education and more than the half of all adult education is organised at higher education institutions (Zawacki-Richter and Reith 2007, p.176). With the establishment of the Open University a profounded UCE is offered for all interested students. On the contrary the situation of Austria gives a multifaceted and highly diversified picture. The trend goes towards outsourcing of providers and to concentrate on different clients and demands (Pellert and Cendon 2007, p.309). At the political level the main challenges are related to the Bologna structure and the coherent strategy of lifelong learning. With AUCEN a functioning network between universities is offered to make more and coordinated innovations in UCE. In terms of the Danube-University in Krems a university solely in charge of UCE was created as a frontier in German-speaking countries (ibid., p.279).

In conclusion it can be stated that Finland has taken the first steps towards a ULLL earlier and has a high proportion of participants in UCE and a functioning network of an Open University. On the contrary Austria has started later and set priorities in establishing a network (AUCEN) and founding of a special university responsible for UCE. To show the way of both systems towards the lifelong learning mode of Schuetze and Slowey (2002) the main objectives are listed in table 3.
Table 3: The Austrian and Finnish lifelong learning mode

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Austria</th>
<th>Finland</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Access and admission criteria</td>
<td>differs concerning the respective professional area (with or without academic background)</td>
<td>-predominantly work experience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-mostly holding an academic degree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age cohort</td>
<td>-19% of 25 to 34-years-old of the whole population in tertiary education</td>
<td>-38% of 25 to 34-years-old of the whole population in tertiary education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-14% of 55 to 54-years-old of the whole population in tertiary education</td>
<td>-27% of 55 to 54-years-old of the whole population in tertiary education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning for all</td>
<td>open</td>
<td>open</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Range of programs</td>
<td>diversified</td>
<td>diversified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part-time or full-time programmes</td>
<td>both</td>
<td>both</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distance learning</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bologna structure (modules, credits)</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student-centered learning</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degree and/or non-degree studies</td>
<td>both</td>
<td>both</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UCE</td>
<td>Yes (continuing education university, university courses)</td>
<td>Yes (Open University, university of the third age)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diversified higher education system</td>
<td>Yes (private, public and non-university sector)</td>
<td>Yes (public and non-university sector)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Question:** What did you learn at your university?

Although the clear trend towards ULLL for both countries is visible further initiatives could be made in their national policies:
- to formulate strategies to include prior learning in their admission processes,
- to find appropriate ways to assure quality within the UCE programmes,
- to provide transparent and coherent information about UCE to participants,
- to create programmes that are international recognized (mutual recognition),
- to open UCE for an increased population.

This comparative study shows that the nature of education is bound to change and will become a continuing life-time affair. The higher education sector is responsible to produce new knowledge and expertise and provide space for free public discourse. Moreover, higher education institutions have to become spaces for lifelong learning not only traditional degree distribution centres. Countries as Finland and Austria need to be able to react quickly to the educational needs of a fast changing society. Both have taken great steps towards ULLL but there are still grounds for improvement to encourage more students to participate in further education and find effective ways to implement a coherent strategy for ULLL.
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Abstract

For some years, most of the universities have delivered a common speech on continuing education and its development in the context of new professional needs and of initiatives to widen the access to a various public. This speech is also supported by most of stakeholders even in the politic field or economic one.

However, in most of the countries, human resources supported by state funds, like teachers particularly, are dedicated to initial teaching for young students. Their legitimacy is guaranteed by their strong research activity, related to their status. The proximity with the highest level of knowledge is one of the arguments put forward to attract more clients to our continuing education activity.

A very simple arithmetic reasoning shows that with equal human resources, the development of continuing education will remain a vain wish. We can draw only three solutions for this contradiction: either to replace one by one an initial student by an adult, or to rise dramatically overtime, or finally to recruit more teachers…

The aim of this presentation is to underline these contradictions which are the main hindrance for the development of university lifelong learning. Each country has different regulation and agreements for teachers’ status, workload and obligation of university teachers. Starting from possible evolutions a comparison of the situation in some countries will be proposed.

Introduction

Since some years, many sources are delivering a recurrent message on the necessity of the development of Lifelong learning, needed by citizen in order to raise his level of knowledge; to acquire tools and competencies useful for his personal and professional development. Lifelong learning is also a requirement for the entire society because it’s one the main keys of social and economic development.

The Lisbon declaration uses Lifelong Learning and the elevation of education level involved in it. Quantitative and qualitative indicators are given and regular comparison with the objectives fixed for 2010 are delivered by the European commission. In this context, higher level education and University Life learning (ULLL) has a specific place and is submitted to paradoxical injunctions. Politic representatives invited ULLL to take a lead role in knowledge economy, but the question of adult education has rarely been placed in the main priorities of the decision makers.

Several authors have worked on this question, deploring the difference between prescriptions and reality (Denantes 2006), some of them even talk about “missing appointment” (Lenoir 2008). In the political sphere, we can find many arguments to integrate a LLL approach in Higher education. Already in 1997, J. Attali has published a report called “Toward a European Model of Higher education, Pour un modèle européen d’enseignement supérieur”, in which he has assigned a central place to LLL in higher education institutions. So, at national and European level, politic decision makers consider ULLL as a driving force for university development. As an echo to the blue book on vocational education⁶, J. Rosé notices, in a study on « the state of the University » published in 2003 by the CEREQ, that « Continuing education is considered as a necessary answer to an unforgiving movement of the economy and of the society which raises competencies update needs as an opportunity to prevent from the lowering of students registration and a way to transform university practices » (Rose 2003). In the step report delivered by the national debate commission « Job/University » to the French ministry for Higher education in June 2006, we can read these recommendations: « Creating a Life Long Learning University is to postulate that initial education, and so the last obtained diploma, is not an end in itself. Its potential development is therefore very important and must be supported by specific decisions strengthening the functional organisation of this

---

⁶ The contribution of the French state-secretary for women right and vocational education (1999)
activity (Organisation and development modes of continuing education must be clarified inside the universities) »

Within universities, Continuing education actors, like Michel Feutrie (Feutrie 1999) have welcomed warmly these recommendations. A quick inventory makes us able to support them. Today; in most of European countries, only half of an age group has an access to Higher education while the other half would like to have access later during is professional career, either from necessity, or personal choice. Universities are now at the end of the education cycle. They propose a full diploma offer, which is, for certain countries, completely open to all kind of public. Higher education can satisfy all the individual needs of competencies, which can be immediately useful for professional activity or, more widely, in adequacy with individual and cultural desires. The recognition of formal, informal and non formal prior learning procedure contributes to this evolution, and also to the widening of the access and to the integration of the persons who have been obliged to end prematurely their initial studies for all kind of reasons.

Strong connection to research is another argument which legitimates the important role of higher education institution for LLL. These institutions house the widest network of scientific experts, with a high level of scientific production recognised in all international ranking. Universities are major actors of the education because of this strong link with research activities. Without negating the necessity of a long term research, the potentiality and the economy interest represented by the knowledge and skills developed inside laboratories are more and more recognized and solicited. They enable to efficiently and quickly train persons who will be able to put in action the latest evolutions of their different domains, as diverse as they could be.

This objective of qualification is often combined with high level and peak competencies, coming from laboratories and applied in research valorisation operations or creation of innovative enterprises.. This is true but recent reports have shown that these actions have not been often developed, or even considered.. France has, as an example, labelled in 2005, seventy one “competitive poles” associating research/education/ enterprises. The very first conclusions of the expertises is that the knowledge management and the competencies transfer have been considered in a very few number of existing poles (Bertrand, H.,Ekls, B., Dayan J-L.,2008). This is a very curious situation because universities are in all these poles. A specific work has already started in order to address the following question to the concerned ministries.

The question is: Have the higher level education institutions, and also decision makers, become aware of these potentialities of development? The European Universities Charter for Life Long Learning charter, proposed by the EUA (European Universities Association) in November 2008 to the European conference of Higher Education Ministers in Bordeaux (EUA 2008) can be viewed as one of the first presentation of the commitments necessary to make possible the construction of real ULLL organizations. Ten are government commitments and ten are universities commitments. The Charter can be used as a frame of reference to analyse our specific situation in each country.

In this communication, we start the analysis of one of the less studied aspect of ULLL, the one of teacher resources involved in continuing education activities. Specific needs like providing information, counselling and guidance to various persons, managing UCE department, activity… have been studied in the past. The jobs are quite well described and the potential needs well known. We will not analyse all the questions of pedagogy and lessons organisation specific to adult education.(Filloque 2008).

We will concentrate on the teachers who are required to organize and deliver lessons. The questions focus on their status in the universities and their origin.

The methodology and its limitations

Our first objective is to identify the means implemented for accepting pedagogical responsibility of adults resuming their studies at University and to compare with the institutional declarations. We have developed a quick questionnaire and tried to answer the following questions:

- Who are the teachers who deliver Continuing education lessons and courses in Universities nowadays?
- Is there a clear strategy in each institution regarding this question?

With our first answers, we wish, or we hope, to raise some areas to think about as much for institutions as for politics.

The questionnaire is composed of four series of questions:

- The main specialities of the university, the number of full time students and the number of permanent teachers, professors, lecturers…
- Some figures dealing with continuing education activity like the number of registered continuing education students preparing a diploma (Bachelor degree or master degree), the
number of continuing education attendees registered in short courses and the number of hours of courses delivered in each cases.
- The number of teachers involved in continuing education programs, and their status
- The number of hours of continuing education courses delivered by each category of teachers.

We have taken the year 2007 as reference.

We have got, in this first stage of our work, very few answers, despite the use of national continuing education networks contact persons, to diffuse our questionnaire. Six countries are represented in our sample, five by only one university and one by six. This sample is very limited, versus the thousand of universities existing in Europe. Nevertheless, we have found that it’s sufficient to start a first analysis because all go in the same direction.

We have some introductive remarks to do, even if they are quite an evidence for many of the readers.

First of all, each country has a specific definition, and sometime very different, of the persons they classify in the “continuing education” category, and also of the activity itself. Consequently, figures obtained from universities don’t show the same reality, and we have to be very careful with our interpretation of them. “Integrative politics” has been promoted in France since many years. Adults, as young students, can be registered in the same courses and can obtain exactly the same diploma, whatever it is. No other country do that. Most of the time, graduate studies in CE are specific and candidates obtain a different diploma or certificate. So, it could be easier to obtain the information we need from all the countries but France. There, it’s very common to have what is called a “mixed public”, some time half of the attendees, but more frequently only some unit coming with the “tag” Continuing education student. So, the question is: do we count the teachers for such group of students? There is no good solution, but the simplest is to take into account only the specific CE courses.

Several colleagues give rise to a second difficulty. There is not a reliable system for collecting statistics, let alone for CE, in all universities. In France, there are two annual national surveys, one conducted by Ministry of labour and the other one by the statistic department of National Education Ministry. In each case, they don’t ask the good questions, in relation with our subject. They focus only on three categories of teachers (number, and activity): teachers from the centre, without separating « in service » and overtime activity, External teachers, without separating « real » professionals and teachers from other institutions, and finally subcontracting. We have information about such surveys in other countries. In most of them, the surveys seem to be under the responsibility of each institution, and depend of their strategy in our domain. It’s also information of interest for our conclusions.

First results

The first part of the questionnaire gives global information on each institution. We can calculate on the whole the training rate. This rate varies in large scale. It depends on the type of institution .

Scientific and technological universities have the best rate, whatever the country, between 5 and 10 students per teacher. The scale is larger for multidisciplinary universities, from 4 for Geneva University to 29 for Aix-Marseille 3 University. The worse case is found in Universities dedicated to human sciences, arts… which are over 20 students per teacher. If we postulate that the rate of activity is the same in all the domains, it’s easy to understand that all institutions have not the same possibilities to be active in the CE field.

7 For comparison, the official average is 19 for France, 9 in Sweden, 15 in USA, and 21 in Italy.
Comparing the total number of full time registered students to the number of CE one shows that some institutions have a real politic to support adults’ access and that they are able to identify them quite easily. Comments given by the other ones show that in most cases, they are unable to evaluate this indicator because of the lack of support for these specific candidates. This is true in several countries, including many French universities. So, in our sample, the returning students’ rate varies from 0 to 25%. The two universities which have best training rate are also the ones which have the highest number of returning adults registered in graduated studies.

Chart 2: *Ratio between students and continuing education trainees preparing a diploma*

The last general indicator enables the comparison between short and long courses activity. We think that it could be one of the elements used to understand the high or low implication level of teachers of the institution in CE activities.
The next charts concentrate on teachers. Unfortunately, it was much more difficult to get the required information on this subject. Many of our institutions never collect such data, or have only a partial view of them. Despite this, we have enough information to come to some conclusions…

**Chart 4: Participation of the teachers of the university to CE**

From the 12 universities which have completed the questionnaire, ten of them are able to give the number of teachers working for CE, but only 5 know the number of hour of courses delivered. All indicates that they use externals. The participation rate of the teachers of the university varies from some percents to more than 35%. The one concerned by this value is a multidisciplinary university but it is not significant. Two Universities cannot give any information on their teachers!

The ratio of tenured teachers is quite high in more than 30% of the UCE centres and is higher than 60% in five cases. We have to correlate these figures with the activity in term of hours produced. Only few universities are able to give this information for each category of teacher to extract serious conclusions but, it is evidence that the importance of externals and professionals is high where the ratio of tenured teachers is low. But also, it is evidence that the ratio of activity made in overtime is always significant.

**Chart 5: CE participation of the teachers of the university VS external teachers and professionals**

One of the objectives of this work is to collect data on this work made in overtime. Only 6 universities have been able to give data. The ratio is between 12% and 87% and reflects certainly some kind of choice of the university.
Chart 6: CE activity of the teachers of the university (Overtime or not) VS external teachers and professionals

First conclusions

This prospective work focusing on the teachers and trainers involved in UCE activity has permitted to see several tendencies. We have chosen a small sample, composed of institutions engaged in our sector so that result could be significant. Finally, only one declares that Lifelong Learning is not a strategic priority of its university. So, the others are supported by their management team which become a good relay with politics and stakeholders. They all have identified UCE departments. They are in charge of administrative aspects, and sometimes also pedagogical engineering. But the questions of teaching resources are rarely considered and bring under control. This question hits on the obstacle of human resources availability because if the activity grows, it’s often impossible to increase the permanent teaching pool. Two kinds of solution can be used:

- The first one is « project » type. Long term actions are mainly operated by permanent teachers, while occasional ones are operated by externals. In parallel, we can identify a position connected with a « project factory» which is in charge of activity development. The CE department will be more or less able to develop a sustainable and ambitious policy for LLL depending on whether the position is provided by first or second type of actors.

- The second one is ‘Human resources management » type. It’s an approach wherein the activity can follow one of the four scenarii, separated or combined:
  1. If there is a diversification of the demand in term of domain, speciality,… then different persons can be enrolled for each new project.
  2. If there is growth of the number of courses in the same domain or speciality, then UCE centres can either ask the teachers of their institution to work overtime or/and to hire externals teachers. These ones can come either from other higher level institutions or from private or public companies.
  3. If there is growth of the number of courses in the same domain or speciality, then UCE centres can hire new permanent teachers, under a contract according to the rule of the country.
  4. If there is growth of the number of courses in the same domain or speciality, then UCE centres can also use provision of a service or subcontracting.

Case 1 and 3 offer the best connection with competencies of teachers and researchers. Obviously (Chart 6), they are not the most « popular » compared to case 2. In some cases, not reported in this study, we can find also the use of case 4 when the unique objective of the centre is activity. Case 2 and 4 enable a fast solution and no long term management of human resources problems but we think that it is a wrong answer to a good question.

Despite their wilful attitude⁸, the survey doesn’t allow us to say that universities are in a state to take up the challenge of ULLL. We understand that the first necessity is to have good and up to date indicators. The second one concerns the contradiction between the long term of the tenured teachers’ solution and the short term of qualification needs. We think that this contradiction is less difficult in the

⁸ Only one out of 12 universities answers that there is no support to a lifelong learning development strategy from its direction.
case of graduated studies, and so, we have to consider the question of financial support, even if this question is not new.

For example several initiatives which could have given a huge impetus to ULLL, have been taken in the past in France. Between 1970 and 1980, the government decided that the centres having enough activity have the possibility to create position of civil servant (for tenured teachers), but with salary paid by the centre. In most of the case, centres have used this possibility for staff, not for teachers. In 1987, the national evaluation committee (CNE) stated that « UCE departments have a shortage of tenured teachers” and revealed that less that 5% of all UCE training courses are made by tenured teachers. Another survey, some years later, has found 33% of academic among the 38000 training teachers (Fond Harmant, 1991). Between 1998 and 2001, the French Minister of higher education was really confident with the positive effect of LLL on universities evolution. He decided to organise a request for proposal called « Concours Allègre ». Universities with selected project have won positions of civil servant and the ministry has imposed teachers! This decision has been subject of much scathing criticism from many UCE department directors because most of them have based the development of their activity on administrative staff, thinking that they will always find teachers available for their projects. Not less than 105 positions of teachers have been created during these four years. A survey made five years later has shown that more than 50% of them have been diluted all over the universities, increasing the potential for initial students’ studies (Pons-Desoutter, M, 2005). We think that universities have better to remember this lesson from the past. Sustainable and ambitious UCE must be supported by research activities. This is indisputably the trademark of UCE, by comparison with other training centres. But universities must wonder about the reasons which often dissuade tenured teachers from working for continuing education, following the example of « Allègre teachers ». It could be because adults are more demanding, critical and non captive, with an overvalued representation of the university, but also because of demanding hours or marginalization risk inside university community, etc. Another specific study could be done on this specific subject.

In addition, we must wonder about teachers who develop an important activity in private training centres, using the corporate image of their university. Most often, these ones refuse to work for their UCE department.

Based on these elements, we encourage higher level institutions to identify all the possibilities to rally the largest number of tenured teachers to continuing education. This is the best way to promote a sustainable and ambitious strategy of development. However, without the support from state which control, most often, the number of job positions, the UCE department will be compel to navigate by sight without perceiving a coast where being anchored for a long time to come.

References


Feutrie M., (1999), La formation continue demain, une mission centrale pour les universités, Actualité de la formation permanente, n° 162.


UNIVERSITY of LLL: DREAM or REALITY?
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INTRODUCTION

Lifelong learning is, nowadays, a really widespread paradigm in higher education policies (Prague Communiqué, 2001; European Commission, 1995, 2003). One of the numerous operational aspects of those policies is the possibility for citizens to access easily to higher education (Berlin Communiqué, 2003).

The political aim of lifelong learning is to create a competitive knowledge-based economy (European Commission, 1995): by improving diffusion of knowledge and know-how, the economy should become more competitive (Osborne, 2003). The origin of this thesis is to be found in human capital theory developed by Schultz and other economists (Schultz, 1961; Becker, 1964; Denison, 1962). However, this theory is invalidated by some empirical observations (Livingstone, 1997). For some economists, it is necessary to limit the number of “educated” workers, in order to avoid the saturation of the labour market (Freeman, 1976; Spence, 1974).

Lifelong learning can become, in this perspective, an ideal response to conciliate both approaches: it allows the worker to learn when needed for some external reasons (promotion in a firm, period of unemployment…). This utilitarian goal of lifelong learning corresponds to the “adeguationist” scheme that characterizes the higher education reforms since the sixties (De Meulemeester, 2003). It is important to relate this way to conceive lifelong learning with the more global conceit of workforce flexibility, which is promoted as a key-element of the Lisbonne Strategy (Hirtt, 2001).

But does the university necessary have a role to play in such a strategy? Indeed, the classical ‘humboldtian’ university is based on the idea that “a theoretical academic education provides better preparation for a career than professional training” (Paletschek, 2001). This late thesis seems fairly inconsistent with the “adeguationist” scheme.

In this paper, we will discuss different rationales for lifelong learning in three different “idealized” universities: the humboldtian university, the massified university and the market university. Those three models co-exist in actual universities. We will then show that the rationale for lifelong learning and the various ways to implement it reinforce the “stresses” between those models. We will discuss two examples of classical stresses in contemporary universities and their ‘declension’ in the case of lifelong learning.

As a conclusion, we will pinpoint the reasons why it seems so hard to implement lifelong learning in universities.

THREE ‘IDEAL’ MODELS

We choose to define three “typical models” based on historical reforms of European universities; as each European country developed its own educational tradition, this typology is general and does not recover all ‘local’ examples.

Lifelong learning in the “humboldtian” university

Since the foundation of the ‘von Humboldt’ University in Berlin in 1812, numerous European universities develop simultaneously learning and (fundamental) research. Those two missions are inextricably connected to each another (Charle & Verger, 1994; Paletschek, 2001).

This model must be put in perspective with the global conception of Higher Education developed in Prussia during the XIXth century. In parallel to the foundation of Berlin University, Christian Peter Wilhelm Beuth reformed the Bau-Akademie and the Gewerbe institut (De Meulemeester, 2003) and entrusted them with the mission of developing applied research. And, even if in some cases the hochschulen developed fundamental research, pure research was the jealously kept privilege of universities.

In the “humboldtian” university, the learning process is summarized by the idea of “Bildung durh Wissenschaft” – “formation of the personality through scholarship” and the academic freedom is guaranteed in order to allow the development of generalist non-targeted learning and science (von Humboldt, 1810). It also should be emphasized that this university is meant for the education of high-level society.
An example of continuous education in the humboldtian universities is the academic career. The access to higher position inside the university is conditioned to an evaluation process performed by peers (election process) or future peers (cooptation process).

**Lifelong learning in the “massified” university**

In the context of the “golden sixties”, under the influence of theoretical research in economy but also in order to answer the families’ social demands policy-makers developed massification policies in Europe (De Meulemeester, 2003). More students could gain access to higher education: in France, for example, between 1960 and 1970, the ratio of students in the population aged between 19 and 25 evolved from 9.8% to 18.4% (Lévy-Garboua, 1976). Nevertheless, as shown by French sociologists, this massification process did not imply a democratization process: even if the access to higher education increased, an induced selection process tended to reproduce the social inequalities (Bourdieu & Passeron, 1964, 1970).

The legislative initiatives on *éducation permanente* and popular education in the seventies in France and Belgium can be related to this massification process. Those initiatives are mainly designed for unqualified workers. They are characterized by an instrumental vision of continuous education: their main goal is to facilitate access to (better) job positions and thus to increase social insertion of people. Especially in Belgium, the influence of workers movement in the development of popular education in universities was important, which contributes to explain this conception.

Two (Belgian) examples of structures created in universities in this context could be the *Institut des Sciences du Travail*, created by the Université Libre de Bruxelles (ULB) in 1955 and the *Faculté Ouverte de Politique Economique et Sociale* (FOPES) created by the Mouvement Ouvrier Chrétien (MOC) and the Université Catholique de Louvain (UCL) in 1974.

**Lifelong learning in the “market” university**

In the second half of the seventies, with the collapse of the growth rate, the emerging unemployment and the beginning of the difficulties for the states to maintain their level of investment in social policies, the public sector was subjected to numerous reforms – including the privatization of public services. As a consequence, the number of jobs in the public sector – which was the most important employer of the university-trained graduated students – dropped dramatically.

Subsequently, students began to seek diplomas that best suited the private sector’s expectancies. In this context, the management schools developed quickly, as well as the technical curricula such as computer science (De Meulemeester, 2003). From the beginning of the eighties, the level of investment in higher education decreased and, in parallel, more and more employers’ lobbies and international organizations developed claims of structural re-founder of universities to improve its links with the industries (ERT, 1985, 1989; World Bank, 1994). Theoretical works in economy focused on the “qualitative” benefits of education – e.g. technological innovation (Romer, 1990). The development of “individual skills” seemed more important than the contents of education, considered as perishable goods (De Meulemeester, 2003).

The MBA is a relevant example of lifelong learning in the market university (de Montlibert, 2004): it answers to the need of “excellence” demanded by enterprises in a specific field – the management. Dedicated to experienced professionals, it is organized in the evening or during the weekend. It prefigures the in-company approach where universities adapt their knowledge “on demand” no more for a particular public and theme but also for a specific company.

**A MIXED APPROACH FOR A MIXED MODEL: HOW TO IMPLEMENT LIFELONG LEARNING IN AN ACTUAL UNIVERSITY?**

In Europe, numerous universities do not clearly correspond to one of the three models cited above, even if they were subjected to many reforms especially during the second part of the XXth century. We will assume in this paper that they are “mixed” universities: each of them shows various characteristics of every model.

In this section, we perform an analysis based on two axes (centralization/decentralization and internal/external structures) inspired by previous works (Brennan, 2000; Jallade, 2001) and completed by a third axis dealing with the top-bottom or bottom-up LLL policy implementation.

**Centralized or decentralized approaches**

In function of the institutional support, the university will develop a centralized or decentralized approach. A strong support will lead to a more centralized process: the institution will invest more resources, define a common policy and rules concerning the activity (the scope, the strategy, the
themes, the financial model) and will set up structures to share experiences and decisions. This institutional approach will be more integrated with other mission of university and will lead to a higher unity and visibility of the project inside and outside the institution. This centralized approach is quite coherent with the humboldtian model, which promoted the unity of science and scholarship and thus a certain transdisciplinarity.

On the contrary, a low support will induce a more decentralized approach, which will be more adapted to specific needs and target. This will lead to a strong visibility at faculty or school level, as for instance in the management schools: this approach can be qualified as a "niche" strategy and will not conduct to a unified communication. The lifelong learning structures in the "market" university and, to some extent, the continuous education structures in massified universities are typically decentralized.

**External or internal structures**

Does lifelong learning belong to the missions of the institutions? A positive answer will lead to an internal structure, which will also need a strong commitment. The university wants to keep the control of the activity.

An internal structure of lifelong learning will be able to develop an institutional policy until the production of lifelong courses. The funding by the university and the benefits mutualisation will contribute to assure the sustainability of the lifelong learning activities: the university will be able to offer answers both to social demand (e.g.: teachers training) and to specific enterprises’ demand. Both massified universities and humboldtian universities will develop internal structures.

On the contrary a negative answer has more chance to conduct to an externalized structure, which will be more flexible but also weaker and market dependant. The courses developed would have to meet the market demand and will be less able to develop a social answer to the needs of society. Here also, this approach will contribute to the visibility of the entity and not of the university.

**Top-down or bottom-up strategies**

A bottom-up approach presents the advantage of allowing a greater support from the lifelong learning actors: for diverse reasons, they are convinced of the necessity to perform lifelong learning activities, should this activity be centralized or decentralized. The danger of this approach lies on the lack of sustainability: if one of the key factor drops (the market, the teacher, the academic support), the activity disappears.

A top-down approach is strongly needed to set up the activity, to define its frame, its policy and its scope and to support it by the means of resources and recognition. But without an a priori agreement of the actors, the top-down approach will of course causes great difficulties to spark off the participation of those actors! Furthermore, top-down strategies can cause the actors to question the legitimacy of the lifelong learning policies (Jallade, 2001).

A mixed approach consisting in the creation of policies negotiated between actors’ representative, authorities and experts could be the best way to avoid the weakness of the top-down and bottom-up strategies. This implies the set-up of structures to share experiences and decision and thus, a rather centralized approach.

**“Stresses At The Interface”**

In actual universities undergoing the plethoric reforms that broke over them since the sixties, some stresses between the different ideals of higher education are “classical” problems. The academic freedom guaranteed in the Humboldtian University seems fairly threatened in the market university (de Montlibert, 2005; Giroux, 2006). The students of the massified university, seeking a diploma, synonym of better job and social position, rather than access to “pure” knowledge put the tight link between fundamental research and learning, typical of the humboldtian model, into question (Levy-Garboua, 1976). In the case of lifelong learning policies, those classical problems find some special declension.

An internal structure that develops a centralized lifelong learning activity will be able to put the resources in common: the beneficiary activities (typically, firms-targeted training) fund the loss-making activities (which can be institutional priorities). In this case, the renouncement to a part of the academic freedom (development of à la carte firms-targeted training) can help to insure the viability of priorities that are freely fixed by the academic staff. In a context of low public funding of universities, the firms-targeted lifelong learning activities can then become a way to insure certain autonomy of the university. This paradox is non-longer valid, of course, when the university becomes totally dependant on the private funds: this constitutes of course the main danger in countries where the public funding of lifelong learning is (almost) inexistente.

The students of lifelong learning courses can be motivated by various expectations. In the case of firms-targeted courses (management, technical specialization), the expectation is generally to maintain
her/his position or to obtain a promotion in the firm. This really instrumental approach is of course difficult to conciliate with the classical academic courses which will not be directly linked with "on field" situations. Nevertheless, students choose to begin a learning process in a university and not in a specialized private institution generally because of the privileged status of the university in the "education market". This status of the university is ensured by the link between learning and original research that could not be developed elsewhere, and thus by the "humboldtian" characteristics of universities. In a way, the “humboldtian” principles are the best asset of the universities in the lifelong learning market! This paradox is also fading away when the original research can no longer be maintained (e.g. when public funding runs out).

Conclusions
Lifelong learning university is nowadays a widespread paradigm: the concept of LLL universities has given birth to a reality in the academic institutions. Institutional actors responsible to implement lifelong learning inside universities may however encounter difficulties in this implementation.
We may talk about LLL universities when the institutions have defined their policy about its organisation: centralised or not, externalised or not, with bottom-up/top-down approach. Those organizations may be understood in the light of three classical models of universities (humboltian, massified and market university). The stresses between those conceptions of university are particularly obvious in the case of LLL policies: this can explain the difficulties experienced by the structures in charge of LLL development.
In this perspective, a strong commitment of the academic authorities and the actors will be necessary to insure the stabilisation of the LLL process. The creation of specific structures dedicated to deployment of LLL policies inside the academic institutions, structures that gather actors' representative, experts and authorities can greatly improve the adhesion of the actors to the process. It nonetheless implies a certain centralisation and internalisation of the LLL structures. The more a given university corresponds to a "mixed" case between the three models, the more this late consideration is valid.
Two paradoxes (academic freedom and mutualisation of external funds; development of targeted courses and development of original fundamental researches) clearly highlight the need for general public policies about LLL – including, *inter alia*, its subsidization. A coherent legal and financial framework developed by public authorities would certainly improve the efficiency of the LLL policies of each institution.
The public LLL strategy in the French-Speaking Community of Belgium is, in this matter, not yet finished: since 2004, the universities are summoned to develop LLL but almost all the courses must be self-supported by the institutions. Exceptions exist, although, and some training can be financed. To be eligible to public funding, they must answer two contradictory conditions: they must be auto-financed after 3 years at maximum and they must match specific priorities fixed by the government. Amongst those priorities, one can find the training of ministers of recognized cults, the training to supervision of underprivileged students, to gender issues or to scientific vulgarization, the foreign language learning and set up of enterprises. This *meli-melo* is a clear result of a political difficulty to conciliate the different outlooks of the university in a coherent way. If the state wishes university to develop public mission, it should also fund this activity in order to sustain it.
Maybe it is now the role of the academic actors to impulse a fundamental debate about this issue: what is the best model for the LLL university of our dreams?
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VIDEOCONFERENCING ENABLES THE UNIVERSITY TO STRENGTHEN ITS ROLE IN LIFELONG LEARNING: THE PENTALFA PROGRAM
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Background
In Flanders, medical specialists have been used to attend educational postgraduate seminars at the K.U.Leuven. Escalating transport times due to traffic congestion, and increasingly busy practices of medical professionals threatened to cause a decline in the attendance of postgraduate education in evening seminars in our eccentrically located university. In 1998, the faculty of Medicine of the K.U.Leuven decided to start a videoconferencing program of postgraduate, multidisciplinary, interactive, medical education, to maintain its central position for lifelong learning.

THE PENTALFA PROGRAM

Concept
Pentalfa is a videoconferencing program with continuous telepresence, making immediate interaction possible between all participants and speakers. Every session includes Leuven as central location and 5 guest locations, selected on a rota basis from a network of 14 partners from the Flemish Hospital Network evenly distributed over the Flemish part of the country. Participants everywhere follow the program on two video screens. One shows the speaker and during the interactive parts also the participants and discussants using a motorized camera controlled by the local technician at all sites. The other screen is used for showing visual aids such as PowerPoint presentations, graphs or film excerpts. A central moderator in Leuven, who usually also coordinates the scientific content of the session, is assisted by a moderator at each site. A session lasts 2.5 hrs and usually includes 3 short presentations presenting the topic from different angles. Discussions take place after each presentation, with often a general discussion to conclude the session. To increase the interaction with the participants, clinical case presentations or provocative viewpoints are often used. The speakers can present from each location.

A structured organisation
Since the beginning (Himpens 2003a), more than 260 interactive Pentalfa sessions have taken place on Thursday evenings, making it a stable program. Structured cooperation at three levels is necessary to ensure this stability: consultation within a scientific steering committee; the cooperation between K.U.Leuven technicians and project collaborators at the various sites; and the presence of an administrative support assistant at each site.

Scientific quality is assured by the scientific steering group, which compiles the program. This group includes representatives of various clinical disciplines within Leuven’s University Hospital, and of the hospitals participating in the Hospital Network. The topics usually are suggested by practicing medical doctors from Leuven or the network. Selection is balanced according to disciplines, taking recent progress in the field in consideration, and the multidisciplinary nature of the proposal is seen as an asset. After selection, the topic is entrusted to a central moderator who works out the details of the program, and usually will be the central moderator for that evening.

The technical preparation including preparation and testing of the presentations to allow smooth use for videoconferencing, setting up and testing the connections for each session, audiovisual support
during the videoconference, and technical troubleshooting is performed by the technicians at each location, guided by the technician-director in Leuven.

The administrative support assistant at each site is responsible for mailings, lists of attendance, catering, and promotion. Promotional material and requests for accreditation for continuous medical education are organized centrally.

Apart from a well-structured organization, a stable financial environment is necessary. Occasional sponsoring is in our experience insufficient to allow a long-term planning which is necessary for a complex videoconferencing program. Therefore, the stable structure of the University is important to build a successful and long-lasting program.

**EVALUATION: PROFILE OF THE PARTICIPANTS**

The total number of participants was 44900 in 253 sessions during the ten first years (October 1998-May 2008), an average of 178 per session, with 65% participating at a guest location. A survey was performed with questionnaires (Himpens B, 2003b). The response rate on the questionnaires handed out at the entrance decreased with time, from 29% response rate the first year until 9% the last year. In one guest location started only in the 10th year of the program, response rate there was again 30%. From personal contacts with participants, it became clear that many participants who had attended the Pentalfa program on a regular basis did not fill out the questionnaire regularly, since they considered it as a repetition. In the evaluation therefore, the answers of less experienced Pentalfa attendants might be overrepresented.

Attendance was counted manually during the second presentation of the evening at each site and decreased progressively from a mean of 173 per session in the first year to 152 in the fifth year, and afterwards progressively increased up to 191 per session in the last year. Female participants increased from 35% to 50%, and age increased from a mean of 38 to 40 years, reflecting the changing demographics of medical professionals. In the figure below, age distribution of the respondents in the 8th year is depicted. Female participants are younger. In Leuven, a large training centre, the mean age is significantly lower than in the guest locations (36.7 vs. 41.6 years, P<0.05).
The median number of Pentalfa sessions that a respondent reported to have participated in was 5 (range 0-60). This is probably an underestimation, due to the lower response rate in frequent participants.

From the respondents 51.8% of the respondents were specialised medical doctors, 11.8% were residents in training, 18.6% were general practitioners, 13.2% were not medical doctors (nursing, dentistry, psychology,…), and 4.3% only were undergraduate students.

EVALUATION: EDUCATIONAL ASPECTS

From the participants at the guest locations, 85% responded that they would not come to Leuven to attend this particular session if no videoconference would be available, mainly because of distance (67%), insufficient time (64%), and traffic congestion (49%). Time gained as reported by participants at the guest locations ranged from 10 to 360 min (mean 123.5 min), concordant with estimates made by a navigation website.

The motivation to attend the meeting was reported on a scale agree – not particularly important – disagree. The motivation of the respondents was as follows:

- Interest in the topic of the session for 95.9% of respondents, 0.5% disagreed
- 67.1% agreed that the level of the speakers was an important motivation to attend, 10.7% disagreed
- 61.3% agreed that the multidisciplinary character of the session was important, 16.2% disagreed
- Accreditation for continuous medical education credits were an important motivation to attend for 51.8% of respondents, 24.9% disagreed.
- Social and professional contacts were important for 27.8% of respondents, but 40.4% disagreed that this was an important motivation.

The quality of the videoconference session on educational aspects was scaled on a 6 point scale, with 1 being below acceptable level, 2 disappointing, 3 weak, 4 fair, 5 good, and 6 excellent. The following aspects were detailed:

- Was the session easy to follow: 70.9% score 5 or 6.
- Did the session support my professional activity: 52.8% score 5 or 6.
- Did it contextualise my professional activity: 56.1% score 5 or 6.
- Did it increase the scientific basis for my professional activity: 56.7% score 5 or 6.
- Was the videoconference clear and attractive: 73.6% score 5 or 6.
• Did I as a person learn something new and enriching: 69.9% score 5 or 6.
• Did the session clarify the standards of good practice: 58.9% score 5 or 6.
• Was the session instructive in the sense that it will influence my personal practice: 53.3% score 5 or 6.
• Did the videoconference technology allow adequate interaction and technical quality (Pentalfa videoconferences as effective communication): 71.4% score 5 or 6.

For each aspect, less than 0.4% was judged as 1, less than 2.2% as 2, and less than 5.1% as 3. The most frequent score was 5 (between 40.0% and 52.8%).

EVALUATION: ECONOMIC ANALYSIS

Time savings

96% of participants at guest sites said that videoconferencing resulted in time gain. The time gained for individuals ranged from 10 to 360 minutes (mean 123.5 min). This depended from site to site, with a minimum of 60 minutes and a maximum of 210 minutes as mean per site. Of course, this is only an estimation. The estimated gain in time was compared with the calculated time necessary with the on-line navigation programme ViaMichelin (www.viamichelin.be). The transportation time estimated by the respondents was for each respondent within 15 min (both over- and underestimation) for a single trip calculated by the on-line navigation programme (not taking traffic jams into account). Therefore, this estimation seems to be not exaggerated (probably on the contrary).

84.6% of participants at peripheral sites said that they would not come to Leuven for this particular session if no videoconference was available. This percentage is stable in time, except for the first year 1998-1999, when this was only 68%. This probably means that people consider the videoconferencing program a standard means of postgraduate education early after it becomes available.

Total savings in time were 7478 hrs per year for participants at a peripheral location. Of course, no time savings were reported by those attending the session in Leuven.

Transportation savings

606285 km of transportation was avoided per year for participants at a guest location (calculated from the preferred route as suggested by ViaMichelin).

Analysis of cost and return

Return

Cost savings for transportation were calculated for each participant at a peripheral location at a rate of 0.3093€ /km. Time savings were calculated as 86.15€ per hour saved in transportation time for each participant at a peripheral location. This is the amount of honorarium that could be generated by 3 consultations, calculated in a ratio of 2/3 specialist consultation and 1/3 general practitioner consultation fee. No savings in time or transport were calculated for participants in Leuven.

Per year 606285 km of transport were avoided by participants at a peripheral site, with a cost of 187524€. Total savings in time were 7478 hrs, with a cost of 644207€. The total return for all participants at peripheral locations during a year was thus 831731€, which is 264.3 € per participant, or 105.72 € per participant in a peripheral location and per hour.

Of course the return is different from location to location. The return ranges from 115€ up to 376€ per participant at a peripheral location.

Cost

The total cost per year is approximately 330105 €. This consists of personnel cost in Leuven and at each site, communication costs, depreciation of technical equipment also in Leuven and at guest sites, promotion costs, and other expenses.
The equipment is also used for other purposes in some sites, nevertheless all investment costs are included in this calculation, since investment was mainly performed for the Pentalfa program, and it is uncertain whether these investments would have been performed for other purposes alone.

The cost per hour of broadcast is thus 5079 €. The cost per participant at a peripheral location is 104 €, which is 41,67 € per hour of broadcast.

**Cost-effectiveness**
The net benefit from a societal viewpoint is 501626 € per year. The netto saving from a societal point of view is thus 64,05 € per hour of continuing medical education by a participant at a peripheral site.

**DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION**

The Pentalfa videoconferencing programme is a stable initiative of lifelong learning that allowed our university to maintain its role as central provider of postgraduate medical education.

Such a complex program should be well planned. This makes ‘hot topic’ sessions, discussing subjects under actual public interest, difficult to organise. A good organisational structure is necessary. The providers of scientific content should not be bothered by complex technical or organisational problems. The program should be embedded in a sound financial structure. Therefore, the university as provider for this way of lifelong learning is a correct environment.

An evaluation of the program has been performed in accordance with the Bologna process. The Pentalfa program is judged to improve knowledge, can be implemented in the professional life of the participants and enriches the individual.

The escalating transportation time to reach the K.U.Leuven for postgraduate education threatens the role of the university for lifelong learning. Almost 85% of the participants at guest sites said that they would not come to the University for the specific seminar that they participated in closer at the working place using videoconference technology. We are thus convinced that this program promotes lifelong learning directed by the university by transforming transportation time in learning time.

The cost is paid by the participating sites of the Flemish Hospital Network and the faculty of medicine of the K.U.Leuven, and the financial benefits are mainly for the participants at guest sites. If one would like to balance this, and have the costs paid by the participants at the peripheral sites, a reasonable ticket price should be around 100 € for participants at a peripheral site for a 2.5 hrs session. It is unclear whether participants would be willing to pay this ticket price.

**REFERENCES**


HOW DO WE ENSURE TRANSFER OF TRAINING FOR PART TIME, ADULT STUDENTS?
Dr. Tim London, Queen’s University Belfast, Northern Ireland

What is currently done quite effectively to maximize the ability of part-time students who work full time to learn and then apply this learning in their workplace is that there are strong connections between the work students are asked to do in their courses and their actual work lives. In a quick review of assessments for Master’s students in the School of Education at my university, case studies, papers designed as a combination of their personal experience joined with research, and reflections on their work experiences are common and useful ways of connecting courses to work. Bransford, Brown, and Cocking (2000) make it clear that these opportunities to build on students’ prior knowledge and preconceptions are essential to new learning. During the course, this allows students to implement new ideas with the safety net of being able to approach their lecturer for clarifications as necessary. Also, because in most Master’s programs students can choose from a range of courses to fulfill the points necessary to earn a degree, it is likely that they will be interested and engaged in the learning process because they have chosen it (Wiggins & McTighe, 1998). While these are two strong facets of current Master’s programs, there are also structural weaknesses that can limit the amount of long term learning achieved by students.

CHALLENGES TO EFFECTIVE TRANSFER OF TRAINING

Issue 1: While the precise time will vary between institutions, Master’s students receive approximately 30 hours of “seat time” with a lecturer but are largely left to their own devices when not in the classroom setting. Usually these 30 hours are also taught over the course of only a few days, creating a situation where the bulk of students’ time related to thinking about and practicing new concepts is done in relative isolation, even during the semester duration of the module. This isolation from peers who have studied the same issues, as well as the lecturer, makes it less likely that they will fully understand new ideas and apply them in their work setting even during the term of the course. Extending the amount of face-to-face time a lecturer spends with students, while sounding like an easy solution, is not necessarily the best way forward as this dramatically impacts the internal resources of a University or School and is not always feasible.

Issue 2: Most researchers who study effective training point out that a key to long term usage of new information is follow-up contact, ongoing support, and feedback once learners are back in the workplace (Zenger, Ulrich, & Smallwood, 2000; Halpern & Hakel, 2003; London & Smither, 1999; Broad & Newstrom, 1992). Given the fact that contact between student and the university usually ceases after courses have been completed, there is little opportunity for students to receive this ongoing feedback while at work from either lecturers or peers. The inherent purpose of students taking these courses is to allow them to enhance their practice outside of the program; the current system, however, marks two strong divisions that impede this process. One is that the optimal learning in this environment only happens when a student is in class as noted in the previous paragraph; the second is that learning is expected to take place in the timeframe of a semester. People are simply less likely to try new practices when they are working in isolation from either experts – in the form of their lecturer – or their fellow students.

Issue 3: Because students are given wide discretion as to which Master’s level courses they will take to complete their degree, there is less likelihood of continuity throughout their program in terms of course content as well as peer groups who can provide formative feedback (Bransford, Brown, & Cocking, 2000). Focusing on the issue of content continuity, it is easy to see that many students may graduate with a Master’s degree that, while named, may not provide enough coherent and specific experiences to markedly improve students’ capabilities in the work setting. This discontinuity and inefficiency can come in many forms including gaps or omissions, time spent on the same topic in multiple courses, or insufficient time on topics students find particularly useful or engaging.

Issue 4: There is generally a lead time of anywhere from a year to several years in the development of new courses to meet emerging needs of the external community. This lag is the result of both internal structures and a lack of connection to external stakeholders. External stakeholders such as local employers will be on the cutting edge of their fields and so are in ideal positions to help inform universities what is “next” and needs to be addressed in courses for practitioners. While some disciplines, notably business schools, forge strong connections with the employers their students will be working for, other areas such as education generally have much weaker uptake mechanisms for addressing emerging issues.

The internal issues stem from bureaucracy that involves a series of steps to be taken before a new course is put in place. Firstly, a need must be recognized and then a course plan developed to be
submitted for approval; depending on the university’s procedures, this could require approval at multiple levels from the department level through the central University administrative structures. Following this, assuming that this new area does not correspond closely with an existing member of teaching staff, a new hire will need to be sought out and brought on board, another time consuming process. This is not to say that some of these internal layers are not necessary, merely that the time taken to navigate them makes the higher education system less responsive than is ideal.

RESOLVING THESE ISSUES

Moving forward, if these issues are to be addressed – and addressed in realistic ways that do not place an undue burden on university staff – there are several steps to take. The first is tapping into available technologies to improve the teaching and learning process. This can take place in many ways, all of which can provide enhanced connectivity between students and the university as well as extending the length of time of these connections beyond a student’s graduation from University. The pieces at most Universities are already in place, with many online platforms offering the capability of discussion boards and e-mail searches.

In addition to changing usage of technologies to help “extend the classroom”, it is essential to provide training to teaching staff in how to use the technology as well as how to rethink what using these tools means for their teaching practice. As American K-12 education has learned, investing in new hardware, software, and online tools is enormously expensive and, when training for staff is not provided, incredibly wasteful.

A second and related improvement is that Universities need to re-think who is hired and the criteria that are most essential to being an effective lecturer. To some extent this means evaluating their technology competence and interest. In relation to Issue 4 above, it also means re-thinking the concept of relying on lecturers who are highly specialized in very narrow field as this limits the ability of the University to deploy its teaching resources flexibly and efficiently.

Finally, currently Universities have a very inward directed focus, comparing themselves against other higher education institutions on measures like grant funding and research production. While it is certainly reasonable for an organization to compare itself to others in the same field, this may ignore the fundamental difference that educational institutions have community responsibilities as well in terms of preparing and developing their students to be successful in the workplace; the ability of a University to prepare its students for their job is something can only be measured by external sources, not within the field of higher education institution.

Method 1: Enhancing existing online management systems (such as Blackboard, Moodle, etc.) to allow students to search for other students within and outside their courses to link with people in similar work situations or interests of study. This can allow them to create larger and more compatible networks informally than the university is currently able to do within the formal structure of modules or courses. Linking these students together can then lead to student created message boards or e-mail list-servs to communicate with each other.

This means capitalizing on technologies to make them more than expenses and items to enhance the school’s brochure. In Universities, this means training not only in the online technology to enhance communication outside of class, but also utilizing in-class technology to greater advantage to maximize the face-to-face time that is quite limited for postgraduate, part time students.

Method 2: Following the same model as above, it would not produce an undue burden to allow alumni similar access to existing online tools and resources. This would provide them with ongoing connections to both the university as well as to former and current students who could serve as valuable sources of support and feedback. One of the great weaknesses of the current learning paradigm is that it is strongly bounded by time and place. When the module is over, the student returns to their work and hopefully implements new ideas and practices, but does so largely on their own. Current students can be given a clearer picture of how what they are studying will look when applied to the work place and graduates can refresh their learning by having contact with students immersed in the readings and coursework. Alumni access to online resources requires no real change in policy or infrastructure either, simply providing them with a new password or login, making this change one that requires a minimum of time or money investment.

Method 3: Being responsive to changing needs of employers can only be effective if it is both quick and value added. The issue of speed of response certainly falls to the internal workings of Universities and its Schools to fine expedited ways to develop and approve new courses. This does not mean a lessening of the quality controls in place – these quality controls in a faster system are just as important – but a focus on figuring out the most efficient system for this. The other major internal component to this process is closely examining who is hired and the basis for these hirings. The old model in academia has been to hire niche experts whose focus and interests lie in a very narrow
subset of their field. This certainly provides great expertise in a small number of areas, but can lead to sacrifices in the areas of flexibility and broader understandings of employer needs. This is not to argue that such experts no longer be hired or that they do not have tremendous value – it is my ardent belief that they are vital – but for the hiring process to take into account the necessity of having people on staff whose expertise is broader; this can allow them to develop courses that build on their own expertise and also allows them to tap into the highly specialized knowledge of their colleagues where appropriate. This results in Universities and Schools that can quickly align their resources to address new areas effectively.

Method 4: The major measuring sticks among academics remains other higher education institutions along measures of research output and funding. These measures are certainly informative of what a University or School has produced in the field of academia, but it ignores the value added to its students in their workplace. For example, the RAE makes no mention of how much more effective graduates of a University were in their jobs than the graduates from another University. Focusing almost solely on research outputs is a strong signal to academics that, if they want to keep their jobs or gain promotion, their focus should not be on the time consuming task of developing more effective teaching strategies, but on writing more articles in their narrow field for publication. In conjunction with this focus on research outputs as measures of Universities, coursework, when it is examined by an external body, is generally evaluated by other academics. While this can provide a valuable check on the use of latest research as readings, clear objectives, and consistent marking practices, it ignores almost entirely the impact this course will have/has had on part-time students’ ability to do their job more effectively based on the course. This signals very clearly that, while teaching is an important aspect of an academic’s work, it pales in comparison to procuring grants and writing articles for submission to journals.

DISCUSSION MATCHING ISSUES TO METHODS OF RESOLUTION
Suggestions for improvement given here are geared around their efficiency: in other words, the goal here is productivity, rather than simply the biggest outcome difference (Boyd, 1998). This embraces the reality that, especially given the current economic crisis, Universities and Schools need to be as efficient as possible in performing their mission as effectively as possible. Capitalizing on existing technologies and infrastructure is the best way to make the most of money already spent. Similarly, developing closer links with employing bodies is initially a time consuming venture but, if done properly, results in a long term, low investment system for improving the University productivity. Even with some of this technology and infrastructure in place already, these suggestions would certainly create more work: moderators of content would need to be put in place and website maintenance would need to be carried out; training for existing staff would need to be expanded in terms of scope and numbers of staff enrolled in professional development courses; developing lasting links with employers can be complex and convoluted; and changing the mindsets of people sitting on hiring panels is a long and involved process. To me, the pay off for such additional structures and commitments of resources in terms of transfer of learning to students would far outweigh these added costs. Not only would students gain more learning, but their workplace would see the immediate benefits in a range of areas, making it possible that there could be partnerships between Universities and business that could defray the cost of such measures even further. Research shows that students actively engaged in developing their own learning can learn more; it is crucial that Universities utilize existent technology to provide students with this opportunity by expanding the learning opportunities provided both in and out of the classroom.

The key to all of this change is re-focusing on the idea that Universities serving part time adult students are working not just to improve the Universities’ standing, but rather to benefit the students and their workplace directly. This does not mean ignoring some of the noble ideals of lifelong learning and the power of accumulated wisdom and knowledge; rather it is the emphasis on turning the power of these beliefs directly to the benefit of these students as they take their newfound wisdom back to their work.
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Historical Aspects

It is of emerging interest since when and why international organisations of education, culture have started to influence the changing character, tools and aspirations of higher education, however, there were several outstanding phases in their modern history when they had to consider sending signals towards higher education institutions to recognize the time for change and time for action. We need to go back to the time of the crisis of the welfare-state, when in the 1970s there were several social, economic, and political considerations to involve more and more people in learning activities through the realization of mass education and to give impetus to the further development of adult learning and education. However, It became also clear that higher education would and should play an important role in such activities and this process would accelerate such dimensions as it had been profoundly reflected in university extension a century earlier (Fieldhouse, 2000). The UNESCO started to point out the role of higher education institutions in the development of adult and lifelong education at its CONFINTA III (International Adult Education World Conference) in Tokyo in 1972 when it underlined the importance of cementing the basis of research and promotion of international cooperation in adult education through universities (Adult Education and Development, 1994).

Accordingly, it was in 1976 when the UNESCO initiated recommendations on the development of adult education in Nairobi and gave details of taking higher education into the development of adult education. I think this was the momentum of the emergence of a paradigm shift to balance the market-oriented aspects of higher education roles with rather humanistic approaches of adult education-related roles to take. At the same time, this situation highlighted upon the necessity of recognising a slowly, but constantly changing composition of higher education clientele referring to a growing number of non-traditional students/learners with a reference to an ageing society in the developed part of the world.

The UNESCO's Nairobi-recommendations indicated that:
“(1) adult education, however, must not be considered as an entity in itself, it is a sub-division and an integral part of, a global scheme for life-long education and learning;

The term “life-long education and learning”, for its part, denotes an overall scheme aimed both at restructuring the existing education system and at developing the entire educational potential outside the education system” (UNESCO, 1976)

The UNESCO put an emphasis to the acceptance and recognition of adult and lifelong education by academic cycles and to promote the change and reconfiguration of current higher education paradigms into a paradigm-shift. The same Nairobi-recommendation underlined, referring to the place and definition of adult education in each education systems, that:
“(7) Adult education and other forms of education, particularly school education and higher education and initial vocational training, should be conceived and organized as equally essential components in a coordinated but differentiated education system according to the tenets of life-long education and learning.” (UNESCO, 1976)

Of course, it was more than obvious even in 1976 that research of adult and lifelong education and learning and related research activities ought to be coordinated by higher education institutions in association with adult education research centres/institutes. Therefore, the Nairobi-recommendation pointed out, according to adult and lifelong education, in its point 35., that:
“(35) Member States should actively encourage cooperative research in all aspects of adult education and its objectives. Research programmes should have a practical basis. They should be carried out by
universities, adult education bodies and research bodies, adopting an interdisciplinary approach...‖ (UNESCO, 1976)

It is not surprising that the Nairobi-recommendation clearly stressed that universities would have to belong to the group of organisations and institutions to help achieving the planned its objectives as follows:

“ (39) In order to achieve these objectives it will be necessary to mobilize organizations and institutions specifically concerned with adult education, and the full range, both public and private of schools, universities, cultural and scientific establishments, libraries and museums, and in addition, other institutions not primarily concerned with adult education...‖ (UNESCO, 1976)

I think the strongest point of the Nairobi-recommendation outlined the aim and vision of a clear message for higher education that it should integrate adult and lifelong learning into its educational programmes and to participate in such actions with partnership-oriented manner which is a message of the 40th point of the recommendation indicated as:

“ (40) Member States should encourage schools, vocational education establishments, colleges and institutions of higher education to regard adult education programmes as an integral part of their own activities and to participate in action designed to promote the development of such programmes provided by other institutions, in particular by making available their own teaching staff, conducting research and training necessary personnel.” (UNESCO, 1976)

Emergence of a Changing Learning Climate

The impact of the Nairobi-recommendation can be explored in follow-up debates over the 1970s and the 1980s. They connected the issue of developing quality adult and lifelong education and learning to promoting the change and development of higher education being able to react to challenges of the knowledge society in an information-age. I agree with the argument of Jarvis, who, by examining universities as institutions of lifelong learning, indicated according to social economic changes to challenge educational structures that both adult education and universities are being forced to change to respond to globalization and the pressures of knowledge societies, while it is obviously difficult for those universities having traditionally taught discipline-based knowledge and whose main students has been young adults. He underlined that new demands for continuing education for adults are coming from a knowledge-based workforce and that universities are being forced to become institutions of lifelong learning with greater proportion of adult students than young adult undergraduates (Jarvis, 2001).

Such considerations make me emphasize that current statements and charters on lifelong learning by universities and other institutions of higher education are apparent recognition of the realization of those arguments. Jarvis, when elaborating upon the changing roles of higher education, pointed out the problem of relation of local knowledge to universal knowledge and the relationship between theory and practice as well generated by social conditions which change university-base teaching and assessment (Jarvis, 2001.). These approach have reflected the changing status, clientele, forms of knowledge, nature of research, methods of delivery of programmes, role of the academic, whereas the majority of academic staff in the institutions of higher education and learning has reported stress and, on the other hand, users of academic knowledge have indicated that educational system is still unable to recognize and understand their demands.

It is essential to clarify that forces of changes come from inside and outside through global constraints in an age of instability and growing social, political and economic pressures at the same time.

University Continuing Education or University Lifelong Learning

It is worth examining how the changing social, political and economic environment for higher education brought about complex policies and promoted traditional approaches of lifelong education to integrate into the lifelong learning paradigm so as to support a rather learner-centred model for education and learning. Even if the educational models and implications of lifelong learning have been rather economy-focused and have mainly been used by the OECD for almost two decades after 1973, the European environment has helped, since 1991-92, to have a systematic combination of UNESCO promoted, rather humanistic approach for lifelong education and learning, especially in the sense of the Faure-report and, of the OECD-represented economy and market-orientation. The former stressed the community-centeredness of learning and education, the later envisaged a rather learner-centred vision. Now, I think that it became peculiar for the European environment to give a chance to the
combination of the two approaches in an outstanding way of Jacques Delors who implemented that combination in his famous report for the UNESCO as *Learning: A Treasure within* (Delors, 1996). I think that the context of university continuing education was rather capable of being misunderstood, especially in those countries where the notion has never meant too much or adult and continuing, from another angle, has never been able to modify traditional academic understanding of higher education and resistance towards university-based adult and continuing education except for peculiar courses and lectures to disseminate scientific knowledge for the public.

The 1990s reflected a special phase for university continuing education (UCE) in international higher education environment to collect relevant examples and best practices of higher education-oriented adult continuing education and, at the same time, examples of efficient university structures referring both to institutional changes towards management, education and research. In the European environment, the community efforts to promote quality education and training, efficient access and equal opportunities and partnership-building have reached higher education and adult and lifelong education at the same time with an influence to shift from education towards learning in a constant process. It has resulted in various UCE actions to enable universities create close and regular links between academic staff and practising members of their profession and update their teaching to full-time students to reflect the current attitudes of their professions and, at the same time, to attract funds for research or development work creating greater freedom for action. In some other universities it has helped to fill the increasing number of student places being offered. However, the most apparent impact has been enabling universities to play a significant role in their regions’ economic and social development and meet their obligations to make available state-of-the-art knowledge to all parts of society (Becher, 1993). A clear danger for higher education has been staying intact and opposing any real change required by the outside world, which later was strongly challenged by the Memorandum of Lifelong Learning:

“Most of what our education and training systems offer is still organised and taught as if the traditional ways of planning and organising one’s life had not changed for at least half a century.” (EC, 2000)

But it was still in the second half of the 1990s, when the UNESCO in Hamburg, Germany stated in its very well-known *Agenda for the Future of CONFINTEA V.* that:

“We commit ourselves to: 19. Opening schools, colleges and universities to adult learners:

(c) by establishing joint university/community research and training partnerships and by bringing the services of universities to outside groups;

(f) by providing systematic continuing education for adult educators;

(g) by calling upon the World Conference on Higher Education (Paris, 1998) to promote the transformation of post-secondary institutions into lifelong learning institutions and to define role of universities accordingly.” (UNESCO, 1997)

The overall aims of the *Agenda for the Future of CONFINTEA V.* became very influential and together with the respected *Hamburg-declaration* of the same event strongly supported a learner-centred approach and gave way to adult and lifelong learning to serve as a new paradigm both for adult and continuing education and for higher education! It became also obvious that higher education had to signal new tasks in the frame of lifelong learning. Some distinguished scholars of CONFINTEA V. went on to formulate a new debate over higher education and lifelong learning by indicating institutions of higher education aiming to understand and consider new roles for universities in a changing time preparing for the Millenium in the year of 2000. Therefore, the UNESCO, together with respected university-based adult educators, scholars and specialists in the field of lifelong learning, together with NGO representatives, organised a conference into Mumbai, India, when preparing for the World Conference on Higher Education in Paris, for a debate over the issue and a statement followed and concluded the discussions named as the Mumbai Statement.

The Mumbai Statement recalled the words of the *Hamburg Declaration*, considered the relevant points of the *Agenda for the Future* stated that global trends affect higher education and other institutions of higher education which struggle to cope with new opportunities and demands. The Statement indicated that higher education institutions will have to play new roles in the perspective of lifelong learning (International Journal of Lifelong Education, 1998) The imperatives of education, the Statement pointed out, throughout life are driven by diverse demands of global economy and those of equitable and sustainable societies. Therefore, the Mumbai Statement recognized that:

“(2) Lifelong learning has become a key concept in the thinking about education and training worldwide.

(3) We see a key purpose of lifelong learning as democratic citizenship, recognizing that democratic citizenship depends on such factors as effective economic development, attention to the least powerful in our societies, and on the impact of industrial processes on the caring capacity of our common home, the planet.....
Lifelong learning is about the interaction between learners, educators, and diverse knowledge. The long tradition in adult education of supporting learning opportunities for the excluded groups of women and men in our societies draws attention to the rich and different ways of knowing and representing knowledge within our societies. As the construction, understanding and sharing of knowledge is the most fundamental purpose of universities and other institutions of higher education, so a full understanding of lifelong learning calls on us to examine many of our assumptions about what is taught and why.

Changes and adjustment to academic life implied within lifelong learning include such practices as flexible and responsive systems of access, delivery, curricula, and accreditation which take adult learners' backgrounds, daily schedules, prior learning and life contexts into account. Counselling and guidance, for instance, may need to be available at later hours or in community-based settings for ease of access. The education of university level professionals needs to be rethought, taking into account initial university education and continuing learning throughout life. Importantly, the faculty and administrative staff of institutions of higher education need support and personal development opportunities in the light of changes due to the implementation of lifelong learning.

The transformation to genuine lifelong learning institutions require a holistic approach which
(a) supports the institution becoming a lifelong learning community itself;
(b) integrates academic, financial and administrative elements;
(c) provides structures which are responsible for organisational, staff, student and curriculum development and community engagement; and
(d) aligns the various supportive structures such as academic information systems, library provisions and learning technologies to the new mission of universities in learning societies.” (UNESCO, 1997)

The Mumbai Statement moved forward the debate and discussions over university lifelong learning and also helped the European cycles of university adult and lifelong education and learning to promote such implications with the Memorandum-debate over lifelong learning and the new contexts of the Bologna-process, the former to demonstrate a wide-range discussion in Europe over lifelong learning and its key messages and the later to frame the tasks of a reconstructed European higher education preparing for quality centred changes both in education and research. However, the Mumbai Statement reflected the implications of the lifelong learning paradigm in structural changes within in institutions of higher education in order to prepare for lifelong learning action/service for various learners, regardless of age, sex, nationality, etc.

The Mumbai Statement was, in the context of the UNESCO was followed by the famous Cape Town Statement of a further debate after Mumbai at the University of Western Cape, South Africa. The Cape Town Statement moved further with the familiar issues of lifelong learning and connected higher education, lifelong learning to active citizenship and it called for characteristic elements of a lifelong learning higher education institution. The following six such elements were outlined by participants of the Cape Town Conference discussing the characteristics elements of a lifelong learning higher education institutions:

1. **Overarching frameworks** which provide the contexts facilitating an higher education institution to operate as a lifelong learning institution. These are: regulatory, financial and Cultural/social;

2. **Strategic partnerships and linkages** – to include the following: forming relationships internationally; forming relationships with other institutions; forming relationships within institutions as well as forming relationships with other groups in society;

3. **Research** is understood in a broad sense and includes working across disciplines and/or across institutions. Lifelong learning is regarded as an important and legitimate research area;

4. **Teaching and learning processes** – Educators encourage self-directed learning, engage with knowledge, interests and life-situations which learners bring to their education and use open and resource based learning approaches;
(5) **Administration policies and mechanism** – service to learners is top priority of the administration;

(6) **Student support system and services** – Learners are supported to become independent learners in various ways. “(UNESCO, 2001)

I want to stress that the Cape Town Statement generated further debates over university lifelong learning (ULLL) and such debates over ULLL was promoted by EUCEN in programmes like CEPROFS at the University of Mulhouse in 2001 and onwards.

The UNESCO has dealt with the issue of promoting adult and lifelong learning in various ways, forms, and at several occasions, like at the Bangkok Interim CONFINTEA meeting and its synthesis report (UNESCO, 2003). However, the most reluctant indication of roles for higher education in the development of adult and lifelong learning was in Statement of the UNESCO’s Pan-European CONFINTEA VI. Conference in Budapest, from 3 to 6 December, 2008.

The Budapest Statement indicated at its 4th point that:

“(4) Countries should promote access to adult and lifelong education (ALE)... In addition, higher education institutions should become more responsive to the increasing demand for higher level qualifications;

(8) Policies, structures and measures to assure the quality of learning should be developed....Higher education along with other providers has a key role to play in this regard;

(9) **ALE is a legitimate and essential research area.**” (UNESCO, 2008)

These points, I think, are relevant examples to reflect the necessary recognitions of and interrelated and interdependent status of higher education and adult lifelong education in development and change. Higher education will inevitably play a significant role in the promotion of adult and lifelong education, while higher education will also benefit from this cooperation in case it considers recommendations of the examined UNESCO statements and policy documents.

**Conclusions**

In my paper, I tried to point out that the UNESCO has played a significant role in and had, therefore, a peculiar impact on promoting university lifelong learning and in the development of adult and lifelong education for all. Universities being engaged in the development of their institutional structures, educational and research provision can take respected points of those elaborated UNESCO statements and recommendations for further considerations and take them into comparison and debate, I suggest, with the points of the Lifelong Learning Charter of the European Universities’ Association (EUA, 2008).
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