

Journal of
Higher Education Policy
And
Leadership Studies


JHEPALS (E-ISSN: 2717-1426)

<https://johepal.com>

**Higher Education,
(In)Visible Key Actors,
and Global Post-
pandemic Trends: An
Interview with Glen
JONES**

Glen A. Jones

*Dean of the Ontario Institute for Studies in Education (OISE),
University of Toronto, Canada*
Email: glen.jones@utoronto.ca



Interview Questions
Submitted
2020/07/20

Interview Responses
Received
2020/07/28

Published Online
2020/10/13

Cite interview as:

Jones, G. A. (2020). Higher education, (In)visible key actors, and global post-pandemic trends: An interview with Glen Jones. *Journal of Higher Education Policy And Leadership Studies*, 1(2), 79-85. DOI: <https://dx.doi.org/10.29252/johepal.1.2.79>

Jones, G. A.

Higher Education, (In)Visible Key Actors, and Global Post-pandemic Trends: An Interview with Glen JONES

Journal of Higher Education Policy And Leadership Studies (JHEPALS)

E-ISSN: 2717-1426

Volume: 1 Issue: 2

pp. 79-85

DOI:

10.29252/johepal.1.2.79

Glen A. Jones is Professor of Higher Education and Dean of the Ontario Institute for Studies in Education (OISE) of the University of Toronto, CANADA.

Glen is the author of more than one hundred papers on Canadian higher education. His research and teaching focuses on higher education systems, governance, politics, and academic work. His recent books include *Governance of Higher Education: Global Perspectives, Theories and Practices* (with Ian Austin, Routledge, 2015), *Universities and Regional Development: A Critical Assessment of Tensions and Contradictions* (with Romulo Pinheiro and Paul Benneworth, Routledge, 2012), *Canada's Universities Go Global* (with Roopa Desai Trilokekar and Adrian Shubert, Lorimer, 2009), *Creating Knowledge, Strengthening Nations: The Changing Role of Higher Education* (with Patricia McCarney and Michael Skolnik, University of Toronto Press, 2005) and *Governing Higher Education: National Perspectives on Institutional Governance* (with Alberto Amaral and Berit Karseth, Kluwer Publishing, 2002). His 1997 book entitled *Higher Education in Canada: Different Systems, Different Perspectives* was translated into Chinese and was published in China in 2007.

Glen is a prolific contributor to the Canadian and international literature on higher education and a frequent public speaker and commentator on higher education issues.

https://www.oise.utoronto.ca/hec/Profile/Full_Bio.html



Glen A. Jones *

Keywords: Higher Education; Governance; Policy

*Corresponding author's email: glen.jones@utoronto.ca

Interview

Question: At first, we aim to give our readers and audiences an overview of your perspective towards and the way you look at the main core of your research: *higher education policy, governance, academic work, and administration*.

Answer: I begin with the assumption that universities are one of the most important institutions in contemporary society. They play a fundamental role in developing the human resources needed by knowledge societies and knowledge economies, they create new knowledge, and they represent a unique space within society for critical thought and debate. Given that central role, it is extremely important to understand how higher education is governed, and how institutions are shaped and influenced by the policy context in which they function. Of course most of the actual work of the university is conducted by professors in the classrooms and laboratories, and so I have become fascinated with the changing nature of the academic profession and understanding whether and how academic work is shaped and influenced by governance, policy and administration.

My initial focus was on higher education in Canada, and while that continues to be a major element of my work I also had opportunities early in my career to engage in international conversations on specific issues in policy and governance, and I quickly learned the importance of adopting a more international/comparative perspective. I have had wonderful opportunities to learn about quite different higher education systems, different policy environments, different governance arrangements, different assumptions about academic work and careers – and trying to understand these differences has shaped a lot of my research. Understanding something about these differences between systems, and the socio-political-historical context in which they function, has forced me to ask different questions and to consider new approaches that would simply have never occurred to me if I had continued to focus only on my home country. This international work has provided me with the ability to learn from and collaborate with excellent scholars from around the world, and those collaborations usually introduce me to new ideas, theories, and approaches.

I am fairly pragmatic and agnostic when it comes to theory – I tend to shift approaches depending on the subject or research question as I look for theoretical tools that will have the greatest potential in terms of explanatory power. There are certainly concepts that I return to time-and-time again. Burton Clark’s notion of “levels of authority” is an extremely simple but powerful way of recognizing the multi-levelled complexity of higher education systems, and of course we now talk a great deal about multi-level governance. Horizontal or “systemic” diversity and vertical stratification are important tools for understanding and comparing different institutional arrangements. Ian Austin and I wrote *Governance of Higher Education: Global Perspectives, Theories and Practices* (Routledge, 2016) as a textbook with the objective of trying to introduce junior scholars to the wide range of theories and concepts that might help us understand governance and policy from an international perspective.

Now, with an enlightened portrayal of your philosophy towards the key concepts of Higher Education; we move forward to learn your illuminative responses to the following questions:

Jones, G. A.

Question: What kind of policies universities are obliged to follow to win the non-stop global pace towards success and increasing their competitive advantage?

Answer: That is an extremely complex question, in large part because the answer depends so much on the mission of the institution and the national and local context. There are many universities that are primarily teaching institutions serving the human resource needs of the country or region, while other universities aspire to be “world-class” research universities. All universities need to have a governance structure that will provide the foundation for furthering their mission, whatever that mission or role might be. In the context of the higher education system, the university needs to have the autonomy necessary to be innovative and creative as it fulfills its mission. Governments will simply stifle innovation if they exercise too much centralized authority over institutions. The university must, in turn, develop a policy context that recognizes the importance of protecting the academic freedom and professional autonomy of individual professors.

Aside from ensuring that there is an appropriate level of institutional autonomy and that academic freedom is protected, universities need to develop policies and approaches that focus on the institutional mission – whether that mission is serving students in a regional context, or as a global university contributing to knowledge creation and dissemination in an international context. As an organization, the university needs to attract and enrol students in fulfillment of that mission, monitor their progress, collect information from students so that the university can further their success and address their challenges. They need to help professors be excellent teachers by supporting their continuing education and providing them with appropriate resources. They need to support university leaders through continuing professional learning and mentorship. In short, the university needs to create a policy environment that will further its mission, whatever that might be; it needs to develop policies and management structures that support its leaders, professors and students. I do not think that there is a single list of policies that will lead to success, it is more about an organizational arrangement that promotes learning, organizational advancement and best practices within a particular context.

Question: Scuffling with complex of missions and visions might be one of the challenges of the current universities worldwide. How do universities survive from these fad multidimensional missions and visions to achieve their goals? Further, when we talk about 1st, 2nd, 3rd, and 4th Generations of universities; how do universities must balance their missions and visions with their authorities to obtain optimum efficiency in their policies and plans?

Answer: I have recently been involved in a research project led by Julia Eastman where we have been using Bourdieu’s concepts of restricted and mass modes of cultural production as a way of exploring some of the key tensions within public universities. In many contexts these universities must be responsive to external stakeholders, like governments and employers, because they have a “public” mission and they depend on external funding in order to fulfill that mission. They engage in mass modes of production by expanding enrolment to address increasing student demand, or ensuring that their graduates fulfill the needs of the local labour market. There must be ways in which they can obtain input from and respond to external communities. At the same time they may want to support elite or restricted modes of production by providing the space for professors to make elite, academic decisions about their research activities, and where peer-review plays a role in determining the quality of research or assessing the academic performance of departments and

Interview

educational programs. There is clearly a tension between these two very different modes of production, and many public universities struggle with this balance. International rankings tend to focus on indicators that are more related to restricted modes of production such as research impact and productivity, or perceptions of prestige, and so this notion of international competition drives one side of the tension. On the other hand, we live within societies where there are expectations that universities will serve large, diverse populations of students and respond to the broader needs of the communities in which they are located. Government funding and community support may be dependent on a university responding to these external pressures. Some universities have the resources needed to simply focus on elite production, to be what Brendan Cantwell and Simon Marginson refer to as “artisanal universities” which are positioned at the very top of the institutional hierarchy, but others are “demand-absorbing” universities that must respond to external constituencies in order to fulfill their role within the system. Many universities are somewhere in-between, trying to navigate these tensions between restricted and mass modes of production.

I also think it is important to recognize that both modes of production are needed within contemporary higher education. There are broader societal benefits associated with expanding participation in higher education, and it would be highly inefficient for government to fulfill this objective by creating and funding only elite, artisanal universities.

Question: You talk about invisible sector in higher education in one of your research. Why Invisible?; and how do you analyze public and private sectors in higher education throughout the world?

Answer: I used the term “invisible sector” in a paper discussing private higher education in Canada. Canada is a federal system and it is the provinces that have assumed responsibility for higher education policy. There are quite distinct provincial systems. In the major expansion of Canadian higher education following WWII, the provinces created “public” systems in that almost all major institutions received government funding. There is, however, a long history of private higher education in Canada that has largely been invisible both in terms of public discussions of higher education and in terms of basic data. There are private career colleges and an increasing number of private universities that contribute to higher education in Canada that receive surprisingly little attention. These institutions are largely invisible to our national data systems since Canada does not collect data on the enrolment of students in these institutions, or collect data on the academic staff who work there. In many jurisdictions private higher education is heavily visible, in fact there are systems where the majority of students attend private institutions, but in Canada the private sector is relatively small, frequently marginalized, and largely invisible.

Question: When we talk about changing patterns of Higher Education in the 3rd millennium; what do you think about the current and future trends of HE?; and how does change management happen within our universities?

Answer: I think that there is now a research imperative that is underscoring many of the current changing patterns of higher education. We could argue that research has always been a key function of higher education, especially since the emergence of the Humboldtian university in the nineteenth century, but there have been many systems where the core role of the university was teaching and

Jones, G. A.

where research was associated with specialized academies or other organizational arrangements, such as in France or Russia. Reinforcing the role of university research in these systems is far from new, but there is no doubt that these pressures have been exacerbated by the positioning of universities as core institutions within national research and innovation systems, by international rankings and the desire for “world-class” universities, and by an increasing emphasis on the role that these institutions can play in both social and economic development. Governments around the world are paying far more attention to the research role of universities and this has had major implications for government policy, for university leadership, and for academic work. In our recent book *Professorial Pathways*, Martin Finkelstein and I noted that this global emphasis on research is a major driver of change in academic careers and career pathways.

This emphasis on research, increasing international competition, and the increasing importance being placed on rankings (including within government policy) in some countries is also leading to increasing vertical stratification within higher education systems. There are increasing differences in the prestige, resources and opportunities for professors who work at universities at the top of this hierarchy compared with those who work at lower status institutions. This has always been true for countries with highly diverse systems like the United States, but it is becoming increasingly true in many other countries. These differences in institutional prestige may translate into differences in how their graduates are perceived in the labour market, the pathways of their doctoral graduates in the academic labour market, or opportunities for international research partnerships and collaboration.

I believe that the increasing resources devoted to research and innovation combined with the direct ways in which university research activity is linked to international prestige is further exacerbating the differences between higher education in the developed and developing world. I worry about how shifting immigration patterns, “brain-drain,” and an increasingly international academic labour market will simply further these divisions, and increase the level of inequity, between nations and their capacity for economic and social development.

There are clearly some common trends in terms of governance. Neo-liberal policies have had an impact on the relationships between universities and governments in many countries, and they are shifting relationships within universities and other institutions of higher education. In many systems there are tensions between notions of academic self-governance and the professional autonomy of the professoriate, and managerialism with a shift towards more hierarchical authority relationships.

I think that one of the challenges associated with the current pressures for more managerial practices and notions of change management is that institutions of higher education have frequently not done a particularly good job at supporting the continuing and professional learning of those involved in governance and management. I think that universities are quite unique institutional forms, and that it is extremely important for those who govern and lead our institutions to be aware of the distinctive nature of these organizations. You cannot govern a university the same way that you might govern a bank or a factory – and you cannot lead a university in the same way that you might lead a hospital or a store. I think that universities need to take the professional learning of our governors and leaders seriously so that they will understand these differences and be able to lead these institutions forward. We work in organizations where learning is highly valued, but I think that we have often ignored the unique learning needs of those who govern and lead our universities.

Interview

I think that whatever the trends we might have discussed a year ago are now being disrupted by COVID-19 and our current uncertain context – and I know that we will discuss the implications of COVID-19 a little later in this conversation.

Question: What are the problems and main issues of future study in the field of higher education policy and leadership studies? How can future study be developed at university studies?

Answer: I think that there has been a significant growth in scholarship within the field of higher education since I was a junior scholar. There are more scholars participating in international conversations on key research questions, and in some countries there has been an increasing recognition of the importance of higher education research. However in many countries higher education scholars continue to struggle for recognition, funding and status. Higher education is still a fairly marginalized field of inquiry in many countries.

On the positive side, I think that the field has clearly opened-up and developed in many parts of the world. Overall, I see an increasing depth and sophistication of scholarship in the field with greater methodological and theoretical heterogeneity. There appear to be an increasing number of international collaborative projects taking place and I see richer international collaboration in the field. There has also been a growth in graduate programs specializing in higher education in many countries - there was a time when it was quite unusual to see graduate programs in higher education outside of the United States, Canada and China, but now one can see a growing recognition that higher education is a legitimate area of graduate education and that there are benefits in furthering dedicated studies in this field.

There are certainly many wonderful contributors to the scholarship of higher education who view themselves primarily according to their basic discipline – they are economists, organizational theorists, sociologists or historians who have turned their attention to research questions in higher education. However, I think that scholars who view themselves primarily as specialists in the scholarship of higher education play a unique role in the field – and those individuals are frequently associated with research centres and university-based graduate programs specializing in higher education. They play an important role in synthesizing the scholarship in the field, in editing the journals and organizing the conferences that are so important to the development of the field, and in training or mentoring the next generation of higher education researchers. I think that we need both discipline-based scholars who can bring the newest theories and scholarship in their discipline to research questions, but also higher education scholars who will advance higher education as an interdisciplinary field of scholarship.

Of course there are parts of the world where higher education receives surprisingly little attention in terms of research. This is a problem for international and comparative scholarship – it is sometimes difficult to identify researchers working on higher education issues in specific countries, and this limits our ability to understand these systems, or to collaborate on projects that might involve these countries. There is surprisingly little higher education scholarship in the Middle-East, in India, in most African countries, etc. This presents a challenge as we try to understand international trends or how higher education issues are taken up differently in different regions. I

Jones, G. A.

think that it is also a challenge for these countries since they sometimes lack communities of higher education expertise that might help inform or critique policy developments.

I believe that institutions of higher education are one of the most complicated organizational forms that the human species has ever created – a large university engaged in a myriad of specialized activities, services and research activities. There is no end to the possibilities for research in higher education – the field involves an extremely complex object of study that is changing rapidly.

Question: How do you see a post COVID-19 university? Does COVID-19 reshape the way of academicians' approach to post-secondary education?

Answer: That is an extremely important and challenging question. There is little doubt that the first impact in the mid-COVID-19 period has been the almost universal transition to on-line learning in many countries. Many universities have moved quickly to provide professional development and technological support to faculty to facilitate this transition away from in-person instruction, and many professors are experimenting with the use of virtual technologies in new ways and seeing the possibilities of innovative approaches to organizing and teaching their courses. I think that we will see a shift in balance in the ways in which these technologies are used in a post-COVID-19 environment – that professors will have a larger toolkit of approaches to draw from, and some will use these technologies to modify their teaching practices. Of course it also illuminates the challenges of the digital divide and access to technology.

I think that we may also rethink how we provide services to students and support the work of our faculty – some of these services can be provided more effectively and efficiently using distance technologies. Will this current experiment with virtual education and virtual services lead to a rethinking of how we use physical space within universities? Will it force us to rethink the use of social spaces within higher education, or to rethink the ways in which we build and allocate office space.

The disruption of COVID-19 also raises a number of other very challenging questions that may have lasting implications. What are the implications for international student and faculty mobility, and will the current disruption lead to a major shift in how we think about internationalization and international academic relationships? Will we rethink the need for in-person conferences and short-term international travel as the realities of addressing climate change return to the forefront of public attention?

We know that this crisis has had a much larger impact on some populations, frequently exacerbating existing inequalities within our societies, and so COVID-19 raises broad questions about whether we will take steps to address these inequities as we recover from this disruption. Will this create an opportunity for universities to find new ways of engaging and supporting the societies in which they function? Will they be able to use new technologies to expand access and further the dissemination of new knowledge? Will higher education as a “social good” be given more attention as we recover from a virus that has forced us to pay more attention to how individual action contributes to social benefits? These are the questions that we need to raise moving forward.