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The Rise of Regional and International Academic Networks

Associations, consortia and networks are quite common in the academic world. In recent years, academic organisations have become increasingly international in nature as a result of the globalisation of our economies and societies. The emergence of new international academic organisations is directly related to the growing importance of the internationalisation of higher education and the impact of globalisation on higher education. There is a great variety of such academic organisations – associations, consortia and networks – and it is not always clear what their objectives and goals are nor how successfully they operate. This chapter gives a typology of international associations, consortia and networks in higher education and will concentrate on the functioning of the last type, institutional networks, which appear to be the latest trend in the international organisation of higher education. As Hans van Ginkel (1996, 91) observes, networking has been one of the key words in higher education for the last ten years, and increasingly networks are of an international rather than a national character. Why has there been such a rapid growth in international networks in the past decade? What are the challenges in establishing, operating and sustaining such organisations? What is the added value that such an organisation provides compared to what is done at the individual or bilateral level? What are the success and failure factors for an international academic network? Answers to these questions will be provided in this chapter.

1. Trends in Academic Co-operation

The emergence of new academic networks and alliances is directly related to the growing importance of internationalisation of higher education and the impact of globalisation on higher education. “Never before have university networks been so numerous; never before has it been so technically easy to create them and use them. The telephone, the fax machine, and now e-mail and instantaneous data transmission have revolutionised linkages between network members. It can also be said that never before has it been so necessary for academics to work together in networks. The complexity of the questions asked of researchers, the obligation – in face of financial constraints – to work together rather than alone, allied to the realisation that the sum of the parts is often greater than the whole, are all factors which motivate people to establish different types of collaboration and, in particular, to create networks.” (Tousignant, 1996, 3) The growth of associations, consortia and networks in higher education in the second half of the twentieth century and in particular in the last decade, is a reflection of the globalisation of society and the response of higher education to this process. Ulrich Teichler (1996, 89) states: “We find increasing common elements between international networks of higher education institutions on the one hand and decreasing elements of national systems.”

Traditionally, institutions of higher education establish their international linkages with a partner institution abroad via bilateral agreements, memoranda of understanding and letters of intent. These agreements have the character of arrangements for educational co-operation (student and/or faculty exchanges, joint degree programmes, curriculum development), research co-
operation, international development projects, etc. Sometimes these agreements are quite concrete, sometimes they are more an expression of intent. They are made either at the level of departments, centres or schools, or at the institutional level.

The recent rise of multilateral associations, consortia and networks in higher education reflects the multilateral character of the process.

2. Meaning

The words 'association', 'consortium' and 'network' are used most commonly to describe different types of multilateral co-operation in higher education. Other terms one may encounter are for instance 'league', 'group' and 'alliance'. There does not appear to be a relation between the use of the term and its original meaning. According to the Cambridge and Oxford Dictionaries, the meanings of the three terms 'association', 'consortium' and 'network' are as follows.

Both dictionaries give the following definition of an association: "A group of people who are united in a single organisation for a common/joint purpose".

The original meaning of consortium is 'partnership', from the Latin, consort. According to the Oxford Dictionary it means "an association, especially of several business companies". The Cambridge Dictionary describes it as "an organisation of several businesses or banks joining together for a shared purpose". From these two definitions it is clear that a consortium is associated with the business sector. The Penguin Business Dictionary describes a consortium as "a group of companies or firms none of which is competent to fulfil a contract alone. Generally a 'once only' combination bringing together a number of quite different operational skills or areas of specialised knowledge."

Networks are described by the Oxford Dictionary as "a group of people who exchange information, contacts and experience for social or professional reasons" or as "a group or system of interconnected people or things." The Cambridge Dictionary defines a network as "a large system consisting of many similar parts that are connected together to allow communication between or along the parts or between the parts and a control centre."

These descriptions do not help much in distinguishing between the three terms. Certain common features can be identified: partnership, group, system and connection. Some differentiating aspects can also be detected: common versus specific purpose; multipurpose versus single purpose; 'once only' versus permanent; individual versus institutional membership; centred versus flat structure; people-orient ed versus object-orient ed; complimentarity versus commonality.

3. A typology

Guy Neave (1992 p, 55-58) distinguishes between pro-active and reactive consortia. The fundamental purposes of the first type are to limit competition between the partners by co-ordination, and to seek greater external resources by 'cornering' a portion of the market. The
driving factor of the second type is more efficient co-ordination in order to be able to take advantage of proposals for linkages coming from outside. Neave links the first type to market oriented countries such as the UK, USA and France, which seek the import of foreign students; and the second type, for instance, with the ERASMUS programme. Suggesting that consortia are “a further stage in the intensification of international linkages between institutions of higher education”, he describes them as the fifth point of a continuum: mono-disciplinary bilateral linkages, exchange partnerships, network partnerships, multidisciplinary networks, and consortia.

Although Neave is correct to identify pro-activity and reactivity as factors of relevance for consortia, they are not an adequate basis for a typology. His five-stage typology of inter-institutional co-operation is a simple analysis of international co-operation and exchange in education, but does not clarify the notion of consortia.

Without meaning to make a judgement on the use of terms by various international academic organisations, it might be useful to distinguish between three types of international, multilateral organisations in higher education: academic associations, academic consortia and institutional networks. Van Ginckel (Ibid., 92-93) arrives at a similar typology for Europe: associations, institutional networks, inter-university co-operation projects/joint European projects, and university-enterprise training partnerships (the last two are included in academic consortia in the typology here).

a. Academic Associations

An academic association is an organisation of academics or administrators and/or their organisational units (departments, centres, schools, institutions), united for a common purpose, which is related to their professional development (information exchange, training, advocacy, etc.). This type of organisation is quite common and has a long history in higher education, even at the international level. This is particularly true for those associations that are based on individual membership, and are single purpose, academic and discipline based, and faculty driven.

Institutional, multipurpose, management-based and leadership-driven associations and the individual, administrative associations are a more recent phenomenon. Examples of institutional associations are the International Association of Universities (IAU) and the Programme on Institutional Management of Higher Education (IMHE). Examples of the individual, administrative type of organisations are the International Association of University Presidents (IAUP) and the European Association for International Education (EAIE). The latter group is tending to become more institution based. An example is the Association of European Universities (CRE), originally the association of European rectors.

b. Academic Consortia

An academic consortium is a group of academic units (departments, centres, schools, institutions) who are united for the single purpose of fulfilling a contract, based on bringing together a number of different areas of specialised knowledge. In principle their lifespan is limited by the terms of the contract. They can be either faculty or leadership driven, but with a strong faculty commitment in the case of consortia with an academic purpose. Examples of academic
consortia are the Joint Study Programmes in the ERASMUS scheme (in the area of teaching); consortia in the Framework programmes for Research and Development of the European Commission (research); and consortia tendering for Technical Assistance projects (service).

The multilateral Joint Study Programmes in the ERASMUS scheme were discipline-based, faculty-driven agreements, focused on student and staff exchange and curriculum development. Their success was mainly the result of the existence of external funding from the European Commission and their strength was more in student exchange than in the other two areas. As soon as these programmes were forced to integrate with the leadership-driven institutional agreements in the new SOCRTATES programme and the money coming from the European Commission was reduced, many of them came to an end. This was also true for research- and service-oriented consortia which were project-based and externally funded.

Academic consortia can develop into institutional networks when the success of their joint contract becomes the basis for more structural and multipurpose co-operation between the partners. An example is the Utrecht Network, a network of institutions which originated in a consortium for a Joint Study Programme of the ERASMUS programme.

International academic consortia are a rather common phenomenon in higher education, in particular in research. They appear to come and go according to the needs of the different partner institutions to make use of their partners’ complementary skills, experiences and facilities. As the example of the Joint Study Programmes demonstrates, external funding is a crucial factor for their success.

Academic consortia are and will continue to be the most common form of international organisation in higher education, and increasingly as part of academic associations or institutional networks.

c. Institutional Networks

An institutional network is a group of academic units (departments, centres, schools, institutions) who are united for, in general, multiple – academic and/or administrative – purposes, and are leadership driven and have an indefinite lifespan. While academic consortia are usually ‘single mission’, institutional networks tend to have a ‘general framework objective’, as noted by Neave (1992, 65).

Although they are less focused on objectives and goals than associations or consortia, owning to their multipurpose character, it is this type of organisation that seems to be emerging most recently. There is a trend towards leadership-driven multilateral institutional networks, mostly within the European Union but also elsewhere, and recently also examples of an international nature emerge.

The European networks resulted mainly from the success of the Joint Study Programmes. The Coimbra Group, an institutional network of the two oldest universities in each of the countries of the European Union, was the first of these networks. Later followed the Network of Universities in the Capitals of Europe (UNICA), the Santander Group, the Utrecht Network, the...
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*Santiago de Compostela Group, the European Consortium of Innovative Universities, the European Consortium of Universities of Technology, and others. They differ from the discipline-based networks in the sense that they are leadership driven (top-down) and multipurpose. Student exchanges, staff exchanges, administrator exchanges, joint tenders and joint research co-operation are the activities that these networks most commonly undertake. Although these networks are strongly driven by European Union funding, they have extended their membership to the rest of Europe as well. Others have a more interregional scope. Examples are the ALMA scheme, unifying the Universities of Aachen (Germany), Liege (Wallonia, Belgium), Diepenbeek (Flanders, Belgium) and Maastricht (The Netherlands); and the European Confederation of the Universities of the Upper Rhine (EUCOR).  

Some of these networks do not limit themselves to the academic community but are networks including Chambers of Commerce, industry or local government.

One can find institutional networks also in other regions of the world, such as the Association of East Asian Research Universities (AEARU); the Asociación de Universidades Grupo Montevideo (AUGM), a group of twelve universities in Argentina, Brazil, Paraguay and Uruguay; the Consejo Superior Universitario Centroamericano (CSUCA), a consortium of Central American universities; and the College of the Americas, an inter-American network of institutions co-operating in interdisciplinary teaching, research and continuing education.

In the US, institutional networks or consortia are mostly regionally based American consortia, even though they are oriented to international co-operation. Examples are the ‘Midwest Universities Consortium for International Activities Inc.’ (MUCIA) of ten universities in the Midwest; the ‘Consortium for International Development’ (CID) of twelve Western public universities; the ‘Illinois Consortium for International Education (ICEI); and the ‘Texas Consortium’. The first two focus on tenders for development assistance contracts; the others are examples of networks for study abroad and international curriculum development. Some of these consortia seek partners abroad, such as ICEI and the Utrecht Network in Europe.

Some networks have a cross-regional character, such as the University of the Arctic, in which universities from Northern Europe and Canada work together.

Recently, new international networks have been emerging, some based on existing regional networks – such as the combination of ICEI and the Utrecht Network – others as new initiatives. Examples of the later are Universitas 21, an initiative of the University of Melbourne; the David C. Lam Institute for East-West Studies (LEWI), an initiative of Hong Kong Baptist University; and the League of World Universities, an initiative of New York University, all three with different objectives.  

The last one, the League of World Universities, is a more informal global network of the presidents/rectors of large, comprehensive, urban universities, who meet every two years to exchange
views on developments in their institutions and their environment. Attempts to make the league a more active network to discuss and take joint action on common issues in between the biannual meetings – for instance on teaching and information technology, public health – did not bear fruit. From the League, however, a strategic alliance between four of its members: New York University, University College London, Freie Universität Berlin and the Universiteit van Amsterdam, is emerging, which is focusing on closer co-operation on strategic issues such as curriculum development, human resources, new technologies and joint research.

The David C. Lam Institute is a membership network of originally five and at present 28 universities from China, East Asia, South-East Asia, Australia, Northern America and Europe. It was founded in 1993 to reach out across oceans and cultures and to work together for the common good; to increase, through interaction between its members, mutual understanding, and by this to contribute to human well-being. In 1995, its mission was stated as follows: "to promote mutual understanding between East and West, by way of intellectual discourse among scholars in the Eastern and Western worlds through research, academic exchange, and other scholarly activities." (Teather, 2000) An evaluation of LEWI by David Teather (Ibid.) indicates ambiguity between the objective of the institute as a university-wide research centre of Hong Kong Baptist University and that of an international consortium. Looking at the composition of the membership and the activities of the institute, the institute appears to be a consortium, in which the link between the individual members and the centre institution, Hong Kong Baptist University, is stronger than between the other members. LEWI is caught somewhere between being a ‘single mission’ consortium focusing on East–West studies in a more restricted sense and a ‘general framework’ consortium.

Universitas 21, established in March 1997, is an international association of comprehensive research-intensive universities. The director of the Universitas 21 Secretariat, Chris Robinson (1998, 96), describes it as "an active, effective association, small enough to permit high levels of commitment, familiarity, collaboration and inter-operability between the member institutions, yet large enough to capture the benefits of international diversity. The underlying concept is of a small, tightly knit association of kindred institutions with immense potential to secure and improve international opportunities and positioning for its members." In addition to the activities that are common in other networks, Universitas 21 strives for benchmarking and development of new teaching and learning technologies, modalities and delivery systems.

Universitas 21—more than the other two cases— is an example of an institutional network, which crosses national and regional borders to better prepare its members for the competitive global market. Transnational/borderless education creates new incentives for global institutional networks or bilateral and multilateral alliances, such as the allaince between the universities of Amsterdam, London, Berlin and New York mentioned above.

Another example of such an alliance – in this case a bilateral one – is the US $ 135-million joint venture which the Massachusetts Institute of Technology (USA) and the University of Cambridge (UK) announced in November 1999. According to the president of MIT (Chronicle of Higher Education, November 19, 1999, A71) this joint venture will "establish a model for the globally linked research universities of the future." The Cambridge–MIT Institute will be involved in collaborative research and education to improve British productivity and competitiveness; research programmes to improve technology; stimulating spinoff companies; bringing MIT’s business-
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executive programmes to Britain; and developing shared courses in science and management. The institute is funded mainly by the British government (US $109 million). This fact and the activities planned indicate that the initiative is primarily in the interest of the UK. "The institute will help place the UK at the cutting edge of the globalisation of higher education," according to David Blunkett, Britain’s Secretary of Education in the Chronicle. But MIT also benefits from the project. "For MIT, this partnership offers an opportunity to participate in the education of the next generation of European technology leaders; to develop important relationships with European industry; and to expose its students to the culture of Europe", according to Lawrence Bacow, chancellor of MIT in the Chronicle.

4. Success and Failure Factors

Although institutional networks in higher education appear to have become rather popular, not many success stories can be told as yet. What are the factors that are relevant to the success or failure of such networks?

Van Ginkel (1996, 100) states, "Unclear choices and reluctant commitment to networking will result in the loss of identity." He notes (Ibid., 101) the following characteristics of successful strategic alliances, based on his experience with strategic alliances of the University of Utrecht with private multinationals in research co-operation: congruence of missions, the will to invest through budget allocation and extra resources, appointment of liaison officers to bridge the differences in culture between the partners, strong agreement on methodology and quality standards; agreement on intellectual property rights, and take time getting to know each other.

Roger Prichard (1996, 5) provides an overview of factors for successful networking, relevant for institutional networks:

1. "Long-term relationships have to be built." This implies that a lot of time and energy has to be invested in making the network objectives and goals known and accepted within and among the member institutions. This also implies that time is needed to establish and build good person-to-person relationships, at both the level of the leadership of the institutions and at the level of the academics involved in the projects.

2. "It is important to pick winners." Many projects are created on an ad hoc basis, by brainstorming at leadership assemblies and are based on superficial assumptions instead of well–thought-out plans. Picking winners can be stimulated by awards and by well–funded plans.

3. "Cultivate sufficient resources to enable the programme of work, and any obvious spin-off programmes to succeed." Successful projects need investment, both in time and money, of those involved. This is often ignored in the design of projects. Clear plans and awards can help to overcome this threat.

4. "Network projects need to have limited and realisable goals, appropriate to the level of development of the institutions." This aspect is frequently ignored in networks, resulting in
failure and frustration among the members. Formulation of clear goals for the short, mid and long term is essential for success.

5. "The projects must be built around people in the institutions with relevant experience and interest to make a medium to long term commitment." Given the fact that many projects are designed by the leadership of the institution and lack guaranteed commitment of the relevant persons in the institutions, they have a tendency to fail. Again, awards and plans are helpful instruments for making project commitment a success.

6. "In building networks, specific areas should be targeted, not the whole operation." Many institutional networks live by their institutional nature and not by the sum of objectives, goals, projects and targets.

7. "To get the network off the ground, it is important to have some project champions in key institutions who will keep the project moving forward." If there are no project champions, it will be difficult to convince others in the institution to commit themselves to projects of the network.

8. "Set up a network listserv to keep as many participants in frequent contact as possible." Communication is important, but only if one has something to tell.

Prichard also provides some warnings, 'don’ts', that are relevant to institutional networks:

a. "Don’t develop a network without significant involvement of the people who will be key players in the network." Given the fact that the institutional networks are leadership driven, this is a crucial factor in the success or failure of the network.

b. "Don’t take a short term perspective." Many networks look only at the possibilities and sources available in the short term and do not survive the fact that these opportunities will disappear.

c. "Don’t try to do too many things at once." Networks try to satisfy the interests of all their members and end up with a long list of things to accomplish, without having the guarantee that the organisation can handle all these suggestions.

d. "Don’t have too many players." Experience shows that networks tend to expand their membership too fast to be representative and to cover the political, regional and individual interests of their members. Too many players are a danger for any network. In addition, the selection of members is not always based on criteria related to the mission and objectives of the network.

One should add to these warnings the following:

e. Base the mission of the network on more than a geographical or historical identity. Such an identity does not provide a sufficient basis for successful partnership in a network.
f. Emphasise the complementarity of the partners, not only the commonality. Institutional networks are based on commonality – oldest universities, research universities, regional focus – and tend to neglect complementarity, which is the basis of success for a network. Co-operation only makes sense when both similarities and differences in operational skills and areas of specialised knowledge are recognised and used.

g. Recognise potential discrepancies between the partnership of the institution in a network and the partnership needs at the decentralised level. An institutional network cannot and does not need to cover the whole institution. Accept the fact that departments, centres and schools have their own networks, that these do not always overlap with the institutional network, and that for that reason there is no interest in being involved in network activities.

h. At the same time, the choice of institutional network should cover enough interest at the decentralised level to create commitment. A network that only exists in the heads of the institutional leaders will not have sufficient ground for survival.

i. The cost of the network organisation should not become the main drive for maintaining the network and place the organisation into direct competition with its members. When network organisations become too big and require overhead costs from contracts, this is a real danger.

j. Be aware of the differences in structure, funding and culture among the partners. If the network is not aware of this diversity, this will create misunderstanding, of the objectives and goals of the network as a whole and the projects planned within the network.

k. Be aware of the potential tensions between the interest of the founder and/or centre institution of a network and those of the other members. There are cases of networks in which the founding/centre institution has bilateral relations with each of the members without real links between the other members. Teather (2000) calls this the ‘hub-and-spokes model’ or ‘single node network’.¹⁰⁰

l. Do not organise the network around external funding but around institutional funding, with external funding as an additional resource (see also Van Ginkel, 1996, 94).

Institutional networks should be conscious of the following elements:

- mission of the network
- description of the purposes, objectives and goals of the network
- geographical focus
- size of the network
- composition of the membership in relation to the mission and purposes
- relation between the founder and/or centre of the network and the other members

¹⁰⁰ Two variations on this type of network Teather (2000) has labeled the ‘dumb-bell’ model and the ‘conduit’ model, which he describes for the David C. Lam Institute (LEWI) in Hong Kong: in the centre Hong Kong Baptist University (HKBU) and around two groups of spokes: universities from the West and universities in China, separately linked to HKBU (dumb-bell), or HKBU linked to a pipe through which connections can occur between LEWI member institutions in the East and the West.
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- relation between leadership commitment and commitment within each of the institutions
- financial resources, including membership fees, external and internal project funding
- organisational structure
- mechanisms for evaluation of the network and its activities.

5. The Future of institutional networks

The institutional, multipurpose and leadership-driven networks are facing many problems with their identity, their size, the commitment of their faculty and students, and their objectives and goals.

Can these regional and international institutional networks become the key to the next stage of internationalisation, in which not only the mainstream activities and programmes of the universities but the whole of the institution becomes international? Can we expect that universities will finally follow the same path that banks, industry and even nation-states have followed over the past century: move into joint ventures, merge across borders, share their human resources, create common products? According to Magrath (2000, 255) the transnational linkages of universities will move from ‘cottage industries’ to ‘multinational consortia’ as a consequence of globalisation, and in particular the digital and information technologies. It seems a logical, unavoidable step, but even a network such as Universitas 21 is a long way from such a concept of internationalisation, and still has a strong activity orientation.

According to Robinson (1998, 92) “globalisation means that major universities have to be systematically and essentially international in character and function. However, it is clear that no institution, however strong or prestigious it may be, can continue to be entirely successful operating on its own. (...) Universities seeking to respond to these challenges can contemplate several different approaches to internationalisation. They can adopt strategies involving the international expansion of a single institution through the establishment of off-shore campuses. Alternatively, an existing institutional ‘brand’ can be franchised to agencies in other countries. Or, there is an option that already has proven itself in other multinational industries: a consortium organised as a network.”

Peter Scott (1998, 129), addressing the question ‘What is likely to emerge?’, also sees a diverse pattern. “Probably not, despite the evident power of the Murdochs and Gateses, global universities designed by News Corporation or Microsoft. (...) But nor are global universities to be simply extensions of existing universities, in which international activities have simply been given greater prominence. So perhaps the most likely outcome is a highly differentiated development – of a few world universities (or, more probably, of world-class elements within them); of networks of existing universities that trade in this global market place while maintaining their separate national identities (...); of the growth of hybrid institutions that combine elements of universities with elements of other kinds of ‘knowledge’ organization (...); of the emergence of ‘virtual’ universities organized along corporate lines (...); and, inevitably, of a few global universities on a News corporation or Microsoft pattern.” There are and will be institutions of higher education which, deliberately or not, are oriented to the local environment and for which the international dimension will stay incidental, individual or at most consist of a combination of unrelated

101 For characteristics of academic networks see also José Silvio, 1996, 11-22.
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activities, projects and programmes. Others will not evolve further than having a separate internationalisation strategy, without affecting the functions of the institution. Only a few global players will emerge, old institutions but also new providers of higher education, making use of the opportunities which new technologies and the global market provide. Coalitions, networks, consortia or alliances among institutions of higher education, and between them and industry, are and will be increasingly important factors in ensuring a role in this global arena.

As Robinson and Scott note, this century will see such a differentiated development of new models of higher education. As Van Ginkel (1996, 97) states, universities that want to be global players must focus their attention on the fields in which they are excelling and therefore have “to find co-makers, other universities as well as other role players in society, in order to keep offering a broad variety of good courses and good research. It is this type of networking, the connecting of the best within reach, the linking of university services to societal change, that needs our attention.” Davies (1997, 90) also observes an increasingly likely substantial importance of inter-institutional alliances as a lever in institutional change for marketing, new interdisciplinary connections and regional and international services.

This century will see international mergers and joint ventures of institutions of higher education, first at the interregional level, later also at the global level. At the same time, more and more faculties and schools will combine their efforts in consortia and alliances, beyond such institutional mergers and joint ventures. This will be the result of the principle that partnerships at the institutional level cannot always and completely match the needs at the decentralised level.

Even though institutional networks at present seem to be rather weak, lacking commitment at the departmental and school level and not very effective in their operations, they are more likely to be the motor for future mergers than the discipline-based networks, consortia and alliances. Only the central leadership is able to make the radical decisions needed to move away from fragmented activity-oriented co-operation to real mergers and joint ventures. It is only a question of time before such decisions are made. Initiatives such as 'Universitas 21', and the joint venture between MIT and the University of Cambridge are examples of this trend. The strategic alliance developing between the Universiteit van Amsterdam, University College London, the Freie Universität Berlin, and New York University can also be seen in this perspective.

Strategic partnerships in research, teaching and transfer of knowledge, between universities and of universities with business and beyond national borders, will be the future for higher education, in order to manage the challenges that globalisation will place on it.
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