‘Only connect’: Is there still a higher education sector?

David Watson

Higher Education Policy Institute

HEPI Occasional Paper 8

Foreword by the HEPI Director

Welcome to the first HEPI yellow book of 2014. The distinction between our analytical blue books and our occasional yellow books is not widely understood, but the latter are designed to challenge as well as to inform.

This piece by David Watson does exactly that. The author pores over some of the issues that divide the higher education sector from itself – even though, as he notes, some parts of the UK have been somewhat more willing than England to discuss them.

His analysis of the relative performance of institutions within and outside the Russell Group prompted a lively response when it was first made, but the starkest lessons here are on the country's long-term failure to grapple with credit-transfer issues.

As the report makes clear, the Open University leads the field but it 'imports and exports more credit at explicitly HE level than the whole of the rest of the system put together'. Perhaps the OU is, in Martin Trow's memorable phrase, behaving like a 'safety valve' that provides others with an excuse not to act?

That would be a shame. Our position on credit transfer looks odd from the perspective of other nations. Yet it is not a divisive political issue. Has the time come to tackle the problem with renewed vigour?

Nick Hillman

'Only connect': Is there still a higher education sector?

David Watson[*]

> *'Only connect! That was the whole of her [Margaret Schlegel's] sermon. Only connect the prose and the passion, and both will be exalted, and human love will be seen at its height. Live in fragments no longer. Only connect, and the beast and the monk, robbed of the isolation that is life to either, will die.'*
>
> – E.M. Forster, *Howard's End* (1910)

1. Last time I contributed to this series I laid out eight 'category mistakes' that bedevil contemporary discourse about higher education (Watson, 2012). Several of these relate to the identification – some would say the reification – of systems or sectors.

2. I spoke about how 'tertiary' has overtaken 'higher' education, about how the higher education mission groups are really just self-selecting 'gangs', about how top-level research fails to respect national boundaries, about how governments (and institutional governors) say they want one set of things from their universities and then beat them up if

[*] David Watson is Professor of Higher Education and Principal of Green Templeton College, Oxford. This paper is based on a talk given to the HEPI House of Commons Seminar on 'HE in England – one sector, or every university for itself?' on 26 March 2014.

they do not win in league tables that measure quite different things, and so on. For a compelling update on our collective blindness to the scientific inadequacy of international league tables see Marginson (2014).

3. In lots of ways, nations are no longer good units of analysis for understanding what is really going on in higher education. At the other end of the scale, I pointed out that institutions are not a good unit of analysis either: that the goals, methods and outcomes of the subjects and professional groups to which they give living space are much more influential than the sometimes rather desperately articulated 'corporate' mission.

4. In this essay I go back over some of the same territory, with a potentially annoying different (I would say supplementary) set of conclusions.

5. Whatever our institutional, and our subject and professional, elements of distinctiveness and differentiation, there are some things that we can and should do together, and do better together. I want to make this argument principally in three zones: regulation and quality assurance; lifelong learning; and the significance of universities as recognisable membership organisations.

Quality

6. Here the big question is about the ability – or not – of UK HE to maintain its commitment to a controlled reputational range.

7. One of the most distinctive features of the longer-term development of the UK system of higher education has been its willingness to take academic responsibility for its own enlargement. This has always been regarded as having been put under pressure by expansion ('more will mean worse'). However, it is important that we don't forget the extent to which the British road to mass higher education was influenced by shared, sector-wide commitments to quality and standards.

8. If you take the historical view, the 'collaborative' gene was there from the start, for example through London external degrees and the system of 'validating universities' (notably the Victoria University of Manchester). External members of university college committees played their part in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, before the two major phases of late twentieth-century expansion. These were overseen, in turn, by 'academic advisory committees' for the post-Robbins foundations and by the Council for National Academic Awards (CNAA) for what was termed 'public sector higher education'. All this sat alongside academic contributions to other quality assurance agencies; including both the accrediting and recognition role of professional and statutory bodies, and the more direct 'inspection' role of the state (HMI,

and latterly OFSTED). But perhaps the most potent symbol is that of the external examiner, a figure of immense moral importance, significantly envied in other systems (Finch, 2011).

9. Following the Conservative legislation of 1988 and 1992, some of these functions were indeed bureaucratised, and the sector tried – late in the day – to take pre-emptive action against the encroachment of the state. But the paradox was that, as the world beat a path to the UK door to learn about how to do these things, a series of 'popular revolts' at home did their best to do away with them (Watson, 2006).

10. Partly as a result of the 'quality wars' the sector has, in effect, paved the way for the state to take over, under the guise of 'regulation'. The current government would like to legislate to transform the Higher Education Funding Council for England (HEFCE) from a funding body into a comprehensive regulator.

11. Fortunately, or unfortunately – depending on where you stand in this argument – this isn't going to happen fast. As Nick Hillman has argued, the Coalition is simply afraid of what would happen in Parliament if they were to table a Higher Education Bill (Hillman, 2014: 1-2, 7, 24).

12. So it's not simple growth that is the problem. I would argue that much more serious today are two other pressures: the government concern to ease the path for alternative providers, and the divisive behaviour of the sector itself, especially through the mission groups.

13. Successive UK governments' privileging of the private over the public sector is at the heart of Anthony King and Ivor Crewe's wonderful account of *The Blunders of our Governments*. Put crudely, King and Crewe demonstrate how the assumption that the private sector will always do it better and the public sector worse has led to massive waste of public money, (ironically) to distortion of the market and (at worse) to simple corruption (King and Crewe, 2013).

14. In the case of HE, there is another blind spot: the fear that, if regulated to traditional standards, the private sector will simply not play. This is in contrast to the view taken by other governments all around the world: that the private sector can be welcomed, and allowed to prosper, but can simultaneously be regulated to meet public purposes. To repeat: in the UK we have a fear, verging on paranoia, about regulating the private and for-profit sector to the same standards and levels of the public sector in case they take away their ball.

15. For example, we have apparently not learned the lesson of the catastrophe of Individual Learning Accounts (ILA) in 2000-2001 (NAO, 2002; see also King and Crewe, 2013: 127-140). It was this abject failure of policy memory that led to the government in November 2013 having to stop the enrolment of public voucher-bearing students on Higher National qualifications at 22 private colleges and chains (Malik and McGettigan, 2013). Looking across the Atlantic would also have alerted an administration more cognisant of the international evidence to what happens when incentives

enabling for-profit providers of HE to draw in publicly-funded students trump regulatory responsibility for what the students (and graduates) might get (Mettler, 2014).

16. There is a similar policy-blindness in the over-estimate of the amount of money to be recovered from the new student loan system. In both cases we told them exactly what would happen and where it would happen. They didn't believe us, and it has (Morgan, 2014).

17. Nor has the sector helped its own cause in this particular area. I have railed in the past about the provenance and the performance of the various HE gangs (Watson, 2009: 104-118). Particularly unhelpful is the bottom half of the Russell Group.

18. Every significant national system has what Robert Cowen called its 'apex' institutions, and they are vital to the tone, style and reputation of the systems they represent (Cowen, 1996). There are very few of them: the USA could probably claim around 25, but the UK no more than four, or possibly five. The Russell Group's claim to be made up of 'the 24 major research-intensive institutions' in the system is a real stretch.

19. 'Research intensity' is a weasel concept. You can do something very intensively by not doing anything else. What it refers to most usefully in this context is something about both the proportion and the quality of an HEI's research effort. The table below ranks the top ten institutions (with over 4,000 students) by their position on the league table of research funding as a proportion of teaching *and* research funding

from the Funding Councils. In other words, it gives an index of the likelihood that students will be working in an environment also producing highly-rated research.

Research funding as a proportion of teaching and research, 2011-2012: selected institutions – position in overall rank in brackets

	Institution	%
1	Oxford (4)	68
2	Cambridge (5)	68
3	LSE (6)	66
4	Imperial College (7)	63
5	UCL (8)	62
6	Cranfield (10)	51
7	Edinburgh (12)	51
8	SOAS (13)	50
9	St Andrews (14)	49
10	Manchester (15)	46

Source: HESA. The year 2011/12 is the last one for which this index can be compiled, as a result of the shift from teaching grant to student fees.

20. There is a natural (sub apex) gap after rank 5. Meanwhile, the big hitters are interspersed with all sorts of smaller players, giving the lie to the fact that size rules in research performance (the Institute of Cancer Research is 1st, the London Business School 2nd and the London School of Hygiene and Tropical Medicine 3rd). In this rank, the lowest

Rustler (it is Exeter) is at 51st (27%) and the lowest 94-group institution (before that gang handed in its weapons) is above it at 50th (East Anglia at 28%). The highest then-94 grouper is SOAS at the dizzy heights of 13th (50%). The Alliance joins in at 63rd (Bradford, 18%), Million+ at 77th (Guildhall School of Music and Drama, 9%) and Guild HE at 109th (Winchester, 5%).

21. So the problem with the Russell Group is that it represents neither the sector as a whole, nor in many cases the best of the sector (for another reality check see the analysis of 'ten top tens' in Watson, 2009: 114-118). A further problem is that it has somehow convinced the politicians that it does play this role. Look at how the Chancellor of the Exchequer believes it leads the way in recruitment of Chinese students (Parr, 2014). Look at how the Secretary of State for Education has invited it to 'overhaul' A-Levels (Paton, 2013).

Lifelong learning

22. Widening the frame, the Inquiry into the Future of Lifelong Learning (IFLL), which I chaired between 2007 and 2009, asked a number of hard questions of the national system of post-compulsory education and training. One was 'what is the contribution of HE to life-long learning?'

23. Go back to 1998 and David Blunkett was correct, in responding not just to Dearing on higher education but also to Kennedy on Further Education and Fryer on adult

education in his Green Paper *The Learning Age*, to suggest that the UK had the building blocks for a world-leading system of lifelong learning (DfES, 1998).

24. Nationally, we had created, against the official tide, a remarkably open and responsive HE sector. More than half of our registered students were, and remain, not on full-time first degrees. We have led Europe in terms of mature student participation, enrolment of those with registered disabilities – and despite propaganda to the contrary – we are behind only Finland in the participation of students from lower socio-economic backgrounds (Ramsden, 2003). Historically we have led the world in the professional accreditation of higher education qualifications. Forty years ago we invented a particularly powerful and effective Open University (OU). We have an amazingly innovative formal and informal adult education network. Look, for example, at the University of the Third Age (U3A) with nearly 900 centres and nearly 300,000 learners. By 2015 we shall have raised the participation age (and hence the springboard into post-compulsory education) to 18.

25. But at the same time we have had countervailing obsessions. Our discussions about funding HE always converge on the needs and support of younger, full-time participants, living and studying away from home. Thus the latest funding settlement led to the melting away from 2011/12 of part-time and mature entrants. While acceptances of applicants aged 18 and younger from the UK fell by 1.7% between 2011/12 and 2012/13, for those aged 20 and over there was a drop of 7.1%.

Since 2010/11, part-time undergraduate entrants have fallen by 105,000 (40%), while on postgraduate programmes the fall was 25,000 (27%) (HEFCE 2013). Meanwhile, we have a permanent mistrust of the preferences of the student market, embedded in policies that have led to the failure of successive supply-side STEM initiatives. Perhaps most insidiously, we love institutional hierarchies and tolerate their symbiotic relationship with class and income-related status.

26. The big picture is that if we want a system of post-compulsory education with better prospects for achieving our social, economic and cultural goals, we are going to have to take lifelong learning more seriously.

27. What is more, unlike many other intractable problems for higher education, the solution to this problem is in our hands. It will mean commitment to the controlled reputational range. Above all, it will mean taking widening participation seriously rather than just pretending that the traditional 'royal route' will suddenly open up for new types of student.

28. Practically, the big disappointment is around student mobility and credit. In chapter seven of the Report of the IFLL (*Learning Through Life*), Tom Schuller and I argued that the flexibility that a proper credit framework brings will be needed all the more in the light of current economic turbulence and the effects this is having on employment as well as education. Large numbers of adults will be seeking to improve their qualifications without having to commit themselves to a long stretch of full-time education. Our

conclusion was stark: 'This is not a technical issue: we have the systems. It is a cultural and moral issue: we fail to use these systems for reasons of conservatism, snobbery and lack of imagination' (Schuller and Watson, 2009: 155).

29. In a recent report for the Leadership Foundation for Higher Education (LFHE), I have tried to unpack the problem in more detail (Watson, 2013). The most important pressure militating against the success of Credit Accumulation and Transfer (CATS) in UK HE seems to have been institutional protectionism, reflected especially in the reluctance to grant advanced standing on admission. This is reinforced by funding approaches which devalue part-time and mixed-mode study. Then there is cultural rigidity; an individual lifelong learning journey is nearly always set in stone by the first step taken (this is the theory of the 'royal route': unless you start on it – at school, and even before – your chances of joining in later on, however successful you are, are slim). Within universities an unempirical and poorly theorised pedagogy based on 'meritocracy' (that believes, for example, that getting something right first time – rather than after some effort – means that it has been more securely learned) takes its toll, as does comparatively slow progress on assessment of prior and, especially, experiential learning (APL and APEL). This has led to the victory in many institutional settings of 'subject' over broader, including interdisciplinary and multidisciplinary, interests. Finally, these are compounded by a 'management' error (interestingly, made by both of the significant modular pioneers – the universities now known as Oxford Brookes and

London Metropolitan) that having many subject combinations on offer is inherently inefficient. What counts is the efficiency of registration on individual units, not the awards towards which they can be compiled (Ibid., 7).

30. At several stages both the sector and the government have made CATS a high policy priority. For example, a specific goal in *The Learning Age*, was to have a fully functioning credit transfer system by 2000. There have been many efforts to design, calibrate and promote such systems. In 1999 SCOTCAT (Scottish Credit Accumulation and Transfer) was launched, and has been now inherited by the Scottish Credit and Qualifications Framework (SCQF). Another was the Credit Framework for Higher Education in England published by the Quality Assurance Agency (QAA) in August 2008. Across the sector as a whole the outcomes have been feeble, although the OU remains an important outlier.

31. The relevant data is hard to get hold of. We don't collect it in the same way as, for example the USA and Canada. But when we do the juxtaposition is stark. A QAA survey of 129 HEFCE-funded institutions in 2009 showed 100 claiming to make full use of national frameworks, and only five saying they had no interest. If we look at what that implied for student mobility across the UK in 2011/12, the data is hugely disappointing. It is dominated by one institution: the OU, which imports and exports more credit at explicitly HE level than the whole of the rest of the system put together. In 2011/12 only 3,206 students entered years two or above on the basis of higher education

credits earned in other universities: 2,333 of these (65%) entered the OU. Meanwhile the OU took in 28.3% of the 27,895 students who entered on the basis of formal sub-degree qualifications, like HNDs and Foundation Degrees (Ibid., 9).

32. A hot topic for contemporary discussion of HE development is the plate-tectonic movement apart of our 'territorial' systems. Scotland, as I have said, has made a huge play out of being credit-friendly. But only one per cent of students entering the four ancient universities on the basis of study elsewhere get full credit for their achievements. In England nobody cares very much, other than the OU. Wales sees it largely as a question of institutional configuration. Northern Ireland, which floated the most radical idea (of funding by credit), then lost its nerve. (Ibid., 10-11).

33. As the LFHE report concludes, there are lessons here for players across the sector (Ibid., 22). Institutional heads need to be less precious about the linking of their status with that of the prior experience of their student body – which, admittedly, is a trend encouraged by the compilers of league tables. In other words, they need to relate to other institutions and to the wider tertiary sector as a whole to ensure that opportunities genuinely exist for students to use their achievements in other settings as the basis for admission, including with advanced standing. They need to talk up the commitment of UK higher education as a whole to quality assurance (including, for example, through external examination) and to recognition of what candidates can do rather than where they did it.

34. Senior academic leaders (provosts, pro-vice-chancellors and others with responsibility for academic affairs) need to ensure that cross-institutional academic frameworks are transparent and fairly assessed. This does not mean that everything should be minutely modular. It does mean that at each summative point (such as the end of the equivalent of a full-time academic year or qualification stage) achievement is properly documented, and that it is possible for new entrants (including those with appropriate credits from elsewhere) to join in.

35. Course leaders and tutors need to think hard about learner autonomy and its implications. They will be familiar with the characteristically 'higher' education theory of co-creation. Taking this seriously also means responding to potentially variable modes of attendance, to the recognition of alternative sources and types of achievement and, above all, to the goal of an award that is individually earned rather than just collectively taught.

36. Students need to play their parts as well. The best modern learning environments are characterised by an atmosphere of purposeful and principled negotiation. If student progress is to be more varied, it also has to be more regularly and effectively owned by the participants and beneficiaries.

Membership

37. Talking of students leads on to another hard question: what does higher education do for its participants?

38. Higher education is a noble and long-standing enterprise. And yet in a curious way it is has not been a particularly self-reflective one. Especially in times of economic or political difficulty, the scholarly community has been more ready to analyse and to campaign about what is being done to it than about what it does to itself, and especially to its most important members: its students. One result is that we can focus on issues like funding, economic returns on investment, relative institutional prestige and the like, while ignoring what tutors and researchers working directly with students frequently hear in interviews: 'it changed my life' (Walker, 2006: 32, 93, 114-14; Barnett, 2007: 61; Case, 2013: 129-30).

39. Looking at the long sweep of university history, it is possible to extract several distinct claims about what higher education does to students: in existential terms (how participants come to be); in epistemological terms (how they think and appraise information); in behavioural terms (how they learn to conduct themselves); and in positional terms (including through competition and collaboration). Some are open (and provisional); some are closed (and create compliance). The validity and the applicability of such claims vary over time, by institutional setting, by subject and mode of study, according to the expectations of funders and other

stakeholders, and critically in terms of the approach taken by the student himself or herself.

40. Most of the claims about the purposes and achievements of higher education are irreducibly individualistic: it will change your life, through conversion or confirmation of faith, by improving your character, by giving you marketable 'abilities', by making you a better member of the community, or by simply being 'capable' of operating more effectively in the contemporary world. As I have tried recently to address, these qualities scale up, but in differing ways (Watson 2014).

41. Meanwhile there is an over-arching question, linked to the claim that 'it changed my life'. Is higher education likely to make you better, to improve your capacity to make sound moral as well as technical judgements; in other words to take part in what Amartya Sen calls 'public reasoning'? Does it work?

42. If you probe beneath the supermarket-style superficiality of the Key Information Sets (KIS), what do students actually get, and what do they deserve? I think most teachers in higher education would – if pushed – agree that they are working to a core curriculum at a high level of generality. As you study at this level, you try to answer some hard questions, some hypothetical, some not. You learn how to work with other people, dead or alive, directly or indirectly (through their work), present or remote. You meet deadlines. You ask yourself why you are doing this, and what difference doing it well will make, for yourself and for others. You get a certificate (as a whole, or in stages). You take out a

membership. In this way higher education's purposes come together in terms of self-creation and the authentic life, the habit of thinking deeply, and the capacity to connect with others empathically (Ibid.,100-108; see also Walker, 2006: 128-130).

43. At the end of the day everyone makes sense of his or her own higher education, not necessarily immediately, and in some cases not for a considerable time. You do not have to buy the full proposition if you don't want to; there is a definite 'conscience clause' (away from doctrinal study) that says that no one can make you take away what you do not want to. You are, however, compelled by an authentic higher education experience to practise answering difficult questions. You are given a safe place in which to do so. Depending on your subject or discipline (or combination of these) you will gain a powerful evaluative toolkit. You will be required to communicate what you have learned. This is hard work, but for centuries participants have found it to be immensely satisfying and it has, generally, helped to make the world a better place.

Is there still a higher education sector?

44. This over-arching question has been asked at several difficult times in the past: around the time of Robbins (by Kingsley Amis and others); post Baker-Clarke (with the ending of the binary line); and now post Willetts-Clegg (with the problems of our half-baked 'voucher' system).

45. The answer is that there *is* still a sort of mutually-assured higher education enterprise, which government and others would like to be more differentiated, by purpose and especially by price. In other words, the policy emphasis is to try to break it down, often promoted as 'letting the market decide'. But many of the key players in this enterprise refuse to behave. At their best staff chase similar measures of esteem; students refuse to be narrowly typecast (for example, as simply 'vocational' or 'academic'); and managers (sensibly it would seem, given the degree of policy volatility with which they have to deal) keep their strategic options open.

46. This argument is made somewhat independently from the details of public policy. There are two reasons for this. First, if there is to be a sector of the type I have characterised, we must look for it in the right place. It won't simply be legislated into being. Secondly, I consider the current funding and sector-wide governance and regulatory machinery to be so volatile and badly connected as to be unsustainable. Something else is going to have to happen, even if it is very painful and doesn't happen quickly. That is why across the sector we need to keep our nerve and follow what Abraham Lincoln called, in his first inaugural address in 1861, 'the better angels of our nature' (recognition of credit earned elsewhere is a good candidate for angel status).

47. If there is still a sector, I have tried to suggest three important ways in which it is 'connected'. We share concerns for the quality and standards of what we offer ('follow the

award' rather than 'follow the money'). We share concerns about how we can create opportunities for learners across the life-course, including by collaborating. And we share concerns about the goals and conditions of membership of our rather peculiar institutions.

48. I called this piece 'Only Connect'. We need to reflect on the beastly and the monkish tendencies in our present situation across the sector and how together we can moderate them both.

References

Barnett, R. (2007) *A Will to Learn: being a student in an age of uncertainty.* Maidenhead: SRHE and Open University Press.

Case, J. (2013) *Researching Student Learning in Higher Education: a social realist approach.* London & New York: SRHE/Routledge.

Cowen, R. (1996) Introduction: apex institutions, statuses and quality control. In *The World Yearbook of Education 1996: the evaluation of higher education systems.* London: Kogan Page, 1-4.

Department for Education and Employment (DfEE) (1998) *The Learning Age: A Renaissance for a New Britain.* London: HMSO.

Finch, J. (2011) *Review of external examining arrangements in universities and colleges in the UK: final report and recommendations.* London: UUK (March). http://www.universitiesuk.ac.uk/highereducation/Documents/2011/ReviewOfExternalExaminingArrangements.pdf.

Higher Education Funding Council for England (HEFCE) (2013) *Higher Education in England: impact of the 2012 reforms.* Bristol: HEFCE Report 2013/03.

Hillman, N. (2014) *Unfinished Business? Higher education regulation.* Oxford: Higher Education Policy Institute (HEPI), Report 65.

King, A. and Crewe, I. (2013) *The Blunders of Our Governments.* Croydon: Oneworld.

Malik, S. and McGettigan, A. (2013) Government stops private colleges taking on more students. *The Guardian*, 28 November.

Marginson, S. (2014) University Rankings and Social Science. *European Journal of Education*, 49:1, 45-59.

Mettler, S. (2014) *Degrees of Inequality: how the politics of higher education sabotaged the American Dream.* New York: Basic Books.

Morgan, J. (2014) Hillman holds up his hands over RAB charge 'mistake.' *Times Higher Education*, 20 February.

National Audit Office (NAO) (2002) *Individual Learning Accounts.* London: Stationery Office, 22 October.

Parr, C. (2014) Osborne unveils China-Russell Group link. *Times Higher Education*, 20 February.

Paton, G. (2013) Russell Group universities 'to review new A-Level exams'. *Daily Telegraph*, 14 June.

Ramsden, B (2003) Euro Student 2000: comparisons with the United Kingdom. In Slowey, M. and Watson, D. (eds) *Higher Education and the Lifecourse.* Maidenhead: SRHE and Open University Press, 3-19.

Schuller, T. and Watson, D. (2009) *Learning Through Life: Report of the Inquiry into the Future of Lifelong Learning.* Leicester: NIACE.

Walker, M. (2006) *Higher Education Pedagogies.* Maidenhead: SRHE and Open University Press.

Watson, D. (2006) *Who killed what in the quality wars?* No 1. in series *Quality Matters*, Cheltenham: QAA.

Watson, D. (2009) *The Question of Morale: managing happiness and unhappiness in university life.* Maidenhead: Open University Press.

Watson, D. (2012) *Misunderstanding Modern Higher Education: eight 'category mistakes'* Oxford: Higher Education Policy Institute (HEPI), Occasional Report 4.

Watson, D (2013) *Credit Risk? Reviving Credit Accumulation and Transfer in UK HE.* London: Leadership Foundation for Higher Education (LFHE), Stimulus Paper (November).

Watson, D (2014) *The Question of Conscience: higher education and personal responsibility.* London: Institute of Education Press.

Trustees

Professor Sir Graeme Davies (Chairman)
Dame Sandra Burslem
Professor Sir Ivor Crewe
Professor Sir Peter Scott

Advisory Board

Professor Janet Beer
Professor Sir David Eastwood
Professor Dame Julia Goodfellow
Professor David Maguire
Ruth Thompson
Professor Dame Helen Wallace

Partners

BPP University
Elsevier
HEFCE
Higher Education Academy
JISC
Kaplan
Mills & Reeve LLP
Pearson
Times Higher Education
UPP Group Limited
Wiley

President

Bahram Bekhradnia

HEPI was established in 2002 to influence the higher education debate with evidence.

We are UK-wide, independent and non-partisan.

July 2014
ISBN 978-1-905315-18-5

Higher Education Policy Institute
99 Banbury Road
Oxford OX2 6JX
Tel: 01865 284450
www.hepi.ac.uk

Printed in the UK by Oxuniprint
Typesetting: www.preparetopublish.com