

**CHET  
POLICY / CHANGE DIALOGUES**

**REPORT**

**The University and the City  
Towards an Engaged University for the Nelson  
Mandela Metropole**

**Joint Engagement Research Project**

**A collaborative project involving the University of Port Elizabeth,  
Port Elizabeth Technikon and Vista University (Port Elizabeth)**

**Funded by the Ford Foundation**

**2003**

## Contents

1. Introduction	2
2. Background to the Project	2
3. The Concept of an Engaged University	4
4. Multiple Projects and One Goal	5
5. The Joint Engagement Research Project	6
6. Activities of the Joint Engagement Research Project Team	6
7. The Conference	7
8. The Way Forward	15
9. Approval and Blessing	16
Comments	16
Participants List	17

### Appendix 1:

**Building the Engaged University in the American City by D. Perry**  
[Estimated download time: about 2 min]

[http://www.chet.org.za/papers/perry\\_paper.pdf](http://www.chet.org.za/papers/perry_paper.pdf)

## 1. Introduction

This is a report on the work of the Joint Engagement Research Project (JERP), funded by the Ford Foundation. The project was initiated in anticipation of the merger of the University of Port Elizabeth, the PE Technikon and the Port Elizabeth campus of Vista into a single institution, a merger which offers the opportunity to develop an ambitious new higher education model. For the Nelson Mandela Metropole, this process could place higher education at the proverbial cutting edge as an active participant in the development of the region and the Metropole.

## 2. Background to the Project

The Provincial Growth and Development Strategy (1996) sees the Eastern Cape, in which Port Elizabeth is the biggest metropolitan area, as characterised by high unemployment, social inequalities, high levels of preventable diseases, a low skill base, dependence on subsidies and social grants, stand alone and low value-added industries, export of unprocessed raw materials, low levels of inward investment, poor land access and an unacceptably high crime rate. Against this, the goals of the PGDS are provincial employment growth, social equality, accessible and efficient primary health care, an appropriately skilled labour force, self sufficiency, integrated industrial development, export-led value-adding products, access to international credit and markets, an 'optimised' tourism approach, secure land tenure and safety and security (Pillay and Cloete 2002).

In a memorandum to the President, the Minister of Education describes the higher education system in the province, and in Port Elizabeth in particular, in the following terms:

The levels of poverty and under-development are in part due to a low level of skills distribution, with a low proportion of the population having matriculation and post matriculation qualifications and relatively high levels of functional illiteracy. The socio-economic profile of the Province is unlikely to change dramatically in the short to medium terms unless there is considerable improvement in education provision and output at all levels, as well as investments in other key areas of social and economic development.

In this context, one of the central challenges for higher education is to contribute to developing the human resources of particular importance to the Province, such as the need for teachers, health and social service professionals and personnel for the public sector. In addition, there is an urgent demand for skills and competencies to support the automotive industry, the Coega (deep harbour) development, and the tourism and hospitality industry, amongst others.

Presently, the higher education sub-system is unable to meet these needs. An analysis of enrolment trends and performance of the institutions point to the current shortfalls and, importantly, highlights the uneven nature of the constituent elements of the system. (Memo to the President, Department of Education, p28-29)

In light of the above, the Minister proposes that: "a comprehensive institution be formed in the Port Elizabeth metropolitan area through the merger of Port Elizabeth

Technikon, the University of Port Elizabeth and the Port Elizabeth campus of Vista University" (Memo, p29).

The proposal by the Minster to merge the three institutions in Port Elizabeth focuses mainly on structural issues, namely forming a single comprehensive institution. This project (JERP), however, develops a vision of closer co-operation amongst all higher education institutions and between higher education institutions and the city based on a new model for development that posits a closer link between higher education institutions and the metro, with the metro as the engine of development for the region.

The regional development model is informed by an emerging international consensus about the key elements of development, which, in the new 'knowledge economy', is driven by new processes of globalisation and localisation in economic development, in which the local environment is as relevant as the national macro economic situation in determining the ability of enterprises to compete in the global economy. Within this environment and as a result of these dynamics, regionally engaged universities can become key local and national assets and powerhouses for economic development (Pillay and Cloete, 2002).

The new economy is knowledge-based. If the region cannot perform into this new system, then it will fall into low value-added production and will not develop, regardless of the level of trade. The knowledge economy is based on the combination of technological infrastructure, connectivity, and human resources. Without human resources, nothing works. Human resources require not just technical skills in a small group of people, but a broad level of education in the population at large.

At another level there is a need for strong higher education institutions, which develop their own academic dynamic. There must be bridges to business and communities that can complement research, and increased funding for research and for faculty in applied research programmes. In addition, key research developments happen in international networks, but to enter these international co-operative networks, a certain level of excellence has to be achieved. Once this connection is made, then the system becomes self-expanding. Given the scarcity of resources, the problem is how to concentrate resources in some institutions and in some areas, because an equal spread leads to minimal gain.

To achieve the above, the integration and co-ordination of higher education is crucial, and this would include post-school further education, vocational technical and post-graduate training. There is no single way in which this needs to be organised; forms can range from large integrated comprehensive institutions to multiple well co-ordinated institutions with different functions. This kind of organisation is increasingly happening at a sub-regional level, and particularly at city or metropolitan levels. Large cities, or metros are increasingly the drivers of socio-economic development. Successful rural development is then linked to, or connected to the development 'hubs' (Castells).

At a 2001 UNESCO sponsored conference in Barcelona on the 'unicity' (university/city), it was concluded that the traditional role of community service of universities is being replaced by a recognition that within the knowledge society innovation and regional development will add more value to the development of society. As the new economy depends on innovators and entrepreneurs, cities

provide the necessary climate for new development and economic growth (Jooste, 2001).

While institutions are located *in* regions, they are being asked by a new set of regional actors and agencies to make an active contribution to the development of regions and to turn them into 'learning regions'. As a result, within this environment, regionally engaged universities can become key locational assets and powerhouses for economic development. The conference clearly pointed to a new paradigm for higher education – the traditional community service mission of higher education institutions is being replaced by regional development through innovation, with 'unicities' as one of the key drivers of the process (Jooste, 2001).

Thus, the issue of the relationship between the university and its immediate environment is under scrutiny. It was therefore decided that this project should focus on the notion of the 'engaged university'.

### **3. The Concept of an Engaged University**

After much deliberation the JERP team (JERPT) decided that its task would be to explore the notion of an engaged university.

The term 'engagement' is used in this report to describe a particular type of relationship between a higher education institution and its environment. Engagement refers to a systemic relationship between higher education (HE) and its environment that is characterised by mutually beneficial interaction in the sense that it enriches learning, teaching, and research and simultaneously addresses societal problems, issues and challenges. The emphasis is on mutuality. This means that it is a relationship unlike other forms of interaction with the external environment that reflect one-sided benefit, and / or determination, of the nature of the relationship.

The debate about engagement as a model for higher education – and for the university in particular – takes place against the background of a reconsideration of the nature and role of HE. In the context of globalisation, there are growing calls for HE to engage with the corporate world in order to become more responsive to the needs of the so-called knowledge society. Thus, the motivation for engagement is related to innovation and strategies to increase corporate competitiveness. While much of the national policy debate in South Africa reflects the same pre-occupation with the global competitiveness of the corporate world, the notion of engagement also features in the South African higher education debate in relation to ways to enhance the responsiveness of higher education institutions to the needs of the broader community and the pursuit of development objectives. In both instances, higher education is seen as a means to achieve societal objectives – a form of 'other-directedness' that is at odds with the traditional aloof and disconnected 'ivory tower'.

The debate about engagement in the Nelson Mandela Metro also occurs, as mentioned above, against the background of the merger of its three higher education institutions - the University of Port Elizabeth, the Port Elizabeth Technikon and Vista University (PE). The situation is both conducive to, and restricting of, the exploration of innovative models. The merger means radical change, and the weakening – if not disintegration – of institutional cultures, and in that sense opens the way for re-thinking

the relationship between higher education, the Metro and beyond. There is enough evidence to believe that the time is now ripe to craft such a mutually beneficial relationship. However, the merger process inevitably has a dynamic that channels energies away from designing a new vision and future towards securing interests during the process of transition and managing the technical aspects of the merger.

As agreed by the JERPT, this study approaches the notion of engagement from a University of Port Elizabeth (UPE) perspective. The idea of becoming an engaged university has featured in thinking about the future of UPE for some years. Dr. Rolf Stumpf placed this firmly on the UPE agenda in his inaugural speech as new Vice-Chancellor and CEO of UPE on the 20<sup>th</sup> of June 2002, when he stated that he wanted the university to become an engaged university, i.e. a university that interacts with its environment and society. While the concept is now in wide use at UPE it remains vaguely defined as Dr. Stumpf has chosen to encourage further debate on its meaning and implications rather than foreclose discussion.

#### **4. Multiple Projects and One Goal**

This project was used to reflect and build on work done on the notion of engagement as a defining feature of higher education over the past few years.

- The concept of engagement was introduced into the UPE context in 1997 when UPE was in the process of adopting a new strategic vision. The work of Gibbons *et al* (1994) was informative in this respect. However Gibbons' use of the word 'engagement' with reference to so-called Mode 2 knowledge production was problematic in the local context and over the next few years a considerable amount of work was done through the Institute for Social and Systemic Change at UPE to adopt a modified approach, and to test the idea of engaged scholarship in case studies.
- Furthermore, the idea of community service as integral to teaching, learning and research (rather than being a separate 'add-on') emerged in the debates about the future of community service at UPE around 1996 (Pretorius 1998).
- In 1999, a National Science Foundation research grant was awarded to conduct an initial exploration of 'socially engaged science'. Aside from in-depth exploration of extant literature, intensive conceptualisation and the development of a set of case studies, the project also resulted in the design of a Youth Work Programme informed by the notion of 'socially engaged science' (Pretorius and Booyens, 2000 and Booyens, 2002).
- In 2000, the Ford Foundation funded a project called 'Curriculum Transformation in Social Sciences' at UPE. A book reflecting the work done entitled *A Tale of Three Countries* (Cloete and Naude, 2003) contains a chapter entitled 'Social Engagement and the Creation of Knowledge' (Pretorius) and several chapters that showcase curricular innovations in the social and human sciences at UPE.
- During a year of working at the University of Washington, in the Office of Education Partnerships and Learning Technologies, more case studies were

conducted, the US approaches to outreach and service learning were explored, and views were exchanged with leading participants in the debate about higher education and society in the USA.

While there is growing support for such an idea of engagement much work still needs to be done to refine the concept, put it into operation, and work out its implications. Based on some of the work already done, it is evident that the implications of embracing the notion of an engaged institution may be profound. It will result in a redefinition of the very core mission of the university and it will also have the effect of redefining and restructuring the relationship between the university and its surrounding environment.

## **5. The Joint Engagement Research Project**

The project consists of two phases. Phase One of the project is designed to achieve the following aims:

- Conceptual clarification of the notion of engagement;
- The hosting of a conference to achieve such clarification;
- Preparation for Phase Two of the project; and,
- Making a contribution to the international debate about models of higher education.

The following representatives from UPE, PE Technikon, Vista and the Centre for Higher Education Transformation (CHET) constituted the team:

- PE Technikon: Prof Niekie Dorfling, Dr Pieter van Breda, Prof Nick Allen (Secundus)
- Vista, Port Elizabeth: Prof Gert Jooste, Dr Thapelo Mamiala
- UPE: Prof Piet Naude, Prof Deon Pretorius (Project Coordinator)
- Centre for Higher Education Transformation: Dr Nico Cloete
- Students: Phumzile Ndlebe, Nomahlubi Shumpa, Lungiswa Gaxela

## **6. Activities of the Joint Engagement Research Project Team**

**6.1.** Besides regular electronic interaction the project team met on a number of occasions to contribute to the management and co-ordination of the project in the following areas:

- Defining the status and location of the project;
- Redefining the project brief;
- Deliberating on and assisting with the planning of the conference.

**6.2.** The project was launched and overlapped with a number of related projects. The results of the following related activities are therefore intertwined with the results of this project:

- At the end of 2002 and beginning of 2003 a number of conversations about the relationship between higher education and the Nelson Mandela Metropole were held with a range of decision-makers. (See attached document.)

- Early in 2003, the UPE Management decided that it needed to 'audit' the state of engaged work at UPE and commissioned the ISSC to conduct a study to this effect. The results of this exercise are currently being reviewed.
- Two De Vlerick Business School MBAs, Liesbet Vanderpoel and Stefan Vloeberghs conducted a study to assess the state of engaged work at UPE. This information fed into the UPE audit and this project.
- The notion of engagement was conceptualised in a document prepared by Prof Pretorius and assistants, with contributions from the team members, on the basis of work conducted for this project and some of the activities described above. It was presented at the conference referred to above and reported on below.

## 7. The Conference

An important aspect of work of the project team was to arrange the conference: *Higher Education and the City: Implications of Engagement for a Comprehensive University in the Nelson Mandela Metro*. The conference was held on 16 & 17 September 2003 at the VISTA University Conference Centre.

### 7.1. Target Audience

The conference was targeted at senior academics and managers of the three HE institutions in the Metro. Local government, civil society and business representatives of the Metro also attended the conference. In addition, a select number of national and international experts in higher education contributed to the proceedings.

### 7.2. Aims of the Conference

- To **explore** different approaches to engagement between higher education and the city;
- To **contribute** to laying the foundation for engagement in the Metro;
- To **stimulate** a broader debate about higher education models.

### 7.3. Project Focus

The JERPT agreed that the conference would focus on the following:

- Contributing to the ongoing refinement of the concept engagement;
- Taking note of some examples of engaged work at Vista, PE Technikon and UPE;
- Exploring some implications of engagement; and,
- Plotting a way forward for HE engagement in the Metro.

## 7.4. Programme and Speakers

### ***Tuesday 16 September***

---

Opening and Welcome: Prof Miemie Struwig, Acting Campus Director, Vista Port Elizabeth.

Background to the conference: Dr Nico Cloete, Director of the Centre for Higher Education Transformation (CHET) and Jon File, Centre for Higher Education Policy Studies (CHEPS), University of Twente.

#### **Signing Ceremony of the Merger Memorandum of Agreement**

The relationship between higher education and its environment as seen from local government, business and civil society:

Mr Nceba Faku, Executive Major of the Nelson Mandela Metropolitan Municipality.

Mr Alfred da Costa, Chief Executive Officer, Port Elizabeth Regional Chamber of Commerce and Industry.

Ms Sal Muthayan, Development Consultant.

An International Perspective: David Perry, Director of the Great Cities Institute and Professor of Urban Planning and Policy at the University of Illinois at Chicago.

Examples of local engagement:

George De Lange, Co-operative Education, PE Tech.

Danie Hatting, Technology Station, PE Tech.

Karen Hollelly, Child Witness Protection Project, Vista.

Phumeza Kota-Nyati, Psychology Centre, Vista.

Helen Hemsley, Management Development, UPE.

Graham Kerley, Terrestrial Ecology Unit, UPE.

Reflection on the day's proceedings: Nico Cloete, Jon File and David Perry.

**Cocktails and book launch: *A Tale of Three Countries – Social Science Curriculum Transformation in South Africa* (eds Cloete N & Naude P). Introduced by Dr Rolf Stumpf.**

### ***Wednesday 17 September***

---

Examples of engagement (National / African):

National Study on HE/Industry Partnerships: Dr Glenda Kruss, Chief Research Specialist, Human Science Research Council.

Visions of HE in Africa – based on the Ford Foundation "New Visions for Africa HE" Project: Trish Gibbon, Higher Education Consultant.

Frameworks for engagement:

Work done on Conceptualising Engagement in the Joint Engagement Research Project: Prof Deon Pretorius, Director of the Institute for Social and Systemic Change, UPE.

Critical Reflections on the Notion of Engagement: Dr Lis Lange, Director, Advice and Monitoring, Council on Higher Education.

Plenary discussion on the implications of engagement in a comprehensive institution:

The Curriculum;  
Human Resources and Staff Development;  
Structures for City /Institutional interaction.

The road ahead

## **7.5. Summarised Proceedings**

### **7.5.1. Acceptance of the Notion of Engagement**

The notion of engagement was not seriously challenged by any participant:

- The idea seemed to locate itself comfortably inside present debates about transformation in the HE sector. In fact, engagement was mooted as a practice that had the potential to inject some life into the rather somnolent current state of transformation debates;
- It seems to fit/blend in with the current HE restructuring exercise, i.e. the merger/incorporation of HE institutions, such as the three in the Nelson Mandela Metro. It can be integrated into the process of institutions pulling up their roots and seriously defining and redefining themselves in terms of their core business, as they prepare themselves internally for the mergers;
- The notion seems to be integrated easily into discussions around issues like 'local' and 'global' in the debate about HE in the 21<sup>st</sup> century.

Engagement as an idea informing practice seemed to find ready acceptance. One speaker, however, Dr Lis Lange from the CHE, sounded a clear note of caution: one has to question the benefits associated with engagement, for various stakeholders may impose conflicting demands on the engaged institution.

The historic signing of the Memorandum of Agreement by representatives of the three institutions' councils on the first day provided a fitting context for the discussion of a notion that could have a great influence on the mission and configuration of the new, comprehensive institution in Port Elizabeth.

### **7.5.2. Definition of Engagement**

Participants posed the question: what do we mean by engagement? When Dr Nico Cloete (CHET) introduced the notion at the beginning of the conference, he stressed that the key element of engagement is the linking between the HE institution and its environment.

Engagement was analysed in order to reveal its constituent parts. Prof David Perry (Director: The Great Cities Institute at the University of Illinois at Chicago) unpacked the notion and defined some critical factors, such as the following:

When you say engagement, you use the language of partnership, and this usage is underpinned by the following three implications of major importance: there is parity of relationship, key issues are in balance and there is reciprocity.

Speakers and commentators pointed to a duality in the definition of engagement: on the one hand, engagement is a way of responding to the needs of society and in this way it is intended to add value to society; on the other, it is also a way of adding value to the academic enterprise. In this respect, a valuable contribution came from Prof Perry who pointed out that this is the crucial difference between engagement and service: engagement feeds back into changes in research and curriculum in the institution.

In her paper "Visions of HE in Africa" Ms Trish Gibbon explicated a number of assumptions that underlie perspectives on the African university of the future. One of these was that there must be a form of university that works for regional development, in recognition of the symbiotic relationship between adequately functioning HE units and socio-economic development. Another assumption was that there is a need for a new social contract between the state and society, and that HE institutions should be active participants in developing and enacting that contract. This led to some discussion later, when the opinion was expressed that curriculum development has to address the expectations of society, in general. This is engagement in its most general sense. When external stakeholders are accommodated, and made part of the process to the extent that they feel that they own it, then it can be called a partnership.

In the end, the conference considered the following preliminary definition of engagement: "a systemic relationship between HE and its environment characterised by mutually beneficial interaction which enriches learning, teaching and/or research while addressing societal problems, issues and challenges" (Pretorius). This definition is based on the following features:

- A mutually beneficial relationship between the university and its environment;
- A multi-perspective theory of knowledge;
- A comprehensive institution;
- A multi-mode approach to learning;
- Curricula that are both universal and contextual;
- Quality that is characterised by many facets;
- An academic structure that is socially engaged.

### **7.5.3. Opportunities (Speakers from the Metro)**

Two speakers from the Nelson Mandela Metro spoke about engagement in the context of the merger. Mr N. Faku (Mayor) and Mr A. da Costa (Chamber of Commerce), emphasised the merger as a unique and singularly challenging opportunity for the academic community to get rid of old baggage, to define itself

anew, and to develop a new vision and mission that could encompass much more than was the case with the traditional academic enterprise. After the merger, the Metro speakers argued, HE in the region could play a catalytic role in the positioning of the Metro globally. Engagement in HE could become the way to mobilise a wealth of resources in order to optimise the available capacity. The opinion was expressed that the region could, through the mergers, become successful as a global player, following the example of the automotive industry.

#### **7.5.4. Implications of Engagement**

While a conference structures debate, it also gives participants ample opportunity to raise key points that are more or less loosely connected to the central matter. The following issues were recorded as possible implications of engagement:

- Marketisation versus social responsibility: the institution faces a dilemma, namely to balance its roles as a broker of change (a progressive role) and as a custodian of values (a democratic function). Engagement requires promoting change but also preserving academic integrity at the same time;
- Engagement necessitates definitive action, e.g. the creation of a defining initiative to shape engagement and give direction to a new thrust (as in the Chicago example);
- Engagement brings with it uncertainties and doubts because the extent of engagement cannot be determined in advance. This doubt is expressed in questions. Is engagement going to be useful? Is engagement going to be permanent? Will freedom be curtailed or enhanced by engagement?
- Engagement has to be prioritised in terms of teaching/learning, research and service because no individual academic can be equally strong in all three areas;
- Engagement must be accommodated in a long-term strategic vision – there is a need to look forward;
- Engagement may unsettle existing employees but may in time contribute to the development of a different kind of academic;
- Engagement is in essence a view towards the outside of the institution but will force institutions to think along a continuum inside/outside because it will necessitate much thinking about internal policies and practices such as recruitment and reward systems, capacity building and the need for flexible staff structures. To paraphrase Perry, there can be no outreach without inreach;
- Engagement can impact on institutional integrity if a partner (e.g. the state or business) succeeds in hijacking the relationship;
- Engagement aims to bring about new partnerships that may require innovative ways of looking at a traditional resource, like knowledge. There needs to be a recognition of the fact that there are non-traditional sites of knowledge and there are new ways of processing knowledge;

- Many forms of engagement are likely to happen on a fairly informal basis. Making it too formal may inhibit the development;
- Engagement cannot be left to the individual – it has to be driven institutionally;
- Even in an engaged institution, academics need to be academics. They don't have time to be something else;
- Engagement has to be shared by everybody;
- Engagement can only succeed if it starts with the mission and is formally and structurally supported throughout, e.g. in the provision of databases. Structure and organisation are needed to co-ordinate efforts;
- Engagement has to be carefully organised and co-ordinated, otherwise it will be rejected by industry.

### **7.5.5. Applications of Engagement**

The first and probably most important step is the definition of a mission that puts engagement at the centre of the HE institution. It must be the fundamental, defining element of a mission and it must spell out clear answers to key questions like: Engagement with whom (metro, region, country, world)? Engagement to what extent (branding, funding)? Engagement by whom (staff, students, catalyst units, other resources)? When you apply engagement in an institution, for any of the core activities, you need three key things:

- leadership – internal and external;
- resources – funding;
- rewards – promotion and tenure (Perry).

The application of engagement necessitates some organisational decisions that may even entail organisational changes:

- Engagement has to be accommodated in a structured way, i.e. in policy (e.g. policy on recruitment, where engagement will impact on selection criteria, policy on reward mechanisms, and policy on interaction, e.g. with a metro council, where engagement may influence curricula);
- Engagement has to be accommodated in a structural way, e.g. in a centre that will co-ordinate efforts or in units that differ from the present traditional ones, like departments, schools and faculties;
- Engagement funding has to be located at spots where it matters (in the Chicago example, with the units, not with top management where there may be changes).

Prof Hennie Snyman (PE Technikon) expressed the opinion that nothing works unless you have a policy in place.

Dr. Kruss (HSRC) presented a paper on the symbiotic relationship between policy and contribution in the context of a partnership like that envisaged by engagement. There needs to be a balance between the different forms of partnership that meet the innovative needs of industry and society on the one hand and the intellectual needs of the institution on the other. These are, to some extent, competing needs. This process of creating balance is regulated by three key questions:

- What are the institutional strengths (e.g. research) that are of interest to industry and society in general?
- How can the institution develop strategic policy (e.g. research policy) to engage?
- How can the institution consolidate internal structures and develop external interface structures?

### **A Provisional Comparison of Limited Manifestations of Present Engagement (Jon File)**

On the basis of six short presentations given by representatives from the three institutions, Jon File (CHEPS) gave delegates some idea of the extent to which units in the institutions have already engaged with interested partners.

	<b>Nature</b>	<b>Partners</b>	<b>Links to core</b>	<b>Effect on core</b>
<b>Co-operative Education PE Tech</b>	Programmes	Numerous	Direct	Direct
<b>Technology Station PE Tech</b>	Service	Multiple	Significant	Significant
<b>Psychology Centre Vista</b>	Service	Community	Direct B&M	Enhanced
<b>Child Witness Protection Project Vista</b>	Research +	Many, government	Significant	Significant
<b>Management Development UPE</b>	Service	Multiple	Spun-off	Limited
<b>Terrestrial Ecology Unit UPE</b>	Research +	SANP	Direct	Direct

### **A Typology of Engagement (Deon Pretorius)**

In order to arrive at a provisional definition of engagement, Prof Deon Pretorius (UPE) argued along the lines of four ideal types of HE institutions: the traditional ivory tower with total internal determination, an overly transformed cousin of this type, namely one which is totally owned and controlled by external forces like the state or the market, a partially transformed cousin that still connects itself to the ivory tower but is trying hard to reach outward, and finally the engaged institution, whose core mission reflects direct and mutually beneficial interaction between institutional sites of knowledge and the external environment. These are compared in the next table, according to seven key criteria.

	<b>CRITERION 1 Relationship: institution/society</b>	<b>CRITERION 2 Approach to knowledge</b>	<b>CRITERION 3 Institutional structure</b>	<b>CRITERION 4 Approaches to learning</b>	<b>CRITERION 5 Curriculum content and process</b>	<b>CRITERION 6 Quality</b>	<b>CRITERION 7 Academic process</b>
<b>TYPE 1: IVORY TOWER</b>	1.Internal determination of mission 2.Academic freedom opposed to local needs	1. Hierarchical: academic knowledge at apex 2. Defined from inside discipline	1.Comprehensive 2.Academic focus	1.Traditional methods 2.Lecture hall 3.Professor rules!	1.Universal content passed down through generations 2. Curriculum emerges from academic discourse	1.Scholarly excellence 2.Service add-on 3.Papers in journals 4.Peers	1.Focus on teaching of research 2.Disciplinary orientation of teaching and research
<b>TYPE 2: EXTERNALLY DETERMINED</b>	1.Monopolist definition of theory 2.External definition of mission 3.External determination of focus	1.Inverted hierarchy 2.Questions value of disciplinary theory 3.Practice associated with monopolist	1.Niche-focused, determined by external demand 2.Vocational	1.Transmission without theory/reflection 2.Classroom and application 3.Experienced practitioner	1.Contextual content, determined by monopolist 2.Innovations from practice fed into curriculum	1.Graduates that fit 2.Practitioners & users like professional bodies	1.Practice / demand determines curriculum and research agenda
<b>TYPE 3: LIMITED ENGAGEMENT</b>	1.Potential of exchange not actualised 2. Internal determination 3.Lack of territorial focus	1.Within trade paradigm 2.Engages in various contexts but without optimal benefit	1.Confused 2.No coherent rationale about scope and focus	1.Limited exposure to other sites of knowledge 2.Lecture plus other contexts 3.Prof rules but competition is emerging	1.Half-hearted focus on universal; introduction of 'other' 2.No consistent curriculum development process	1.Encourages engagement but fails to incorporate it into mission 2.According to traditional criteria/peers	1.Confusion, lack of coherent theory that could link aspects of academic process
<b>TYPE 4: ENGAGED INSTITUTION</b>	1. Cyclic relation 2.Engagement of practice with mission 3.Adds value to region	1.Recognises value of multiple forms of knowledge 2.Multiple sites 3.Making the implicit explicit	1.Comprehensive in scope and voc/acad 2.Spectrum of core disciplines to respond to external environment	1.Multiple modes 2.Multiple sites 3.Many teachers; prof competes and demonstrates value of acad knowledge	1.Spectrum of core disciplines 2.Thrusts that respond to context 3.Curriculum emerges from multi-faceted engagement	1.Simultaneous value for institution and society 2.Multiple criteria	1.Theory, practice, responsiveness, teaching, reflection linked through thematically focused inter, multi, transdisciplinary projects

The engaged type is advanced as the preferred option because of a number of superior features:

- The cyclical and dialogical interaction between institution and society that marks decision making;
- The reciprocal relationship between mission and practice;
- The addition of value to local and regional communities;
- Recognition of the value of multiple forms of knowledge (academic, popular, practical, indigenous etc.);
- The creation of multiple sites inside and outside an academic context;
- Its comprehensive scope (encompassing academic and vocational approaches);
- A spectrum of core disciplines act as base for further thematic projects, programmes, thrusts, institutes, units and centres that all respond to the needs of the external environment;
- Its curricular multiplicity and use of multiple modes of teaching and learning (classroom based, experiential, co-operative, team, project etc.);
- There are many teachers and the professor has to compete in order to demonstrate the value of academic knowledge;
- The curriculum is engaged in the sense that the spectrum of core disciplines and multi-, inter- and transdisciplinary thrusts respond to the needs of external society;
- There is a developmental loop in that the curriculum is constantly emerging from ongoing and multifaceted engagement;
- There is simultaneous generation of value in society and the academic environment, according to multiple criteria;
- From the side of the institution, all forms of theory, practice, responsiveness, teaching and reflection are linked through thematically focused projects.

## **8. The Way Forward**

This conference ended with the formulation of the following key aspects of engagement that need to be integrated into the merger process:

- Engagement and the resulting special relationship with the Metro need to become a component of a new vision and mission;
- There needs to be a catalogue of all current engaged work taking place in the institutions;

- Attention needs to be given to the implications of engagement for institutional functions;
- Attention needs to be given to possible structure and policies for promoting and supporting engagement.

## **9. Approval and Blessing**

At the close of the conference Prof Hennie Snyman expressed his satisfaction with the work conducted by the Project Team and pledged support for the next phase of the project as suggested in broad outline by Jon File.

**Report by:**  
**Professor Gert Jooste**  
**Vista University (Port Elizabeth)**  
**January 2004**

**FOR COMMENTS OR SUGGESTIONS PLEASE CONTACT**  
**[chet@chet.org.za](mailto:chet@chet.org.za)**

## PARTICIPANT LIST

1. Dr Lis Lange	CHE
2. Jon File	CHEPS
3. Dr Nico Cloete	CHET
4. Mr Khwezi Tiya	Coega Development Corporation
5. Mr Andre Forbes	Delta Foundation
6. Mr R Matlock	Delta Foundation
7. Ms Elsabe de Vries	Department of Labour
8. Ms Sal Muthayan	Development Consultant
9. Ms Trish Gibbon	Higher Education Consultant
10. Dr Janet Cherry	HSRC
11. Dr Glenda Kruss	HSRC
12. Ms Melanie Preddy	Independent Development Consultant
13. Mr V Dayile	Khanya Youth Dev. Project
14. Mr N Faku	Major/Nelson Mandela Metropolitan Municipality
15. Mr Gixavu	Nelson Mandela Metropolitan Municipality
16. Mr T Nondumo	Nondumo Properties
17. Mr Michael Bendle	PCRD
18. Mr Alfred da Costa	PE Regional Chamber of Commerce and Industry
19. Mr Leo Doria	Port Elizabeth Technikon
20. Mr P Gilbert	Port Elizabeth Technikon
21. Prof Niekie Dorfling	Port Elizabeth Technikon
22. L Nduvane	Port Elizabeth Technikon
23. Prof Brian Wells	Port Elizabeth Technikon
24. Mr George de Lange	Port Elizabeth Technikon
25. Dr R Gerber	Port Elizabeth Technikon
26. Prof I Moutlana	Port Elizabeth Technikon
27. Mr Louwrens Bezuidenhout	Port Elizabeth Technikon
28. Mr Charles Qoto	Port Elizabeth Technikon
29. Mr Pieter Swart	Port Elizabeth Technikon
30. Prof Hennie Snyman	Port Elizabeth Technikon
31. Prof Cobus Zeelie	Port Elizabeth Technikon
32. Dr Pieter van Breda	Port Elizabeth Technikon
33. Mr T Soga	Port Elizabeth Technikon
34. Prof E du Preez	Port Elizabeth Technikon
35. Dr D Hattingh	Port Elizabeth Technikon
36. Prof Kobus van Wyk	Port Elizabeth Technikon
37. O Mtati	Port Elizabeth Technikon
38. B Erickson	Port Elizabeth Technikon
39. Ms V Mayana	Planned Parenthood Association
40. Mr H van Wyk	SADTU
41. Mr T Mtsulwana	SADTU
42. David Perry	University of Illinois
43. Dr G Zide	University of Port Elizabeth
44. Prof Bruce Robertson	University of Port Elizabeth
45. Ms Susan Smit	University of Port Elizabeth
46. Mr Paul Geswindt	University of Port Elizabeth
47. Prof R Blunt	University of Port Elizabeth
48. Prof C Ball	University of Port Elizabeth
49. Prof Christo van Loggerenberg	University of Port Elizabeth

50. Ms Samantha Venter	University of Port Elizabeth
51. Ms Jenny Bishop	University of Port Elizabeth
52. Ms Goeril Havro	University of Port Elizabeth
53. Prof Henry Thipa	University of Port Elizabeth
54. Prof Graham Kerley	University of Port Elizabeth
55. Ms Helen Hemsley	University of Port Elizabeth
56. Dr Rolf Stumpf	University of Port Elizabeth
57. Prof R Grebe	University of Port Elizabeth
58. Ms R Baatjies	University of Port Elizabeth
59. Prof P Naude	University of Port Elizabeth
60. Mr T Jennings	University of Port Elizabeth
61. Dr Nico Jooste	University of Port Elizabeth
62. Prof M Oosthuizen	University of Port Elizabeth
63. Prof M Finnemore	University of Port Elizabeth
64. Prof Naidoo	University of Port Elizabeth
65. Prof Deon Pretorius	University of Port Elizabeth
66. Prof E Straeuli	Vista
67. Prof D Raubenheimer	Vista
68. Prof Gert Jooste	Vista
69. Ms Fagmieda Hendricks	Vista
70. Prof MM Botha	Vista
71. Prof Miemie Struwig	Vista
72. Dr Reuben Masango	Vista
73. Mr D Mtukela	Vista
74. Dr E Mazibuko	Vista
75. Prof N Bohler-Muller	Vista
76. F Francis	Vista
77. Dr T Mamiala	Vista
78. Dr L Kwatsha	Vista
79. K Hollely	Vista
80. Mr T Balfour	Vista