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THE PAST, PRESENT AND FUTURE OF HIGHER EDUCATION RESEARCH:
BETWEEN SCHOLARSHIP AND POLICY MAKING

The European higher education landscape has changed dramatically over the last 25 years. In the early 1980s, speaking about “European” higher education was still more or less an abstraction. On one hand, the Iron Curtain made a substantial cut between education systems to the West and East; on the other, there were “European models” of national higher education rather than a “European higher education”. A quarter of a century later, the “European Higher Education Area”, spreading from Lisbon to Vladivostok, has been declared.

This dramatic change has been the culmination of ongoing policy developments, largely related to the internationalisation, Europeanisation and globalisation of higher education. To mention just a few key steps along this route: the decisions taken on the Erasmus (1986) and Tempus (1990) Programmes, the Maastricht Treaty of 1992 giving the green light to “Community Action” in the field of education and training, the Lisbon Recognition Convention (1997), the Bologna Declaration (1999) resulting in the Bologna Process, the EU Lisbon Strategy (2000) and the Lisbon Process and so on. These steps have had an enormous impact on policy making processes at both national and institutional levels.

These 25 years of change have been accompanied by a growing number of higher education research endeavours. Distinguished research centres have started to be established (e.g. INCHER, 1978; CHEPS, 1984), while in 1988 CHER (the Consortium of Higher Education Researchers) was founded. Gradually, the new research specialisation has been recognised and promoted across Europe as an important interdisciplinary field. In addition, the academic dimension higher education research has been directly or indirectly connected to the area of higher education policy making. Since the invention of “evidence-based policy making” such a connection appears quite normal, e.g. contemporary education reforms need ample support in terms of data and system analysis which can only be provided by research centres at universities or outside them. Universities not only provide research but also research training. Due to their relative autonomy they themselves need “evidence-based institutional policy making”. However, the relationship between higher education research and policy making – European, national or institutional – has never been simple.

What is the relationship between higher education research and higher education policy making in the past and in the future? This is the leading question of the CHER 2012 post-conference symposium and subsumes a number of issues to be discussed, e.g.:

- the impact of research on policy making (and vice versa);
- particular tensions that appear between research and (inter)national policy making;
- specific tensions between research and institutional policy making;
- a future research agenda on higher education in Europe;
- etc.
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Changes in HE policy and governance: How did HE research respond?

Åse Gornitzka
University of Oslo, Department of Political Science and Arena – Centre for European Studies

In this presentation I will discuss the relationship between academic research and policy making from a political science/public policy perspective. I will start with a presentation of how the nexus between academic research and governmental policy making can be understood. This will allow me to make some general observations about the connections/disconnections and multimodal links between the two: ranging from the instrumental, substantiating, strategic, “problem-identifier”, legitimizing, to the symbolic use of research in policy making. In this I will present assumptions about how the nexus research – policy making changes, and how these changes may affect the development of research fields.

From this general point of departure I will reflect on the way in which the nexus academic research – policy making has played out in higher education policy. My main interest here goes out to the tradition in higher education research of focusing on vertical higher education policy and governance interactions. This started in the 1980s with research on the changes in the (formal) vertical policy and governance linkages between the ministries of (higher) education and the higher education institutions, to which gradually the European policy and governance level was added. In essence this change meant a shift from a bi-level to a multi-level governance and policy focus in higher education research. A more recent challenge to the research – policy nexus can be argued to stem from the emerging horizontalisation of higher education policy and governance. What does this do to the link between policy making and higher education research and what kind of challenges and opportunities for new research arise?

* * *

* * *
The Competitive Turn in Higher Education Policy

Jürgen Enders
Twente University, Centre for Higher Education Policy Studies (CHEPS)

In my presentation I will discuss one of the main features of shifts in governance of higher education systems: the international rise of competition as an increasingly popular mechanism of social coordination in teaching and research. First, I will point at the variety of manifestations that competition takes including governance by comparison, market and quasi-market competition, national and global rankings or state-sponsored contests. Second, alternative while not mutually exclusive explanations for the competitive turn in higher education policy are examined: massification and the need for functional differentiation in higher education, neo-liberal ideology and the rhetoric of innovation and employability, statehood in transition and the search for output legitimacy. Finally, I will argue that the rise of competition in the field is serving to strengthen the hand of government as well as to provide blame avoidance for public policy.

*   *   *


Academically Ambitious and Relevant Research: The Legacy of CHER

Presentation at the CHER 2012 Post-Conference Symposium

by
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International Centre for Higher Education Research Kassel
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34109 Kassel, Germany
Tel. ++49-561-804 2415
Fax ++49-561-804 7415
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Themes of Higher Education Research: The Early Priority of CHER Conference (I)
At the foundation conference of CHER (1988 in Kassel), trend reports were presented on higher education research in various thematic areas:
- Quantitative, structural and institutional development of HE
- HE and work
- Innovation in HE
- Teaching and learning
- Evaluation
- University-industry relationship
(see European Journal of Education 24/1989/3)

Themes of Higher Education Research: The Early Priority of CHER Conference (II)
Most subsequent CHER conferences addressed specific thematic areas:
- Decision-making in HE (1989 in Enschede)
- Changing Europe: Challenges for HE Research (1990 in Brussels)
- HE Finance (1991 in Dijon)
- HE and the World of Work (1992 in London)
- Graduate Education (1993 in Stockholm)
- Governance and management in HEIs (1996 in Turku)

Meta-Themes within CHER (I)
Reasons stated for the foundation of CHER in 1988:
- Strengthening the small and institutionally feeble field of HE research (a “club” serving external visibility and international networking)
- Enhancing the theoretical and methodological basis of HE research through regular communication solely among researchers
- Stimulating comparative analyses on HE

Meta-Themes within CHER (II)
During the first decade of CHER
- HE research and HE policy (e.g. “Evaluation and HE Research” – 1997 in Alicante)
- Comparative HE research (e.g. “Cross-national Studies in HE Research” – 1994 in Enschede and 1995 in Rome)
- The institutional basis of HE research (e.g. preparatory conference of the 1998 conference in Kassel)
- The situation of HE research in general (e.g. “HE Research – Achievements, Conditions and New Challenges” – 1998 in Kassel)

Higher Education Research in Europe up to the 1970s (I)
The first steps towards visibility:
- A marginal scattered field until the 1960s (cf. the Goldschmidt et al. trend report for UNESCO)
- The first push: the political discourse on education and economic growth, HE expansion and access (equality)
- The second push: The students protests and the subsequent research and service activities in teaching and learning
Higher Education Research in Europe up to the 1970s (II)

The first steps towards visibility (continued)

- Scattered/varied steps towards institutionalisation of HE research (closely linked to policy and services, often linked to broader disciplinary and thematic areas)
- Visible HE research community only in the UK (see SRHE)
- Specialized HE research promotion only in Sweden

Higher Education Research in Europe up to the 1970s (III)

Subsequent steps in the pioneer stage of HE research

- The most visible systematic knowledge on higher education: International “think tank” products of experts (including HE researchers) initiated by supra-national organisations (OECD as well as Council of Europe, UNESCO et al.)
- Also: Similarly, national commissions and national reports
- A pioneer generation of higher education researchers (Burton Clark invited 1982 – as speakers for a worldwide account of HE research – from Europe: Tony Becher, Ladislav Cerych, Maurice Kogan, Harold Perkin and Gareth Williams

Higher Education Research in Europe up to the 1970s (IV)

Subsequent steps in the pioneer stage of HE research (continued)

- A multitude of research projects on HE: policy-driven and often policy funded; undertaken by varied persons from varied disciplines and often only occasionally involved in HE research
- Uneven development across European countries – in terms of scholars involved, institutional basis and amount of projects

The Institutional Basis of Higher Education Research (I)

The U.S. scene (Elaine El Khawas 2000)

Three “homes” of HE research

- “Research”: Academic research, mostly within schools of education, mostly linked to master and doctor programmes on higher education
- Practice: “Institutional research”, units within the university administration, “reporting” to management, projects mostly focussing on the own institution
- Policy: Institutes or think-tank units linked to governmental agencies or various policy actors

Limited communication between the three groups of researchers; different modes of publications; different links between analysis and practice; only occasional perception of activities in the other sectors; rare collaboration.

The Institutional Basis of Higher Education Research (II)

Heterogeneity of HE researchers (Teichler 1996): Differences according

- Duration of involvement in HE research: between short phases and all academic career
- Disciplinary identity (various disciplines) vs. identity as HE researcher
- Theoretical vs. practical, academic vs. policy orientation
- Individual researcher vs. collaborative researcher

The Institutional Basis of Higher Education Research (III)

Typology of HE researchers (Teichler 1996)

- The discipline- department based occasional researchers on HE
- The continuous discipline-based HE scholars
- The scholars based on HE research institutes
- The applied HE researchers (possibly at applied HE research units)
- The occasionally researching practitioners
The Strong Relevance Orientation of HE Research (I)

Characteristics explaining the relevance orientation

- Theme-based research (HE research, youth research, organisation research etc.) is characterized by (a) being driven by relevance, (b) requiring in-depth thematic knowledge, (c) cutting across disciplines
- Problems in HE are the driving force (a) for many actors/agencies to sponsor HE researchers, (b) for many scholars to choose HE as theme of research

The Strong Relevance Orientation of HE Research (II)

Characteristics explaining the relevance orientation (continued)

- Supra-national organisations as drivers of systematic knowledge acquisition: policy-oriented but more strongly aware than national actors that systematic knowledge is useful for practical problem-solving
- HE research: A field where the borderlines between the researchers and the reflective practitioners are exceptionally fuzzy (high expertise of the practitioner/policy maker)

The Strong Relevance Orientation of HE Research (III)

Possible options of HE researchers

- Search for ivory tower niches
- Yielding to relevance pressures: policy/practice-driven rationales
- Searching proactively for ways to ensure a theoretical and methodologically ambitious basis amidst predominantly policy/practice-initiated research

Proactive Search for a Balance of Theory and Relevance in HE

- Institutionalized teamwork in HE research linked to academia (e.g. institutes such as INCHER-Kassel, CHEPS, CIPES)
- Associations of HE research with theoretical and methodological focus (e.g. CHER)
- Active negotiation with possible sponsors of HE research rather than waiting for call for tenders
- Analyzing the “actors’ theories”
- Exploring the conceptual “logic” of practical problems (e.g. “recognition”, the power of “credentials” and “indicators”)
- Critique of research consciously or unconsciously yielding to policy preoccupations

Disciplines – the Basis of Theory for HE Research?

- Many HE researchers escape to disciplines as the easiest platform of academic reputation and quality
- Concepts from the various disciplines can be a fruitful basis for HE research
- Most issues in HE, however, need a theoretical basis from various disciplines. They have to overcome the biased perspectives of individual disciplines (e.g. links between study and work)
- Many “theories” based in disciplines are generated from observation of other phenomena and do not reflect sufficiently the conditions of HE (e.g. theories of organisation prevailing in business studies, public administration)
- HE research needs the courage to believe in and to promote the potentials of HE research as a basis of ambitious academic work

What Does HE Research Mean for Practical Problems – the Example of the Bologna Process Review 2012 (I)

The review

- Prior to the 2012 ministerial conference, an initiative was taken by policy makers to summarize the state of systematic knowledge as regards the Bologna Process.
- “The event aimed at bringing the researchers’ voice into higher education international level policy making” (preface, p. v).
What Does HE Research Mean for Practical Problems – the Example of the Bologna Process Review 2012 (II)

The review (continued)
- I attended the conference when the papers were presented in order to prepare the books. I argued at that conference that the authors should not sign any policy-oriented memorandum regarding the Bologna Process for two reasons: (a) The authors are not representative for the HE researchers in Europe; (b) A policy-oriented memorandum could not be sufficiently based on the results of the reports.
- Instead, P. Scott wrote a Chapter 1: “Going Beyond Bologna: Issues and Themes”

Some observations
- The index at the end of the 2nd volume shows that the following authors are by far most frequently named (according to the number of pages named) (1) Neave, (2) van Vught, (3) Amaral, (4) Teichler, (5) Clark
- Composition of authors: 10 HER linked to CHER, 10 other HER, 13 scholars with other priorities partly or occasionally addressing HE, 9 with mixed HER and policy careers, 20 policy/practice actors, 5 students/doctoral candidates mostly involved in HE policy
- The substance of the reports: theory, methods, analysis, policy conclusions: remains to be analysed

Conclusion (I)
- The dominance of problem-based research funding and problem-based institutionalisation of HE research and the fuzzy borderlines between the practitioner and the researcher are endemic for higher education. We will not get rid of them
- HE researchers themselves are responsible to care for the theoretical and methodological sophistication of as many as possible problem-initiated projects

Conclusion (II)
- In addition, HE researchers have to create and stabilize means to ensure the theoretical and methodological work (e.g. CHER, publication outlets)
- HE researchers should try to convince practitioners and policy makers that projects are more relevant, if they are strongly theoretically and methodologically based

Did HE Research Improve in Ensuring a Quality-Relevance Balance Over the Years? (I)

Doubts
- Increasing relevance pressures and pressures of HE ideologies
- More impressive growth of consultants, policy/practice-based “researchers” than theoretically and methodologically ambitious researchers
- More quasi-research (evaluation, indicators)
- Difficult position of HE research vis-à-vis major policy issues (e.g. Bologna Process, vertical stratification of HE, managerialism, popularity of international mobility and cooperation)

Did HE Research Improve in Ensuring a Quality-Relevance Balance Over the Years? (II)

Success Stories
- Tell your own success stories
- Do you know success stories from others?

What can CHER do? Do we need a closer link between reports of results and meta-reflection of results? Do we need more meta-discourse in CHER?
Research Policy and Power in European Higher Education: Challenges and Opportunities

Susan L. Robertson,
University of Bristol, Centre for Globalisation, Education and Societies

In my presentation I will be examining the opportunities and challenges involved in undertaking research on the production of higher education policy in and on Europe. These include: what counts as the ‘field - HE, ‘Europe’, the institutional ensembles, and so on; the theoretical and epistemological resources available for studying HE policy formation and circulation at multiple sites and scales; the methodological challenges of ‘seeing’ policymaking, movements and remakings within and across sites and scales; and the ethical challenges of methodologies aimed at revealing power at work, and therefore the work of the powerful, in institutional settings.

* * *
What a difficult task ...

First, there hasn’t been said much on this issue so far.
Second, this European region (as all regions) possesses specific characteristics and it is often difficult to apply “imported” theories, concepts and policies directly.
Further on, the region itself is very diverse; it is not easy to provide common denominators.
Finally, the distinction research – policy is very vague everywhere in the region (policy = politics; politics = bad).
Therefore – a really intriguing and challenging issue!
Let’s address it!

“Dramatic changes over the last 25 years”

“The European higher education (HE) landscape has changed dramatically over the last 25 years.”
→ What particular changes in South-east Europe?
- Dramatic political changes of the 1990s; various scenarios of a “transition” – from peaceful to extremely aggressive.
- Dramatic changes also in HE: massification, privatisation, politicisation, etc.
- HE research in the region has been underdeveloped; however, not without tradition, e.g.:
  : CEPES (Bucharest, 1972-2011);

Higher education research in progress

Today, HE research is not (yet) a recognized research area – but it is obviously in progress.
Three paths towards establishing HE research (groups):
- a political perspective (e.g. “alternative”, “opposition” or “position” groups of academics and/or students) which gradually turns into HE research;
- an academic leadership perspective (e.g. ex-Rector’s, ex-Dean’s etc.) which turns into reflecting HE (regardless of the individual’s disciplinary background);
- a disciplinary perspective (e.g. sociology, comparative education, etc.) which focuses – in rare cases though – on HE as a privileged subject of research.

HE: “researchers”, “professionals” and “politicians”

There are several reasons which make profiling HE research and its recognition difficult, e.g.:
- Terminological aspect: in (regional) colloquial language(s), “expertise” on HE is rather easily attributed to a “professional”, not to a “researcher”.
- Policy aspect: thus, “expertise” on HE is “monopolised” by “professionals” (i.e., academic leaders); “research” on HE often (yet not always) sounds “too academic” to be involved in policy making.
- Political aspect: a dialogue between authorities and HE institutions tends to be reduced to negotiations and/or “orders from above”; it is rarely directed to “expertise” (professionals’ and/or researchers’ expertise).

HE research or HE policy studies?

What “relevance”, “weight” and “impact” for “society”? (Academic) research and (governmental) policy are often observed as “opposite territories”.
“(Public) policy analysis” vs. (public) policy development. Research “about” public policies – or research “for” public policies?
There is “an increasing combination of researchers’ and actors’ roles: we note higher education researchers concurrently active as consultants, institutional researchers, administrators involved in research part-time, consultants producing analyses similar in outlook to academic papers, etc.” (Teichler, 2003:178)
Research vs. policy: “kings” vs. “philosophers”

Until philosophers are kings, or the kings and princes of this world have the spirit and power of philosophy, and political greatness and wisdom meet in one, and those commoner natures who pursue either to the exclusion of the other are compelled to stand aside, cities will never have rest from their evils, – nor the human race, as I believe, – and then only will this our State have a possibility of life and behold the light of day.

(Plato, Republic, Book V, 18)

That kings should philosophize, or philosophers become kings, is not to be expected. But neither is it to be desired, for the possession of power is inevitably fatal to the free exercise of reason. But it is absolutely indispensable, for their enlightenment as to the full significance of their vocations, that both kings and sovereign nations […] should not allow the class of philosophers to disappear, nor forbid the expression of their opinions, but should allow them to speak openly.

(Kant, Perpetual Peace, 1795)

The “governmental” and “principled” approach: the hybrid character of the modern university

…“the university is regarded as a “republic of scholars” oriented to a principle that transcends the state and civil society and their merely practical and one-sided concerns. In short, this kind of critical approach is in one way or another “privatising” what the administrative intellectual regards as the public sphere and reserving the “real” public sphere for intellectuals and scholars realizing a rational or spiritual community […] Yet, this critical and idealistic position is ambiguous for what seems to be lost out of sight is the hybrid character of the modern university housing both governmental and spiritual technologies”.

M. Simons (2007)

SEE Universities between policy and politics

From a recent CEPS field research (8 countries):

“Universities have had a fairly large impact on shaping higher education policy” but “I do not know if this is still true. Now, the university is under the main pressure by politics.” (CEPS 2012; 037, 11/04/12)

“The University is absolutely a political body. This is not the junction where we are one profession, one body we have; it is by the political line. Ideally, a professor at a university is a non-political entity. But here, a complete replacement of the thesis has occurred: politics is in all tissues.” (CEPS 2012; 027, 01/03/12).

“Always we were starting anew. […] Since the 1990s, we have been elaborating new strategic documents every four years again.” (CEPS 2012; 009, 22/03/12)

From an “absolute” to a “relativised” research

Scientific research has been “relativised”: it is required to be “relevant”, “useful”. Two possible approaches:

⇒ research should provide the “truth” as it is (non-ideological, non-biased);
⇒ research should provide only “relevant”, useful knowledge (i.e., interested, biased knowledge).

Relativization of research and expertise as understood through “the transition”: democracies require pluralism of political parties – well, “pluralism of researchers and experts” should also be required (Researchers = biased).

In this optics, academia is not a “partner” any more; it is converted into “an instrument”.

Pluralism of parties – “pluralism of experts”?

Comments from a distinguished Slovenian education researcher:

There is a wish to create an impression that all professional [i.e., expert] views and ideas are equal, equally well-grounded, and therefore does not really matter which of them school politics takes into account. […] We can either believe to the Minister or not. Therefore, his word only is not enough. Evidence is necessary. Further, it would be pointless to believe in something when we can make sure. […] The arguments are decisive. […]

Unfortunately, even most compelling professional arguments are considered in politics only if they are in accordance with the objectives set by the political parties in power.

(Kodelja, 2005 and 2007)

HER in SEE: An attempt of a SWOT analysis

| S | interest for HER on increase |
| W | fragmentation of HER |
| O | the region: “terra incognita” |
| T | HER “not relevant”; “biased” |
|   | systemic / institutional needs |
|   | HER not (yet) recognized as a field |
|   | brain drain (discipl.; geog.) |

12/14
Conclusion: an agenda for future

Small nuclei of HE research in the region need:
- to strengthen their critical mass – and identification;
- to participate in and contribute to the international discussion on key issues in HE as well as to the key issues of the national and European HE policy;
- to address the most vulnerable regional HE issues and to further improve their intra-regional co-operation;
- to achieve recognition both from authorities as well as academia;
- to increase substantially their co-operation with HE research centres in Europe and worldwide.

Higher Education wishes to discuss its future
Call for a withdrawal of the amendment bill because there is not enough time for discussion

DELO Thursday, 13 September 2012

četrtek, 13.09.2012
Visoko šolstvo si želi razpravo o svoji prihodnosti
Poziv k umiku novele zakona, saj ni dovolj časa za razpravo.
Jasna Kontler Salamon, Znanost
sre, 12.09.2012, 21:00
Higher education research and higher education policy – future look

Chair and moderator: John Brennan, Open University Business School

Panellists:
Janja Komljenović, University of Ljubljana
Martina Vukasović, University of Oslo & Centre for Education Policy, Beograd
Paul Ashwin, Lancaster University
Pedro Teixeira, University of Porto
Terhi Nokkala, University of Jyväskylä

The panel will address the questions of the relationship between HE research and HE policy making and its future developments from the perspective of young researchers from different regions in Europe. The panelists are invited to offer personal views and share personal experiences from researching and working in the area of HE Studies.

Questions for panel discussion

1. We have just come from CHER2012; one of the two main academic conferences in the area of HE Studies in Europe. What are your impressions about the development of the field of HE Studies? What are the key topics? What is the main discourse? What research is considered important, relevant?

2. Let’s have a quick round of some of the classic topics in HE research. Please give your views on what is happening with this topic: is it still hot, is it fading out, is it changing into something else, which aspects of that topic are most highlighted?
   a. HE internationalisation
   b. HE system diversity vs. convergence
   c. Governance
   d. Financing
   e. HE reforms/policy making
   f. Students
   g. Academics
   h. Teaching and learning

3. HE Studies is a rather young research area. Sometimes it is being blamed for not being rigorous enough when compared to the more established research areas within political science, sociology, etc. Is it too dominated by policy and practice? What is your opinion on that?

4. Is there already a critical mass of researchers in HE studies that identify themselves as such? Or do we have political scientist, organizational theorists, sociologist, etc. which also do HE research?

5. What are your impressions about the funding available for HE research in Europe? On national level, as compared to other parts of the world?
6. What is the relationship between science and policy in HE research? How is the “politics of knowledge” reflected in the context of our research area? There are a variety of institutions and organisations that claim to be delivering knowledge. And then there are politically mediated interests within the politics of knowledge. Finally, there is a perceived shift in value systems characterized especially by emphasis on “robust knowledge” with external criteria of validity, and on “useful knowledge” (as decided by the user). Is such a new contract in the politics of knowledge present equally everywhere or are there differences between national contexts? What is the role and the capacity of HE research institutes in this context? How does it work in different national contexts?

* * * * * *
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Jana</td>
<td>Bacevic</td>
<td>Singidunum University</td>
<td>Serbia</td>
</tr>
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<td>4 Sait</td>
<td>Baškaya</td>
<td>Institute of Production and Industrial Information Management</td>
<td>Germany</td>
</tr>
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<td>5 Nina</td>
<td>Brankovic</td>
<td>Faculty of Political Science</td>
<td>Croatia</td>
</tr>
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<td>Brennan</td>
<td>The Open University, London</td>
<td>UK</td>
</tr>
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<td>7 Karin</td>
<td>Doolan</td>
<td>University of Zadar</td>
<td>Croatia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Mari</td>
<td>Elken</td>
<td>University of Oslo</td>
<td>Norway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Jürgen</td>
<td>Enders</td>
<td>CHEPS</td>
<td>Slovenia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Alenka</td>
<td>Flander</td>
<td>Centre of the Republic of Slovenia for Mobility and European Educational and</td>
<td>Slovenia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Training Programmes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Katalin</td>
<td>Forrei</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Aljaž</td>
<td>Gaber</td>
<td>Student organisation of University of Ljubljana</td>
<td>Slovenia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 Lars</td>
<td>Geschwind</td>
<td>KTH (Royal Institute of Technology)</td>
<td>Sweden</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 Ase</td>
<td>Gornitzka</td>
<td>University of Oslo</td>
<td>Norway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 Aleksandra</td>
<td>Hanc</td>
<td>Slovenian quality assurance agency for higher education</td>
<td>Slovenia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 Gyda</td>
<td>Johannsdóttir</td>
<td>University of Iceland</td>
<td>Iceland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 Katja</td>
<td>Kamšek</td>
<td></td>
<td>Slovenia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 Karmen</td>
<td>Klavžar</td>
<td>The National Education Institute of the Republic of Slovenia</td>
<td>Slovenia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 Manja</td>
<td>Klemencic</td>
<td>Centre for Educational Policy Studies</td>
<td>Slovenia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 Janja</td>
<td>Komljenovič</td>
<td>University of Ljubljana</td>
<td>Slovenia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 Tamas</td>
<td>Kozma</td>
<td>University of Debrecen</td>
<td>Hungary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23 Svein</td>
<td>Kyvik</td>
<td>NIFU Nordic Institute for Studies in Innovation, Research and Education</td>
<td>Norway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Institution</td>
<td>Country</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Laetus</td>
<td>Central University of Technology</td>
<td>South Africa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Jasminka</td>
<td>University of Rijeka, Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences</td>
<td>Croatia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Igor</td>
<td>Lorger</td>
<td>Slovenia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Giulio</td>
<td>Marin</td>
<td>Italy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Michelle</td>
<td>McGinn</td>
<td>Canada</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Marja</td>
<td>Centre of the Republic of Slovenia for Mobility and European Educational and Training Programmes</td>
<td>Slovenia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Klemen</td>
<td>University of Ljubljana</td>
<td>Slovenia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Simona</td>
<td>Miklič Ogrin</td>
<td>Slovenia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>Christopher</td>
<td>Morphew</td>
<td>United States</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>Rajani</td>
<td>Naidoo</td>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>Terhi</td>
<td>Nokkala</td>
<td>Finland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>Petr</td>
<td>Pabian</td>
<td>Czech Republic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>Irena</td>
<td>Petrušič</td>
<td>Croatia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>Gemma</td>
<td>Puig</td>
<td>Spain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>Igor</td>
<td>Repac</td>
<td>Slovenia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>Susan</td>
<td>Robertson</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>Laura</td>
<td>Rožman</td>
<td>Slovenia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>Rui</td>
<td>Santiago</td>
<td>Portugal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>Jung Cheol</td>
<td>Shin</td>
<td>Korea, Republic Of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>Kristjan</td>
<td>Sigurdson</td>
<td>Canada</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>Vesna</td>
<td>Skrbinjek</td>
<td>Slovenia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>Urška</td>
<td>Štremfel</td>
<td>Slovenia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>Ivan</td>
<td>Svetlik</td>
<td>Slovenia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>Masahiro</td>
<td>Tanaka</td>
<td>Japan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>Ulrich</td>
<td>Teichler</td>
<td>Germany</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>Pedro</td>
<td>Teixeira</td>
<td>Portugal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>Tatjana</td>
<td>Trebec</td>
<td>Slovenia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>Nada</td>
<td>Trunk Širca</td>
<td>Slovenia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>Marko</td>
<td>Turk</td>
<td>Croatia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>Darinka</td>
<td>Vrečko</td>
<td>Slovenia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>Tina</td>
<td>Vršnik Perše</td>
<td>Slovenia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>Martina</td>
<td>Vukasovic</td>
<td>Norway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>Mitchell</td>
<td>Young</td>
<td>Czech Republic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>Pavel</td>
<td>Zgaga</td>
<td>Slovenia</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>