A Transformation Barometer for South African Higher Education

Draft Discussion Document

André Keet and Derrick Swartz

With the TMF/TSG

July 2015

This document is work in progress. Comments and inputs are most welcome and full references will be included once it is finalized.

I. Introduction – The 'System'

1. Higher education has shifted, in substantive respects, from a fragmented and structurally racialized system of 36 public and more than 300 private institutions in 1994 to a relatively more integrated, 'system-like' formation of 26 public universities (traditional, comprehensive and universities of technology) and 95 private higher education institutions in 2015 (see Blom, 2015). Nine hundred and ninety thousand (990 000) students are enrolled in the public higher education sector, and 120 000 in private institutions in the same sector, according to the 2013 statistics (DHET, 2013).

2. The entire post school education and training (PSET) sector is made up of more than 4000 institutions: public and private Higher Education Institutions (HEIs), public and private Technical and Vocational Education and Training (TVET) Colleges, public and private Adult Education and Training (AET) Centres, and workplace-based education and training facilitated by Sector Education and Training Authorities (SETAs). More than two million students and learners were enrolled in PSET institutions by 2013. The FET/TVET sector comprised almost 680 public FET/TVET and private FET Colleges in 2013, 50 of which were public and 627 private. The AET sector comprised over 3 200 public and private AET Centres in 2013 (DHET, 2013).

3. The Blom study (2015) asserts that 'post-secondary education in developing countries takes the form of an expanding and widening pyramid, with a widening college system at the base and a somewhat smaller university sector, each growing as more and more progression routes are made available. In the South African education system, the

widening college base has disappeared, leaving the university system to cater for all post-secondary education needs', according to Lolwana (2010:14, quoted in the Blom study). Although the problem may be over-stated above, it is indeed true that the university component of the South African PSET system had grown disproportionate to the 'college' component – producing the much talked about 'inverse pyramid'.

4. It has only recently been fully recognized by policy-makers, as expressed in the Green Paper on Post-School Education and Training of 2013, that the long-term transformational requirements of the South African post-school education and training system requires fundamental reconstitution and integrated articulation and development. This wider system is still in the process of being planned, funded and built from the existing institutions within the sector, as well as new entities, comprising both public and private educational providers. In this context, it will become important for us to think 'university transformation' not in terms of the internal dynamics and requirements of the university system, but crucially also in relation to its role, functions and purposes within this wider post-school education and training system and, more widely, within society and the economy. In a sense, universities have to achieve a double-transformation: internally, to better reflect the goals set by policy and South Africa's constitutional goals, and externally, in their contribution to the wider PSET and society.

II. Systemic Transformation Challenges

5. The Minister of Higher Education and Training, Blade Nzimande, in his May 2015 budget speech in parliament, promised an uncompromising push for higher education transformation in the wake of various student-initiated movements such as the Rhodes Must Fall campaign at the University of Cape Town (UCT); the Open Stellenbosch movement at Stellenbosch University (SUN); the transformation battles at North West University (NWU); and similar ones at various institutions of higher education across the country. However, such criticisms are by no means restricted to these institutions as the transformation challenge, read in its widest, multi-dimensional meaning, affects all our institutions albeit in differential terms. The Minister captures the combination of difficulties as follows: 'Despite the significance of symbols such as names and statues, we must not conflate these with more fundamental matters of transformation. There remains an urgent need to radically change the demographics of our professoriate; transform the curriculum and research agendas; cultivate greater awareness of Africa; eliminate racism, sexism and all other forms of unjust discrimination; improve academic success rates; and expand student support'[1]. Our view is that no single South African higher education institution today can claim to have overcome these challenges which are inscribed in differential forms and states of transformation across the institutional landscape.

6. Recent demands for 'transformation' come from a wide range of quarters and are articulated in varied forms, but do not appear to be fundamentally different in substance

---

[1] xx

and style from similar calls made at various periods over the past 20 years. These demands usually include 'Africanization[2]' of universities; 'decolonization' of knowledge and curricula reform; equality of access and success; better facilities and better support systems; demographic representation on all levels of the academy, and across university structures; democratic and inclusive institutional cultures; and universities being more responsive to the vast developmental needs and challenges of their environments.

7. In a meeting with the Transformation Oversight Committee on 26 May 2015, the Minister also foregrounded the transformation challenges at Historically Disadvantaged Universities (HDIs) in relation to functionality, efficiency, quality and good governance, in addition to the challenges experienced at other 'types' of universities. Between 1994 and 2012 the Minister appointed 14 assessors to deal with public higher education institutions in crisis; this includes governance breakdown, maladministration and near collapse of institutions (see Lange and Luescher-Mamashela, forthcoming). These are described as follows: 'Factional councils that have failed to exercise their fiduciary responsibility; a lack of leadership and absence of efficient administrative systems; academic matters often involving weak, marginalized or dysfunctional senates; maladministration, corruption and financial crises' (*ibid*).

8. Problems in leadership and governance are equally not peculiar to HDIs, and have periodically affected quite a vast range of our institutions in recent years and still continue to affect some today. The fact that universities face such problems from time to time is not *the* key problem, but rather how they deal with it. After all, corporate and public institutions also face these challenges in their life histories. If, however, such problems become endemic, ingrained and self-perpetuating and undermine the normal functioning and integrity of an institution, they require more fundamental interventions. Similarly, institutional 'divides' along departmental, school, 'schools of thought' and other lines are perhaps inescapable characteristics of human organizations, and manifest realities at all our institutions. After all, knowledge is always produced and reproduced within a given set of social relations. However, when such 'divisions' crystallize across race, class, gender, sexual orientation, and other discriminatory lines, it gives rise to inequitable arrangements and 'othering'. Moreover, when these arrangements obtain the status of 'political power blocs' conserving arcane and reactionary interests in blatant opposition to progressive transformation goals, then it constitutes a problem.

9. Some writers have strongly pointed to the role that alumni, 'ethnic', academic, intellectual and political 'cabals' play as 'shadow governments' on some campuses, by promoting 'race' and 'ethnic' (and one might add, gendered) networks and career advancement (see Law, Phillips and Turney, 2004). Such networks are often based on various regimes of patronage and the accumulation of power, influence and resources that do not have the principle of equal opportunity as its inherent basis. Nevertheless, it is a given that all universities have sub-cultures and networks to promote or facilitate a range of

---

[2] Need proper framing

administrative, functional or intellectual purposes. However, it seems that networks within higher education tend to morph into exclusionary 'clubs' that are organised around six 'economies' that constitute, in part, a university's institutional culture - the material, administrative, socio-cultural, affective, intellectual, and political economies - as discussed later.

10. The expression of these economies as transformation challenges seldom features in discourses and institutional narratives on transformation as they are generally held as 'normal' or 'naturallized' parts of 'the idea of the university'. Their power is often reinforced by 'managerialist' cultures within higher education (see Lange and Luescher-Mamashela, forthcoming) that take many aspects of their basic design and functioning as 'given'. Furthermore, often running parallel to the above, is the prevalence of strongly 'technocratic doctrines' expressed, for example, in audit and quality assurance regimes that end up reinforcing the deeply unequal legacies inherited from our collective past. It also, for example, tends to bleach blatantly racist and exclusionary practices into financial, administrative and sustainability matrixes. That is, 'clean' audits, financial sustainability, effective regulation and administrative composure act as 'pardons' and 'exemptions' for manifestly discriminatory practices; facilitating the 'reign' of a-historical and socially-decontextualized conceptions of 'quality' and 'excellence'.

11. It thus came as no surprise that many of the systemic challenges in the higher education sector inherited from the colonial-apartheid past, despite several and significant shifts (e.g. enrolment patterns, student financial aid), have not fundamentally shifted. The 'system' still reproduces student and staff development outcomes reflective of the enduring legacies of our past. Despite its stated intentions, the higher education system still largely functions as a-massively-powerful reproductive machinery. The Vital Statistics (2014) of the CHE, which captures audited data from 2007 to 2012, confirms that despite some significant progress in enrolment rates, our higher education system still reproduces much of the racialized participation rates of the past. More damning, in relation to academic success, the system has most recently been described as a 'low-intake-high-attrition-system because only about half of the 18% of the country's 18 to 24 year olds entering the system graduate' with 'Black African' and 'Coloured' students fairing the worst (Van Zyl: May, 2015). Most of the other quantitative data points in the same direction.

III. Transformation – Research and Policy Starting Points

12. The present focus on the transformation of higher education in South Africa follows a range of impressive reports and research studies over the past fifteen years. Prime amongst these are the Council on Higher Education's (CHE) higher education reviews, the Higher Education Monitor and the Kagisano series. The work of the Centre for Higher Education Transformation (CHET) since 1996 is noteworthy, whilst a series of books and a wide scope of articles of a reflexive and analytical nature also add to our

body of knowledge (see Maake, 2011; Jansen, xx; Nkomo, Swartz and Maja, 2006; Chetty and Merrett, xx).

13. Reflections on higher education transformation in South Africa generally choose the policy-starting-points reflected in the report (1996) of the National Commission on Higher Education (NCHE); the White Paper on Higher Education (1997); the Higher Education Act (1997); the National Plan for Higher Education (2001); the Report of the Ministerial Committee on Transformation and Social Cohesion and the Elimination of Discrimination in Public Higher Education Institutions (2008); the Declaration of the Higher Education Summit (2010); the National Development Plan (2012); the terms of reference of the Ministerial Oversight Committee on Transformation in South African Public Universities (2013); and the White Paper for Post-school Education and Training (2014)[3].

14. Jansen *et al* (2007) suggest six types of knowledge-production that define research on change (transformation) in higher education in South Africa: statistical surveys; case studies; historical inquiry; critical events research; policy analysis; and single-issue studies[4]. 'Many of these studies are descriptive and to some extent analytical, but very

---

[3] The draft social inclusion policy framework of the Department of Higher Education and Training includes a comprehensive list that constitutes the South African post school legal and policy architecture as it relates to transformation: Department of Education, National Education Policy Act (Act no.27 of 1996); Department of Education, White Paper 3 on the Transformation of the Higher Education System, 1997; Department of Education, Education White Paper 4 – A Programme for Transformation of Further Education and Training, 1998; National Student Financial Aid Scheme Act, 1999, and subsequent amendments; National Policy on HIV/AIDS, for learners and educators in public schools, and students in Further Education and Training Institutions (1999); Department of Education, National Plan for Higher Education, 2001; Department of Education, White Paper 6: Special Needs Education: Building an Inclusive Education and Training System, 2001; Department of Education, *Report of the Working Group on Values Education, 2001;* Department of Education, Values Manifesto, 2001; Department of Education, Bill of Responsibilities for the Youth of South Africa, 2008; Department of Higher Education and Training, Higher Education Laws Amendment, Act 26 of 2010; Department of Higher Education and Training, Adult Education Act (Act 52 of 2000) as amended by the Higher Education and Training Amendment Act of 2010; Department of Higher Education and Training, Skills Development Act, 2010; Department of Higher Education and Training, Formal Further Education and Training College Programmes at levels 2 to 4 on the National Qualification Framework, 2011; Department of Higher Education and Training, National Skills Development Strategy 111 (2011); Department of Higher Education and Training, the Green Paper for Post-School Education and Training, 2012; Department of Higher Education and Training, the White Paper on Post-School Education and Training, 2013; Further Education and Training Colleges Amendment Act, 2012 (Act no.3 of 2012).
Strategic Documents and Reports include the following: Department of Education, *The Ministerial Report on the Elimination of Discrimination and Promotion of Social Cohesion in Higher Education Institutions* (Soudien Report, November, *2008);* Department of Higher Education and Training, Council on Higher Education (CHE) Report on student engagement (2010); Department of Higher Education and Training, National Skills Development Strategy 111; Department of Higher Education and Training, Human Resource Development Strategy for South Africa (HRD-SA) 2010-2030, (2010); Outcome 5 of Government's 12 performance outcomes: "A skilled and capable workforce to support an inclusive growth path" (2010); Department of Higher Education and Training, *Report on the Charter of Humanities and Social Sciences*, 2011 (HSS Report); Framework for co-operation in the provision of career development (information, advice and guidance), 2012; Presidency, National Planning Commission, The National Development Plan, Vision 2030, 2011.
[4] See Jansen *et al* (2007:159-160) **Statistical surveys** – broad surveys of system monitoring and performance in relation to standard indicators, such as equity, efficiency and effectiveness, for example, headcount and enrolment studies (Cooper & Subotzky, 2001); system-wide monitoring studies (Cloete & Bunting, 2000); annual reports on policy initiatives and achievements (CHE, 2004); national planning accounts and strategies (Department of Education, 2001); and research performance trends (Mouton, 2003). The most common equity indicators used in most of these studies relate to race and gender participation and performance. **Case studies** – site-specific and in-depth studies of typically single institutions, faculties, departments or programmes (Ensor, 2001; Anderson, 2002; Jansen, 2002) where the subject matter could range from institutional mergers to deracialization to curriculum restructuring. These studies tend to offer fascinating accounts of one or more institutional sites but, with few exceptions, lack a broader theorization, which enables these single cases to hold meaning beyond a specific locale. **Historical inquiry** – intensive studies of higher education policy or social movements concerned with higher education, for example, policy evolution (Sehoole, 2005) and student politics (Nkomo, 1984; Badat, 2001). These studies tend to foreground the role of politics and political movements in shaping and constraining policy options in higher education; their value lies in the thorough documentation of historical processes and events that continue to shape higher education. **Critical events research** –

5

few can be classed as theoretical in design and approach' (*ibid*:159-160), is one of the critiques against research on higher education forwarded by Jansen *et al* (xx). Moreover, what these studies reveal is the power of the reproductive machinery of the university which is structurally anchored within its institutional arrangements.

15. This machinery is disclosed in various data on the system and its major operations captured, albeit in a different genre, in The Report of the Ministerial Committee on Transformation and Social Cohesion and the Elimination of Discrimination in Public Higher Education Institutions (2008; the Soudien report). This report, given the public expression of present challenges within the sector, needs to be revisited. A focus on its clear and detailed recommendations on staff development, student achievement, knowledge and governance over the past 6 years would already have made massive inroads into the system's transformation challenges.

IV. Transformation – key conceptual frames

16. **Globalisations**

   a. The world has become connexionist in the wake of globalising economic, cultural, political and social processes that are steered, almost exclusively, by neo-liberal logics. The alignment of universities with this logic and the new spirit of capitalism; and the ensuing managerialism linked with notions of efficiency and control has received widespread scholarly attention over the past two decades (Adams, 2006; Vally and Motala, 2014; Lynch, 2014; McGettigan; 2014; Hedley, 2010; Ntshoe, 2008). Badat (2009:3-4) identifies three forms of neoliberal influences on the university: the way in which the logic of the market defines the purpose of higher education in economic terms; the redefinition of the university as supermarkets for varieties of public and private goods; and the rise of rampant materialism, also within higher education spaces.

   b. These developments afflict the global higher education scene as captured in *University in Ruins* (Readings 1996); *Scholars in the Marketplace* (Mamdani 2007);

---

special study of an emergent, significant national phenomenon that is of contemporary and critical importance to higher education, for example, private higher education (Kruss, 2004); black academic migration (Potgieter, 2002); new forms of knowledge production (Kraak, 2000); institutional culture studies (Thaver, 2005); and higher education as international trade (Sehoole, 2005). These studies generate high concentration value for limited periods of time and tend to locate South African higher education within international thinking and trends on the issue under analysis. ***Policy analysis*** − focused review and criticism of an emergent or established higher education policy or policies, with an assessment of the nature, origins and consequences of such policies (Muller, 2003; Hall, Symes & Luescher, 2004; Jansen, 2004; SAUVCA, 2003). This category of study ranges from thoughtful theoretical or public position papers on a topic to more conventional policy analyses targeting a particular higher education policy or plan. ***Single-issue studies*** − coverage of a wide spectrum of issues or concerns in higher education that are often confined to a particular institution, based on a specific interest of an individual academic researcher, and using a wide range of methodologies. Such studies typically appear as a single article in a higher education journal or as an entry into a general education or social science journal. A single issue of the *South African Journal of Higher Education* would, for example, cover topics as disparate as performance management in higher education, environmental education research, building research capacity, indigenous knowledge systems, language policy in higher education, postgraduate supervision, and industry-university partnerships.

Between Race and Reason: Violence, Intellectual Responsibility and the University to Come (Susan Searls Giroux 2010); *The Closing of the American Mind* (Bloom 2008); *Achieving our Country* (Rorty 1999); *Our Underachieving Colleges* (Bok 2006); and *Universities in the Marketplace* (Bok 2009). Others include *Citizenship and Higher Education - The Role of Universities in Communities and Society* (Arthur and Bohlin, 2005); *Higher Education and the Public Good* (Nixon, 2011) and *Intellectuals and the Public Good* (Misztal, 2007).

c. Economic, cultural and political globalisation is, amongst others, organised around global knowledge economies and thus 'higher education institutions are more important than ever as mediums for a wide range of cross-border relationships and continuous global flows of people, information, knowledge, technologies, products and financial capital' (xx). But, globalisation also raised a critical question as formulated by Torres (xx): 'Will globalization make human rights and democratic participation more universal, or will globalization redefine human enterprise as market exchanges invulnerable to traditional civic forms of governance? Whether education as a publicly shared invention, contributing to civic life and human rights, can thrive depends on the specific dominant trajectories shaping globalization – either a future that may offer internationalization of the ideals of a democratic education or reducing education and civic participation to narrow instruments of remote and seemingly ungovernable market forces'. Both trends are discernable and often co-present in higher education systems across the developed and developing worlds.

d. Amidst analyses of this kind, ranking frenzies and the overproduction of such orderings are now dominating the higher education landscape; its over-proximity within universities gave rise to forms of anti-educational and narcissistic forms of academic citizenships across the sector. A perfunctory analysis of the Daily Higher Education News (DHEN) will underscore this assertion.

17. **Institutional inequities**

a. An important dimension of transformation relates to institutional inequities, particularly the impact of accumulated under-capitalization of many historically-black institutions (HBIs) and/or campuses inherited from HBIs as a result of merger/incorporation processes in 2005. Many HBI universities or campuses still face formidable challenges stemming from long legacies of chronic under-funding in infrastructure, staff and student services that, despite periodic, but generally wholly inadequate, policy interventions by Government since 1994, has not yet tilted the balance of economies within these institutions towards lasting sustainability. However, policy interventions alone would not be sufficient to meet the challenges of structural inequality for most of these institutions. Fundamentally, many face significant problems in their underlying business models and economies – located in small, rural or peri-urban towns, primarily

serving students from poor communities - and relatively disarticulated from the urban corporate support networks enjoyed by their urban counterparts.

b. Unless these two issues – inadequate policy support and economic disarticulation – are resolved, it is unlikely that these institutions will be able to successfully promote the goals of higher education transformation. Firstly, without proper infrastructure, services and solid management and governance systems, they cannot provide equitable services to, and/or attract and retain good quality staff and students. Secondly, without full financial aid, particularly via NSFAS, they will endure chronic instability and dropout rates. And, thirdly, without integration into a supportive local and regional economic system, it is hard to see how they can adequately meet their differentiated mandates of research, teaching and engagement roles in wider society. Therefore, the recapitalization and economic integration of former HBIs and campuses are a *sine qua non* for both their internal transformation and playing a transformative role in their wider environment.

c. It cannot be expected, either by default or design, that HBIs should carry a disproportionate social responsibility - relative to their size and internal demographic composition - of enrolling students from poor communities, whereas a similar class demographic is often not reflected in the enrolment patterns of many other institutions across the higher education sector. Critics are often quick to point out that former white universities enrol numerically larger numbers of poor students than individual HBIs, ignoring the fact that HBIs still enrol a far greater per capita percentage of students from working class/poor than middle class and wealthier sections of the population. It surely must be a serious consideration that universities and the State agree on setting targets for the enrolment of students coming from poor and dysfunctional schooling backgrounds. Why should this responsibility only or mainly fall on former HBIs? After all, setting enrolment targets for working class students is a common and longstanding practice in countries such as the UK – as an explicit goal set for all universities to break down inherited and reproductive class inequalities.

18. **Equity and Redress**

a. The figures[5] that indicate the extent of change in staff demographic profiles at universities since 1994 are stark and extremely jarring; they suggest that painfully little has been done, at least not on a systematic (system-level) basis, by higher education's leadership, to 'grow' black academics of all genders. This has resulted in transformation inertias across the national system. There is very little logic in

---

[5] See Andile Makholwa (2015): 'Of the 475 permanent and associate professors at UCT, only 18 are black African. Add Indian and coloured professors and there are 71 — still woefully inadequate. Wits University has 202 black full and associate professors, including temporary staff, out of 916. At both universities, African includes staff from the rest of Africa. At the end of 2013, there were 491 black (including Indian and coloured) professors in the country and 1,862 white professors. There were 530 black (including Indian and coloured) associate professors compared with 1,299 white associate professors. Black women are the most underrepresented group amongst academic staff. http://www.bdlive.co.za/national/education/2015/05/18/campuses-changing-slowly--and-unevenly.

arguing that it takes 'time' to grow black academics if woefully little has been done to put a system-wide programme in place to expand and nurture the pipeline for black academics at all levels within higher education, and if artificial, often racial and gendered barriers are not directly and firmly broken down within that system. Our collective failure to create such a national system to date is both an indictment and deriliction of duty by our leadership *in toto,* not only the current, but also all past leaderships of higher education. The figures for disabled staff and students are even worse; though some improvements are noticeable.

b. The expansion of the higher education system has not necessarily meant a significant increase in the actual participation of African students in higher education (CHE, 2007). 'An analysis of the distribution of student enrolments by race across major disciplinary fields shows some of the limitations that the expansion of access has had in bringing about greater equity in the South African higher education system. […] Black and, particularly, African students still constitute the minority of the enrolments in Science, Engineering and Technology and Business and Commerce, which raises the issue of the equity of opportunity among different race groups. These figures suggest that the South African higher education system has been unable to break substantively with pre-1994 enrolment patterns' *(ibid).* These patterns seem to project themselves into the future (see CHE, Vital Stats, 2014). 'Only 14% of African and 14% of Coloured students are enrolled in [higher education institutions], as opposed to 57% and 58% for White and Indian students respectively. Black and female students are under-represented in science, engineering and technology as well as in business and commerce programmes; while postgraduate studies are dominated by white males.' (South Africa 20 year review; 49). Also, achievement within the system remains racially skewed, by reproducing and feeding into existing societal inequalities. The present focus on teaching and learning is a step in the right direction but its impact will arguably be limited outside the general, positive disruption of the social structure of the academy.

19. Knowledge and its disciplines

a. Higher education in South Africa and on our continent suffers a profound constraint: the western disciplining of knowledge. Here one can summon Ndlovu-Gatsheni's[6] argument that 'the worst form of colonization […] on the continent is the epistemological one (colonization of imagination and the mind) that is hidden in institutions and discourses that govern the modern globe'. The lack of interpretive resources to cognise 'black' is thus structurally-anchored within the disciplines; the very terms for decolonisation are prefigured in the colonising knowledge project. This epistemic injustice features in our research, teaching and learning and community engagement practices; they are discipline-

---

[6] Ndlovu-Gatsheni, S.J., 2013. *Coloniality of Power in Postcolonial Africa: Myths of Decolonisation.* [e-book] Dakar: Council for the Development of Social Science Research in Africa. Available at: http://www.codesria.org/IMG/pdf/2-Coloniality_of_Power_Ndlovu_Chapter_2.pdf [Accessed on 20 November2013], p.63.

bound, constituted by the organisation of knowledge and finding expression in what we do as knowledge practitioners. Crucially, these injustices are legitimated by knowledge and are, for the most part, rendered invisible to the academy itself (see Keet, 2014).

b. Needless to say, the disciplining of knowledge, though particularly associated with the advancement of the scientific method, has long histories that are constitutively tied to the history of western and northern hemisphere-based universities, themselves shaped by the imperial and colonial histories of the states in which they were formed. Such histories map the production spaces and locations of epistemologies and the intellectual, economic and social dominance that ensue from them. Charles Van Doren captures this well in *History of Knowledge*[7] in an inclusive account that geographically spans the globe and historically extends to the 'ancient empires'. The mistake made by Van Doren, although common, is to present 'coming into epistemic being' as dependent on 'discovery' by the cognitive faculties of the western observer.

c. As argued later, the dynamics inherent to disciplines are part of the *intellectual* economies and reproductive machinery of universities. 'More so than any other social and intellectual arrangement, the disciplines permeate the life of the university. Academics and students are streamed; professional, academic and student identities are constructed; scientific authorities are established and maintained; social statuses are affirmed; social spaces are mapped out; recognitions, rewards and sanctions are distributed; and epistemic injustices legitimated. A series of classes, textbooks, study-guides, tutorials, practicals, conversations, seminars, journals, conferences and assessment regimes, each charted according to the status of the disciplines within the university space, animates the university. Ritual behaviours, symbolic expressions, ceremonial practices, triumphal architectures and artifacts add to this picture of the university as an institution steeped in the self-referential logics produced within the disciplines. Lenoir suggests a useful definition for disciplines: Disciplines are the institutional mechanism for regulating the market relations between consumers and the producers of knowledge [...] disciplines are political structures that mediate crucially between the political economy and the production of knowledge' (Keet, 2014).

d. Little attention in higher education studies is given to the political construction of disciplines and the patterns of inclusion and exclusion that inhere in such constructions. However, it may well be one of the most influential determining factors in setting up the inequity patterns within the system. The various forms of networks that emerge around disciplines are also central to the social structure of the academy, amongst others factors.

---

[7] Van Doren, C., 1991. *A history of knowledge. Past, present, and future. The pivotal events, people, and achievements of world history*. New York: Random House.

20. Differentiation, Transformation and the Idea of the University

   a. Our higher education system has differentiated itself for well over four decades now, beginning prior to the collapse of the apartheid system to date, yet our policy and funding system has not explicitly come to terms with and provided for an adequate framework for supporting differentiation. The residues of the 'classical' university type are still a dominant major part of our thinking, public discourse, the intellectual system of knowledge production, funding models and current strategies of national higher education development. The most well-known, but inadequate mode of differentiation is that stemming from the 'institutional landscape' reforms introduced by Government from 2005, with the creation of the so-called 'universities', 'comprehensive universities', and 'universities of technology' types to designate morphologically distinctive types of educational offerings and forms of knowledge creation. Whilst the exact boundaries marking the transition from one to the other institutional 'type' is less than clear, and often disputed in the literature, the higher education system has also not been able to codify their supposedly differentiated funding and policy support requirements.

   b. Moreover, beyond these broad distinctions, universities are differentiated across a range of markers including programme configurations and areas of specialization; their links to segmented and specialized local, regional, national and international markets for students, staff, resources and intellectual exchanges; their internal funding models; their skills profiles and strategic orientations; the nature and intensity of their links to industry, commerce and public sectors; their application of knowledge and strategies of innovation; their pedagogical and curriculum praxis, and so on.

   c. Whilst almost all university leaders recognize these distinctions, they do not nearly coincide with institutional-type demarcations depicted at policy level, as all universities have evolved in a myriad of ways of combining their teaching, research and engagement praxes. All our universities embrace, and must embrace, the three core mandates of teaching and learning, research and engagement. It is therefore curious to see attempts by some universities to artificially distinguish their institutions as 'research' universities, as if they eschew their other mandates and/or imply, by default, that the rest of the university system does not embrace research as a core part of their differentiated mandates.

   d. This attempt at projecting the elite 'research' university is often sitting alongside an unspoken 'hierarchy of knowledge' ('higher' and 'lower'), which is itself tied up with value assumptions and preferences; elitist pretentions of some universities pitched as 'global' or 'international', whilst others are being deemed, by default, as 'local' or 'regional', and others as 'national' in their nature and

ambitions. It is also tied to the implicit or explicit privileging of 'research', and particularly 'blue sky' research amongst the three institutional mandates of universities, and with this, promoting by some university leadership, the myth of the so-called 'research' universities as the apex-type university in the South African higher education system. The unstated claim underpinning this logic is that such universities constitute the 'idea of *the* archetypal university' in South Africa.

e. This patently ideological construction of the post-apartheid university system needs to be contested and debunked if we are to develop a conception of the university system as open, discursive, multipolar, and not arranged along some kind of imperial, hierarchical and self-interested lines which put competition and mimicking a European or North American ideal of the university over collaboration, collegialism and a commitment to tackling the deep-seated issues of African development, whilst holding onto an internationalism that is normatively based on the values of democracy, social justice, equality and human solidarity.

f. It is in this context that transformation imperative have to grapple with the idea of 'what kind of universities' we strive to establish: an extension of the European or North American ideal (itself fully reflective of those realities) or the evolution of universities fully embracing and drawing on their African existence and identities as currency in a wider cosmopolitan and democratic internationalism.

21. Institutional Culture - Six Economies and the Social Structure of the Academy

a. Notwithstanding Higgins' (2007) productive analysis of the complexities of the notion of institutional culture in South African Higher Education, we view institutional culture in much less amorphous terms; it is not as slippery a concept as it is made out to be. Institutional (academic and administrative) cultures within universities refer to 'the deeply embedded patterns of organisational behaviour and the shared values, assumptions, beliefs, or ideologies that members have about their organisation or its work' (Peterson and Spencer, 1991:142). If this formulation is linked to the social structure of the academy, we may speak of *institutional culture* as the *collective outcomes of the six economies* that produce the social structure of the academy, its administration and governance, and its habits and dispositions.

b. The social structure of the academy has not featured in any serious research on higher education transformation post 1994. It remains the most unstudied aspect of transformation within universities combining scientific fact with social fiction[8] into a powerful reproductive matrix. We refer to the social structure of the

---

[8] The discourse on excellence is a good example of the circulation of social myths.

academy as a 'system of rules and practices that influence the actions and outcomes of large numbers of social actors within university settings: it consists of rules, institutions, and practices; is embodied in the actions, thoughts, beliefs, and durable dispositions of individual human beings; assigns roles and powers to groups and individual actors; and has distributive consequences for individuals and groups' (xx).

c. The structure, though embedded, is disclosed in equity patterns; promotions, privileges, access and success rates; governance; teaching and learning; community engagement; and research. It is at the heart of the reproductive machineries of the university, and should be one of the central priorities on the transformation agenda. The way is which scientific authority is distributed and transferred; the constitution of university committees such as disciplinary, ethics and research committees; the patterns of decisions emerging from these committees; the pedagogical arrangements and support matrixes within institutions; the access and success rates of students; etc. are all constitutive of and functions of the social structure of the academy.

d. The social structure of the academy, to our minds, is organized around six economies: *management-administrative, material, socio-cultural, affective, intellectual, and political.* These economies are central to the reproductive machinery of the university. Its dominion is affirmed in the mass of quantitative data available to us that reveals a higher education system that continues to reproduce many of the fundamental discriminatory fault lines in society.

e. *Management* economies distribute the variety of codes by which institutions operate. On one level, the emergence of a managerialist discourse focusing on system efficiencies steered by an audit and input-output logic represents a clear example of how regulatory frames can shift institutional cultures; in negative and positive ways. On another level, *administrative* economies serve material economies on all levels of the system; where *administrative* economy refers to the circulation and distribution of administrative and regulatory power and control; access to systems and the codes and rules by which these systems operate. The shared values and assumptions that steer administrative cultures and practices dovetails with broader institutional cultures which normalise entrenched patterns of exclusion and inclusion. Studies on how powerful disciplinary, research, higher degrees, promotions and ethics committees are constituted and what patterns of decisions emerge from their deliberations, are non-existent. One can, given narrative accounts, simply speculate on their powerful role in replicating discriminatory patterns.

f. In the case of *material* economies, privileges and benefits, financial and otherwise, are circulated within established networks that reaffirm the *power-positions* of those *already* on the grid. These include access to publication and research outlets and wide networks of 'buddy-systems', nationally and internationally, whose sole gate-

keeping function is the reproduction of academic 'authority' and its privileges; a form of operation that seems incapable of cognising 'black', unless the latter 'fits' in with the dominant culture on its terms and sheds its own identities. Other practices include closed research networks with associated research funds that validate scholarly work and legitimate its self-referentiality so as to ensure the accumulation of privileges. There are many more examples.

g. *Socio-cultural* economies ensure the flow of beliefs, customs and behaviours that affirm the status quo. For instance, the logics of this economy steer dominant arguments that set up a discourse of 'transformation tensions' within higher education; it reduces the transformation project to trade-offs between equity and quality; redress and efficiency; and change and development (Cloete *et al.* 2002; Cloete and Moja, 2007 and Cloete, 2014). Though 'tensions' are to be viewed as productive within the mandates and roles of universities, the frames[9] used by these studies are unquestionably linked to images and pictures that are 'framed' so as to organize the interpretations of higher education transformation on the basis of conceptions of 'excellence' within higher education, devoid of any context and history of injustice and privilege. This is one of *the* major weaknesses of higher education transformation studies in South Africa and elsewhere; it has bequeathed us with racist, sexist, discriminatory, preservationist, brutal and false conceptions of 'excellence' and 'quality' that have become its own ideology; a point demonstrated by any discursive analysis of official and public discourses - marketing materials and media narratives - generated by universities themselves.

h. *Affective* economies circulate collective emotions and affect. For instance, the case in which the 'white subject' 'is presented as endangered by imagined others whose proximity threatens not only to take something away from the subject (jobs, security, wealth), but to take the place of the subject'[10], is a case in point. The converse, the anxiety of continued subjugation by other means of the 'black subject', circulates its own set of affects. Anger, fear and despair usually accompany this anxiety as expressions of the 'unsayable' effects of institutional cultures for which a regime of articulation does not yet exist in its fullest.

i. *Intellectual* economies safeguard the movement and pre-determined transfer of scholarly authority and credentialisation according to established institutional and sector-based rules that reproduce the social structure of the academy, by regulating who has access to the 'games' that set up the 'rules'. The monopoly of 'scientific competence' is ensured, so that the agent is socially recognised to speak and act legitimately (Bourdieu), even if such competence is mythical in real scientific terms.

---

[9] See Butler, 2009.
[10] Ahmed, 2004.

j. *Political* economies here refer to the circulation of political beliefs and ideologies, *and* to the social 'relations, particularly power relations, that mutually constitute the production, distribution, and consumption of resources' […]; social relations organized around power or the ability to control other people, processes, and things, even in the face of resistance'[11]. These resources and control, in higher education institutions, are varied. They include material, academic, opportunity and intellectual resources, and the means to control processes by which the distribution of privileges is determined.

k. If we view university practices as constituted by these sets of economies, we are able to cast a framework within which to view a critical thrust of 'transformation' across the entire sector; not a single institution escapes this interpretive scheme. The economies of historically disadvantaged institutions have the same logical structure of advantaged, previously 'white' institutions (although this 'generic' structure has been manifest differently as a result of the racial, spatial and economic inequalities within our university system); they serve *historically established patterns of interests* as distributed across the sector[12]. Though localised dynamics may differ from institution to institution, and are expressed in heterogeneous ways, the interests embedded within these economies are comparable across the sector. We can thus comparatively engage with transformation matrixes and priorities at institutions that profoundly differ from one another.

22. **Research, Teaching and Learning**

One of the most critical aspects of university transformation relates to the core concerns of teaching, learning and research. The recent report on Baseline Institutional Submissions for Phase 1 of the Quality Enhancement Project (CHE, May, 2015) suggests that university teaching is not conceptualised as a profession. Many academics, it is contended, do not have the tools to respond to the multiple and dynamic learning needs of diverse student populations because pedagogical approaches are rooted in particular conventions of scholarship of teaching and learning, largely developed during previous decades and under different social and educational conditions. Apart from the quantity and quality of South African based research, thematic areas of research seldom include careful in-depth studies on the key social justice related questions of our time: race, racism, diversity, ethnicity, inclusion, etc. The big contemporary social issues dissolve into epistemic injustice and 'epistemologies of ignorance'.

---

[11] Mosco, 2009.

[12] This sector includes all South African universities: Walter Sisulu University; University of Zululand; University of Fort Hare; Mangosuthu University of Technology; Rhodes University; University of Limpopo; Tshwane University of Technology; University of the Western Cape; Cape Peninsula University of Technology; University of Johannesburg; University of Venda; Nelson Mandela Metropolitan University; University of the Free State; Vaal University of Technology; Stellenbosch University; University of KwaZulu-Natal; Central University of Technology; University of Cape Town; North-West University; Durban University of Technology; University of Pretoria; and the University of the Witwatersrand.

V. Transformation: Floating signifiers and unstable discourses?

23. 'Transformation', in the South African context, may well be one of the most prolific empty signifiers that 'absorbs rather than emits meaning' (xx). It also seems to be a dynamic floating signifier meaning different things to different people in that 'they may mean whatever their interpreters want them to mean' (xx). This particular challenge is underscored by a review of Integrated Transformation Plans (ITPs) of universities (Soudien 2013) which identified nine meaning-making themes from the various ITPs: reparations; compliance; relevance; evolution; psychological; contexts; social; review; and mission[13].

24. A survey across universities produced the following six transformation indicators and categories in order of weight: institutional culture; curriculum and research; teaching and learning; equity and redress; diversity and social inclusion; and community engagement (2015: xx). The core mandates of higher education, research, teaching and learning, and community engagement are reflected in these prioritized themes.

25. The most recent policy initiative in the area of higher education transformation, the Draft Social Inclusion Policy Framework of DHET (2015), aims to address 'deep historical inequalities and, in moving forward, heals the divisions of the past through interventionist policies and programmes. Race, gender, class, age, disability, HIV and AIDS as well as geographical inequalities need to be addressed through deliberate policies and programmes that focus on [substantive] equality, anti-racism, social cohesion, inclusion and human rights in the post-school education and training sector. This social inclusion policy ensures that all public colleges, Adult Education and Training Centres and other public higher education and training institutions operating in South Africa have in place anti-racism and anti-discrimination policies as well as grounding programmes that focus on building an inclusive society'. 'Social cohesion', a key theme in

---

[13] '**Reparation:** Transformation as a process of making **amendments.** It is about bringing about radical changes in ourselves and advocating change to structural defects and dehumanising systems for the betterment of higher education whereby it is possible to build a culture of mutual respect, trust, co-operation, tolerance and humaneness; **Compliance:** Transformation as a response to constitutional and legal requirements; **Responsiveness:** Transformation as a process of becoming useful in and to society at large. It is a multifaceted and integrated process by which the university continuously renews itself in an ongoing effort to complement national development and societal goals; **Evolution**: Transformation as an inevitable (involuntary) process of change. It is an ongoing process and not an event or an end in itself. It is a journey that requires courage, tolerance, fairness, and equity and the willingness and courage to ask the difficult questions; **Psychological:** Transformation as a change that takes place in individuals. It refers to the change process that takes place in people. It involves the promotion of moral, ethical and social values as well as the enhancement of moral regeneration; **Context:** To provide opportunities for an excellent teaching and learning experience that is contextually responsive to the challenges of globalisation and of a society in transition; **Social:** Transformation as a change that takes place between individuals and where **historical power relations** are fundamentally altered and equalised; **Review:** Transformation as a process of **evaluating** existing conditions; **Mission:** Transformation as a process of meeting set **objectives**. Transformation is fundamental and purposeful advancement towards specified goals - individual, collective, cultural and institutional.

the NDP, dovetails with 'social inclusion' as two of the primary signifiers for transformation; this is a priority underscored by the review of the ITPs and the survey.

26. Despite the slipperiness of the concept, a broad meaning-making frame is emerging around transformation that hinges on the following operational concepts: institutional culture; curriculum and research; teaching and learning, equity and redress; diversity, social cohesion and social inclusion; and social engagement. This meaning-making frame can be interpreted as having the *development of an inclusive narrative of progress and equality in mind: one that can facilitate the fundamental reconstitution and re-expression of the nature and role of the university in wider society in pursuit of the goals of social justice, democracy and human solidarity.*

27. In general, the principles of transformation, the transformation themes; and the mandate and roles of the university provide sufficient bases for the development of a heuristic, definitional framework for higher education transformation borne from the accumulated experiences of over twenty (20) years of debates, struggles and experiments aimed at the 'transformation' of higher education in South Africa.

28. Transformation of higher education is generally conceptualised around the following principles, as expressed in the White Paper on Higher Education and Training of 1997: equity and redress; democratisation; development; quality; effectiveness and efficiency; academic freedom; institutional autonomy; and public accountability.

29. It is possible to combine the transformation themes with the transformation principles; but, for conceptual clarity, we need to differentiate the layers along the following lines:

    a. The *mandates* of universities (research, teaching and learning, community engagement).
    b. *Principles* of transformation (equity and redress; democratisation; development; quality; effectiveness and efficiency; academic freedom; institutional autonomy; and public accountability).
    c. *Themes* of transformation (institutional culture; curriculum and research; teaching and learning; equity and redress; diversity; social cohesion and social inclusion; and community engagement).

30. The overlaps between *mandate* and *themes* can be tolerated conceptually given the predisposition to interpret the *principles* from the standpoint of preservationist ideologies; this is something higher education transformation practitioners should be mindful of. Further, the mandates, principles and themes have to be situated within the mission, role, objectives, tensions and contexts of higher education in South Africa, aptly captured in Badat's writings (2006; 2007; 2010; 2013)[14]. He further articulates five roles for higher education (Badat, 2013:5-6):

---

[14] See Badat, 2007: The role of higher education must necessarily intersect and effectively engage with the economic and social challenges of local, national, regional, continental and global contexts. These challenges include the imperatives of economic growth and development; the ability to compete globally; job creation and the reduction/elimination of unemployment and

i. 'to produce *graduates* that possess values, knowledge, attitudes and skills acquired through thoughtfully designed and implemented formative and professional teaching and learning programmes that engage simultaneously with disciplinary, historical, ethical, cultural, economic and learning issues;

ii. to undertake *critical social and scientific inquiry* and imaginative and rigorous scholarship – of discovery, integration, application and teaching - that serves diverse intellectual, economic and social goals and the greatest public good;

iii. to contribute to forging a *critical and democratic citizenship*. Vibrant and dynamic societies require graduates who are not just capable professionals, but also thoughtful intellectuals and critical citizens that respect and promote human rights;

iv. to *proactively engage with our societies* at the intellectual and, more generally, cultural level. This requires universities to not just transmit knowledge to people in the wider society, but to have a two-way engagement with the wider society; a reflexive communication if you like;

v. to *actively engage with their wider contexts and societal conditions*. Our universities must engage effectively with the economic and social challenges of our local, national, regional, continental and global contexts; with the tasks of economic development and the ability to compete globally; job creation and the elimination of unemployment and poverty; the effective delivery of social services and the threat of HIV/AIDS and other diseases'.

31. Useful contributions in *Being at Home: Race, Institutional culture and Transformation at Higher Education Institutions in South Africa* (Tabensky and Matthews, 2015) highlight the following transformation themes: the 'idea' (purpose) of a university; institutional culture, transforming disciplinary communities; the instrumentalisation of universities in relation to neo-liberal logics; tolerance and inclusion; policy; the role of leaders and the agency of those who 'flourish in the cracks'. Agential responsibility is distributed across the university community. An instructive question from this book is: 'Can we really think of transforming our institutions without transforming the disciplinary communities to which we belong?' (Taylor, 2015).

VI. Transformation - Definitional framework

32. Given the preceding discussions and ideas underpinning the mission, purpose, mandates, and transformation principles and themes, the following definitional framework for higher education transformation is proposed:

a. Progress towards the attainment of levels of *inclusion* as reflected in the social structure of the academy and its administration; governance and management

---

poverty; the effective delivery of social services and the threat of HIV/AIDS and other diseases. The challenges also encompass the imperatives of equity and redress; social justice; the democratisation of state and society, the building of a culture of human rights, creating a vibrant civil society, and promoting a culture of vigorous and critical intellectual public discourse. At the same time, in playing its role, higher education must also be guided by and embody specific *principles* and *values*. These include: equity and redress, quality, development, democratisation, academic freedom, institutional autonomy, effectiveness and efficiency, and public accountability'.

processes; the institutional culture of universities; and patterns of equity and redress[15].

    b. Inclusive *and* equity-based student access, success, and support.

    c. *Africanization*[16] in relation to curriculum, research, language, aesthetics and governance (Metz, 2015); the capacity of universities to 'read' African.

    d. A more *just* reconfiguration of power-relations embedded within the organisation of knowledge, its disciplines and disciples and the construction of professional identities and authorities.

    e. Fair and inclusive distribution of authority within knowledge generation processes, research subjects, objects, topics and trends.

    f. The advancement of critical and post conflict pedagogies and an understanding of the constitutive links between pedagogy, research and institutional culture.

    g. The promotion of equitable and equalising relationships between higher education and the state, private sector, interest groups, pressure formations and broader society.

33. On the strength of the above, it is clear that one-dimensional or narrow conceptions of the remit and nature of higher education transformation cannot suffice in our context. This was the case, for example, with the Equity Index Report (2013), co-authored by Makgoba and Govinder, which provided what turned out to be a highly flawed and much discredited assessment of academic staff and staff equity, correlating this with research productivity, and projecting this as a measure of the state of transformation of universities. It has been criticized on a range of legitimate grounds, and this will not be the subject of further elaboration (see Moultrie and Dorrington, Dunne, 2014). Whilst racial staff equity is indispensable for transformation, it has to be linked to, and facilitate the simultaneous transformation of other dimensions of the system including gender, disability, class, and the structures through which these relations are mediated, including curricula and epistemological frameworks, teaching, learning, research and engagement, student access and success, governance and management, ethics of leadership and the wider role of the university in society.

34. A more complete framing of higher education transformation must per force recognize the interconnectivity and simultaneity of race, class, gender, disability and other markers of social difference, with the systemic and institutional mechanisms constructing and reproducing wider social inequalities and power relations in society and the economy. We must reject reductionist, essentialist and one-dimensional conceptions of transformation. After all, we talk about the higher education 'system', suggestive of a more or less integrated, but contradictory ecosystem comprising different social relations, practices, traditions, cultures, and so forth.

---

[15] Here we have to avoid giving in to the seductive allure to reduce higher education transformation to equity targets; the Baudrillardian warning of seduction followed by catastrophe should be heeded. The much critcized and largely discredited Equity Index, co-authored by Makgoba and Govinder (2013), is a case in point.

[16] xx

35. Whilst this document does not attempt to develop a theory of higher education transformation, it hopes to provide a heuristic and critical framework for enabling us to recognize the multi-dimensionality, interconnectivity and relational nature of that which we seek to transform. The precise ways in which specific institutional cultures 'construct' these relations is a matter of further empirical investigation, not possible in this framework document.

36. Furthermore, there can be no absolute state or end point of transformation for the simple reason that societies are inescapably in states of transition and change is a permanent feature of life. We must resist simplistic, cartoon-like media descriptions of universities as either 'transformed' or 'untransformed', as if this depicts a singular empirical datum. Transformation per definition is a set of social changes at various internal states of transition along a continuum. We must insist on asking 'what' exactly is being referred to when we characterize the 'state of transformation' in a particular setting, and how this relates to other elements in the same system. Hopefully, a more complex system revealing uneven, contradictory and convergent processes of change and resistance to change will emerge, so that we can appreciate the full 'balance sheet' of social transformation in higher education.

37. As we build a better understanding of the uneven, contradictory 'states of transition' within this system, and the powerful mechanisms and constructs shaping institutional cultures, it must be borne in mind that there is always a level of indeterminacy of how these mechanisms and constructs shape individual behaviors; that we are talking about a living system inhabited by human beings who are irreducibly complex, whose identities and responses to their worlds cannot be 'fixed' in a static set of representations of social orders, and that they always have the capacity for self-reflection and change. After all, true transformation such as that envisaged by our Constitution cannot only emerge on the basis of the law, policy, compliance or force. It has to emerge as deeply personal, emotional, intellectual, if not 'spiritual' (in the sense of the human spirit) from within us all if it is to lead to a lived experience.

VII. The Transformation Barometer[17]

38. Diversity toolkits and transformation plans are littering the higher education landscape, globally. The establishment of well-resourced diversity offices is a common feature of higher education institutions in Western-Europe and North-America. On our continent, 'The Working Group on Higher Education of the Association for the Development of Education in Africa in 2006, developed a toolkit for mainstreaming gender in higher education in Africa in collaboration with the Association of African Universities' (2015,

---

[17] The themes and indicators require more thinking and development, especially in relation to qualitative indicators.

xx). However, broader transformation toolkits are not commonly available in African higher education institutions.

39. 'Chief Diversity Officer' is also nowadays a standard designation in universities in the USA; usually appointed at very senior levels; and diversity scorecards are commonplace (see Williams 2013; 2014). This development has been steered by three models: the affirmative action and equity model (1950-1970s); the multicultural and inclusion diversity model (1960s-1980s); and the learning, diversity and research model (1990s-2000s). It also explains South Africa's focus on equity and redress over the last 20 years, and the seductive allure to reduce higher education transformation to these targets.

40. Indicators for education quality have also become a feature of the comparative work of regional and international institutions (UNESCO, OECD, OSF and the World Bank). Measuring the attainment of outcomes is central to the logic of these indicators. With reference to the MDGs, there is already a frenzy of activities associated with the post-2015 agenda, and the role of higher education. Captured in the NDP, South Africa already has long-term targets in place associated with the performance of the higher education sector.

41. As a consequence of processing national policy imperatives, expression within ITPs, and feedback from transformation practitioners, the thematic areas for the barometer must emerge from the concepts captured in the following table:

Mandates	Principles	Themes
• Research • Teaching and learning • Community engagement	• Equity and redress • Democratisation • Development • Quality • Effectiveness and efficiency • Academic freedom • Institutional autonomy • Public accountability	• Institutional culture • Curriculum and research • Teaching and learning • Equity and redress • Diversity • Social cohesion and social inclusion • Community engagement

42. Emerging from these concepts and the preceding discussions, the following themes should steer the higher education transformation project:

    a. Institutional culture
        i. Governance and Management
        ii. Professionalisation of 'Transformation' work
        iii. Social structure of the academy
        iv. Social inclusion/cohesion
        v. Language and Symbols

    b. Equity and redress

  i. Access and success (staff)
  ii. Race, Gender, Disability
  iii. Support/opportunity
  iv. Diversity and inclusivity

c. Research, scholarship and post-graduate studies
  i. Knowledge transformations
  ii. Diversity and inclusivity
  iii. Internationally recognised research on 'race', 'gender', 'disability' and social justice

d. Leadership, relations with external stakeholders, and community engagement
  i. Diversity, training, development and professional growth
  ii. Transformational leadership
  iii. Socially just, diverse, inclusive community engagement
  iv. Equity-based external engagement

e. Teaching and learning
  i. Inclusive enrolment planning
  ii. Access and success (students)
  iii. Critical pedagogies
  iv. Diversity competencies

Dimension/ Theme	Sub-themes	Goals	Indicators/ activities
Institutional Culture	Governance and management	Developing broad transformation policy trajectories; supported by council and top management	• Transformation statement from councils • Commitment of councils to transformation • Improving equity patterns on councils and in top management structures • Support and embed the work of Institutional forum • Policy reviews and alignment • Human resource reviews and alignment • Recommendations to DHET re legal and policy reform if so required • Activities aimed at a corruption free university • Levels of efficiency in strategic and academic management
	Professionalisation of higher education transformation work	Establishing professional transformation outfits at universities that is located in the VCs' office; and linked to all other relevant structures within the university Developing collaborations between transformation offices and *ombud-function* (independent structure dealing with concerns, confidentially)	• Suitably qualified, experienced, Head (Director) of University Transformation; reporting directly to the VC • Dedicated positions outlining the strategy, structure and goals of the unit; with budget from central funds proportionate to the size of the institution[18] • Support and toolkits for developing transformation plans and generating transformation reports • Earmarked website for transformation • Influence over academic and strategic plans to embed transformation imperatives • Some measure of independence to provide advice without fear or favour • Specialised training/ professional association/ defined territory and jurisdiction/ code of ethics

---

[18] Comparative analysis required.

	Social structure of the academy	Studying and analysing the mechanics of Institutional Culture steered by an analysis of the six economies that set up the social structure of the academy to identify patterns of privilege and in/exclusion	• Quantitative indicators (shift in demographic profiles of committees) • Qualitative assessment of strategies (shifts in networks; inclusive distribution of resources and opportunities • Identification of socially unjust systemic and structural patterns and responses to deal with it
	Social inclusion/ exclusion/ cohesion	Studying the meaning and experiences of inclusion/ exclusion and affiliation/ disaffiliation Ensuring inclusive learning spaces; diversified workplaces, and hospitable environments across its campuses Developing and implementing innovative and cross-cutting programs to improve the institutional culture for diverse students, staff and visitors	• Number and nature of studies • Institutional social inclusion policy • Number of social inclusion projects • Solidarity-generating initiatives (e.g. support across universities for students facing financial exclusion) • Perceptual measures • Levels of participation • Perceptions of engagement • Perceptions of satisfaction • Perceptions of affiliation (not belonging) • Number and patterns of disciplinary, harassment and discrimination cases • Number of diverse student and staff associations • Number of campus 'incidents' • Number of affinity organisations (e.g. LGBTI) • Number of transformation articles in campus media
	Language and Symbols	Develop inclusive language policies informed by the needs of students Develop policy on university symbols, and naming processes	• Policy, and levels of inclusivity it generates • Policy, and levels of inclusivity it generates
Equity and Redress	Access and success	Recruiting, promoting and retaining diverse faculty and staff – (focus on 'race', disability and gender/ *be mindful of the 'white' female diversity trap*) Conducting studies of human resource conceptualisations and practices that facilitate/ inhibit equity Studying the composition of recruitment and promotions committees on all levels and the patterns of decisions ensuing from it Linking equity with the diversification and transformation of knowledges	• Number of staff appointed to advance demographic representation across universities (e.g. 'Black' dominated staff profiles - universities to recruit and retain 'white' academics and staff; and the other way around) • Number of transformative academic communities • Diversity levels in recruitment search processes • Number and distribution of development grants • Analysis of patterns of disciplinary cases • Initiatives at transforming recruitment practices • Targeted focus on STEM related recruitment of diverse staff • Levels of integration between academic and 'service' staff • Perception studies of 'service' staff • Number of targeted interventions for 'service' and administrative staff
	Support and opportunity	Establishing university-based development programmes Consciously designing efforts for inclusive and equity driven opportunities	• Number of targeted interventions supporting staff • Nature of resource and academic support
	Diversity and inclusivity	Developing and maintaining diverse and inclusive staff profiles	• Development of a diversity index; and f efficacy of strategies to meet the demands of the index

Research, scholarly and post-graduate studies	Knowledge transformations	Studying intellectual communities within the academy and its national and international networks, and the patterns of in/ exclusion relating to participation, engagement, opportunity and funding
		
		Exploring the continued political constructions of disciplines; and the ways it generate in/ exclusions and possibilities of self-transformation
			• Number of study programmes:
			   o First nation studies
			   o Africa studies
			   o Gender studies
			   o Ethnic studies
			   o Disability studies
			   o Area studies
			   o Diverse Histories of STEM
			   o Etc.
			• Number of full-time or affiliated staff in these programmes, and their equity profiles
			• Presence of transformation and diversity-themed research

		The diversification of knowledge, its producers and beneficiaries, which specific emphasis on 'Africanization'	• % of research funding available for transformation studies • Total number and value of grants • Scholarly outputs on transformation themes • Qualitative assessment of the roles of committees such as research committees and ethics committees on facilitating/ constraining transformation-themed research • Engaged scholarship • Number of interdisciplinary diversity-themed research, administratively, financially supported across faculties
	Diversity and inclusivity	Enrolling and graduating postgraduate students from diverse environments, geographical locales, 'abilities', and socio-economic conditions (class and social status)	• Number of students and demographic, socio-economic, gender and 'ability profiles' • Study area and demographic profiles • Number of support initiatives for diverse post graduate students • Number of targeted recruitment initiatives of students within a broad understanding of diversities, and increase degree completion • Develop and implement non-discriminatory supervision standards and practices • Number of interventions that facilitate postgraduate student intellectual cultures • Number of trainings on good practices in recruiting and graduating diverse students
	Internationally recognised research on 'race', 'gender', 'disability' and social justice	Commitment to developing and supporting the production of nationally recognized research and scholarship on race, 'ethnicity', gender, 'disability' class, and other dimensions of transformation and diversity. Clearinghouse of opportunities for funded research, scholarship, and creative activities addressing transformation and diversity issues	• % and value of funding/ support and development initiatives • Number of research clusters • Number of scholarly outputs
Leadership, relationships with external stakeholders, and community engagement	Diversity, training, development and professional growth	Increasing opportunities for leadership training, professional growth and advancement of diverse academics and staff in all divisions	• Re-aligning skills development regime • Institutional plans that link skills development with diversity training; and the diversification of the professional base
	Transformational leadership	Strong transformational leadership at top level, deans and heads of department; as part of key performance requirement Retraining and development of academic and administrative managers Coordination and support of transformational leadership on campuses, faculties, departments and the various academic, support and business units	• Faculty, Departmental and Unit plans with targets in place that include equity figures; and substantive initiatives to advance inclusion • Number of transformation related training and development interventions • Qualitative assessment of impact of transformational leadership activities
	Socially just, diverse, inclusive community engagement	Advancing transformational external relations and community engagement practices	• Qualitative assessment of external relations and community engagement on our academic and institutional cultures • Number of transformational community engagement initiatives - away from conventional, patronizing and discriminatory paradigms, towards inclusive epistemological practices • Increase number and quality with diverse external communities/ partnerships

	Equity-based external engagement	Ensuring alignment of alumni, student and staff organisations with the transformation objectives of the university	• Technical review of impact of alumni organisations on patterns of in/exclusion • Number of and diversity of external engagement practices
Teaching and Learning	Planning for inclusive enrolment Access and success	Enrolling and graduating undergraduate students from diverse environments, geographical locales, 'abilities', and socio-economic conditions (class and social status).	• Numbers and diversity profiles • Graduation rates of designated groups • Grant recipients and bursary rates; and diversity profiles of such • Gateway achievement levels • Level of diversity in different majors, e.g. STEM • Number of 1st generation students
	Critical pedagogies	Aligning teaching practices with critical, just and humanizing pedagogies	• Diversity in teaching awards • % research funds for critical scholarship • Qualitative assessment of pedagogical approaches
	Transformation and diversity competencies	Ensuring that undergraduate students acquire the knowledge, experience, and cultural competencies necessary to succeed in a multicultural, globally interconnected world Equipping graduate students with diversity-related and social justice expertise Increasing capacity to teach about diversity issues and to develop inclusive learning environments	• Compulsory general education programme focusing on diversity, transformation, environment, development and pluralistic societies • Credit bearing intervention at faculty level (convergence/ divergence design) • Integration of diversity and social justice themes into academic courses, living and learning activities, and other co-curricular activities. • Initiate process to link skills on diversity and social justice education to promotion and professional development points • Review and realign academic development programmes of universities • % of budget on infra-structural developments

VIII. Now what? The Perennial Questions

43. The idea of the barometer is to develop a template for integrated transformation planning and execution and generate comparable reports across the sector, as well as making possible the comparative sharing of ideas, good practices, learning and strategies. The transformation report, and continuous future planning, will serve the general principles of transparency, openness and accountability which should be the heart of academic institutions.

44. One should ideally use this framework as a heuristic tool, using a series of key *questions* against which to interrogate the information/evidence supplied by our universities through their Integrated Transformation Plans and annual Transformation Reports on their self-evaluation of the state of transformation across a range of tracks:

   a. How can we demonstrate that the sum total of our transformation efforts engender our universities with a higher commitment to its social justice purposes?
   b. To what extent have we tackled forms of symbolic and material domination and exclusion in our universities?

c. How does the political economy of the university contribute to the perpetuation of unacceptable and exploitative practices?

d. How does our self-interest facilitate anachronistic aspects of the academy?

e. How do we overcome inertia and lack of courage in confronting the major issues facing our institutions?

f. Who controls the material, academic, organizational and social instruments to reproduce the faculty and the university?

g. Do we have the capacity and categories for self-understanding and self-clarification to transform ourselves?

h. What qualitative indicators can we point to in the data which is demonstrative of real transformation?

i. How do we study and transform institutional culture?

j. What is the role of students and academics in the different dimensions of university transformation?

k. What is the equity profile of our most powerful internal committees?

l. What role does teaching, learning and research play in institutional culture? How can we study and disrupt these?

m. What is the correlation between the composition of committees and the nature of decisions taken in respect of the goals of equity, inclusion and social justice?

n. How do we recognize and act against 'gatekeeping' inimical to the goals of inclusion, diversity and social justice?

o. How do we set up our baseline data, especially in relation to the 'hard-to-measure' areas?

p. How do we make sure that shifts in numbers for marketing purposes translate into deeper experiences of transformation?

q. What does the barometer data say about us?

r. How does the distribution of academic and research support play out patterns of in/exclusions?

End
AK and DS