



CHET

CENTRE FOR HIGHER EDUCATION TRANSFORMATION

Differentiation in the South African public university system

**Ian Bunting
Cape Town
24 January 2013**

Introduction



CHET has based its analyses of differentiation in the SA public university system on the following documents, which are all in the public domain.

(a) Government documents:

- 1997 White Paper on higher education transformation
- 2001 National Plan for Higher Education
- 2007 edition of Higher Education Qualification Framework (HEQF)
- 2011 revised edition of HEQF
- 2011 National Development Plan, chapter 9
- 2012 Green Paper for Post-school Education and Training

(b) Other documents

- 2000 Council on Higher Education (CHE) size and shape report
- 2010 Higher Education SA (HESA) strategic plan
- 2010 Higher Education Stakeholder Summit

Introduction (continued)



The first part of CHET's presentation deals with two issues which arise in various of the documents listed on the previous slide.

These are:

1. Why should the SA's public university system be differentiated?
2. What are the primary or basic elements of the system? Academic programmes or individual institutions?

The second part of the presentation outlines CHET's views on how further progress could be made in the SA debates on differentiation in the public university system.

Why differentiation?



The documents referred to earlier offer a range of reasons why the SA public university system should be a differentiated one. The responses of four are summarised below:

1997 White Paper:

1. An undifferentiated system would, because of resource constraints, move to lowest common denominator; leading to a poor quality system and delivery failure.
2. To meet post-apartheid equity and development challenges, the system must consist of a range of institutions with different missions and mandates.

2010 Higher Education Summit:

1. Differentiation would lead to improved access for a diversity of students; furthermore student mobility would be facilitated.
2. Differentiation would enable public university to respond effectively to the labour market, in a more competitive higher education terrain.

Why differentiation? (continued)



2011 National Development Plan

1. Differentiation would signal that the public university system has many functions, and that no one institution could serve all of society's needs.
2. Differentiation would enable institutions to build on strengths and expand areas of specialisation.

2012 Green Paper

1. Differentiation would provide a diversity of programme offerings to learners and would increase overall higher education participation rates.
2. Differentiation would enhance institutions' ability to meet national needs.

POINTS TO NOTE:

1. Summit, National Development Plan and Green Paper pick up only point 2 of the White Paper, i.e. differentiation is needed for equity and development purposes.
2. The need for differentiation because of resource constraints is not raised. CHET's view is that this should be included in any account of the purposes of differentiation.

Academic programmes and institutions



1. The 1997 White Paper laid down two ‘axioms’ to determine the direction of official government discussions of differentiation:
 - a) that academic programmes are the basic elements of a public university system, and
 - b) that institutions are secondary in being no more than platforms for the offering of academic programmes.
2. Its 2010 strategic plan indicates that HESA did not accept White Paper view that a public university system is primarily a set of academic programmes. HESA argued
 - a. that institutions are the primary elements in a system, and
 - b. that government should determine into which broad categories public university institutions fall. These broad categories should be the current ones of ‘university’, ‘comprehensive university’, and ‘university of technology’.
3. HESA then argued that institutions should, through self-determination, be able to decide into which sub-categories they fall within the three broad government categories. For example universities could, after processes of self-determination, be placed into subcategories such as ‘research university’ or ‘rural university’.

Academic programmes and institutions (cont.)



1. The 2012 Green Paper does not take public universities to be merely ‘delivery platforms’ for academic programmes. Institutions are, under the Green Paper, the basic building blocks of the public university system. The 2012 Green Paper has, in other words, dropped the academic-programmes-first view of the 1997 White Paper.
2. The Green Paper adds that the three basic categories of ‘university’, ‘comprehensive university’, and ‘university of technology’ will underpin future policies. These categories of institution will furthermore be closely linked to the 2011 HEQF’s progression routes of ‘vocational’, ‘professional’ and ‘general’ programmes.
3. The Green Paper maintains that use of these categories and progression routes will ensure that the public university sector comprises a continuum of institutions. These will range from specialised, research-intensive universities to largely undergraduate institutions, with various levels of research focus and postgraduate niches at masters and/or doctoral level.
4. The Green Paper rejects the 2010 HESA notion of ‘self-determination’. The Green Paper stresses that the missions, roles and development paths will be determined by contracts between the Minister of Higher Education and Training and individual institutions.

Summary of the differentiation debate in SA



1. It is more than 15 years since the 1997 White Paper placed differentiation on the SA higher education policy agenda. Little progress has been made on this issue.
2. The National Plan on the implementation of the White Paper was published 12 years ago. The national department responsible for higher education was not able, over this lengthy period, to develop and formulate a final policy on differentiation. The difficulties experienced could be ascribed to the National Plan's acceptance of the White Paper's 'axiom' that the primary units in higher education are academic programmes and not individual institutions.
3. Alternative accounts of differentiation were developed by the CHE in 2000 and by HESA in 2010. These were based on views that the primary units in a public university system are individual institutions, and not academic programmes. Neither of these accounts was accepted by the Minister of Higher Education.
4. The 2012 Green Paper for Post-school Education and Training offers a way of ending the SA debate on differentiation. It ends in effective ways the uncertainties generated over this 15-year period.

CHET's views on the differentiation framework



1. CHET has adopted a pragmatic stance on the 2012 Green Paper.
2. CHET argues that the Green Paper contains a framework which, if adopted, could close down the broad policy debate on differentiation in the SA public university system. Future work could then focus on implementation details.
3. The framework aspects of the 2012 Green Paper which CHET finds acceptable are these:
 - a) For policy purposes, the basic elements in the public system will be the **current 23 universities**.
 - b) The 23 universities will also **retain their current academic programme offerings**. However, all these academic programmes must, over time, become HEQF compliant.
 - c) These 23 public universities will initially **retain their present classifications** of 'university' or 'comprehensive university' or 'university of technology'.

CHET's views on the differentiation framework



- d) The three categories will have **flexible boundaries**. The boundaries will allow individual institutions to move between categories, under the conditions described in points (f) and (g) below.
- e) **Subcategories** within the three main categories would be possible. The institutions clustered in a subcategory would have to possess specific sets of features which distinguish them from institutions in other subcategories.
- f) **Self-determination will not be accepted**. Institutions could not move between main categories, or within subcategories in a main category, on the basis solely of changes they make to their missions and/or strategic plans.
- g) Category and subcategory moves would be possible only if (a) the institution and the Department of Higher Education agree on sets of conditions in a new 'contract', and (b) the Minister approves the changes.
- h) The public university system will eventually comprise a **continuum of institutions**, ranging from specialised, research-intensive universities to largely undergraduate institutions, with various levels of research focus and various postgraduate niches at masters and/or doctoral level.

Implementation



1. CHET believes that points (3e) and (3g) of the proposed Green Paper framework need further development.
2. Decisions on the initial subcategories into which institutions are placed, and subsequent moves between subcategories and even categories, cannot be based only on (a) institutional missions and strategic plans, and (b) negotiations between government and institutional representatives. These decisions should be linked to evidence-based criteria, which take account of the overall state and performance of the public university system, and of the state and performance of institutions.
3. In the remaining slides CHET offers examples of the kinds of analyses which need to be made either before institutions are placed into subcategories within the three main categories of 'university' or 'comprehensive university' or 'university of technology', or before they are moved between the main categories.
4. The slides consist of 7 tables which will not be discussed in detail. They will simply be shown on the screen, with reference being made to features which could assist in the implementation of a differentiation framework.

Shape of student enrolment (2008–2010)

Arranged by Total post/grad, descending order



	ANNUAL AVERAGES FOR 2008-2010						
	U/grad diplomas	U/grad degrees	Total u/grad	Postgrad below masters	Masters	Doctors	Total postgrad
UNIVERSITIES							
Stellenbosch	0%	63%	63%	14%	19%	4%	37%
Pretoria	14%	53%	67%	20%	10%	3%	33%
Witwatersrand	5%	63%	69%	9%	19%	4%	31%
Cape Town	3%	68%	71%	10%	14%	5%	29%
Free State	11%	63%	73%	16%	8%	2%	27%
Rhodes	4%	71%	75%	10%	11%	4%	25%
North West	36%	40%	76%	18%	5%	2%	24%
KwaZulu-Natal	12%	67%	79%	8%	10%	3%	21%
Western Cape	6%	74%	79%	9%	9%	3%	21%
Limpopo	5%	77%	83%	7%	10%	1%	17%
Fort Hare	5%	79%	84%	7%	6%	2%	16%
COMPREHENSIVE UNIVERSITIES							
Johannesburg	39%	47%	87%	9%	4%	1%	13%
Nelson Mandela Metropolitan	45%	42%	87%	6%	6%	2%	13%
Unisa	28%	61%	89%	9%	2%	0%	11%
Zululand	18%	71%	89%	7%	3%	1%	11%
Venda	4%	87%	91%	4%	4%	1%	9%
Walter Sisulu	58%	39%	96%	2%	1%	0%	4%
UNIVERSITIES OF TECHNOLOGY							
Cape Peninsula	69%	25%	94%	3%	2%	0%	6%
Central	71%	24%	95%	2%	2%	0%	5%
Tshwane	78%	18%	97%	1%	2%	0%	3%
Durban	79%	19%	98%	0%	1%	0%	2%
Vaal	87%	12%	99%	0%	1%	0%	1%
Mangosuthu	87%	12%	99%	0%	1%	0%	1%

Permanent academic staff (2008–2010)

Arranged by Lecturers & below, ascending order



	ANNUAL AVERAGES FOR 2008-2010				
	Professors	Assoc. Professors	Senior lecturers	Lecturers & below	3-YEAR AVERAGE
UNIVERSITIES					
Cape Town	22%	19%	28%	32%	961
Rhodes	21%	14%	24%	41%	317
Stellenbosch	21%	14%	24%	41%	886
Western Cape	33%		26%	41%	517
North West	14%	16%	29%	42%	1003
Witwatersrand	15%	17%	27%	42%	985
Pretoria	16%	13%	27%	44%	1655
Fort Hare	13%	11%	28%	48%	223
Free State	14%	10%	26%	49%	777
Limpopo	10%	7%	31%	52%	756
KwaZulu-Natal	11%	12%	19%	57%	1444
COMPREHENSIVE UNIVERSITIES					
Unisa	17%	15%	32%	37%	1369
Johannesburg	15%	6%	34%	44%	864
Nelson Mandela Metropolitan	13%	12%	26%	49%	558
Venda	8%	9%	24%	60%	302
Zululand	9%	6%	20%	65%	246
Walter Sisulu	4%	2%	15%	80%	574
UNIVERSITIES OF TECHNOLOGY					
Tshwane	5%	11%	26%	58%	803
Durban	3%	8%	27%	62%	562
Vaal	4%	6%	28%	63%	304
Central	2%	7%	22%	69%	243
Cape Peninsula	1%	10%	19%	70%	720
Mangosuthu	0%	6%	8%	86%	135

Permanent academic staff with doctorates (2008–2010)

Arranged by Total staff with doctorates, descending order



	ANNUAL AVERAGES FOR 2008-2010				
	Total staff with doctorates	Professors with doctorates	Assoc. professors with doctorates	Senior lecturers with doctorates	Lecturers & below with doctorates
UNIVERSITIES					
Cape Town	59%	83%	73%	61%	31%
Stellenbosch	55%	89%	83%	62%	25%
Rhodes	53%	94%	72%	50%	27%
Witwatersrand	52%	88%	78%	59%	23%
Western Cape	48%	90%		47%	14%
North West	47%	95%	90%	58%	9%
Pretoria	37%	86%	74%	39%	8%
Free State	45%	94%	84%	53%	17%
Fort Hare	38%	74%	55%	47%	14%
KwaZulu-Natal	36%	80%	70%	51%	14%
Limpopo	20%	61%	72%	24%	3%
COMPREHENSIVE UNIVERSITIES					
Nelson Mandela Metropolitan	36%	91%	58%	45%	12%
Unisa	34%	72%	68%	29%	6%
Venda	34%	99%	87%	58%	8%
Zululand	34%	97%	93%	53%	14%
Johannesburg	24%	71%	53%	21%	6%
Walter Sisulu	10%	68%	86%	25%	3%
UNIVERSITIES OF TECHNOLOGY					
Central	26%	100%	94%	59%	7%
Vaal	15%	81%	59%	25%	2%
Tshwane	17%	94%	46%	23%	3%
Cape Peninsula	12%	92%	39%	19%	5%
Durban	10%	35%	42%	16%	2%
Mangosuthu	5%	0%	8%	12%	4%

Permanent academics without doctoral degrees (2008–2010)



	ANNUAL AVERAGES FOR 2008-2010					
	Total permanent academics		Professors	Assoc. professors	Senior lecturers	Lecturers
	Who do not have doctoral degrees	% of total without doctoral degrees	% of total in rank without doctoral degrees	% of total in rank without doctoral degrees	% of total in rank without doctoral degrees	% of total in rank without doctoral degrees
Universities	5356	56%	14%	23%	50%	82%
Comprehensive universities	2795	71%	23%	33%	68%	92%
Universities of technology	2367	86%	21%	54%	76%	96%
TOTAL	10518	65%	16%	29%	59%	88%

High-level knowledge outputs of permanent academics

Not ranked; arranged alphabetically by university within categories



	Annual averages for 2008-2010				
	Permanent academics		Research publication units		
	Total	Total with doctorates	Publication units produced	Units per total permanent academics	Units per permanent academics with doctorates
UNIVERSITIES					
Cape Town	961	563	1166	1.2	2.1
Fort Hare	223	85	121	0.5	1.4
Free State	777	346	475	0.6	1.4
KwaZulu-Natal	1444	515	1057	0.7	2.1
Limpopo	756	150	84	0.1	0.6
North West	1003	474	514	0.5	1.1
Pretoria	1655	620	1186	0.7	1.9
Rhodes	317	168	323	1.0	1.9
Stellenbosch	886	491	1014	1.1	2.1
Western Cape	517	336	262	0.5	0.8
Witwatersrand	985	508	911	0.9	1.8
COMPREHENSIVE UNIVERSITIES					
Johannesburg	864	204	459	0.5	2.3
Nelson Mandela Metropolitan	558	204	219	0.4	1.1
Unisa	1369	468	644	0.5	1.4
Venda	302	101	56	0.2	0.6
Walter Sisulu	574	58	31	0.1	0.5
Zululand	246	83	69	0.3	0.8
UNIVERSITIES OF TECHNOLOGY					
Cape Peninsula	720	88	121	0.2	1.4
Central	243	64	33	0.1	0.5
Durban	562	56	43	0.1	0.8
Tshwane	803	139	151	0.2	1.1
Vaal	304	45	33	0.1	0.7
Mangosuthu	135	6	5	0.0	0.7

Productivity ranking of 2004 & 2005 cohorts of new doctoral entrants in science and technology programmes



Ranked in descending order by total of graduates produced



	Cohort of new entrants in 2004+2005	Total graduated after 6 years	% of new entrants graduated	University's share of graduates
Cape Town	272	177	65%	19%
Pretoria	287	146	51%	16%
Witwatersrand	198	121	61%	13%
KwaZulu-Natal	226	106	47%	11%
North West	97	58	60%	6%
Free State	119	51	43%	6%
Rhodes	64	47	73%	5%
Stellenbosch	65	47	72%	5%
Johannesburg	93	44	47%	5%
Western Cape	74	33	45%	4%
Nelson Mandela Metropolitan	36	18	50%	2%
Tshwane	31	16	52%	2%
Fort Hare	27	12	44%	1%
Unisa	60	10	17%	1%
Limpopo	37	9	24%	1%
Cape Peninsula	23	8	35%	1%
Venda	13	6	46%	1%
Durban	19	5	26%	1%
Central	19	4	21%	0%
Zululand	16	3	19%	0%
Vaal	22	3	14%	0%
Walter Sisulu	0	0	0%	0%
Mangosuthu	0	0	0%	0%
TOTALS	1798	924	51%	100%

Efficiency ranking of 2004 & 2005 cohorts of new doctoral entrants in science and technology programmes

Ranked in descending order by % of cohort graduating



	Cohort of new entrants in 2004 +2005	Total graduated after 6 years	% of new entrants graduated	University's share of graduates
Rhodes	64	47	73%	5%
Stellenbosch	65	47	72%	5%
Cape Town	272	177	65%	19%
Witwatersrand	198	121	61%	13%
North West	97	58	60%	6%
Tshwane	31	16	52%	2%
Pretoria	287	146	51%	16%
Nelson Mandela Metropolitan	36	18	50%	2%
KwaZulu-Natal	226	106	47%	11%
Johannesburg	93	44	47%	5%
Venda	13	6	46%	1%
Western Cape	74	33	45%	4%
Fort Hare	27	12	44%	1%
Free State	119	51	43%	6%
Cape Peninsula	23	8	35%	1%
Durban	19	5	26%	1%
Limpopo	37	9	24%	1%
Central	19	4	21%	0%
Zululand	16	3	19%	0%
Unisa	60	10	17%	1%
Vaal	22	3	14%	0%
Walter Sisulu	0	0	0%	0%
Mangosuthu	0	0	0%	0%
TOTALS	1669	924	55%	100%



Ian Bunting

iabunting@pine-wood.co.za