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Introduction

This report is the result of carefully culling through OECD publications relating to higher education. Many of the Organisation’s in-depth studies and analyses over several years from various Directorates have revealed important information about higher education, yet this information is scattered and sometimes difficult to find among a wealth of data.

The impetus behind this publication was a motivation to provide an essential service to members of the OECD’s Higher Education Programme. Sympathetic to higher education leaders under time pressure yet who can make good use of relevant and timely higher education data, the OECD Higher Education Programme seeks to support the essential work of its members working in the field.

This report is the first of what will be produced as an annual publication, with exclusive access for members of the Higher Education Programme. The topics chosen by the programme’s Governing Board for 2013 are:

- higher education returns and financing
- higher education, skills and employer expectations
- lessons from the Feasibility Study on the Assessment of Higher Education Learning Outcomes (AHELO)

In addition, five articles were commissioned from experts in the field to share further information and spark debate among members.

Higher education is important in terms of public and private financial and non-financial returns. Given the level of investment, it is in everyone’s interest to get it right. Some of the key aspects of getting it right involve priorities from within and from outside higher education:

- quality in teaching and learning for good student outcomes
- labour market relevance for the employability of students.

Chapter 1: Higher education returns and financing

KEY FINDINGS

The public and individuals benefit from higher education HE in financial and non-financial ways.

Higher education generates positive returns to the public in general, as well as to the people who obtain degrees. Although higher education is expensive, financial returns are much greater than returns for lower levels of education. In addition, society and higher education graduates enjoy a variety of non-economic returns, including lower crime rates, longer life expectancy, more life satisfaction and better health.

Higher education without a degree does not boost earnings.

Despite the many benefits of higher education, not everyone who enrolls in higher education achieves an advanced degree. Many people drop or fail out of higher education for various reasons and this can be very costly. Although there are some benefits to higher education participation, even if no degree is earned, drop-outs do not usually enjoy the same financial returns that degree holders can expect.
Returns to higher education vary considerably by gender and field of study.

Net private returns to higher education are typically higher for men than for women. Nevertheless, women are likely to benefit more from higher education than men, including women who work in sectors with relatively lower salaries. This is because, in general, wages for women without higher education are significantly lower than wages for men without higher education.

Large differences in earnings by field of study appear in many countries, although internationally comparable data does not yet exist. Higher education degrees in science, technology, engineering, and mathematics typically lead to jobs with salaries 60% to 90% higher than salaries in arts, education and other humanities fields.

The share of public funding for HE is in decline.

Although the dollar amounts of public investment in higher education have increased in recent years, the share of the total cost covered by public funds is in decline. On average across OECD countries, 68% of higher education is publicly funded, down from 77% in 1995 and 71% in 2005. Most of the decline in the share of public investment is happening in non-European countries, where tuition fees are generally higher and enterprises participate more actively in financing higher education.

Countries increasingly rely on cost sharing to finance higher education.

Demand for higher education is high and rising in every country, including countries with near-universal rates of participation. At the same time, higher education costs are rising, in part because teaching in higher education may be less amenable to capital substitution than activities in other sectors.

As a result, cost sharing is increasingly used to address the need for revenue from non-governmental sources. Beyond the financial rationale, cost sharing is also seen as justified from the perspective of equity, given the large private returns of higher education, and because market values may help make higher education more responsive to students and society.

KEY POLICY RECOMMENDATIONS

Higher education institutions should help students succeed and graduate.

Higher education institutions should ensure that students are informed of the financial and non-financial risks of dropping out of higher education. Effective student support services can help students succeed and graduate.

Student aid is important to ensure cost sharing does not limit access.

As cost sharing is used more widely, there is a need to adapt approaches to student aid. The introduction of generally available loans (loans that do not depend on the creditworthiness of the family), or means-tested student grants, paid for in part from tuition revenue, can help maintain access to higher education for disadvantaged students. It is important to ensure that repayment of such loans is income dependent, so as to remove the notion of risk that might deter risk-adverse students from low-income backgrounds from participating.
Chapter 2: Higher education, skills and employers’ expectations

KEY FINDINGS

Higher education is increasingly relevant due to the shifting demand in skills.

Employment rates are highest among higher education graduates; graduates also tend to earn relatively high salaries and enjoy stable employment conditions. Higher education graduates have also been less affected by the rise of unemployment since the 2008 global financial crisis. This situation is driven in large part by the continued expansion of occupations requiring higher-level skills, while the share of employment for occupations associated with lower education levels is shrinking on average across OECD countries (OECD, 2013c).

Employment rates vary significantly according to gender and field of study.

On average across OECD countries and all education levels, only 65% of women are employed, compared with 80% of men. However, the gap between men’s and women’s employment rates is smallest among those with higher education degrees, where the difference is less than 10 percentage points on average.

Employment rates and earnings also vary significantly according to the field of study, with more stable and well-paid employment concentrated in science, technology and engineering fields and below average employment stability and earnings for arts and humanities graduates.

More women complete programmes in the humanities, arts, education, health and welfare fields, while more men complete programmes in mathematics, science and engineering. This further impacts differences among genders in terms of employment rates and earnings.

Higher education leads to higher proficiency in information-processing skills.

The recent OECD Survey of Adult Skills shows that people who attain higher education degrees usually demonstrate the highest levels of key information-processing skills such as literacy, numeracy and problem-solving in technology-rich environments.

Higher education graduates have opportunities to strengthen these skills, both during their studies and later, because they are more likely to access demanding jobs that help them maintain and further develop their skills.

However, the Survey of Adult Skills highlights striking differences between countries in the skills of tertiary degree holders. In a few countries, young adults with secondary education outperform tertiary graduates from other countries.

Skills evolve over the life cycle, and the best way to maintain skills is to use them.

The Survey of Adult Skills indicates that proficiency increases in increments from age 16 and peaks around age 30. While older adults generally show lower skill levels than their younger counterparts, the skill gap between generations varies considerably among countries. This reflects differences in the quantity and quality of education received by older generations, but also suggests that some countries are better than others at mitigating the effects of ageing and allowing people to maintain their skills over time.

Another key finding of the Survey of Adult Skills is that practice helps maintain or even improve skills: adults who engage more often in literacy- and numeracy-related activities and regularly use information and
communications technologies (ICTs) at work have higher proficiency levels. The relationship is even stronger for the use of these skills outside work.

**Employers expect a mix of skills from higher education graduates.**

While employers want higher education graduates to arrive on the labour market “work-ready”, they are often reluctant to invest in developing transferable skills in their employees. Instead, employers expect higher education institutions to ensure graduates have the required academic and professional skills upon completing their degrees.

When asked to prioritise the skills that higher education institutions should focus on developing in a context of constrained time and resources, employers tend to identify discipline-specific professional expertise and generic academic skills as most critical. While they also highly value interpersonal skills, international orientation, strategic/organisation skills, and commercial/entrepreneurial skills, employers suggest that these types of skills could also be developed outside of higher education.

Research also highlights that employers do not expect higher education graduates to all have the same types or level of skills. Employers have different expectations and needs in terms of graduates’ skills, which can only be met by a mix of skills across the pool of higher education graduates. Employers also have different views of graduate employability: for example, employer perceptions of the employability of Bachelor’s, Master’s and Doctoral graduates vary across European countries. Overall, however, employers stress the importance of ensuring that higher education curricula and practices are relevant to labour market needs.

**Partnerships with employers and quality workplace learning enhance employability.**

Recent research points out that employers value the introduction of a period of practical experience in higher education programmes, for example through internships or dual programmes that combine work and study. Workplace learning has been shown to significantly increase graduates’ labour market success.

**KEY POLICY RECOMMENDATIONS**

**Institutions have to balance higher education principles with labour market priorities.**

Driving economic development is only one of the roles of higher education institutions and must be balanced with other priorities, including quality research and knowledge production. It is, therefore, important to ensure a balance between the priorities of the labour market and the relevance of the curriculum with a sufficient level of institutional autonomy to ensure academic freedom.

**Institutions should keep students informed of labour market risks and opportunities.**

There is greater demand for people with high-level skills in the labour market than there are higher education graduates; however, many students choose study fields that lead to poor employment prospects. Although it is difficult to predict changes in the labour market or to match short-term labour market needs with longer-term higher education outcomes, higher education institutions should help students become as informed as possible about how their study field choices will affect their options in the labour market. Institutions could also take steps to encourage women to enrol in high demand study fields, many of which also lead to a higher payoff.
Institutions should be differentiated to serve diverse niches and needs of society.

Employers do not want all graduates to have the same skills and levels of expertise. Higher education institutions should encourage creativity and originality in students and they should demonstrate their own originality by differentiating themselves from the competition. No university can be all things to all people; however, any university can develop a cachet of excellence in a chosen area or for a specific stakeholder group.

There are local measures institutions can take to open access to higher education.

Opening access to higher education is a priority in every country. This mandate may run counter to the priorities of the higher education sector where merit remains the first consideration; however, institutions should strive to open access as part of their mission in service to society and to diversify the student and faculty profiles.

In systems where potential students do not have the necessary skills to succeed in higher education after compulsory education, institutions should develop strategies to help improve compulsory education, i.e. through improving teacher education and curricular reform. Institutions can also offer remedial programmes and other appropriate student support services to help students develop the skills they need to succeed.

Institutions can contribute to gender equality in study fields, which will influence the labour market.

Higher education institutions can help promote gender equality across study fields by implementing career counselling and student guidance services.

Broader policy measures would also need to be considered to help increase women’s participation in the labour market, including providing childcare subsidies with employment; increasing the availability of affordable, flexible, high-quality childcare services, especially for single mothers; providing maternity and paternity leave; and offering flexible working hours.

Higher education institutions can take steps to enhance the employability of graduates.

Higher education institutions must develop and maintain an active, open line of communication with a range of labour market stakeholders and employers in particular. Resources such as higher education alumni, buffer organisations and consortiums of higher education institutions can play a role in fostering a robust relationship with the labour market. Internally, ensuring that external stakeholders are actively involved on institutional governing boards can be crucial to institutions’ relationships with the labour market.

The development of workplace training opportunities can strengthen ties between higher education and the labour market and enhance the employability of graduates. OECD research highlights several practices that help achieve these objectives, such as establishing permanent structures within institutions and single points of contact with employers and consistent monitoring of students’ experiences during and after workplace training, with particular attention on the quality of training.

Institutions can play a significant role in helping individuals maintain and upgrade their skills throughout life.

By paying growing attention to the effective labour market insertion of their graduates, higher education institutions (HEIs) could contribute both to the productive use of skills in the economy and help prevent individuals’ skill loss.
Further, graduation should not be a farewell to higher education. With adult education programmes, higher education institutions can contribute to up-skilling or re-skilling higher education graduates later in their careers; work with employers to develop training programmes, train trainers and raise awareness about the need for at-work skill development; and support the government with programmes to help people maintain and recover skills as they age. Such programmes may mean rethinking tertiary admission criteria and delivering programmes in flexible ways to meet the needs of adult learners.

Chapter 3: Lessons from the feasibility study on AHELO

KEY FINDINGS

The AHELO concept emerged to fill an information gap.

The strong development of quality assurance systems is one of the most significant developments in higher education since the early 1980s. Yet while the fundamental question when it comes to quality is how effective higher education is at teaching and learning, none of the quality assurance indicators and proxies for quality directly measure learning outcomes. There is a clear need for a way to assess institutional performance in this area. Accordingly, the AHELO concept aimed to provide a direct evaluation of student learning outcomes at the global level and to enable institutions to benchmark the performance of their students against their peers as part of their improvement efforts.

The AHELO feasibility study aimed at proving a concept.

While a number of higher education systems have developed assessments of learning outcomes at national level, the feasibility study on the Assessment of Higher Education Learning Outcomes (AHELO) has been breaking ground in attempting to develop such an assessment at the international level. The purpose of the AHELO feasibility study was to provide a proof of concept: is it technically and practically feasible to assess what students know and can do near graduation across different contexts?

The study comprised four strands of work and involved a mixed group of countries.

The study unfolded in four distinct strands of work. The first three strands consisted of developing and implementing assessments of learning outcomes in three different domains: Generic Skills, Economics and Engineering, while the fourth strand examined the measurement of value-added in higher education through a reflection on methodological approaches, data needs, and the pros and cons of different approaches.

Since the feasibility study tested the challenges of capturing higher education outcomes internationally, taking into account cultural and linguistic differences, it was important to cover quite different countries to provide a reasonably balanced picture in terms of geographic, linguistic and cultural diversity in each strand.

Instrument development paid careful attention to the reduction of potential bias.

An assessment instrument was developed for each of the three strands, through consultation with international experts in the discipline areas. Contextual instruments were also developed to identify factors that would explain observed learning outcomes, e.g. student context, faculty context, institution context. Once the instruments were developed, they were translated, adapted, pre-tested and revised to ensure that the resulting measures of learning outcomes would be valid, reliable and free of bias to the extent possible.
A large-scale test of practical implementation.

Test instruments and contextual surveys were implemented from the beginning of 2012 until July 2012. Data was collected from almost 23,000 students, 4,800 faculty and more than 240 institution Co-ordinators across all 17 participating countries.

Quality, validity and reliability of AHELO instruments.

The AHELO feasibility study produced many items that functioned well, despite some degree of differential item functioning for some of them. All three instruments also achieved reasonable levels of validity. Finally, the three instruments functioned reliably overall, meaning the results were consistent and stable across different testing situations.

Scoring was reliable in all three strands. Although variations were observed in scoring across countries, the scores were consistent in the rank orderings of the quality of the responses, which indicates that with appropriate training and scoring monitoring, student responses can be scored reliably across countries.

Analysis of the AHELO feasibility study results pertain only to the instruments tested, but suggests that it is feasible to assess student learning outcomes internationally.

Because of the limitations inherent to a feasibility study, the analysis pertains only to the instruments tested and cannot be generalised. However, it can be concluded from the outcomes that it seems feasible to assess student learning outcomes internationally.

Even more importantly, the feasibility study sparked debate.

A number of participants from different countries felt they got something extra out of the feasibility study because it brought about deep reflections on teaching and learning. This is perhaps the most important lesson from the feasibility study: that the assessment of higher education outcomes is not an end in itself, but rather a stimulus to deeper professional dialogue on desired learning outcomes and the teaching approaches needed to achieve them. The study was, therefore, a success for bringing the issue of learning outcomes to the forefront of the quality assurance debate. The questions raised throughout the process of the feasibility study are as much a part of its success as the actual findings.

Was AHELO worth the cost? It is too soon to tell.

Different stakeholders in the AHELO feasibility study have different opinions as to whether the exercise was worth the cost. The general consensus is that more data and analysis could still be gained from the feasibility study before a judgment on worth vs. cost can be made.

KEY RECOMMENDATIONS ON POLICY AND METHODOLOGY

Higher education institutions can take steps to increase the focus on learning outcomes.

Irrespective of the different viewpoints of stakeholders regarding the value or the feasibility of an AHELO, a clear outcome from the feasibility study lies in the increased attention on learning outcomes, which is unlikely to fade away. In this context, institutions are likely to face growing pressures to demonstrate their performance in this area. In anticipation, they can take steps to adopt a stronger focus on learning outcomes.
Lessons from the feasibility study design can inform future assessment efforts.

The design of the feasibility study deliberately sought to confront the challenges associated with diversity and, as more countries joined, the final set of participants encompassed even more diversity than originally planned. Overall, this diversity proved to be a source of added richness to the feasibility study. Efforts to bring together diverse experts to define learning outcomes and develop the instruments paid off and the proof of concept was successful.

The feasibility study chose institutions as units of analysis. While this proved to be a reasonable approach and the volunteer institutions seemed highly motivated, a follow-up survey of participating institutions would be useful to probe deeply into which aspects and data are most useful and attractive to them.

The feasibility study process also affirmed the importance of seeking input from key stakeholders and the value of consultative processes. These consultations brought invaluable perspectives and any future development would only be enhanced by even greater involvement of all stakeholder communities.

The study design adopted an artificial distinction into three separate strands of work. In many ways, the discipline strands proved more straightforward to implement. However, the relative merits of adopting a discipline-based versus generic skills approach in the future needs to reflect further consideration of the relevant learning outcomes for different institutions and how they would want to use the results for improvement.

The goals of an AHELO have important implications for instrument design.

An interesting finding from the study was the existence of trade-offs in item types. Overall, constructed-response tasks were engaging for students and brought about key insights for pedagogy, but this came at the cost of lower reliability of these items. By contrast, multiple choice items were highly reliable, but leveraged less value for teaching and pedagogy. A direct implication is that for any future AHELO, the balance of different item types should reflect the aims of the assessment, with more emphasis on constructed response tasks wherever the focus is on quality improvement and more emphasis on multiple choice items if the aim is to develop accountability measures.

International consensus on assessment frameworks is essential to the instrument development process.

A major challenge was to demonstrate that an assessment framework could be agreed upon across diverse country and institutional settings. This process went smoothly in the discipline strands, where it proved easier than expected to get agreement amongst discipline experts (including in Economics) on what AHELO should cover and measure. By contrast, the Generic Skills framework was only developed late in the process, thus limiting the scope for expert consensus. A lesson from this experience is that establishing international consensus on the assessment framework should be an essential upstream part of the instrument development process. Another lesson is that what might have seemed at the time as a reasonable short-cut may not have been the most cost-effective approach after all. This underlines the importance of developing completely new, tailor-made instruments for any future AHELO.

Further analysis of the feasibility study results will be needed to unpack all findings.

While the AHELO concept proved feasible overall, the feasibility study exercise highlighted that there are methodological and practical challenges that would need to be addressed and overcome for any future full-scale endeavour. These include the development of an internationally-valid framework to assess learning outcomes related to the acquisition of generic skills, the analysis of the various contextual factors that
ARTICLES BY EXPERTS

The following five chapters are original contributions from intellectuals and experts in the higher education field. The authors were invited to contribute to this report to share information and stimulate debate.

Three articles focus on issues of institutional concern, such as autonomy, labour market relevance and the advent of new modes of provision:

- The first article, by higher education consultant Mrs Holta Vrioni, opens this section of the report with an historical overview of the key trends and debates surrounding institutional autonomy and academic freedom, particularly the tensions that have arisen with the “evaluative state”.

- The second article, by Dr. Martin Humbug and Professor Rolf van der Velden, explains a framework for re-thinking skill formation in higher education. The authors contend that it is critical to think very carefully about which skills should be developed in higher education and which left to the learner to develop elsewhere.

- Finally, Professor Peter Coaldrake and Dr. Lawrence Stedman lay out the context of technological innovation in higher education and the advent of Mass Open Online Courses (MOOCs). The authors argue that technology can, ideally, help defend and preserve the best elements of traditional university education.

The next two articles focus on the prevalent global issues of institutional financing and international mobility:

- First, Dr. Ellen Hazelkorn reflects on the impact of the economic crisis on higher education, including the disconcerting finding that institutional responses to austerity often result in greater social stratification.

- Second, Professor Philip G. Altbach airs concerns about international brain drain and institutional responsibility. This candid exposé explores the topic in greater depth than Professor Altbach has written on the subject to date.

Disclaimer: The views expressed in these commissioned articles are those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect the views of the OECD.

Chapter 4: Key tensions and debates surrounding institutional autonomy and academic freedom

_Holta Vrioni_

The relationship between the university and its stakeholders is rife with tension. In many countries, the public structure and funding of higher education institutions result in the “single master” syndrome, by which the one who pays also decides. Without exception, when there is a single master, this master is the government. In principle and in good practice, institutional autonomy should be upheld for the management of universities. However, autonomy should not be absolute in university governance, since universities have direct incentives to do some things (such as maximise revenue), but no direct incentives to do others (such as diversify student enrolment), many of which serve the larger public interest. To ensure that universities fulfil their defined missions and serve the greater public interest, autonomy should be in balance with accountability to stakeholders.
Chapter 5: A note on skill formation in higher education

Martin Humburg, Rolf van der Velden

Higher education is facing many challenges, including increased student enrolments, diversification of the student population and decreasing budgets. Meeting the demands of the labour market is another of the major challenges faced by higher education.

In the area of meeting demands of the labour market, the role of higher education has significantly changed over the past century. When higher education was still elite education, graduates were certain to find good jobs. Nowadays, getting a higher education degree does not automatically guarantee a good position on the labour market. Between 2008 and 2011, the unemployment rate of young adults with a higher education degree has risen from 3.3% to 4.8% in OECD countries as a result of the economic crisis (OECD, 2013). These figures do not take into account the probably substantial number of graduates who avoided unemployment by accepting jobs for which they are overqualified and in which they are not able to put the skills they acquired in higher education to full use.

Questions therefore arise as to whether higher education meets the demands of today’s labour market. Could higher education contribute more to the innovative capacities of economies? Should more attention be paid to the so-called 21st century skills? If so, which ones? Should higher education produce more generalists to keep up with the fast changing world? Or should it focus more on producing specialists who can deal with the increasing complexity of the work to be done? Should higher education focus on imparting skills that increase short-term employability, or should it focus on imparting skills that ensure long-term employability?

These are not easy questions to answer and we need a more systematic approach for dealing with them. This paper outlines a framework to help think about skill formation in higher education in a more structured way.

Chapter 6: Weapons of mass instruction

Peter Coald rake and Lawrence Stedman

The promise of technological enhancement for universities has long been accompanied by prophesies of fundamental disruption and change. While people have been furiously speculating about what MOOCs might mean, universities have to make practical and strategic decisions, and student expectations are rising while government funds are tightening. To do this, universities need to separate the real promises and threats from the hype and wishful thinking, and put what students need and want at the forefront of their thinking.
Chapter 7: Impact of the global economic crisis on higher education: the leadership and policy challenges

Ellen Hazelkorn

The 2008 global financial crisis triggered the collapse of financial institutions around the world, rising unemployment, and prolonged problems of public and private debt. Some governments have been able to maintain or expand funding for higher education and research, while others have been forced to reduce expenditure. An OECD conference in 2009 found the crisis was likely to precipitate trends already apparent, and while there were short term measures or adjustments that could and should be made, there were likely to be long term implications. Four years on, how much do we understand about the impact of the crisis on higher education institutions and the challenges being faced by institutional leaders? Do the changes simply reflect the continuation of existing trends, or do they signify a transformative paradigm shift in the Western model of publicly-funded mass higher education?

This chapter presents preliminary results of an international survey of higher education leaders conducted during 2012-13. From the perspective of institutional resilience, the chapter looks at issues of institutional strategy, quality finance, student participation and faculty work, and considers the range of remedial actions and strategies being adopted by HEIs around the world.

Chapter 8: The world is not flat: The brain drain and higher education in the 21st century

Philip G. Altbach

The academic brain drain is alive – many scientists and scholars from developing and middle-income countries are attracted to the North to teach and conduct research. These academics, despite the global knowledge economy, are largely lost to their home countries. Increasingly, the policies of the rich countries favour encouraging international graduates to remain by boosting “stay rates” to counteract demographic declines. The loss of top talent from Africa, especially, and other developing areas is quite considerable. Do the universities and governments of the North have any responsibility to the academic systems and economies of the developing world?
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