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Introduction

Although it has almost become a cliché to describe the contexts in which higher education (HE) is situated as being ‘challenging’ or representing a ‘period of change or flux’, it is, in the case of the Republic of Ireland, not too far removed from the truth. In common with many European and non-European societies, Irish HE has over the past half a century evolved from an ‘elite’ to a ‘mass’ system in accordance with international trends, albeit with residual ‘elite’ features, particularly in older universities, and continuing social stratification. In 1965 there were five universities and a number of teaching training colleges which accommodated 18,127 full-time undergraduate students. By 2012, the HE system encompassed over 40 institutions, including 7 universities and 14 Institutes of Technology (IoTs): Higher Education Authority (HEA)-funded institutions accommodated 163,046 students, including 21,560 postgraduates. Beneath this headline data is a heterogeneous arrangement of HE institutions and state organisations, such as the HEA.

The Irish HE sector, which is explored here through the dimensions of history, policy debate, institutional standpoints, socio-political positioning and participant experiences, provides a fascinating case study of a small European system. This study becomes all the more relevant when set within the matrix of unparalleled socio-economic demands and increasing state intervention at a time of extraordinary economic uncertainty and societal change. The confluence of so many influential and even determining factors on a small sector offers the opportunity to study critically how these factors affect national aspirations, institutional missions and individual experiences.

This volume invites the reader to study the dynamics of the Irish HE system, both historically and contemporaneously. It is also the first collection of chapters to explore Irish HE from a wide variety of disciplinary perspectives and across a range of themes, each of which could potentially be given book-length treatment. Indeed, Irish HE has received relatively little
scholarly attention in the literature both nationally and internationally, and in particular it has not been the subject of a dedicated study exploring various aspects of historical and contemporary transformation. However, there is an extensive and ever-growing corpus of literature from state and non-state sources both within and outside the Republic (the latter exemplified by the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD)) in the form of reports, commentaries, evaluations and foresight proposals. This ‘official merchandise’, so to speak, has (with some exceptions) dominated the debate and largely shaped the discourse around the role and purpose of HE for many years. It is only recently that other voices that provide an alternative to this narrative or at least a critical commentary upon it are beginning to emerge. This volume is our attempt to provide a ‘pause’ in the process of near-perpetual change and take stock of where HE has ‘got to’ as both a socio-cultural phenomenon and a form of lifeworld for many thousands of participants. The contributions are written mainly by academics, and also by colleagues with experience of HE administration, so it offers a critical perspective from those who have been caught up in mediating such far-reaching changes. Also to reflect the binary nature of the system, the authors are drawn both from the universities and the IoTs.

The text can be regarded as having two parts, though no formal division is necessary. The first part covers what might loosely be described as the ‘macro’ dimensions of HE, whereas the second part explores the more ‘meso’ and ‘micro’ dimensions. For those of us who are familiar with the sector, these dimensions form an intricate matrix; hence it is not possible, for example, to discuss teaching and learning in HE without reference to the Bologna process or that of knowledge production to graduate labour markets. The same logic applies to the theme of access and participation, which becomes intelligible only with reference to a number of interrelated ‘bigger’ concepts such as lifelong learning or economic growth and regeneration. To retain a coherent narrative, material is cross-referenced between chapters and there is a strong integration of theoretical and empirical work. However, it seemed apposite to start the book by setting the historical context of the system.

For those unfamiliar with Irish HE, John Walsh’s two chapters provide a fascinating glimpse into the historical evolution of the system, from one of relative neglect and fraught with religious disagreement to being placed at the forefront of political agendas predicated on societal and economic regeneration and ‘modernisation’ influenced by actors both ‘domestic and foreign’. The latter theme of regeneration in particular is a very familiar narrative across many countries and in the context of the ‘knowledge-based economy’ is explored and critiqued by Andrew Loxley in Chapter 3 (‘From Seaweed & Peat to Pills & Very Small Things: Knowledge Production and Higher Education in the Irish Context’). Along with the rapid expansion of the human capital formation function of HE, knowledge generation (for the increasingly familiar motive of commercialisation) has absorbed significant
resources over the past 20 years and has been positioned by policymakers as a totem of national and institutional prestige. In taking the classic theme of Bildung, Aidan Seery offers a different view on the role of HE in formation and development of the individual. He poses a direct challenge to the near-hegemonic discourse of crude utilitarianism, which has underpinned for the past five decades much of official thinking around what kind of graduate should emerge from HE institutions. In continuing with the macro view of the system, Michael Grenfell in Chapter 5 (‘Ireland and the Field of Higher Education: A Bourdieusian Perspective’) brings the distinctive perspective of field theory to bear upon the Irish landscape, whilst making prescient comparisons with the United Kingdom and France. This is timely as new systemic governance structures in Ireland which are being constructed around ‘service-level agreements’ seem to be emerging into a hybrid of Napoleonic centralisation, characteristic of the French experience, with the licensed autonomy characteristic of both Ireland and the United Kingdom.

Ireland has a relatively small but well-established network of private and/or demand-absorbing HE providers (as characterised by UNESCO), which is a theme critically explored by David Limond. In his chapter (‘Prospects for a Private, Indigenous and For-Profit University in Dublin’), he traces the growth and future possibilities for such institutions and the effect, if any, they have upon the state-funded system. Concluding the macro-orientated chapters, Andrew Loxley provides a largely numerical overview of the system through the prism of the academic workforce, their outputs and subsequent evaluations of their work in ‘Measures & Metrics and Academic Labour’. In contrast to the expansion in student numbers, the size of the academic workforce has remained fairly constant over the past ten years and has across a number of measures become more productive – a perhaps surprising conclusion in the light of much critical comment of academic practices in the media and sometimes from the political elite.

In shifting the book’s orientation into the meso and micro dimensions of HE, Ted Fleming and Fergal Finnegan in their chapter (‘A Critical Journey Towards Lifelong Learning: Including Non-Traditional Students in University’) take up the theme of access and widening participation. Although the issue of participation beyond the traditional cohort has, to the credit of Irish policymakers, formed part of the HE agenda for over two decades, this heterogeneous group has still remained very much a minority at least within the more traditional universities. Although the diversification of the HE system since the 1960s has offered greater avenues of opportunity, particularly to students from low-income families, significant inequalities have persisted in the relative pattern of participation between advantaged and traditionally under-represented groups, with below average rates of participation closely linked to socio-economic status, age, ethnic background or disability.

The next chapter by Anne Murphy takes up the interconnected theme of the student experience (‘Student Experience and Engagement in Higher
Introduction

Although student well-being should be central to the work of any academic institution, it has for policymakers taken on the status of a potential panacea for a variety of persistent challenges. Re-configuring ‘first-year experience’ in particular is being seen, despite a lack of empirical evidence, as a remedy for non-progression, which in the Irish system is relatively low in the universities, although higher in the IoT sector. A quiet revolution which has taken place in Irish HE is the relatively unproblematic adoption of the Bologna Process. Frank McMahon in his chapter ‘Bologna: Consonance or Dissonance?’ narrates, from his position of (a now retired) HE administrator, how this process became part of the Irish landscape. This discussion segues into Damian Murchan’s chapter on curricular change. In this chapter entitled ‘Changing Curriculum and Assessment Mindsets in Higher Education’, Damian Murchan also takes up the theme of how the human capital agenda has influenced this dimension of academic practice. He explores the extent to which the internal dynamics of institutions foster or inhibit the adoption or development of innovative forms of curricula and assessment. As an example of this tension, Tom Farrelly, in his chapter on ‘E-Learning and Higher Education – Hyperbole and Reality’, provides a timely critique of the extent to which this mode of teaching and learning has become part of the Irish system. He cogently argues that there is a significant gap between the rhetoric of policymakers and senior HE administrators and the realities experienced by the student and lecturer in the milieu of e-learning.

In the final two chapters, Carmel O’Sullivan and Ciara O’Farrell take up the related themes of academic professional development and the emergence of Teaching and Learning Centres (TLCs). These themes echo the recent official focus on the quality and extent of teaching in third-level institutions. New managerialist ideas regarding the academic profession stress the perceived (or imagined) need to demonstrate accountability and transparency in all aspects of academic life, but most especially in the public activity of teaching. On the learner side, increases in student registration charges, or fees by any other name, are understandably leading to students making more vocal demands for good teaching and quality contact with their tutors. One of the responses to these demands and pressures is evident from the establishment of TLCs throughout HE systems, although the scope, roles, stability and operational foci of such centres are still diverse and often ambiguous in their institutional and national settings. In the final chapter O’Farrell envisions a broader, more sustainable role for TLCs based on more strategic leadership, which would embed their position within the academy. The book ends with the obvious but hopefully more richly detailed recognition that the endeavour of HE is a complex one but full of creative ambiguity and challenge.
1
The Transformation of Higher Education in Ireland, 1945–80

John Walsh

Introduction

The Irish higher education (HE) system has undergone a far-reaching transformation over the past half a century, driven in part by changing social and cultural norms but primarily by government intervention linked to the dominant national priority of economic development. The origins of far-reaching policy change can be traced to the period immediately following the Second World War, when a small, ‘elite’ Irish HE system struggled to cope with the consequences of long-term official neglect of third-level education, combined with the first indications of increasing social demand. A dramatic change in government policy towards higher education, combined with the impact of increased participation in the second-level sector, stimulated a long-term transformation of higher education in the 30-year period from the 1950s to the 1980s. The sea change in HE policy early in this period was driven by changing attitudes among domestic political elites, linked to the influence of international ideas mediated through the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD). Government policies focused on quantitative expansion of participation, coupled with a far-reaching diversification at system, institutional and subject levels to meet perceived economic requirements for a more highly skilled workforce and accommodate increasing social demand for third-level education (Ó Buachalla, 1984, pp.165–7; Clancy, 1989 in Mulcahy and O'Sullivan, pp.99–150).

Martin Trow’s theoretical model for the development of higher education indicates a progression from ‘elite’ to ‘mass’ systems of higher education and ultimately to ‘universal’ access (Trow, 1974, pp.61–2). He suggests that the entry of over 15% of the relevant school-leaving age cohort to higher education marked the transition from traditional ‘elite’ institutions to ‘mass’ education, with 50% identified as a similar threshold for ‘universal’ education (Ibid., pp.61–2). Perhaps the most valuable insight of Trow’s model was
not its concept of linear progression which was subsequently questioned, not least by Trow himself (Clancy, 1989, p.100), but its focus on the transformative nature of expansion which exerted a far-reaching influence at all levels of institutional life, work and culture: ‘Mass higher education systems differ from elite higher education not only quantitatively but qualitatively… the differences between these phases are quite fundamental and pervade every aspect of higher education’ (Trow, 1974, p.61).

The Irish HE system followed a similar trajectory to Western European norms, although it began to expand somewhat later than some developed European states, including Sweden, Denmark and West Germany (Trow, 1974, p.61). O’Sullivan suggests that religious ideals associated with a dominant ‘theocentric’ paradigm, which provided the ideological backdrop for educational policy in the first generation of the Irish state, were gradually displaced from the 1950s by a ‘mercantile’ paradigm with economic considerations at its core (O’Sullivan, 2005, p.104). Human capital theory, which held that investment in people produced a greater return of investment than investment in physical capital, emerged as a major strand of international economic thinking in the early 1960s (O’Sullivan, 2005, p.143). Various studies underline that the Irish political and administrative system enthusiastically embraced ‘human capital’ theory as the primary institutional rationale for investment in education (Coolahan, 2008; O’Sullivan, 2005; Walsh, 2009). This broad ideological reorientation underpinned a gradual transformation of Irish higher education from an ‘elite’ to a ‘mass’ system as identified by Trow (1974, pp.61–3). Yet while economic imperatives undoubtedly played a crucial part in the rapid expansion of the system, vocational considerations co-existed with increasing pressures created by social demand for third-level places. Moreover, political elites sought to legitimise policy changes through an appeal to political and egalitarian objectives, seeking to demonstrate that their agenda was not exclusively defined by economic priorities.

An elite system

Higher education institutions (HEIs) in Ireland historically enjoyed a high degree of institutional autonomy and were not the focus of significant state intervention following the foundation of the Irish Free State in 1922. Yet autonomy came at a price: higher education occupied an insignificant and almost invisible position during the first generation of the independent Irish state (Coolahan, 2008, p.261). The four established universities, Trinity College Dublin (TCD) and the three constituent colleges of the National University of Ireland (NUI), were largely left to their own devices by the Irish government. TCD operated in an inhospitable cultural and political context due to its traditional association with the dominant Protestant elite in the nineteenth century and to the firm opposition of the Catholic Church to
‘neutral’ or secular educational institutions. The Catholic bishops regarded the university colleges of the NUI as acceptable institutions for the education of Catholics, but opposed the attendance of Catholic students at TCD since the late nineteenth century, partly on the basis of its Protestant tradition but even more because it was considered to be a repository of secular and anti-Catholic influences (MFS 8223, Commission on Higher Education, 26 May 1961, pp.141–61). The hierarchy re-affirmed their policy in 1956, at the instigation of John Charles McQuaid, the archbishop of Dublin, a formidable exponent of traditional Catholic teaching: the bishops adopted a comprehensive regulation prohibiting the attendance of Catholics at TCD without the explicit permission of the archbishop (Lydon, 1992 in Holland, pp.39–43). The NUI enjoyed a very different cultural inheritance, due to its origins in 1908 as a non-denominational institution which was explicitly designed to offer higher education acceptable to the Catholic majority. Moreover, many students and staff from its constituent colleges were associated with the struggle for national independence. The colleges of the NUI, particularly University College Dublin (UCD), enjoyed significant connections with the political elite of the new state: indeed the first two Ministers for Education, Eoin MacNéill and John Marcus O'Sullivan, held university chairs in UCD. Moreover, Eamon de Valera, the dominant political figure of nationalist Ireland, was also the chancellor of the NUI throughout his lengthy public career (Walsh, 2008 in Dunne et al., pp.135–45). Yet the prominence of NUI graduates, professors and members of the Senate in the political elite did not translate into a high public profile for the institution or generous financial support for its colleges. The protectionist agenda adopted by de Valera's governments from the early 1930s focused firmly on economic self-sufficiency and development of native industry behind high tariff barriers. Higher education was virtually invisible in the rhetoric of protectionist economic development. University leaders also adopted a very low profile and did little to encourage communication with a wider public or even to highlight their increasingly acute accommodation needs publicly (Coolahan, 2003, p.763). The universities featured hardly at all in a dominant national discourse marked by traditional Catholicism, protectionism and social conservatism.

Whatever their cultural or religious differences, the universities shared similar characteristics: they attracted only a small minority of the population, were severely under-resourced and were oriented strongly towards training for the professions. A seminal report on long-term needs for educational resources, *Investment in Education*, which was produced by an Irish survey team under the auspices of the OECD between 1962 and 1965, graphically highlighted the restrictive and elitist nature of university institutions (Government of Ireland, 1965, p.172). *Investment* indicated that only 2% of the population aged 15–19 and 3.4% of the population aged 20–24 at the time of the 1961 census were enrolled in third-level education,
excluding theological training for the priesthood (Government of Ireland, 1965, p.120). Moreover, the report underlined that universities were predominantly the preserve of the upper middle class, noting that ‘the strong association between university entrance and social group is unmistakable’ (Government of Ireland, 1965, p.172). Indeed 65% of university entrants drawn from the Leaving Certificate cohort in 1963 (the overwhelming majority of entrants) were the children of professionals, employers and higher white-collar employees: only 2% of university students were drawn from the unskilled and semi-skilled manual category, while 4% were the children of the unemployed or widows (Ibid., p.172). Entry to universities was almost exclusively determined by social and family background, and university education remained the preserve of a small privileged elite until the mid-1960s.

The policy of successive governments towards higher education between 1922 and the late 1950s amounted to little more than benign neglect. The annual appropriations for higher education outlined in the reports of the Public Accounts Committee reveal a strikingly low level of public investment in higher education up to the late 1950s. The net expenditure from the exchequer for universities and colleges in 1948–49 was £323,916, a mere 0.5% of overall exchequer spending voted by the Oireachtas (Public Accounts Committee, 1950, p.103). This minimal allocation increased only marginally over the following decade: the comparable level of state expenditure on higher education in 1958–59 amounted to 0.62% of the overall appropriations (Public Accounts Committee, 1959, p.88). The very limited increase in state funding for higher education coincided with a gradual increase of student enrolments in the period following the Second World War, which turned out to be a prelude to a spectacular expansion over the following generation. The number of full-time students in the four universities doubled from 6,796 in 1948–49 to 13,006 in 1964–65, with the increase being particularly marked in the colleges of the NUI (Government of Ireland, 1967, p.21). This represented a very limited expansion in the level of participation in third-level education, but the universities were obliged to accommodate increasing enrolments over a 20-year period when there was no significant capital investment by the state in university education (Government of Ireland, 1959, p.126). The inadequate funding of the institutions certainly reflected the economic weakness of the independent Irish state, but it was not simply about poverty. The absence of significant state investment underlined the low priority attached by the political and official elite to higher education and the absence of public debate on the place of universities in society.

University education was strongly associated with training for the professions. John Henry Newman’s ideal of liberal education, emphasising the cultivation of knowledge as an end in itself, commanded respect within the universities but had little resonance within Irish society (Newman, 1852).
Taoiseach Eamon de Valera expressed a widely held view when he told the Seanad in May 1940 that training for a professional career was the essential role of the university in Ireland:

> [T]he modern universities have very largely to be professional schools, but the fact is that in our universities at present, excepting those particularly fortunate in having brains as well as means, the students have to think when they come to the universities of a career, and that they cannot live in them for a prolonged period.

(Seanad Éireann, vol.24, col.1393–4, 15 May 1940)

de Valera’s view was notable not simply for his pragmatic view of the Irish university but for his open acknowledgement that entry to universities was determined primarily by means rather than merit. The composition of the student body certainly underlined a strong popular attachment to professional careers. The colleges of the NUI saw a steady increase in the proportion of students pursuing professional qualifications, particularly in medicine, dentistry and engineering, between 1929–30 and 1947–48 (Coolahan, 2003, p.767). Arts and humanities disciplines continued to attract a significant cohort of students during this period, while science and commerce languished, attracting a relatively small and in some cases a declining segment of students. Coolahan suggests that the underdeveloped state of the Irish economy up to the late 1950s helps to explain the neglect of science, commerce and agriculture (Coolahan, 2003, p.767). Certainly, the lack of economic opportunity within Ireland encouraged a focus on stable occupations, including the professions and the public service. Yet the strong demand among parents and students for entry to the humanities and the professions also reflected a profound social and cultural conservatism, which privileged professional status over ‘practical’ or technical disciplines.

The underdevelopment of higher technical education was a particular feature of a neglected tertiary system. The universities dominated the small HE sector: only 660 students were pursuing higher-level technical or vocational courses on a national basis in 1964 (Government of Ireland, 1965, p.4). The vast majority of these were concentrated in the colleges of technology offered by the City of Dublin Vocational Education Committee (CDVEC). The opportunities for higher education for most vocational school students were poor to non-existent, as the only institutions offering higher-level courses in technical education were the colleges of technology in Dublin, Crawford Municipal Technical Institute in Cork and a centre specialising in hotel management in Shannon: there were no technical institutions serving rural areas. The underdevelopment of technical education was the logical consequence of a traditionalist consensus in Irish education, shared by ministers, officials and prominent private stakeholders, for the first generation of the independent Irish state. This conservative consensus was characterised
by a timid and tentative approach on the part of the Department of Education and a general deference towards the powerful religious interests within the educational system, particularly the Catholic Church. The traditionalist approach placed a low value on vocational and technical studies, emphasising the primacy of the humanities, classical studies and the Irish language. It was not accidental that higher education remained an underdeveloped ‘elite’ sector well into the middle of the twentieth century.

**A tale of two commissions**

A far-reaching transformation of HE policy began in the late 1950s. Séan Lemass, who replaced de Valera as Taoiseach in 1959, oversaw a radical reorientation of economic policies, marked particularly by a gradual transition from a protectionist regime to free trade and from self-sufficiency to sustained promotion of foreign investment (Murphy, 2009, pp.302–9). The Department of Education, led by a number of younger, more dynamic ministers appointed by Lemass, adopted equality of opportunity as a key policy objective by the mid-1960s. The major reforms adopted by the government at post-primary level, notably the introduction of free second-level education and raising of the statutory school leaving age to 15 by 1972, contributed to an extraordinary expansion of enrolments (Walsh, 2009, pp.211–2), which intensified societal demand for access to higher education and helped to ensure that it became a focus of political action.

Changing attitudes among domestic political elites dovetailed with an emerging international consensus that investment in education at all levels was essential to economic development. The OECD promoted investment in ‘human capital’ among the developed countries of the West from the early 1960s, identifying the development of education and scientific research as vital elements in achieving economic growth. International influences mediated primarily through the OECD contributed significantly to a radical change of direction by the political and administrative elite (Walsh, 2011 pp.365–81).

The limitations of institutional provision were underlined by a series of expert group reports, of which ‘Investment in Education’ was the most significant. The first critical re-appraisal of the university system was offered by a commission on accommodation needs, established by de Valera’s final government in 1957. Justice Cearbhall Ó Dálaigh chaired a small commission composed mainly of members drawn from the business community and government departments, including the stockbroker J.J. Davy and Aodhogán O’Rahilly, a director of Bord na Móna (*Irish Press*, September 1957). Jack Lynch, the newly appointed Minister for Education, delegated much of the planning required for the development of the university sector to the commission. TCD was not included in its terms of reference, not least because the government wished to avoid any consideration of merger between TCD and
Index

academic developers, xiv, 235–6, 240–1, 243
academic labour, v, 123
academic professional development, vi, 4, 216, 238
access, xii, 2, 3, 5, 10, 19, 40–1, 45, 47–8, 53, 82
accountability, 4, 33, 38–40, 42, 44–5, 51, 58, 66, 94, 126, 220, 228
active learning, 161
Advisory Science Council, 63, 71
Australia, xii, 50, 67, 117, 124, 126–7, 161, 234, 236
autonomy, ix, 3, 6, 15, 19, 25, 36, 40, 42, 43, 44, 45, 46, 57, 103–7, 124, 126, 160, 173–4, 177, 184, 188, 203
BERD, 67–9
Bildung, v, 3, 86, 88–92
binary model, 23, 25, 28–9
bio–sciences, 80, 135
Bologna Process, xiii, 2, 4, 164, 172, 174–5, 179–84, 193
Bourdieu, xii, 57, 96–102, 105, 127, 156
capital, ix, 2, 4, 6, 8, 10–14, 16, 29, 37–8, 49, 56, 57–9, 65–6, 70, 72, 74–5, 77, 79, 98–108, 115–16, 140, 147, 163, 200, 202–3, 217
capital investment, 8, 13–14, 202
Celtic Tiger, 37, 49, 51, 63, 123
Central Applications Office, 47, 111, 166, 187
Centre for Research on Adult Learning and Education (NUIM), 141
Centre for Research on Learning and Teaching, 234
Centres for Science Engineering and Technology, 80
Combat Poverty Agency, 147
commercialisation, 2, 63, 66, 70–4, 78, 183
commodification, 103, 107, 218–19, 221
communities of practice, 243, 250
completion, students, 42, 126, 161–4, 178, 209
continuous assessment, 161
critical theory, xii, 153
curriculum design, 161, 164, 194, 237, 242
deadwood, 79
Department for Education and Skills (DES), 71–2, 110, 124–5, 142, 146, 190, 191, 193, 196, 203
Digital Agenda for Europe, 201
diversity, x, 81, 160–1, 177, 184, 216, 222, 233, 235, 241, 247
Dublin Region Higher Education Alliance, 227
economic growth, 2, 10, 58, 85, 86
economic instrumentalism, 57
Educational Developers in Ireland Network, 226
e-learning, vi, 4, 163, 190, 198–211, 224, 238
Employment Control Framework, 124
Enterprise Ireland, 61, 71–3
EU Council, 201
European Credit Transfer and Accumulation System (ECTS), 193
European Higher Education Area, 175, 177, 179, 184, 192–3
European Patents Office, 135
European Union (EU), xii, 48–9, 56, 63, 66, 68, 75, 81, 125, 129, 132, 139, 143, 147, 174, 175, 181, 199, 201, 206, 209
253
Index

The Expert Group on Future Skills Needs, 202

fees, 4, 35, 41–2, 48, 51, 112, 125, 187, 206, 219


Finland, xiv, 67, 77, 80, 124, 132, 136, 137–9

First Programme for Economic Development, 60

for-profit, v, 3, 110, 112, 114–20, 206–7

Foresight Report 1998, 65

Forfas, 55, 61, 65, 68–9, 71–2, 77, 85, 127, 143

fourth level, 74


Further Education Authority (HEA), 1, 12, 33, 72–3, 110, 159, 187, 204, 217, 224, 235

Higher Technical Education, 9, 19–23, 25, 31

Honneth, A, 152–6

human capital, 2, 4, 6, 10, 13, 16, 29, 37, 49, 58–9, 65–6, 70, 72, 74, 77, 79, 101, 106, 140, 147, 200, 203, 217

inclusion, 89, 97, 105–6, 159, 161, 189, 223

Industrial Development Agency, 61, 72, 190

Information Communication Technology (ICT), vii, 49, 56–7, 65, 80, 81, 135, 137, 198, 200, 202–3, 206

Institute of Learning and Teaching, 216, 226

Institutes of Technology (IoT), vii, 1, 4, 46–7, 50, 76, 79, 82, 99, 111, 124, 127–9, 131–3, 135, 142, 165, 180, 181, 189, 211, 235

intellectual property rights, 65–6

International Consortium for Educational Development, 224

investment in education, 6–7, 10, 21, 37, 147

Irish Patents Office, 133

Irish Universities Association (IUA), 110, 119, 135

Irish Universities Quality Board (IUQB), 163, 180, 192

key performance indicators (KPI), 126, 220

knowledge

codified, 133

diffusion, 59, 70

economy, 57–8, 94, 190–1, 200

embodied, 140

Mode 1, 57

Mode 2, 57, 59, 70

production, 2

society, 57, 155, 199–202, 205–6

triple helix, 70

labour market, 48, 86, 149, 159, 167–8, 173, 179, 183, 200


learning institution, 155

learning society, 155

life–long learning, v, 86
managerialism, 94, 105–6, 123, 127, 183, 220–1, 228
Marx, Karl, 81, 101
marketisation, 119, 228, 233
Massachusetts Institute of Technology, 207
Massive Open Online Courses (MOOCS), 198–9, 207–10, 212
meritocracy, 97
mobility, viii, 172–3, 175–9, 181–2, 184, 193–4, 218
modularisation, 164, 191, 224
National Academy for Integrated Research in Teaching and Learning, 216
National Academy for the Enhancement of Teaching and Learning, Academic, 233
National College of Ireland, postdoctoral, 206
National Competitive Council, 70–7
The National Development Plan (2007–13), 203
National Digital Learning Repository, 203, 244
National Forum, viii, 203, 227, 238, 243–5
National Forum for the Enhancement of Teaching and Learning, 227, 238, 243–4
National Framework of Qualifications, 46, 112, 164, 179–180, 182, 191
National Innovation System, 56, 76
National Qualifications Authority of Ireland, 46, 112
National Science Foundation: US, 57, 139
neo–developmentalism, 69
neo–evolutionary economics, 80
neo–liberalism, 120
neo–Weberianism, 123
network governance, 123
new public managerialism (NPM), 94, 106, 123, 126
New Zealand, 67, 126, 138–9, 141, 142, 161, 234
Office of Equity of Access, 146
Open and Distance Learning (ODL), 203
patents
PCTs, 136
triadic, vii, 136, 138, 143
philosophy of education, xiv
PISA, 106
policy, xii–xiv, xv, 1, 5–8, 10, 13–14, 16–17, 20–3, 26–30, 33–5, 37–41
professional development, academic, vi, 4, 216, 225, 227, 238
Programme for Research in Third Level Institutions, 56, 127
Programmes of Advanced Technology, 63
Public Service Agreement, 124
public university, 88
Quality and Qualifications Ireland (QQI), 192, 211
quality assurance, xiv, 38, 40, 45, 124, 159, 163, 167, 173, 175, 188, 193, 195, 200, 220, 241
quasi markets, 126
rankings
CWTS–Leiden, 141
Higher Education, 103
QS–THES, 141
Quacquarelli Symonds (QS), 141
Regional Technical Colleges (RTCs), 19, 21, 23, 25, 30, 35–6, 40, 46, 111, 189
research and development (R & D), vii, 48, 56, 59–63, 66–70, 72, 77, 79, 81–2
researchers
  academic, 130–131, 164
  postdoctoral, vii
Royal Irish Academy, 110

salaries, vii, 132, 135, 143
scholarship of teaching and learning, 227, 235, 238, 246
Science and Irish Economic Development Report, 60
Science Foundation Ireland, 49, 56, 61–62, 71, 72–73, 79, 127
Science Technology & Innovation (STI), 58, 61, 63–5, 67, 70–4, 77, 140
Science, Technology and Innovation Advisory Council, 63
semesterisation, 164, 166, 191
Skilbeck Report, 66
social media, 200, 210
Solas, 110
South Africa, 161, 234
Staff–student ratios, 129
STEM, 70, 78
Strategic Innovation Fund, 202, 224, 244
Strategic Research Clusters, 80
student engagement, 159–67, 218
student evaluation, 159, 161
student experience, V, XIII, 3, 87, 147, 159–62, 164, 166–7, 169, 218, 224, 226
students
  completion, 42, 126, 161–4, 178, 209
  employability, 161
  full–time, 8, 47, 51
  participation, 184
  part–time, 41, 51
  PhD graduates, 50, 140
  postgraduate, 50, 62, 64, 66, 77, 118, 172, 193, 196, 205, 218, 236, 248
  progression, 160, 163, 165
  retention, 126, 163
  undergraduate, 116, 159–60, 165–6, 204, 227
symbolic violence, 156

Index

teaching and learning centres, 4, 233, 248, 250
Theory of Communicative Action, 153
see also Habermas
third mission, 123
Tierney Report, 62–4, 69
TIMMS, 106
Tinto, 166
Towards a Future Higher Education Landscape, 127
Trinity College Dublin (TCD), xii, xiii, xv, 6–7, 10–11, 14–19, 23, 26–8, 42–3, 45, 73, 75, 77, 80, 82, 99, 102, 127, 133, 138, 141, 183, 195
Triple Helix, 82
Universities Act, 1997, 44
University College Cork (UCC), 12, 14, 27–9, 42, 45, 80, 82, 99, 127, 133, 141
University College Dublin (UCD), 7, 11–13, 15–19, 27, 29, 42, 45, 80, 82, 99, 102–3, 105, 111, 127, 141, 205, 224
US Patents office, 133
virtual learning environments (VLE), 201, 204–5, 212
Vocational Educational Committee (VEC), 9, 23, 36–7, 111
vocationalism, 106
web 2.0, 200, 245
Web of Science, 138–9
widening participation, 3, 39, 41, 51, 97, 164, 222