

Toward Integral Higher Education Study Programs in the European Higher Education Area: A Programmatic and Strategic View¹

Markus Molz²

Abstract: This essay somehow arbitrarily freezes my ongoing attempt to grasp the present situation and future possibilities of higher education courses, programs, institutions and initiatives that are inspired by integral and likeminded approaches. The focus in this essay is on the European Higher Education Area and its specifics, whereas some implicit or explicit comparisons with the USA are made. My reflections are triggered by the recurrent observation that in Europe there seems to be i) more demand than offer of integrally oriented higher education programs, ii) an imbalance between overused but little successful and underused but potentially more promising strategies to implement such programs, iii) little or no learning from past failures, and iv) little mutual awareness, communication and collaboration between different activists and initiatives in this field.

The context for this essay is i) the current societal macroshift, ii) the unfolding of academic level integral and likeminded research worldwide, and iii) the large scale reform of the European Higher Education systems brought about by the Bologna process, its (false) promises and the potential it nevertheless has for realizing examples of a more integral higher education. On this basis the consequences for attempts to overcome a relatively stagnant state of affairs in Europe are discussed. Given that; most past attempts to implement programs inspired by an integral worldview have failed from the start, or disappeared after a relatively short period, or are marginalised or becoming re-mainstreamed, this essay aims to devise a potentially more promising strategic corridor and describes the contours of the results that could be brought about when following a developmental trajectory within this corridor. This futurising exercise is inspired by principles shared by many integral and likeminded approaches, especially the reconsideration, integration and transcendence of premodern, modern and postmodern structures and practices of higher education.

This essay is programmatic and thus deliberately combines facts and values, past and future, summaries of first person observations and third person factual information, without the burden of systematic referencing required by scholarly writing. It does not claim to replace empirical surveys which, however, are still lacking to date regarding the actual state of affairs of higher education inspired by integral and likeminded approaches in Europe. Accordingly, at this stage, the essay is an exercise of awareness-raising to stimulate more and better collaboration across streams, disciplines and countries between those scholars, students and activists who are already inspired by integral and likeminded

¹ University of Luxembourg (www.uni.lu), and Institute for Integral Studies (www.integral-studies.org)

² The author is indebted to Roland Benedikter, Mark Edwards and Wendelin Küpers for their valuable comments on the unpublished 2005/2006 version of this essay, and to Philippe Blanca for his feedback on a draft of this completely revised edition. All weaknesses, however, have to be attributed to me as the author alone.



approaches and interested or already engaged in developing and sustaining higher education programs according to a more integral spirit.

Keywords: Andragogy, European Higher Education Area, higher education, implementation, integral and likeminded approaches, knotworking, learning communities, macrosift, project-based learning, service learning, strategy, study programs, transformation, vocation.

Table of Contents

Overview.....	154
Contexts	156
Transformation of Society and Rise of Integral Consciousness	157
Evolution of Research Paradigms	162
European Higher Education Area	167
Strategies.....	174
Strategic Options for Developing Higher Education	174
Strategic Corridor for Building Integral Higher Education	179
Contours.....	186
Principles.....	187
Integral Learning Communities	188
Integral Andragogies.....	195
Integral Organisations	205
Call.....	214
References.....	217
Appendix.....	222

Acronyms

In this paper the following four acronyms are used:

ILA = Integral and Likeminded Approach

HESP = Higher Education Study Program

HEI = Higher Education Institution (regardless of the more specific type like university, institute of technology, institute of teacher education, polytechnic, business school, art school etc.).

EHEA = European Higher Education Area

The first and the second acronym have been created because of their frequent use in this paper, the third and fourth are widespread official acronyms.

Overview

We believe the next transformation will give rise to the integrative university or transversity representing the next stage in evolution from the university and multiversity. The transversity is a new institution that will be multi-dimensionally connected not only within and across disciplines, but across cultural boundaries and across barriers to the broader society that separate it from primary education, industry, business, government and other institutions. These integrative universities will become living institutions in which organizational structure and patterns of behavior provide permeable boundaries to the outside community with fluid internal boundaries that allow people and resources to coalesce around prominent issues, opportunities, and challenges. These changes will enhance the exchange of research expertise and practical knowledge between universities and society. (Awbrey & D. K. Scott, n.d.)³

What is needed now is a kind of university that has never existed before.... I propose that we can and should remake the university so that it becomes an intentional force for good in the world. Such a project runs counter to the kind of academic analysis that is modelled in the university today, for it is a project informed by care and passion and developed from within a distinct philosophical commitment and political interpretation. (Ford, 2006, pp. 8-9)⁴

We are facing tremendous opportunities and threats, individually and collectively, in today's increasingly complex, interrelated and dramatically changing world. Globalisation and the associated far-reaching developments across all domains make heavy demands on almost all of us, and opening up new opportunities at least for some. Overall, we are experiencing and co-producing a growing rate of change not only impacting ourselves, but so many future generations such as has never occurred before in the history of humankind. In Europe and other parts of the world we are already in the midst of a profound and irrevocable cultural transformation which is not only an economic or a technological one, but a macro shift (Laszlo, 2001) concerning the dominant worldviews, lifestyles, life worlds, and their governance. Only two or three times since the dawn of the species *Homo sapiens* on planet earth did human societies undergo such a profound transformation. Through the second wave of globalisation in the last 20 years or so we are on the way to a new societal formation beyond the industrial nation state model. Some are inclined to perceive this as a lethal global crisis – for many good reasons linked to data-based mega-trends – others as the possible dawn of a new, more inclusive and peaceful planetary civilisation – for other good reasons more linked to vision, values and creativity. Whether the unprecedented accumulation of intractable problems or the upcoming wave of new opportunities is highlighted depends on one's position, perspective and temper. It might be wise, however, to keep closely in touch with both, as do integral and likeminded approaches (ILAs).

³ Scottish-born nuclear physicist David Scott was Director for Research at the Cyclotron Laboratory, Vice President for Academic Affairs, and Professor of Learning, Science and Society at Michigan State University, and then served as Chancellor of the University of Massachusetts at Amherst 1993-2001.

⁴ Marcus P. Ford is Professor of Humanities at Northern Arizona University and serves in the integrative Comparative Cultural Studies program.

Scientific research, through its technological and technocratic outlets⁵, has been one of the most important enablers and amplifiers of the earlier and the contemporary wave of globalisation. Unfortunately however, the educational and ethical aspects of scientific developments are lagging behind the technological ones which found their way into practice much quicker.⁶ For this reason academia has today the prime responsibility to support individuals, organisations and societies through appropriate research, higher learning and service to communities to understand and utilise the high level of complexity of this macro-shift as productively, sustainably and inclusively as possible. Many ILAs are foregrounding individual development and collective evolution in a multidimensional and emancipatory perspective. When facing uncertainty and standing on shifting sands, as we all actually are today, they appear as suitable and timely contributions for inspiring higher education for the 21st century.

It appears, however, that there are major obstacles to an implementation of higher education study programs (HESPs) inspired by ILAs. In order for implementation to meet the breadth and depth of contemporary challenges and the speed of actual change, various issues must be overcome. For example institutional inertia and hyper-specialisation deeply inscribed into the structures and mentalities of academia on the one hand, and lack of professionalism and strategic collective power in many upcoming projects and initiatives based on ILAs on the other hand. Another factor playing a role are the low levels of communication and collaboration between streams representing different ILAs which generally tend to emerge as rather self-contained communities. The overall consequence is a considerable lack of overview, grounding, potential insight, mutual constructive criticism, and practical synergies. As a result, the absolutely crucial shift towards locally and globally sustainable lifestyles is much less than optimally stimulated and amplified by higher education and research. Therefore, leaving aside differences in emphasis, most ILA-inspired thinkers and activists would agree that the agenda of today's mainstream higher education and research needs to be complemented, broadened, and reorganised in order to be able to reasonably tackle the new requirements related to the current macroshift.

Through European, and later North Atlantic imperialism, modern Western universities have become the globally dominant model of higher learning and of the definition of valid and useful knowledge. They have been profoundly shaped by, and instrumental to the development and stabilization of industrialized nation-states. The current global challenges and the globally emergent designs of knowledge-based, networked living and working bring about a new, unprecedented societal formation. On the one hand this formation strongly depends on even more powerful "knowledge" institutions. On the other hand many existing higher education institutions (HEIs) are considerably challenged by digital media, cultural / linguistic diversity, post-materialist values, transdisciplinary problem-solving demands, demographic shift, ultimate massification and accountability towards an ever larger array of stakeholders. In addition, they are particularly challenged by the strengthened competition between each other and with more

⁵ Like transportation systems, fossil and nuclear energy production, military technology, information and communication technology, management fads, sustained political and economic ideologies, and the new horizon of genetic engineering.

⁶ Coined in one of Albert Einstein's catch phrases as "It has become appallingly obvious that our technology has exceeded our humanity."

agile competitors like continuing education providers, virtual and corporate universities, and with institutional less or unbounded knowledge production and dissemination over the Internet.

Consequently, traditional HEIs are under pressure and need to adapt and change to become hosts and catalysts of adequate higher learning in this century. All this being said, new models of HESPs are called for, building on, reorganising, extending and transcending current structures and practices of higher education, models that embrace dialogical, plural and integrative practices regarding the worldwide quest for knowledge, wisdom and appropriate practice in midst of turmoil, breakdowns and difficult to track new emergent patterns. HESPs inspired by ILAs can and should play a substantial role in this transformation. Until today, however, the (although limited) institutionalised offers in the USA are not equalled by anything comparable in the upcoming European Higher Education Area (*EHEA*). Both areas of higher education show up with a comparable number of students and HEIs. They are the two largest ones in the world,⁷ and the hosts for the largest proportions of all international students worldwide. Given that many of the historical lead figures of ILAs are Europeans or learned from Europeans there is one more good reason to push the development of HESPs inspired by ILAs in the EHEA. The goal then is to reach levels of program implementation corresponding to the existing potential in terms of academic teachers and students already now inspired by or interested in ILAs, but lacking academic contexts resonating with their aspirations and vocations. For this to happen the pervasive strategies of curriculum design and organisational set-up of new HESPs need to be rethought and refocused. As a requirement, the new conditions for running HESPs, generalising with the realisation of the EHEA, have to be considered thoroughly as they are partly a barrier and partly a potential vector for creating more integral approaches to Higher Education in Europe. On this basis innovative models can emerge in the interstices of the long-standing and inert structures and practices of higher education, hopefully anticipating and exemplifying a more general transformation.

Contexts

Without a global revolution in the sphere of human consciousness nothing will change for the better in the sphere of our being as humans and the catastrophe toward which the world is headed – whether it be ecological, social, demographic or a general breakdown of civilization – will be unavoidable. (Havel, 1990)⁸

In this section the ground will be prepared for the strategic reflection in the section on Strategies by considering a range of contextual influences on higher education, research and integral approaches in Europe and beyond. Specifically, transformation in society and the rise of integral consciousness, the evolution of research paradigms, and the realization of the European

⁷ With China strongly catching up since the turn of the millenium and India already being quite strong.

⁸ In his address to the United States Congress, Washington, February 1990. Václav Havel is a writer, dramaturge, and politician. He was one of the major critics of the Soviet regime and an important activist in the velvet revolution of 1989 upon which he became president for 14 years, first of Czechoslovakia and then of the Czech Republic. For both his literary and political work he received numerous awards. A cross-cutting theme in his writings is the alienation and fragmentation of the life of the modern human being determined by science and technology which have taken the place of the Highest.

Higher Education Area. Those who feel already well acquainted with one of these contexts can skip the respective subsection without hampering the understanding of the following main sections (Strategies and Contours) containing the core arguments of this paper.

Transformation of Society and Rise of Integral Consciousness

Historically, in Western societies there has been an evolution from an almost pervasive dominance of the religious over other societal domains (politics, economy, knowledge and media) to a relative or in some countries absolute separation between the church and the state. This transformation enabled the deployment of scientific inquiry that is unthreatened and unconstrained by religious dogmatism and so gave rise to modern science and higher education, fuelled by the competition between the collection of medium-sized and small countries on the European peninsula. More generally, a cognitive revolution occurred in the Gutenberg era through more widely available print publications and through the introduction of mandatory schooling of entire populations. The industrial revolution, however challenging it was for those directly involved in it, ended up with higher living standards and life expectations, and the development of democratic regimes guaranteeing women's and minority rights etc. in what is called the Western world. Through the process of secularization the impact of religious institutions declined as well on the life of the average individual. Today, in certain geographical areas in Europe traditional local faith communities are threatened with disappearance. At the same time a patchwork of new "spiritualities" has been emerging. Rational science, powerful technology and material abundance of the broad middle classes of Western countries apparently has not ruled out transcendent aspirations as earlier proponents of the Western-style enlightenment project would have expected. Nevertheless, in most parts of Europe, an enduring uneasiness in the relationship between science and spirituality resulted from these historical processes.⁹

From the internally fractured and blood-saturated European soil not only the cognitive and industrial revolutions were expanded globally, but as well colonialism and the two world-wars. Colonialism, nationalism and war cannot be separated from the Western enlightenment project which, in Immanuel Kant's¹⁰ famous definition was meant to be "man's leaving his self-caused immaturity" towards the enactment of the values of the French and other revolutions, freedom, equality and solidarity. Colonialism, nationalism and war have been Western enlightenment's continuous condition, companion and shadow-side. And they still are, just in different disguises, as today, on a global scale, some are much more free and equal than others, and some are

⁹ Compared to the USA, lower levels of attendance of faith communities and of communication between science and religion can be observed in most European countries in which different historical trajectories have produced similar results: whether in the radical French state secularism in which spirituality is banned from the public sphere, including schools and universities, whether in Germany where 12 years of Nazi regime were sufficient to create a transgenerational suspicion regarding everything not appearing neatly rational at first glance, whether in several Eastern European countries under former Communist rule in which atheism became the new state religion and which survived the fall of the Soviet regime in the attitudes of important sections of the population.

¹⁰ As a case in point, Kant's otherwise ingenious world-centric life work is not at all free from Prussian cultural chauvinism.

included whereas others are excluded from the circle of solidarity and care. We are lucky of course that the Cold War, artificially forcing Europe and the whole world into two ideological camps, East and West, communist and capitalist,¹¹ did only almost but not actually explode into a hot nuclear third world-war. But as a matter of fact we don't need to wait for the third world-war as it is already taking place day after day, through the neo-colonial socioeconomic imbalance and injustice between the global North and the global South which is structurally reproduced on the basis of the historical world-system put and kept in place by the North Atlantic nations. Accordingly, not only the material conditions are highly asymmetric, but as well the geopolitics of knowledge. Knowledge and power goes rather one-way from the global North to the global South whereas migration (brain drain) and resources go the reverse way. What is lost in the middle is dignity of life for the (much too) silent majority of humankind, and the ecological balance of great many natural habitats, including the global habitat of the globalised humans themselves.

Given the deep implication of generations of Europeans in these historical dramas, directly or indirectly, intentionally or unintentionally, it has come somehow as a miracle that now, as an ongoing political, economic and sociocultural project, the very first transnationally integrated society of the planet is shaping up step by step in the last 50 years on the European peninsula: the *European Union* has become an undeniable reality despite the waves of developmental crises it is undergoing and despite frequent contradictions between great ideas and weak realizations.¹² Some of the hallmarks of the current transition in European countries and elsewhere from industrialised nation-states towards a transnational or eventually global networked society are:

- The high impact of major breakthroughs in physics, genetics and information technology and their associated technological opportunities and threats;
- A quick and profound demographic shift with far-reaching consequences through dropping birth rates, further rising life expectation and highly controlled immigration, producing a rapidly ageing society;
- A growing instability of the global financial and economic system and growing socio-economic inequalities between social classes and between prospering and declining regions, between employed and unemployed, coupled with persistent and ever more rising public debt;
- An extreme dependency on the availability of fossil energy carriers whose availability is declining, and a generally completely unsustainable lifestyle and associated long-term ecological degradation, some of which has already become irreversible, as reflected by global climate change, loss of biodiversity and fertile soils, accumulation of dangerous chemicals and nuclear particles in the environment and in the food chain;
- Wide-spread health problems typical for (post-)modern societies (cardiovascular diseases, obesity, diabetes, addictions, depression, burn-out, ...) despite a medically highly sophisticated health care system and high life expectations.

¹¹ Very much paralysing as well the States of the Non-Aligned Movement who precisely tried to escape from it.

¹² As well as some well-realized bad ideas like export subsidies for European agricultural products destroying local agricultural markets in countries the EU is claiming to support in their development.

- Threats for the Western-style democracies by new religious fundamentalisms, global terrorism, political populism and most of all, frustrated disinterest of a growing number of non-voters.
- Repeated attempts at economisation of all spheres of life (and Westernisation of all cultures) in terms of the dominance of one worldview and lifestyle over all other worldviews and lifestyles.

In the face of these developments, the political inertia and lack of collective anticipatory learning made us lose the period of more than a generation through inaction, insufficient or inadequate action despite well substantiated early and recent warnings.¹³ The systemic incapacity of most contemporary decision-makers to influence any of these global trends substantially is becoming more and more evident. However, there is a growing awareness of all these developments among those who are well-educated and critical, and many are starting to realize that these trends taken together are going to have disruptive effects, and that many of the measures implemented are often rather part of the problem than of the solution.¹⁴ The part of the measures that could be helpful is generally implemented too late, too slowly, too modestly and too unsystematically. The more overarching visions for a plan B¹⁵ come from outside the centres of power and decision making and infiltrate them only in downshifted and fragmented versions. What makes things really embarrassing is that apparently there is no plan C (preparing for *catastrophes*) or D (generalised *disaster* management) even though this is likely what is needed in this century. The goals of the political realists are rather coined in terms of “reducing the acceleration of the growth of ...” (many issues can be filled in the slot: public debt, global warming, uncontrolled proliferation of nuclear weapons etc.) The dominant discourse is that there is no alternative to the overall path of socioeconomic “development,”¹⁶ and the idea is that growth can now somehow miraculously become green growth. Undifferentiated notions of growth and development are and remain the long-time favourites of verbal narcotics in political discourse and action across countries and political parties that are immune against contrary evidence (Rist, 2002). Under these conditions the UN millennium development goals,¹⁷ coined in

¹³ The report to the Club of Rome “Limits to Growth” (Donella H. Meadows, Dennis L. Meadows, Randers, & Behrens, 1974) that has become a bestseller in many countries being a major case in point. But until today, as the 30-years update of this report shows (Donella H. Meadows, Randers, & Dennis L. Meadows, 2004) or Ervin Laszlo’s (Laszlo & Seidel, 2006) take on the same issues, actual action is lagging behind available and more and more specified insight and action potential. See as well footnote 15.

¹⁴ The way the current globalised financial crisis is tackled is a case in point which will amplify international imbalances, future global problems, and intergenerational injustice.

¹⁵ Many Plan B’s have actually been devised until most recently, in scientific (Rockström et al., 2009) and in popularized (Brown, 2009) versions, but as they all imply substantial changes in Western consumerist lifestyle they linger at the margins of actual political action, even though certain political discourses start to rhetorically take up some of those Plan B elements that appear less threatening to the electorate (and to political careers).

¹⁶ This is perhaps the biggest case ever of a TINA (“there is no alternative”) – formation. TINA-formation is a term Roy Bhaskar has introduced in his work, referring to Margret Thatcher’s famous expression, as an invitation to forcefully and intentionally explore the alternatives to “no alternatives” (Bhaskar, 2002, pp. 202-204).

¹⁷ www.undp.org/mdg/basics.shtml

the same terms, are more than likely to remain utopian even when considerably stretching the deadline that has been fixed (2015).

Actually, to run “business as usual” “without an alternative” equals being a generation which is unabashedly living on the basis of the heritage of its children and grand-children rather than the other way round. The fact that this is now happening on a global scale is a historical first. This alerting reversal, if continued, unmistakably foreshadows an “end of civilization as we know it” – scenario (e.g. Diamond, 2005). The causes for this likely scenario are known by many of those who bring it about before the breakdown has actually taken place on a broader scale – this is another historical first. An array of curative and preventive measures are known and at least partly available but not (sufficiently) employed – this is a third historical first. These three historical firsts combined make humankind very much appear as travelling on planet earth as a suicide bomber.¹⁸ On this basis there is one big unanswered question, and it is unanswered because it is taboo to ask it in the first place: How to act appropriately after it’s too late?

In this overall context the European Union, through its Lisbon strategy¹⁹ and its reform treaty²⁰ wants to strengthen its path towards a transnational, sustainable, open and inclusive society but, at the same time, become the most competitive and innovative knowledge economy of the world. That goal is stated in the nowadays pervasive economic slang. But even when striving for alternative futures in alternative terms, there is a large consensus that research, innovation and lifelong learning are key. What is rarely considered, however, in European policies – and in other regions either – is that the current challenges cannot be overcome by learning and innovating more and faster in any linear way. There is little awareness yet that the core issues of societal macroshift need to be addressed on the much deeper meta-paradigmatic level of worldviews. Only then can the contemporary predominance of partial perspectives and of specific levels (national) and domains (economy) become more balanced. This requires a deep, multidimensional transformation.²¹ This transformation cannot be caused in any straightforward way, though. However, it is possible to create and cultivate organisational and educational environments that are more receptive and conducive for its emergence than this is generally the case.

As a proxy for this transformation we can look at empirical research on values change.²² This line of research has quite consistently shown that the distribution of value systems held by

¹⁸ There is generally much indignation, and rightly so, when people called terrorists employ a similar approach on a much smaller scale and harm or kill innocent bystanders and children. The lack of indignation regarding our own involvement in collectively employing the same approach on a much larger scale is striking and shows that the mirror image is not understood.

¹⁹ http://europa.eu.int/growthandjobs/key/index_en.htm

²⁰ http://europa.eu/lisbon_treaty/index_en.htm – after years of intensive struggle and contestation the reform treaty is just now entering into force. For the new lighthouse positions of a President of the EU Council and of a High Representative for Foreign Affairs which the treaty creates two politicians almost totally unknown to the European and world public have been appointed.

²¹ Or even more deeply, a *mutation*, as Jean Gebser (1985) contended.

²² Like the World Values Survey (www.worldvaluessurvey.org), and the European Values Study series (www.europeanvaluesstudy.eu), among many more specialized or geographically more limited studies.

specific sections of the population is shifting in time. It appears that in the last generation or so a growing percentage of the population of Western countries identifies with post-materialist values. This section starts to represent a separate force, distinct from religious traditionalists and secular materialists – or at least would represent a separate force if more mutual awareness and coordination was established. Individuals identifying with post-materialist values tend to be more interested in quality of life than standard of living, psycho-spiritual development than material security, relational care than untempered competition, cultural diversity than identity politics, environmental protection than exploitation of nature, social justice than domination.

This (inter-generational and to a certain degree intra-generational) values change in a section of the population is probably too recent to attract wider awareness, but it is empirically undeniable. In many countries the growing proportion of the population holding and enacting post-materialist values is not yet properly represented in the post-war system of political parties and does not yet have a substantial impact on the existing public educational provision. But as a matter of fact it has a different pattern of consumption and is quite active in cultural production and civil society organisations. These people holding post-materialist values actually become more and more organised in multiple groups, networks, projects and training programs. Mostly this occurs outside formal political and academic contexts in informal meetings, associations, and settings of coaching, consulting and alternative adult education. Many of these initiatives are often still largely isolated from each other and unaware of their commonalities, especially across domains, streams and countries. But day after day there are more of them.

Conclusion

Vaclav Havel's contention introducing this section says it all: either we are bringing about a leap in consciousness and substantial transformation of our post-war consumerist Western lifestyles within a generation or civilisational decline if not cataclytic breakdown will take over. The time window for this to be catalyzed is shrinking very quickly, and in many respects it is already too late. There are signs, though, that the leap in consciousness has indeed started to take place in growing sections of Western populations and elsewhere, and that these sections are among the best-educated, critical, spiritually interested, and engaged in civil society initiatives. However, there are too few educational opportunities yet reflecting and enhancing their values, attitudes, knowledge quests, practices and lifestyles (especially so in publicly recognized forms of higher education). On this basis the need for information and knowledge, discussion and networking, training and competencies, research on and practice of ILA's is already sensible and is very likely to grow steadily in Europe and elsewhere.

Today, there is no other reasonable way to influence the (true but partial) rationalistic, science-based, and technologically propelled power base of the Western world than to target in its heart: the scientific enterprise and its underpinnings. Transforming academia from within is necessary because the techno-scientific power-base in its current globalised performances reveals severe (self-)destructive tendencies. It is very efficient with regards to isolated processes but evidently very little effective with regards to cross-cutting issues, higher purposes and long-term sustainability (Maxwell, 2007). As a consequence ILAs have to make inroads into academic research and training or they go nowhere, and higher education thus goes nowhere as well.

Evolution of Research Paradigms

The creation of our current global problems, and our inability to respond adequately to these problems, has much to do, in other words, with the long-standing, rarely noticed, structural irrationality of our institutions and traditions of learning, devoted as they are to acquiring knowledge dissociated from learning how to tackle our problems of living in more cooperatively rational ways. Knowledge-inquiry, because of its irrationality, is designed to intensify, not help solve, our current global problems. Inquiry devoted primarily to the pursuit of knowledge is, then, grossly and damagingly irrational when judged from the standpoint of contributing to human welfare by intellectual means. At once the question arises: What would a kind of inquiry be like that is devoted, in a genuinely rational way, to promoting human welfare by intellectual means? I shall call such a hypothetical kind of inquiry wisdom-inquiry ... (Maxwell, 2007, p. 103)

To understand the unique contributions to higher education ILAs can make it is necessary to mention some features that became powerful forces in mainstream versions of academic research and higher education: hyper-specialisation, scientism, but as well worldview revolutions generated by scientific research itself.

The flourishing of specializations can be considered the single most important and most pervasive structural feature of the research and higher education systems from the 19th century onwards until today (Becher & Trowler, 2001). The number of institutionalized disciplines and sub-disciplines grew almost exponentially, and today we arrived at approximately 10,000 recognized research fields. Interdisciplinarity, by the way, is not a new buzzword at all, but a pretty old claim, historically arising almost together with disciplinary and sub-disciplinary specialization. However, the call for and practice of interdisciplinary endeavours has rather added to than remedied the rapid proliferation of compartmentalized pockets of knowledge generation, because it is creating uncountable new cross-over niches, hybrid sub-disciplines and many temporary projects not leaving any new imprint, coordinated perspectives or conceptual integration. The disciplinary structure and its interdisciplinary sibling help to create professional identities and cross-generational lineages at the price of decreasing societal usefulness of the knowledge produced, even more so as facts were often separated from values.²³ This drift towards scattered and “value-emptied” knowledge has reduced the possibility to communicate results beyond the small community of fellow specialists and to derive helpful recommendations for and co-operations with practitioners and policy makers.

Scientific inquiry as practiced in many of the contemporary institutional settings of higher education and research in this spirit often turns out to be scientific dogmatism (scientism) when challenged by phenomena and arguments not fitting right away in the dominant frameworks and their unquestioned background assumptions, be they modernist or postmodernist. Scientism is rather unscientifically restricting the range of legitimate questions, methods, theories and fields of inquiry. Scientism in less obvious forms seems respectable in many research communities and

²³ As if the selection and construction of facts is not guided by values, as if relying on facts is not a value in itself, and as if one could remain neutral regarding certain facts.

beyond. It is part of the strategic game of rhetorical and institutional delimitation of “true science” from other forms of generation of insight (like practical knowledge, spiritual experiences, or worldviews from non-Western cultures) – as if there could be a completely neat split. This continuous attempt to make academic science special – and superior – often lacks reflexivity, and doesn’t reflect what makes scientific research truly specific in terms of an undogmatic, pluralistic, rational, transparent and reflexive mode of inquiry. It doesn’t sufficiently take into account that the practice of the academic researcher is embedded in a multi-layered knowledge quest co-determined by a-rational intuitions, personal themes, and cultural metaphors. And it doesn’t consider the whole impact of worldview revolutions that scientific research has produced by itself, and which show the limits of understanding and dealing with reality in terms of scientism.

If the quantum revolution has shattered the mechanistic worldview in the sciences in the early 20th century, the postmodern and reflexive turn has shattered any myth of the given in the humanities and the social sciences in the late 20th century. It appears that data is observer and theory-dependent, that language, metaphor, and cultural communities of practice play a major role in interpretation and sense-making, that there is a diversity of rationally defensible paradigms which don’t go away with scientific discoveries and advances, and that the link between knowledge and social power relations cannot be denied. Accordingly, post-positivist research approaches have gained influence, and the call for a more self-reflexive practice of scientific research has started to spread and to become normative, at least in the social sciences.

Interestingly, many proponents of quantum physics²⁴ and of variants of post-modern philosophy²⁵ came close to a post-conventional (proto-)spiritual worldview when pushing their genuine approaches to the limits. They touched a hyper-rational / trans-rational scientific / spiritual vision of reality, and couldn’t do otherwise when following the internal contradictions of their respective approaches from within. In a nutshell it could be said that they naturally arrived at the entry point of an ILA. As they can be seen as forerunners and expressions of a wider cultural transformation it can be assumed that in the near future a significant proportion of scholars and academic teachers will struggle to follow them up to that point and beyond. A promising number of smart students seem to be faster on track in this direction than many of those formally in charge to teach them.

ILAs are actually going beyond the limitations of scientism and reductionist (but as well older holistic) visions and approaches, beyond the dissociation of science and spirituality which is specific to the Western world and gave rise to modern science in the first place (see the section on contours), but as well beyond extreme relativism widespread in research communities infused by postmodern thought. To be clear, ILAs are neither opposed to specialised research nor to cultural diversity. They are widely drawing and relying and residing on both. They are just opposed to the striking imbalance between specialised and boundary-crossing research, between

²⁴ E.g. Max Planck who said: “I have become a believer because I have been thinking until the end of thinking. We all stop our thinking much too early.”

²⁵ E.g. Gilles Deleuze’s “productive void,” François Lyotard’s “black void,” Jacques Derrida’s “absolute secret” – for a thorough treatment and further examples see Benedikter (Benedikter, 2006) or an early online draft thereof on <http://www.integralworld.net/benedikter1a.html>.

empirical studies regarding specific limited contexts and meta-studies. They are heading towards post-metaphysical and post-disciplinary meta-theories and “integrally informed” action derived from the recognition of all the partial but complementary worldviews, perspectives, theories, and methodologies from natural and social sciences, humanities, arts and spiritual traditions. In integral approaches scientific, artistic and spiritual disciplines are generally equally respected for exploring intertwined realms and layers of reality.

As far as I can see it between the 1850s and the 1950s more than a dozen original thinkers from different continents, thought traditions and cultural contexts introduced “integral” as a core term and as an approach of a more encompassing kind. When doing so most of them didn’t know of each other. Among them were many cosmopolitan Europeans. The fact that ILAs were born in multiple, independent streams with their specific but overlapping emphasises can be interpreted as a typical phenomenon of emergence.²⁶ This multi-local emergence is not widely known, not even by researchers inspired by one or the other brand of an ILA. Many of them tend to reproduce the partial historical picture storied in the stream they identify with. Some of these streams have been born inside, some outside, some at the margins of academia. In addition, many other streams having chosen other labels²⁷ can be considered complementing, resonating and overlapping with those that have become known as “integral” approaches. Since the 1970s a new wave of ILAs unfolded, once again in multiple streams. Today, we can look at and take advantage of a richly textured ecology of ILAs provided that cross-stream scholarly communication and reflexivity becomes more strongly developed. This is not yet the case to an extent which would be adequate in face of the globally available treasures brought to us by ILAs.

This stands in some contrast to the core motivation of ILA’s that can be seen as attempts to take into account and relate major dimensions of reality and human life to each other across and beyond paradigms, disciplines, cultures and eras. Today, it is possible for the first time in history to simultaneously access great many worldviews and practices humanity has developed and made use of in various places and contexts for various purposes. As a consequence, in today’s rapidly globalising knowledge sphere, we can consider them in conjunction as a heritage of humanity and critically reappraise them in the light of contemporary scientific research, higher learning and societal challenges.

For this to happen, we need to bring about a new step of maturation of research and higher education and to leave behind the still dominant scientific propensity to grasp and explain reality through the lenses of basically reductive models and methods. ILA’s are generally designed to complement and transcend hyper-specialised and reductionist research and education. Our times demand neither the perpetuation of eclectic pluralism or relativism, nor monistic fusion of everything into one unified theory which risks to be disrespectful of the knowledge already generated through the domain-, discipline- and paradigm-specific developments fruitfully going on for decades and centuries.

²⁶ The reconstruction of the cross-cultural and multi-stream historical unfolding of integral and likeminded approaches is the object of another line of research I am pursuing and preparing to publish.

²⁷ Like meta-(theoretical, methodological, ...) studies and (neo-)humanist, critical realist, transformative, transdisciplinary, transmodern, biosemiotic, multifocal, complexity and quantum paradigms, among others.

Instead, developing various forms of *integral pluralism* (Dallmayr, 2010; Gidley; forthcoming, 2007; Molz & Edwards, 2010) allows basic commonalities and relationships among the multiplicity of perspectives and traditions to become more apparent, more approachable and more useful, without neglecting their differences and specifics. The challenge, hence, is to bring responsibly together the wealth of knowledge, and of quality criteria and methodologies scientific research and higher education have brought about so far, but also the practices and results of other viable paths of development of knowledge and wisdom, practical and spiritual. Contemporary ILAs are precisely designed as possible answers to this huge challenge, and they overlap in their concerns and contentions whether or not their proponents are aware of this or not.

The development and cultivation of integral knowledge, however, is but one strand of the endeavour of ILAs. Overall, it strives to value, deploy and sustain a *wisdom* adapted to our era (Awbrey & D. K. Scott, n.d.; Blasi, 2006; Maxwell, 2007; Standish, 2000). This can happen through a mindful reintegration of the (necessary and welcomed) modern differentiation between sciences, arts and spiritualities as the three major interdependent realms of human beings' expression and (co-)construction of reality. ILAs transcend the widespread representation of science as value-free and of spirituality as renouncing this-worldly affairs, as well as the idea that the practices of the arts and the sciences, the sciences and the spiritualities are necessarily at odds with each other. They are designed to develop interwoven integral sciences, integral arts, integral ethics, and integral spirituality and to raise the awareness for their multiple interrelationships.²⁸ Based on a widely shared emergent complexification principle of "differentiation without separation" (rather than reductionist simplification through "differentiation and separation") most promoters of ILAs are hoping to contribute to overcome the pervasive split restated in much of Western thought between subjectivity and objectivity, values and facts, theory and practice, being and becoming etc.

As much as many efforts have been put into developing more encompassing conceptual frameworks corresponding emancipatory practices are called for. Those practices invite individuals and collectives to realise their specific potential through synergetic self-transformation of body, mind and spirit, mindful communication, social service and communities of inquiry, and finally through transformative action related to the political, economic and environmental systems. There is a huge array of practices which can be composed into an integral lifestyle. This allows to follow personal preferences, habits, vocation, bliss or cultural traditions and nevertheless to live up to a shared integral ethos. On this basis it becomes possible to locally and globally inter-relate to each other and integrally co-evolve together. The overall goal of emancipatory practices is to consciously contribute to the health of the whole multi-layered individual and collective adventure of evolution instead of supporting one part or level while neglecting or being harmful to others (and by this retro-actively to oneself, immediately and in the long run). ILAs directed to small and large scale individual and institutional transformation emerge as a necessary wing of such a commitment for an undivided, interconnected and creative life. Higher education, then, cannot be an exception. Rather, it

²⁸ See e.g. the role of aesthetics in the process of scientific discovery, the technologies of artistic production, the value orientations implicitly or explicitly guiding scientific research.

should be a priority given its purportedly central role in the upcoming global, networked, knowledge-based society.

However, those ILA-streams that are already engaged with questioning, infiltrating and transforming higher education are often so self-absorbed by their own intellectual and organisational development, frequently at the limit of sheer material survival, that apparently there are no (motivational, mental, time and organisational) resources left to imagine and realize overarching coordination and synergy, across streams and initiatives. Another unsolved challenge is adding to this problem: how to assure that the work of one generation (e.g. the work of the founder of a stream) is carried on by the next generation? Generally, inside academia, immediate intergenerational lineages as they are common in and constitutive for disciplinary research do not exist for ILAs. Some of the reasons for this are the lack of institutional containers: there are (almost) no ILA-institutes, study programs, degrees and labor markets. The stream-specificity of labels, networks, associations, conferences and journals prevent a common identity and intellectual space to coalesce, to be institutionalised and promoted more visibly. On this basis ILAs cannot contribute their crucial potential of complementing specialized research and stimulating new, less fragmented practices. Institutional achievements of one generation of scholars at one place tend to disappear, forcing the next wave of pioneers to invest large parts of their energy to start organising everything from scratch. The number of pioneers who see their vocation in breaching the fortresses of mainstream academia at the considerable risk of getting threatened and lost themselves, together with their families, is limited, however. The number of persons interested in ILAs, and ILA-based higher education is much larger, and it is certainly growing from age cohort to age cohort. Accordingly, more thoroughly conceived strategies for institutionalising ILAs in higher education and research are an absolute requirement as today the critical mass of scholars and (future) students inspired by ILAs already exists whereas a sufficient number of adequate institutional contexts do not yet exist.

Conclusion

The historical differentiation of the scientific knowledge sphere from other societal domains (especially religion), and in itself, has turned in parts into dissociations that have become a road block to further evolutions in higher education, research and society. As long as analysis is structurally highly favoured over synthesis, and diving into ever smaller details more valued than the way they connect to each other, there is really a huge problem. Regardless, growing implicit and explicit demand and the urgent need for a more boundary-crossing and integrated research, education and societal problem-solving of those approaches responding to these demands, like ILAs, are largely ignored or even actively rejected by the academic world as it stands. On the other hand, inter- and transdisciplinary inquiries are today still very often plagued by a lack of conceptual and methodological grounding and they are often too loosely coupled with more specialised discourses to have a positive career impact. The deep-rooted institutional fragmentation of knowledge and knowledge production (as reflected in organisational structures, job descriptions, study and funding programs...) works like an in-built immune-defence against attempts to learn about, develop further and make use of ILAs. At the same time the worldview revolutions that have occurred in the 20th century through scientific research itself are pretty much conducive to ILAs if they were taken more seriously by mainstream researchers and decision makers in higher education.

These are reasons why the existing explicit or implicit demand arising from “unsolvable problems” in society on the one hand, and from spreading post-materialists values in the population on the other hand, is not satisfied by the academic world as it stands now, nor, by the way, by adult education providers lacking a research basis and charging high fees for their services. There are more and more initiatives inspired by ILAs popping up today but quite often they are ignoring each other, especially across national, linguistic, disciplinary and stream boundaries. Under these conditions, for reasons inherent in mainstream research and higher education as much as reasons inherent in the current (academic) practice of ILAs themselves, there is still much work to be done towards an acceptable and accepted integral pluralism which could provide a conceptual basis and viable praxis for setting up HESPs inspired by ILAs. It appears that this development could be catalyzed by more and better cooperation across streams of ILA in conjunction with more thoroughly conceived strategies for institutionalising ILAs in higher education and research.

European Higher Education Area

A Europe of Knowledge is now widely recognised as an irreplaceable factor for social and human growth..., capable of giving its citizens the necessary competences to face the challenges of the new millennium ... (Bologna Declaration, 1999)²⁹

In Europe, many universities emancipated from clerical authorities during the Renaissance. An individualistic humanism gained importance at that time and became a structural feature of higher education. As Latin served as lingua franca mobility of academic teachers and students across universities and countries was relatively widespread and allowed new ideas to spread with relative ease. But when universities became more and more involved in and instrumentalised for building the modern nation-states, teaching was switched to the respective national language, and new subject matters besides the classical canon were introduced. Like the nation-state, the European type of university became implemented worldwide, very much by i) 16th-19th century colonialist expansion and its neo-colonial aftermath until today, ii) the attraction of the apparent successes of technology based on discoveries in the sciences which provided an “international” language for researchers and engineers regardless their origin, and finally iii) developmentalism as an extremely pervasive political ideology of the second half of the 20th century hypnotising the global South to catch up with the North Atlantic nations in terms of the latter.

Even though the university came to the West in the 11th/12th century probably borrowing from prior Arabic models and earlier ecclesiastical schools, the foundation of new HEIs spread quite slowly across the entire European peninsula. It took centuries to fairly cover the European territory and only concerned the elites. The substantial expansion of the higher education sector is pretty much a recent phenomenon. The large majority of contemporary European HEIs have been founded in the 20th century. In addition, after the 1968 “revolution” the higher education sector expanded considerably and student intake rose dramatically resulting in the first wave of massification of higher education. To date, in the EHEA there are around 4000 HEIs in which

²⁹ <http://ec.europa.eu/education/policies/educ/bologna/bologna.pdf>

roughly 20 million students are enrolled.³⁰ Despite the demographic shift in Europe a general decline of the absolute numbers of higher education attendance is not forecasted in the immediate future because i) the attendance rate per age cohort is still rising, ii) more international students are attracted to the EHEA, and iii) lifelong learning becomes more and more a policy and a career requirement, i.e. the number of non-traditional students is rising as well.

Given its history Higher Education in Europe is very much a public and state-funded affair, and compared to the USA today there are pretty few private universities. Until recently attending a higher education program at a public higher education institution was basically free and not fee-based in most continental countries.³¹ Even though this is about to change in several countries the fees introduced are generally considerably lower than in the Anglosaxon countries, and any introduction of fees is heavily contested and subject to intense political struggles, and there are first cases of already implemented fees being cancelled again by a new government. So, as higher education in Europe is now undergoing the ultimate wave of “massification” and as additional public resources won’t be made available in many countries for a long time to come,³² there is a desperate search for additional resources from third parties. At the same time there isn’t any widespread culture of private donations to higher education. It goes without saying that the current global financial and economic crisis whose effects will only really hit higher education from 2010 onwards, doesn’t make a situation better which has already been structurally bad in most places for a great many years. This has often started to affect the quality of academic learning, e.g. because of a worsening ratio of students per teacher. This state of affairs often prevents deep-level innovation spreading across isolated test areas and favours a “back-to-the-basics” mentality, i.e. back to the traditional disciplines. Innovation, however, generally comes from the margins of the disciplinary mainstreams, from the interfaces between up-to-then isolated strands of inquiry, and from outside or the fringe of the academic system. There is little institutional action, however, that would actually flow from this recurrent insight from research on innovation.

These evolutions are the background for and mingle with the so-called Bologna process.³³ The Bologna process is a large-scale, transnational reform of the European higher education systems, actually the largest undertaking of targeted transformation of higher education the

³⁰ Let’s assume that 0.1% of these students are more actively and consciously favouring a clearly ILA-based higher education over (post)modern study programs. This is an extremely pessimistic estimation largely underscoring the actual results of the empirical values studies available to date. In this case an educational provision corresponding to these expectations could mobilize 20,000 students in Europe. Taking into account their diverse interests regarding content and focus, and imperfect communication and matching opportunities, it still holds true that a provision that could attract thousands of students with already existing and conscious ILA-affinity simply isn’t there yet. Even less explored are the opportunities to attract the even more important number of students with a latent affinity.

³¹ The case of the UK being more aligned with other Anglosaxon countries worldwide.

³² There are interesting exceptions to this general rule in rich countries like Norway strategically investing its gains from its national oil industry into education, or Luxembourg trying to perform a late but quick move into the knowledge age by investing into the creation of a national research and higher education system.

³³ <http://www.ond.vlaanderen.be/hogeronderwijs/bologna/about/>

world has ever seen. It was started in 1999 – symbolically at the oldest university of the Western world³⁴ – by the ministers in charge of higher education of several European countries. To the surprise of many sceptics and of observers of past failed attempts to harmonize the pretty strong and diverse national traditions of higher education in Europe, reaching deep into the history of the creation of nation-states, this reform gained considerable momentum. Eventually it attracted 46 European countries, from Ireland to Russia and from Norway to Cyprus, to engage simultaneously in one of the most far-reaching transformations their national higher education systems have undergone since their creation. The shared overall goal of this reform is to create a common European Higher Education Area (EHEA). The process is widely supported, e.g. by supranational bodies like the European Commission, the Council of Europe, and the UNESCO European Centre for Higher Education, but as well by international associations like the European University Association, the European Students Union and the European Association for Quality Assurance in Higher Education. Nevertheless many critics have shown up and many attempts to undermine or at least limit or delay the process have occurred in various countries and disciplines (basically pleading for variants of “new wine in old wineskins” or even “old wine in old wineskins”). But in the end the proponents of this version of a TINA (“there is no alternative”) formation³⁵ won the battle and the Bologna process will be generalized until 2010 with only very few exceptions to its general scheme.

The major goal of the reform is the full mutual recognition of higher education degrees based on a three cycle system (bachelor, master and doctorate). This becomes possible through the generalisation of the European Credit Transfer System (ECTS) which is presupposing a complete modularisation of all study programs. The specific trajectory of each student is reflected in a mandatory and standardised diploma supplement based on the new European qualifications framework and their national specifications. The content and output (in terms of competencies) of each module needs from now on be described for study programs to become accredited. In some countries this does not change that much, in others this induces a radical transformation from input to output orientation, from content to competencies. Other goals of the Bologna process are the coordination of the quality management systems, the strategic facilitation of transnational mobility of students, graduates, faculty and staff, greater relevance of higher education and research for society and a better integration of higher education in a process of lifelong learning (Garrod & MacFarlane, 2007).

Even though the EHEA will be officially inaugurated in 2010 as planned at the beginning of the Bologna process certain “collateral damages” of this unprecedented multi-stakeholder effort are emphasized by the critics, among them:

- The problem that national systems based on different types of HEIs (e.g. universities and polytechnics-like HEIs) are unlikely to survive in the long run because of the formal equality of their degrees the reform has enforced, and so a unified system will become pervasive and with it the rush for ranking between individual HEIs – if this becomes true the idea of harmonization based on diversity and cooperation turns into homogenization destroying diversity and favouring strongly competitive institutional behaviours.

³⁴ The University of Bologna is believed to be founded in 1088.

³⁵ See footnote 16.

- The fact that today there is not much less cross-country, cross-domain and inter-institutional structural diversity of programs than before and that the transnational readability of degrees is only apparent³⁶ whereas internationally well-known national diplomas were forced to disappear.
- Academic freedom and possibilities for transnational mobility for students have actually been reduced rather than enhanced, at least on the Bachelor level because those first-cycle programs have often become much more school-like than the first years of the former study programs were before in several countries, with a tight, fixed and prescribed curriculum and ongoing assessment without, however, reducing the drop-out rate which was one the driving goals for this transformation. In addition, many intra-European cross-border programs which were running well before the onset of the Bologna process didn't survive the implementation of the new constraints related to it.
- In many countries in which the doctoral level research training has not been formalized before it now becomes formalized and thus limits self-governed unfolding of personalized trajectories of research and building of unique profiles.
- The requirement to split and package the entire learning process of all students into predefined little modules which can be often quite randomly combined is much more favouring a spirit of tactically collecting credits from modules allowing to acquire them with the least effort than to engage in more organic and sustainable processes of learning related to the potential of a student.
- The specification of learning outcomes and ECTS points for each module is more often than not an artistic and rhetoric exercise rather than an approach grounded in method and data. The ECTS points are calculated on the basis of an (often simply invented or roughly estimated) average workload for a fictive average student. The extent to which the assessment of the competencies acquired through a module is connected to the competencies specified in the module description is often pretty much unclear. This approach anchored in the old-fashioned and fragmented thinking in time-slots and in the separation of curriculum planning, learning and assessment activities rather than in integrated processes of learning fosters normativity rather than individual pathways, in contradiction to the strong European diversity-policies.

If some of these critiques turn out to be or become at least partly true then in some respects the Bologna process put into practice worked paradoxically against its own well-intentioned goals. This effect is not different from many institutional reforms conceived and implemented with little involvement of those being concerned in the first place (somehow the “new wine doesn't fit into the new wineskins”).

With regard to the second cycle (Masters programs) a twofold development can be observed so far, a development I would like to emphasize for the sake of the argument in the strategy section: On the one hand there is a tendency to just rename pre-existing programs and to try to

³⁶ There are now Bachelor programs of 3 and of 4 years full time duration, and Masters programs of 1 or 2 years duration, and all combinations thereof. Accordingly, a Masters degree made in Europe can now reflect between 4 and 6 years of actual study. As a consequence, a much deeper understanding of individual trajectories is now required.

continue business as usual (basically “old wine in new wineskins” – whereas the old wine risks to turn into vinegar through its rebottling); on the other hand in many countries with a traditional single long-cycle system now all of a sudden the first cycle and the second cycle have become structurally delinked. This has triggered a wave of creativity to develop completely new, and at least partly innovative programs in order to be attractive for students from a broader range of first cycle programs and as well for non-traditional students (professionals, part-time students etc.). Many of these truly new programs (“new wine in new wineskins”) open up specific interdisciplinary niches, have an international outlook,³⁷ and are run by an inter-institutional and cross-border consortium rather than by a single HEI (see sections on strategy and contours). The “Erasmus Mundus”³⁸ support program of the European commission, started in 2004 to complement the long-standing Erasmus program for individual intra-European student mobility, has made this development even more prominent. Through a very competitive process Erasmus Mundus selects high quality cross-border European Masters programs and endows them with attractive scholarships for non-European students (!)

Another recent major transformation of academia has to be noted: many HEIs in many countries have switched from a traditional self-governance model of the professoriate to new governance styles adopted for their management. To make universities more agile small university councils have taken over the power to decide on major strategic issues. They are generally composed by a small number of personalities from different walks of life external to the HEI. This transformation was catalyzed by the new public management approach releasing decision power to educational institutions which were under direct state control before. If it is true that this managerial approach has been speeding up reform processes in many cases in which they were blocked for decades by a traditionalist professoriate, it has further reduced the already few possibilities of participatory decision-making, and of electing representatives bottom-up. In HEIs that have adopted the model of external university council the split between research and higher education managers on the one hand and scholars, young scholars, and students on the other, has become even more profound than it already was the case before. The development of such a HEI very much depends on the intellectual horizon and foresight of the members of the council, the time they actually invest in their deliberations, and the quality of dialogue and decision-making between them. It goes without saying, that in practice this varies considerably. Those councils can trigger and favour innovation as much as they can suffocate new bottom-up initiatives – in each case it really depends on just a couple of men (mostly).

If this means less democracy within HEI’s another trend democratizes access to higher education degrees. New national laws were introduced³⁹ that generalise and organise the possibility of formal recognition of learning that takes place outside HEI’s, in non-formal or occupational settings, for the acquisition of higher education degrees. Even though not directly linked to the creation of the EHEA these laws are very much affecting higher education. They considerably strengthen the value of practical experience and rebalance the relationship between practice-based learning and theoretical learning. The juries created to decide on requests of

³⁷ Some are run in English in countries where English is not the national language, or in more than one language, to be attractive to international students.

³⁸ http://eacea.ec.europa.eu/erasmus_mundus

³⁹ In more and more European countries – the UK and France having taken the lead.

academic recognition of practice-based learning are generally composed of scholars and practitioners. This creates a completely new contested field in which power games and hot debates are occurring, but as well mutual learning. Many practitioners are eager to get their actual competence formally recognized whereas the professoriate is still often reluctant to accept other paths of learning than the one inside the ivory tower, but is more and more legally forced to do so. The translation of practical experience into academic subject matters or study modules is far from self-evident. It is often quite demanding for the candidate to submit an application that is bridging the two worlds convincingly. But more and more succeed, and so a new era has started in which the boundaries between the worlds of theory and practice are becoming more permeable.

Astonishingly loosely coupled with the EHEA is the development of the European Research Area (ERA). Transnational research and development partnerships are very much triggered by the European framework funding programs in many different focus areas. Traditionally, mixed-type and cross-sector partnerships are particularly welcome. The programs have been considerably redesigned on the basis of a quite innovative at least partly open, participatory process and an independent European Research Council has been created from scratch. The new funding schemes resulting from it have been implemented with the 7th Framework program.⁴⁰ The European Science Foundation offers additional interesting opportunities.⁴¹ An unprecedented emphasis on boundary-crossing approaches can be noted.⁴² On the other hand, it still holds true that the administrative load is important in EU projects and that it remains very difficult to acquire European research money for process-oriented research as task and outcome has to be fixed and detailed in advance. More and more applications are submitted which makes the competition quite fierce. But nevertheless it appears that sometimes ILA-informed approaches can manage to correspond well to the European research policy whereas this is often more challenging on the national level.

⁴⁰ <http://cordis.europa.eu/fp7>

⁴¹ <http://www.esf.org>

⁴² In a Communication of the European Commission called “Delivering on the modernisation agenda for universities” (2006) one of the required lines of action is called “Enhance interdisciplinarity and transdisciplinarity” and spelled out as follows:

Universities should be able to reconfigure their teaching and research agendas to seize the opportunities offered by new developments in existing fields and by new emerging lines of scientific inquiry. This requires focusing less on scientific disciplines and more on research domains ... associating them more closely with related or complementary fields (including humanities, social sciences, entrepreneurial and management skills) and fostering interaction between students, researchers and research teams through greater mobility between disciplines, sectors and research settings. All this necessitates new institutional and organisational approaches to staff management, evaluation and funding criteria, teaching and curricula and, above all, to research and research training. The implications of inter- and trans-disciplinarity need to be acknowledged and taken on board not only by universities and Member States, but also by professional bodies and funding councils, which still rely mostly on traditional, single-discipline evaluations, structures and funding mechanisms.

(http://ec.europa.eu/education/policies/2010/doc/comuniv2006_en.pdf)

Overall, the broadly pushed structural development of the EHEA and the European Research Area is currently going on, and will go on beyond 2010, together with waves of reforms and pseudo-reforms on the national level. On this basis, there are different trends to be observed, among them:

- Accountability towards society is going to become more important and more immediate for higher education and research institutions than before. The new governance models bring external quality assessment systems to countries and institutions in which they have not been in use so far.
- Modularisation has quickly become not only the main buzzword but a must for the organisation of any study program to become accredited. The learning outcome / competence / ECTS-slang and the according rules of the game need to be mastered.
- Hyper-specialisation in research and education is continuing but transdisciplinary approaches are getting more opportunities to actualise than before.
- Internationalisation starts only now to become really important for many HEIs. It is evolving from a nice-to-have add-on concerning a minority of incoming and outgoing students to a strategic core concern for the future institutional development.
- Lifelong learning has become a prime directive and the market for higher learning especially in postgraduate and continuing professional education is indeed ever growing.⁴³
- Underfunding and restricted, structurally overregulated career paths are currently generating "HEIs short of academic teachers and researchers" (the average student / teacher ratio has been substantially growing in most European countries over the last decades) and "academic teachers and researchers short of HEIs" (there are many highly qualified researchers and academic teachers not fitting to the profiles of the job openings and the bureaucratic regulations regarding staff categories).
- Student-centred learning has very much become a trend designating most varied actual practices of teaching and learning, many of which are student-centred to a very limited degree only (see section on contours).

Conclusion

The Bologna process is such a huge undertaking, so unfinished yet and requiring reforms of the reform, that a next wave of reform of the whole higher education system in Europe, a reform of a more integral kind, is very likely to take generations to shape up. So, basically, for decades to come and despite extremely pressing societal challenges, we cannot realistically expect a methodologically more integral reform of the higher education system specifically devised to transform the structurally integrated EHEA into a substantially integral EHEA. The EHEA as conceived by the promoters of the Bologna process is a reality from now on which can neither be ignored nor circumvented. Accordingly, a thorough analysis of its problematic aspects needs to be followed by a focus on the opportunities it offers. These opportunities are mainly i) a more and more favourable climate for boundary-crossing approaches on the level of European and other funding programs, ii) the need to attract new student populations in a situation of stronger

⁴³ However: "lifelong learning tends to contribute to the fragmentation of knowledge, while at the same time enhancing the appropriation of knowledge by individual learners" (Kehm, 2001, p. 5).

international and inter-institutional competition, declining resources and demographically diminishing young generations combined with the receptiveness of certain target groups for new programs corresponding to their values, expectations and lifestyles, iii) new spaces for creativity that can be deployed for developing and implementing new Masters programs and doctoral schools, especially by innovative inter-institutional consortia. The precondition to succeed under the conditions reigning now is to understand and master the new formal and terminological game that everybody is required to play.

Strategies

What the future of the university will be, as with all questions about the future, is unknown. Our intent is to ... contour the unknowable ... While historical forces will dramatically change the current university there are still choices to be made as to the shape of future universities. (Inayatullah & Gidley, 2000, p. 13)

This section is devoted to a strategic reflection of various options and paths to developing higher education generally, and more integral variants of higher education more specifically. It appeared to me that such a strategic reflection has not yet been conducted, that the array of options is rarely fully explored, and that past failures to advance more integral forms of higher education in Europe and elsewhere may in part be related to weak, implicit, undiscussed strategies. On this basis a promising strategic corridor will be proposed within which the likelihood to advance ILAs in the EHEA and to advance the EHEA with ILAs is higher than with other strategies.

Strategic Options for Developing Higher Education

I will now first turn the attention to strategic options available to HEI's within the EHEA (and beyond), then to options available to programs, and then to options available on the course-level. On all these levels I will discuss the options most of the time chosen and reproduced by past attempts to implement more integral alternatives and complements to mainstream higher education.

For higher learning in Europe there seem to be three major institutional options:

- By far the most dominant one is the rat race within under-funded public universities and their more or less traditional faculties, disciplines and sub-disciplines;
- Second are the often domain-, purpose-, or stream-specific private or corporate "universities;"
- Finally, there are new (cross-border) virtual providers (often lacking a research-base on their own), or more traditional open universities, and their often ready-made programs.

We have to be clear, that the main structures, goals, practices and respective funding and incentive systems of none of these types of HEIs is primarily concerned with, prioritizing or structurally supportive of ILAs. Of course there are niches and margins that are potentially more conducive – we will come back to them later (see section on contours). Today, regardless the structural, strategic and other differences between institutional types, they are equally focused on

assuring funding (or making money) and creating reputation (in terms of rankings, external quality assurance reports etc.). In a way, all those institutional options are likewise structurally limiting rather than enhancing innovation and transformation as perceived as necessary from the angle of ILAs. None of them fits well to the idea of a more integral higher education which is neither disciplinary nor necessarily limited to one specific practical domain nor easily transmitted as content packages dissociated from actual research and authentic face-to-face encounters.

There are probably more failures than thriving attempts in Europe to implement sustainable alternative and vanguard models for entire higher education institutions. As a matter of fact, despite a comparable size of their higher education systems (see section on contours) there is a considerable less important number of such institutions in Europe compared to the USA.⁴⁴ Many of them are financially unstable, of mixed reputation and durably marginal to the overall system. Over time, they tend to disappear, stop to further evolve after the initial impulse or to become re-mainstreamed. Even though pressures having these effects are by no means unique to the specificities of European higher education they seem to have a strong(er) impact there. Nevertheless, there are still new attempts under way to create alternative higher education institutions and of course we can only hope that some of them will be luckier than many of their “predecessors” have been.

Generally, the possibility to bring ILAs to higher education by building new, alternative, private HEIs from scratch is severely limited in Europe, even though this is precisely the dream of many academic teachers and students inspired by ILAs, or simply by those discontent with the current state of affairs, especially as they have normatively shaped higher education everyday reality through the implementation of the Bologna process. Only in case of really important donations from several donors directed to one specific project over a consequent period of time it could be hoped to create a cross-domain “integral university” in the brick & mortar sense anytime soon. Even though legal barriers and regulations for the creation of private universities have been alleviated in some European countries I already mentioned that a culture of private funding of higher education is not well developed. Another important barrier is that fees cannot be very high for all but the most elite programs and will never be sufficient to run an alternative HEI without other sources of funding. Public funds go prioritarily to the already underfunded public HEIs and the new, fashionable “centres of excellence” (creating new opportunities in a few places and even more underfunding in all others). Conceiving and realizing alternative brick

⁴⁴ All over Europe there seem to be little comparable institutions to long-standing private alternative HEIs in the USA like the California Institute of Integral Studies, Naropa University, The Fetzer Institute, The Graduate Institute, Saybrook Graduate School and Research Center, JFK University, San Diego University for Integrative Studies, etc. The European examples like Schumacher College (GB), University for Humanistics (Netherlands), and the Campus University of Applied Integral Pedagogy, Health and Management which is in the process of being founded (Germany) are much smaller, less developed and more strongly focused initiatives, among other upcoming projects. The University of Witten-Herdecke (Germany) can be considered a major attempt to build a private vanguard model of a multi- and cross-disciplinary university. It has gone through a series of serious crises and backlashes until recently, though, so that it remains to be seen which parts of the original vision will survive in the long run.

& mortar dreams absorb an amazing amount of time, energy and resources. If by good luck such an institution appears and remains on stage it can serve a specific function in a broader view on how to evolve toward programs of integral higher education (see section on integral organizations).⁴⁵

The institutional level having been discussed, let's now turn to the options on the program-level because they are more lightweight and easier to realise, at least some of them. On this middle-level, basically there are three largely dominant options once again:

- The *traditional strategy* to have disciplinary programs starting in the first cycle and then continuing through the second to the third cycle. This is not only the chronological order students are running through the programs but as well the traditional way to set up new programs – like the stories of a building from the fundamentals to the roof. As such continuous programs in traditional disciplines are run in many universities they attract and first and foremost students who are geographically close-by already before their enrolment.
- The *umbrella strategy* of generic programs allowing for specialisation after having taken some introductory courses of general interest. This strategy is more and more employed because the administration and promotion of many small programs is more complicated and expensive for a HEI than the administration of larger generic programs. This fits well with the general tendency to look for economies of scale but it creates at the same time additional need of student support and guidance to help them find their specific way through such a broader offer. Therefore, often, choice is relatively restricted to quite a few predefined options whereas principally more choice could be offered on the basis of this option than on the basis of the other two options.
- The *niche strategy* of small programs specialized as a whole from the outset (either in the sub-disciplinary or in the interdisciplinary sense) and attracting students partly coming from far away precisely because of the unique or rare speciality. The niche strategy is most promising for smaller departments or upcoming HEIs but often requires considerable efforts in marketing to become known and to continuously attract a sufficient number of students. It applies rather to the second and third cycle than to the first cycle.

Regarding the perspective of the development of HESPs inspired by ILAs, none of these three options really fits. Integral studies won't evolve into a discipline anytime soon, and for many ILA-inspired researchers it would be a pretty self-refuting prospect to create a new discipline alongside the traditional disciplines. Can we seriously expect integral studies to fare better than philosophy which has degenerated from the “mother of all disciplines,” the meta-discipline par excellence, the purported reflective centre of knowledge building, to an ungrateful niche

⁴⁵ A potential fourth institutional option will not be discussed here because it extremely unlikely to occur: the transformation of an already well-established (post)modern HEI into an ILA-based HEI. In Europe, there is probably no single example for such a sensational transition. In the USA one example of an attempt in such a direction was the transformational leadership of David Scott as Chancellor of the University of Massachusetts at Amherst (see footnote 3), and the creation of the Community for Integrative Learning and Action (CILA) in which faculty from the HEIs of the Five Colleges Area connected for collective activities of learning and transformation.

existence within shrinking humanities departments, scattered into its own manifold sub-disciplines? No, we can't. Under the conditions of institutional structures tuned to support hyper-specialisation we can only expect that integral studies would have an even worse position.

The umbrella option must be ruled out as the critical mass of ILA-inspired researchers and teachers isn't there in any given single HEI in Europe,⁴⁶ and there is no department with the strategy to systematically attract this rare breed of scholars to it. It is extremely unlikely that anybody manages to start an ILA-inspired study program as a broad first-cycle program and attracts a sufficient number of students from scratch to make such an effort viable. As long as the umbrella strategy is realized mainly for administrative reasons and economies-of-scale inside one larger mainstream HEI it is not likely that a whole department is willing to get rid of an existing generic program and to replace it by an ILA-based one, or to subsume a variety of more specific programs under one single, integral umbrella. This may at best happen in a non-mainstream HEI, but we already mentioned the challenges and limits linked to such a whole institution strategy, especially in Europe. Even though the umbrella strategy would make the best fit for ILAs out of the three traditional program-level options it is unfortunately the least likely to be realized.

No wonder then that the niche strategy is the only one which has actually been tried out, as far as my knowledge goes, because it allows starting small and at the margins. The recurrent downsides are weakness within the hosting institution, insufficient numbers of employed faculty, and a less than optimal differentiation of tasks / responsibilities producing a lack of professionalism in certain areas crucial for the proper development of a new program, be it administrative support, public relations, teaching, research or quality development. The niche strategy has further downsides for ILAs. Not only because of the internal paradox to deploy an encompassing approach within a niche and the consequence not to engage and challenge the mainstream. But as well because of an external threat: This strategy lets ILAs appear unimportant amongst the large, traditional disciplinary programs who can afford to follow the umbrella strategy. Reversing the actual relevance of ILAs in a fragmented world the niche strategy creates an image which is very much conducive to get rid of such a program in case of cuts in funding or in case of its founder and director leaving the university, or other fragile transition phases. Commonly, niche programs are naturally considered to be non essential, a nice add-on, but not very important for the future of the HEI hosting it. And so it goes in practice: if there is no institutional strategy to develop the niche to become part of the core mission of the respective HEI – and this is not widely the case – then alternative niche programs only survive by chance in otherwise mainstream settings, and are easily wiped out, merged or re-mainstreamed.

Well, then the analysis of the program-level options doesn't allow us to draw a friendlier picture for the implementation of HESPs inspired by ILAs than the analysis of the institutional options. Nevertheless, the best guess is that in the long run there will be more HESPs inspired by ILAs at traditional HEIs than at HEIs created for the very purpose to develop such programs. The reason is a simple, numeric one: in Europe there are so many conventional HEIs around and

⁴⁶ This is different in the particular micro-climate of some of the alternative HEIs in the USA mentioned in the prior footnote.

so few alternative ones that a few attempts deployed at existing HEIs can easily outweigh the number of programs on offer at alternative HEIs. I will later return to the idea that both approaches shouldn't be seen in opposition but should ideally be linked to each other to the advantage of both sides and of the greater good.

This prediction that in the long run the strategic potential of conventional HEIs in the EHEA for developing ILA-inspired higher education is more important than the strategic potential of alternative HEIs can be related to an analysis of the course level options. I already mentioned the relative autonomy of the academic teacher in many if not most HESPs at many if not most traditional HEIs, even when declining here and there. As a space opened by this traditional core concern of academic freedom it is basically possible to introduce integral spirit, content, and andragogical approach (see section on integral andragogies) into the courses under any academic teacher's responsibility. This can often be done without too many problems as long as traditional academic values are respected (like critical rationality of discourse, theoretical pluralism, utilisation of explicit methods, recognition of existing research in the field, prevention of plagiarism etc.), and as long as the specialness of ILAs is not too much stressed and overtly displayed (e.g. in the title of a course).

As there are many academic teachers (and students) already inspired by one or the other variant of an ILA, there are many more courses already infused by them than are overtly declared. Either an ILA inspires the content, or the andragogical approach, or both. But despite certain dangers there are even already quite a number of courses overtly displaying that they are ILA-based. More often than not, however, they are a kind of outlier within a HESP not designed on the basis of integral principles and not directed towards integral purposes nor reflecting integral content all over. ILA-based courses might formally belong to a program but not resonate with it regarding the pursued approach. This being said, we have to consider a matrix of at least – $2 \times 2 \times 2$ – eight cases on the course level: i) ILA-based content – ILA-based andragogy, ii) covert or overt ILA-inspiration, and iii) courses resonating or not with other courses within a study program and the general approach of the overall program. This last option of several courses resonating with each other within a program comes already close to a program-level realisation.

As a consequence, the major problem so far is not that ILA-based courses are lacking altogether, but that they are isolated from each other. This isolation stems from the fact that in any discipline in any European country there are at best only a handful of academic teachers and researchers already adopting an ILA in their research and teaching, and that there are very few to adopt several ILAs at the same time, and/or deliberately working across and beyond the disciplinary lines. Accordingly, it is an extremely rare coincidence to have more than one person of this kind in the same department at the same HEI. And even two do not make up the critical mass to build an entire HESP on the basis of their respective courses, even more so as the game to gain institutional support and accreditation is far from assured in advance when it comes to unconventional orientations. Generally, those already teaching courses based on an ILA are inspired by different lead authors, teaching at different levels, in different study programs, in different disciplines, in different languages in different HEIs, in different countries. On the basis of so many heavily institutionalised boundaries, it appears virtually impossible to come to know each other by more than mere chance. Acquaintances are more likely inside the same country, the same discipline, the same ILA-stream. This is not a guarantee either. The specific situation of

ILA-inspired researchers within mainstream HEIs made many of them being used to being solitary and autonomous. As many are innovators in their specific contexts they are generally overwhelmed by more pressing tasks than looking for far away company. On this background, almost every academic teacher working on the basis of an ILA conceives, or is forced to conceive, his or her courses as self-contained units and not as being part of a cross-domain, international, integral HESP.

Conclusion

The creation of a HEI inspired by ILAs – in the more traditional understanding of a HEI – doesn't appear to be the most promising and efficient strategy to move things forward toward integral higher education provisions given that the resources absorbed by building brick & mortar infrastructures are distracted from being used right away for developing, researching, teaching, learning, and otherwise disseminating ILAs and bringing them into practical fields. None of the widespread strategies to implement new study programs seem to be very adequate either for realizing HESPs inspired by ILAs. On the other hand, on the course level there are many scattered attempts to move toward designs, approaches and content inspired by ILAs. Accordingly, these readily available resources and capacities need to be disclosed to each other much more and combined and uplifted to the program level through strategies departing from those pervasively employed in conventional higher education (with success), and more or less copied by scholars and activists inspired by ILAs (without much success).

Strategic Corridor for Building Integral Higher Education

In complex situations, i.e. where in the same place and at the same time there is not only order but as well disorder, where there is not only determinism but as well chance, where uncertainty emerges, there is a need for the strategic attitude of a subject; in face of ignorance and confusion here perplexity and brightness are indispensable ... The method/path/attempt/crossing/research and strategy can't be reduced to a ready-made program, not more than to a statement of an individual experience; in fact, it is the possibility to find in the details of the concrete ... life, as fragmentary and dissolved it is in the world, the totality of its open and temporary sense. (Morin, Ciurana, & Motta, 2003, pp. 17, 24-25)⁴⁷

⁴⁷ Translation of the quote from the French original by the author of this essay. Edgar Morin was research director of a transdisciplinary research centre at the CNRS (French National Research Centre). He is a prolific writer across many fields, since 1946, and has received numerous awards and honorary doctorates worldwide. The core of his approach to complex thinking is laid down in the six volumes of *La méthode* (Morin, 2008). He wrote a commissioned report on the future of education for the French government (Morin, 1999a) – which evidently was not followed, and another one for the UNESCO (Morin, 1999b). He is co-initiator of the International Observatory of University Reforms: www.orus-int.org and of the Collegium International on Ethics, Science and Governance: <http://www.collegium-international.net>. A University built on his educational recommendations has recently been created in Mexico: www.multiversidadreal.org. Edgar Morin is insisting on the fact that the necessary reform of thought under conditions of complexity and the necessary reform of higher education are co-conditioning and co-determining each other, and that one side doesn't move forward without the other.

Based on the array of options discussed in the prior section and their respective advantages and disadvantages, a strategic corridor for the implementation of more integral versions of higher education is becoming apparent. The strategic corridor is a selection of options and a more circumscribed array of paths of developmental progression which is more likely to succeed than paths following options outside this corridor. This doesn't imply that under particularly favourable conditions other options and paths couldn't succeed. It just supposes that this is more difficult and less likely. It appears that conventional ways of conceiving higher education in terms of brick & mortar institutions, in terms of disciplinary or interdisciplinary programs run by one such institution, in terms of study programs composed by courses taught by scholars who are employed by the respective institution, are not very helpful and conducive for the implementation of (more) HESPs inspired by ILAs. Accordingly, academic teachers and researchers interested in conceiving and actually implementing these kinds of new programs need to transcend such a conventional understanding of higher education, at least if they are not by great chance supported by an unconventional local context allowing to conventionally implement unconventional HESPs.

The development of a more powerful strategy can be based on at least two sources of insight. First, on a reflection of failed attempts to implement a more integral higher education provision.⁴⁸ As far as I know, there has not been any cross-case analysis of such failed attempts yet. Second, on a reflection of the characteristics of higher education systems and their major historical transformations over a long period of time (in the perspective of the last millennium, see appendix). For any integral approach to transformation of higher education in this century a proper understanding of its (Western)⁴⁹ long-term history is crucial. Such an understanding is necessary for selecting and integrating constructive features from all periods, medieval, modern and postmodern, and to transcend those features that fit less and less well in our time given the evolution of culture, social structure, educational provision and technology, and given the unprecedented characteristics of the challenging contemporary macro-shift.

Let's start with listing some major problems which I could repeatedly observe in past attempts to implement HEIs or HESPs on the basis of an inspiration at least close to ILAs:

- Investment of the limited material and intellectual resources available to ILA-inspired scholars and activists to establish a new HEI instead of investment directly in study and research programs (see this section);
- Too much idealism coupled with lack of viable strategies and professionalism regarding organisation and management (visionaries and vanguard researchers are not necessarily, or perhaps even rarely, good strategists, implementers, and managers committed to the required practical organisational work on a daily basis, see this section);

⁴⁸ The failed, disappeared and long-term marginal, unstable or weak attempts will not be mentioned explicitly in this essay in order not to blame those who tried hard to realize their projects and didn't reach their goals. The analysis, however, which was leading me to the suggestions and conclusions exposed in this essay have actually been conducted case by case.

⁴⁹ An extension of this analysis to the forms of higher education other historical civilizations have developed would fruitfully extend and deepen this reflection but cannot be performed in this essay.

- Lack of cooperation with enough suitably (i.e. traditionally) qualified academic staff to teach courses rooted in actual academic and professional expertise, and as a consequence avoidable problems with academic recognition of the initiative adding to the unavoidable ones arising frequently in the conventional, disciplinary, and sometimes openly hostile institutional environments (see this section and the one on contours);
- Reproduction of the individualistic bias inherent in higher education and Western culture regarding both, project development (involving often too much pride, idiosyncrasy and closure) and andragogical approach (often not differentiated from pedagogical models, see sections on integral learning communities and integral andragogies);
- Under-utilisation of the new opportunities afforded by the most advanced Web 2.0 information and communication technologies (learning management and virtual community systems; multimedia conferencing; intertwined personal, team and collective digital media repositories and portfolios etc., see section on integral organizations);
- Weak or entirely lacking international cooperation in terms of inter-institutional partnerships, transnational mobility, cultural diversity, multilingualism, global service learning etc. (see section on contours);
- Lack of institutional capacity to grant accredited, widely recognized degrees appealing to a range of potential employers (i.e. too much reliance on the intrinsic value of the offer and blindness regarding the links between the institutional fields of higher education and work, see section on integral organizations);
- Overestimation of the willingness of potential students to pay high tuition fees for unknown, beta-phase programs, in a European environment in which tuition-free programs still exist in various countries (resulting in insufficient student influx, see section on integral organizations).

The conventional structures of higher education won't fade away any time soon given that they have been quite stably reproduced for decades and in parts even for centuries. They have their use and value, even for future HESPs inspired by ILAs attempting not only to induce change regarding the content of higher education but also regarding the "containers" and finally those persons (re)producing the content and the containers. Of course then the question arises how to connect with and influence something as inert and traditional as higher education as a system? Well, by riding on it rather than attempting to supplant or change it directly. We are well advised not to expect a multi-centennial institution to change its core quickly – somehow like riding an old horse doesn't change its constitution and temper whereas the equestrian can and must nevertheless provide direction. It has even been considered one of the defining characteristic of HEIs to appear flexible at their margins in order to better protect and reproduce their core over many generations. If we consider the core of higher education to be a space for the rational pursuit of knowledge and the reflective development of creative and responsible inquiry not dominated by other societal domains like politics, religion and the economy, then, actually, it is not that bad that this cannot be changed easily. In this case we can be lucky that there is an immune system protecting academic freedom against ongoing assaults from many sides. If we consider the core of higher education as delivering degrees to those students most apt to follow through a ready-made disciplinary or pre-professional program and reproduce a fixed knowledge canon just-in-time on exams, then institutional inertia is indeed truly embarrassing in 2010.

I do not hold an idealistic vision of academic freedom in practice. Nevertheless, in great many cases, faculty has not only the possibility but the duty to pursue research and teaching according to what is deemed important and promising to them. There is an extremely individualistic bias to it reflecting a path Western cultures have had the tendency to go down more generally, a path still very much amplified by the specifics of the career ladder leading to professorships. Nowadays, this untouchable, individualistic academic freedom has suffered in many respects, especially through imposed frameworks for curricula like the modularization and learning outcomes hype, through formalized assessment, evaluation and accountability procedures, through more specific job descriptions, application guidelines and institutional development plans. But in the end, this might only appear as a new version of an old tension between the work of university administrators and the work of scholars. This tension is somehow part of the core of higher education as well. Putting aside its frequent Kafkaesque downsides and exaggerations, administrations of HEIs must be acknowledged to create relative stability and predictability and above all, they manage student enrolments, facilities and infrastructures, however they do this. All those who ever tried to build up their own infrastructure and administration know how much this diverts from the academic core business of research, teaching and service to society. So, basically, why not take advantage of the infrastructure (buildings, student administration, fundraising and degree granting reputation, access to physical and digital libraries, etc.) while not becoming sucked into its development and management?

The flexible margins sitting on this solid infrastructure concern the question what is researched and taught with whom to whom, when, where and why. As long as the basic interests of a HEI, or a department or institute are respected concerning student intake and success rates, academic reputation, acquisition of external funding, respect of equal application of formal rules regarding e.g. the teaching load etc., there is more than one possibility of running a program that can be (made) acceptable from an institutional and scientific perspective. The already mentioned trends toward more and stronger inter-institutional networks, toward strategic internationalisation, and toward pervasive utilisation of information and communication technologies are quite helpful. These trends are trickling into the core of HEIs – at least formally – and make the flexible margins of higher education even more flexible. On this basis the margins of and interfaces between (several) HEIs taken together can serve as the incubator for new HESPs based on ILAs.

From this double analysis, of conventional higher education and of alternative attempts, the following tentative *strategic corridor* can be derived:

- First focus: Building mutual awareness between the promoters of existing initiatives, and stimulating cross-cutting communication among them;
- Second focus: Creating mutual learning opportunities and enhancements between otherwise loosely coupled self-organising and self-maintaining small initiatives (e.g. by teaching each other's students, writing in each other's journals, devising criss-crossing team-teaching opportunities, engaging in smaller joint research and transformative practice projects etc.);
- Third focus: Intentional joint program development in trans-national multi-institutional consortia (second and third cycle, i.e. on the Masters and PhD levels, ideally thought together);

- Fourth focus: Creation of interfaces and overlaps between different programs from different consortia, weaving them together more and more (e.g. through joint virtual libraries, summer universities, mutually supportive research and intervention projects, and opportunities created for students to take courses from different programs).
- Fifth focus: Careful and flexible formal framing of the emergent requisite organisation for a series of HESPs based on ILAs which are distributed across several consortia, HEIs and countries (such an organisation would be largely a virtual overlay which leaves the host universities, their organisation and their conventional programs as they are).

The strategy proposed here starts with what is already there and doesn't worry about what is not there – according to the attitude of the Zen cook who is always able to cook a meal for the monks of his monastery on the basis of the ingredients available in the kitchen regardless which specific ingredients are actually available, have run out, or were never delivered. With this in mind, we can state that a whole bunch of tasty ingredients for the creation of HESPs based on ILAs is actually available in the “EHEA kitchen,” and even more if we consider the intercontinental global scale:

- A truly amazing number and diversity of HEIs exposed to a more and more international and competitive field which imposes a strategic approach to differentiation and cooperation, and which is likely to stimulate some open-minded rectors(presidents), deans and heads of institutes to consider more integral options, at least on the program level, in order to assure the advantages of being a first mover for their institution;
- A critical mass of serious scholars and academic teachers in many disciplines and countries – serious according to mainstream criteria – who are already inspired by ILAs, a sufficient proportion of whom are intrinsically motivated to engage in the extra workload of building new programs;
- The courses they already teach which reflect a more or less integral flavour, or at least new ILA-based courses which they are basically able to teach after a short period of preparation;
- A critical mass of students wary of the programs on offer and eager to get a more ILA-based higher education (some consciously, some intuitively, and many who would discover their respective inclination if appropriate programs were on offer and could be compared to more traditional programs).
- At least some funding programs more departing from the (still dominant) traditional ways of funding and more tuned or at least open to innovative, transdisciplinary and collaborative approaches.
- Various experiences with more advanced (and challenging) forms of teaching courses in and for boundary-crossing settings: international/global, cross-domain, multilingual, collaborative, multi-level, blended (virtual / face-to-face) learning, bringing traditional and non-traditional students and teachers of various origins together.
- Various boundary-crossing scholarly discourses within and close to ILAs, and their fallout in journals, books, conferences and research projects.

Put like this one could say, perhaps not without a certain astonishment, that at this stage, i.e. right now, in the EHEA all the essential ingredients that are required to cook tasty meals called HESPs inspired by ILAs are already there: students, teachers, courses, HEIs, advanced

boundary-crossing teaching and learning approaches, theoretical backgrounds, and some potential funds. Well, then, why the hell don't such new programs pop up all around us and be served on silver plates to the students queuing in front of the restaurant? This is quite evidently far from the case. So, what's the problem? *What is not working*, or who?

Well, the Zen cook ... He doesn't cook. Why doesn't he cook? He is supposed to cook! Where is he? What is he doing instead? ... He is looking for the magic k... The magic k? Yes, the magic k. He knows, the k must be there, in the kitchen. It was always there, but so rarely used that nobody missed it. His guess is that it might have fallen under the sink. He is looking there, but he has to tidy up the mess first. Just imagine! While the angry teachers are hungry, the students queuing, the funders looking for breakthrough ideas, the institutions running almost amok in a never-ending cycle of pseudo-reforms, our cook is calmly tidying up the mess under the sink in order to find the magic k - with a smile on his lips, of course. And indeed, after a while, in the midst of brushes, towels and soap, there is a piece of a page stripped from an old journal. It actually contains the magic k. The cook takes this piece of newspaper as if it was the most precious thing on earth and puts it carefully on the kitchen table. He adds it to the phrase that was in everybody's mouth: What is not working? Once the magic k is added, it now reads: What is knotworking?

"Knotworking" is a concept Yrjö Engeström has introduced to capture yet ill-understood emergent forms of collective intentionality and collaborative work departing considerably from the well-known traditional models of organisation, like face-to-face teams, markets, the governance hierarchies of bureaucracies, membership-based NGOs, or even circumscribable informal social networks. Knotworks have unprecedented, emergent characteristics that cannot be reduced to those of teams, organisations, networks, or networks of organisations or networks of networks upon which they build. According to Engeström knots are "*rapidly pulsating, distributed, and partially improvised orchestrations of collaborative performances between otherwise loosely connected actors and organizational units.*" These performances can be extremely productive and innovative without any determinable and localisable centre of control or authority. "*The locus of initiative changes from moment to moment within a knotworking sequence*" brought about by "*interagency connections and reciprocations across boundaries*" that are "*focused on and circling around a complex object.*" It is precisely the capacity to maintain and develop a shared even though shifting complex object – as for example HESPs inspired by ILAs – without any centre of control which makes knotworks different from formal organisations and informal networks in the generation and accomplishment of collaborative work. The readiness to loose rather than gain control, and the "*rejection and deviation from standard procedures and scripted norms are foundational to the success of such amoeba-like formations.*" The new communication and information technologies play a catalytic role for this new type of collaborative work as does the individual cultivation of a specific kind of decentered awareness which allows the recognition of weak signs and complex patterns which would otherwise remain unattended or invisible. "*The efficacy and value lay in their distributed agency, their collective intentionality.*" This distributed but focused collective intentionality can be considered an asset, a new kind of capital (beyond

economic, symbolic and social capital). This distributed, “*collaborative intentionality capital*”⁵⁰ has not (yet) been grasped in its tremendous importance for collective value creation, collective innovation and transformative capacity by the more bounded and stable organisations and the mindsets sustaining them – and quite probably it cannot be grasped and used by them unless they become transformed themselves through the attempt to grasp and make use of it.

Knotworking between academic teachers, students, administrators, funders ... across domains, languages and countries and across the entire range of ILAs is yet seriously and self-contradictorily underdeveloped by promoters of anything integral in academia, even though there are first upcoming attempts. Indeed, we need to put the ingredients together, otherwise nothing substantial happens, at least nothing making it up with the tremendous challenges and urgencies of our era. Without such *knotworking* across academic ILA communities the teachers and the students and the whole society will become more and more hungry and desperate in front of the larder which turns out to be actually ... plain!

The first effect of *knotworking* is to discover that there are many more people interested or already engaged in developing a more integral higher education, and that waiting and preparing was good, but now time has come to act. This can help to redirect latent action potential and to disclose past experiences, current initiatives, and future plans and projects to each other. When this happens the second effect of *knotworking* can be to realize that one is not constantly in charge, but a whole, energizing field moving and moved by multiple actors in multiple places. This requires and allows us to become aware, moment by moment, of one’s unique contribution to this field, and to deploy the right action (or non-action) in the right moment. This mindful awareness can be cultivated individually and collectively⁵¹ and prevents loss of direction, motivation, and energy. It rather provides direction, motivation and energy. A third effect of such field-aware *knotworking* then can be the experience of being “plugged-in” more constantly, to “simply know” the movements of this field by one’s whole multidimensional being, to wholeheartedly trust this flow and to follow its calling without delay. This can be very enthralling and re-enchanting, and contribute to attract additional actors resonating with a *knotworked* style of learning and working.

Conclusion

Most existing HEIs offer physical and digital infrastructures, values protecting a certain level of academic freedom (concerning research and teaching), degrees of a certain reputation, and flexible margins allowing at least some experimentation. The flexible margins of several HEIs taken together enhanced through state-of-the-art information and communication technology and

⁵⁰ All quotes in italics are from Engeström (2005).

⁵¹ Many practices are available to figure out and enact collective intentionality from a deep level connected to transpersonal fields of consciousness, like David Bohm’s (Bohm, 1996) dialogue approach, Gerard Endenburg’s (Endenburg, 1998) sociocracy, systemic constellations (Horn & Brick, 2005), Arnold and Amy Mindell’s process work / world work (Arnold Mindell, 1995; Arnold Mindell & Amy Mindell, 2001), and Otto Scharmer’s presencing (Scharmer, 2007; Senge, Scharmer, Jaworski, & Flowers, 2004), to name just a few.

diversity-proven andragogical approaches are even more flexible and ... even more marginal. This marginality isn't negative at all. Being part of *and* being marginal to traditional HEIs at the same time is actually quite a good and appropriate "place" for the implementation of new HESPs inspired by ILAs beyond the traditional dichotomy of being inside *or* being outside. A layered, developmental strategy can help to move from isolated initiatives to mutual sharing to implementation of single programs to an intentionally interwoven ecology of programs inspired by ILAs. As people, organisational units and initiatives engaged in developing and implementing HESPs inspired by ILAs are quite loosely coupled, and will generally tend to stay loosely coupled to maintain their specifics, new approaches to cross-stream and cross-initiative collaboration are called for (in addition to new content, new educational approaches, and new contexts of implementation). It is suggested that the cultivation of knotworking awareness and capability is called for to take advantage of the already existing critical mass of scholars, students, courses, and research inspired by ILAs. This implies that the development and implementation of HESPs inspired by ILAs in the EHEA presupposes a well developed integral consciousness of the early promoters as much as the development and implementation of such programs is supposed to catalyze the emergence and stabilization of an integral consciousness in the participants.

Contours

In the coming century, there will be an urgent need for scholars who go beyond the isolated facts; who make connections across the disciplines; and who begin to discover a more coherent view of knowledge and a more integrated, more authentic view of life (Boyer, 1994, p. 118) ... the academy must become a more vigorous partner in the search for answers to our most pressing social, civic, economic, and moral problems and must reaffirm its historic commitment to what I ... call ... the scholarship of engagement. (Boyer, 1996, pp. 18-19)⁵²

Based on the insights developed in the prior sections we can now attempt to tackle the core task which is to say something about the future of a more integral higher education in Europe. My attempt in this respect isn't magic for two reasons. The first is that the goal is not to predict but to enable such a future.⁵³ The second is the consideration that the future takes place already now, at least somewhere, and in some respects, and thus can be observed like other empirical objects. We can go even further saying that parts of our future took place in the past. That means that some future-enabling features were actually already implemented in the history of higher education and have then been weakened, supplanted or forgotten altogether. This doesn't mean to revive an imaginary golden age because there was no such golden age of higher education. But many ILAs converge in claiming that certain features from all former eras can be valorised and adapted to contemporary situations. At the same time these worldviews bring with them

⁵² For scholarship of engagement see as well Ven (2007). Ernest Boyer was Chancellor of the State University of New York, United States Commissioner of Education, and President of the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, he received numerous awards and honorary doctorates.

⁵³ According to the famous phrase of the French writer and pilot Antoine de St. Exupéry who disappeared at the end of WW II: "Pour ce qui est de l'avenir, il ne s'agit pas de le prévoir, mais de le rendre possible."

other features which have to be limited, contained, and transcended in the light of later cultural achievements and future requirements.

In this perspective the attempt is made in the following sections to flesh out core features of early medieval, modern and postmodern higher education systems and to recompose and to go beyond them in an innovative integral vision of HESPs. This attempt is based on the material compiled in the tables in the appendix and helps to paint the contours of HESPs inspired by ILAs within the strategic corridor already specified. These contours are rather general and can be concretized in manifold specific ways. For accomplishing this task lenses frequently employed by ILAs are quite helpful, like individual developmental trajectories, cultural contexts and evolution, place, space and time, and the relationship between theory and practice. I will proceed stepwise and first spell out some *principles* required for ILA-based HESPs to be true to themselves, then address questions more specifically related to creating committed *learning communities*, and finally turn to *integral andragogical approaches* and *integral organisational development*. It will appear from the perspective of ILAs that community, andragogy and organisation are different angles of the same process concerning the same group of persons. This stands in contrast to the fragmented vision and practice in most of contemporary higher education in which these are different processes enacted by different groups of persons in different contexts.

Principles

A HESP inspired by ILAs, if it is meant to be coherent in the sense of practicing what is preached, must be designed along at least the following highly interconnected principles:

- *Scientific Quality Development*: Needless to say that in any HESP based on ILAs first and foremost the existing principles and quality criteria of academic research and higher education need to be respected and attained. The goal is not only to stick with existing standards, but to go beyond them and to develop and comply with standards derived from the broader views provided by ILAs, among which are the conscious attempt at raising awareness for, balancing, and mutually enhancing breadth *and* depth, individual excellence *and* collective intelligence, values *and* facts, theory *and* practice, micro- *and* macro-levels, the views of the history *and* of the future, first-order (empirical) *and* second-order (meta-studies) research, etc.⁵⁴
- *Transformative Purpose and Commitment*: HESPs based on ILAs serve at least three higher intertwined purposes. They should contribute i) to substantially and immediately catalyze constructive transformation in society, ii) to serve as scalable showcases of higher education transcending (post)modern assumptions about and conditions for learning and iii) to support all the individuals involved (teachers, students and other stakeholders) in understanding and deploying their unique developmental trajectories according to their deeper vocation (Gidley, 2007; Gliszinski, 2007; Harvey & Knight,

⁵⁴ Little work on quality standards for integral research and integral higher education has been done so far. However, for the process of institutionalisation specific, explicit and more widely shared quality standards and quality development approaches including and transcending the traditional expectations are of crucial importance.

- 1996; Lessem & Schieffer, 2008; Maxwell, 2007; O'Connor, 2002; O'Sullivan, 2002; Reason & Torbert, 2001; Schugurensky, 2002; Weaver, 2008).
- *(Self-)critical Reflexivity*: The cultivation of constructive critique is considered as an integral part of individual and collective self-transformation. Accordingly, issues of contemporary local and global import and impact are addressed with critical reflexivity, as are in turn the worldviews, theories, models, methodologies, interpretations etc. used to address them. Targets for self-reflexivity and critique are the objectives, principles, roles, rules and regulations, standards and procedures of the study programs themselves, and the implication of students and teachers in their unique learning trajectories and their collaboration (Brockbank & McGill, 2007; Kenny, 2008; Moon, 2004; Schön, 1983; Tanaka, 2002).
 - *Integral Pluralism and Dialogue*, i.e. a sustained attempt at the inclusion of a diversity of persons and perspectives in research, learning approach, organisation, and intervention etc.. Accordingly, such a study program can never be confined to a single paradigm, worldview or school of thought and is called to actively foster dialogues between different streams of ILAs and between ILAs and other paradigms, and between higher education and society. This should be cultivated with a scope which is creating and strengthening cross-cultural and cross-civilizational planetary dialogues (Dallmayr, 2010, 2003; Gidley, 2007; Giri, 2006; Molz & Edwards, 2010; Tanaka, 2002). A particular emphasis of dialogue, bridge-building and integration is necessary in our times to counterbalance the particularly strong institutional and intellectual forces of fragmentation (like nationalism, hyper-specialisation, extreme relativism, and the various reductionisms). Part of this principle is a deliberate approach for sharing, open access, and contribution to the global knowledge commons (Hess & Ostrom, 2006).
 - *Organisational Learning and Participation*: Study programs based on ILA's necessarily follow core tenets of organisational learning and of lifelong and lifewide learning of its stakeholders. The organisation has to be designed in all its aspects to stimulate and integrate feedback loops within and across organisational levels (individual, small and large group, community, organisational and inter-organisational), across domains (beyond education extending to politics, business, religion, civil society, the arts and the media etc.), and across layers of learning (from single-loop learning to triple or maybe one day quadruple-loop learning). This is only possible on the basis of strong approaches to participation and unleashing of collective intelligence and wisdom (Kenny, 2008; Kezar, 2005).

Integral Learning Communities

Building learning organizations, we are discovering, requires basic shifts in how we think and interact. The changes ... penetrate to the bedrock assumptions and habits of our culture as a whole. We are also discovering that moving forward is an exercise in personal commitment and community building ... nothing happens without "personal transformation." And the only safe place to allow for this transformation of the self is a learning community. So, we are coming to see our efforts as building "communities of commitment." Communities committed to create learning environments rather than follow recipes for success. Communities that embrace pragmatism and idealism, that address themselves to critical problems while sharing a vision as generators of rich lives rather

than as ends in themselves. Communities that search for meaning and transcend themselves, their organizations, and their world. (Kofman & Senge, 2001).

The constitution of intentional communities of learning, inquiry, practice and self-transformation inspired by ILAs depends on a sound answer to the questions who should be involved, how (which roles, rules, tasks and responsibilities), when, where and how long. Historically, higher education already underwent major transformations regarding these questions. At its very origins in Europe, the “universitas” was nothing else but (small, flexible, mobile, self-governed) communities of a teacher and his students, who spent quite amazing amounts of time together, somewhat like a family. In early medieval higher education it was common that a student choose his teacher, as this generally meant to engage in a longer-term interpersonal master-disciple relationship, and the participation in a specific community instead of another.

In modern higher education the student applies for a study program, and if (s)he is selected the respective teachers and fellow students are simply a given. Academic teachers on the other hand apply for jobs at HEIs and when they are selected in many cases they find themselves in a department with colleagues they never wanted to work with, and with students they are randomly flooded with. In some study programs selection of students is performed by a committee including the director of the program and perhaps some of the teachers. This allows for and even enforces some thoughts about student intake. In practice, however, more often than not, the selection procedure remains quite superficial, based on formal criteria or the usual game of application rhetoric. Scholars have generally little time to devote to the selection of their students, and students today generally select study programs and not teachers, with doctoral studies being partly an exception.

It comes as no surprise that under these conditions the traditional idea of a community of scholars and students based on intensive interpersonal relationships became more and more diluted and that in many places it is now completely lost. Students and academic teachers follow their respective duties, schedules, and trajectories, every student has many teachers, and every teacher great many students. The participants in different classes are not the same, courses are short, and there are many courses on different content to be attended within a week which is sliced up into pre-scheduled time slots.⁵⁵ This picture is quite characteristic for today’s mass higher education. Distance education providers allow for a more flexible organisation of time while often having pushed individualisation even further than campus universities. It can be questioned whether under these circumstances there is any collectively shared intentionality in a teacher / student group.

It should not be bypassed, though, that there are various attempts to revitalize the idea of learning communities. There is even a whole *learning communities movement* in educational research and practice (Gabelnick, 1990; Garrison & Vaughan, 2008; McNay, 2000; Wilson & Ryder, 1996). But first, this movement is not spreading widely, and second, under the structural conditions of mass higher education, individualisation, hyper-specialisation of scholars, and

⁵⁵ They are following on each other, however, in a rhythm and in time slots which in many contemporary HEI’s are still modelled upon medieval monasteries!

geographical mobility of everybody, the best intentions and the best practices can only have limited effects on restoring community for higher learning in the more original sense. The postmodern transition phase does not change anything to this state of affairs. The structural condition of modularization makes it even worse. At the same time the possibilities to create original new study programs are strengthened. If such a program is relatively small in size the creation of learning communities meriting this name become basically possible again, but it needs deliberate and sustained andragogical efforts to create and sustain them.

Students

All this being said, how could ILAs respond to this history of weakened and suspended community and integrate suitable features from premodern, modern and postmodern practices? How could the undeniable advantages of actual learning communities⁵⁶ be reactivated under contemporary conditions? I want to make several suggestions regarding student intake and matching between students and teachers that are questioning deep-seated assumptions on which contemporary higher education is built (before addressing the questions how to keep a learning community going in the remaining sections on integral andragogies and integral organizations). I argue in favour of much more mutually *elective* than one-sided selective procedures reconnecting with the ease of access in the earliest phase of institutionalised higher education. But instead of students selecting a teacher or a study program, and the other way round, the constitution of more authentic learning communities might better be based on emergent transformative projects whose orientations are shared and co-shaped by those interested in them (see section on integral andragogies).

How could this happen? This depends on the type of program. From a developmental perspective I would argue for at least two types of study programs to be designed to adequately spread ILA's in theory and practice. The first type offers introduction into ILAs for students with little prior knowledge but interested in discovering the horizon of ILAs. The second type would be designed for students with more substantial prior knowledge and more arduous and focused transformative motivations. The first type of program can be framed by multi-year strategic transformative projects pursued by a team of researchers and practitioners as part of their practice-based research and research-based practice. Students could engage in such flexibly designed framework projects with a negotiated focus. In this case, the usual approach of individual applications could be used, based, however, on challenging, multidimensional, reflective tasks stretching beyond simple motivation letters. The set of selection criteria should be extended, give unusual profiles a chance, and focus on cross-boundary life trajectories (across disciplines, cultures, occupations, theory and practice etc.), the record of social engagement and spiritual practice.

Instead of simply fishing for the individuals best fitting to the criteria, a stimulating balance of diverse backgrounds within groups of students should be targeted. The attempted balance shouldn't be handled dogmatically as in formal diversity policies working with quotas.

⁵⁶ Small-scale communities were actually the adaptive unit 99% of the course of human evolutionary history. Accordingly, sociality and learning within group and community settings is not only part of our cultural but as well of our genetic heritage.

Nevertheless, in order to engage a broad array of experiences and perspectives a pragmatic mix is looked for between male and female students, students with different prior studies and levels of professional experience, students from different cultural and social class backgrounds, younger and elder students, students with and without family duties etc. Particularly lively and stimulating learning communities can unfold from such original mixtures. Such a micro-cosmos creates the requisite variety (Ashby, 1958) reflecting global human diversity with which transformative projects have to deal. Instead of separating traditional and non-traditional students into separate programs they can enrich and challenge each other within the same learning community if the respective learning pathways are properly framed, supported and crossed with each other.

The approach to the second type of program is more revolutionary because it intentionally breaks with the individualistic bias Western higher education is built upon from the bottom to the top. The undeniable merits of individual-centric education⁵⁷ notwithstanding, a more communal approach is called for in the future, an approach sensitive to individual uniqueness *and* to powerful collective action at the same time. For this to happen I want to launch the idea of *collective applications*. A collective application is an application submitted by a group of candidates who i) make claims on their shared interests, ii) suggest the contours of a transformative project they want to work on during the program, iii) explain the complementary roles they think they can play in this, iv) specify the resources, expertise and contexts they think they need to realize it, and v) those they bring to the picture themselves as a unique team. Once again, some framing conditions regarding diversity should apply. Much prior work must go into such a collective application. But this is already a very valuable learning process in itself, independently from its being taken up and realized by those who imagined it in the first place. The contention is that in the light of lifelong learning and in the light of ILAs more learning in more people can be induced by any single HESP than the learning of the selected students only between the start and end of the program's duration.

Accordingly, it could be imagined that the process of development of transformative projects by teams of students and others can and should be facilitated prior, during and after enrolment in an ILA-based HESP. This facilitation is a service to the ILA-communities and to society at large. Such a task doesn't come into the focus or is rejected by the limits of the strictly formally conceived responsibilities and by the clear-cut time frames from enrolment to graduation in which conventional higher education has become institutionalised. However, it is sure that such a reflective collaborative process of shaping the contours of a transformative project before even taking up a study program fosters reflexivity, unleashes creativity, helps to clarify individual vocation and collective needs. It can eradicate the widespread lack of enthusiasm of enrolled students for courses of a study program they have "chosen" in the first place. It makes students fully responsible for deciding what and with whom to learn and to work. It is an entrepreneurial activity involving risk-taking. It requires a vision and a passion.

⁵⁷ The individualistic bias goes almost untempered from individual applications for individual participation in mostly individual learning processes assessed on the basis of individual performance to achieve an individual degree opening up an individual career. Being practiced for ages this appears self-evident to many. However, there are alternatives which at least should be discussed.

Such an approach makes better use of the limited time of the teachers. A recurrent observation I have made is that otherwise a good deal of the duration of a study program goes into clarification of why students are actually there and what they actually want to learn and what they actually intend to do with what they learn. The matching between the (often vague) motivations of the students and the (often narrow) focus of a conventional program happen to be poor in many cases whereas time goes by until this becomes evident. In addition, the few possibilities for career counselling are often not used, and if they are used it often appears that their institutional separation from the actual dynamics of the study programs and of the work life isn't very conducive to induce better matches. Such a state of affairs produces unreasonably high drop-out rates as well as attitudes of following-through with minimal effort just to receive the degree. Often the main goal of attending classes at all becomes reduced to the desire to socialise with fellow students, and to end up with a degree. Just doing what is prescribed to get a degree is a dry, lifeless goal, bypassing the richness of the here and now which discloses itself in the light of passion, love and commitment.

It is clear that only a minority will appreciate the approach of collective applications and will be ready and capable to engage in such a demanding process. But this self-selection and mutual election is precisely intended when such a collective approach is launched. Web 2.0 tools provide very good possibilities today to help matching those often isolated students (and teachers) who actually share ILA-based interests, attitudes and commitments. If this facilitation of the matching is scaled up to the entire EHEA, or even worldwide, this is already creating community before anyone has enrolled in a study program. The catalyzing effort is small held against its longer term benefits. Through the (multi-step) procedure of collective applications less applications of higher quality have to be dealt with. Applications not retained at one point of time for one reason or another can mature further, merge with other ideas, be realized independently, or be taken up by somebody else. Opening up the possibility of collective applications as described can evolve into a fountain of fresh ideas and insights in their own right.

An advantage of such an approach is that it makes much clearer what students actually desire to study and to achieve (and force them in turn to be much clearer about this) while boiling down individual fancy to realistic collaborative projects. The collective applications retained then contain valuable indications which unique program to assemble to make it a good fit with the spelled-out expectations of a specific group of students and with the transformative needs of society. Instead of fitting students without evident shared concerns into more or less ready-made programs this means dynamically fitting programs to student teams who actually share concerns and commitments. Collective applications could even be conceived by students who pursue different goals and who are at different levels as long as they are convinced on the merits of the emerging co-created project. Masters students and PhD students and participants not interested in getting a degree (e.g. because they already have one or because they are happy with being a social entrepreneur) could apply together as long as they share a vision and a mission and can discover how their experiences, competencies and inclinations (e.g. more research-oriented and more practice-oriented) can complement each other and coalesce in a joint transformative project of learning, life and work.

Another innovative feature could be, back to the origins of Western higher education in this respect, to skip deadlines, and allow for applications any time. Administrative deadlines often

prevent certain interested and interesting people to apply and projects to coalesce, because the rhythms from different contexts are kept separate or imposed and so prevented to supersede each other in more complex patterns. Especially in case of collective applications it cannot be predicted in advance when an application is ready to be submitted. This deadline-free approach would imply to allow for starting study programs more flexibly, according to actual needs and possibilities of an emerging learning community of students, teachers and other stakeholders. If the idea is to bring people inspired by ILAs and motivated to develop transformative projects together on a Paneuropean and global scale, this point is particularly important given that academic years, typical periods for exams and vacations etc. are not at all aligned across countries. For sure, administrations of HEIs won't necessarily accommodate to such a radical suggestion. If one doesn't want to permanently hit the limits of local time frames and their incompatibility with each other there is another good reason to guide our imagination toward a semi-autonomous overlay structure rather than a neat and total integration into any given HEI.

Facilitator

Now I want to focus on a key person in any learning community inspired by ILA's. It is the *coordinator* of the program. Dedicated coordinators for a specific HESP become more and more important in the complex, dynamic settings of postmodern higher education. They are complementing the traditional director of the program who oversees the academic quality and holds the institutional responsibility, and the secretary who is limited to administrative tasks. The coordinator dedicates most of her time to one specific program. Her tasks are i) guiding the students through the program from application to graduation and beyond (including alumni work), ii) providing access to resources, iii) administrating the online learning platform, iv) organising courses, events and assessment, and v) simulating quality assurance and quality development of the program. The need for a dedicated coordinator arises the more we are departing today from homogenous student groups following the quite stable, pre-established disciplinary curricula of modern higher education within a single HEI, and move to international student groups with different prior studies, to the many possible re-combinations of modularized and interdisciplinary curricula, and to cross-border consortia jointly sustaining a program. In the long run, success or failure of many of those more complex programs depend on having a dedicated, apt coordinator who has the overview and who holds everything together. The importance of such a position is still often grossly underscored.

HESPs based on ILAs are no exception to this new rule as they tend to go even further than postmodern HESPs with complexity, flexibility and heterogeneity, while demanding higher levels of coordination, coherence and integration. This implies that the coordinator is not only important but serves as a *key facilitator*. Accordingly, in addition to what a coordinator is already doing in a postmodern HESP, a facilitator in an ILA-based program must have knowledge about ILAs, and competencies in facilitation, individual counselling, team and organizational development, project management, public relations, intercultural communication, Web 2.0 tools and practice-based research. This rather impressive transdisciplinary profile being stated it becomes evident that such a position cannot be considered as an administrative position, nor as a position to be filled by recently graduated former students working on fixed-term contracts as it can be often observed. As it is the pivot of a HESP based on ILAs it should be seen as a full academic job opening up possibilities to evolve with research qualifications (e.g. through

practice-based research into the development of the program). The facilitator is framing and supporting but not directing the work of the students and their negotiations with teachers, funders and supporters. If one day a further move along the strategic corridor (see section on Strategic Corridor) can be actualised, and ILA-inspired HESPs start to cooperate on a regular basis, a coordinator of the coordinators and facilitator of the facilitators may eventually be required. This position is the only additional investment ILA-based programs require in the long run compared to postmodern programs when they are mature enough to create a more integrated offer.

Teachers

When it comes to teachers, who are they, where are they, what are they doing and how do they join the learning community of the students and their facilitator? If a collective transformative project is at the core of the curriculum teaching fulfils a different function than in the additive curriculum content delivery model. Teaching then comes in at least the following four forms:

- As a set of core teachings agreed-upon to create common ground regarding ILAs. A few teachers holding positions in the HESPs of the consortium running the ILA-based HESP can commit together to deliver the core teachings. The possibilities to create fabulous cross-cultural, cross-disciplinary and cross-stream core teacher teams scale up considerably when it comes to a consortium of consortia (last strategic step). Teacher teams (and team-teaching) creates interesting learning opportunities among teachers. Students may join the classes these scholars run anyway, negotiate specific classes, or engage in one-to-one exchange on more specific topics.
- As timely support for the unfolding collective project (e.g. for a method, a tool, or some domain-specific knowledge) based on specific demands rather than on regular pre-scheduled classes. Additional teachers may indeed be contracted for shorter periods as guest lecturers. This is already common practice. But what is specific in the present suggestion is that the students would be in charge, supported by the facilitator, of choosing them, of negotiating content and conditions, and of evaluating their intervention.
- As support to develop the individual profile and personal key competencies. In this respect students can be encouraged and supported in finding the most suitable teachers for their individual development all over the place, the world being full of teachers. Most of them are delighted to be approached by highly intrinsically motivated students in a targeted manner within the range of their unique expertise as this doesn't necessarily happen to them on a daily basis. A lot of teachers come into sight once the artificial limitation to faculty of the department running a program is falling: from young researchers to freelance researchers to retired professors, from artists to social activists to spiritual leaders, from entrepreneurs to consultants to policy makers.
- As peer-teaching between students, but as well of students teaching teachers, given the diversity of backgrounds, competences and prior knowledge.

It is evident that once more people are invited to teach on the basis of their passion, the teachers with institutional teaching roles can teach less and care more. This is an ongoing process which adaptively combines and takes advantage of the roles and positions of academic and other

teachers corresponding to premodern, modern and postmodern times. This process properly framed takes into account that:

- Modern higher education systems systematically produce scholars for whom teaching is not high on the agenda. Their careers progress on the basis of research excellence and not on the basis of teaching excellence. The invitation to contribute to student's transformative research-based intervention projects is actually closer to research and to expert counselling than to traditional teaching and might be more appealing to senior researchers who can take part in those projects at a level of involvement of their choosing.
- Teaching excellence in the spirit of ILAs is yet rare and geographically quite distributed. Students actively searching for teachers can substantially contribute to make connections on a European and global scale. A database helps to keep track and to support the dynamics of net- and knotworking which then is likely to become self-accelerating.
- Interpersonal relationship building and networking across domains and age cohorts is becoming more and more important. This is much more than a nice add-on or a romantic return to the origins. Today, it is well established that social capital built over years is often more important than formal knowledge for professional trajectories across the fractures and ruptures of postmodern economies true to the potential of a person.

Conclusion

Learning communities are a particularly suitable and flexible form and context of learning which allows to build and strengthen self-consciousness, imagination, complex situated knowledge, social relations, collective intentionality and action, simultaneously. Students, teachers and all other stakeholders form committed and intentional integral communities of learning, inquiry, practice and self-transformation. The communities should be as multicultural, multilingual and transnational as possible, and include and consider all stakeholders regardless their formal status and position as researchers, teachers, students and practitioners. Integral learning communities are serious about student-centeredness.⁵⁸ Integral learning communities conceived and nurtured according to insights gained by ILAs support students along their unique pathways of learning and help them to find the most appropriate teachers in any moment. From such a broad perspective committed learning communities are self-extending and self-transcending. They serve a wider community. Accordingly, they show the same characteristics as light which has to be considered simultaneously as small and focused corpuscles and as distributed waves.

Integral Andragogies

The utilitarian model of the university now prevalent and the humanist model differ sharply both in their goals and their basic epistemic conceptions. While the prevalent model functions as a conglomerate of service-stations with no common educational aim, the humanist model reflects the educational aim of enhancing the process of self-design. While the prevalent model is based on the relativistic–positivistic view that existential and

⁵⁸ Otherwise quite often reduced to a plastic word (Poerksen, 1995).

value issues are beyond the scope of scientific discussion, they are the very focus of the humanist model. (Aviram, 1992a, p. 405).

As we have seen, the reflections on how to constitute committed learning communities in higher education is already tightly connected to core andragogical concerns and to the question how flexible or fixed in advance teaching / learning patterns and roles can and should be. Once again a look back into the deep history of higher education can help to understand the task to shape more integral andragogies today. In the context of this essay this will be necessarily a sketchy undertaking and leave many features out. The goal is not to expose a fully-fledge ILA-based andragogy for higher education – this needs to be a long-term collaborative effort drawing on a wide array of streams and cultural contexts⁵⁹ – but much more modestly and pragmatically to present some elements that hopefully prevent to fall into the trap to self-contradictorily deliver ILA-content in a conventional pedagogical mode. If this happens it is fatal because the medium is as much the message as the message and the hidden curriculum then forcefully counteracts and subverts the unique contributions ILAs can make to higher education, research, and societal transformation.

For the purpose at stake a meta-pedagogical perspective is adopted. Meta-pedagogical means that various pedagogical approaches, if properly arranged can be complementary rather than opposed to each other. A meta-pedagogical view can help to determine or devise pedagogical approaches that are integrating otherwise separate practices into more tightly connected, meaningful and sustainable learning processes. This means i) to consider *curriculum* rather as *co-designed process* than as pre-existing structure, ii) to put *vocation, wisdom and commitment* centre stage rather than shying away from even talking about these issues, iii) take the information technology revolution seriously and as a consequence switch to *resource-based demand-driven learner-managed learning*, and finally iv) to depart from the traditionally split relationship between teaching / learning and assessment and facilitate integrated approaches as in *portfolios* used for *collaborative project-based service learning*. Once again I propose to cross-connect these aspects with each other and to cycle daringly back and forth from the early Middle Ages to now and tomorrow.

Curriculum as Co-Designed Process

The curriculum in medieval higher education was almost completely fixed in advance. Learning occurred strictly on the basis of the scholastic method. This was very much a theoretical affair separated from mundane practical demands. This monk-like seclusion was surely necessary in the first place for the rise of an autonomous sphere of knowledge which then became pervasively, and often for understandable reasons, called the ivory tower. The ivory tower still exists today. However, postmodern societal conditions make stronger demands on higher education in respect to accountability, more immediate usefulness, and self-funding. Accordingly, the ivory tower gets more and more holes through private-public partnerships, transdisciplinary action research projects, non-traditional students, online delivery, service learning, the recognition of practice-based prior learning, and the like.

⁵⁹ There are first upcoming attempts in this direction (Gidley, 2010).

The separation of the young generation of future decision makers from actual practice for many years during their studies raises serious concerns in a time in which professional practices are evolving faster than curricula can be reformed.⁶⁰ The modern idea of higher education preparing for life and work once in early adulthood does not appear very suitable when change and rupture in career paths becomes the rule in a lifetime rather than the exception. The postmodern idea of preparing rather for change and uncertainty (Barnett, 2000) is something to be retained while lacking any particular focus. The focus can be provided by the emancipatory and transformational ethical commitment of ILAs. Some modern ideas of the university, especially as they have been rarely or only shallowly realized, merit reappraisal as well. As an example, the Humboldtian vision of higher education was about the unity of teaching / learning and research. It didn't only mean that the teachings should be informed by the teacher's scholarly research. Von Humboldt's humanistic understanding of research was much broader than the contemporary hyperspecialists' conception.⁶¹ It didn't mean controlled laboratory research into exterior phenomena (however important they are). It was meant to be research broadly put, including one's own life and resulting in unique self-designed "experiments in living" (Aviram, 1992a).

Self-design requires opportunities for choice and participation on all levels regarding all determinants of the learning environment. Within the disciplinary curriculum of modern times the Humboldtian vision became actualised only in a very rudimentary and mutilated manner. Choice was reduced to minors and subdisciplinary specialisations. The current postmodern modularization hype undeniably brought about more possibilities for combining courses, but still the courses as such are generally givens mostly still inscribed in additive disciplinary and interdisciplinary curricula. However, endless possibilities for choice lay bare before us right now when leaving those historical limitations behind and considering everyone as a teacher, the entire world as the classroom, and the Internet as the textbook. This sounds unrealistic and revolutionary. But it isn't. Today, it is the perfectly realistic and realisable evolutionary next step andragogies based on ILAs need to explore as seriously and forcefully as they can.

Vocation, Wisdom and Commitment

This exploration requires an attentive navigating between Scylla and Charybdis. Scylla in this case are the restrictions inherited from an era in which strictly place- and institution-bound formal learning was adaptive because there weren't enough teachers nor enough pedagogical materials, restrictions, however, that have turned today into unreflected, self-reproducing, bureaucratic obstacles devoid of any defensible contemporary rationale (Aviram, 1992b). Charybdis in this case is the postmodern situation of endless consumerist choices which turn into arbitrariness, paralysis, loss of focus, sense and value. A third way can be found if we turn to a

⁶⁰ Under modernist institutional planning practices the start of the conception of a new study program (first and second cycle) is separated by roughly one decade from the first cohort of graduate students becoming operational in a field of practice. Until information from this field of practice is fed back and eventually taken up to substantially reform the curriculum and adapt it to actual requirements of professional practice it realistically takes another decade.

⁶¹ Who are often taken to break up the unity of research and teaching because their research is generally too specialised to be taught right away before the third cycle.

crucial perspective on higher education, taking the “higher” indeed very literally: the DIKUW holarchy in which *data* is transformed into *information*, *information* into knowledge, *knowledge* into imaginative and creative *understanding* and *understanding* eventually into *wisdom*, and the other way round when it comes to the enactment of wisdom (Ackoff, 1989; Maxwell, 2007). If we understand wisdom as the capacity to choose between or devise complex alternatives in an incorruptible commitment to what is good for the future of the whole, then it becomes evident that higher education cannot stop at producing data, disseminating information, conveying knowledge and facilitating understanding of the past. If already understanding cannot be taught but at best evocated, it is clear that wisdom cannot be learned like a subject matter. It can only grow by the sustained cultivation of a specific quality of individual and collective awareness enabling to “lead from the future as it emerges” (Scharmer, 2007).

Knowledge and understanding as educational goals can be transcended (and included) by at least two complementary moves that have to be carried out carefully around an inner space which cannot be touched and from which individual and collective creativity and wisdom can emerge: i) exploring individual *vocation* and ii) linking different vocations to each other in collaborative transformative projects intervening in a constructive and future-enabling manner in the ongoing societal macroshift. The notion of vocation has an interesting history downshifting its meaning or making it suspect, from the calling of the priest to modern “vocational training.” However, contrary to the (post)modern appearance vocation is not at all outdated. As a marvellous example, Frederick Buechner coined the famous phrase defining *vocation as the place where “your deep gladness meets the world’s deep need.”* Such an understanding of vocation transcends specific traditions, domains and age groups. It opens up a horizon of a potentially deep coherence between the individual and the collective beyond premodern social fixation, modernist career planning and postmodern patchwork nomadism.

Hence, a profound sense of vocation can be found in the 21st century. Talking and thinking about vocation, intuiting one’s vocation, laying it bare through collective care, and acting true to one’s vocation cannot be discarded from education. ILA-based andragogies are called to focus on vocation in this broad and deep sense. This makes their difference, their value, and their attraction. They need to develop multiple situated practices that are helpful for students and teachers alike to discover and stand to their vocation and unique contribution to collective endeavours, and the other way round to shape collective projects in a way which responds to the vocations of those contributing to them. This is an ongoing process not an achievement which can be made once and then fixed. By cultivating such a focus which was evacuated from most of modern mass higher education a strong sense of individual and shared purpose can unleash high levels of motivation and performance which can be sustained over long periods of time and across all kinds of challenges. As long as higher education is not touching this existential and motivational core of the human being it can barely be called higher either.

Resource-based Demand-driven Learner-managed Learning

As information represents a lower layer on the above mentioned holarchy, it is fundamental. In the very early medieval beginning of Western higher education the professor was lecturing from a book in reduced speed to allow his students to copy word by word what he said. This was an adaptive approach at that time as copies of books were too expensive for the average student.

As the curriculum was fixed and universal it was clear from the outset which books a student had to copy and to learn. This process, rooted in the constraints of a specific sociocultural and technological context, has institutionalised the plurisecular tradition of lecturing professors in higher education. Even though today lectures are not about reading a book aloud they are still pervasively given in higher education with much one-way communication. However, at least in the privileged countries, every student lives now in an extremely information-rich multimodal and multimedia environment of print and digital media. Lectures can be streamed or downloaded ... or replaced by other sources of information without any problem. The contemporary problem is not the scarcity of information input but the exact opposite, i.e. information overload. The problem is not to produce one's own handwritten copy of authoritative books through hard labour of teachers and students, but to pave one's way through an endless, messy ocean of contradictory information any parts of which can be infinitely reproduced by the lazy movement of a finger in front of a computer screen. Under these conditions much well-founded knowledge is necessary to be able to determine the authoritative sources in the first place. This is somehow a vicious circle. A teacher can do this work and convey his/her synthesis of a domain to the students through a lecture, but then the students don't acquire the information literacy necessary to do this on their own.⁶²

The entirely reversed situation concerning sources of information makes demand-driven learning more adaptive than the traditional delivery-driven education (Kirschner & Valcke, 1994). From an ILA-perspective this statement shouldn't be interpreted in absolute terms but in terms of the relative ratio between demand-driven and delivery-driven ingredients to one and the same learning process. If both ingredients are combined the delivery of input by teachers knowledgeable in certain domains can turn into suggestive stimulations. These stimulations tend to be better received and retained when they are less focused on sophisticated technicalities and more on providing orientation and overview that less expert people in a field cannot have. On the other hand, demand-driven learning requires unconditioning the passive habits developed through delivery-driven education pervasive in educational institutions which have not yet substantially transformed themselves to adapt to the contemporary information resource-rich environment. Demand-driven learning is very demanding – it demands inquiries into what one is looking for, i.e. it asks for learning about oneself – which brings us back to vocation, but at the same time about the community and the world, in multiple dynamically connected ways. It demands to develop and cultivate an attitude of continuous inquiry, of questioning, of paving one's way through the opaqueness of complexity by one's own efforts, intuitions and insights. It requires accepting not knowing, or even discovering not knowing as the source and natural environment of our islands of knowing.

The reintegration of inner dimensions into formal learning becomes inevitable on the basis of these insights. Even more so as today HEIs are losing very much their exclusive aura of granting access to sophisticated knowledge. More and more open access digital resources of academic quality are available today and more and more universities adopt an open courseware

⁶² Reflected in the well-known saying: "Give a man a fish, and you feed him for a day. Teach a man to fish, and you feed him for life."

policy making their course materials freely available over the Internet.⁶³ This means that there are ample opportunities to access and acquire academic knowledge without ever being enrolled in a HEI. As a consequence, in an age in which 24h per day broadband wireless Internet access is granted to students on the laptop campus and in great many other places the core concern of postmodern institutionalised higher education cannot be about information delivery any longer.⁶⁴ What actually remains from the traditional core of higher education are dedicated spaces for teacher – student and student – student interaction coupled with degree granting power. Open courseware doesn't deliver this core but just the fundament on which it is built. So let's focus on these interactions which are crucial for the learning of all those who are not auto-didactic heroes. The issue of degrees will be addressed later.

Under the above-mentioned premises, much has already been said about the required change of the role of the academic teacher from “the sage on the stage to the guide on the side.” But the old habits and scripts are deep-rooted on both sides, students and professors, and they are stabilized through the usual institutional inertia. As a consequence, the role expectations and practices regarding teaching and learning are evolving at a very slow pace in higher education. Typically, the age old blueprint is often still the dominant model. It consists of a conception of learning in three steps and settings clearly separated from each other: i) delivery-based teaching, ii) repetition and internalisation by the student, and iii) reproduction during final assessment. The standard script demands several smaller and larger cycles like this leading to a grade. In this respect there is continuity between early and modern forms of higher education.

Alternative ideas of student-centred, self-regulated if not learner-managed learning (Graves, 1994; Harrison, 2000; Ottewill, 2002; Wilcox, 1996; Zimmerman & Schunk, 2001) have not yet cracked this traditional version of a learning cycle at any larger scale. Many versions of these alternatives are themselves limited in practice in their actual student-centeredness or learner-directedness, as students called to learn under the conditions of implementations of such frameworks in actual HEIs rarely (co-)determine the whole set of parameters constituting their learning environment: when and at which pace to learn what and where with whom for which purpose, on the basis of which support and input, and when and how progress and outcomes are assessed. The usual institutional framings and understandings of student-centeredness generally allow certain limited moves but not others that would perhaps be more important for empowerment, participation, emancipation and self-transformation. The radical potential becomes right away domesticated (Taylor, Barr, & Steele, 2002).

Portfolios

However, many proponents of postmodern variants of higher education at least try to bring a different approach to the fore in which teaching, learning and assessment are better coordinated, or even more integrated, i.e. in which they are more coterminous and more continuous, and in

⁶³ Inspired by the pathbreaking “open courseware initiative” started by the Massachusetts Institute of Technology (MIT) in 2001 with more and more material made accessible to the global public since 2002 (see <http://ocw.mit.edu>).

⁶⁴ The responsibility in this respect is shifting rather strongly to lifting the financial, technical and organisational access barriers to protected digital libraries, archives, databases and repositories.

which their co-determination is more critically reflected in dialogues between students and teachers. An integrative approach to catalyzing, reflecting and assessing learning at the same time is the portfolio. It was originally limited to the art faculties but is spreading impressively across all domains and levels of education as postmodern conditions and insights spread. A portfolio is assembled and developed by the student herself. A portfolio allows focusing on strengths, working on the presentation of one's work, and fostering self-reflection on one's learning processes. These features make portfolios coherent with student-centred learning and the development of unique profiles. It can also contain the work submitted to traditional assessments and its results and it can stretch beyond the end of formal education into professional life. This makes portfolios a very flexible tool for self-assessment, peer-assessment, and expert assessment at the same time.

There are many variants of portfolios and of ways to work with portfolios. There are interesting possibilities to extend and transform the work with portfolios through an ILA-informed perspective. One extension would be to de-compartmentalise process and outcomes and to fuse online working environments with electronic portfolios, reflecting different stages of advancement of different activities.⁶⁵ Another extension would be toward a seamless "plug-in" integration of individual portfolios with team portfolios (including extended project documentations) with learning community portfolios with the presentation of the HESP and eventually of the umbrella organisation. This would wipe out with one stroke the usual annoyance of students with assessment and of scholars with contributing to annual reports, quality assurance reports etc. because the activities and the material are already properly presented at the right place from the outset and no extra and double work is needed. These extensions, among others that should be imagined, require new technical (digital) solutions⁶⁶ and new multi-layered and integrated andragogical practices. To bring this transformation about it cannot be circumvented to break with some very deep-seated habits. One example is that because of the individualistic bias groups or teams have rarely been considered as learners in their own right in formal educational settings.⁶⁷ Even less considered up to now are the inter-level links between individual learning, team learning, community learning, organisational and inter-organisational learning, and the global macroshift. If andragogies sympathetic with or rooted in ILA's focus their work on these underdeveloped links, in theory and practice, they can make an appearance with an unprecedented profile and deliver pervasively useful contributions to research and society.

⁶⁵ As they advance naturally from idea, to plan, to draft, to final version, to evaluated final version.

⁶⁶ Attempts in this direction are just about to emerge (Meyer, Sporer, & Metscher, 2009; Sgouropoulou & Skiadelli, 2008; Wolf, 2001).

⁶⁷ Kasl (2001) is one of the very few exceptions. Even in many strands of so-called collaborative or cooperative learning the individualistic bias remains dominant when the collective setting is mainly considered as a means to serve individual learning better. One major objection against team learning in formal education is that the individual contribution cannot be properly assessed, but of course there are many possibilities to assess team work on individual and collective levels. In work settings the situation is totally different. There is abundant literature on team building, team development, high performance teams etc., and a lot of valid research focusing on the team level as such.

Collaborative Project-based Service Learning

Within these considerations collaborative project-based service learning taking advantage of the latest advances in information and communication technology should be a highly integrated and highly flexible merge of andragogical approaches that can be specified in many ways according to conditions and opportunities at hand in a given context (Butin, 2005; Thorley & Gregory, 1994). Up to now, project-based learning, collaborative learning, service-learning, and blended learning evolved as only very partially intersecting autonomous streams of pedagogical and andragogical research and practice. Informed by ILA-frameworks, there are very good reasons, however, to consider them as facets of one integrated core stream of learning in and for the 21st century rather than as different approaches to be employed for different target groups in different contexts and at different occasions (Rowland, 2002; Shneiderman, 1998; Visser, 2001).⁶⁸

Project-based learning in its more simple forms probably goes back to practices developed in Italian Renaissance architectural schools, was reissued and revitalized in alternative education movements across continents during the last century or so, and is now more strongly re-entering higher education across domains, specifically in inter- and transdisciplinary settings. Accordingly, they suit particularly well to the cross-cutting issues ILAs are addressing. Learning through working on projects organically connects research-based practice and practice-based research, play and problem-solving,⁶⁹ history and future, creativity and discipline, first order (empirical and theoretical) research and second order (meta-level) reflection etc. It should be conceived as research-base practice and practice-based research. It is a self-designed learning activity producing multiple outcomes, among them tangible ones. Tangible outcomes are adding widely neglected assessment dimensions to self-, peer- and expert assessment, i.e. assessment by reality (what works, what doesn't work?), and once the service-learning orientation is included, assessment by internal and external stakeholders (do they feel served appropriately?). If service learning is occurring in collaborative projects, e.g. in terms of co-operative inquiry (Heron, 1996) or cognates, the above mentioned cross-level integration from the individual to the community and beyond is sustained. An inquiry project-based approach, especially if it is an ILA-based multi-year endeavour of collective transformation reaching out beyond the confines of the initiating group, is integrating several metaphors of learning otherwise held and practiced separately (if at all): learning as knowledge acquisition, learning as participation, learning as knowledge building, learning as life journey, learning as emancipation. Accordingly, multiple forms of learning occur in such projects concerning all dimensions of the human being.

⁶⁸ I am working towards such integrated conceptions from different angles (see e.g. Duchastel & Molz, 2006; Molz, 2003; Molz & Bauchet, 2005, 2006; Molz & Gidley, 2008; Molz, 2010).

⁶⁹ There are actually three major types of problem-solving which are often at odds with each other as they pertain to different activity systems (i.e. different mixes of persons, communities, roles, tasks, goals, incentives, urgencies and outcomes): solving of research problems, solving of practical problems, and devising policies. An important task of ILA-based problem-solving then is to be aware of this (necessary) differentiation, and to focus on the activity of meta-level bridge-building between research, policy and practice. A more fruitful relationship between these domains is one of the most important unsolved problems to solve across scales (local, national and global) for the achievement of a sustainable planetary civilization.

As collaborative project-based learning rooted in ILA's do not rely on a single metaphor of learning at least four otherwise intractable problems of the traditionally additive and now modularized nature of the (post)modern curriculum can be overcome: i) the integration of knowledge across courses, ii) the unsustainable results of purely intellectual knowledge acquisition, iii) the inefficiency of the factory approach imposing everybody to learn the same content at the same time at the same pace, and iv) the development of key competencies. For the integration of knowledge across courses the student is usually very much left on his or her own. It is considered a personal sense-making endeavour, or not even considered at all. However, it is not sure whether it doesn't fail more often than not and result in a fragmented understanding leading to fragmented intentionality and action.⁷⁰ How could students possibly succeed with the titanic task of creating connections and coherence which their (subdiscipline-bound) teachers don't even try to tackle by themselves? Nor do many of the teachers attempt to provide at least directions and tools to advance their students on a path of boundary-crossing understanding that they do not follow themselves. The burden on the students is unreasonably heavy in this respect, and the one on the teachers unreasonably light. If projects are conducted a practical integration of different domains of knowledge is unavoidable. In ILA-based HESPs this must be reflected by theoretical integration as one of the domains and responsibilities contributed by the core teachers. At the same time innovative practices arising from the projects are challenging the models, theories and frameworks.

Evaluation

It appears that collaborative project-based service learning takes a lot of time. This is undeniably true. But time requirements can only be measured against actual outcomes, and the fact that students tend to spend more time on projects they have co-designed than on rereading lecture scripts if they have the choice means as well that they learn more, more intensively and with more motivation. For this reason it can be assumed that despite the time requirements of longer-term ILA-informed collaborative service learning projects they are likely to outperform other pedagogical approaches according to their own criteria. But they do not only enhance learning of those participating in them, they provide at the same time an immediate service to society. This needs to be considered as an additional evaluation criteria when calculating the invested time and the invested resources. The actual outcomes – all the outcomes – need of course to be evaluated empirically. But to prove the gain in effectiveness, efficiency and ethics of such a highly integrated approach to higher learning there need to be some implemented programs first that subscribe to this vision.

At this stage the argument goes as follows: the ultimate test of evaluation is neither performative evaluation nor summative evaluation (however necessary and helpful both can be to sustain and canalize learning processes), it is confirmatory evaluation. Confirmatory evaluation concerns the learning achievements which are stabilising over a substantial period of time (e.g. five years). Quite probably, little learning from usual higher education would pass

⁷⁰ Isn't this the same state as at the beginning of the studies, but now graduated and probably proud of it ... ?

the confirmatory evaluation benchmark.⁷¹ It is much more likely that crucial insights linked to embodied experiences pass this test, experiences one simply never ever forgets again because they are saturated with passion, emotion, action, dialogue, co-being and –becoming,⁷² whereas specific strands of expert knowledge acquired through lectures and other forms of purely intellectual transmission are easily forgotten after exams took place, and unfortunately often even before.⁷³

If creativity, emancipation, wisdom and transformative practical impact rather than just “being knowledgeable about something” is the ultimate horizon for education, it might be difficult to design a test. However, the constant complex challenges related to collaborative project-based service learning make an individual’s passion and competence as much apparent as her limits and shadows. Once again a supportive community can help to enhance strengths and to integrate shadows. This makes actual transformation as a process beyond knowledge acquisition more likely than a curriculum circling around nothing else than knowledge for the sake of knowledge from assignment to assessment. Project-based service learning doesn’t prevent but enhances the adequate acquisition of more specific content knowledge. Being or becoming knowledgeable about many things is a condition and an outcome of project-based learning and work occurring in a learning environment open to the world if the projects are devoted to a worthwhile cause and deal with complex challenges.⁷⁴ Content-knowledge acquisition occurs on a continuous basis in the organic context of its use, i.e. linked to an exemplary understanding of what this or that piece of knowledge is actually good for.

The disadvantage from a modern perspective is that when running projects in learning communities you can’t say in advance which knowledge is acquired, by whom, and when. Another recurrent critique is that sophisticated knowledge cannot be learned on the fly and just-in-time, but must be built up over some time to be available when it is needed. There is some truth to this, but the impact is limited in learning communities. As in postmodern pedagogical approaches it is welcomed rather than abhorred here that everybody acquires different skills and different sets of knowledge. In a project different complementary knowledges can and must be injected and shared once a situation asks for them. If everybody did the same thing a collaborative project would cease to be a collaborative project because as any complex collaborative activity its success depends on an adequate level of division of labour. Collaborative project-based service learning as the andragogical approach for the core curriculum doesn’t rule out additional learning in individual, subgroup or large group settings occurring on more conventional instructional terms. Another critique is the free-rider problem.

⁷¹ But this doesn’t appear to the fragmented mind because none of the defenders of the “evaluation regime” are administering and nobody is passing such a confirmatory evaluation test. This only happens quite exceptionally for the fun of a specific TV show format.

⁷² This old psychological and pedagogical insight became more recently very much corroborated by results of neuropsychological research.

⁷³ This contention doesn’t imply that experts forget their expert knowledge, but makes a point which is akin to what Albert Einstein already said, namely that “imagination is more important than knowledge and that he “can never commit to memory anything that can easily be looked up in a book.”

⁷⁴ Another of Einstein’s famous phrases was: “Only one who devotes himself to a cause with his whole strength and soul can be a true master. For this reason mastery demands all of a person.”

The free-rider problem is only a problem in short-term project teams, and much less in longer-term committed communities working towards a shared, intrinsically motivated goal. In such longer-term projects the free-rider problem, if it occurs, can be addressed by appropriate facilitation and reflection, including individual counselling.

Today, the development of transversal key competencies like presentational skills, team work, foreign languages, ICT literacy, entrepreneurial initiative etc. etc. becomes ever more important (Fallows & Steven, 2000). Almost everybody agrees on this. But even many postmodern approaches do not manage to overcome modernist additive curriculum designs. The curious result is that they tend to simply add “key competence modules” to “disciplinary subject matter modules” in order to satisfy the requirement to develop key competencies. In doing so the requirement is only met in theory but not in practice, however, because adding further modules to an additive curriculum means i) either overburdening the students, or ii) skipping other modules, or iii) achieving lower levels of expertise development per domain, disciplinary *and* transversal. It is apparent that there isn’t any attractive alternative among these three options. A crucial reversal of all this occurs when projects are not considered any longer as an add-on to a traditional curriculum confined to a specific module in which one is supposed to learn everything about project management or team work for example in a short period of time,⁷⁵ but when they are considered as the core of the curriculum supported by more traditional add-ons (some particularly concerning the development of a conceptual understanding of ILAs helping to connect and integrate knowledge bits). Then all the transversal key competencies are exercised on a continuous basis, provided care is taking that teams have a diverse composition and that reflection on the experiences and their relating back to relevant theories and models is properly facilitated.

Conclusion

Integral andragogical approaches and curricula are co-designed, enacted and continuously adapted by the participants in the learning communities described in the section before. They are interacting with other relevant communities and individuals on the basis of multilateral negotiation and anticipatory learning. As the processes of learning are taking place in an information-rich, relationship-rich blended context they can be dominantly demand-driven. The core of the curriculum is constituted by variants of collaborative project-based service learning supplemented by more traditional learning formats. These projects presuppose the cultivation of a sense of vocation and the analysis of societal needs. While enacting their vision of the good in terms of experiments in living the student-managed project teams reunite teaching, learning, working, living and multiple forms of assessment.

Integral Organisations

In an important sense, the University has had to be a disintegrative institution, despite the persistence of holistic rhetorics. However, to meet the intense challenge of globalisation and to match the volatility of late-modern (or post-modern) society, higher education will

⁷⁵ And forget about it again in the traditionally delivered disciplinary courses.

have to develop a new capacity not simply to build alliances with other institutions (in its own terms) but to reinvent, reengineer and re-enchant itself, to compromise its own integrity in order to allow a new configuration of 'knowledge' institutions to develop. (Scott, 2000, pp. 9-10)⁷⁶

At first sight, the implementation of such an andragogical vision informed, by ILAs and proposed to advance committed learning communities, doesn't seem to be realistic given the many intertwined constraints reigning in most contemporary HEIs. It is right that an appropriate organisation is difficult to realize because many requirements are at odds with pervasive practices and regulations within mainstream HEI's. My suggestion therefore was to settle on the margins, to dwell in the interstices, and to broaden them by linking them together across HEIs, domains and countries. Small interstices can be intentionally expanded into a *third place*. Realising a cross-border HESP can be based on the least common denominator and then result in a doubly, triply constrained space which is then on the verge to become uninhabitable. However, bringing several margins together in cross-border consortia can as well bear a more than additive result if it is guided by a strong vision. Then it becomes possible to make a specific use of the unnoticed unregulated zones, to be granted exceptions to rules, to invent innovative solutions resulting from border-crossing dialogues on the given constraints etc. Intentionally dwelling in the interstices (between disciplines, HEIs, countries) raises many organisational questions, among them those concerning i) languages and language policy, ii) infrastructure and support, iii) organisation and legal status, iv) degrees, v) quality and vi) funding. All these questions will be addressed in the remaining sections, following the already known procedure to look into history to better bounce into the future.

Regarding *languages* used in teaching the constitution of higher education as a system across political borders was possible in the Middle Ages on the basis of a lingua franca, Latin, as it is today again on the basis of another lingua franca, international English. During the intermediate "nation-state era" between those two "cross-border eras" national languages were institutionalised as the dominant and in most cases exclusive languages in use in higher education. This not only had the effect of closing down and reducing international scholarly communication (which never ceased, though), but it also provided a basis for a genuine development of the humanities and the social and educational sciences with characteristics tuned to specific cultural and institutional contexts which they reflect and from which they arise. The use of national languages in higher education was a conducive condition for democratizing access to higher education because completing post-secondary education didn't any longer depend on high levels of mastery of foreign languages.

In order to overcome the closure a series of bi-national cross-border programs were created in Europe in the last quarter of a century, actually working in the respective two national languages at the same time, some courses running in one, some courses in the other language. There are a few bilingual universities as well, but the language sections appear to be institutionally quite

⁷⁶ Sir Peter Scott serves as Vice-Chancellor of Kingston University in London, President of the Association of University Administrators, Chair of the Universities Association for Lifelong Learning etc.

separate from each other in most cases.⁷⁷ More recently, there is a movement in Continental Europe departing from the originally quite strict use of the respective national language in higher education and implementing study programs running entirely in English. The goal is generally to attract more international students (which would otherwise go the UK and the USA for their convenience). Multilingual programs are a rare appearance so far, but there are some examples. Their language policies and practices are not at all homogeneous, but generally the set of official languages is fixed in advance.

On this basis what can be an ILA-based approach to language use in a transnational HESP? Neither the exclusive use of a national languages nor the exclusive use of international English do justice to the complexity of intercultural dialogues and cultural knowledges (popular and academic). Between small national languages and English as a lingua franca there are a dozen or so widely-spoken languages sometimes more suited for conversations depending on the actual foreign language competencies of those actually learning, working and living together. The innovation could be to delink language use in a HESP inspired by ILAs from rigid language policies and to become responsive to the possibilities and limits of written and oral communication in specific contexts, learning communities, project teams and teacher-student-dyads composed by members of different origins. It is quite sure that this opens up new possibilities in many situations, and allows to find creative solutions combining in new ways any language shared among at least two persons, any approach to mediation and translation, and any facilitating organisational tricks.

The next point concerns the material and digital *infrastructure* of higher education. Interestingly, in the very beginning of the “universitas” there was no material infrastructure at all besides the book the teacher brought with him to hold his lecture. Teacher and students met wherever facilities were available, or if there weren’t any the lectures took place in the street, or in the home of the teacher. The core was not the place or building but the student-teacher relationship and the teaching. However, step by step the “universitas” became rather identified with the buildings in which the teaching took place on a more regular basis rather than with the community of scholars and students. Universities started to own buildings on the basis of endowments. Today, some large universities are like a town within a town. They are made up of impressive campus sites with myriads of specialized buildings, lecture halls, libraries, labs, computer centres, sports facilities, halls of residence etc. A virtual overlay has been adding to all this in recent years. Courses, counselling, even sometimes exams can take place online. Digital media repositories, e-administration, learning management and online conferencing systems allow to “de-materialise” entire HEI’s which than appear as distance learning providers, or virtual universities. Many different mixed forms between material facilities allowing for face-to-face encounters and online learning platforms and tools have appeared. They are subsumed under the summary label of *blended learning*. Blended learning allows for more flexible arrangements regarding time and place. It combines the advantages of real people meeting real people in all dimensions, at least occasionally, and the tremendous advantages of what has been coined Web 2.0.

⁷⁷ With the notable exception of the trilingual University of Luxembourg where I am currently located and in which languages are not confined to sections.

Inter-institutional HESP's can much more easily flourish when developing their own "online home" in terms of a digital portal and virtual community platform, independently from the host universities. Today, this can be realized in a very flexible manner at amazingly little costs, especially since more and more powerful open source software has become available specifically for the needs of the academic knowledge worker and for collective distributed learning, research and project management. ILA-based HESPs would be crazy not to make use of the best of breed of digital tools and media in order to realize one or the other variant of a blended learning approach. In order to bring together those students and teachers within the EHEA and beyond who really share ILA-related interests and motivations the online portal of any blended learning program is more pivotal than the location to which somebody is bound by job, family, or other obligations on the one hand, and the location of a brick & mortar HEI on the other hand. What a student actually needs, at least as long as the focus of a program doesn't require heavy lab equipment, is access rather than place – access to protected or dedicated online resources like online courses, online meeting, discussion and co-writing spaces, online repositories, reference databases and full text digital journals. Something that needs to be created – and can be created rather quickly under normal conditions – is an intelligent combination of access granted by the HESP to its dedicated virtual community site, and access to protected digital resources granted by the host universities' ordinary library and computer services.

Interestingly, on this technologically advanced basis it is possible to come back very much to the state of affairs reigning many hundreds of years ago when there were not many facilities at all. A permanent connection over the Internet being the baseline, the face-to-face meetings can be arranged wherever and whenever it is most convenient for those involved, according to their actual geographical distribution. For meetings the projects teams and communities can use the facilities of a partner HEI, but they are not restricted to this option. It must be said that many of the campus sites and buildings constructed in the second half of the 20th century are not of a particularly inspirational aesthetic quality. At the same time there are many very aesthetic and inspirational places which can host small-group gatherings. Some universities own specifically more remote facilities.⁷⁸ Some are run by hosts who are themselves inspired by ILAs. The gatherings can be scheduled as intensives; partners, friends and kids can be invited to travel with the participants and enjoy the site on holidays parallel to the meetings; meetings can be combined with interventions linked to the collaborative service learning projects and hosted by the practitioner-partners; participants who happen to be geographically close can create antennas, i.e. more permanent meeting places, etc. Many unconventional solutions appealing to unconventional people otherwise reluctant to engage in higher education (again) open up once we stop reasoning in terms of material infrastructures we have to use because they "are the university" – many more possibilities than we can imagine today. Overall, if the university is once again imagined and enacted as a specific community of teachers and students, on the basis of the advanced global ICT infrastructures, the participants can "meet continuously" regardless their physical location, and they can meet in the most convenient or the most inspiring locations, once in a while.

⁷⁸ The campus of the Arts, Health and Society Division of the European Graduate School in the Swiss mountains being an outstanding example (www.egsuniversity.ch).

To close this section on material infrastructures let me come back to alternative brick & mortar HEIs. If i) they come to exist, if ii) their leaders understand the overall strategic challenge described in this essay, and if iii) they are not completely absorbed by their own development processes, then they can serve as helpful co-initiators, primary hosts, test-beds, privileged locations for gatherings and strategic reflection. They can test models of how to best reconnect the domains of student affairs, academic staff development, curriculum design and infrastructures to each other and to higher purposes. They can show how a HEI can subscribe to organisational learning based on a participatory approach contrary to the zeitgeist.⁷⁹ And most important to the argument: they can strategically contribute to speed up the movement along the strategic corridor (see section on Strategic Corridors). This doesn't mean only giving but also receiving. If they become part of inter-institutional and international networks alternative HEIs can more easily broaden the array of study programs they can offer and they can gain access to additional sources of funding. They can gain reputation if these networks include conventional HEIs (even though the cooperation is not directly with the conventional HEIs but with the unconventional ILA-programs hosted in the interstices). Under normal conditions compared to conventional HEIs alternative HEIs will always be considered as less serious, less prestigious, less ancient, less this and that (and too esoteric, after all, as the stereotype goes). However they actually work, they are lost in the ranking race because the ranking criteria don't do justice to them, but nobody cares, and their faculty has a hard time moving back to conventional HEIs if they want to because they have been working on the wrong side of the divide. Given this prejudicial basis alternative HEIs don't generally have any immediate impact on the further development of conventional HEIs and the whole higher education system. They are already lucky when they are tolerated and when some day they get their programs accredited. As partners in consortia, however, at least the opportunity is created for conventional HEIs to learn from alternative HEIs and the other way round.

The emergence of HESPs inspired by ILAs as proposed in this essay is supposed to work with and without alternative HEIs connecting to this vision and strategy. Regarding a possibly emerging "consortium of HESP consortia" as ultimate step of maturation within the strategic corridor, an alternative HEI can suggest to assure the meta-coordination, but it can be assured as well by a lightweight independent organisation (see next topic below). According to the strategy espoused in this essay the need for such a central coordination and administration emerges only in the latest stage in the process. In contrast, when building a brick & mortar alternative HEI this need emerges right from the beginning. In that latter case the growing central administration must be continually sustained across fluctuating levels of funding and made adequate to a fluctuating number of students. If a crisis occurs and the administration has to be reduced the whole structure risks to become dysfunctional and break apart. In the former multi-layered and distributed case, however, the umbrella layer can be very small; a single position can already have the desired synergetic effect, and even in case this person ceases working the autonomous constituent programs can be kept running as before on the basis of their own organisational base and history. This characteristic is modelled upon evolutionary system dynamics and makes the suggested moves within strategic corridor (see section on strategic corridor for building integral

⁷⁹ Paradoxically, there are many organisations of learning (schools, universities etc.) that aren't a learning organisations! The possibilities for participation have been further reduced with the introduction of the managerial university.

higher education) much more robust and flexible than niche alternative HEIs can possibly be in Europe in the time to come.

If it comes to the *organisational formalisation* of inter-institutional blended learning HESPs, at an early stage normally a relatively short cooperation agreement between the participating HEIs is generally sufficient. As this has become a common practice in the EHEA that is spreading more and more widely, there are many examples which can serve as a model. However, usually, it takes some time until each concerned central administration is ready to sign such an agreement. A good strategy is to start with any two partners who are ready and to expand the consortium once others are ready to join. In the meantime their representatives can contribute as teachers to the learning community as this doesn't require any specific inter-institutional agreement.

It is quite widespread that inter-institutional and international study programs give birth to a student and alumni association. Once we consider extending the goals of such associations and admitting teachers and other stakeholders as members such an association could actually serve as the organisational container for the integral learning community and for the maintenance of its "window" (the virtual community portal). If we consider that originally teachers and students were organised in guild-like self-governed corporations with everybody having a say, it is worth considering such study-program related associations as a means to come closer to this again, especially so as we have probably arrived at the historically lowest level of collective participation in the decision-making processes within HEIs.⁸⁰ On this basis it becomes clear that organisational development of HESPs rooted in ILAs is likely to be at odds with the usual organisational dynamics within mainstream HEIs – one reason more to decide to rather dwell in the interstices and to create a (lightweight) extra-layer which then can be more self-governed.

In case one day several ILA-based HESPs developed by different consortia or HEIs start to cross-connect and eventually want to establish a more formal organisation according to the next stage of the strategic corridor, European law offers a very suitable but little known legal status: the European Economic Interest Grouping (EEIG). The name is somehow misleading, though. The EEIG is not supposed to produce profits. It is just a legal entity for the coordination of shared interests of its members and for pooling resources and power to act. The idea is that different types of organisations, like associations, foundations, companies, universities, even

⁸⁰ The modern professorial university has reduced the opportunities for participation of the students, and the postmodern managerial university has even reduced the actual influence of the professors. So, why shouldn't students and professors wary of this situation experiment with other approaches to organisation and decision-making regarding the affairs of teaching, learning and research they are concerned by together? Most ILAs hold a genuinely participatory worldview while developing an understanding of the problems with both undifferentiated egalitarian and undifferentiated hierarchical models of decision-making. One way to deal with this tension is to grant decision-making and representation power as a function of genuine trust, of somebody's record of engagement with organisational development and of competence and experience related to specific areas, without emphasizing unnecessarily formal position- or status-related criteria as it is strongly the case within conventional HEIs. Approaches like sociocracy (Endenburg, 1998) can leverage collective intelligence and bring about more inclusive, more adaptive and more agile organisations.

individual freelancers from different European countries, can formally join under one umbrella structure to work for a common cause. The member organisations maintain their full autonomy while coordinating some of their activities with each other. Contrary to other legal entities the headquarter of an EEIG can be moved from one country to another according to arising requirements without need to refound the umbrella organisation. Another considerable advantage is that no capital is needed to found an EEIG, and it is relatively easy to set up from a formal perspective. It is an extremely flexible and adaptable legal status that is providing full rights of contracting with other legal entities. It can integrate any new member organisation interested in ILA-based higher education provided it is located within the European Union.⁸¹ The point here is to show that from cooperation agreement to association to an EEIG-style umbrella organisation, levels, scope and intensity of coordination between individual and organisational actors can evolutionarily scale up sustained step by step by adequate organisational forms and legal entities. It is important to realise that besides the basic anchoring through an inter-institutional cooperation agreement which is a very usual procedure this can happen quite independently from the heavy organisational and bureaucratic mills inside HEIs in a smooth, self-determined and lightweight manner.

Even in the final stage such an umbrella organisation would of course not have a *degree granting power* on its own. It could only issue “ILA-studies certificates” in addition to the degrees granted by the consortium running any single program, certificates which would need to make the proof of their value in the long run. This is not an unusual approach, though. Many consortia in many fields do this. The combination of a joint degree of traditional HEIs with a specific certificate from a higher education consortium testifying an ILA-based learning trajectory is likely to gain a better status and recognition than a single degree from an alternative HEI.

Together with its relative institutional autonomy the degree granting power is the single most important defining characteristic of the Western university. Until today a higher education degree generally has more prestige than other certificates of higher learning, despite the dramatic proliferation of degrees and degree holders. Originally there were identical degrees all over Europe, and they only served for admission to a teaching position at the university. They weren't a requirement to enter a profession or to be eligible to an institutional position outside of the university. Slowly they became an advantage in this respect, however, and eventually, with the modern university, an unconditional requirement. The unity of the degrees was destroyed with universities becoming integrated in national higher education systems, and with the tight disciplinary specialisation of study programs. The Bologna process has now structurally re-harmonized the degree levels, but the diversity still flourishes with a new wave of creativity concerning the development of new interdisciplinary study programs. The generalised diploma supplement is thought to reflect unique pathways within a common scheme. The diploma supplement is very useful for HESPs based on ILAs because of the absolute unique trajectories which are encouraged by them. The diploma supplement might even be extended according to ILA-based reflections.

⁸¹ There are easy workarounds, though, for partners located elsewhere.

If in the USA higher education degrees in integral and transformative studies as such are issued, there are no such examples in Europe as far as I know. The question is whether generic degrees like this are helpful on the job market or otherwise useful. There are too few HEIs and research centres dedicated to ILAs and ILAs have no common identity and label. Accordingly, there is almost no specific job market for ILA-inspired scholars other than the one related to the discipline or field their work comes closest to. On the general job market unspecific degrees are generally disadvantageous compared to specific degrees (disciplinary or professional). A specific focus and a well-known denomination make it easier as well to get a HESP accredited in the first place. A domain-specific degree however doesn't reflect sufficiently the boundary-crossing ambition of ILAs. One solution is to combine well-known degrees with a specification, like integral health, transformative leadership or transdisciplinary sustainability, to take three existing examples. This might work best under the current conditions, but i) doesn't help with forging a common label allowing immediate cross-program recognition, and ii) doesn't do justice to those who are attracted to ILAs because they allow for study across disciplines and fields rather than to stay in the confines of the usual fragmentation of knowledge and practice. Overall, it appears that some thought has still to be invested to determine how to label degrees related to studies of ILAs in an adequate and promising way.

The worth of the degrees does not only depend on an adequate labelling but of course more basically on the *quality* of the study programs. There are paneuropean standards for quality assurance in higher education.⁸² HESPs based on ILAs should strive to comply with them as soon and as well as possible. As these standards are of a very general nature this is not much of a burden if a program is well-designed from the outset. New programs should go through the accreditation process of one of the accreditation agencies listed in the official "European Quality Assurance Register for Higher Education."⁸³ Such an accreditation is based on a self-report, a site visit of a peer panel, and (in case of re-accreditation) student's course evaluations. The challenge is the same as with all ILA-based activities within an otherwise disciplinary landscape: uncertainties and problems can result from peer reviewers not being actual peers in respect to an authentic understanding of ILAs and of the andragogical and organisational approaches they require and pursue. In any event, from an ILA-perspective the accreditation is only the beginning and not the end of an ongoing quality development based on a participatory process. Care must be taken not to fall into the trap of separating external evaluation for the purpose of accountability, and internal evaluation for the purpose of improvement, a daunting split which too often turns the issue of quality assurance into a bureaucratic nightmare eating up precious resources which then cannot be devoted to the students any longer.⁸⁴

The final question to be treated regarding organisational issues concerns the *funding* of such programs. No doubt, funding of innovative HESPs is not easy. My argument here was, however, that there is not more money necessary for HESPs following an ILA than in other postmodern

⁸² European Standards and Guidelines for Quality Assurance in the European Higher Education Area (www.enqa.eu/files/BergenReport210205.pdf)

⁸³ www.eqar.eu

⁸⁴ For this systemic reason which cannot be seen, the fragmented responsibilities and practices in HEIs it happens, indeed, that the introduction of formal external quality assurance systems meant to improve quality are actually reducing the quality of teaching and learning.

programs relying on a coordinator. If such a program is hosted by a public university it can already start with the baseline funding, administrative support, facilities and access to digital resources provided for any other program. As already said, in Europe tuition fees cannot be that high and so other sources of funding are absolutely indispensable. An application to an adequate European funding program, like Erasmus Mundus,⁸⁵ should be attempted, as well as for a kick-off grant by a private foundation. Actually, all the traditional funding possibilities taken together are employed.

In addition to this, a model originally invented to pay back scholarships is well worth a thought. In this model contracts are concluded at the beginning of the study program in which it is agreed, as a freely chosen engagement, that a small percentage of the future income of the graduate is returned to the study program on a regular basis (e.g. yearly) if the income exceeds a certain baseline. This model, once it is built up across a couple of student generations, can generate a constant flux of financial resources. If it is generalised, in the long run it institutionalises intergenerational solidarity (the established seniors helping the next generation to make their way), and makes such HESPs more viable and independent. Inviting students to contribute in ways which are not burdening them with debt is a good idea which can be even further developed. Let me introduce another example: PhD students who receive a scholarship can serve in return as scouts for detecting new opportunities to apply for scholarships for the next generation of PhD candidates. As a rule, the collaborative service learning projects should as well seize opportunities to achieve a certain level of self-funding after an initial phase. The spirit of social and knowledge entrepreneurship to be cultivated departs from the dominant three solutions of i) students taking advantage of but not appreciating tuition-free public higher education true to the phrase “what is free has no worth,” of ii) consumers who pay for (private) higher education as for any other service and expect an appropriate service in return, and of iii) those who pay high tuition fees without having the capital to do so, and who then pay back a loan to the bank for great many years after graduating. Instead of paying interests to a bank why not directly supporting future generations of students? A spirit coherent with ILAs is a caring one attempting to use available resources economically while expanding them through creative collaborative entrepreneurial activity rather than simply consuming them.

Conclusion

The organisational and regulatory (infra)structures should adapt to the needs of the learning communities they are supposed to serve – and not the other way round as it is often the case. The organisational framework for this must be particularly flexible to remain responsive to the learning communities and their projects, however they are shaped and distributed, and however they decide to work and evolve on the basis of their self-direction, self-governance and service-delivering project work. They should enable a blended learning approach, and help to sustain collective social entrepreneurship while responding appropriately to institutional requirements like quality assurance. It has been shown that appropriate legal entities exist for all levels of organisational unfolding along the strategic corridor, and that there are some innovative ways to tackle the hot issues of language diversity, decision-making and funding.

⁸⁵ See footnote 38.

Call

Sometimes it is easier to live with the comfort of despair than with the challenge of knowing that change can happen despite the inertia of organizations. But there is another avenue toward change: The way of the movement. I began to understand movements when I saw the simple fact that nothing would ever have changed if reformers had allowed themselves to be done in by organizational resistance. Many of us experience such resistance as checkmate to our hopes for change. But for a movement, resistance is merely the place where things begin. The movement mentality, far from being defeated by organizational resistance, takes energy from opposition. Opposition validates the audacious idea that change must come. ... The genius of movements is paradoxical: They abandon the logic of organizations in order to gather the power necessary to rewrite the logic of organizations ... What is the logic of a movement? How does a movement unfold and progress? I see four definable stages in the movements I have studied —stages that do not unfold as neatly as this list suggests, but often overlap and circle back on each other:

- *Isolated individuals decide to stop leading "divided lives."*
- *These people discover each other and form groups for mutual support.*
- *Empowered by community, they learn to translate "private problems" into public issues.*
- *Alternative rewards emerge to sustain the movement's vision, which may force the conventional reward system to change. (Palmer, 1992)⁸⁶*

This essay is a contribution to building collective intentionality directed towards a more connected, more strategic, and more integral process of creation of (more) higher education study programs inspired by integral and likeminded approaches, in the European higher education area and beyond. The overall suggestion is to question the recurrent focus on two organisational levels of strikingly little overall impact anytime soon: the creation of alternative higher education institutions and the transformation of the mainstream higher education system on the institutional level, and the introduction of ILA-based content on the course level. Without denying the value of successful attempts on these levels I am advocating a strategy concentrating on the crucial level of higher education study programs delivering degrees compatible with a broader labour. A strategic corridor was devised along developmental layers with each layer having its own value and autonomous functioning and additional layers adding further value. I tried to make plausible that much more higher education study programs based on integral and likeminded approaches could and should be created than can be observed so far given that the

⁸⁶ Parker Palmer abandoned his academic career he started with a PhD in sociology from Berkeley to become a freelance writer, activist and teacher. Many of his books were widely and enthusiastically received despite or because of the fact that their spirit runs counter dominant structures and practices of (higher) education. He became a Senior Associate of the American Association of Higher Education and a Senior Advisor to the Fetzer Institute. In 1998 a national survey of 10,000 administrators and faculty, named Palmer as one of the thirty “most influential senior leaders” in higher education and one of the ten key “agenda-setters.” In 2003, the American College Personnel Association named Palmer a “Diamond Honoree” for outstanding contributions to the field of student affairs. He received 10 honorary doctorates (source: Wikipedia).

necessary conditions and resources are already available, albeit in a largely distributed and kaleidoscopic manner. In order to actually move along the developmental strategic corridor I have been stressing the crucial role of emergent knotworking as a practice of decentered awareness and coordination enabling the realization of collective intentionality in loosely coupled organisational settings.

On the one hand I tried to show that the contemporary European situation opens up fresh opportunities for advancing the cause of tertiary study programs inspired by integral and likeminded approaches. This situation is created by i) the global crises, ii) the Bologna process, iii) new European funding programs, iv) the diversity of national higher education laws and systems, and most of all of v) the development strategies of the myriads of higher education institutions operating under increasingly competitive conditions, conditions which are imposing the requirement on them to become truly distinctive and original. On the other hand I pointed at two types of obstacles which are preventing these opportunities from being seized to make higher education study programs inspired by integral and likeminded approaches a reality. The first type is structurally inscribed in higher education as it has evolved over the last century or more regarding its disciplinary lineages, its specialization bias, and the dogmatic prejudices of scientism. The second type is due to incoherencies in the various communities developing integral and likeminded approaches, especially the lack of interconnectedness, of common identity, and self-transcendence of integral and likeminded streams on the one hand, and of professional levels of complex strategic thinking, organisational development, and management practice on the other hand.

I have sketched possible paths to overcome these obstacles and envisioned the dawn of a new phase of higher education on the basis of interconnected programs espousing integral and likeminded approaches and overlaying existing higher education institutions and their traditional programs. This web of programs could be cultivated by several transnational consortia linked together by an emergent knotworked coordination which can later formalise as the need arises. My main contention in this essay is that only such a flexible and further expanding offer will respond to the vocation and uniqueness of students, teachers and staff already inspired by integral and likeminded approaches and by a concern for the contemporary transformations of self, nature and society. I tried to show how these inspirations can be expressed by fully embracing what is, i.e. taking realistically into account the institutional inertia and immune defence reactions of higher education systems and institutions as they stand today on the basis of their plurisecular heritage and the contemporary zeitgeist.

I argued that in this process integral and likeminded approaches shouldn't limit themselves to add new content to existing study programs, but to invent different containers and processes true to their general principles and to the versions of andragogy they are bringing about. I have discussed how more integral ways to constitute learning communities on the basis of ethical and personal commitments could work and be adequately propelled through integral andragogies and integral approaches to organisational development. A particular concern was to show how these three major views of, or gateways to one single complex individual-collective subjective-objective transcultural and transdisciplinary process of learning, development and self-transformation could cohere and co-evolve.

As a matter of fact it can be observed that today there are vanguard study programs in which many of the innovative features mentioned in this essay are already implemented and practiced. However, they do not generally explicitly espouse an integral or likeminded approach nor do they convey respective content. At the same time there are other study programs conveying content related to integral and likeminded approaches but which do not necessarily yet put a more fully-fledged integral andragogy and integral organisation into practice. This observation might stimulate the desire to create coherence between community, curriculum and organisation in the spirit of integral and likeminded approaches. The vision I put forward is that the power and attraction of higher levels of coherence as usual between interacting persons, approaches to learning, organisational frameworks and societal needs can turn specifically designed and nurtured higher education study programs into inspiring, evolving centres of a “contaminating” transformative power for individuals, groups and larger collectives. I made clear that this requires to simultaneously depart from, transcend and overlay the given mindsets, infrastructures, rules and practices of (post)modern higher education.

The still largely implicit and outwardly fractured field from which this essay emerged calls for other contributions, responses, corrections and critiques, for alternative and complementary expressions, for new initiatives, for follow-ups, and above all, for action! It calls for knotworking between already existing initiatives, most of which are emergent and still invisible but for the most initiated of all those students, teachers, researchers, practitioners and policy makers already inspired by integral or likeminded approaches, or ready to become inspired. The call comes from nowhere in particular but it is there, it is undeniable, and the specific direction, expression and wording chosen in this essay shouldn't hide that what is to be said and to be done is much more than what can be expressed or appropriately foreshadowed at this stage. It is sufficient, though, to amplify the early signs of the emergence of a movement which translates the “private problems” of isolated students and academic teachers who are inspired by integral and likeminded approaches and who are stopping to live “fragmented lives” into “public issues” and into andragogical and organisational innovation in higher education and society.

This revolution —intellectual, institutional and cultural— if it ever comes about, would be comparable in its long-term impact to that of the Renaissance, the scientific revolution, or the Enlightenment. The outcome would be traditions and institutions of learning rationally designed to help us acquire wisdom. There are a few scattered signs that this intellectual revolution, from knowledge to wisdom, is already under way. It will need, however, much wider cooperative support—from scientists, scholars, students, research councils, university administrators, vice chancellors, teachers, the media and the general public— if it is to become anything more than what it is at present, a fragmentary and often impotent movement of protest and opposition, often at odds with itself, exercising little influence on the main body of academic work. I can hardly imagine any more important work for anyone associated with academia than, in teaching, learning and research, to help promote this revolution. (Maxwell, 2007, p. 113)

References

- Ackoff, R. L. (1989). From data to wisdom. *Journal of Applied Systems Analysis*, 16, 3-9.
- Ashby, W. R. (1958). Requisite variety and its implications for the control of complex systems. *Cybernetica*, 1(2), 83-99.
- Aviram, A. (1992a). The humanist conception of the university: a framework for post-modern higher education. *European Journal of Education*, 27(4), 397-414.
- Aviram, A. (1992b). Non-lococentric education. *Educational Review*, 44(1), 3-17.
- Awbrey, S. M., & Scott, D. K. (n.d.). Creating integrative universities for the twenty-first century. Retrieved October 26, 2009 from <http://www.umass.edu/pastchancellors/scott/papers/creatingU.html>
- Awbrey, S. M., & Scott, D. K. (n.d.). Knowledge into wisdom: unveiling inherent values and beliefs to construct a wise university. Retrieved October 26, 2009 from <http://www.umass.edu/pastchancellors/scott/papers/knowWisdom.html>
- Barnett, R. (2000). *Realizing the university in an age of supercomplexity*. Buckingham: Society for Research into Higher Education & Open University Press.
- Becher, T., & Trowler, P. (2001). *Academic tribes and territories: intellectual enquiry and the cultures of disciplines* (2nd ed.). Buckingham: Society for Research Into Higher Education and Open University Press.
- Benedikter, R. (2006). *Postmodern spirituality: how to find a rational alternative to the global turn to religion; educational dimensions, developments and perspectives*. PhD Dissertation. University of Innsbruck.
- Bhaskar, R. (2002). *Reflections on meta-reality: transcendence, emancipation and everyday life*. New Delhi: Sage.
- Blasi, P. (2006). The European university: towards a wisdom-based society. *Higher Education in Europe*, 31(4), 403-407.
- Bohm, D. (1996). *On Dialogue*. London: Routledge.
- Boyer, E. L. (1994). Scholarship reconsidered: priorities for a new century. In G. Rigby (Ed.), *Universities in the twenty-first century*. London: National Commission on Education.
- Boyer, E. L. (1996). The scholarship of engagement. *Bulletin of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences*, 49(7), 18-33.
- Brockbank, A., & McGill, I. (2007). *Facilitating reflective learning in higher education* (2nd ed.). Berkshire: Open University Press.
- Brown, L. R. (2009). *Plan B 4.0: mobilizing to save civilization*. New York: Norton.
- Butin, D. W. (2005). *Service-learning in higher education: critical issues and directions*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Dallmayr, F. (2010). *Integral pluralism: beyond culture wars*. The University Press of Kentucky.
- Dallmayr, F. (2003). *Dialogue among civilizations: some exemplary voices*. Palgrave Macmillan.
- Diamond, J. (2005). *Collapse: how societies choose to fail or succeed*. New York: Penguin.
- Duchastel, P., & Molz, M. (2006). Virtual settings: E-learning as creating context. In A. D. Figueiredo & A. P. Afonso (Eds.), *Managing learning in virtual settings: The role of context* (pp. 24-39). Hershey, PA: Idea Group.
- Endenburg, G. (1998). *Sociocracy: the organization of decision-making*. Delft: Eburon.
- Engeström, Y. (2005). Knotworking to create collaborative intentionality capital in fluid organizational fields. *Advances in Interdisciplinary Studies of Work Teams*, 11, 307-336.

- Fallows, S., & Steven, C. (Eds.). (2000). *Integrating key skills in higher education*. London: Kogan Page.
- Ford, M. P. (2006). *Beyond the modern university: toward a constructive postmodern university*. Charlotte, NC: Information Age Publisher.
- Gabelnick, F. G. (1990). *Learning communities*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Garrison, D. R., & Vaughan, N. D. (2008). *Blended learning in higher education: framework, principles, and guidelines*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Garrod, N., & MacFarlane, T. (2007). Scoping the duals: the structural challenges of combining further and higher education in post-compulsory institutions. *Higher Education Quarterly*, 61(4), 578-596.
- Gebser, J. (1985). *The ever-present origin*. Athens: Ohio University Press.
- Gidley, J. (2007). The evolution of consciousness as a planetary imperative: An integration of integral views. *Integral Review*, 5, 4-226.
- Gidley, J. M. (forthcoming). An other view of integral futures: De/reconstructing the IF brand. *Futures*. doi: 10.1016/j.futures.2009.09.005.
- Giri, A. K. (2006). Cosmopolitanism and beyond: towards a multiverse of transformations. *Development and Change*, 37(6), 1277-1292.
- Glisczinski, D. J. (2007). Transformative higher education: a meaningful degree of understanding. *Journal of Transformative Education*, 5(4), 317-328.
- Graves, N. (Ed.). (1994). *Learner managed learning: practice, theory and policy*. Milton Park: Routledge.
- Harrison, R. (2000). Learner managed learning: managing to learn or learning to manage? *International Journal of Lifelong Education*, 19(4), 312.
- Harvey, L., & Knight, P. T. (1996). *Transforming higher education*. Buckingham: Society for Research Into Higher Education and Open University Press.
- Heron, J. (1996). *Co-operative inquiry: research into the human condition*. London: Sage.
- Hess, C., & Ostrom, E. (Eds.). (2006). *Understanding knowledge as a commons: from theory to practice*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Horn, K. P., & Brick, R. (2005). *Invisible dynamics. Systemic constellations in organisations and in business*. Heidelberg: Carl Auer.
- Inayatullah, S., & Gidley, J. (Eds.). (2000). *The university in transformation: global perspectives on the futures of the university*. Westport, CT: Bergin & Garvey.
- Kasl, E. (2001). Groups that learn and how they do it. In I. Falk (Ed.), *Learning to manage change. Developing regional communities for a local-global millenium* (pp. 91-99). Kensington Park, Australia: National Centre for Vocational Education Research and University of Tasmania.
- Kehm, B. (2001). The challenge of lifelong learning for higher education. *International Higher Education*, 22, 5-7.
- Kenny, R. M. (2008). The whole is greater: reflective practice, human development and fields of consciousness and collaborative creativity. *World Futures: Journal of General Evolution*, 64(8), 590-630.
- Kezar, A. J. (Ed.). (2005). *Organizational learning in higher education*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Kirschner, P. A., & Valcke, M. M. A. (1994). From supply driven to demand driven education: new conceptions and the role of information technology therein. *Computers in Human Service*, 10(4), 31-53.

- Kofman, F., & Senge, P. (2001). Communities of commitment: the heart of the learning organization. Retrieved October 26, 2009 from http://www.axialent.com/uploaded/papers_articles/documentos/Communities%20of%20Commitment.%20The%20Heart%20of%20Learning%20Organizations.pdf
- Laszlo, E. (2001). *Macrosift: navigating the transformation to a sustainable world* (1st ed.). San Francisco, CA: Berrett - Koehler.
- Laszlo, E., & Seidel, P. (2006). *Global survival: the challenge and its implications for thinking and acting*. SelectBooks.
- Lessem, R., & Schieffer, A. (2008). *Integral research. A global approach towards social science research leading to social innovation*. BoD.
- Maxwell, N. (2007). From knowledge to wisdom: the need for an academic revolution. *London Review of Education*, 5, 97-115.
- McNay, I. (Ed.). (2000). *Higher education and its communities*. Buckingham: Society for Research Into Higher Education and Open University Press.
- Meadows, D. H., Meadows, D. L., Randers, J., & Behrens, W. B. (1974). *The limits to growth: a report for the Club of Rome's project on the predicament of mankind*. New York: Universe Books.
- Meadows, D. H., Randers, J., & Meadows, D. L. (2004). *The limits to growth: the 30-year update*. White River Junction, VT: Chelsea Green.
- Meyer, P., Sporer, T., & Metscher, J. (2009). e³-Portfolio – supporting and assessing project-based learning in higher education via e-portfolios. Presented at the Fourth European Conference on Technology-Enhanced Learning.
- Mindell, A. (1995). *Sitting in the fire: large group transformation using conflict and diversity* (1st ed.). Portland, OR: Lao Tse Press.
- Mindell, A., & Mindell, A. (2001). *Riding the horse backwards: process work in theory and practice*. Portland, OR: Lao Tse Press.
- Molz, M. (2003). One goal, two sites, multiple perspectives: extracting the potential of diverse settings through project-based blended learning. In *Proceedings of the 5th International Conference on New Educational Environments* (pp. 77-82). Lucerne.
- Molz, M. (2010). Contemporary integral education research: A transnational and transparadigmatic overview. In S. Esbjörn-Hargens, J. Reams, & O. Gunnlaugson (Eds.), *Integral education. Exploring multiple perspectives in the classroom* (forthcoming). Albany, NY: SUNY Press.
- Molz, M., & Bauchet, G. (2005). Au coeur de l'éducation interculturelle - au-delà de l'éducation interculturelle. Vers une approche pédagogique intégrale. In F. Baasner (Ed.), *Gérer la diversité culturelle* (pp. 175-182). Frankfurt: Peter Lang.
- Molz, M., & Bauchet, G. (2006). Transnational - transdisziplinär - transmedial. Ein Analyseraster für Integrationsstufen im Hochschulbereich. In J. Breugnot & M. Molz (Eds.), *Europa konkret! Grenzräume als Chance für Bildungsinnovationen?* (pp. 227 - 260). Landau: Knecht.
- Molz, M., & Gidley, J., (2008). A transversal dialogue on integral education and planetary consciousness: Markus Molz speaks with Jennifer Gidley. *Integral Review*, 4(1), pp. 47-70.
- Molz, M., & Edwards, M. G. (2010). Crossing boundaries, stimulating creativity: the horizon of integral meta-studies. In A. K. Giri (Ed.), *Pathways of creative research: towards a festival of dialogues*. New Delhi: Shipra.

- Moon, J. (2004). *A handbook of reflective and experiential learning: theory and practice*. London: RoutledgeFalmer.
- Morin, E. (2008). *La méthode*. Paris: Seuil.
- Morin, E. (1999a). *Relier les connaissances : le défi du XXème siècle*. Paris: Seuil.
- Morin, E. (1999b). *Seven complex lessons in education for the future*. Paris: Unesco. Retrieved October 26, 2009 from <http://unesdoc.unesco.org/images/0011/001177/117740eo.pdf>
- Morin, E., Ciurana, E., & Motta, R. (2003). *Eduquer pour l'ère planétaire : La pensée complexe comme Méthode d'apprentissage dans l'erreur et l'incertitude humaines*. Paris: Balland.
- O'Connor, M. A. (2002). Transformative learning and new paradigm scholarship. In E. O'Sullivan, A. Morrell, & M. A. O'Connor (Eds.), *Expanding the boundaries of transformative learning. Essays on theory and practice* (pp. 1-12). New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- O'Sullivan, E. (2002). The project and vision of integral transformative education. In E. O'Sullivan, A. Morrell, & M. A. O'Connor (Eds.), *Expanding the boundaries of transformative learning. Essays on theory and practice* (pp. 1-12). New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Ottewill, R. (2002). Student self-managed learning - time for action. *On the Horizon*, 10(2), 13 - 14.
- Palmer, P. J. (1992). Divided no more: A movement approach to educational reform. *Change*, 24(2), 10-17.
- Poerksen, U. (1995). *Plastic words: the tyranny of a modular language*. University Park, PA: Pennsylvania State University Press.
- Reason, P., & Torbert, W. R. (2001). The action turn: toward a transformational social science. *Concepts and Transformation*, 6(1), 1-37.
- Rist, G. (2002). *The history of development: from Western origins to global faith*. London: Zed Books.
- Rockström, J., Steffen, W., Noone, K., Persson, A., Chapin, S. F., Lambin, E., et al. (2009). Planetary boundaries: exploring the safe operating space for humanity. *Ecology and Society*, 14(2), Art. 32, 1-33.
- Rowland, S. (2002). Overcoming fragmentation in professional life. *Higher education quarterly*, 56, 52-64.
- Scharmer, C. O. (2007). *Theory U: leading from the future as it emerges*. Cambridge, MA: The Society for Organizational Learning.
- Schön, D. A. (1983). *The reflective practitioner*. New York: Basic Books.
- Schugurensky, D. (2002). Transformative learning and transformative politics: the pedagogical dimension of participatory democracy and social action. In E. O'Sullivan, A. Morrell, & M. A. O'Connor (Eds.), *Expanding the boundaries of transformative learning. Essays on theory and practice* (pp. 59-93). New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Schunk, D. H., & Zimmerman, B. J. (1998). *Self-regulated learning: from teaching to self-reflective practice*. New York: The Guilford Press.
- Scott, P. (2000). Globalisation and higher education: challenges for the 21st century. *Journal of Studies in International Education*, 4(1), 3-10.
- Senge, P. M., Scharmer, C. O., Jaworski, J., & Flowers, B. S. (2004). *Presence: human purpose and the field of the future*. Cambridge, MA: Society for Organizational Learning.

- Sgouropoulou, C., & Skiadelli, M. (2008). Reusable project-based learning blocks for higher education. Presented at the European University Information System Organisation (EUNIS) Vision for IT in Higher Education Congress.
- Shneiderman, B. (1998). Relate-create-donate: an educational philosophy for the cybergeneration. *Computers & Education*, 31(1), 25-39.
- Standish, P. (2000). The spirit of the university and the education of the spirit. In F. Crawley, P. Smeyers, & P. Standish (Eds.), *Universities remembering Europe: nations, culture and higher education*. Oxford, UK: Berghahn Books.
- Tanaka, G. K. (2002). Higher education's self-reflexive turn: toward an intercultural theory of student development. *The Journal of Higher Education*, 73(2), 263-296.
- Taylor, R. K. S., Barr, J., & Steele, T. (2002). *For a radical higher education: after postmodernism*. Buckingham: Society for Research in Higher Education and Open University Press.
- Thorley, L., & Gregory, R. D. (Eds.). (1994). *Using group-based learning in higher education*. London: Routledge.
- Ven, A. H. V. D. (2007). *Engaged scholarship: a guide for organizational and social research*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.
- Visser, J. (2001). Integrity, completeness and comprehensiveness of the learning environment: meeting the basic needs for all throughout life. In D. Aspin, M. Hatton, & Y. Sawano (Eds.), *International handbook of lifelong learning* (Vol. 2, pp. 447-472). Dordrecht: Kluwer.
- Weaver, M. (2008). *Transformative learning support models in higher education: educating the whole student*. London: Facet Publishing.
- Wilcox, S. (1996). Fostering self-directed learning in the university setting. *Studies in Higher Education*, 21(2), 165.
- Wilson, B., & Ryder, M. (1996). Dynamic learning communities: an alternative to designed instructional systems. In *Proceedings of Selected Research and Development Presentations at the 18th National Convention of the Association for Educational Communications Technology*. Retrieved October 26, 2009 from http://www.eric.ed.gov/ERICDocs/data/ericdocs2sql/content_storage_01/0000019b/80/14/a1/4c.pdf
- Wolf, K. D. (2001). Internet based learning communities - moving from patchwork environments to ubiquitous learning infrastructures. In S. Dijkstra, D. Jonassen, & D. Sembill (Eds.), *Multimedia learning. Results and perspectives* (pp. 189-223). Frankfurt: Lang.

Markus Molz is trained as an educational and organizational psychologist and studies integral and transdisciplinary approaches across streams since 1989. He was co-founder of two start-up companies, freelance consultant for NGOs, and researcher in several international research projects. Since 1995 Markus is teaching transdisciplinary courses on intercultural relations, new learning technologies and educational quality development to international student groups at various higher education institutions. Currently, he serves as an assistant researcher in educational sciences at the multilingual and interdisciplinary University of Luxembourg (www.uni.lu) to finalize his PhD dissertation "Beyond fragmentation: Toward an integral pluralism in sociocultural research." Markus is co-founder and board member of the Institute for Integral Studies (www.integral-studies.org) and organizes the international symposium "Research across boundaries – advances in theory-building" in 2010.

E-mail: markus.molz@integral-studies.org.

Appendix

The following tables reflecting aspects of the long-term evolution of Western higher education (12th-21st century) are focused on prototypes and tuned to the points made in this essay. It must be noted that they are truncated and warped: within-period homogeneity is grossly exaggerated, i.e. national traditions and differences between HEIs are not considered, the place of the recent and probably short postmodern transition period is likely to be overstated by providing it with a separate column whereas the late medieval/Renaissance transition period has been entirely omitted because it doesn't add much to the argumentation in this essay.

Table 1: Persons / roles involved in Western higher education across eras.

	Early Higher Education	Medieval Higher Education	Modern Higher Education	Post-modern Higher Education	Integral Higher Education (scenario)
Students	Only (young, even very young) male students Socioeconomic and national background of no particular importance to access any university but self-selection of students because of the high fees (some scholarships were provided according to local opportunities) Conditions for admission: "mannered lifestyle," integration in one of the "nationes" (student communities) and one of the scholas (community around one teacher) Admission possible at any time Cross-border trajectories were easily possible	Transition from elite to mass higher education, but students from lower social class background under-represented despite the introduction of national scholarship systems considering socioeconomic criteria Female students catching up to parity but underrepresented on the doctoral level until today Admission upon formal application based on high school certificate or prior degree + admission test (in some programs and countries) Majority of students study one discipline in one university in one country Rather homogeneous student groups regarding nationality	Full mass higher education with some diversity and equal opportunity Lifelong learning becomes important Many more non-traditional students (practitioners returning to higher education etc.) Intake upon individual application according to program-based specifications Cross-disciplinary and cross-border trajectories become more frequent	Cross-boundary trajectories are required (across disciplines, cultures, occupations, theory-practice) Diversity sensitivity (non-dogmatic attempt to roughly balance within student groups male and female students with different social class background, students from different cultures, students with different levels of professional experience etc.) For individual admission balanced combination of criteria and combination of approaches Introduction of collective applications	If some continue to have the formal status as students, some as permanent or guest teachers, or as support

Teachers	Qualified through degree Hired by students (Bologna type) or by religious (Paris type) or royal authorities (Cambridge type) Teaching in different places was common Academic teachers were a rare species	Teachers are professors or those who are on the way to become a professor Professors are hired by a higher education institution on a permanent position and mostly teaching at this university There are many academic teachers	Permanent teachers hired by the higher education institution + guest teachers hired by the study programs Teachers teaching in different programs in different HEIs become more frequent There are great many academic teachers	All possible options combined according to arising needs and pragmatic possibilities Non-scholars are invited to the learning community (like artists, spiritual leaders, social activists, policy makers and other practitioners)	staff, all are actual students and teachers of other students and teachers. It is recognized that each member of the learning community has a specific profile of expertise and levels of development across all domains considered together
Support Staff	In the beginning almost none, later scribes etc., and caretakers, cooks etc. for running the colleges (which were just student residencies in the beginning)	University administration, secretaries, librarians, caretakers, cleaners ...	Those of the modern university + IT & public relations specialists + student counselors & study program coordinators	Almost no additional support staff required compared to post-modern higher education, only coordinators of the network of consortia and programs	

Table 2. Approaches to teaching and learning in Western higher education across eras.

	Early Medieval Higher Education	Modern Higher Education	Post-modern Higher Education	Integral Higher Education (scenario)	
Curriculum	Fixed canonical curriculum centered on books and comments Same studium generale for all students (trivium - first cycle, quadrivium - second cycle) 3 different programs on the doctoral level (theology, law, medical studies) Long studies	Centered on disciplines and disciplinary knowledge Initial choice among disciplines (or professional programs) Few choices within disciplinary curriculum	Modular curriculum centered on competencies More choices across programs, higher education institutions, and countries Possibility to develop a unique profile Shorter studies	Centered on transformative projects informed by ILAs Intertwined pathways of learning on the individual, group & community level Great many choices (refocused according to vocation and societal needs during the macrosift) Students as co-designers of their curriculum seizing the opportunity to cultivate and develop their uniqueness	Tight and continuous integration of curriculum-planning,

Classes	Class with one main teacher (= schola) Classes are small Lectures, repetitions, disputations	Many classes with different teachers Classes are larger Mostly lectures, tutorials, seminars	Many classes with many different teachers Mix between national and international students Various types of classes and other learning activities	Project-based groups of students supported by one major facilitator learning together and individually according to negotiated pathways (attending classes or inviting teachers fitting to their pathway)	teaching/ learning, research, assessment, practice and career development in multi-stakeholder collaborative learning processes
Pedagogical Approach	Uniform scholastic method Traditional tight interpersonal disciple-master relationship Mostly theoretical, largely separated from practice outside the university	Focus on conveying subdisciplinary content Mostly theoretical, in the branches preparing for the professions some contact with practice for advanced students (but often disconnected from the theoretical training)	Varied but non-coordinated pedagogical approaches and types of competencies actually developed Sometimes some reconnection between theory and practice (through fieldtrips, extended internships, service learning etc.)	Meta-pedagogical approach merging transformative, project-based, collaborative, blended, service learning, with all other pedagogical approaches according to arising needs, overall fostering innovation-oriented practice-based research and research-based practice	Continuous improvement and adaptation of the (meta-) pedagogical approach based on educational research, students' actual needs and reflection of collective experiences in the learning communities
Assessment	Disputatio exam) (oral	Assessment of courses (based on presentation, essay or test) Final thesis Final exams (oral or written)	Portfolio Continuous assessment (module-based exams, various assessment methods) Final thesis	Individual portfolio and continuous assessment of (on-going) collective transformation projects through artful combinations of reality checks and self-, peer, expert & external stakeholder assessment	

Table 3: Structural features of Western higher education across eras.

	Early Medieval Higher Education	Modern Higher Education	Post-modern Higher Education	Integral Higher Education (scenario)
Language(s)	Latin	National Languages	National Languages and / or English	Multilingual (diversity-sensitive and adaptive to particular situations)
Infra-structure	Almost no dedicated infrastructure Classes took place flexibly were facilities were available There were only very few copies of books	Brick & mortar campus Library Research labs	Brick & mortar campus and/or virtual campus and access to protected online resources	Using existing brick & mortar and virtual infrastructures, adding own lightweight virtual infrastructures Meetings take place flexibly were facilities are suitable, and aesthetic (face-to-face & online, synchronously & asynchronously) Study and research programs are developed and steered by various, flexibly developing transnational, transdisciplinary and inter-institutional consortia overlapping with each other as a loosely coupled knotwork sharing integral values and practices and jointly overlaying and making use of the (infra) structures of the (post)modern higher education institutions
Organizational Form & Legal Status	“Universitas” as guild-like association of students and teachers based on self-governance in which a substantial role was granted to the students	Public university status depending on the respective ministry of (higher) education or private university status Self-governance of the professoriate with much less rights for the students	Various legal status (public or private university, foundation, company, company or grouping of public utility ...) Managerial governance (regardless legal status) with little influence of teachers & students on central decision making	Flexible, transnational umbrella organisations (e.g. EEIG) Self-governance of learning communities and the community of learning communities based on integral principles (e.g. sociocracy)
Degrees	Degrees were identical & universally recognized in Europe, originally they served only as admission condition for teaching at the university, not for any of the professions	National degrees (which were not directly comparable) in many subject matters Degrees as mandatory entry requirements for professions and occupations	Transnational mutual recognition of degrees Structural harmonization (3-cycle model, ECTS) Diploma supplement Inflation of degrees	Ideally combination/integration of existing and new (integral studies) degrees Integral extension of diploma supplement and competence frameworks

Quality Control	Quality control steered by students (Bologna type) or authorities (other types)	Professoriate's self-control (or none in case self-control fails)	External quality assurance agencies - (re)accreditation based on site visits, institution's and study program's self-evaluation reports and students' course evaluations	Compliance with international quality assurance standards and procedures + continuous participatory quality development process engaging all stakeholders
Funding	Enrolment fees Tuition fees Exam fees Donations	State subsidies Enrolment fees Tuition fees (in some universities and in some countries) Donations/ own assets	Tuition fees State subsidies Competitive third party funds Donations/ own assets	All traditional options + intergenerational contributions from former students
