CHAPTER 2

LIFELONG LEARNING FOR EQUITY AND SOCIAL COHESION: A NEW CHALLENGE FOR HIGHER EDUCATION

Suzy Halimi

CHAPTER SUMMARY

At the start of the twenty-first century, lifelong learning is regarded as a necessity, and national governments make it a political priority, at least in most of the industrialised countries. Globalisation and the international competition that goes with it; the swift evolution of knowledge and its swifter diffusion through the dizzying development of information and communication technology (ICT); modern aspirations towards a better quality of life for human beings – all of these are features of our contemporary situation that make lifelong learning a requirement – indeed, a necessity.

This involves meeting the needs of adults – not the traditional clientele, and until now under-represented in higher education. This clientele suffers from three handicaps: economic (in the case of those who need to find a place in the job market, in a lifetime), psychological (people who are shy of the school system: many will have left it after failing in some way, and may not relish the prospect of applying for more teaching), and, finally, academic, since they do not have the normal qualifications for access to higher education.

This is the challenge which higher education has to meet in opening its doors to this clientele: a teaching challenge, to be ready to listen to learners and offer them individualised courses; an organisational challenge, demanding changes in the way space, time and human resources are managed so as to suit the needs of learners with particular constraints and expectations; and the ethical challenge of providing this "fragile" clientele with high-quality learning and qualifications that are as well recognised as those of conventional education. Such difficulties can only be overcome by partnerships that enable all the parties concerned to pool their resources so as to achieve the objectives by joint action.

INTRODUCTION

In his 1996 report to UNESCO, Jacques Delors championed "Learning throughout life" as "the heartbeat of society […] one of the keys to meeting the challenges of the twenty-first century." (Delors, 1996). In the decade since then, intergovernmental organisations have all taken notice of this issue, consulting experts, organising debates and seminars, gathering examples of good practice, and drafting reports addressed to the parties concerned, including political decision-makers.

The European Commission declared 1996 as the Year of Lifelong Learning, and has since then continued to conduct surveys and studies. In 2000 it published a Communication containing six "key messages" to facilitate the practical implementation of its recommendations. It completed all this with a first review in 2003. The OECD, which pioneered this field in 1973 with the publication of a study entitled *Recurrent Education: A Strategy for Lifelong Learning*, continues to reflect on the best way, in terms of its own purposes, of investing in "human capital", to use a term that features in the OECD's *Education Policy Analysis (1997)*. The Council of Europe, whose ideology is mainly concerned with the defence of human rights and equal opportunities, has conducted over four years a programme of work on the subject of *Lifelong Learning for Equity and Social Cohesion*, which we have taken as the title for the present chapter (Council of Europe, 2001).

Such preoccupations of course reflect those of the member governments of these organisations. They are concerned about what they see as one of the major challenges of our age and of our "knowledge society", in which knowledge has become an economic issue, as well as a factor in combating exclusion, and one of the keys to a better quality of life. Parliaments and educators have the task of finding ways to turn words into action and to give everyone who wants it the opportunity for self-education throughout life.

The task is not an easy one: the situation is complex, as shown, indeed, by the evolution of the terminology. Thus in addition to "continuous or ongoing training", which emphasise vocational training and the upgrading of employable skills, we now have "lifelong learning", a much broader concept, when we recall the four objectives Jacques Delors assigned to education: learning to do, learning to be, learning to learn, and learning to live together (Delors, 1996). As for the expression "lifelong", it recalls Lord Beveridge's grand design as he prepared the United Kingdom's Welfare State at the end of the Second World War, proposing that it should look after its people from one end of their lives to the other, "from the cradle to the grave".

Today there is another change, as "education" gives way to "learning", the former indicating a process established (and therefore, perhaps, imposed) by society, the latter involving rather the voluntary acts of individuals who want to acquire knowledge at their own pace and in their own way, for purposes of their own, which may not necessarily be the same as their neighbour's or those of the whole community. This is why we have chosen "Lifelong Learning for Equity and Social Cohesion" as the title for this chapter. We shall tackle the issue under three headings: "A new context", "A new clientele", and "A new challenge for higher education".

A NEW CONTEXT

The changing and proliferating meanings associated with "lifelong learning" reflect the various facets of the problem, themselves connected with the manifold requirements of our knowledge society. To emphasise one particular aspect or another will give this concept

a particular colouring, and offer a particular "model"; but these models are all mutually complementary, and will vary from one situation to another.

The scientific and technological background plays a supremely important role. The twenty-first century has been called the "Century of Grey Matter", meaning the intellect, which constitutes a new source of wealth for our planet. Science is making spectacular progress, from the infinitely great to the infinitely small. Astronomers send their probes to the edges of our galaxy, while nanotechnology unravels the mysteries of a world invisible to the naked eye. Biology is now mastering cloning and other secrets of human life. Though there are still scourges such as AIDS to be conquered, medicine has succeeded in increasing life expectancy.

These heady developments are instantly recognised, communicated, explained and exploited all over the world in real time, thanks to another development no less spectacular, that of information and communication technology (ICT). This is proving a valuable tool for diffusing knowledge, though much remains to be done if we are to remedy the digital divide between those who can and those who cannot master such technology.

Acquiring knowledge, making it available to as many as possible, keeping up to date with progress in each field of competence, is becoming essential both for individuals and for states that are making research — the creation of new knowledge — one of their political priorities. As the process unfolds over the long term, it clearly falls to lifelong learning to give everyone the opportunity of thinking about the gaps in their understanding ("learning to learn", as Jacques Delors says), and filling them in so as to keep up with progress. Already two missions, two "models", begin to emerge: a "reflective learning" model and a "compensatory" model, to use the classification introduced by Christopher McIntosh in Chapter 1 of this book.

The economic background cannot be separated from the scientific and technological one. Knowledge obviously feeds innovation; it is harnessed in the service of development, and in particular of wealth-generating economic development. Here globalisation, which is such a feature of our twenty-first century, is without any doubt a source of many blessings, such as international solidarity and the sharing of resources, as we have seen with the recent terrible events in South-East Asia; but it also gives rise to ferocious international competition. Terms like "centres of excellence", or "competitiveness", or "attraction" are already part of everyday speech. This is a race in which states know full well they need to equip themselves with the best skilled and qualified human resources possible.

For individuals, such incessant economic changes — there is already talk of the "liquid society" (Bauman 2000), meaning a society in constant flux — can be painful, involving company closures, dislocation and relocation, forced restructurings, and so on. It is now acknowledged that in the next ten years, even those who are lucky enough not to suffer unemployment will still have to face re-skilling and reorientation in order to find work. Diplomas and degrees gained between the ages of 18 and 25 will no longer be an employment passport for life. Employability is becoming a concern for everyone. The economy has its changing requirements, and those responsible for education are called on not to lose sight of the need to ensure that training stays in line with employment prospects. Lifelong learning must provide its learners with the tools necessary for "staying in the race": the quality of human capital depends on it, and here the "functionalist" model takes precedence over all others.

Lastly, our analysis of the situation must also take social and cultural factors into account. Leaving no-one by the side of the road if it can be helped; reducing inequalities; giving everybody a chance to learn and win a place in the sun: these things also work in favour of equity and social cohesion. This is the “model” which the Council of Europe has chosen to make its priority: opening the doors of higher education to people who have so far been under-represented there — women, ethnic and cultural minorities, the disabled, young and not-so-young people from underprivileged social backgrounds. It is the ideal of social justice and equal opportunity, without which it is not possible to live together in harmony.

Such learning has one last function, however; last, but by no means least. That is the “humanistic” model — still referring to the classification presented in the introductory chapter — which leads to a better quality of life, with no functional concerns of any kind. As life expectancy increases, there are more and more adults, whether still working or retired, going (or going back) to university to get further cultural education just for pleasure. Hence the growing popularity of the so-called “leisure universities”, or call them what you will, offering courses and lectures on an immense variety of subjects to a new clientele eager for self-cultivation, wider horizons and knowledge, for the satisfaction they can bring.

A NEW CLIENTELE AND ITS REQUIREMENTS

To characterise the new clientele now knocking at the doors of universities in the name of lifelong learning, we shall be using the classification proposed by Ulrich Teichler[3]. This clientele can be divided into three categories: *postponers*, who could have had access to higher education at the end of their secondary education, but put it off for various personal or career reasons; *returners*, who have already benefited from it, and come back for a second slice of the cake, so to speak — either to upgrade their knowledge for the purposes of a better job or simply to enjoy cultural improvement for their own well-being; and lastly, *second chancers*, those who have not yet had an opportunity to benefit from academic learning, and who apply for or are offered another chance to do so. Most of these are from underprivileged groups that have so far been under-represented in higher education: members of ethnic and cultural minorities, less well-off social backgrounds, women with family commitments, disabled people, and the large numbers who left compulsory schooling without qualifications. This last category, the *second chancers*, is the one we are primarily dealing with here, since the others can easily find their way into universities when they want. But the third clientele is comparatively vulnerable, which makes it harder for them to participate in education, and makes their integration a challenge to be taken up every day.

First of all, these people suffer from economic weakness in one form or another. They may be unemployed or in jobs that bring in too little to support their needs and those of their family, and are looking for skills and qualifications that would enable them to get a more secure footing in the job market. Their expectations are high and specific; they need “learning to do” above all, but they also need “learning to learn”, because their situation is sure to remain precarious and this will require a good deal of reorientation.

How are these less well-off clients to finance their studies? How can they pay the fees giving access to higher education? In their case society will have to step in to cover all or some of the costs of their studies. In some instances, the law provides for this: in France, employers must pay a proportion of their income (the “employer’s one per cent”) towards the ongoing training of their staff. This training may be provided within the firm, which can create its own campus by clearly defining its needs in order to increase the

level of knowledge and skills of its human capital. This is the pattern most often used by the most powerful businesses. However, employers can also use the services of higher education institutions, to which they address specific requests that efficiently target their own properly-identified needs. These in-service training departments then make efforts to design and introduce special courses to meet their particular requirements.

The United Kingdom also encourages firms which invest in their employees' training through its "Investors in People" programme. The training also, of course, enables the firms to become more competitive in the world market. As examples of good practice, we might also mention the European ADAPT programme, which supports a pattern of job rotation: while one member of staff (still on the payroll) has further training, an unemployed person is taken on to fill in the temporary vacancy, which in a way kills two birds with one stone, and helps two people at once. [4]

Other ways of helping this clientele can be imagined, of course. There is also much talk, here and there, of setting up "individual learning accounts" for each person, funded by the state (i.e. by the taxpayer), which individuals can use as they wish, at their own convenience, throughout their life if that is the best pattern. The idea is a simple one, but the way to apply it still needs mapping out.

Another obstacle to be overcome is the psychological frailty of these students who do not fit the conventional profile. The people concerned–the potential beneficiaries of the advantages which they are to be offered at such expense–need to be made aware of them, and to steel themselves to take up this right to lifelong learning. The Council of Europe has worked hard on this aspect of the matter, commissioning experts and psychologists to explain something that is certainly not proving the easiest problem to solve. [5]

Coming from underprivileged backgrounds which do not always recognise the worth of further training or education, and themselves living in precarious circumstances, they do not know their rights in this field, nor sometimes even their needs. To draw up formulas on their behalf is no doubt to act with good intentions, but it depersonalises them.

Moreover, it is generally observed that those who have left the school system because of a failure to meet the requirements are often reluctant to return. Moreover, it is hard for adults to find themselves sharing university classrooms with people young enough to be their children–this is another psychological hurdle. We can see that a whole series of obstacles will need removing if this potential clientele is to be given a second chance.

There is work being done on this; and there are already examples of good practice. The "skills review", which began in France back in 1985, gives employees a clearer idea of their individual aptitudes, personal and professional; in this process they are assisted by universities' in-service training departments which help them specify and formulate their requirements. Another instance is the project in the United Kingdom known as ADAPT-SES-NET, established in the south of Scotland, which aims to stimulate demand for lifelong learning.

Alongside this work, researchers are keen to spread understanding of learning's benefits for the individual, in terms of human success (understanding and know-how), personal identity (self-awareness, self-confidence, enhanced self-image) and social ease (improvements in group relationships). Such are the main conclusions of the work entitled *The Benefits of Learning* (Schuller et al., 2004).

Lastly, academic weakness: many lifelong learners do not have the prerequisite qualifications for entering higher education: secondary school certificate, a high-school

diploma or similar certificates of secondary education. They do, on the other hand, have a great deal of experience from their occupation, or simply from the school of life. Opening the doors of the university to them pre-supposes a solution to the problem of prerequisites.

This may be the point on which the most significant progress has already been achieved. The pioneering Open University has, since its foundation, admitted adult students without requiring the famous GCSE or formidable A-levels that bar the way to traditional universities. The experience has been entirely positive: all that proved necessary was to offer this clientele the opportunity of bringing themselves to the point where they could profitably follow the higher-level courses, by means of remedial classes to fill the gaps.

A NEW CHALLENGE FOR HIGHER EDUCATION

Once the problem of access has been dealt with, by giving applicants credit for their prior learning experience and/or remedial or supplementary courses, many adjustments are still needed to make room for the adult lifelong learning clientele in institutions of higher education. The needed adjustments are at four main levels: teaching, governance, partnerships and ethics.

The challenge of teaching is the first hurdle. For all the reasons mentioned above, this new clientele needs personalised attention: standard teaching tailored to the greatest number will not do, and courses must be made more variable to meet the specific needs of people who are already engaged in active life, or need to be. This is where the notion of the “customised curriculum” comes into its own, as shown by Sweden, for example, in its 1997 – 2002 Adult Education Initiative programme (AEI): it was an experiment whose form and content were designed in accordance with the needs, wishes and aptitudes of learners who were treated as unique individuals in every case.

The reorganisation of teaching into semesters and accumulation credits, currently in progress throughout Europe under the Bologna process, is particularly well suited to managing the constraints of families or careers. Students choose their own pattern of attendance, and new patterns of teaching make far better provision for this than in the past.[6] This overhaul of teaching is helped by using new ICTs. Not only do they make it possible for students to work off-campus if attendance is impossible or off-putting for any of a variety of psychological reasons; they also give students the opportunity of being taught at home or at the workplace, or just nearby — and of studying when it suits them, during their leisure hours. This is a quiet but far-reaching revolution, greatly assisted by civil society, including employers and local authorities, providing the Internet access points needed to make ICTs available to those who need them. We shall return to this shortly.

Teachers still have to offer the course online: and that is not an easy task for them. It involves a new learning experience, one made necessary by the use of technology. They are used to their role as teacher/researcher, creating and then disseminating new knowledge: now they find their profession is moving on. With such a mass of information accessible on the Web, they have to acquire a new skill, that of guiding students to learn how to learn – which now means finding their way with a well-advised eye through this proliferating mass, using it with care, and keeping a critical distance.

Teachers, originally the primary source of information for their pupils, now find their monopoly has gone: they are sharing this position with others, whose approach and interpretation may not be the same as theirs. To acknowledge the fact is a lesson in

humility: coming to admit that nobody nowadays can master this rapidly-evolving sum of knowledge single-handed. It is also necessary to depend on the services of the technician who puts the course online, for this is not necessarily one of the academic's skills. All this leads to a degree of confusion reflected, according to Nicholas Corder, in an uncertainty over what to call this new profession of "adult educator":

> "Teacher" makes you sound like a school teacher, "Tutor" smacks of Oxbridge colleges, "Trainer" sounds like a soccer coach. "Lecturer" implies that all you're going to do is lecture. I dislike the word 'Instructor' even more — flat-pack furniture has "instructions". My pet hate is the word "Facilitator" because it is so ugly, even if it is a useful idea. "Educator" sounds pompous (Corder, 2002, quoted from a review by Carmel Dennison in the online journal *Widening Participation*, Vol. 6, No.1, April 2004).

This confusion is all the greater because teachers can see that the process is complex and many-sided. The models we looked at earlier — utilitarian, humanist, compensatory — are not mutually exclusive but complementary, and teachers who want to be effective must take this into account if they are to respond to all their students' needs.

A similar effort is also needed for governance, or the management of higher education institutions. They will have to revise their accustomed use of available space and time, in order to adapt to these new clients. When they come to the campus — for it is a good idea to combine distance teaching with blocks of attendance in person — this has to be organised taking their personal and professional obligations into account, by means of evening and weekend classes, crash courses, holiday sessions, etc. Teaching hours and the use of teaching rooms become flexible in order to accommodate the needs of students rather than the wishes of teachers, who have to adjust to these new constraints.

As a logical and necessary consequence, the administrative departments and their staff are called on in turn to make their offices, libraries, information and counselling services open and accessible, for these cannot be closed when the clientele needs them. One can understand what a revolution in the management of premises and human resources all this can involve for institutions and their senior managements, which do not always have much room for manoeuvre in these areas, especially in periods of restructuring and budget cuts.

It is necessary, therefore, to turn to partnerships that can contribute to the common effort. We have already pointed out, in discussing the last point, that higher education cannot meet the challenge of lifelong learning on its own. The notion of partnership is at the heart of the new process: partnership with political decision-makers who define the objectives, with parliamentarians who cast these in legally binding form; partnership with business and the world of work, for this is the source of the motivation behind the demand for learning, and of financial contributions to the training of human resources, present or future; and partnership with the local authorities which put resources into defining local employment needs and setting up learning centres. The Queensland state government in Australia, for instance, has managed to facilitate access to higher education for isolated communities by supporting local authorities in actions of this kind. Finally, there should be partnerships within the institutions themselves, between members of the administrative and teaching staffs who need to combine their skills if they are to meet the needs of these non traditional students. As Adam Smith (*The Wealth of Nations*, 1776) recommended, the division of labour is a sure way to efficiency; and popular wisdom recognises that "unity is strength".

Taking up all these challenges in the learners' best interests is in itself a moral issue for the institutions that start along this path; but they very quickly discover the full ethical

force of the undertaking. Here again, the Council of Europe has studied this particular point in depth, as its very vocation requires, and has made recommendations, for instance, concerning the need for quality.

The Council of Europe has pointed out that even in those establishments most disposed to foster lifelong learning, the departments which deal with it remain "minor" or even marginalised by comparison with conventional education; and it has put forward two proposals to ensure that this marginal status does not imply "learning on the cheap": first, the university's teaching body must be involved, to the greatest possible extent and at the highest level, in this branch of activities; and, second, there must be no issuing of ad hoc in-service training diplomas that have no place among the rigorously named forms of certification that are recognised in the labour market. For this reason it would be good if eventually — and indeed as soon as possible — the lifelong learning clientele could join the mainstream, so far as the attribution and recognition of academic qualifications were concerned. This would help to avoid the danger of a two-tier university with different requirements for two types of learners (Council of Europe, 2000).

This need for quality is all the more essential when it comes to distance teaching. Those offering their teaching services — institutions and individuals — must be properly identified; they must provide some guarantee of the quality of the teaching they offer; but who is going to audit this, and by what standards? This is a particularly thorny problem, all the trickier since the clients involved are relatively fragile — are made fragile by the circumstances of their studying — and since they are being called on to pay for their teaching. Lifelong learning begins to look more and more like a market ripe for plucking; and a great deal of vigilance is needed to sift the good seed from the tares, true provision from the meretricious allurements of dubious value. The fourth issue of "Lifelong Learning in Europe" (2004) is devoted to precisely this problem, under the title "Ethics and the Lifelong Learning Market". In the absence of international legislation, the major intergovernmental organisations — the Council of Europe, the European Union, and UNESCO — are producing a wealth of recommendations and codes of good practice, so that all knowledge providers are aware of their responsibilities, and respect and apply the ethical rules concerning quality requirements.[7]

CONCLUSION

Lifelong learning presents higher education with a new challenge. It has already met many others, not least the challenge of mass university undergraduate provision: we should recognise that it has indeed tackled this. With success the university has proved it is no brittle, tradition-bound institution, but dynamic, open to progress, capable of showing flexibility in adapting to the requirements of a globalised, constantly-evolving world.

Lifelong learning, the indispensable key to the twenty-first century, now requires universities to radically review their structures, modes of functioning, and attitudes. The challenge is no less than that of modernity itself. We may be confident that they will take up that challenge with the same steady energy and the same determination to serve the interests of learners above all else. "Where there's a will, there's a way": this is what it takes to build a Knowledge Society that can really contribute to sustainable development and social cohesion.

POLICY CONSIDERATIONS

- ***Many states have developed policies designed to encourage firms, or even compel them, to finance their employees' lifelong learning.*** One such programme is the United Kingdom's "Investors in People"; another, the "Employer's one per cent" enshrined in French law, which obliges firms to devote one per cent of their budgets to staff training, at the request of the employees.
- ***Individual Learning Accounts:*** an interesting idea, in which the State allows each individual an overall sum for his/her adult education, to be used as the individual thinks fit in view of his/her own needs and opportunities: either at the start of working life or later on, and either all at once or in instalments. Individuals would thus be in control of their own lifelong learning plans. The idea is attractive, and appears simple; but if such a scheme is adopted, is certainly not easy to solve the problems of managing it.
- ***The accommodation of an adult clientele with timetable constraints and limited availability means that the university needs to adapt to their requirements:*** lectures need to be organised and rooms made available outside normal hours; the workload and arrangements for teachers who work in these areas need to be revised; libraries and administrative offices need to be accessible outside the opening hours for traditional students; and so on. Are we perhaps moving towards a round-the-clock university? This brings us back once more to the problem of human and operational resources.
- ***Partnership and the sharing of resources are becoming a necessity for lifelong learning:*** parliaments set political objectives and provide for administrative arrangements; institutions construct their "on demand" range of courses to accommodate learners' needs, and issue qualifications; businesses specify their needs and make their financial contributions; and local authorities provide knowledge about their regions' job market, and arrange for educational venues such as Internet access points, so as to ensure that everyone can access the technology required for distance learning; and so on. This is a division of labour made necessary by the complexity of the issues faced nowadays.
- ***The need for quality is fundamental, if lifelong learning is not to be a second-rate or even marginal sector within higher education, to avoid the two-tier university and certifications that are less recognised in the labour market than others:*** involving the institution's most skilled teachers in lifelong learning; bringing the two types of clientele, undergraduates and adult learners, as close as possible; avoiding "one-off" certificates with no recognition among properly-designated official degrees; and ensuring strict quality assurance measures of all online teaching, whether national or international. Right now, UNESCO and OECD are working together to prepare Guidelines on "Quality Provision in Cross-border Higher Education".

RELEVANT INTERNET SITES

UNESCO Task Force on Education for the Twenty-first Century

www.unesco.org/delors/

The aim of this website is to further debate and reflection on the ideas expressed in Learning: the Treasure Within, the report to UNESCO of the International Commission on Education for the Twenty-first Century. Simply speaking, the Commission felt that education throughout life is based upon four pillars: learning to know, learning to do, learning to live together and learning to be.

European Commission — Lifelong Learning

http://europa.eu.int/comm/education/policies/lll/lll_en.html

At the Lisbon European Council in March 2000, government leaders set the EU a 10-year mission to become the most competitive and dynamic knowledge-based economy in the world, capable of sustained economic growth with more and better jobs and greater social cohesion. Lifelong learning is a core element of this strategy, central not only to competitiveness and employability but also to social inclusion, active citizenship and personal development. This site provides documentation and links to further information in this area by the European Commission

OECD — Lifelong Learning and Sectors of Education

www.oecd.org/department/0,2688,en_2649_34509_1_1_1_1_1,00.html

Lifelong learning for all is the guiding framework for OECD's work on learning, both formal and informal. Systemic considerations include foundations; outcomes; access and equity; resources; pathways; visibility and recognition; and policy co-ordination. This site provides further information in this area by the OECD.

Council of Europe – Lifelong Learning for Equity and Social Cohesion

www.coe.int/T/DG4/HigherEducation/CompletedActivities/LLLEquity_EN.asp

The project pursued political aims in a crucially important field for the future of the academic community in Europe: the challenge of lifelong learning, in line with the priorities defined by the Second Summit of Heads of State and Government of the Council of Europe in October 1997, which called for a "new strategy of social cohesion" within the framework of democratic security. The specific role of higher education in this strategy is to combat exclusion and marginalisation by ensuring equality of opportunity in education and meeting the new demands raised by society following the profound political, economic and social transformations which have taken place in Europe. This site provides further information in this area by the Council of Europe.

The Open University, UK

www.open.ac.uk/

The Open University is open to people, places, methods and ideas. It promotes educational opportunity and social justice by providing high-quality university education to all who wish to realise their ambitions and fulfil their potential. Through academic research, pedagogic innovation and collaborative partnership it seeks to be a world leader in the design, content and delivery of supported open and distance learning. This site provides further information on the OU and its programmes.

ECTS - European Credit Transfer System

http://europa.eu.int/comm/education/programmes/socrates/ects_en.html

The European Credit Transfer and Accumulation System is a student-centred system based on the student workload required to achieve the objectives of a programme, objectives preferably specified in terms of the learning outcomes and competences to be acquired. This site provides further information on this topic.

REFERENCES

Baumann, Zygmunt. (2000). *Liquid Modernity*. Cambridge, UK, Polity Press.

Bowl, Marion. (2003). *Non Traditional Entrants to Higher Education: They Talk about People like Me*. London, Trentham Books.

Council of Europe. (2001). *Lifelong Learning for Equity and Social Cohesion: A New Challenge for Higher Education.* Strasbourg, Council of Europe.

Corder, N. (2002). *Learning to Teach Adults: An Introduction*. London, Routledge Falmer.

Delors, J. (1996). *Learning: the Treasure Within*. Paris, UNESCO.

Halimi, S. (2005). *L'Enseignement supérieur au Royaume Uni [Higher Education in the United Kingdom]*, Paris, Ophrys et Ploton.

*Lifelong Learning in Europ*e, journal edited by Kauko Hämäläinin. Helsinki, Finland, KVS Foundation.

Morley, L. (2003). *Quality and Power in HigherEeducation.* Maidenhead, UK, Open University Press.

OECD. (1973). *Recurrent Education: A Strategy for Lifelong Learning*. Paris, OECD.

OECD. (1997). *Education Policy Analysis 1997*. Paris, OECD.

Schuller, Tom; et al. (2004). *The Benefits of Learning*. London, Routledge Falmer.

Scott, P. (ed.). (1999). *Higher Education Re-formed*. New Millennium Series London, Routledge Falmer.

Vesilind, P. Aarne. (2000). *So You Want to Be a Professor? A Handbook for Graduate Students*. Thousand Oaks, California: Sage.

World Bank. (2002). *Constructing Knowledge Societies: New Challenges for Tertiary Education*. Washington DC,World Bank.

World Bank. (2003). *Lifelong Learning in the Global Knowledge Economy*, London: Routledge Falmer.

Notes

1. This phrasing has been used as the title for this chapter, since its author was the co-ordinator for this work in the Council of Europe from 1997 to 2001, when the summary was prepared at an international symposium organised at the Sorbonne, in November 2001.
2. The analysis which follows, and the examples cited, mainly concern the "Europe region" as defined by UNESCO. In the developing countries outside Europe, these issues are emerging as the subject of debate and political decision-making, albeit unevenly as yet.
3. Ulrich Teichler is a Professor at the university of Kassel in Germany, and Director of its Centre for Research on Higher Education and Work.
4. ADAPT.
5. Danguile Beresneviciene: 'The Scope and Role of New Information Technologies in Lifelong Learning: some Psychological Aspects', Council of Europe, *Lifelong Learning for Equity and Social Cohesion*, The New Information and Communication Technologies in Lifelong Learning, 2000, 93-107.
6. The Bologna process, initiated by European ministers of higher education following the 1998 Sorbonne Declaration, aims to create a "European Higher Education and Research Area", within which student mobility and the recognition of academic qualifications will be facilitated by a harmonisation of courses at three levels: Bachelor, Masters, Ph.D, by dividing the academic year into two semesters and by awarding credits which can be accumulated, the European Credit Transfer System (ECTS). One year is equivalent to sixty ECTs. This process should be complete by 2010, in accordance with the Declaration of Bologna (19 June 1999).
7. As this book goes to press, the UNESCO and OECD are working on developing "Guidelines on quality provision in cross-border higher education".

THE CONTRIBUTOR

Suzy Halimi
Professor, New Sorbonne University, Paris III
Former Rector of the University
Head of the Postgraduate School of English Studies
President of the Education and Training Committee of the French National Commission for UNESCO
E-mail: suzy.halimi@univ-paris3.fr