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Introduction

In 1963, the late Clark Kerr [1] predicted that the classical university, extolled by John Henry Newman in the mid-19th Century, together with the American land-grant university was to be superseded by the multiversity or, a term I will use in its place, the multipurpose university. No longer solely a community of scholars dedicated to knowledge for its own sake, and more so than the land-grant university, Kerr’s modern university would emphasize scientific research, graduate education and professional training. The education of undergraduates as a core mission would expand to multiple missions in response to an increasing number of public and private stakeholders.

Kerr’s prediction has largely come true. Every American state has at least one multipurpose university. We read in the Chronicle of Higher Education of the significant investment being made by China and her Asian neighbours to create multipurpose universities that can compete with their international counterparts [2,3]. Indeed, most countries now have a small number of research-intensive universities at the pinnacle of the academic system and a much larger number of less-selective universities with more emphasis on teaching than research to serve a mass clientele often emphasizing technical education [4].

Today the multipurpose universities face challenges as great as or greater than what Kerr perceived. They have grown in size, perhaps even more so than Kerr imagined; they are increasingly complex; more international in scope; and their impact on the health and economic welfare of their state, region, and/or country is unparalleled. The challenges, too, are monumental and transnational in scope. How the multipurpose university evolves in the next decade in response to major challenges, including shrinking public resources, increased demand for access and services, international competition, governmental involvement and more, will be an international phenomenon, which calls for comparative analysis and study. This paper takes a step in that direction by comparing the University of Minnesota and systems of higher education in Minnesota with Norway.

Comparative analysis of structures of higher education is not new. Noteworthy is Trow’s [5] use of a deterministic and developmental classification
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from ‘elite’ to ‘mass’ to ‘universal’. Fundamentally his focus is on access and the crises that ensue when funding is not sufficient to cover the costs of higher education for everyone. And like Kerr, who predicts an evolution of universities to multiversities, Trow envisions universal access to postsecondary education leading to a ‘learning society’, a concept that goes beyond open access to university education [5].

According to Trow, the modern university was already in place in the United States a century ago. European universities are in the process of becoming mass universities, by which he means:

“...size and access beyond 15 percent of the age grade; diversity of forms of higher education beyond elite universities; diversity of students in respect to social class, age, and ethnicity – including a large proportion of older part-time employed students; a substantial component of vocational/professional education; a high measure of institutional autonomy; modular courses, credit accumulation and transfer; a strong executive and administrative staff; multiple sources of support; a relatively flat academic hierarchy rather than a powerful guild of professors.” ([5], p 7)

A recent and informative study by Altbach, Reisberg and Rumbley [4] elaborates on the phenomena of universal higher education internationally, on what Altbach and his colleagues call ‘massification’.

For the purposes of the present study, I use Kerr’s multiversity as the organizing concept as it best describes, for me, the complexity and direction modern universities are evolving toward. I would emphasize that one cannot understand the role and development of the multiversity without understanding its position and dynamics within one of the diverse systems of higher education system to which it normally belongs.

**Origins of the multipurpose university**

The land-grant university, created in the United States by the Morrill Act of 1862, was a precursor of what was to become the dominant university model of the 20th Century. The legislation stated:

“without excluding other scientific and classical studies and including military tactic, to teach such branches of learning as are related to agriculture and the mechanic arts, in such manner as the legislatures of the States may respectively prescribe, in order to promote the liberal and practical education of the industrial classes in the several pursuits and professions in life.”

Michigan State University is considered the first land-grant institution. The University of Minnesota is Minnesota’s land-grant university. By providing federal resources to state universities, the land-grant university began a century-and-a-half-long partnership with the public and government serving three
missions: learning, research and outreach. It also signalled a democratization of higher education.

Higher education prior to 1862 was elitist with an emphasis on law, theology, medicine and philosophy, a curriculum that dates to the medieval European universities. Certainly this was a purpose in founding the first American universities, for example, Harvard, William and Mary, and Yale, and in Norway, The Royal Frederick University in 1811, to be renamed the University of Oslo in 1939. According to John Peter Collett, the purpose of this ‘professional university’ was to educate government officers: civil officials, lawyers, priests and physicians who administered what Jens Arup Seip [6] called the ‘nation of professionals’.

### Systems of higher education

The majority of American public multipurpose universities are part of a multi-campus system of higher education. Johnstone defines public multi-campus systems:

> “as groups of public institutions, each with its own mission, academic and other programs, internal governing policies and procedures, and chief executive officer, but governed by a single board with a system wide chief executive officer.” ([8], p 3)

The development of the multi-campus system is another manifestation of the development and enhancement of the public-driven missions of the multiversity. The consolidation and co-ordination of multiple public institutions within states by state governments began in earnest in the 1950s and continues today as states seek greater efficiency, effectiveness and accountability in return for public funds that support state goals for higher education.

According to Yudof,

> “There are many different types of college and university systems in our country — sometimes even within the same state…. Few, if any, studies have evaluated whether our systems as they operate today are actually a good idea.” ([9], p 1)

The variation may be in part explained by the origin of higher education systems. Boatright [10] comments that systems have political, rather
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2 Bleiklie provides a useful overview of the historical development of Norwegian universities ([7], Chapter 3).

3 For Johnstone “A university system should not be confused with a multiple campus university. A university system contains several universities. A multiple campus university is a single university that has more than one campus. The common test of whether institutions comprise a system is whether a government approved regional accrediting body separately accredits them”, which in the case of Minnesota is the North Central Association Higher Learning Commission. (http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/University_system)
than educational, roots and were configured to address a plethora of state issues. Johnstone notes that:

“Some systems (University of California) or parts of systems (University of Wisconsin) emerged from the state’s original doctoral and/or land grant universities and the branches that were created by (or forced upon) them as state needs grew and population centers changed. Other systems or parts of systems (California State University, the State System of Higher Education in Pennsylvania) were created from the states’ former teachers colleges, now comprehensive colleges and universities, some of them doctoral-granting, that were once governed directly by state departments of education. Others, such as the University of Houston, the City University of New York, or the former regional systems of Illinois, emerged as distinctly regional or metropolitan systems.” ([8], pp. 3–4)

Although lots of variation is a reality, some categorization of systems is possible. Johnstone distinguishes between specialized or segmented higher education systems where institutions within the system are of one type (the University of California which comprises research universities) and comprehensive higher education systems in which all types of higher education institutions belong (the University of Wisconsin) [8]. The University of Minnesota is a comprehensive multi-campus system and one of two public systems in the State of Minnesota, the other being the MnSCU (Minnesota State College and University) system, also a comprehensive system but without a flagship or research institution.

**University of Minnesota system**

The University of Minnesota ‘system’ consists of five affiliated universities geographically distributed across the State of Minnesota. A system-wide governing body, the Board of Regents, governs all member universities. Each of the five campuses of the University of Minnesota has a clear and separate identity and mission statement. Each has its own chancellor. And each campus has its own peer group of institutions for benchmarking and comparison. In addition, the University has seven research and outreach centers, and extension service offices in all regions of the state. And lastly, the University has public service programmes (clinics in medicine, dentistry and veterinary medicine, and outreach to primary and secondary education) serving more than 1 million people annually. The University of Minnesota is the state’s only research university. The University conducts 98% of all sponsored, academic research in Minnesota.

**Minnesota’s systems of higher education**

Noteworthy is the relationship of the University of Minnesota to MnSCU which comprises 32 institutions (25 two-year colleges and 7 state universities), 17 private colleges and 26 private for-profit postsecondary schools. The individual systems
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are synergistic in their relationships. The public community colleges ‘feed’ four-year institutions. Minnesota’s private colleges provide about one-third of the number of the baccalaureate graduates that enrol in the graduate and professional programmes of the University of Minnesota, Twin Cities.

The multiple systems of higher education ensures access to higher education for every high school graduate in the state, primarily through community colleges, state universities and transfer. Competitive excellence is achieved by highly selective freshman admissions to the University of Minnesota, Twin Cities, and by a monopoly given to the University of Minnesota on doctoral and advanced professional education, and on state-supported research. Competition among the institutions and systems is limited through differentiation of function and differential student eligibility standards.

**Norway’s binary system**

Although Norway (and many European countries) does not have formal public systems of higher education, increasingly there is a remarkable resemblance of its two informal systems of institutions to American systems, largely due to governmental policy, goals and initiatives. Norway is described by some as a binary system comprised, on the one hand, of a group of elite universities and, on the other, university colleges. A further division is possible as some university colleges are specialized: art, architecture, business, etc. There are also a few private colleges, which play a complementary role in the broader ‘system’ of higher education.

The elite universities, such as Oslo and Bergen, have traditional faculties: law, medicine, theology, etc. However, they are increasingly evolving into multipurpose universities with broad missions and regional responsibilities, largely due to governmental expectations, policies and funding models (see especially the recommendations of the Hernes Commission, the formation of Network Norway and the Mjøs Commission [11,12]). According to Bleiklie:

“Higher education institutions are not only in the process of having their main function redefined: the state is also in the process of redefining its function in relation to higher education.” ([7], p 37)

Citing Sejersted [13], Bleiklie affirms that state policy is putting an emphasis on the utilitarian role of universities rather than cultural development [7].

In a recent article in *Change*, Ischinger and Puukka comment on strategies employed by the University of Trondheim:

“Over the years and almost unnoticed, the Norwegian University of Technology (NTNU) had transformed the city into Norway’s technological capital. The university had also played a key role in the development of the city through its students. In the knowledge economy, and especially in
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4 Bleiklie provides an excellent overview of state university relationships in Norway ([7], Part II).
High-tech and creative industries, people no longer follow jobs—jobs follow people. Understanding this has led to the emergence of new and stronger links between the city and its university and helped build a regional innovation system that connects the university, public authorities, and business and industry." ([14], p 1)

Google, Yahoo and FAST (Microsoft) have established their Norwegian research and development in Trondheim, not Oslo.

The Hernes Commission, especially, sought to bring the Norwegian elite universities to a quality level matching the best research universities in the world. Bleiklie notes that the Commission:

“represented an ambitious attempt to integrate the higher education system and increase its capacity to produce candidates and research of an internationally acceptable quality." ([7], p 13)

Concomitantly, and not unlike what is happening in many American states and in Minnesota, the Norwegian university colleges, like their American master’s universities and college counterparts, aspire to more of a multiversity status through consolidation of neighbouring colleges, such as happened with Agder University (Kristiansand and Grimstad), the awarding of a select subset of PhDs and an emphasis on applied research, for example, the University of Stavanger and Agder University. They continue to provide what was originally intended, shorter and more vocationally oriented education [7]. Since the Mjøs Commission, there appears to be far less segmentation and mission differentiation. The binary system, in my opinion, is blurring.

Four groups of challenges to multipurpose universities

There are invariably many ways to identify and assess the plethora of challenges confronting multipurpose public universities and higher education systems. Four groups are discussed in this paper:

- State and university expectations, relationships and their dynamic
- Competition among and within systems of higher education
- Non-governmental external factors
- Scientific innovation and technology

The state and the multipurpose university

A dilemma for the state is to determine what its role should be in ensuring the continuing contribution and overall performance of the higher education sector. Governments invest heavily in higher education for the simple reason that the economic and social well-being of the state is integrally tied to the quality and performance of their higher education institutions. The quality of the workforce, life-long learning and outreach that sustains the competency and performance of the workforce and private and public enterprises, and research, which creates
new industries and improves our health and well being cannot be ignored. Bleiklie points out this reality when comparing the Otteson Committee [15] with the Hernes Commission:

“[the Otteson Committee] regarded higher education as a welfare benefit related to its distribution [access], [compared with] the Hernes Commission, [which] regarded higher education as a necessary tool, and a resource in the international economic competition.” ([7], p 14)

In addition, as governments are held accountable for their performance, and especially with respect to the use of public funds, it is not surprising that increased public pressure on government translates into increased scrutiny of public universities.

Although state oversight of university performance ebbs and flows with each administration, it is fair to say that virtually no aspect of university activity is exempt from some sort of government control or influence at one time or another.

A remarkable transnational similarity is the issues that appear to be driving the educational dynamics between the state and the universities in Norway and in Minnesota. I would list the following as noteworthy of further discussion:

- Policy authority (alignment of institutional performance and educational outcomes with public policy)
- Balancing elitism and access (access in response to student demand, diversity and greater social stratification);
- Autonomy compared with control in governance structures (budget models and administrative discretion, management of performance including user satisfaction, redundancy); Quality assurance [benchmarking and accreditation, e.g. NOKUT (The Norwegian Agency for Quality Assurance in Education); in order to promote an international dialogue on quality assurance, UNESCO (United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization) has partnered with the World Bank to create the Global Initiative for Quality Assurance Capacity]
- Cost effectiveness
- Differential investments or financial performance controls (subsidies with or without regard to market forces and performance); Funding tied to public outcomes (research incentives, graduation rates) and especially economic development
- Integration, co-operation and centralization (higher education system integration, e.g. Network Norway, MnSCU and transfer policies among systems); Comprehensiveness compared with segmentation (mission differentiation or monopoly compared with pluralism and competition)

**External challenges facing the multipurpose university**

Further exacerbating state relationships are a broader array of public relationships and issues, including an eroding national consensus on financial support. Who
should pay for college education and how much is very much at issue? Is higher education a public or private good?

The University of Minnesota, and most American universities and colleges, are under severe financial pressure largely due to the worst recession in decades. Unlike previous economic downturns, the changes brought about this time are likely to be permanent. Munck and McConnell [16] refer to the coming years as the post-public era of higher education funding. And in this era:

“Business as usual is simply not an option despite whatever conservative institutional impulses might wish to pull us in that direction.” ([16], p 31)

In addition to declining or static public resources, we are also witness to an eroding public trust, which is in part related to cost of attendance, but also inadequate public awareness of what universities do and their cost of doing business. Universities are responding partially to the public’s expectations of them. The public expects better preparation of graduates, more graduates, more research and better dissemination and commercialization, what Reilly calls the four pillars of higher education:

“The two pillars in the middle are at the traditional core of higher education’s mission. Educating and credentialing our students, and carrying out cutting-edge research, define who we are. On either side of these central functions stand two others that we have not embraced as fully as we now must. What we do to shore up the two ‘bookend’ pillars — preparing youth for postsecondary achievement and leveraging the results of our research — will increasingly define our success as 21st century institutions of higher learning.” ([17], p 1)

**Intra- and inter-system competition as a cost driver**

The expansion of higher education institutions internationally in response to demand for access and higher expectations of quality and performance has led to an increased competition among institutions, and one that has not resulted in reducing cost. We are witness to increased competition for state funding, world-class faculty, top students and research grants in a global education marketplace.

E-education, or online education, has a mixed record in reducing cost, as does increased competition from for-profit higher education organizations. One reason is that private institutions and on-line education programmes tend to serve what I would call ‘low overhead areas’, courses at the lower division and fields of study that do not require huge investments in technology, facilities and an expensive professoriate. If such programmes are able to serve more students, in part because government permits liberal transfer policies, residence requirements and unbundling of courses from the curriculum and courses of study, then the costs of the multipurpose university will skyrocket, as it will be left with having to teach the most expensive courses and programmes with no offsetting low-cost courses.
Scientific and technological challenges as a cost driver

Last, and probably the greatest contributor to change and the cost of multipurpose universities, are the phenomenal advances in technology: digital information and computing, knowledge creation and the largely unpredictable discoveries in science. Genomics and an emphasis on the life sciences, interdisciplinary research with substantial integration of the biological sciences, chemistry, physics, engineering, the health sciences, the deployment of interdisciplinary and organizational strategies that connect science to applications (translational research), as well as a pressing interest in sustainability leading to the expansion of the environmental sciences, all have contributed to the cost of running a multipurpose university. Since 1978 there has been an unprecedented increase in the use of information technology and academic support expenditures have increased by 156%. The annual budget of the University of Minnesota, for example, is approximately 3 billion dollars and growing.

In light of these challenges and pressures, what would Kerr predict for his multiversity in the coming decade and what would be his major concerns?

What must not happen?

I do not question the importance of greater access for an increasingly large and diverse population. This motivation and need for creating the public land-grant university is as great or greater than ever today. However, if the solution is to redistribute investments in higher education in such a way that it flattens a system of institutions to a lower average of quality and performance, then I believe we are undermining the goals of research and economic development. There simply are not enough public investment dollars to accomplish this objective. Mission differentiation has served us well, in my opinion, and I believe that the Minnesota example supports that opinion, as does the three-tier system in California.

According to Altbach et al.:

“The need for differentiated academic systems with diverse institutional missions is universally accepted as a response to ‘massification’. Yet, the pressure for academic institutions to copy one another — the tendency towards isomorphism — and to rise in the academic hierarchy is very strong. While this trend has a long history, it has intensified in the era of rankings and global competition. It is an artifact of the continuing prestige of the research university, as well as of the expansion in the numbers of universities worldwide.” ([4], p 31)

With the advent of the Academic Ranking of World Universities begun in 2007 by The Center for World-Class Universities of Shanghai Jiao Tong University, rankings have become an even greater international focus of attention [18]. Note that the University of Minnesota and its international partner the
University of Oslo are ranked 28 and 65 respectively in the 2009 ranking of 501 universities. Altbach et al. recommend:

“Public authorities need to ensure diverse academic models to serve varied societal needs, while many academic institutions still tend to emulate the research universities at the top of the system. It takes governmental ‘steering’ to keep the academic system diversified and institutions within the system serving larger national goals.” ([4], p 19)

According to Berdahl:

“Sustaining flagship public research universities matters because they help define the nature of scholarly excellence that informs the nature of scholarship at all of the other colleges and universities in the region. It is not that excellence does not exist elsewhere; it does. But the research universities, public and private, largely define quality scholarship and it is important for public institutions to aspire to the highest levels, too.” ([19], p 1)

Further, he comments:

“The enormous problems that confront the world today require solutions that involve broad-based interdisciplinary research. And these are found almost exclusively in the land-grant research universities.”

In Europe and elsewhere, ministries of education are changing funding mechanisms for higher education in recognition that they cannot develop competitive excellence without selective support for excellence. In Norway, we are witness to a competition among its universities with the infusion of differential funding into a few institutions in order to enhance their quality and international position. However, ironically, at the same time, mission differentiation is being eroded and the Ministry of Education does not have now the resources needed to make excellence and equality a reality. Mission creep among the Minnesota systems of higher education is also a reality and is occurring at a time when few, if any, new dollars can be expected from state government.

I believe that both Norway and Minnesota have overbuilt their systems of higher education. In Minnesota, because of a desire by the state to have a public institution situated no more than 35 miles from any citizen, we now witness a plethora of institutions with low enrolments in low-density areas and where the cost of instruction per student far exceeds the real cost of attending one of the larger urban campuses. An uncoordinated online education effort exacerbates the problem. Mission creep is another cost driver as the state universities seek to add expensive doctoral and engineering programs that are needed and whose students are hard to place.

Norway may be guilty of the same. For a country with a population about equal to Minnesota it has four research universities and six PhD-granting institutions as opposed to one. Such an organization invariably means that high-quality faculty is diffused through the system in smaller departments at
the expense of a single, large and internationally prestigious department. The current government policy is permissive of further expansion of programmes, making matters worse. The OECD (Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development) programme on IMHE (Institutional Management in Higher Education), working in collaboration with other international organizations, show that building and sustaining a world-class university is roughly a 1.5 billion-dollar business annually [14]. The State of Minnesota is the smallest state in the U.S.A. to support a top-30 public research university, which is made possible in part through a deliberate and fiscal enforcement of mission differentiation. If such a strategy is not politically practical in Norway, then one solution might be the formation of a national graduate school, where boundaries among faculties and university are blurred, through combining faculties for the purpose of granting doctoral degrees, and made possible with increased student mobility.

What must happen?

Perhaps the greater challenge in this environment is reforms internal to higher education, and especially higher education systems, not unlike the proposal for Norway above. It is not realistic to pursue strategies solely within state boundaries, ones that would ensure monopolies in the face of E-learning, declining resources and, in some instances, declining populations. At Minnesota, for example, its Crookston campus must find a regional solution with North Dakota and the Morris campus must develop partnerships with north-west Iowa and eastern South Dakota. And in so doing, they may have to modify their missions and goals. A within-Minnesota solution is no longer realistic:

“Often higher education is not part of the design and implementation of local and regional strategies and the scope and extent of the regional engagement of a college or university depends on the role that the institution chooses for itself. The regional agenda is a particularly tough challenge for research-intensive universities, which often have a stronger focus on national and international excellence than on local utility.” ([14], p 1)

Trondheim, in Norway, is a good example of what needs to be done. Berdahl asserts that universities:

“will have to be less insular, more willing to collaborate with other institutions, developing concentrations where they have a comparative advantage, shrinking or dropping programs where they do not and encouraging faculty to collaborate elsewhere by arranging flexible teaching schedules.” ([19], p 1)

Network Norway promised to do this but I suspect the results have been mixed. The University of Minnesota, Twin Cities, has strong relationships with the ‘Big Ten’ institutions through the CIC (Committee on Institutional Cooperation). The value of the CIC has largely been in information sharing and there is much room for improvement in the co-ordination of member programmes and offerings.
The universities have a responsibility to significantly improve the use of data for purposes of better decision-making, leading to greater efficiencies, as well as accountability, and the aggressive and adaptable implementation of ‘academic analytics’ is key; management by anecdote is much too normal. As noted above, the University of Minnesota is accountable to a wide range of constituents. Students, parents, the state legislature, employees and alumni are just a few of the stakeholders that the University deals with on a daily basis. Actions and decisions must be transparent, rational and justifiable. Although the University is capable of fulfilling this role today, it must continue to do so in a more efficient and articulate way.

Finally, universities must confront the new budget realities head on. Budgetary considerations have forced the immediate attention of the institution on to leaner and more sustainable business practices. These practices are not new, but they have been afterthoughts during more generous times. The established budget principles that the University of Minnesota now utilizes in forming strategies and making decisions related to short- and long-term budget planning include the following:

- Grow a larger and more diversified portfolio of revenues. These strategies include a ‘new covenant’ with the State of Minnesota that more clearly articulates the rationale and responsibilities of the state to support our mission. Additional strategies include: increased private giving; development of intellectual property and real estate assets; and increased indirect cost recovery on grants.

- Grow tuition revenue while ensuring financial access for qualified students from families of modest financial means. Tuition is the revenue stream with the highest potential for significant, long-term growth, though the University of Minnesota likely cannot sustain the high rates of growth seen in the last decade. To protect this revenue stream, the University of Minnesota needs to advance the quality and reputation of a University of Minnesota education, better articulate its place in the academic marketplace and ensure that the University is the destination of choice for a smaller and increasingly diverse pool of students.

- Substantially increase administrative and academic effectiveness, reduce costs and boost efficiency. The University of Minnesota must create more powerful incentives, reduce cost structures, increase co-ordination and collaboration, and build a culture of effectiveness, service, efficiency and productivity.

- Narrow the scope of the University’s mission to advance a distinctive constellation of excellence. New revenues, annual budget reductions and efficiency gains will not yield sufficient resources to replace the loss of state support, meet rising costs, fund the University’s broad strategic positioning agenda or ensure the excellence of the University of Minnesota. The University must continue to narrow the scope of its mission and direct scarce resources to activities that will ensure a distinctive constellation of excellence. The University of Minnesota must strategically configure academic units and reporting lines to fuel the synergies needed for innovative teaching and research.
• Develop and execute long-term financial plans, along with budget and planning processes that advance the vision, and discipline the setting of priorities. Budget decisions must be made within the context of an overall strategic and financial framework that relies on, and adheres to, a realistic set of financial assumptions and parameters while also ensuring that the University can respond with agility to new opportunities.

I suspect this is prudent advice for multipurpose universities everywhere. However, it may be harder to undertake in countries like Norway where such entrepreneurial initiatives still run contrary to its history and culture, and especially among its faculty, who are likely to resist such change in the expectation that the state will continue to provide necessary resources. That may already be a fiction. Some faculties at the University of Minnesota bristle when I say that the multipurpose university is a ‘business’ and needs to run like one, more so than is currently the case. It cannot be managed with arcane governance structures appropriate to its past as an elite university. It has gotten so big financially and its products so diverse that in many ways it resembles a Fortune 500 corporation. I believe an accommodation of the best of both governance and fiscal models is possible, especially in areas such as academic freedom and research. However, teaching models are in some cases bankrupt, the curriculum needs an overhaul to meet the economic challenges facing society today, and both budget models and administrative models make little sense to me and need to change and quickly.

References

© The Authors. Volume compilation © 2010 Portland Press Limited


15. Ottesenkomitéen (1965–69) *Instilling om Videreutdanning for Artianere m.m.*, Oslo, Kirke-og undervisningsdepartementet, 5 volumes


