

EXCLUSION AND ACCESS IN HIGHER EDUCATION POLICIES

BY DR. KIRTI MENON



Dr Menon is the Director of Academic Planning at the University of Johannesburg and a Research Associate in the Faculty of Education. In 2013, she resigned from her position as Registrar of the University of the Witwatersrand to complete her PhD. Prior to this she was the Acting Deputy Director General in the Department of Higher Education and Training, and a Chief Director: Higher Education Planning and Management at the Department of Education. She worked for the Council on Higher Education between 1999 and 2008, and has also served on several national task teams. Dr Menon continues to enjoy writing on higher education in South Africa.

Abstract

The democratisation process of higher education in South Africa commenced in 1994, with the refrains of 'widening access, broadening participation' and 'the doors of education and culture shall be opened'. The deep structural and systemic deficits in the apartheid education system restricted access to higher education based on race, while simultaneously deepening inequalities in the schooling system.

Education reform as the transition to democracy commenced, required seismic policy and systemic shifts widely described as an agenda to transform the higher education system. Thus equity of access and success reverberate in the policy documents and reforms undertaken by the government. The focus of this paper is on a 16 year time-span from 1994–2010, tracing the journey of policy reforms and analysing the quantitative data at the national level of the higher education system¹.

Dr. Menon sought to understand the enormity of the education system problems, while taking into account that changing the course for the country is a major task which would require deep transformation that would not be feasible in a short period.

Introduction

This paper provides a description of some of the major policy initiatives between 1994 and 2012. While not an exhaustive account of policy development and implementation, it serves as a guide to the key milestone moments in the period under review.

The analysis confirms that widening of access remains an abiding goal for higher education, although it is now complicated by rising costs of higher education, inadequate flows from the basic education system to higher education, limited resources to support expansion, and shifts in the discourse of access linking it more closely to the economic development and growth path of the country.

The point that is made that strategy for the country needs to take into account the context, the role of civil society, the role of donors and most importantly, the will of the government to address the problems through proper analysis and implementation programmes. The legacy of apartheid looms heavily over sectors such as education and health.

¹ Menon, K. S. (2015). *Exclusion and access in higher education policies* (Doctoral dissertation).

² Jansen, 2001, 2002b; Badat, 2003; Fataar, 2003; Bunting, 2002; Cloete & Bunting, 2004; Cooper & Subotzsky, 2001; Kraak, 2004a

³ Bundy, C (2006), 'Global patterns, local options? Changes in higher education internationally and some implications for South Africa', In Kagisano: Ten Years of Higher Education under Democracy. Pretoria: CHE, page9

Reform, Access and Redress

Education policy analysis has coalesced on a number of themes, with minor variations.² The characteristics of this consensus has been that the policy reform process since 1994 has been symbolic and policy pathways have had minimal effect in terms of outcomes; that fiscal restraint is a sign that neo-liberal policies have triumphed; that the accountability requirements of the state have deprived institutions of autonomy; that redress and equity have been compromised by other priorities; and that policies have not translated to the active redistribution of resources to addressing inequalities.

So how then does one locate redress, access to higher education and policy reforms within these debates? In addition, higher education in SA is also vulnerable to changes that have assailed higher education globally since the 1980s.³

While some analysts have referred to the period post-1994 as 'symbolic policy-making'⁴ with a recent publication⁵ highlighting the 'ticking bomb' of youth between the ages of 18-24 not in education, employment or training. Jansen arguing that 'symbolic policymaking' is simply the state dealing with political issues in the public realm.⁶ Although implementation has not been a strong feature of the democratic state, the critique avoids the complexities of the initial transitional phase. Critics have also noted the realism encountered in the period 2000–2005.⁷

Despite some interventions and adjustments made to the higher education funding formula⁸, no redress funding surfaced, with some analysts referring to the 'shift in discourse from what was desirable in terms of history to what was feasible in terms of function and funding',⁹ and others arguing that this ought to have been used more effectively to steer the system¹⁰.

Restructuring has raised questions and provoked debate and some discussion on the post-school system and the new Green Paper (DHET, 2012) has focused on the need to ratchet up numbers in the vocational education sector and limit the growth in higher education. The role of private providers has not been explored in sufficient detail and, unlike in Brazil and Malaysia, they have significantly not been considered as serious partners in increasing participation rates.¹¹

Jansen and Cloete have identified four key areas in policy-making: the drive to achieve the entire suite of objectives and goals with limited capacity and fiscal constraints; the impact of macro-economic conditions on government's ability to spend and on individual achievement based on graduate employment; imported policy ideas with insufficient contextualisation; excessive policy production with unreasonable demands placed on institutions.¹² Badat has cautioned that the analysis of higher education policy has to account for the context of the new democratic dispensation and the 'paradoxes, ambiguities, contradictions, possibilities and constraints' are thus inevitable.¹³ The use of categories and phases to describe and interpret policy-making since 1994 is useful, though limiting as it presumes that stages can be circumscribed.¹⁴ Such an approach does not necessarily recognise the multitudinal policy developments or the impact of exogenous factors on policy-making.

² Jansen, 2001, 2002b; Badat, 2003; Fataar, 2003; Bunting, 2002; Cloete & Bunting, 2004; Cooper & Subotzky, 2001; Kraak, 2004a

³ Bundy, C (2006), 'Global patterns, local options? Changes in higher education internationally and some implications for South Africa', In Kagisano: Ten Years of Higher Education under Democracy. Pretoria: CHE, page 9

⁴ Council on Higher Education (CHE). (2004B). South African Higher Education in the First Decade of Democracy, page 230

⁵ Cloete, N & Sheppard, M. (2009). *Scoping the Need for Post-School Education*. Wynberg, Cape Town: CHET

⁶ Jansen, J.D. (2001). 'Rethinking Education Policy Making in South Africa: Symbols of Change, Signals of Conflict'. In Kraak, A., & Young, M. (2001) ((Eds.) Education in Retrospect: Policy and Implementation Since 1990. Pretoria: Human Sciences Research Council, 41-57

⁷ Ibid, Jansen, 2001 and Op Cit, Bundy 2006

⁸ Funds were allocated to institutions based on the proportion of African and Coloured students. Funds to address disparities at former Black institutions were provided on an ad hoc basis when requested.

⁹ Barnes, T. (2006). *Changing discourses and meanings of redress in South African higher education 1994–2001*. Journal of Asian and African Studies, 41(1-2), 149-170, page 222

¹⁰ Le Roux, P. & Breier, M. 2012. *Steering from a distance: Improving access to higher education in South Africa via the funding formula*. Johannesburg: Friedrich-Ebert-Stiftung

¹¹ According to 2011 data from the DHET, there are approximately 93 000 students enrolled at private higher education institutions (DHET, 2013).

¹² Ibid, Jansen 2001, also see Cloete, N (2012). *Higher education and economic development in Africa*. In Vukasović, M., Maassen, P., Nerland, M., Pinheiro, R., Stensaker, B., & Vabo, A. (Eds.). Effects of Higher Education Reforms: Change Dynamics, 137-152. Sense Publishers

¹³ Badat, S (2003), *Transforming South African Higher Education 1990-2003: Goals, Policy Initiatives and Critical Challenges and Issues*. In Cloete, N., Pillay, P., Badat, S., & Moja, T. (2004). National Policy and Regional Response in Higher Education. London: James Currey Ltd, page 1

¹⁴ See, Kraak, 2004b; Jansen, 2002b; Badat, 2003

For Cooper and Subotzky, the period from 2000 onwards signalled the death of 'symbolic policymaking' and a move to 'substantive procedural and material policy approaches'.¹⁵ Jansen argues that 'the flurry of policy was replaced by a flurry of implementation talk' but that the reality of limited resources may make it difficult to deliver on 'symbolic policy-making'.¹⁶ Moja and Hayward argue that policy focused initially on racially offensive aspects that could quickly be fixed, and that access was seen as an achievable goal.¹⁷ The concept of steering in higher education was clearly flagged in early policy documents,¹⁸ with funding, quality and planning being identified as the three steering mechanisms.¹⁹ Examples of how these aspects have been addressed elsewhere are instructive. Brazil expanded by arrangements between government and private higher education institutions. McCowan review the expansion and suggests that despite its rapidity, the poor have remained socially excluded from both public free higher education and from private higher education system.²⁰

This suggests that this expansion model has not addressed core equity. In fact, inequitable expansion has worked to curb participation by lower income groups. The introduction of a quota system to address disparate opportunities has been widely critiqued, although it has been accepted that any other strategy would have delayed the required outcomes.²¹ In China, the higher education system grew from two million in 1997 to 7,3 million by 2006, with the gross enrolment ratio increasing from seven to 22 percent.²² Growth was achieved by changes in public funding shifting from a model supported by three different levels of authorities to a co-funding model supported by tuition fees. This shift brought about some measure of social exclusion, as rural universities were not appropriately funded and the expansion saw the establishment of campuses in different locations. It has been argued that the restructuring resulted in differential exclusion as access to employment depended largely on the university attended.²³

The SA reform measures reveal ambiguity, ambivalence, inaction and compromise, as well as firmness, clear agenda setting and goal driven processes. The vacillation between the two extremes is evident and poses challenges to analysts wishing to interpret and enact these. Clearly, however, contrary features are not unique to SA and are characteristics of policy-making processes in general. The stress is on an higher education system that is planned, governed and funded as a 'single, co-ordinated system' which symbolises a deliberate break with the apartheid system.²⁴ However, the reality is that fiscal constraints could not support the 'massification' envisaged in the National Council for Higher Education, and explains the reference to 'limited real growth in public expenditure'.²⁵ The insufficiency of state funding of higher education remains a reality.

Subsequent to 1997, it is clear that beyond agreement on the goals and principles espoused in various policy texts, institutions and various role players assumed a counter-position to the state partially attributable to the emergence of the size and shape debate. The *CHE Report: Towards a New Higher Education Landscape*²⁶ advanced a case for equity and access issues to remain at the forefront of higher education, pointing out that 'the extent to which equity and access are actively promoted or frustrated will determine the nature and extent of social and class stratification and have a direct bearing on the nature of SA's democracy, labour market and social stability' (CHE, 2000:27).²⁷

Following the White Paper 3 in 1997 and the enactment of the higher education Act 101 of 1997, the next significant policy document emerging from the Department of Education was the National Plan for Higher Education. The goals stated in the National Plan resonated with the earlier goals in the White Paper but were

¹⁵ Cooper, D., & Subotzky, G. (2001). *The Skewed Revolution: Trends in South African Higher Education 1988-1998*. Cape Town: CSHE Publications, page 2

¹⁶ Jansen, J. D. (Ed.) (2002a). *Mergers in Higher Education: Lessons Learned in Transitional Contexts*. Pretoria: UNISA Press, page 51

¹⁷ Moja, T., and Hayward, F.M (2005), The changing face of redress in South African higher education. *Journal of Higher Education in Africa*, 3(3), 31-56, page 33

¹⁸ Department of Education (DoE). (1997). *Education White Paper 3: A Programme for the Transformation of Higher Education*. (Government Gazette No. 18207). Pretoria: Government Printers, and Department of Education (DoE). (2001). *National Plan for Higher Education*. Pretoria: DoE.

¹⁹ Statutory bodies like the Council on Higher Education and SAQA.

²⁰ McCowan, T. (2004), page 3. The growth of private higher education in Brazil: implications for equity and quality: *Journal of Education Policy*, 19(4), 453-472

²¹ Ibid

²² Li, Whalley, J., Zhang, S., & Zhao, (2008), page 2 Li, Y., *The Higher Educational Transformations of China and its Global Implications*. (Working Paper 13849), March. Cambridge: National Bureau of Economic Research, page 2

²³ Ibid, Li, et al.,(2008)

²⁴ National Commission on Higher Education (NCHE), (1996),. An Overview of a new Policy Framework for Higher Education Transformation

Also see, Ibid, DoE, 1997

²⁵ Ibid DoE1997:2, page 27

²⁶ CHE, 2000 Council on Higher Education (CHE). (2004b). *South African Higher Education in the First Decade of Democracy*. Pretoria: CHE

²⁷ Ibid page 27

underpinned by strong planning language. Goals, performance indicators, and outcomes were clearly stated. The National Plan for Higher Education provided a framework for the government's course of action and made explicit the goals of the higher education system. Significantly, though the effect of the National Plan for Higher Education was experienced differently by institutions, depending on their status: merging, merged or soon to be incorporated.

The National Plan for Higher Education linked access²⁸ to transformation in higher education, and recognised the role of institutions in interpreting goals and defining the parameters within which planning and funding would be used as incentives and disincentives. Perhaps one flaw in the National Plan for Higher Education was that while some of the strategies identified were clearly defined, others belonged to the category of rhetoric, without clearly identified strategic levers which resulted in mixed signals to institutions required to comply.

Notwithstanding some of the consequences of these mixed signals, the National Plan for Higher Education was a step in the direction towards a strategic plan for higher education. The Programme Qualification Mix was implemented in 2002 to develop a grid of learning programmes and qualifications per institution by subject area and level. The first academic programme differentiation process ran from 2001–02 to address mission drift²⁹ and prevent duplication and overlap between institutions. The stage was set for a formal restructuring of higher education and what became known as the 'size and shape' debate.³⁰

In December 2002, the Ministry of Education published its proposals, which were subsequently approved by Cabinet, for the transformation and restructuring of the country's higher education landscape, resulting in the consolidation of universities and technikons into eleven traditional universities, six 'comprehensive' universities and six universities of technology. In addition, two National Institutes of Higher Learning were established in Mpumalanga and Northern Cape.³¹ In 2012, the intention to create two new universities in these provinces was announced.³² Jansen points out that the mergers reduced access for rural students; resulted in institutions attracting middle class students; and reduced significantly the number and types of institutions available to students.³³ Jansen's argument gained significant currency, as the burden of restructuring shifted to institutions and detracted from the pursuit of widening access and diversifying and programme offerings.³⁴

Although some analysts argue that the scale of restructuring diminished opportunities for access,³⁵ the entire education sector collectively created a reduction of opportunities as the closure of colleges of education, the neglect of Further Education and Training colleges and the restructuring of higher education limited access to students and increased the cost of education for those lived far from the centres. In 2012, Minister Nzimande stated his intention to undo the merger of the University of Limpopo³⁶ and to revisit the possibility of opening colleges in some provinces to focus on teacher education,³⁷ a policy reversal that will come at a significant cost to the state.

While funding is required to expand enrolment, the planning instruments used by the Department of Education were and are still constrained by the limited purse, as well as the carrying capacity of the higher education sector. Despite the policy rhetoric of widening access, it will be demonstrated that higher education has not significantly expanded in line with demand. Bunting categorised the South African case into three phases:

²⁸ Draws on Wally Morrow's (1994) distinction between formal and epistemological access.

²⁹ Mission drift refers to deviation from expected programmes, different cohorts of students, academic orientation, research profiles and qualifications structures (Gibbons, 2004:24).

³⁰ SAUVCA, 2000

³¹ Now established as Universities – University of Mpumalanga and Sol Plaatje University

³² DHET, 2012:37 Department of Higher Education and Training (DHET). (2012) *Green Paper for Post-School Education and Training*. Pretoria: DHET, PAGE 37

³³ Op Cit, Jansen, 2002a

³⁴ Centre for Development and Enterprise (CDE). (2002). *Restructuring higher education: For what? And how will we measure success?* CDE Debate May 16, 2002. Retrieved April 10, 2007 from <http://www.cde.org.za/publications/education-skills-and-markets/79-ducation/284-restructuring-higher-education-for-what-and-how-will-we-measure-success>, page, 6

³⁵ Stumpf, R., Papier, J., Needham, S., Nel, H., & Unit, S.P. (2009). *Increasing educational opportunities for post NQF level 4 learners in South Africa through the further education and training college sector*. Retrieved April 10, 2011 from www.uwc.ac.za, page 9

³⁶ Merger undone in 2015

³⁷ Nzimande, 2012, Nzimande, B. (2012). *Minister of Higher Education and Training Budget Vote Speech in Parliament*. Cape Town, <http://www.dhet.gov.za/LinkClick.aspx?fileticket=uMdiEZL0pr4%3D&tabid=36>, page 1

1994–99: More is better
1999–2000: More is not better
2000–present: More but different.³⁸

This categorisation is useful as a lens to understand the policy shifts that occurred. In the last 13 years, which ties in with Bunting's categorisation of '*More but different*', the debate has shifted from access with success to the need for a differentiated higher education system.

The early National Commission on Higher Education report focused on 'massification' and advanced the position that participation rates³⁹ should reach 30 percent by 2005.⁴⁰ The National Plan for Higher Education revised this figure to 20 percent by 2011 and the target still stands.⁴¹ Both documents linked equity goals to massification, focusing on inclusivity as a central feature of the new higher education system. Bunting argued that the last phase is a natural progression towards realisation of the goal of a differentiated system.⁴² It is interesting to note that the Green Paper again introduces the idea of differentiation and acknowledges that not much has happened to realise the goal.⁴³ However, it stops short of expanding on exactly what is meant by differentiation. The international literature on the subject of higher education differentiation points to several dimensions like functions of institutions or missions, which require consideration for a debate on differentiation.⁴⁴ Badsha and Cloete pointed out that there are variances in interpretations of differentiation, especially amongst institutions and advocate a more nuanced approach to increasing participation rates based on a differentiated sector.⁴⁵

Behind the differentiated system lies the narrative on funding, which remains murky precisely because despite policy goals and objectives, the sector was almost rudderless in the absence of sufficient funding. Infrastructure funding allocated to higher education institutions by the state in the years 2009 to 2011 was insufficient to fully fund developments required by individual institutions. Given the delay in allocating funds for infrastructure from the 1990s to the late 2000s, the funding for new infrastructure was welcomed but the backlog in redress funding was raised by the sector as well as routine upgrading of existing infrastructure.

The model of funding adopted was based on an analysis of the balance sheets of institutions, which, in turn, determined the amount the Department of Education / Department of Higher Education and Training expects each institution to self-fund for a specific infrastructure project. A percentage of the total infrastructure project cost is funded by the state. This model while perhaps the only route available to the Department of Education / Department of Higher Education and Training to distribute funds from a limited purse for infrastructure development has triggered major development, but has placed pressure on individual institutions.

The current formula rewards research in terms of postgraduate students and research outputs. The funding formula operates in terms of volume – rewarding input and output, as opposed to quality. At the end of each planning initiative, changes are made to the funding formula to ensure that institutional plans could be resourced. At no point were massive injections of funding added in the years under review to give credence to the goal of widening access. Although funding has been in line with inflation, it has not taken into account a high growth strategy.

The cry for free education has its roots in the ANC Conference in Polokwane in 2007 by adopting a formal resolution that speaks of the 'progressive introduction of free education until undergraduate level'.⁴⁶ In 2009, the Minister of Department of Higher Education and Training proclaimed by gazette the terms of reference for the review of National Student Financial Aid Scheme,⁴⁷ the purpose of which was to assess the strengths and shortcomings of the current scheme; and to advise the Minister on the short, medium and long-term needs in

³⁸ Bunting, I. (2002). '*Funding*' in *Transformation in Higher Education: Global Pressures and Local Realities in South Africa*. Pretoria: CHET. pages 4-6

³⁹ Participation rates (Gross Enrolment Ratio) are defined as the total headcount enrolment in the university system divided by the 20-24 year age group of the population DoE, 2001).

⁴⁰ Op Cit, NCHE, 1996, page 7

⁴¹ Department of Education (DoE). (2001). *National Plan for Higher Education*. Pretoria: DoE. 19

⁴² Op Cit, Bunting 2002

⁴³ Op Cit, DHET, 2012, pages 39–41

⁴⁴ See, Huisman, 1995; Meek, 2003; Trow, 1979; Muller, 2003

⁴⁵ Badsha, N., and Cloete, N (2011). Higher Education: Contribution for the NPC's National Development Plan. CHET

⁴⁶ ANC, 2007

⁴⁷ DHET, 2009

order for student financial aid to promote the twin goals of equity of access and providing free undergraduate education to students from working class and poor communities, who cannot afford further or higher education.

The report made several insightful recommendations as a consequence of which several changes were made that provided a rough roadmap for the realisation of free undergraduate education.⁴⁸ Following the National Student Financial Aid Scheme Ministerial Review Committee was the Ministerial Committee chaired by Cyril Ramaphosa to review the current funding formula.⁴⁹ The merits or demerits of such a review have been debated in the public arena, with the argument being advanced that in order to achieve any of the stated intentions of such a review, there would have to be an increase in state funding of higher education.

In the SA context, a number of contestations and conflicts have dominated policy-making and the meanings of policies. Institutions account to the state, and performance is monitored in terms of indicators, targets and goals. Government policy emerges from 'contestation' and is reinterpreted and reinvented at institutional level and subject to more 'contestation'. Thus the cumulative impact of policies has an impact on the sector.⁵⁰ Based on an analysis of the funding formula, student enrolment planning initiatives of the Department of Education, and wider institutional planning initiatives, it is clear that the extent to which the state can achieve targets is a moot point. There has been detailed policy analysis interrogating whether equity of access has been subsumed by efficiency and effectiveness agendas.⁵¹

It seems the policy analysts are correct and the emphasis has shifted since the early National Council for Higher Education (1996) reports from 'massification' of the Higher Education system to 'planned growth' in the White Paper,⁵² it has been translated into the National Plan for Higher Education,⁵³ A New Funding Framework,⁵⁴ Green Paper,⁵⁵ and other policy planning instruments. Planning for the university sector in the context of these policy developments had to be significantly different. Enrolment planning for the university sector had to be viewed in relation to the planned major expansion of the college sector, as well as the policy requirement to accommodate the growing need for increased participation by National Senior Certificate and the National Certificate Vocational candidates who were eligible for admission to certificate, diploma or degree programmes at a higher education institution. The Green Paper for the Post-School Education and Training System, sketches the architecture of the new Department of Education and Training and the vision for widening of access to different institutional typologies.⁵⁶ The university sector is narrowly described as a vehicle for increasing headcount enrolment, with no focus on research-intensive universities and the role of the sector in the knowledge economy.

The narrative of policy development from 1994 retains social justice as an abiding theme, although the instruments selected to achieve equity of access and widening of access differ. Lo points out that for policy-makers, 'education is a major state planning apparatus serving national economic goals',⁵⁷ a view borne out by the Green Paper,⁵⁸ and other statements on higher education policy narrowly. The synergies brought about by the creation of a post-school education and training landscape heighten government's focus on the link between the economy and skills development and, despite a growing coalescence between various policies, the National Planning Commission Diagnostic Report identifies higher education problems only as being enrolment, throughput and graduates with the skills required for the economy.⁵⁹ Though the model of funding is distinctly different from that in SA, the recent student tuition fee crisis in Canada in 2011 and 2012 shows

⁴⁸ One major change directly addresses the 'burden of debt' problem and is simply that as of 1 April 2011, a student registered for full-time studies would not be charged interest on loans and interest would only accrue a year after completion of the degree (NSFAS Annual Report, 2011/12). A second radical shift in policy was the Final Year Programme of NSFAS that worked on the principle that if a student on a NSFAS loan successfully completes the requirements for the degree, then the amount owing for the final year would be converted into a bursary (NSFAS, 2011/12).

⁴⁹ DHET, 2011

⁵⁰ Ball, S.J. (1993). *What is Policy? Texts, Trajectories and Toolboxes*. Discourse, 13(2), 10-17, page 11

⁵¹ See, CHE, 2004b; Jansen, 2001; Badsha & Cloete, 2011

⁵² Op Cit, DoE, 1997

⁵³ Op Cit, DoE, 2001

⁵⁴ Ministry of Education, 2004a

⁵⁵ Op Cit, DHET, 2012

⁵⁶ Ibid

⁵⁷ Lo, M.W.K (2010), To What Extent Education Planning and Policy Decision out to be guided by Economic Considerations- A Case study on Recent Education Development of Hong Kong. *International education Studies*, 3(4), 107. page 1

⁵⁸ Op Cit, DHET, 2012

⁵⁹ National Planning Commission (NPC). (2011). *Diagnostic Report (National Planning Commission)*. Pretoria: Department of the Presidency, page16

how reduced state funding to universities leads to a corresponding shift of the burden to students in the form of tuition fees.⁶⁰ Simply put, universities are reliant on state subsidy and student fees as primary income streams. Reduction in one results in pressure on the other stream and the burden being placed on students. The crisis highlighted in Canada is one which has repeatedly played itself out in SA. Thus, the National Student Financial Aid Scheme review estimated that in 2009, institution debt was R 2, 7 billion.⁶¹

The reality of university funding is that funding allocations are determined by the state and an institution's plans are limited or expanded according to the resources available. An analysis of policy development from 1994 to 2010 reveals no significant changes in the 'desire of the state to be an interventionist agent in restructuring the system'.⁶² Despite the claim that the state should play an interventionist role to focus on redress and equity, the Green Paper,⁶³ identifies the lack of capacity at the level of the state to actually make significant inroads. A number of observations regarding this is pertinent, key among which is that the logical connectivity amongst the different policy initiatives is diluted by delays in policy implementation.

Conclusion

The 'window of opportunity' available in 1994 when SA was donor rich meant that a long-term plan should have been conceptualised to tackle the problems of education holistically. In India, for example, concerted planning post-British rule resulted in a series of five year plans was developed to take into account the developmental challenges of the country.⁶⁴

In China, despite some problems, such as an increase in tuition fees, enhancement of social exclusion for the poor and uneven development of institutions, participation grew from 0,4 million to 3,4 million between 1978 and 1998⁶⁵ using a combination of resourcing and planning to achieve specific goals. Somalia, which has been war-torn for many years, resorted to radical interventions in order to deal with primary and secondary education backlogs. These have involved rapid up-skilling of teachers and compressing the number of years of schooling to address the disruption of the schooling careers of primary and secondary students.⁶⁶

Long-term planning of the education sector with a more holistic view should have been designed to drive through policy reforms. There was a critical opportunity in 1994 to effect a radical transformation of the system and that a Marshall plan should have been designed to drive through policy reforms.

What has transpired is a tinkering with parts of the system, which has led to a perpetuation of the problems that bedevil higher education and the rest of the education sector. The issue of equity, for example, is one such concern. The provision of access to higher education for individuals from a lower income group could produce an outcome that is inequitable in comparison to an individual from a higher income group.

The inequity may arise from choice of degree, institution and absorption into the labour market. SA, with its inherently varied institutional histories and capacities, is a challenging environment with historic dynamics that have to be considered. If education is to be a 'primary means of intergenerational economic and social change',⁶⁷ then major shifts at policy level and systemically are needed.

As poverty and inequality continue to be the detractors and inhibitors, widening of access to higher education has become like a game of snakes and ladders, with progress alternating with reversals and hurdles.

⁶⁰ See, Yu, 2011

⁶¹ Op Cit, DHET, 2010, page, xv

⁶² Sayed Y. (2000). The Governance of South African Higher Education System: Balancing State Control and State Supervision in Co-operative Governance? *International Journal of Educational Development*, 20, 475-489, page 285

⁶³ Op Cit, DoE, 1996, page 40

⁶⁴ Tilak Tilak, J.B.G. (2005). Post-Elementary Education, Poverty and Development in India. *Working Paper Series No.6 (Revised). Post-Basic Education and Training*, November. Edinburgh, UK: Centre of African Studies, University of Edinburgh, page 35

⁶⁵ Li, Y., Whalley, J., Zhang, S., & Zhao, X. (2008). *The Higher Educational Transformations of China and its Global Implications*. (Working Paper 13849), March. Cambridge: National Bureau of Economic Research. 2008, page 4

⁶⁶ Brannelly, L., Ndaruhutse, S., & Rigaud, C. (2009). *Donors' Engagement: Supporting Education in Fragile and Conflict-affected States* from http://www.iiep.unesco.org/fileadmin/user_upload/Info_Services_Publications/pdf/2009/Donors_Engagement.pdf

⁶⁷ Hall, M. (2012). *Inequality and Higher Education: Marketplace or Social Justice*. Stimulus Paper. London: Leadership Foundation for Higher Education. Retrieved April 15, 2012 from http://www.salford.ac.uk/data/assets/pdf_file/0015/76110/Inequality-and-Higher-Education-published-Jan-2012.pdf, page 16

References

- Badat , S (2003), *Transforming South African Higher Education 1990-2003: Goals, Policy Initiatives and Critical Challenges and Issues*. In Cloete, N., Pillay, P., Badat, S., & Moja, T. (2004). *National Policy and Regional Response in Higher Education*. London: James Currey Ltd
- Badsha, N., and Cloete, N (2011). *Higher Education: Contribution for the NPC's National Development Plan*. CHET
- Ball, S.J. (1993). *What is Policy? Texts, Trajectories and Toolboxes*. *Discourse*, 13(2), 10-17, page 11
- Barnes, T. (2006). *Changing discourses and meanings of redress in South African higher education 1994–2001*. *Journal of Asian and African Studies*, 41(1-2), 149-170
- Brannelly, L., Ndaruhutse, S., & Rigaud, C. (2009). *Donors' Engagement: Supporting Education in Fragile and Conflictaffected States* from http://www.iiep.unesco.org/fileadmin/user_upload/Info_Services_Publications/pdf/2009/Donors_Engagement.pdf
- Bundy, C (2006), 'Global patterns, local options? Changes in higher education internationally and some implications for South Africa', In Kagisano: *Ten Years of Higher Education under Democracy*. Pretoria: CHE
- Bunting, I. (2002). *'Funding' in Transformation in Higher Education: Global Pressures and Local Realities in South Africa*. Pretoria: CHET.
- CHE, 2000 Council on Higher Education (CHE). (2004b). *South African Higher Education in the First Decade of Democracy*. Pretoria: CHE
- Cloete, N (2012). *Higher education and economic development in Africa*. In Vukasović, M., Maassen, P., Nerland, M., Pinheiro, R., Stensaker, B., & Vabo, A. (Eds.). *Effects of Higher Education Reforms: Change Dynamics*, 137-152. Sense Publishers
- Cloete , N& Sheppard, M. (2009). *Scoping the Need for Post-School Education*. Wynberg, Cape Town: CHET
- Cooper, D., & Subotzky, G. (2001). *The Skewed Revolution: Trends in South African Higher Education 1988-1998*. Cape Town: CSHE Publications
- Council on Higher Education (CHE). (2004B). *South African Higher Education in the First Decade of Democracy*
- Centre for Development and Enterprise (CDE). (2002). *Restructuring higher education: For what? And how will we measure success?* CDE Debate May 16, 2002. Retrieved April 10, 2007 from <http://www.cde.org.za/publications/education-skills-and-markets/79-ducation/284-restructuring-higher-education-for-what-and-how-will-we-measure-success>
- Department of Education (DoE). (1997). *Education White Paper 3: A Programme for the Transformation of Higher Education*. (Government Gazette No. 18207). Pretoria: Government Printers, and Department of Education (DoE). (2001). *National Plan for Higher Education*. Pretoria: DoE.
- Department of Education (DoE). (2001). *National Plan for Higher Education*. Pretoria: DoE.
- DHET, 2012:37 Department of Higher Education and Training (DHET). (2012) *Green Paper for Post-School Education and Training*. Pretoria: DHET
- Hall, M. (2012). *Inequality and Higher Education: Marketplace or Social Justice*. Stimulus Paper. London: Leadership Foundation for Higher Education. Retrieved April 15, 2012 from

http://www.salford.ac.uk/data/assets/pdf_file/0015/76110/Inequality-and-Higher_Education-published-Jan-2012.pdf

Jansen, J. D. (Ed.) (2002a). *Mergers in Higher Education: Lessons Learned in Transitional Contexts*. Pretoria: UNISA Press

Le Roux, P. & Breier, M. 2012. *Steering from a distance: Improving access to higher education in South Africa via the funding formula*. Johannesburg: Friedrich-Ebert-Stiftung

Lo, M.W.K (2010), To What Extent Education Planning and Policy Decision out to be guided by Economic Considerations- A Case study on Recent Education Development of Hong Kong. *International education Studies*, 3(4), 107

Li, Y., Whalley, J., Zhang, S., & Zhao, X. (2008). *The Higher Educational Transformations of China and its Global Implications*. (Working Paper 13849), March. Cambridge: National Bureau of Economic Research.2008

McCowan, T. (2004), page 3. The growth of private higher education in Brazil: implications for equity and quality: *Journal of Education Policy*, 19(4), 453-472

Moja, T., and Hayward, F.M (2005), The changing face of redress in South African higher education. *Journal of Higher Education in Africa*, 3(3), 31-56

National Planning Commission (NPC). (2011). *Diagnostic Report (National Planning Commission)*. Pretoria: Department of the Presidency

Nzimande, 2012, Nzimande, B. (2012). *Minister of Higher Education and Training Budget Vote Speech in Parliament*. Cape Town, <http://www.dhet.gov.za/LinkClick.aspx?fileticket=uMdiEZL0pr4%3D&tabid=36>

National Commission on Higher Education (NCHE), (1996). An Overview of a new Policy Framework for Higher Education Transformation
Also see, Ibid, DoE, 1997

Participation rates (Gross Enrolment Ratio) are defined as the total headcount enrolment in the university system divided by the 20-24 year age group of the population DoE, 2001).

Sayed Y. (2000). The Governance of South African Higher Education System: Balancing State Control and State Supervision in Co-operative Governance? *International Journal of Educational Development*, 20, 475-489

Stumpf, R., Papier, J., Needham, S., Nel, H., & Unit, S.P. (2009). *Increasing educational opportunities for post NQF level 4 learners in South Africa through the further education and training college sector*. Retrieved April 10, 2011 from www.uwc.ac.za

Tilak Tilak, J.B.G. (2005). Post-Elementary Education, Poverty and Development in India. *Working Paper Series No.6 (Revised). Post-Basic Education and Training, November*. Edinburgh, UK: Centre of African Studies, University of Edinburgh