

TWO PARADIGMS OF HIGHER EDUCATION - MODERNIST AND TRANSFORMATIVE

Markus Molz & Gaudenz Assenza

University for the Future Initiative

Working Paper ❖ No. 1 ❖ Version 21 ❖ 19 February 2015

Catalysing the New Renaissance

Abstract

In this Working Paper we reflect the currently prevailing paradigm in higher education, Modernist Higher Education, through the lenses of the *University for the Future (U4F) model*. The U4F model is a specific whole system design of higher education that is contributing to the emerging new paradigm of Transformative Higher Education. The comparison is carried out in a systemic way along a number of dimensions and characteristics that are constitutive for higher education and that influence and reinforce each other. The contention of the U4F model is that reinventing higher education for the 21st century requires transformative changes in all dimensions in ways that are aligned with each other. The comparison therefore emphasizes the systemic, multidimensional view of the needed changes (not just providing a philosophical argument), and presents concrete strategies and designs to transform higher education. The comparison is based on long-standing professional experience of the authors in mainstream universities and in educational innovation initiatives. For the sake of readability, literature is not included in the comparison tables.

Contents

Introduction	2
<i>The Coming Paradigm Shift</i>	2
<i>Terminology</i>	4
<i>The University for the Future Model</i>	4
The Comparison	6
<i>Aims & Orientation</i>	7
<i>Education</i>	8
<i>Research</i>	9
<i>Assessment</i>	10
<i>Internationalisation</i>	10
<i>Organisation</i>	11
<i>Partnerships</i>	11
<i>Resource Model</i>	12
<i>Quality Management</i>	13
<i>ICT</i>	13
<i>Academic Culture</i>	14
<i>Recruitment & Promotion</i>	14
<i>Facilities & Locations</i>	15
Outlook	16
About the Authors	18
Acknowledgements	18

Introduction

The Coming Paradigm Shift

The most widespread contemporary higher education institution is the “multiversity”, i.e. the multidisciplinary university, in which a range of disciplines co-exist as relatively self-contained and little interacting domains of teaching and research. The multiversity model of higher education underlies different types of higher education institutions. They can be smaller or larger, teaching or research oriented, regionally focused or internationally oriented, campus-based or online, public or private, and still represent the same basic paradigm. We call this paradigm Modernist Higher Education as it was rising with and strongly contributing to modernisation.

It can be observed, accordingly, that many if not most higher education institutions today have similar mission statements, educational programmes, organisational structures, academic cultures, etc. There is a global higher education system operating on the basis of Modernist Higher Education, a paradigm that has been shaped over the past two centuries and reformed in converging ways over the past two decades, in particular through the Bologna process and the creation of the European Higher Education Area, harmonizing the higher education systems of almost 50 countries and influencing the developments of many more worldwide.

In the 20th century, Modernist Higher Education has contributed to the cognitive and digital revolutions, to widening educational opportunities and international exchange, to breakthrough inventions and economic development, among many other valuable contributions. The number of multiversities rapidly increased after the Second World War, along with the number of graduates, scholars, academic journals, research projects, etc. Cities with universities tend to develop better, in conventional socioeconomic terms, than cities without. For these and many other reasons, the multiversity looks like a historical success story and many people believe that Modernist Higher Education should be expanded even further throughout the 21st century.

While we recognise the historical success and contribution of multiversities, we are also aware of the paradoxes, problems and limitations of this institutional model and its underlying paradigm. A long-term historical perspective reveals that institutions cannot be understood independently from the major challenges of the historical era in which they have been created and in which they flourish. Multiversities evolved as elite institutions based on print media in the context of the industrial revolution of nation states that were imagined as culturally homogenous. Most multiversities have been turned into mass institutions in the past decades without substantial changes in the underlying paradigm.

There is historical evidence that institutional systems that are successful across generations tend to reproduce themselves and ultimately outlive the conditions that were responsible for their creation. From being part of the solution for a set of societal challenges they become part of the problem. The contemporary grand societal challenges are markedly different from those that characterized the era in which multiversities have been created. The digital revolution, climate change, resource depletion, globalisation, mass migration and social superdiversity, contribute to a historically unprecedented situation of accelerated and irreversible change.

In this situation, we have to face the *academic anomaly*: Never in human history there have been more graduates, more scientific research, more new knowledge produced every year, and more ease in accessing and spreading information worldwide. At the same time, for half a century already, and with no end in sight, our modern civilisation is unsustainable, while simultaneously increasing social inequality and intergenerational injustice. There are many countries in the world (including European countries), in which a substantial proportion of the younger generation has little chance to find a place in the globalised socioeconomic system in any way that would be in line with their talents, and this often despite higher education degrees. How can all this happen, if the majority of politicians, CEOs and leaders of influential civil society organisations are highly educated and attended a multiversity, a business school, if not also an advanced leadership training?

Modernist Higher Education as a whole, despite its internal diversity and some countervailing practices, did not prevent the large-scale failure of respecting the planetary boundaries and the dignity of many sentient beings; it rather seems to participate in these developments that undermine, over time, the fundamentals of our contemporary civilisation. Modernist Higher Education did not stimulate individual, social and cultural development in a substantially deeper, broader and more enlivening sense than the mantra of endless economic growth and

consumerism affords. Modernist Higher Education, coming from another historical era, did little to transform itself in order to become a catalytic force in addressing the grand challenges of the 21st century. We therefore believe that there is a need and a place for new models of higher education, including systemic redesigns such as the University for the Future vision.

The multiversity, in particular the modern research university, has been itself a new model of higher education that replaced the formerly dominant model. The former model was the medieval scholastic university based on a universal curriculum in which there was no place for the disciplines and methodologies arising from the scientific revolution. As medieval universities did not tend to transform themselves into modern multiversities, there was a longer phase of co-existence of both models. However, the new model ultimately replaced the old model, as it was better aligned with the worldviews and the societal conditions of the modern era. Our contention is that a similar process is likely to unfold in the coming decades, and necessarily so as the societal and educational challenges of the 21st century are fundamentally different from those of the 19th and 20th centuries, in which Modernist Higher Education became the prevalent model.

Most of all, we are no longer living in an era of information scarcity, which was one of the foundational conditions for the creation of the historical “ivory towers”. An ivory tower type of institution that attracts, pools and protects the few literate persons and the few books that existed, made sense at that point of time in history. On the contrary, the contemporary digital era is characterised by abundance of information leading to permanent information overload. Almost any information (and also disinformation) is available anytime at the fingertips of any user of a digital device connected to the Internet, and there are now billions of these devices in daily use. It therefore makes little sense to continue centring education primarily on placing a subject matter expert in a room with presumed novices for the purpose of conveying information from the former to the latter. Other educational approaches need to be brought to the fore. Especially so as education has become one of the major global industries and huge resources are allocated (or misallocated) to educational institutions.

The current level of self-containment, specialisation and standardisation in academia does not look like the most promising response to the cross-cutting, mutually interdependent, and dynamically evolving grand challenges in society. These challenges question hitherto cherished ideals and approaches of personal and socioeconomic development in epochal ways. The contemporary challenges can be turned into opportunities, but only through a profound paradigm shift that is going beyond reforms, as reforms refine or modify the concrete expression of a paradigm, but not the deep assumptions ingrained in the paradigm itself. New kinds of being, knowing and acting are required, new curriculum and research designs, new ways of governing institutions, of managing their boundaries and of relating diverse stakeholders to each other, and also new approaches to resourcing higher education. Accordingly, a new institutional type in higher education is called for that some started to name the transmodern transversity, following the modern multiversity and the medieval university.

Transversities are transformative universities that are transdisciplinary and transparadigmatic, transcultural and transgenerational, transsectoral and translocal. This is not to say that as long as an institution or system fulfils all “trans-“criteria, it is automatically superior. The nature and quality, the detailed shaping — and even more the interrelations — of all features across all dimensions matter greatly. Furthermore, not all features can be applied equally in all circumstances. There may be certain global solutions as well as universally valid aspects of learning and inquiry, but there are also localized, contextual aspects based on the fact that most regions and nations stand on their own specific languages, cultures and wisdom traditions.

A general orientation of the U4F model of higher education is the transformative mission and approach, which means the capacity to intervene in targeted, value-based ways in the dystopian trends of our century. The goal is to catalyse change towards visions, models and practices of individual and collective thriving that respect the planetary boundaries and that therefore can also serve as a foundation for the thriving of future generations. This requires focusing on the dignity of life in terms of individual, social, cultural and spiritual well-being, locally and worldwide. Higher education should take a long term view, independently of media soundbites, business interests and election cycles. In our view, it is one of the key missions of higher education in the 21st century to take the lead in developing economic, social, cultural, and political visions, practices and showcases for dignified futures, and to partner for this purpose with supportive forces in all other sectors of society, in particular from civil society.

Terminology

- Modernist Higher Education and Transformative Higher Education are *paradigms* and at the same time *fields of academic research, institutional development and educational practice*, with Transformative Higher Education being an emerging field and Modernist Higher Education an established field.
- Multiversities and transversities are the key *institutional types* representing each of these paradigms, respectively, in an exemplary way.¹
- The University for the Future (U4F) is a specific *model* contributing to the current emergence of the paradigm of Transformative Higher Education. The U4F model is, and shall remain, independent from single schools of thought or single institutions. It is developed as a new authentic approach facing boldly the future with a clear identity and position. This independence assures that it can be implemented and localised in many contexts in various suitable ways. The U4F model is not the only conception of Transformative Higher Education. We respect other development efforts, and we look forward to shape this new paradigm of higher education together.
- The U4F is not a single transversity, but the design of a comprehensive system innovation in higher education. The U4F model offers a particular design approach to conceive and build transversities, but it is not the only design approach for creating transversities.
- The *University for the Future Initiative* (U4F Initiative) is an *international network* that seeks to design, implement, spread and scale the U4F model of Transformative Higher Education.

The University for the Future Model

The U4F model is reviving carefully selected aspects of historical visions of higher education. It also shares certain features with other current attempts of advancing and showcasing Transformative Higher Education. Nevertheless, it represents a fresh and independent agenda, for instance due to its unparalleled whole system design approach. Accordingly, the guiding question of the University for the Future Initiative is:

What would higher education look like if we built it from scratch today?

When asking such a radical question, it is necessary to be unprejudiced and to be willing to learn both from traditional and contemporary approaches, while also considering new approaches that are about to emerge. Seeking inspiration and lessons of experience from a wide range of approaches is a prerequisite for quality. At the same time, the U4F has no particular attachments or commitments to any specific tradition, school of thought, or ideological orientation. It cannot be understood as a representative, subsidiary, or next evolutionary step of any specific educational paradigm. Therefore, it should be judged on its own terms, and not by association with other approaches. This is particularly important because we do not yet know how the currently emerging paradigm of Transformative Higher Education will evolve, and whether in ten or twenty years the U4F model can be suitably described as one of the manifestations of this paradigm. Original ideas have often been subsequently modified, for better or for worse. Even more so, the implementation of ideas does not always correspond with the original intent.

The *University for the Future* model works with three interconnected horizons of transformation that are required for a life-affirming Great Transition during the 21st century:

1. *Individuals*. We believe that higher education shall serve to empower self-transformation of individuals by unlocking their higher human potential (not only their intellectual potential, but also their moral, emotional, social, aesthetic potential, etc.). Higher education shall furthermore favour the expression of the resulting qualities, capabilities and responsibilities in all domains of life. Higher education shall in

¹ Differently looking higher education institutions can represent the same institutional type whereas institutions representing different types look necessarily differently. The key institutional type of a paradigm co-exists with complementary institutional types that also represent the respective paradigm, albeit less comprehensively. For example, specialised schools such as business schools are not multiversities, but most of them still represent many features of Modernist Higher Education, while modulating other features because of their specific and more limited mission and target group.

particular support individuals in questioning the status quo and developing a vocation as change-makers and system innovators.

2. *Society*. The second line of transformation relates to social well-being at all levels of society (from families and other small groups to neighbourhoods, communities, regions and nations, and all the way to globalised society). Social well-being includes dimensions such as health, peace and justice, culture and governance, models of socioeconomic development, etc. We believe that given the special characteristics of our era, higher education is an anchor institution that has the duty to catalyse positive transformative change across sectors (public, private and civil society) in the communities and regions in which its institutions are located and active, as well as in the globalised society at large.
3. *Nature*. The third line of transformation is to spur the sustainability transition and dramatically improve ecological resilience in the age of climate change and environmental degradation. This is part of the Great Transition and a key transgenerational challenge of our era. A future-proof education needs to develop and uphold the responsibility of individuals and institutions for the consequences of their actions and inactions, even those that are more hidden and systemic.

The U4F model can be used for creating new higher education programmes and institutions as well as redesigning existing ones. The goal is to align these programmes and institutions with unmet or underserved transformation needs and aspirations of learners, organisations, local communities, as well as society as a whole, in respect of social and intergenerational justice and planetary boundaries.

The U4F model is flexible and allows creating *showcases* in various locations and contexts and in different variations, including:

1. International, inter-institutional, and cross-sector programmes (transformative and transdisciplinary action-research-education);
2. New standalone higher education institutions (transversities);
3. U4F innovation zones within existing universities (“transversities within multiversities”);
4. Transformative higher education within businesses and other organisations (e.g. change lab, transformative leadership development, corporate university 2.0);
5. Concepts of integrative development on the local level, which include also non-higher education institutions (multi-institutional campuses, learning villages, learning cities, neighbourhoods for “one planet living”).
6. Networks of diverse institutions in different locations (multi-local transformation ecosystems).

The showcases shall have a model character aiming to manifest the U4F model in practice as comprehensibly as possible. This means including as many dimensions as possible, as shown in the following comparison tables. The showcases are tailor-made to the possibilities of the specific partnership developing them and the needs of the target groups and communities they serve.

The *University for the Future* model does *not*

- *Emulate multiversities*. It rather aims to bring forward a specific type of transversities as a system innovation that can stand on its own and that directly or indirectly stimulates the full-scale transformation of existing multiversities with insightful leadership into genuine transversities.
- *Reform multiversities*. This has been attempted by the Bologna process and it is unlikely that we will see any other system-wide international reform happening in higher education in the foreseeable future. What we start to see are reforms of this reform, mostly without questioning the underlying paradigm of Modernist Higher Education. System transformation based on a paradigm shift is an approach to institutional change that is substantially different from reforming existing institutions. The U4F model can be used (or misused) for partial innovations by existing multiversities to keep their basic model afloat under rapidly changing conditions, but it was not developed with this purpose in mind.
- *Replace multiversities*. For the foreseeable future, the classical disciplines and their institutional forms will continue to exist. Transversities will not replace multiversities in basic disciplinary and interdisciplinary research nor in mass teaching for degrees in standard professions anytime soon. In the next decades we expect a co-existence of established multiversities and emerging transversities in the same way as the established scholastic universities and the emerging research multiversities co-existed in the 18th/19th century.

The Comparison

In the following tables we compare typical features (including unintended systemic consequences) of two paradigms of higher education:

- Modernist Higher Education that is generally enacted by contemporary multiversities and their regulating institutions as the most prevalent variant of contemporary higher education.
- The University for the Future model, a specific variant of the emerging paradigm of Transformative Higher Education. Our own understanding of Transformative Higher Education is co-emerging with differently shaped or emphasised understandings of Transformative Higher Education.

The comparison is carried out in a systemic way along a number of dimensions that are constitutive for higher education and that influence and reinforce each other, such as the primary aims, the educational and research paradigm, the organisational and resource model, as well as the quality and facility management approaches. The foregrounded features are indicative, not comprehensive in the absolute sense. They will be further extended and refined in the course of the development of the *University for the Future* model through co-creative methodologies involving not only academics and students, but also representatives of civil society, local communities, etc. The compilation of characteristics reflected in the following tables stems from the long professional experience of the authors in educational innovation in and across several disciplines, in and across a variety of universities, in and across more than a dozen countries. The statements are also backed by extant literature, which, however, is not included in this particular Working Paper, for the sake of the readability of the tables.

In our attempt to convey an understanding of paradigmatic differences between Modernist Higher Education and Transformative Higher Education, we can neither cover the diversity of higher education institutions in the contemporary global higher education system structured along the Modernist Higher Education paradigm, nor the diversity of approaches of Transformative Higher Education. The two columns of the following comparison tables shall therefore be understood as ideal types in the following sense:

- In light of the great diversity of existing higher education institutions, there is probably no institution that reflects all criteria of Modernist Higher Education as per the first column. The higher education system that has been spread from Europe over the entire world in the last centuries, has nevertheless a number of widely shared characteristics. Many academics, students, administrators and higher education policy makers therefore recognize many features of the first column as matching their experience (but not necessarily all these stakeholders will recognize all features, nor exactly the same set of features).
- There is no scholarly overview yet of the diversity of approaches that make a contribution to shaping the emerging field and paradigm of Transformative Higher Education. Many of these approaches are recent and in an early stage of development. We therefore prefer presenting our own interpretation of Transformative Higher Education, the *University for the Future* model, as a system innovation proposal that can be clearly described. To our current knowledge, there is no higher education institution in the world yet that complies with the complete set of characteristics of the U4F model as per the second column. However, there are both small and large higher education institutions and initiatives that already exemplify certain characteristics of our model. Each real life attempt of implementing approaches inspired by one or another variant of the Transformative Higher Education paradigm that we know about covers a particular subset of characteristics of the U4F model, while other characteristics still correspond to the approaches characteristic for Modernist Higher Education. The U4F is intended to be the first transversity model and higher education system that strives to realize a comprehensive set of characteristics of Transformative Higher Education in a way that aligns these characteristics with each other across all dimensions reflected in the comparison tables. Through this overall alignment new systemic qualities emerge that differ from the typical systemic qualities of Modernist Higher Education (and not only from specific, isolated qualities of this paradigm).

MULTIVERSITY Modernist Higher Education Paradigm (in terms of the globally prevailing model)	TRANSVERSITY Transformative Higher Education Paradigm (in terms of the <i>University for the Future</i> model)
= key characteristics of the predominant higher education model ruling most contemporary universities	= key characteristics of the <i>University for the Future</i> as a model of higher education for the 21 st century

Aims & Orientation	
Academic excellence per se	Thought leadership and transformative leadership in society
Academic performance of students and scholars	Supporting the realization of the higher potential and the unique purpose of each individual
Accumulation of knowledge	Cultivation of wisdom as the capacity to realize what is of value in life for oneself and others
Disciplinary competences	Capacity to (co-)create across boundaries
Employability of students	Capacity to generate fulfilling work that contributes to catalyse the Great Transition; transforming existing organisations and communities or creating new ones
Primary focus on research; secondary focus on teaching, outreach and service to society as separate add-ons	Integration of research, teaching and service to society into a single stream of activities; primary focus on co-creative transformation work with representatives of all sectors of society ²
Scientism and materialism	No a priori limitation of worldviews and frameworks
Reductionism	Generalised complexity
Dichotomy of facts and values	Co-dependence of facts and values
Scientific “neutrality” (science as “disinterested”)	Science in and for society (science as value-based and ethically engaged in real-world affairs, in particular focused on the grand challenges)
Separation of levels of reality (e.g. physical, biological and sociocultural, or individual, organisational and societal)	Integrative multi-level frameworks
Paradigm wars	Meta-paradigmatic perspectives
Competition as higher value than cooperation	Cooperation, teamwork and co-creation as more important than competition

² Outreach is one way to fulfil the mission of service to society, among others. The U4F model does not need outreach as it does not separate itself from society in the first place.

Education	
Focus on factual knowledge about preselected parts of the external world	Cultivation of self-knowledge in relation to goal, system and transformation knowledge (whereby factual knowledge is part of knowledge about complex systems)
Largely predefined curricula	Largely co-created curricula
Learning for testing	Vision-to-action cycles
Learning driven by pedagogical questions (to which the teacher already knows the right answer)	Learning driven by existential questions to which there is no uncontested answer and the requirement to tackle grand challenges that nobody solved so far
Self-development considered a private matter	Education essentially about self-development
Initial choice of study programme determines specialisation	Big picture acquaintance and clarification of the qualities and vocation of a person precedes specialisation
Academic studies separate from the rest of one's life	Life-long, life-wide and life-deep whole person learning
Teachers mainly as instructors in a narrow field ("sage on the stage")	Teachers as co-learners, process facilitators and mentors for whole person learning ("guide on the side")
Reproduction of standard disciplines and professions	Encouragement of unique profiles and participation in emerging transdisciplinary fields and in the creation of new professions ³
Focus on individual knowledge acquisition and skill development according to homogenising standards	Focus on co-creation based on the cultivation of talents, dispositions, awareness, intentionality, creativity and higher-order capabilities
First attending lectures, then doing exercises	Students prepare for engagement with teachers and become co-teachers (flipped classroom, shadowing, learning by teaching, project-based learning, etc.)
Separation of head, hand and heart (i.e. separation of intellectual and practical education and work, and both from personal passion and values)	Integration of head, hand and heart (e.g. through social-emotional and intercultural learning, arts & handicrafts, working with animals and the land, real-world transformation and future-creation projects)
Separation of disciplines and disciplinary fields (arts, humanities, social sciences, sciences ...) from each other and from practice	Transdisciplinary inquiry and practice throughout
Environmental, citizenship and leadership education as mostly taught subjects for a minority of students in specific programmes only	Education for sustainable development, global citizenship and transformative leadership for all students, with a strong experiential focus
Ease of adding new courses and educational programmes within given disciplinary structures; difficulty of creating transdisciplinary courses and programmes	Interdisciplines, in-between spaces, emerging fields and transdisciplinary explorations are considered key for learning and practice in the 21st century and structurally supported to develop
Separation of target groups (e.g. traditional and non-tradition students, undergraduate and postgraduate levels, academic and professional continuing education, domestic and international students) into target-group specific educational programmes	Emphasis on educational programmes that favour intergenerational, interprofessional, and intercultural co-learning and co-creation
Most academic teachers do not have any training in adult education	Training in adult education is an integral feature of induction into academic life
History departments separate from social sciences focused on contemporary realities; futures studies absent from of the standard set of disciplines	Intimate connection of past, present and future perspectives in all study programmes

³ The difference of speaking about disciplines in the left column and fields in the right column is intentional. Fields are more open and flexible than disciplines; there can be new fields within a discipline, across disciplines or beyond disciplines – this triple interrelated understanding links to Nicolescu's definition of transdisciplinarity.

Research	
Dominance of hyperspecialized, sub-disciplinary research; cultivation of reductionism	Dominance of integrative, trans- and metadisciplinary research; cultivation of systemic thinking
Relevant research questions arise in small communities of experts	Relevant research questions arise in dialogues of researchers and stakeholders of the communities served, concerning needs related to grand challenges
Ideal of universalist, decontextualized science, of the controlled laboratory experiment	Ideal of contextualised science, participation in complex evolving “real-life experiments”
Predominance of short-term research projects, unrelated to each other	Predominance of long-term transformative research engagements with specific communities, also and in particular beyond academia
Focus on mode 1 research (incremental improvements within given research paradigms)	Focus on mode 3 / transformative research (such as transdisciplinary, action-oriented, exploratory, community-embedded, and paradigm-changing frontier research)
Emphasis of scholarship of discovery and scholarship of (subject matter) teaching	Emphasis of scholarships of integration, application and transdisciplinary facilitation
Research funding programmes designed and fixed in advance by bureaucrats and/or status quo commissions	Research priorities developed dynamically by researchers and stakeholders together in long-term cross-sector communities of practice, including disadvantaged people
Research projects must fit predefined project plans with little possibility to adjust for new learning and circumstances in the course of the project	Research projects follow learning where it generates the greatest impact
Publish or perish	Publications as one among many aspects of real-world impact generation (alongside teaching in contexts of practice, transformation projects, practice-based research, institution and capacity building, advisory services, etc.)
Academic writing focused primarily on single idea papers as well as splitting ideas into as many papers as possible to optimise publication lists	Academic writing focused on deep exploration, complexity and unexpected outcomes; learning to write more succinctly and for wider publics, producing pre-publications reflecting various stages of maturation of an idea or line of research (idea bank, blog, sketch, draft, ...)
Spread of anticipatory optimization strategies for publication lists and research assessments (such as quoting circles, selecting the research question to fit the data, and designing research to fit the criteria of journals with the higher impact factor)	Focus on transformative innovations and real-world impact, not on number of publications/ quotations/ impact factor/ publication types
Narrow definition of academic publication, with primary focus on peer-review, impact factor journals	Broadening academic publishing to include explorative, experimental, artistic, practical, multimodal and other types of presentation
Research ethics primarily a matter of “ticking boxes” in application forms (e.g. confidentiality, informed consent, etc.)	Research ethics part of the process of research design and research evaluation conducted together with the communities served
Very few academic researchers are trained in and dedicated to inter-, trans- and metadisciplinary research	Transdisciplinary and transformative research training is part of the general induction of students and scholar-practitioners
Narrow set of acceptable research methods; career-deciding hierarchy of certain types of methods (quantitative over qualitative over action research methods)	Extended set of equally appreciated research methods, methodological pluralism, and multi-method research
Research sponsored by corporations and rich individuals often leads to outcomes desirable for them	Total transparency of funding streams as a basic requirement for all projects and publications

Assessment	
Measuring what is easy to measure becomes, over time, what is considered important in education, research and institutional development; reversal of means and ends	The focus remains consistently on what is important, whether or not it can be (easily) measured; the reversal of means and ends is actively countered
Emphasis on summative evaluation (i.e. concerning short term result of a learning, research or development process)	Emphasis on formative evaluation (i.e. as a means to improve processes when they take place) and confirmative evaluation (i.e. long-term achievements)
Exams, tests, and grades govern education	Self-reflection, peer evaluation, portfolio work, 360° feedback, reality checks – overall emphasis on systematic, holistic, qualitative feedback loops
Progression measured by credits completed	Progression measured by achievement of personalised commitments enshrined in flexible learning contracts
Narrow, multiple one-stop measurements of intellectual performance	Support of reflexivity on the developmental stages of a broad set of intelligences
Academic theses are the main option to complete studies	A variety of combinations of academic, design and practical work are possible to demonstrate mastery
Scientometrics govern research	Multi-layered, dialogical, qualitative assessment, including stakeholders from outside the academy; focus on supporting individual and collective development based on individual vocation and community needs
Impact factor as main measure of research productivity	Positive psychosocial and environmental impact as main measure of research productivity

Internationalisation	
Most higher education institutions belong to national higher education systems and require internationalisation strategies, accordingly	The U4F model is transnational and multi-local by design and therefore does not require an internationalisation strategy separate from its design as such
The default internationalisation strategy is student mobility, in most cases short term (e.g. Erasmus semester), but the majority of students does not participate in international mobility	The default is intercultural co-creation from day 1
For students participating in international mobility there is generally no preparation for the intercultural experience, nor reflection following the experience	The default is ongoing reflection of diversity as an asset and challenge for co-creation processes
The international dimension is confined to specific study programmes and subject matters (e.g. international relations, intercultural communication, area studies) that are studied only by a tiny minority of students	The international dimension is an integrated part of all study programmes, e.g. by means of international laboratories
The ratio of international to domestic students rarely exceeds 1/10. There is generally no institutional approach to make use of the international experience of students	Learning and research happens predominantly in culturally diverse groups, explicitly taking advantage of the diversity of backgrounds
In most cases, the percentage of international academic staff is low in relation to domestic academic staff. There is generally no institutional approach to make use of the international experience of academics	As default, academics and students work in transnational and transdisciplinary teams
Multilingualism is desired, but there is generally no institutional approach to multilingualism. Teaching happens predominantly in the national language	Multilingualism is constitutive for the daily work and everybody gets used to use more than one language for study and work
Some universities engage in the expensive and risky internationalisation strategy of creating off-shore campuses in selected target countries	Expansion into other countries starts in a lightweight and flexible manner, e.g. through small local labs, and evolves strictly driven by demand

Organisation	
Fixed hierarchy of many levels; culture of positional power	Flat, networked, agile holographic organisation; emphasis on self-organised teams; culture of commitment and responsibility
“Ivory tower” separated from society	Transformation Labs as basic organisational structure in which students, scholars, practitioners and decision-makers collaborate across sectors
Disciplinary departments	Flexible, issue-based (re)configurations
Rule-based bureaucracy	Goal and vision-based organisational flexibility (including institutional experimentalism by means of meta-design and co-design through which stakeholders become systematically involved in organisational redesign, governance and development)
System of formal ranks and titles determining organisational roles – leadership through formal positions	Formal ranks and titles are deemphasized; actual engagement, competence and trust create propensity in the community for organisational roles and leadership
Split between administrators, academics, adjunct faculty and students	Self-administration based on strong subsidiarity and on participation of all stakeholder groups
Focus in organisational development on incremental change of institutions and reforms of institutional systems	Focus on system innovations in ecosystems of diverse organisations
Institutions built / merged to realise economies of scale; growth mentality often leading to dehumanizing and unsustainable giantism; emphasis on quantity	Institutions not growing beyond self-determined human scale; deep relationships and respect of the ecological carrying capacity of each location; emphasis on quality
Establishing a new university is a great challenge and a long process that can only be undertaken by formally qualified “experts” on the basis of substantial funding	The U4F ecosystem model enables smaller players across sectors to contribute to and take advantage of higher education, thus lowering the entry barriers, broadening access and leveraging synergies

Partnerships	
Typically, universities are growing toward larger, internally complex and externally monolithic organisations that develop partnerships, mostly with other universities	The U4F is itself conceived as a partnership, an ecosystem of mostly smaller organisations collaborating across sectors and locations
Science and society are often split from each other by design and tradition; productive and resilient linkages are difficult to create and maintain due to this fundamental split	The basic organisational structures of the U4F, such as Transformation Labs and Learning Villages, are conceived as cross-sector spaces of co-creation in which students, scholars, practitioners, and citizens address grand challenges together
Dependence on third-party funding creates many short-term consortia that rarely outlast project life cycles	Long-term cooperation (e.g. the <i>Alliance for the Future</i> stimulates long-term collaborations beyond single projects)
The role of government is primarily as a regulator and funder, and as a target for lobbying	Governments on all levels are seen as partners of co-creation along with businesses and civil society organisations. The specific opportunity of working with government institutions is to create system innovations in education and other sectors and in changing the role and rules of higher education more generally depending on the success of new models tested in reality
Graduates have to leave their alma mater and are turned into alumni	Every stakeholder has the opportunity to remain part of the U4F ecosystem for their whole life, whereas roles and engagements can evolve organically

Resource Model

<p>In many ways, the academic enterprise has been forced into considering money as its core concern; there has been a creeping commercialisation, commodification and one-sided business orientation of higher education. Economic viability is achieved by profit testing of every unit and every activity, with little attention to systemic and long-term effects</p>	<p>Platonic ideals such as truth, beauty and goodness at the core of the academic enterprise. Economic viability through new economic models embedding higher education at the core of communities, regions and cross-sector networks of organisations</p>
<p>Primary sources of funding are state subsidies, third party research funding and tuition fees (especially in the Anglosaxon world and private higher education institutions)</p>	<p>Increased attention to new core funding models (e.g. pay-it-forward schemes, crowdfunding, impact investments, service learning agreements, transformation projects for organisations and communities, equity in incubated organisations)</p>
<p>Requirement to intensify the search for money in pseudo-markets created by increasing the dependency of universities on competitive third-party funding, entailing a focus on “the next project” and a disinterest in the long-term viability of projects</p>	<p>Primary focus on substance and meaning, not on money: Focus on shaping and realizing unique collaborative visions based on profound ideas, personal integrity, conceptual integration, increasing societal value; and the confidence that these qualities will entail long-term viability and community support</p>
<p>Dichotomy between a decreasing proportion of permanent positions and an increasing proportion of temporary positions creates systemic gaps in many academic careers and partnerships (e.g. lack of support for keeping fruitful collaborations alive beyond project funding, for keeping young academics going between short-term contracts, for continuing promising lines of research or education when funding priorities shift)</p>	<p>Emphasis on continuity, productivity and value of careers of engaged scholarship and of scholar-practitioners; focus on the middle ground, i.e. neither sequences of short-term contracts nor tenure; flexible and case-dependent solutions; gap funding system for individuals, teams and organisations without undermining the principles of self-sufficiency, initiative and entrepreneurship</p>
<p>University budgets concentrated on maintaining existing activities and structures</p>	<p>Concentrating university budgets on facilitating the development of new activities and structures that can become self-sustaining and that actively contribute to catalysing the Great Transition and to the viability of the U4F ecosystem, at the same time</p>
<p>Scholars work for reputation, for money, and for keeping the privilege of academic freedom (whereby academic freedom is becoming more and more constrained in practice)</p>	<p>People work for meaning and impact; work and money become dissociated (e.g. through gift economy and time-banking systems established in the community, through consistent support of personal vocation, etc.)</p>
<p>Salary schemes are often fixed and dependent on job category and seniority</p>	<p>Flexible salaries, depending on actual contribution to overarching goals of the organisation, on actual personal needs and on the success of the organisation in generating societal impact and developing associated income streams</p>
<p>Mix of employment and entrepreneurial activities (of any kind) is difficult or impossible (or conversely excessively practised without benefit for the community, as in many business schools)</p>	<p>Mix of employment and socially-engaged entrepreneurial activities as well as volunteering is encouraged; excessive participation in profit maximizing organisations is discouraged</p>
<p>Decision-making on resource allocation generally happens top-down and exclusively within the respective institution</p>	<p>Decision-making on resource allocation also involves members from the operational level and from communities that are served</p>
<p>Resource allocation is influenced by informal networks, political behaviour and sometimes outright corruption</p>	<p>Communal resource allocation mechanisms designed to respond to actual needs of supported communities and to eliminate undue and one-sided individual influences and manipulative behaviours</p>
<p>Base income depends on quantities (student numbers, square meters of facilities, number of publications, etc.); additional income of increasing share based on competitive third-party funding</p>	<p>Base income depends on quality (depth and breadth) of impact generation capacity; additional incomes based on community support and entrepreneurial success through mission-driven partnerships</p>

Quality Management	
Accreditation through (often private) accreditation agencies applying general standards and procedures developed independently from those to which they are applied	A new Transformative Higher Education quality system favours continuous dialogical co-development and improvement of the standards and procedures with the user communities
Accreditation rules often favour homogenization around the status quo, thus suppressing system innovations	Accreditation rules are designed to recognize breakthrough innovations and to encourage the development of specific quality profiles within the overarching principles of a Transformative Higher Education label
Third party funding systems often myopic, bureaucratic, inflexible, short-term, inefficient, and controlled by status quo networks. Users often react with tactical pragmatism, untruthfulness and face-saving reporting. Control and accountability based on imposed quality assurance systems lead pervasively to tactical, defensive and submissive rhetorical work in the required self-evaluation reports rather than improvement-oriented critical reflection and action	Complete re-design of the funding system, its priorities, procedures and rules. Focus on cultivating trust, entrepreneurialism and personal responsibility (controls are the exception, not the rule; the rule are freely chosen public commitments and verifiable statements on achievements in relation to these commitments that everybody is free to check back)
Audit trails (paper check); emphasis on quantitative indicators	Reviews of real process and outcomes (reality checks); emphasis on qualitative value and societal impact rather than paper checks; allowing projects to improve rather than sticking to inflexible designs, getting rid of timesheets, reductionist indicators and other impact preventing bureaucratic mechanisms
Course evaluation by students based on standard evaluation forms	Continuous improvement of learning environments based on focus groups, mutual learning of teachers, inquiries into reasons for choices student make, database of “stories of learning” from students, success in realising one’s vocation and in community-building, contribution to synergies, etc.
Increasing influence of national and international rankings based on normalising assessment of a limited number of dimensions	The U4F Initiative develops an Education for the Future listing of a diversity of inspiring showcases representing the emerging Transformative Higher Education model
Conviction that quality management systems result in improved quality, even though they take increasing parts of the time away from the core business	Awareness that systemic consequences of institutional quality management systems can deteriorate and undermine quality

ICT	
Overconfidence in ICT as the primary pathway to educational innovation	Emphasis of direct, live, face-to-face interaction, one on one and in small groups
A primary driver of ICT are direct, measurable cost savings (while overlooking indirect and often hidden costs)	A primary driver of ICT is to simplify or complement the learning experience where face-to-face interaction is not possible or where preparation through ICT demonstrably enhances face-to-face experience
MOOCs 1.0, 2.0, etc. as current hype of the future of higher education	MOOCs as one among many complementary options for learning materials
Mountains of papers despite complex ICT systems	Paperless office
Non-integrated commercial software systems	Integrated, open-source software systems
Top-down, expert driven software development	Development of software tools driven by user communities and their needs
Many ICT systems limited by organisational boundaries	ICT systems specifically designed for ecosystems of organisations and communities

Academic Culture	
Tendencies toward “low oxygen” academic culture	Enlivened, soulful community
Overemphasis of self-promotion, individualism and competition	Emphasis on teamwork and cooperation
Self-celebratory academic rituals	Meaningful and profound rituals and rites of transition based on shared values and wisdom; recognition also and in particular earned from communities that are served outside of academia
Student and faculty roles dominate interactions	Authentic interactions of whole human beings; people take on roles in a flexible manner (e.g. everybody is a teacher and learner, depending on the domain and the context)
System of formal ranks and titles	Formal ranks and titles are deemphasized and do not predetermine the roles in teams and organisations. Natural authority of the unpretentious, engaged intellectual and scholar-practitioner
Inaccessible academic language	Vivid, sharp, accessible language
The personal side of “science in the making” is mostly hidden	Reintegration of the personal side of “science in the making” and the results of science
Little attention to the side effects of performance based cultures (fear, dishonesty, strategizing, undermining colleagues, conflict, etc.)	Focus on prevention and healing of negative emotions and behaviours
Ethics enforced by management, reporting, controls, professionalism, code of ethics, ethics commissions	Primary emphasis on the well-being and harmony of teams, integrity of relationships and personal development as sources of moral behaviour
Organisational and team culture favouring acceleration, short term targets and other phenomena leading to stress and burnout	Organisational and team culture favouring personal growth, positive atmosphere, friendship and long-term impact

Recruitment & Promotion	
Universities generally recruit candidates for predefined slots in fixed organisational charts	Organisational units are dynamically formed as support for real-life transdisciplinary communities of practice responding to a grand challenge; everybody is invited to entrepreneurially develop their genuine contribution to the co-creative dynamics
Recruitment based on individual achievements alone	Individual recruitment is possible, but preferred is the creation of organisational boundaries around already impactful teams as well as promising new initiatives – enabling group applications for staff and students
Overreliance on journal publications in hiring academics	Comprehensive recognition of personal qualities, life achievements, and compatibility with existing team members, as well as with organisational vision, mission and culture
Binary logic and fixed institutional boundaries (anybody is either part or not part of the organisation)	Permeable boundaries inviting and enabling various, possibly shifting, types and levels of participation (the whole range from small occasional contributions to full-time engagement)
Split between knowledge and action (i.e. separation of learning and application, of academic courses and internships, of scholars and practitioners, etc.)	Emphasis on the promotion of scholar-practitioners and on co-creation between scholars, scholar practitioners and practitioners

Facilities & Locations

Big multi-story buildings, technicist architecture, landscaping to fit drawing board architecture	Organic architecture and human-scale buildings integrated in natural surroundings and landscapes
Focus on extensions of existing campus sites or on greenfield campus development	Focus on reconversion of brownfield sites, reconstruction of existing buildings, new buildings exclusively as positive impact constructions
Construction of facilities executed by private companies that are otherwise uninvolved in the higher education institution; often by big construction companies that are also uninvolved in the community; strict sequence of first building and then using facilities	Construction sites as dedicated learning environments; user-driven planning, building, interior design and facility management, reconstruction of a site as a permanent stepwise process during its use, extended into the local community
Overbuilt spaces; most rooms separated from the outside	Proper ratio between built environment and nature; connecting the inside and the outside (e.g. through interior courts, winter gardens, interior greening, vertical gardens, terraces, bridges, light seasonal constructions, etc.)
Architecture and landscaping rarely reflect integrated development principles	Land and buildings reflect ecological and permaculture principles, include food production, etc.
Industrial building materials, unhealthy chemicals and concrete; carbon-intensive materials and energy systems, little or no consideration of daily and seasonal natural cycles	Natural or recycled building materials from local environment; positive-energy systems, benefitting from daily and seasonal cycles, e.g. of sunlight, temperature
Prevalence of buildings looking like boxes combined with cubicles for interior spaces; impersonal, sterile atmosphere; insufficient or lacking options for resting and communication; separate sports facilities	Highly differentiated interior architecture attuned to varied creative learning and working environments; inviting atmospheres (e.g. as in living-rooms, stimulation of creativity through intentional use of colours, sounds, artwork, plants etc.); abundant comfortable spaces for resting and communication; fully integrated concept for wellness and regeneration
Pervasive dependence on electric light and air-conditioning; electro-smog in many spaces	Natural lighting and air-conditioning; minimisation of electro-smog; separation of technical rooms from living, learning and working spaces
No integrated water management; limited recycling, external waste disposal	Integrated intelligent water management (e.g. use of rainwater, organic sewage systems); towards zero waste systems: waste avoidance, waste minimisation, advanced recycling, cradle-to-cradle cycles
Cost calculation for buildings based on low initial costs; externalisation of other costs (e.g. related to resource depletion through the extraction of non-renewable materials or to waste disposal of toxic building materials at the end of the life cycle)	Cost calculation for buildings based on entire life cycle; internalization of external costs
Rooms on campus centrally allocated by the university administration for entire semesters, users have little or no choice and are locked in for predefined periods	Users choose rooms and places flexibly themselves, according to arising and changing needs, in any facility available in the multi-local network of partner organisations
Prevalence of commuting and dominance of high-carbon individualised transport	Proximity or integration of living and working; integrated, low-carbon mobility systems (e.g. electric buses, shared bicycles, integration of private and public transport)
Mono-purpose facility use; facility shut down in idle periods	Co-use of facilities through many stakeholders from the community throughout the day/week/year
Commercialism encroaching learning and work spaces	Minimisation of consumerist elements (such as ads, billboards, vending machines, etc.)

Outlook

The shifting from the paradigm of Modernist Higher Education to the paradigm of Transformative Higher Education requires transformative changes in and across all dimensions constitutive for higher education. Any single innovation that is part of the presented U4F model does not in itself assure the realization of the paradigm of Transformative Higher Education. The U4F vision is only realized when it comes to specific, simultaneous and coordinated changes in design and practice across the great majority of features treated in the above comparison tables.

Before an emerging paradigm becomes a widely shared practical philosophy and institutional reality capable of challenging the previously dominant paradigm, there is usually a period of co-existence of paradigms. In this period, ideas, practices and institutions based on different paradigms challenge each other, but also mix and merge in various ways in attempts to adjust to the new requirements of a changing era. There are indications in higher education that we are now entering this period of co-existence. The U4F model is a pioneer that can shape this period and influence developments both in Modernist Higher Education as well as Transformative Higher Education, and how they interact.

We can see the first public and private higher education institutions implement strategies for becoming pioneers of Transformative Higher Education. The gridlocked dichotomy of mainstream higher education (meaning mass multiversities) versus alternative higher education (meaning small, often disregarded and underfunded niche institutions) is currently breaking up. It is hard to predict how this new stage of paradigm pluralism will turn out. In what follows, we would nevertheless like to share a scenario of how it could turn out.

First of all, the typical multiversity is supposed to fulfil three missions, from basic and applied research to mass education to public engagement. While attempting to do everything at the same time (in ways that are only loosely related), it is difficult to do anything well. Multiversities trying to do everything will continue to exist, but their quality in different areas risk lagging behind the following types of institutions with more specific and complementary foci.

1. In research, multiversities are already submitted to heavy competition for research funding with public and corporate research institutes employing researchers without teaching load. The latter have a competitive advantage in bid development over researchers with a teaching load. Furthermore, in various research areas there are large-scale research facilities that are shared by researchers from various institutional backgrounds. For the health of the whole system, there need to be publicly funded and protected spaces for non-utilitarian research — spaces that commercialism tends to neglect and to reduce.
2. In teaching, multiversities compete with big players taking advantage of the economies of scale of e-learning and blended learning, in particular in providing standard curricula for the disciplines and professions that have so far attracted the greatest number of students. Many of these virtual or semi-virtual universities are run as for-profit businesses. Recent developments like MOOCs (version 2.0) reinforce the idea that a teacher can reach many more students than those fitting in a classroom. Furthermore, the open courseware platforms like edX, Coursera, and Udacity, a new phenomenon in this decade, are creating and dominating a different approach to mass teaching. They are not universities themselves, but they pool and produce courses provided by professors from across different universities. These courses are available online, mostly for free. The course catalogue of these platforms expands at a rapid rate. In a few years, it will cover pretty much all fields of knowledge. The reasons to attend a lecture at the multiversity next door delivered in lesser quality is about to dwindle. As a consequence, in the 21st century it can barely be the main task of a university any longer to deliver learning content packaged in courses. Students do not need local universities as intermediaries for world class open courses. On the other hand, standardized and globally delivered courses can only teach established and universalist knowledge. They cannot teach emergent and contextualised knowledge. In other words, these platforms can only deliver knowledge on what is already known. They cannot deliver co-creation of the future in particular contexts as contexts of learning and development. This opens up unlimited new opportunities of human scale local learning centres and learning communities offering facilitation and support for personalised pathways of learning focused on personal and vocation development that neither mass multiversities nor online open courseware can provide.
3. In terms of public engagement, societal relevance and social impact generation, a new diverse international movement has been emerging, the “social labs revolution”. In many places independent “think and do tanks” variously called change labs, social innovation labs, living labs, science shops or future centres, but also an increasing number of social enterprises, are linking knowledge to action in response to grand challenges.

They are either independent, created by activists and entrepreneurs, or by cross-sector consortia. Higher education institutions, however, are not the prime movers of the social labs revolution and only timidly engage with them, if at all.

4. Transversities strongly merge the formerly separate three missions of teaching/learning, research and service to society into integrated streams of activity. The main mission of transversities consists in catalysing the Great Transition, in co-creating desirable futures. The new mission is cultivated where the three traditional missions of higher education overlap. Transversities adopt organisational structures and ways of operating that are championed by social labs. This allows tighter connections to civil society than ever before. Moreover, it allows actively developing cross-sector partnerships centred on conducting transdisciplinary transformation programmes that respond to the grand challenges. As a primary focus, research, teaching and service to society will be integrated within concrete contexts of change-making and societal impact generation. Transversities participate as co-creators, together with other societal stakeholders, in highly context-dependent endeavours of social-ecological transformation that disciplinary inquiry tends to ignore or to consider as too complex to deal with. Transversities furthermore generate meta-disciplinary integrative frameworks and context-sensitive transformative methodologies that can inform and advance many forms of research, teaching and intervention. This is a specific type of basic research of the so-called scholarship of integration that has been structurally neglected in Modernist Higher Education.

Transversities will transform existing fields, define new transdisciplinary fields, renew institutions and generate new professions that will shape society in this century and beyond. In the time to come, there is a much larger potential for transversities than for multiversities, because multiversities are not agile and have a hard time to adapt themselves to the new requirements, while the grand challenges are becoming more and more pressing in society. Transversities are much more embedded in society than any precursor institution of higher education. They represent a version of higher education opposite to the ivory tower model. They are open and connected. Transversities create interfaces and feedback loops with the other types of institutions mentioned above: specialised research centres, online course providers, and social labs. Transversities operate more like local and international hubs linking diverse individual and institutional stakeholders and their respective knowledges and practices to each other, including practitioners' and indigenous.

The emergence of transversities that are oriented by real-life issues, not academic disciplines, will enforce a new balance in resource allocation. It will be challenging to find a proper balance between disciplinary and interdisciplinary research centred on non-utilitarian knowledge production on the one hand, public educational institutions centred on teaching, autonomous social labs, and the integrated transdisciplinary and transformative action-learning-research centred on catalysing the Great Transition. The formerly institutionalised dichotomy between basic and applied research (and respectively focused higher education institutions) might well shift towards a new dichotomy between non-utilitarian and transformative research for the common good (that both have their respective interconnected basic and applied streams).

The U4F model does not focus on non-utilitarian research, nor on mass education for standard professions, even though both can also take advantage of certain suggestions arising from the U4F model. However, the more mass educational programmes would do so, the more they would also risk losing the efficiency gains lowering costs that are part of the pragmatic rationale of such standardised programmes. The efficiency and productivity of the U4F model is much more multidimensional. We do see a continued legitimate place for specialised schools, e.g. for medical or teacher training, architecture or design, IT or engineering, whether as standalone higher education institutions, as part of multiversities or connected to transversity ecosystems of organisations. We advocate the latter solution of embedding them in transversity ecosystems and transforming them accordingly.

The *University for the Future Initiative* does not seek to dominate the paradigm of Transformative Higher Education, nor to define the rules for others. It strives for developing and implementing a variant of this paradigm that is as uncompromised as possible. It seeks to develop free spaces for development, prototyping and implementation. Keeping a different impulse while playing by the rules of the mainstream higher education system is a most difficult endeavour, as many alternative universities have experienced. We believe that the best option is to develop new institutions from scratch. Supporting apt leaders in higher education and society to comprehensively transform existing institutions is a complementary pathway.

As any other impulse of cultural and educational renewal, the development of Transformative Higher Education runs the risk of being undermined or spoiled. The threats are both external (by opponents of paradigm change) and internal (by unpreparedness in relation to systemic dynamics, lack of clear purpose or perseverance, and lack of cooperation across likeminded and complementary initiatives).

As for the external opposition, Transformative Higher Education is likely to come under attack by forces trying to prevent transformative change. These forces are not only individuals or lobby groups, but also the bureaucratic system as a whole.

As for the internal opposition, the risk is no less formidable. As soon as Transformative Higher Education will be recognised as cutting edge, many actors will appear claiming to represent this paradigm. As a result, Transformative Higher Education risks becoming contested, politicized, and commercialised. If Transformative Higher Education becomes a vehicle to make money or acquire prestige, there will be people who will adopt it in rhetoric, dumbing it down to make it more easily sellable. Many players will use its concepts, claiming to represent and promote them, while actually putting a shadow over the qualities inherent in this paradigm through superficial or incoherent practices. Once status quo players adopt the language of Transformative Higher Education, or claim to be the *University for the Future*, we should be very careful and scrutinize the substance of their claims, so as to prevent that future developments converge to the same system as today, albeit in different garments.

We are giving these ideas away for free through creative commons licenses, inviting critical feedback and welcoming and supporting the creation of transversities by many development teams in many places for many different target groups.

About the Authors

Gaudenz Assenza is a transdisciplinary social scientist holding five degrees in different social sciences, including a Master's degree from Harvard University, and a Doctoral degree from the University of Oxford. He has taught at prestigious universities across Europe and the United States. He now chairs the international *University for the Future Initiative*, developing new approaches to education that are responsive to the societal challenges of the 21st century. He can be contacted at gaudenz.assenza@u4future.net.

Markus Molz is a transdisciplinary social scientist holding a Doctoral degree in Educational Sciences from the University of Luxembourg and a Master's degree in Psychology from the University of Regensburg with a Minor in Sociology and a concentration in Intercultural Relations. He serves as coordinator of the *University for the Future Initiative*, managing director of the *Alliance for the Future*, founding board member of the *Institute for Integral Studies* and associate editor of *Integral Review – A Transdisciplinary and Transcultural Journal for New Thought, Research and Praxis*. He can be contacted at markus.molz@u4future.net.

Acknowledgements

We are grateful to Stefan Pecho for his editorial work and ideas that were implemented in the paper.