

SOME COMMENTS ON THE NEW ENROLMENT PLANNING CYCLE

LIS LANGE

UNIVERSITY OF CAPE TOWN

WARNING

- The views presented here are UCT's and do not pretend to represent any other university.
- Whatever I say is said on the assumption that we are among friends who have aged together in HE.

ISSUES

- Conceptual elements in the policy.
- Context of the cycle.
- Technical issues.

ISSUES

- Research
- Teaching and learning
- System level concerns.
- Reporting and governance.

CONCEPTUAL ELEMENTS IN THE POLICY

- Connection between enrolment and funding and between planning and performance reporting in relation to DHET.
- Connection between enrolment and funding and between planning and performance reporting internal to HEIs.

CONTEXT OF THE CYCLE

- Financial/administrative uncertainty.
- Political uncertainty (NSFAS induced protest).
- Policy uncertainty (When will the new funding framework kick in).
- Communication and steering: current letter is no different from previous ones.
- No individual meetings prior to submission.

CONTEXT OF THE CYCLE

- Prediction of performance becoming more difficult (planning uptake).
- Opportunity for correcting targets?
- Growing number of students with undeclared race (gender is next).

TECHNICAL ISSUES

- The tables do not provide sufficiently granular information for internal planning.
- The tables on staff do not provide DHET or HEIs with a real perspective on the level of casualisation and juniorisation of the academic workforce.

TECHNICAL ISSUES

- Why we keep on submitting graduation rates?

(we know that is a meaningless figure in an unstable environment and when we have cohort studies)

- Why are we submitting new tables on CESM categories, no explanation provided (measuring the impact of the new funding framework?)

RESEARCH

- Staff/research output: no granular enough for planning.
- Out of step with transformation imperatives (who is publishing/ who is supervising?)
- Caps out of step with PhD target imperative.

TEACHING AND LEARNING

- Teaching and learning (block grant) funding does not take into account the cost of educating the real students.
- The Foundation Grant is an obstacle to respond to the need for curriculum transformation and decolonisation across all academic years.
- The fact of a four-year undergraduate curriculum?

SYSTEM LEVEL CONCERNS

- Old unsolved issues:
 - Differentiated university sector and the impact on funding.
- What are the targets we are pursuing at PhD level?
- Expansion?

SYSTEM LEVEL CONCERNS

- HEQC (2 years to accredit a programme) and SAQA (no IDs) inefficiency and lack of response to institutions.
- Distance education policy? Why looking for this as alternative expansion at 40% of funding?

REPORTING AND GOVERNANCE

- From an academic point of view the annual reporting is meaningless (technically speaking our performance should be reported on every three years).
- We are reporting annually with a financial audit mentality that is not helping the academic project or enhancing real accountability.

REPORTING AND GOVERNANCE

- From a practical point of view the yearly submission of a mid-year report is a waste of time and resources and it should be scrapped.
- Time frames for the submissions are problematic to get the enrolment plan through all the governance structures.

REPORTING AND GOVERNANCE

- We are reporting annually with a financial audit mentality that is not helping the academic project neither enhances real accountability.
- From a practical point of view the yearly submission of a mid-year report is a waste of time and resources and it should be scrapped.

Thank you