Emergent Scholar Seminar
National Higher Education Research Institute (IPPTN)
Universiti Sains Malaysia Penang, Malaysia
October 9-11, 2014

Changing Dynamics of Asia Pacific Higher Education
Concept Paper
Deane Neubauer
John Hawkins

It has become a truism to assert that higher education in the Asia Pacific region has been characterized over the past three or four decades by a set of identifiable dynamics that themselves are characterized by substantial change. Over this period in country after country the capacity for higher education has grown as these societies have embarked on trajectories of economic transformation for which higher education expansion has been a major prerequisite. As differences in such developmental courses have varied because of the particular economic circumstances of individual countries, so has the particular course that higher education has taken. In general, however, it has been possible to identify a set of such dynamics and circumstances to allow focused investigation and in many cases more detailed research.

Background: The International Forum for Education 2020 (IFE 2020) was established by the East-West Center around 2002 to begin to track and analyze such changes. In what became, by 2005, a series of annual seminars, entitled senior seminars to reflect the fact that most participants were indeed, senior scholars the center sought to identify and analyze these change elements and some of their consequences. This research manifested itself through a series of edited books and special journal issues. In 2013 the IFE 2020 was transformed into a membership organization called the Asia Pacific Higher Education Research Partnership (APHERP), at which time the number of senior seminars was increased to two a year. Throughout this period the following publication work has resulted, with the last three volumes currently under editorial review.

1) Peter Hershock, John Hawkins, and Mark Mason, editors, **Changing Education: Leadership, Innovation and Development in a Globalizing Asia Pacific**. Hong Kong: Comparative Education Research Center and Springer, 2007. Reprinted in Chinese and Japanese editions. This first book contained work developed over the course of the first three seminars between 2002 and 2004. At this time, the IFE was concerned with the

whole of education throughout the region and most specifically attention was giving to what appeared to be the changing paradigm (s) of education.

2) **Journal of Asia Pacific Public Policy, Vol. 1, # 2, June 2007,** Special Edition: Tensions Between Higher Education as a Public Good and Private Commodity, guest editor Deane Neubauer

This issue reflected the work done in a senior seminar held at the East-West Center in 2006 in which contributors sought to examine changes occuring in the ways in which the public good in general was understood, and in particular how it was being differentiated in an Asian-Pacific set of contexts.

3) T. Bigalke and D. Neubauer, editors, *Quality and the Public Good in Asia Pacific Higher Education,* Palgrave-Macmillan, 2009. This volume contained some additional work on issues of the public good, but in this instance framed by the broad issue of quality in higher education. This attention to quality issues was to continually reappear in subsequent senior seminar contexts.

4) D. Neubauer and Y. Tanaka, *Access, Equity and Capacity in Asia Pacific Higher Education*, Palgrave Macmillan 2011. This volume contained work initiated at the first senior seminar held within the Asia Pacific region, at National Cheng Chung University in Chia-yi, Taiwan. Here the seminar focused on the the manner in which these three critical higher education "factors" tend to co-vary with each other, and the complex policy dynamics that are created as a result.

5) D. Neubauer, ed. *The Emergent Knowledge Society and the Future of Higher Education*. Routledge, December 2011. This volume was developed through the 2009 Senior Running throughout all these previous seminars had been the constantly transforming issue of how the emergent knowledge society was impacting how higher education is conceived of as a social enterprise. This volume has come, like the others, to operate as a kind of "assumptional floor" for other seminars as many of the concepts and assumptions we employ find use in other settings.

6) *Quality in Higher Education*, D. Neubauer, John Hawkins and Thalya DeMott co. editors, available at: http://publications.apec.org/publication-detail.php?pub_id=1204 In 2011 the East-West Center and the University of Hawaii combined to host an APEC conference focused on quality issues in higher education. 20 of the 21 APEC economies participated in the three day meeting. Papers and other related documents are available at the website sited above.

7) D. Neubauer and Kazuo Kuroda, eds. *Mobility and Migration in Asia-Pacific Higher Education*, Palgrave 2012. In 2010 the senior seminar was conveyned at J.F. Oberlin University in Tokyo to examine issues of mobility and migration. In this seminar we sought to examine a wide range of "circuits of exchange" that have come to characterize

Asia Pacific higher education, the most commonly referenced being cross boarder student flows.

8) John N. Hawkins, Ka Ho Mok, and Deane Neubauer, editors. *Regionalization and Governance in Asia Pacific Higher Education,* Palgrave Macmillan, 2012. In 2011 the senior seminar was held at the Hong Kong Institute of Education, focused on the broad issue of regionalization and its attendant issue of governance. Central to the papers presented at this meeting was the effort to distinguish regionalization from regionalism and to provide a common set of concepts that could prove useful in the analysis of the varying sub-regional forms of governance making an appearance.

9) Vol.1, No. 1, *Asian Education Development Studies,* 2011, Deane Neubauer Guest Editor was devoted to the regionalization theme as well with earlier versions of some of the papers that came to be included in the subsequent book.

10) D. Neubauer, J.C. Shin, and John N. Hawkins, editors. *Dynamics of Higher Education Development in East-Asia*—2013. In this 2012 senior seminar at Seoul National University, senior seminar participants focused on four contesting hypotheses concerning the nature of the continuing emergent Asian university. The developmental nature of this seminar moved the discussion into its concluding session which focused on the question of whether one can identify a distinct hybrid Asian university.

11) The first senior seminar under the revised APHERP organization was held in Hong Kong at the Hong Kong Institute of Education in September 2013 on the subject Research, Development and Innovation in Asia Pacific Universities. The book derived from this seminar is currently in production with Palgrave Macmillan, edited by Ka Ho Mok and John Hawkins. Publication is expected in 2014.

12) The second senior seminar of 2013 was held at East China Normal University in November 2013 on the subject of 21st Century workskills and learning competencies. The papers from this seminar are have been developed into a prospectus submitted to Palgrave Macmillan for publication, edited by Deane Neubauer and Kamila Ghazali. Publication is expected in late 2014 or early 2015.

13) The most recent senior seminar and the first of 2014 was held in March at the Royal Melbourne Institute of Technology University in Melbourne, Australia on the subject of changes taking place in graduate education in the Asia Pacific region. The papers for this volume have been organized into a prospectus and will be submitted to Palgrave Macmillan for publication, edited by Deane Neubauer and Prompalai Buasuwan. Publication is expected in 2015.

14) The second senior seminar of 2014 will be held at the Hong Kong Institute of Education in October 2014 on the subject of the differential patterns emerging for the massification of higher education in the Asia Pacific region.

The Tool Kit: Throughout the history of IFE 2020 and APHERP, the coordinators of those programs have utilized the content of these seminars to create an extensive and constantly changing curriculum for a leadership institute that is conducted once a year. In 2014 it will be held at National Cheng Chung University in Chia-yi, Taiwan. We have found that this dense and intensive institute provides a meaningful immersion experience for participants. Over the years of its existence the staff at the East West Center has produced what they have termed a "tool kit" of concepts that they have found useful in their own work and that owe much to the nature of the presentations and discussions that have constituted the senior seminars. A recent version of the tool kit is appended to this document for the reader's review.

The Seminar: The seminar being proposed by this concept paper is directed specifically at younger scholars just beginning to publish in the area of Asia Pacific higher education. We will conduct the first seminar to be held in Kuala Lumpur October 9-11, 2014 much as we have previous senior seminars.

1) A concept paper is prepared by staff and supplied to prospective attendees. Participants are free to address that aspect of the concept paper that most interests them. These papers are usually about 3000 words.

2) Prior to the meeting each participant is requested to develop a brief <u>partial</u> paper addressed to this subject matter. The reason for the partial paper is that we wish it to work as a platform for the argument being presented, but also for that argument to be open for development through discussion at the seminar.

3) During the seminar notes will be taken of all the discussions and provided to attendees.

4) After the seminar editors will be selected and if the volumes are selected for publication, the editors will contact contributors to recommend modifications and completion of their papers based on seminar discussions. Final papers will be requested to be between 3500 and 4500 words.

Publication of the papers, depending on the nature of the content, will be directed at a relatively new publication series of Palgrave Macmillan, called the *Pivot* series. Books in this series will be shorter (typically 45,000 words rather than 80-90,000) and the publication time frame 4-6 months.

The seminar is being hosted by the Ministry of Education of Malaysia and will be conducted through the auspices of the National Higher Education Research Institute which is located at the Universiti Sains Malaysia, located in Penang, Malaysia. Facilitators for the seminar will be Professor Christopher Collins of Azusa Pacific

University of California and Deane Neubauer, Professor Emeritus of the University of Hawaii and Co-Director of APHERP.

Developing your paper topic. In this first seminar of what we intend will be a series, we are utilizing the framing of 'the changing dynamics of Asia Pacific higher education." One purpose for providing a listing of the activities of the senior seminars is to suggest a set of dynamics that we have chosen in the past to examine or on which we are currently working. We see these all in some way as part of the dynamics of change that are impelling AP higher education. Others might come readily to mind. For example, in an echo of the Access, Equity and Capacity seminar, an investigator may want to provide a closer look at how current demographics are affecting the ways in which higher education is being both conceived and acted upon in various counties—those in which declining birthrates are characteristic have generated "excess" higher education capacity with different responses occurring country by country. Or, to take another example, not yet covered by one of our seminars, the rapid growth of income inequality throughout the region is having considerable impact on how higher education is being provided and developed in various settings. And to offer just one other example, one aspect of the progressive "liberalization" of various societies is a recalibration of the degree to which the state in any or all its forms should finance higher education. And finally, as a review of the APEC papers will make clear, quality issues present themselves in any number of ways across this intellectual landscape.

How to become a seminar attendee:
APHERP is providing 16 "slots" in this seminar. Three are reserved for the Ministry of Education as the sponsor of the event. The rest will be assigned to applicants on a first come—first serve basis. If you wish to propose someone at your institution, please send the name and a brief bio, along with a tentative paper topic to:

Deane Neubauer, deanen@hawaii.edu

Please send name and bios as soon as you are able. Tentative paper topics will be due September 1, 2014.

As has been indicated in previous communications, arrangements for this seminar are that the sending institution will be responsible for international airfares. APHERP and its coordinating sponsor will provide local transportation, meals and accommodation for four nights as well as editorial services and negotiations with the publisher or publishers for materials produced for the seminar.

THE IFE 2020 TOOL KIT

The staff of 2020 has been developing a set of heuristics or learning devices that provide a common core around which the sessions at our leadership institutes are formulated. These are concepts we have found particularly useful in understanding the complex ways that increasing global interdependence is impacting higher education. Collectively, they constitute an open "tool kit" which we are continuously refining and adding to— one that we hope you will carry home with you and adapt to the specific circumstances in which you are working.

We do *not* imagine this tool kit as providing information about how things actually are educationally. Rather, we envision it as offering some strategically chosen points of departure for developing a conversation about higher education and contributing to a better understanding how educational practices and institutions have come to be as they are—and the kinds of responses the might be most effective in relation to them. None of the "definitions" that you will find should be taken as complete. We see ourselves as developing a of "orientations" that may lead to gaining a fuller appreciation of how these concepts and approaches may be of use to you.

The tool kit is separated into two parts: "areas of tension" and "concepts." "Areas of tension" refer to key sites associated with generating and expressing the interplay of contrasting, competing and, at times, contradictory forces throughout the global system. These are places where educational stresses are often most acute—regions in which the needs for and realities of change are especially evident. We have organized several of our senior seminars and leadership institutes around these areas of tension.

In the "concept" part, we address important ideas and distinctions that we have found useful in entering into each of the areas of tension to develop better understandings of their dynamics, to explore how they interrelate, and to assist in drawing out both analytical and policy-relevant insights related to them.

1) **Areas of tension**

Paradigms

An initial premise of the IFE 2020 senior seminars and leadership institutes was that contemporary educational practices and institutions can usefully be seen as expressing a quite specific, historically developed paradigm—a particular approach to education— that has been evident throughout the world over many decades, but which has come under stress with increased global interdependence.

Minimally defined, paradigms express long-standing alliances of strategies for understanding and action, structured in accord with abiding sets of values. Thus, like all paradigms, the now-globally dominant approaches to education express a distinctive configuration of both theoretical and practical commitments, defining the key problems faced by education, establishing norms and agendas for educational research and assessment, and setting the overall horizons of educational discourse. A sense of the scope and key features of the dominant educational paradigm can be gained by considering what is brought concretely to mind by references to differences between formal and informal learning.

Seeing current educational practices and institutions as concrete aspects of a globally dominant paradigm neither suggests nor legitimizes overlooking important local,

national and regional variations that are occurring in higher education. Instead, it enhances our likelihood of identifying significant "family resemblances" that link across local, national and regional boundaries in ways that are critically useful. This encourages seeing possibilities for educational research and leadership that go beyond seeking and gaining incremental reform, but rather aim at tackling more fundamental issues in how educational institutions and practices are shaped by—and, in turn, shape—the dynamics of global interdependence.

Paradigm change contrasts sharply with reform-oriented change and can be described as a function of the phenomenon of emergence. That is, paradigm changes are not engineered, they evolve. Making use of the problem/predicament distinction (see below), it is possible to contrast reform approaches to change as treating educational shortfalls as *problems to be solved*; whereas, paradigmatic approaches to change engage educational shortfalls as *predicaments that must be resolved by taking new creative actions*. During the 2020 institutes we work through exercises in which we identify various aspects of the dominant paradigm as it is manifest in diverse higher education settings, seeking also to identify the elements of transitional and/or newly emergent paradigms.

Globalization

Globalization is among the most complex contemporary phenomena, and now constitutes a distinctive nexus of academic activity and concern. Tensions exist in scholarly approaches to globalization, but also in the dynamics of the change processes themselves that are associated with it, particularly those aligned with greater homogenization and standardization on one hand and those aligned with greater heterogeneity and individuation on the other.

Globalization processes are facilitating greater fluidity and boundary crossing—of ideas, organizational models, and people—with such effects as nationally based higher education systems being infused with international resources and evaluated in terms of global standards and ideals. Such systems are also often subjected to rapidly fluctuating pressures to adapt to needs and interests outside the education sector as such. The so-called issues of "alignment," for example, are no longer plausibly framed in strictly local or national terms, but must be viewed as powerfully affected by the shifting dynamics of global production, labor and design markets, and the movements of global capital.

Quality

Quality has a strong intuitive appeal to people, and most would claim that although they find it hard to define, they know quality when they see it. But quality has come to enjoy a highly contested status within higher education as a concept/outcome brokered between higher education, the policy sector and the public. That is, a tension exists between conceiving of quality as a unique aspect of the character of education, and conceiving of it in terms that are essentially quantitative and therefore capable of being quantified and compared.

Parallel tensions exist between seeing quality as a function of emergent and opening patterns of opportunity or one of achieving specific, measurable outcomes. Tensions are often identified between viewing quality by identifying complex relationships (among, for example, higher education, industry, government, and public culture) or with respect

to individuals (students, departments and institutions) as the appropriate "units of analysis" in quality assessment.

Globally, dominant efforts to define higher education quality are closely tied to those designed to identify and measure it, especially in institutional processes of quality assurance, assessment and accreditation. We link quality issues to the shifting balance between public and private provision of higher education as a distinctive public good, but also between public and private interpretations of how higher education best serves competing notions of "the public good." These tensions are represented with particular force in struggles to align quality with capacity.

Public good/private commodity

'Public goods' are those things and outcomes provided through public sector action and made available to citizens (and others) in ways that are neither rivalrous (that is they do not compete with each other) nor divisible. Providing education as a public good has been argued as crucial for nation-state development and wealth generation for more than three centuries, and the globally dominant educational paradigm has had as one of its foundational cornerstones a commitment to publicly providing universal basic education.

But over the past several decades, higher education in particular has been subjected to an array of powerful commercializing forces at the same time as governments have been trending globally toward privatizing the provision of traditional public goods like transportation infrastructure, drinking water, and education. Considerable controversies now exist about whether higher education is best provided publicly, privately, or through public/private hybrids of various sorts. In particular, tensions have begun emerging between the dynamics of higher education provision (whether public or private) and its public good purposes.

We have found it useful to explicitly distinguish the *provision* of higher education as *a public good* and the *purpose* of serving **the** *public good* that is traditionally attributed to higher education. 'The public good' connotes both a present status and goal, encompassing determinations of both means and ends from within the citizenry, typically in terms of particular legitimacy discourses linking leaders and the led, governors and the governed. 'The public good' is what is best for "each and all of us," and its determinations vary widely across, but also within, cultures and societies.

In a completely homogeneous society, there might be minimal tension related defining and accepting **the** public good. But a plurality of interests brings to light differences—and potential tensions—in the conception of public good and hence the purposes of higher education. As higher education becomes increasingly globalized, such tensions can easily intensify. But important issues are also now being raised as to whether higher education contributions to **the** public good might be adversely affected if higher education is no longer treated as **a** public good. That is, tensions are beginning to appear between issues of provision and purpose as such.

Capacity

When discussed in the context of higher educational systems, capacity is seen to embody the physical, social, intellectual, fiscal and probably political and moral ability of an entity (nation state, province, municipality, private entity) to create, maintain and

sustain higher education activity. Capacity is directly related to level of pretense or aspiration, and is knowable through various means of measurement, monitoring and assessment. Tensions in regard to higher education capacity reflect shifting arrays of interests and values, and often the changing complexion of higher education's public good(s) profile.

For example, research capacity and teaching capacity are often in direct competition for limited resources, with each reflecting distinctive dimensions of quality assessment, serving public good purposes, and establishing institutional ranking. In the context of increasing higher education globalization, tensions also exist in regard to whether capacity needs to be understood in a single (for example, national) or multiple (for example, cross-border) contexts.

Cross border

Cross border issues are increasingly central to discussions about the future of higher education. Growing global interdependence has been recognized within higher education for decades, usually seen as "international education" and having its primary manifestations in student and faculty exchanges between countries. Over the past decade, and especially since the passage of the GATS agreement, higher education has been redefined in part as a tradable commodity, and the amount of "globalized education" taking place is on the increase. We have come to realize that cross border education phenomena are prevalent in multiple ways in many countries, constituting a significant component of service trade, and are associated with an environment characterized by continual change. Cross border education has become a major component of the transformations taking place within the higher education private sector environment, as well as a central element of how quality is recognized within higher education.

Leadership

Our approach to leadership in 2020 has not been to stipulate what it might "be," but to suggest problematically that what we know about leadership may have to be rethought in the context of tensions between the homogenizing and pluralizing effects of globalization and changing educational paradigms.

One effect of globalization on higher education has been a tendency to recognize the necessity and value of standards and standardization. We have argued that leadership is one arena in which standards and standardization have potentially negative consequences of narrowing the cultural bases and resources for educational leadership. Empirical evidence exists that differences in leadership approaches may yield considerable benefits, especially in cross-border or multicultural contexts. A post-industrial leadership model may require a "de-centering" of leadership, both within the classroom (in which the receiving student is replaced as object by an active learner) and within the administration and visioning of higher education. This has been a basic component of how we discuss the changing classroom, and the progressive shift in quality assurance and accreditation toward assessing higher education on the basis of outcomes and opportunity structures rather than inputs—or toward asking questions about alignment and learning, rather than merely tallying inputs in terms of some accepted metrics.

2) **Conceptual Tools**
Interdependence
We have used this concept in very general ways to refer to the interactive dynamics within and among complex systems. Focusing on interdependencies emphasizes attention to relational dynamics. Global interdependence is demonstrated and concretely illustrated by the interrelationships among the many parts, elements, actions, structures, dynamics and impacts of globalization. A key feature of our approach is to attempt to identify clearly the various 'parts' of higher education as a complex whole and indicate how these parts interact. We also examine how these interactive dynamics are linked to other systems (social, economic, political, technological, and cultural) and the relationships among them.

Our approach has also emphasized that there are many different "lenses" through which to view globalization, describe and analyze it, and value it. This approach also emphasizes that globalization will appear differently depending on where one is "located" within it. Our goal is to promote a self-consciousness of this location for all participants, seeking to engage us all in reflection on where the portion of higher education we inhabit and interact with is located in the global educational landscape.

Complexity
Complexity is understood as that attribute of physical and social environments in which the interactive effects are such that predictability (and to some degree explanation) is limited, often in association with what is now commonly referred to as "emergence" and the generation of ironic or unintended consequences. Complex systems are characterized by feedback and feedforward relationships that facilitate patterns of mutual adaptation between systems and their environments. *Complexity* is not just a function of high numbers of variables—as in complicated systems—but rather of a distinctive *quality of system dynamics*. The contemporary system of global interdependencies interfusing the social, economic, political, technological and cultural domains is well treated as a complex system.

Emergence
Emergence is a property of natural and social phenomena, often poorly understood, in which novel patterns of behavior arise interactively. Emergence is often associated with complex systems and with re-configurations of existing resources in ways that yield "wholes" that are greater (or at least other) than the sum of pre-existing parts. Emergence is also associated with the super-additivity potentials implicit in diversity. Networks and information systems are increasingly seen to be associated with emergent phenomena. Exploring the social and educational implications of the information and network revolutions takes one in the direction of exploring the nature of emergent phenomena and has the potential for triggering a paradigmatic rethinking of the means to and meaning of knowledge generation.

Problems and Predicaments
We have found it useful to draw a qualitative distinction among the kinds of difficulties posed by global interdependence, the impacts of scale, and issues of difference.
Problems arise when changing circumstances make evident the failure of existing practices for meeting abiding needs and interests. *Solving* problems involves developing

new or improved means for arriving at ends we intend to continue pursuing.
Predicaments occur when changing circumstances lead to or compel awareness of conflicts or competition among values, aims, interests, and constructions of meaning. Predicaments are *resolved* through enhancing clarity about situational dynamics and meaningfully coordinating commitments. Whereas problem-solution typically does not require a reconfiguration of situationally relevant values, predicament solution always does so.

Difference

Issues of difference are central to addressing both problems and predicaments, especially in the context of increasing global interdependence and its affects on education in terms of such key factors as access, quality, equity, interdisciplinarity, and multiculturalism. We have found it useful to engage difference as an intrinsically dynamic process and as the basic condition for mutual contribution. That is, *difference* signifies ongoing *processes of differentiation*.

Diversity and Variety

In the context of recognizing the dynamic nature of difference, we have found it heuristically useful to distinguish between variety and diversity as two types, orientations or meanings of differentiation processes. **Variety** is a function of simple co-existence, a *quantitative* index of factual multiplicity: a surface characteristic that is visible at a glance. **Diversity** is a function of complex interdependence, a *qualitative* index of self-sustaining patterns of mutual contribution: a relational achievement evident, if at all, only over time.

Equity and Equality

Concerns about difference are implied in each of the areas of tension noted above, as well as in the dynamics of their interdependence. In responding to these concerns, appeals to the values of equality and equity differ importantly.

In practice, promoting **equality** involves establishing parameters of relevance. That is, equality is never total and so principles or 'rules of thumb' must be employed in determining what commonalities are centrally relevant and what differences are irrelevant. Appeals to equality are useful in establishing thresholds of acceptability or minimal standards (as in universal human rights conventions), and often assume that the test of how well equality-promoting policies are working is well they respect and protect the fundamental independence or autonomy of each.

In contrast, promoting **equity** involves taking differences more fully and aptly into account. Appeals to equity assume the irreducible nature of interrelationships and seek to insure that their dynamics exhibit fairness to all. Appealing to equity is useful in establishing conditions for shared flourishing, and crafting common patterns of aspiration. One operational definition of equity that stresses its relational nature is that equity is enhanced when all relevant individuals (persons, communities, states, etc.) enjoy capacities-for and commitments-to acting resolutely in their own self interest, in ways that are deemed valuable by others.

These minimal characterizations suggest that policies framed in terms of achieving greater equality and equity may be differentially effective in responding, respectively, to problems and predicaments. That is, an equality bias will tend to encourage framing

issues of concern in terms that idealize homogeneity of response, whereas an equity bias will tend to encourage framing these "same" issues in terms that idealize heterogeneity of response. In basic education, *gender inequality* might be addressed, for example, by legislatively mandating education for all and insuring that enough teachers are hired and classrooms built to insure that space is available to all boys and girls in a given locale. Boys and girls are treated the same to insure common educational opportunities. A bias toward addressing *gender inequity* will involve taking into account differences in personal, familial and cultural values surrounding gender, employment expectations, and aspirations for civic or political contribution in framing policy recommendations. Boys and girls will be treated differently to insure fair educational outcomes.

It should be noted that in educational (as well as broader development) contexts, equity is most often defined in terms of "equality of opportunity." But such a reduction of equity to equality runs the risk of biasing educational change in the direction of problem-solving reforms rather than predicament-resolving paradigm innovation.

Innovation

Innovation has come to be highly valorized, not only in education, but in virtually every domain of contemporary life. Often, however, innovation is understood as a "one-step" process: a new idea or practice is formulated and then implemented, innovation complete. In 2020, innovation is understood to be on ongoing activity of *creative engagement*, where creativity implies, not simply change, but *significant change*. To capture this, we speak about the need to "innovate innovatively." Innovation involves continuously evolving strategies for discerning how best to make meaningful contributions.

For instance, if we fully acknowledge the complexity of the educational challenges that are being faced in each country, we can ask what kinds of creative engagement might work to bring about feedback/feedforward loops suited to fostering the emergence of paradigm-challenging initiatives? Innovating innovatively requires structuring such initiatives in ways that are at once recursive and open--that is, in ways that are conducive to engaging in ongoing challenges of the axiomatic and presupposed.

For instance, a major axiom seems to be that "educational equity" depends on broadening educational access. This axiom operationalizes a very complex relationship in a way that suggests the work is done when doors are opened and classrooms supplied with teachers and texts. But if equity is tied to diversity (as we've argued), then there are real questions about the content, purposes and cultural modalities of education that have to be factored in alongside access. Like human rights that warrant certain ideal structures of opportunity for each, but cannot guarantee positively progressive structures of outcomes for all, access to education cannot by itself insure equitable structures or processes of learning. Understanding the task of realizing more equitable education as one of innovating innovatively leads to seeing educational equity, not as a pre-determined destination, but as a continuously revealing direction.