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This paper discusses developments in open and distance education in Australian and Japanese universities. It argues that these call for transformational leadership and outlines the steps that leaders need to take in encouraging and supporting change.
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Australia

Australia's universities are autonomous and self-accrediting but government audited. In recent years, the student cohort has grown and diversified. Fewer than 50% of students enter straight from school, and 41% are part-time. Study costs have been transferred from the state to the individual, faculty and funding have been reduced, and Australian and international full fee-paying students and distance education have been used to generate additional income. Distance education has been transformed into open and flexible learning, from a marginal and equity-driven to a mainstream and commercially-driven activity, and from the use of print and correspondence to a mix of methods and media including information and communications technology (ICT). About 14% of Australian university students now study through open and distance education. Sixty percent of these live in or near the main cities, the main need being for flexibility rather than to overcome the tyranny of distance. Another factor leading universities to adopt open and online learning is their fear of increased competition from local institutions and international, virtual and private providers. Thus the moves into open and distance education are in response to external circumstances rather than central direction by government. There have been some great achievements. There are also instances of 'technological determinism', institutions seeking 'quick fix' solutions, faculty making 'lone ranger' ventures into online learning without adequate support, and focusing on the 'digital products' rather than the learners' needs. McInnis (2001)
reveals that 66% of faculty nation-wide are engaged in developing ICT courseware, 72% with computer-based learning, and 46% in distance education. Two-thirds of these report that this work has a major impact on their teaching and accounts for half their working week. Their main motivations are the availability of the technology, university policies and student expectations. Few receive any formal training for this work and most would like to see it accorded equal status with research in the promotion criteria.

Japan

Moves towards the wider adoption of ICT began with the 1996 Advisory Council report, Higher Education by the Use of Multimedia in the 21st Century, supported by NIME’s research into the use of technology in Japanese and overseas universities. This report stressed the urgent need for higher education to respond to societal and global change, to match world’s best practice and to use multimedia and flexible learning to expand and reform higher education and provide more opportunities for life-long learning. It made recommendations regarding the hardware, infrastructure and learning environments needed for such change; for a national institute to support such initiatives and undertake research and development; and for the transformation of correspondence education into ICT-based open and flexible learning. The higher education system was subsequently reviewed by the University Council, various measures were put in place, and NIME was reorganized to be the core institution to meet these challenges (NIME, 2000). These government policies have been adopted (see, for example, Ministry of Education (2000) and www.mext.go.jp) and the ICT infrastructures put in place. What now appears lacking is the long-term vision and leadership needed to bring about systemic change in policies, attitudes and practices. Most faculty seem unaware of the threats to the system and imperatives for change. The Japanese economy is under-performing. New responses are needed to meet the challenges of globalization and the information age. Japan’s image as a technological giant and innovator is fading, the country is falling behind other industrialized countries in e-education and e-commerce, and there is growing competition from overseas, virtual and private educational providers.

Leadership

It is interesting to consider the Australian 'bottom up' and Japanese 'top down' approaches to higher education reform. Hammer and Stanton (1995) claim that change can never be solely bottom-up and that without top-down leadership and total commitment, failure may not be immediate but is inevitable. They conclude that the quality of organizational leadership is an absolute predictor of success and that leaders must create an environment in which staff not only feel that it is safe to have breakthrough ideas but expected of them. Japan and Australia both face the need to improve the quality and equity of their higher
education systems and transform traditional locally focused and face-to-face institutions into open and flexible providers with internationalized curricula and student cohorts. Such transformations require leadership at all levels and in their study into leadership for 21st century learning, Latchem & Hanna (2001) conclude that leaders of such change need to:

1. **Analyze and make judgements about:**
   - international, national and local needs and opportunities for open and distance learning
   - existing and potential markets and competitors
   - commercial opportunities and/or cost savings
   - opportunities for change, innovation and improvement in what is taught and how it is taught
   - unrecognized or underutilized internal and external opportunities and resources

2. **Work with key stakeholders to:**
   - define a strategic plan
   - define the key customers
   - determine the costs and the benefits
   - identify who will be accountable for the change or innovation
   - establish the major risks and counter-measures
   - determine the workload and timeline factors

3. **Gain commitment by:**
   - 'walking and talking' the vision and goals
   - forming powerful coalitions to drive the change, innovation or improvement
   - establishing a sense of priority and urgency
   - ensuring that managers, teams, lines of responsibility, support systems and resources are in place for the tasks ahead

4. **Ensure that the following are attended to:**
   - funding
   - intellectual property and copyright issues
   - faculty release, recognition and reward
   - professional development
   - technology support
   - administrative and entry systems
   - assessment and examinations
   - accreditation, credit recognition and credit transfer

5. **Lead the process by:**
   - encouraging risk-taking
   - nurturing 'change activists'
   - supporting the 15-20% of faculty who are 'early adopters'
   - gaining commitment to quality assurance
・ ensuring that key customers ‘buy in’ early to the change, innovation or improvement
・ achieving visible performance or productivity gains
・ sharing the successes with the 45-50% of faculty who are likely to change
・ changing any systems that undermine the vision or faculty endeavours
・ creating internal and external networks to share experiences
・ attempting to bring along the laggards
・ standardizing new approaches as they are proven and accepted

And finally, if all else fails:
・ create new institutions, commercial arms or strategic alliances.
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