

Följande personer har varit involverade i bedömningen av din ansökan: se bilaga

Följande bedömningar har inkommit till Vetenskapsrådet:

Bo Sundqvist
2006-314
4

This is an extremely interesting and timely Centre proposal.

One of its major strengths lies in the genuinely multi-disciplinary team upon which it draws to investigate Modern History of Education (it is rare internationally to come across such a wide range of disciplines collaborating on the development of the one research agenda).

The case for focusing on this particular topic is well made, with a clear emphasis on historical interpretations which can contribute to better understanding of contemporary trends in educational policy and practice.

The research programme identifies three strands: Governance; Social change, Mobility and demography; and 'Normalisation'. The substance of these draw directly on the relevant contributing work emerging from the Departments of History, History of Science and Ideas, Sociology of Education and Culture, Educational Policy and Philosophy, Business, Literature, Law, Mathematics, Teacher Training plus a number of other sections. (But not, it appears, a Department of Sociology?)

International evidence would support the view of the proposers that research on education is likely to be strengthened by being addressed as a field of study from the perspective of the major disciplines. (Although in passing it might be noted that, given this perspective of the proposers, it is slightly surprising that the text sometimes has a rather nostalgic feel to it, reflecting on a 'golden age' of research on the history of education which needs to be "rescued" (eg p3)).

As the core of the proposal focuses on three strands my comments address these in turn.

Governance

Under this theme four areas are identified which are topical and of considerable international interest – including, the relationship between the state, market and NGOs, and the relationships between local, national and trans- and inter-national agencies. Additionally, as they proposers point out- rightly in my view- many important aspects under this heading (for example, in relation to judicial systems) are under-researched internationally providing an opportunity for the Centre to make its mark in this area internationally.

While the discussion and analysis is of a very high standard, and the track record of previous relevant work well articulated, this section reads more like an extended, and penetrating series of reflections on the issues, rather than strongly focused research agenda. In other words, I

found it rather difficult to ascertain exactly what the focus and outputs would be in the first phase of operation of the Centre under this theme.

Social change, mobility and demography

The outputs in this section are more clearly defined identifying four particular types of studies which will be conducted. One of these is directly concerned with international patterns and especially higher education flows which will be of general interest outside Sweden.

I think this strand in particular might be strengthened by a greater sociological input- for example, in relation to theoretical explorations of the nature of social reproduction of 'elites' and in relation to gender. The latter does come indeed come up as an area for consideration under specific research questions. However, it is somewhat surprising not to see a stronger, more theorised and integrated focus on issues of power, gender and social class which are well developed areas within educational research.

Normalisation

It may be a matter of language, however it took me several readings to understand what was meant by the concept of 'normalisation'. I am not sure this is the best overall title to capture what is encompassed within this strand, which it seems to me essentially shift the focus from structures to educational processes.

However, the main point is that the three areas identified are undoubtedly of interest and significance. One of these does relate directly to the growing individualisation associated with post-modern forms of economic and social life and its impact on educational processes- and also issues of inclusion and exclusion.

The focus on the changing fates of different domains of learning and the way they wax and wane as a result of the interaction of different power factors over time carries, in my view, a particular potential to make a significant and distinct contribution to new knowledge at the highest international standards.

3

This Centre brings together an array of senior researchers, and in fact, it is this engagement from senior academics from a range of disciplines.

It appears from the application that many of these are already working together on the Graduate School.

Most of the publications of most of the team are in Swedish, which unfortunately means they are not accessible to this reviewer. Using however their international connections as a rather approximate indicator, they have links with many of the major international centres in their field.

(a) The proposal indicates that a research leader will be identified for each strand with overall co-ordination undertaken by Professor Broady.

(b) The role of the Advisory Group will be important in setting targets for outputs along agreed timescales as these are left rather vague and open ended in the proposal

© There is strong support from the highest levels of University that this Centre has been identified as one for strategic development- securing engagement from such a wide range of departments is evidently significant in terms of promoting inter- and multi-disciplinary research.

(d) In relation to dissemination the strategy is fine as far as it goes. However, given the fact that a key aspect of the underlying rationale for the establishment of this Centre lies in the utilisation of historical analysis in order to gain a better understanding of contemporary trends, then I would suggest that it would be desirable to develop a more extensive and dynamic connection with the senior levels of the educational policy community, as well as practitioners across all the sectors under consideration.

(e) It would be helpful to identify in an explicit way which of the extensive array of international collaborators will be drawn into the work of the Centre.

If successful this Centre would be well located within an extremely strong research environment. A Graduate School already exists in the area providing an excellent base from which to build with the support of each of the contributing departments.

There is strong support from the University that the Centre is one which fits with its strategic objectives.

4

There has been a view that education systems are so rooted in the particular historical, social and economic conditions of countries that it is difficult to achieve international research excellence in this area.

This Centre proposal does indeed generally take the Swedish educational system as the main object of study. While this is obviously appropriate, for the Centre to achieve an outstanding position internationally it will have to make a contribution to general theoretical development. If this proposal is successful, and the Centre builds upon the specific to create new knowledge in the domains identified, then this would be a major contribution to positioning Sweden in this field internationally.

My overall assessment of this proposal is that, taking on board some of the suggestions made above, it should be extremely well placed to achieve this level of outcome.

1

As a Graduate School already exists in this area, no additional funds are being sought. My research expertise includes comparative education policy, higher education, equality of opportunity, widening access to formal and non-formal lifelong learning opportunities, the participation of adults in education and training, and the role of the university in the community.

I have written extensively on these issues and have acted as a consultant to a range of bodies including OECD, UNESCO, the EC, the Council of Europe, the European Training Foundation, the European Association for Education of Adults, the Scottish Executive, the (previous) Swedish National Board for Higher Education, the New Zealand Qualifications Authority, the US Advisory Council on Continuing Education. I have served on a number of committees connected with the Higher Education Funding Councils of England and Scotland.

Two factors are probably of particular relevance from the perspective of consideration of the Linnaeus Grant proposal.

Firstly, I have been involved in evaluating major social science research center and programme proposals on behalf of the ESRC in the UK (Economic and Social Research Council). I served two terms as member of the ESRC Strategic Research Board and am a member of the Steering Committee for the ESRC Teaching and Learning Programme (TLRP). This is the largest research Programme ever to be funded in the UK on education and learning in formal and non-formal environments.

Secondly, I served two terms on the Continuing Education Sub-Panel (1996 and 2001) for the Research Assessment Exercise (RAE) conducted by the Higher Education Funding Councils across the UK. The RAE establishes a grade for research conducted in every university which, in turn, is associated with national funding allocations.

I have no known relation with any of the proposers

Följande personer har varit involverade i bedömningen av din ansökan: se bilaga

Följande bedömningar har inkommit till Vetenskapsrådet:

Bo Sundqvist
2006-314
4

Dnr
2006-314
Applicant
Sundqvist, Bo
Project Title
Modern History of Education

Grant or Position
*Linnéstöd och Berzelius Center
Research Area
*HS och Utbildningsvetenskap
Code
VR-HS+U
Name of evaluation panel
VR-Humanistic, Social and Educational Sciences Linnaeus Grant

Last day to write reviews.
2006-04-19

Reviewer
Schriewer, Juergen
Suggest Evaluation

Quality, potential and timeliness

4

Comment on Quality, potential and timeliness

The Linnaeus research environment on „Modern History of Education“ would constitute a unique experience in the field of educational studies (understood in a broader social science sense). To my knowledge, nowhere in the world does there exist a research group of similar size, academic strength and multidisciplinary composition which would entirely be devoted to studying, from a social history perspective, the governance, social effects, and instructional practices of a modern educational system. This holds true also when institutions are taken in consideration such as

the History of Education Research Group established over the last ten years or so at the University of Lisbon by António Sampaio Nóvoa, which, in spite of its sociological orientation and comparative outlook, is strongly anchored in the disciplinary framework of Education;

the Paris-based Service d'Histoire de l'éducation which is essentially dedicated, not to undertaking historical research proper, but to establishing dictionaries, collections of source materials, and other compilations meant to serve as bases for historical studies on education; or, finally,

the large History or Education Departments of US Research Universities, which, as a rule, lack both the focus on the History of education and the multidisciplinary orientation.

German Forschergruppen or Sonderforschungsbereiche, on the other hand, are clearly multidisciplinary in composition, to be sure, but in so doing they assemble, under an overarching theoretical perspective or conceptually defined problematique, research projects firmly rooted in each of the disciplines involved, and focusing on issues related to the state of research of those disciplines.

Thus, the proposed research environment on „Modern History of Education“ would be unique both in terms of its institutional size and composition and in terms of its multidisciplinary orientation. A further advantage of the research programme outlined is that it attributes considerable weight to comparative analyses, to a research approach in other words, the pertinence of which for socio-historical explanation can hardly be overestimated. It is, in sum, the very combination of these aspects that conditions the particular potential of the programme to generate new and comprehensive knowledge on the historical shaping of multiple education-and-society interrelationships, and on their long-term social and educational effects. If only because of these aspects, the Linnaeus environment would merit unrestricted support.

The extraordinary assets the Linnaeus environment proposal on „Modern History of Education“ displays, should nevertheless not prevent one from making some suggestions that might be taken into consideration in the course of the research environment's implementation:

(1) Thus, it would be desirable to extend even more the multidisciplinary composition given at the moment by also inviting scholars from fields such as sociology, political science, communication studies, or theology. These are fields of study that, while being pertinent to multidisciplinary research on education anyway, are suited to contribute particularly to investigating into issues and processes of „educational system building“, „governance“, or „normalisation.“

(2) Furthermore, one would like to encourage the scholars participating in the forthcoming Linnaeus environment on „Modern History of Education“ not only to develop comparative research designs on more topics and in more sophisticated ways, but also to subject to systematic scrutiny the incessant relations of intellectual and institutional transfer that have taken place between European societies since the late 18th century. Quite particularly, processes such as the formation of modern educational systems in relation with nation-building processes require both cross-national analysis and the study of political and educational transfer. The pertinence of systematically resorting to these complementary approaches is incidentally illustrated by some of the educational patterns and processes the importance of which is underlined by the Research programme. Thus, in order to fully grasp these processes' significance for either social change and mobility or the historical evolution of teaching technologies, it is no longer sufficient to focus more or less exclusively on the international migration of mainly Swedish students (p. 15) or the implementation of the

monitorial system of teaching in Sweden only (p. 16), and not to take into consideration the broader state of the relevant international research (notes 18, 22 and 23, respectively).

(3) Seen from the vantage point of socio-historical analysis, finally, the limitation of comparative analyses to so-called „dominating educational systems“ (p. 9 and reiteratively) seems misleading both in terms of substance and in terminology. If the American High School or the German University had indeed a far-reaching impact on shaping, in different periods of time, different parts of the Swedish educational system, that system in turn played an important role in the educational reform debates in Western Europe, and particularly in Germany, during the 1960s and 1970s, and again from the late 1990s onwards. Moreover, the term of „dominating countries“ carries a one-sided view of international educational relations in that it tends to eclipse the considerable impact Swedish experts, consultants, and government agencies have had on defining educational reform agendas both internationally and for Third World countries. Therefore, the concepts of „reference societies“ or „model states“ as couched, inter alia, by Reinhard Bendix in connection with his analyses of European modernisation processes seem to be more appropriate to account for a complex reality, not only in history, but also when it comes to present-day internationalisation processes. Likewise, from an analytical point of view, comparative studies of smaller versus larger countries, Protestant versus Catholic countries, or of centralised versus de-centralised systems seem to be more fruitful, for the study of patterns of governance or the formation of educational systems, than analyses that would contrast a small number of purportedly „dominating systems“ with those thought to be more or less „dependent.“

4

Individual excellence

4

Comment on Individual excellence

The proposal is supported by scholars belonging to different disciplinary fields. Most of them can present an impressive list of publications and display a no less impressive array of activities in both national and international bodies, a diversified membership in prominent scholarly societies and/or Academies as well as, last but not least, manifold links with the international academic community. Salient examples are, quite particularly,

Donald Broady, who is to serve as the coordinator of the research environment proposed, with his strong ties to French sociology as well as numerous publications in French;
Ulf P. Lundgren who accumulates a broad expertise in both national bodies such as the Swedish Skolverk and international organisations such as OECD, The Worldbank and different European Union programmes;

Lars Engwall and Kerstin Sahlin-Andersson who belong to the Department of Business Studies – to a disciplinary field, in other words, that counts among the most internationalised ones – and who, accordingly, display a listing of national and international memberships, assignments, visiting scholarships, and publications that is simply outstanding. While clearly displaying, thus, a differential rate of international affiliation in terms of membership, cooperation networks, and publications, all scholars meant to join the proposed research environment are highly productive in terms of research and publishing.

Evaluate the organisational structure described

The organisational structure of the Linnaeus environment on „Modern History of Education“ as described in the application sounds convincing. It seems reasonable indeed to start from existing structures, i.e., to establish the research environment in the form of a collaborative network of the participating research centers and to secure their coordination by the Staff Committee (kollegium) for Educational Sciences at Uppsala University. This coordinating function can hardly be overestimated. Once the Linnaeus funding granted, it will be an important task of the Committee to break down the general research programme into individual sub-projects and to make arrangements for these sub-projects to be carried through in forms that are agreed upon by the participating centers and scholars. Last but not least, this coordination will not fail to also include the intellectual level proper, i.e., the definition of certain key concepts and explanatory models as well as the debate of theoretical and methodical orientations.

Comment on the proposed research environments position in the applicant HEI's strategic planning

Uppsala University provides an ideal academic setting for the Linnaeus environment on „Modern History of Education.“ Several factors may account for this particular situation:

- (1) In intellectual terms, the multidisciplinary composition of the proposed research environment would perfectly correspond to the general „Uppsala model“ for the development of educational studies more generally. According to the Board of the University's Faculty of Educational sciences, the latter should indeed be regarded as an intrinsically multidisciplinary field of studies to which many university disciplines are invited to contribute.
- (2) In institutional terms, Uppsala University already houses the National Graduate School in the History of Education, funded also by the Swedish Research Council. The cooperation of this Graduate School with the Linnaeus environment would facilitate considerable synergies in terms of funding, of personnel, of collaborative research projects, and of supervising forthcoming doctoral theses in the field.
- (3) In overall strategic terms, Educational sciences in general have been developed as one of Uppsala University's major research profiles. This strategic decision has been translated into the establishment of a comprehensive Faculty of Educational Sciences as well as of a Staff

Committee – kollegium – whose composition manifests a clear multidisciplinary orientation, and which is meant to promote any kind of research and graduate education with relevance to educational studies.

(4) In financial terms, finally, Uppsala University has not only invested in the construction of a new Faculty building – the Pedagogicum – but has also accepted to substantially support the Linnaeus environment on „Modern History of Education“ (see Financial plan, Table 2, note **).

4

Overall quality of the application

4

Ranking

Does not apply.

Additional funds for graduate student training

Additional funds for graduate student training do already exist in the form of the National Graduate School (or Doctoral Program) in the History of Education, which was established at Uppsala University in 2005, under a grant of the Swedish Research Council. This doctoral program is also directed by Donald Broady and will be coordinated in close touch with the proposed Research environment. There is no doubt that both networks, the Doctoral program and the Research environment, complement each other in an extremely fruitful way. The successful establishment of this doctoral program should also be considered an important element in Uppsala University's strategic planning.

Your scientific qualifications

Dr. Jürgen Schriewer is Professor at Humboldt University, Berlin, and Head of Humboldt University's Comparative Education Centre. Before being appointed to Humboldt University, in 1991, he was Professor of Comparative Education at Goethe University, Frankfurt am Main. A former Dean of Humboldt University's School of Education, he also served as President of the Comparative Education Society in Europe (1992 to 1996), as Chair of other professional associations, and as a member of policy-related Advisory Boards and Academic Selection Committees both in Germany and internationally. He was a Visiting Professor at the Université Paris-René Descartes; at Waseda University, Tokyo; as well as at the Universidad de San Andrés, Buenos Aires; the Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México/UNAM; and at Stockholm University. Schriewer was awarded the German-Japanese Research Award of the Japanese Society for the Promotion of Science (in 1999) as well as the Research Award of The Bank of Sweden Tercentenary Foundation (in 2001). He is a member of the Editorial Board of Comparative Education (London: Francis & Taylor) and serves as an Advisory Editor of major European, US, and Latin American journals specializing both in Comparative Education and comparative social research more generally.

Schriewer's particular research interests include the comparative social history of education (including the history of Education as an academic field of study in Western Europe), issues of globalization and world-systems research, as well as the history and methodology of cross-cultural research in Education and the Social sciences. Since 1994, he has been a member and co-coordinator of interdisciplinary research networks focusing on cross-cultural studies in history and the social sciences. These interdisciplinary networks – a Forschergruppe and a Sonderforschungsbereich, respectively, – , which have been established at Humboldt University by funds of the German Research Agency (Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft), may by and large be considered as an equivalent to a Linnaeus Grant research environment.

Among his recent book publications, one might mention

- Welt-System und Interrelations-Gefüge (Berlin: Humboldt-Universität zu Berlin, 1994), published also in English, Spanish, Portuguese, and French translations;
- Diskurse und Entwicklungspfade. Der Gesellschaftsvergleich in den Geschichts- und Sozialwissenschaften, edited with H. Kaelble (Frankfurt am Main & New York: Campus, 1999);
- Problems and Prospects in European Education, edited with E. S. Swing & F. Orivel (New York: Praeger, 2000);
- Discourse Formation in Comparative Education, Comparative Studies Series, volume 10 (Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang, 2000, 2003), published in Spanish under the title Formación del discurso en la Educación comparada (Barcelona: Pomares Corredor, 2002) as well as in Chinese (Taipei: Higher Education Publishers, 2005, and Beijing: Beijing University Press, 2006);

Formas de Externalização no Conhecimento Educacional (Lisbon: Educa, 2001);
Vergleich und Transfer. Komparatistik in den Geschichts-, Sozial- und Kulturwissenschaften, edited with H. Kaelble (Frankfurt am Main & New York: Campus, 2003);

Transnational Intellectual Networks. Forms of Academic Knowledge and the Search for Cultural Identities, co-edited with Ch. Charle & P. Wagner (Frankfurt am Main: Campus, 2004; Spanish edition Barcelona: Pomares Corredor, 2006);

Nationalerziehung und Universalmethode – frühe Formen schulorganisatorischer Globalisierung, edited with M. Caruso (Leipzig: Leipziger Universitätsverlag, 2005).

Relation

The Institute of Education of Humboldt University, Berlin, and Uppsala University's Department of Education have been linked by an ERASMUS bilateral agreement since a couple of years. In addition, in 2005, Professor Ulf P. Lundgren served as an external evaluator of a doctoral thesis presented to our Faculty, the major topic of which was on the discursive elaboration, in the frame of the Swedish Parliamentary Commissions, of Swedish educational policies over a period ranging from the 1930s to the late 1990s. Professor Lundgren also repeatedly attended academic symposia organised either at Humboldt University's Institute of Education or in the frame of conferences held by the German Educational Research Association.

Följande personer har varit involverade i bedömningen av din ansökan: se bilaga

Följande bedömningar har inkommit till Vetenskapsrådet:

Bo Sundqvist

2006-314

3

This is a most interesting proposal of very high potential significance for the international field. It is of high quality in relation to the range of the research programmes which certainly would be most useful to develop more fully. It is also most timely for the role that it may be able to play for the fuller understanding of the history of education and the potential implications for the field elsewhere as well as for specific topics within the context of Sweden itself. Governance, social change and normalisation present excellent scope for the development of new research especially if they are informed by interdisciplinary theory and methods as would be the case with this proposal. There may be some aspects that could be developed further - for example one might like to see further reference to gender in relation to social change, and to biography in respect to normalisation. In some ways the proposed outcomes of the programmes may also appear a little vague at this stage and I would be hoping that these could be clarified and developed with clear priorities further established at an early stage. The argument developed about the concept of the modern history of education and of history itself, and the significance of the issues developed for the understanding of current problems could be contested but these ideas together form a potentially potent combination that could help to develop and sustain a major project. These issues are raised from the perspective of being overall highly positive about the principle and the potential of the proposal as a whole.

4

It is a very strong aspect of the proposal that it has assembled such an impressive list of members involved in the application from a wide range of backgrounds and specialisms. There are a number of senior researchers with a great deal of relevant experience to bring to bear from their own disciplines. This experience appears to include support for doctoral students, administration, management and leadership activities of different kinds, and research achievements including a strong output of publications. These do not all necessarily have established international reputations in the history of education but the point of the proposal as I understand it is to bring in and engage more fully with a wide range of areas and the proposal is very well constituted to achieve this it seems to me.

The organisational structure of the proposal seems to me to be very suited to the stated purpose. It proposes a clear structure for coordinating the participating research groups which is based principally on existing frameworks, most notably the Collegium for Educational sciences. This will develop a close relationship with key groups to promote activities. A communication group will also be appointed to coordinate communication activities, involving a broader range of experts and enabling a process of evaluation to be established. This appears a generally appropriate structure, albeit inevitably an ambitious one.

The proposed research environment appears to be well situated in relation to the applicant HEI's strategic planning as a whole. The proposal suggests that the HEI has developed a coherent strategy involving the founding of a Faculty of Educational Sciences and the establishment of a new building for the purpose. The cross-disciplinary activities that are at the heart of the proposal appear to be closely related to the strategic thrust of the HEI's

development in recent years which bodes well for the sustainability and further development of the project.

4

The overall quality of the proposal appears to be outstanding. It offers cross-fertilisation of related research fields and the promotion of added value in the development of an area of research endeavour that appears to have been relatively neglected in this national context. It has international significance also and might well provide an important contribution to work being developed elsewhere. In addition, the model of collaboration that is proposed here might well be one that could be adapted for use in other countries in this general field.

Not applicable

I am currently Brian Simon Professor of the History of Education at the Institute of Education, University of London, and am also currently the president of the History of Education Society in the United Kingdom. My publications and contributions to the history of education in this country and internationally have been developed over the past twenty years. Overall I feel appropriately qualified to evaluate the proposal.

I do not have any connection to this research environment.

Följande personer har varit involverade i bedömningen av din ansökan: se bilaga

Följande bedömningar har inkommit till Vetenskapsrådet:

Bo Sundqvist

2006-314

3

The Proposal is conceptually quite sophisticated and the multi-disciplinary approach adopted very well elaborated. I particularly liked the way that the three sections on governance, social change and normalization are described and integrated and I think that this makes a uniquely generative focus for the proposal.

The use of the word modern is still a little unclear to me and the phrase on page 2 that the use of the word modern is not decisive as a starting date... 'what is of crucial importance is rather that the end is contemporary' seems to beg rather a large number of questions and sets up possibly a need to discuss a little more, whether we are now entering a period which Giddens describes as 'late-modern' and others describe as 'post-modern'. This is the one area where there might need to be a greater degree of conceptualization than is current available in the proposal.

I stress, however, that this is a small issue and that in general the proposal is very well conceptualized.

4

I am also extremely impressed, both by the team that has been assembled, many of whose work I know and am familiar with and the international outreach of the project. The section on international collaboration is very impressive and brings together many of the major authorities in this field

I am impressed that the proposal does not follow the normal temptation to create new structures. This is a temptation that is hard to resist because it always looks innovative and it is always attractive for academics to create 'new worlds'.

I think the Collegium for Educational Sciences will provide successful coordinating functions and after all it is a fairly recent creation itself. Since it is already charged with developing multi-disciplinary approaches to educational research. I think the proposers have been very wise not to 'reinvent the wheel'.

Again it is noted that the opportunity has not been taken to apply for funding for a separate doctoral programme and again I think this restraint is admirable and reflects well on the aspirations of this programme.

I know that the mission of Education Science has been very well profiled and defined at Upsalla. The attempt to coordinate the field of educational sciences and the strategic initiatives that are described on page four seem to me to be very well founded and on a number of visits to the University I have been impressed by the way this mission is being vigorously pursued. The micro politics of coordinating new activities are always contested in academic milieu, but I am persuaded that this mission is well on course and therefore this



research proposal will fit very well with the strategic planning already ongoing at Upsalla University.

4

I think this is a very valuable project (with considerable value added potential). It is well conceptualized, well organized and has substantial international outreach. I think that if it is funded it will provide excellent guidance to a very important field of enquiry.

It is always desirable, I think to provide additional funds for graduate student training and this project would provide a very desirable milieu for such training so if additional funds were available I would certainly support this application for this proposal.

My own work has looked quite closely at some of the issues raised in this proposal. I edited a series called Studying Studies of Curriculum History for Falmer Press, which involved the commissioning of 25 volumes, and I think provided a very important body of work on curriculum on the social history of curriculum. Likewise I have produced a number of studies that look at issues of social change and governance in ways that are quite comparative to what is suggested in this research proposal.

See section on Scientific qualifications above.



Professor Gordon Marshall
Emeritus Professor Peter Burke
Professor Anne Edwards
Professor Colin Hay
Professor Emeritus Robert Heeger
Professor J. Rogers Hollingsworth
Professor. Dr. Ursula M. Staudinger
Slowey, Maria
Schriewer, Juergen
McCulloch, Gary
Goodson, Ivor