



國立臺灣大學
National Taiwan University

Our Digital Future in a Divided World

**22nd APRU ANNUAL
PRESIDENTS' MEETING**

**JUNE 24-26, 2018
NATIONAL TAIWAN UNIVERSITY**

MEETING REPORT



APRU Members

Australia

Australian National University
The University of Melbourne
The University of Sydney
UNSW Sydney

Canada

The University of British Columbia

Chile

University of Chile

China and Hong Kong SAR

Fudan University
Nanjing University
Peking University
The Chinese University of Hong Kong
The Hong Kong University of Science and Technology
The University of Hong Kong
Tsinghua University
University of Chinese Academy of Sciences
University of Science and Technology of China
Zhejiang University

Taiwan

National Taiwan University
National Tsing Hua University

Indonesia

University of Indonesia

Japan

Keio University
Nagoya University
Osaka University
Tohoku University
The University of Tokyo
Waseda University

Korea

KAIST
Korea University
POSTECH
Seoul National University
Yonsei University

Malaysia

University of Malaya

Mexico

Tecnológico de Monterrey

New Zealand

The University of Auckland

Philippines

University of the Philippines

Russia

Far Eastern Federal University

Singapore

Nanyang Technological University
National University of Singapore

Thailand

Chulalongkorn University

United States of America

California Institute of Technology
Stanford University
University of California, Berkeley
University of California, Davis
University of California, Irvine
University of California, Los Angeles
University of California, San Diego
University of California, Santa Barbara
University of Hawai'i at Mānoa
University of Oregon
University of Southern California
University of Washington

Contents

- 1** Address by APRU Chair
- 3** APRU Secretary General's Annual Report
- 6** APRU Presidential Statement
- 7** Program Schedule
- 11** Reports on Annual Presidents' Meeting featured in *University World News*
 - 11 • Universities and our digital future in a divided world — by Yojana Sharma
 - 13 • Universities 'key to bridging global digital divide' — by Yojana Sharma
 - 16 • Urgent need to address ethics of artificial intelligence — by Yojana Sharma
 - 19 • Turning the tide on the ebbing of public trust in higher education — by Michael Schill
 - 22 • The cost to higher education of free speech on campus — by Howard Gillman
- 24** List of Presidents
- 25** List of Delegates
- 27** List of Guests
- 28** Photo Album

Address by APRU Chair

APRU Vision and Strategy: a New Strategic Plan

This address was delivered by Chancellor Gene D. Block of UCLA at the Annual Presidents' Meeting on June 25, 2018.



As APRU chair, I want to share our vision for the network, how we plan to implement it and the process we will use to create strategic plan over the next year.

First, APRU's vision is to be the voice of knowledge and innovation for the Asia-Pacific region.

Our 50 members are the leading universities from 17 APEC economies. In our Annual Report you can see how we are working to address global challenges across the region and across the borders of nations, disciplines, languages and cultures. Research universities are uniquely placed to contribute to social and economic well-being.

Over the past three years, we have worked to implement our vision, establishing APRU as a strong advocate for higher education that can have real impacts. We face many common issues in higher education and our communities. APRU wants to help find practical solutions. We have already achieved some successes, as the Secretary General will report to you next.

Looking ahead, we need to recognize that the world is rapidly changing so that we can address new challenges. These include:

- Heightened tensions across the region, both economically and politically.
- Increased pressure on research universities to demonstrate responsible use of public funds.
- Less cooperation between nations, even as we realize the importance of partnerships in solving global challenges.
- The need to ensure that universities overcome rather than replicate inequality within our societies.

Yet, there is reason for hope – because of organizations like APRU. The international community has increasingly come to recognize the value of our organization, and the collective power of our universities. I am pleased that many new opportunities for partnership are emerging.

Over the coming year we must all focus on reviewing and honing our strategy. At the next APM in June 2019, which I am very excited to host at UCLA, we will consider and approve a new strategic plan for the organization.

Today we will begin this process during the next breakout session and then report back under the moderation of Vice-Chancellor Stuart McCutcheon, who has been a strong supporter of APRU over many years including on Steering Committee.

Gene D. Block
Chancellor, UCLA
Chair, APRU

The initial questions we need to consider are:

1. How do you think the international context of higher education will change and how do you think your university's internationalization strategy will have to change?
2. What further role could APRU play in supporting international collaboration on global challenges and how can we provide an international platform for advancing higher education, research and innovation?
3. What will be the best way for you to engage with other APRU members and the international policy community over the next five years?

Your feedback will be greatly appreciated. The International Secretariat will draw up a new Strategic Plan in consultation with the Steering Committee and we will bring the plan forward to you next year. This will be an incisive working document that enables us to measure future progress.

In conclusion, I want to thank all of you for your support and engagement over the past year. We are dedicated to ensuring that your APRU membership becomes increasingly valuable to your institution, the academic community and beyond.

APRU Secretary General's Annual Report

This address was delivered by Dr Christopher Tremewan at the Annual Presidents' Meeting on June 25, 2018.



This session is a great opportunity to share with you APRU's achievements since we met in Sydney a year ago.

Last year, we adopted the vision statement that APRU is 'the voice of knowledge and innovation' for the Pacific Rim.

Since then, we have amplified that voice through a strategy of advocacy and impact addressing Asia-Pacific challenges.

At the international level, achievements are usually incremental. However, this year, it feels like the work over a number of years has come together to produce a wave of highly visible results. So, I am pleased to report that we have demonstrated impact across a number of areas. We are still some way from breaking through the sound barrier but we have made significant progress.

The Annual Report you have in your conference materials highlights this progress. It builds on more than 20 years of collegial activities. It shows how APRU is:

- Contributing to solutions to global challenges
- Developing our capacity as a collective policy think-tank
- Raising members' visibility
- Building international influence through external partnerships, and
- Providing opportunities for the international engagement of faculty and students

The success of this strategy comes from:

- a commitment to multilateralism in the face of economic nationalism,
- the provision of an international platform which leverages network effects through multi-stakeholder partnerships,
- the assertion of ethical leadership through identifying and standing for the global common good.

Highlights

The Annual Report also highlights many of the ways APRU has expanded its impact and built bridges in a divided global society.

During 2017 alone, there were 18 international APRU events in 14 economies – and this does not include the many program activities happening on a daily basis.

Significant developments in our continuing programs include:

1. the partnership between the International Federation of the Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies and the APRU Multi-Hazards Program,
2. the development of the APEC Labour Mobility Cooperation by the Population Aging Program, and
3. a new textbook on Global Health Leadership to be published by the Global Health Program in cooperation with Springer publishers.

Several new initiatives from the past year also highlight our progress:

- The Annual Presidents' Meeting in Sydney in June 2017 focused on the sustainability of the Pacific Ocean and APRU's commitment to the United Nations' Sustainable Development Goal on ocean sustainability. The first APRU Pacific Ocean Cluster Project, led jointly by UBC and the University of Washington, has since been launched.
- The first APRU Sustainable Cities and Landscapes Conference held in Portland, Oregon, September 15-17, 2017, brought together 120 researchers and practitioners: planners, architects, transportation specialists, and policy-makers from local government to international organizations. Ten working groups brought forward proposals and a multi-year program led by the University of Oregon was planned, including the production of research and policy papers.
- The APRU-APEC University Leaders' Forum held in Da Nang, Viet Nam, on November 8, 2017, brought together university leaders, policymakers, and the business community within the APEC CEO Summit and Leaders' Meeting, to discuss the implications of the Fourth Industrial Revolution. The outcomes included:
 - A partnership with APEC's Project DARE to address the 1.5 million estimated skills shortfall in data science and analytics in the APEC economies, and
 - The announcement of the APEC Education Strategy Action Plan.

The next APEC University Leaders' Forum scheduled for Chile in November, 2019.

- The APRU Digital Economy Program has produced two policy research projects on artificial intelligence. The first, 'AI for Everyone', is led by Keio University and engages researchers from a range of members. It focuses on the social implications of artificial intelligence in different contexts and from the perspective of different disciplines. The second is led by HKUST and focuses on the future of work, a critical policy issue for the region. Both are funded through a partnership with Google.

The network has been further strengthened by the addition of seven distinguished new members. They are already enthusiastically involved in APRU activities and give us even greater capacity to achieve our goals.

Investment in the Network

All the achievements and initiatives of the past year are the product of your engagement and support as members. I wish to acknowledge your continuing investment in the network in so many ways and beyond the payment of membership fees: enabling faculty members and students to participate in projects and events, hosting activities on campus, participating in governance and advisory bodies.

I also wish to recognize four members who assign and pay for a faculty member or senior administrator to coordinate APRU program hubs on Population Aging, Sustainable Cities and Landscapes, Multi-Hazards and Global Health. They are Keio, Oregon, Tohoku and USC respectively. These program hubs continue to demonstrate their value as super-connectors across the region on these vital topics and produce both scholarly and policy outcomes.

As international organizations and companies have seen the value of working with us, we have also benefited from the investment of external partners in our joint projects. Elsevier has again generously supported the Impact Report and the APEC University Leaders' Forum as well as providing access to their databases for several projects and the production of infographics. Google has supported the two AI projects and the production of policy papers. We have also had support from APEC and from some national governments in terms of funding faculty members to participate in various forums. All this support over the past year totals well over US\$500,000.

Second Impact Report

Soon after this meeting, we will be launching the Second APRU Impact Report entitled "Amplifying Impact: Transformative Solutions to Asia-Pacific Challenges". This report shows the remarkable range of initiatives undertaken by APRU and its members in bringing together the STEM disciplines with the social sciences and humanities in seeking solutions to Asia-Pacific challenges. This represents two years of hard work by our analyst-writer, Kate Harland, and the editorial advisory group of senior international leaders along with the assistance of our data partner, Elsevier. It is not a prescriptive document but an evidence base of our capabilities and a stimulus for further development of collaborative models. In the current international environment, modelling cooperation is especially important. An executive summary is included in your conference materials to give you a foretaste. We will be working with you on how best to communicate and use this report when it is published.

Communications

We in the International Secretariat constantly seek to upgrade our capacity to advance the network's priorities. Communications with members and with external constituencies is key. We have increased APRU publications and our virtual media presence.

We will soon launch the new APRU website which will make information more accessible to members as well as be a platform for sharing initiatives across the network.

I invite you to look at your own websites as well. Please review the links which enable faculty and students to know their university is an APRU member and to find out what APRU is doing that is of interest to them.

As we draw up our next communications plan, we will propose an international meeting of members' communications directors so that we can coordinate an effective information flow around the network. Having a more informed university community will ensure you can get the most value from your membership of this network.

New Strategic Plan

In looking ahead, as our Chairman has announced, we will be reviewing APRU's strategy over the coming year. This process will take account both of the changing international context and of members' strategies and aspirations.

The aim is a brief, concise plan which can guide APRU for three years from 2019. We will need to think deeply about the future of this region, of higher education and universities in particular. The theme of this meeting, the panels and speakers are designed to help us with this task. At the same time, we need to evaluate what APRU is already doing, acknowledge our achievements and understand the powerful potential of this network.

Chancellor Block has proposed some core questions for this exercise. These key questions will inevitably lead us to some critical issues. For example, are we doing enough to understand the trajectory of public policies in higher education and research? Should APRU find new ways to increase the mobility of research students around the network? Are there other major global challenges where APRU should be focused?

The breakout session following this report is the first opportunity to do this thinking together. Then, in the coming months, the Steering Committee and the Senior International Leaders will stress test a draft strategic plan prior to bringing it to next year's APM at UCLA for endorsement.

New Understanding of Internationalization

I want to conclude with the observation that APRU's engagement with Asia-Pacific challenges is shaping a new understanding of the internationalization of higher education.

The focus on areas of institutional development such as student and faculty mobility, research collaboration, and international faculty and student recruitment remain fundamental building blocks. But they are a partial response to our dynamic environment.

Christopher Tremewan
Secretary General

APRU's focus on impact and advocacy brings us face to face with the necessity to aggregate at scale at the international level the social power of knowledge and innovation for the benefit of our societies and the survival of the planet.

This redefinition is transformative as it speaks to the kind of world we want to create, the kind of values we aspire to uphold in our societies and in the international community, and to securing the future through commitment to the global common good.

How we develop the next phase of our strategy on the basis of these values and actions is the task for the coming year. I look forward to working with you on this.

Acknowledgements

In conclusion, I wish to thank Chancellor Gene Block for his insightful leadership this past year and other members of Steering Committee for their service and many other presidents for their support and advice throughout the year. I wish to thank Professor Cindy Fan and Professor Jiro Kokuryo for co-chairing IPAC and also the many senior international leaders, faculty members and staff of our member universities who have helped us shape the programs and achieve so much. I wish to acknowledge the growing number of partners who are now engaged in joint programs and who provide valuable insights from their sectors as well as resources. I want also to acknowledge the dedicated staff team in the International Secretariat for sharing the vision and for their untiring efforts.

I wish to thank our gracious hosts here at NTU for their hospitality and their active collaboration.

It is a privilege to work with such a dynamic network of colleagues dedicated to the common good of our societies.

APRU Presidential Statement

Our Digital Future in a Divided World: APRU Commitment to Action

APRU Presidents vote to approve a Presidential Statement at the 22nd Annual Presidents' Meeting as a commitment to action on issues raised by "Our Digital Future in a Divided World."

As a consortium of leading research universities of the highly diverse Asia-Pacific region, APRU universities, we are committed to promoting the public good locally and globally.

While each university faces challenges in its own context, APRU universities acknowledge the similarity of many issues across national borders and appreciate the significance of addressing regional and global challenges of increasing cultural parochialism and institutional complexity.

By providing world class environments that facilitate teaching, learning, research and social inclusion, we translate leading-edge research and produce the next generation of leaders to address the challenges of the 21st century.

APRU universities can network and collaborate on:

- sharing resources (e.g. data and online courseware)
- sharing best practices in teaching and learning
- enhancing faculty, staff and student performance
- crafting narratives that address issues of social justice, diversity, equity and access
- sharing practices on how to address these issues both within and beyond the network
- crafting narratives that support higher education and best represent our engagement and impact.

Specifically, APRU could facilitate across the network:

- student and faculty mobility (e.g. APRU Scholars Program, group-based study abroad program);
- multi-disciplinary and cross-border collaboration in both teaching and learning; and
- narratives that best represent impact to diverse stakeholders.

Program Schedule

DAY 1 JUNE 24 SUNDAY	
Time	Activity & Venue
1000-1600	Arrival and Registration Shangri-La's Far Eastern Plaza Hotel Lobby
1400-1530	Steering Committee Meeting (for Steering Committee Members) Room West Gate, Level B1
1450	Transportation to NTU for Museum Tour (Gather at hotel lobby for transportation)
1500-1700	NTU Museum Tour (one of the following) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Museum of Medical Humanities • Gallery of NTU History and Museum of Anthropology • Herbarium of NTU and NTU Heritage Hall of Physics
1800-2100	Welcome Reception and Dinner Shangri-La Ballroom, Level 2, Shangri-La's Far Eastern Plaza Hotel <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Formal meet and greet by APRU Chair and NTU President at the reception • Welcome to new APRU members

DAY 2 JUNE 25 MONDAY	
Time	Activity & Venue
0820	Transportation from hotel to NTU Campus (Gather at hotel lobby for transportation to NTU)
0900-0915	Opening of Annual Presidents' Meeting 2018 2/F, Shih-Liang Chien Lecture Hall, Multi-purpose Classroom Building <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Welcome address by President Tei-Wei KUO, National Taiwan University • Welcome address by Chancellor Gene D. BLOCK, University of California, Los Angeles, and APRU Chair
0915-1005	NTU Introductory Session: Higher Education and Research Issues in Taiwan Professor Pan-Chyr Yang, Former President and Chair Professor, Department of Internal Medicine, National Taiwan University, gave an overview of higher education and research policy settings in Taiwan with particular emphasis on Artificial Intelligence and Precision Healthcare. Precision medicine is the direction of future health care and is the ultimate goal for translational researches. Multidimensional factors need to be considered in executing precision healthcare. These include a comprehensive infrastructure of big data composed of integrated biomedical databases and personal biological and sociological information. <p>MODERATOR: Chancellor Henry T. YANG, University of California, Santa Barbara</p> <p>KEYNOTE SPEAKER: Professor Pan-Chyr YANG, Former President and Chair Professor, Department of Internal Medicine, National Taiwan University</p>
1005-1015	Group Photos
1015-1035	Coffee Break 2/F, NTU Multi-purpose Classroom Building
1035-1135	Panel I – Our Digital Future in a Divided World 2/F, NTU Multi-purpose Classroom Building <p>MODERATOR: Ms Louise LUCAS, Asia Technology Correspondent, Financial Times</p> <p>TOPIC OVERVIEW BY: Professor Toby WALSH, Scientia Professor of Artificial Intelligence, UNSW Sydney</p> <p>PANELISTS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Dr. Deborah ELMS, Founder and Executive Director, Asian Trade Centre • Professor Pascale FUNG, Department of Electronic and Computer Engineering, The Hong Kong University of Science and Technology • Professor Chang-Chuan CHAN, Dean, College of Public Health, National Taiwan University
1135-1235	Panel II – Our Digital Future and Opportunities for Partnership 2/F, NTU Multi-purpose Classroom Building <p>MODERATOR: Ms Louise LUCAS, Asia Technology Correspondent, Financial Times</p> <p>TOPIC OVERVIEW BY: Professor Peter COWHEY, Dean, School of Global Policy and Strategy, and Qualcomm Endowed Chair in Communications and Technology Policy, University of California, San Diego</p> <p>PANELISTS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Professor Jane HSU, Department Chair of Computer Science and Information Engineering, National Taiwan University • Professor Jiro KOKURYO, Vice-President for International Collaboration and Professor, Faculty of Policy Management, Keio University

DAY 2 JUNE 25 MONDAY	
Time	Activity & Venue
1235-1300	Walk/Shuttle Bus to Lunch Venue
1300-1400	<p>Luncheon Talk – Free Speech in a Divided World: The US Experience Living One, NTU campus</p> <p>MODERATOR: President Tony F. CHAN, The Hong Kong University of Science and Technology</p> <p>SPEAKER: Chancellor Howard GILLMAN, University of California, Irvine, and author of <i>Free Speech on Campus</i> (Yale University Press)</p> <p>Chancellor Gillman provided an overview of campus free speech controversies in the United States, which have consumed the attention of many campus leaders, inflamed disputes on campuses, and attracted the attention of an increasing number of state and federal politicians. The discussion invited other leaders to provide a comparative perspective on how these issues shape decision making at other Pacific Rim universities.</p>
1400-1415	Walk/Shuttle Bus to Meeting Venue
1415-1500	<p>APRU Vision and Strategy 2/F, NTU Multi-purpose Classroom Building</p> <p>MODERATOR: Vice-Chancellor Stuart McCUTCHEON, The University of Auckland</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Address by Chancellor Gene D. BLOCK, APRU Chair • APRU Initiatives – video highlights • Annual Report by Dr. Christopher TREMEWAN, APRU Secretary General
1500-1530	<p>Breakout Groups 2/F, NTU Multi-purpose Classroom Building</p> <p>APRU: the next steps?</p>
1530-1630	<p>Report Back and Discussion 2/F, NTU Multi-purpose Classroom Building</p> <p>MODERATOR: Vice-Chancellor Stuart McCUTCHEON, The University of Auckland</p>
1630	Transportation to Hotel
1800	<p>Transportation to Dinner Venue (Gather at hotel lobby for transportation)</p>
1900-2100	<p>Conference Dinner Sky Lounge, The Grand Hotel Taipei</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Dinner talk by Professor Benson YEH, CEO & Co-Founder, PaGamO/Bonio Inc., and Professor, Department of Electrical Engineering, National Taiwan University <p>A New Paradigm Shift for Future Learning! PaGamO: E-Sport + Education How to keep students engaged in class? How can we make our students motivated to learn? These have been the most challenging questions for teachers/instructors nowadays as we have more and more digital natives in schools and in corporates. It is more and more difficult for teachers/instructors to keep the students' concentration in learning! Over the years, Professor Yeh has developed a series of Peer-to-Peer Gamification schemes for teaching following his unique teaching philosophy: "For the student! By the student! Of the student!". In 2013, Professor Yeh's team created PaGamO, the first-ever educational platform in the world that combines E-Sport and Education. It has been widely used in Asia for K12 learning and corporate training. The success of PaGamO in motivating students to learn, shows that E-Sport + Education will become a whole new paradigm for future teaching and learning.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cultural performances
2100	Transportation to Hotel

DAY 3 | JUNE 26 | TUESDAY

Time	Activity & Venue
0700-0830	Steering Committee Briefing (for Steering Committee Members) Room West Gate, Level B1
0900-1030	Presidential Forum – Public Trust and the Changing Role of Universities Shangri-La Ballroom, Level 2 MODERATOR: Ms Yojana SHARMA , Asia Director, University World News TOPIC OVERVIEW BY: President Michael H. SCHILL , University of Oregon PANELISTS: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Professor Cynthia Rose BAUTISTA, Vice-President for Academic Affairs, University of the Philippines • Professor Cindy FAN, Vice Provost for International Studies and Global Engagement, University of California, Los Angeles • Rector David GARZA, Tecnológico de Monterrey • Chancellor Gary S. MAY, University of California, Davis • President Santa J. ONO, The University of British Columbia • President TAN Eng Chye, National University of Singapore
1030-1100	Coffee Break Shangri-La Ballroom, Level 2
1100-1230	Presidential Forum – Our Digital Future in a Divided World: Opportunities and Challenges for Research Universities Shangri-La Ballroom, Level 2 MODERATOR: Ms Yojana SHARMA , Asia Director, University World News PANELISTS: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Professor Kathy BELOV, Pro-Vice-Chancellor (Global Engagement), The University of Sydney • Chancellor Pradeep K. KHOSLA, University of California, San Diego • President Tei-Wei KUO, National Taiwan University • President Seiichi MATSUO, Nagoya University • Professor Victoria V. PANOVA, Vice-President for International Affairs, Far Eastern Federal University • President Sung-Chul SHIN, KAIST
1230-1330	Business Session Shangri-La Ballroom, Level 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Financial Report 2017-18 • Election of Steering Committee 2018 • Presidential Statement • Highlights of Annual Presidents' Meeting 2018 • Invitation to Annual Presidents' Meeting 2019 • Thank you and farewell
1330-1415	Farewell Lunch Room North & South Gate, Level B1

Reports on Annual Presidents' Meeting featured in University World News

Universities and our digital future in a divided world



Yojana SHARMA

Asian Director, *University World News*

June 15, 2018



In what ways can higher education and research direct digital innovation to benefit society and how should universities respond to the current socio-economic and international divisions in the world? University leaders from Pacific Rim countries will discuss these issues in Taipei next week.

University leaders across the Asia-Pacific and the Americas will be meeting in Taipei, Taiwan, on 24-26 June to discuss responses to common issues in an era of geopolitical and technological uncertainty and change.

Over a hundred delegates, including 30 university presidents, will attend the Association of Pacific Rim Universities (APRU) conference entitled 'Our digital future in a divided world', being held at the National Taiwan University in Taipei, "to consider the fundamental pressures on university leadership in terms of the major themes affecting higher education and research. The digital future is one, and the inequality in the world is another", says Christopher Tremewan, APRU secretary general.

"We're not just talking about the digital divide, but a world divided socio-economically and in international relations."

APRU – a grouping of some 50 university heads of some of the most prestigious universities in Asia, the Pacific and the Pacific-facing Americas, including Mexico, the western United States and Canada, particularly the province of

British Columbia – is a part of a region that is "at the leading edge of digital technology in terms of innovation, of the emergence of giant tech corporations and of market growth in applications that bring together big data and information and communications technology," Tremewan notes.

"In this fast-evolving landscape of artificial intelligence and data science we are aware of the opportunities to bring benefits to our societies and, also, that we have the responsibility to understand and mitigate the risks of powerful new technologies."

"Our members constitute a large proportion of the research and innovation capabilities of the APEC [Asia-Pacific Economic Cooperation] economies. As institutions and as a network we have a responsibility to direct that capability in socially responsible ways, as well as offering ethical leadership."

Geopolitical changes

APRU, he says, is committed to collaboration and multilateralism, despite the turn towards nationalism, for example under President Donald Trump in the United States and in the United Kingdom with Brexit.

Against this backdrop, universities need to build public trust and long-term relationships. "Academics have always done this, but now the environment for collaboration is more complex," he says.

Geopolitically, “global tensions are heightening, the rivalries are deepening and the role of the research community and the education community is to maintain trust and build links regardless of these pressures and tensions between nation states,” he says.

With inequality, climate change, sustainability, ageing populations and global health still major global challenges to resolve, “some of these geopolitical pressures are making it harder for us to collaborate on global challenges, but in the interests of all our societies we have overcome these funding and geopolitical pressures and ramped up our collaboration.”

“Another aspect of higher education geopolitics is that funding of university research seems to be increasingly directed by funding bodies on the basis of short-term national interests, and that’s not just China, it’s everywhere,” he notes.

Yet the enormous growth of open research collaboration in the past three decades has led to a global research system that is “surprisingly open in the sense that many of the major research countries – but not only the major research countries – are players, but also practically everybody has come in on it,” Tremewan says, adding that “it’s producing quality science and not necessarily controlled by the agendas of each nation state”.

APRU as a network is able to tap into this open global research system for far greater outcomes than the group ever thought they would obtain, he said, in part because the spectacular development of an open global research network over past decades “happened largely behind the scenes”.

“It’s a historical moment for the APRU network, which has become a seamless network of world-class universities, and our particular network is focused on the geopolitics of the Asia-Pacific region, which is one of the most dynamic regions of the world.”



Higher education geopolitics – the shifting balance

The shifting balance of power in the geopolitics of higher education, which Tremewan sees as “a subset of broader geopolitics”, includes the way talent moves around the globe. “The attraction of the best minds both of student and faculty members is a kind of geopolitics, too,” he says.

This has been heightened by the global competition for top researchers in artificial intelligence, robotics, nanotechnology, genetics and other high technology fields.

“An aspect of the geopolitics of higher education is the mobility of scholars and students and the influence on national foreign policies and attitudes to foreigners, refugees and immigrants. It is beginning to have an impact on where people feel welcome,” Tremewan says.

“For research universities there is a lot at stake – whether or not we can recruit the best PhD students and the like.”

He notes that the “research race” appears to be skewing the behaviour of many universities. So one of the benefits of the Taipei meeting is for university presidents to “discuss common challenges and examine trends in public policy and technology that are going to impact on universities if they haven’t already; and exchange experiences on how to deal with these challenges, so that they can be better prepared in their own country”.

“Multilateralism, leveraging networks and contributing to a global common good are the things that drive us as a network that can produce positive outcomes as a kind of super connector across this region,” he says.

Universities 'key to bridging global digital divide'



Yojana SHARMA

Asian Director, *University World News*

June 28, 2018



Universities will be key in bridging new emerging 'digital divides' within countries and globally in the era of innovation driven by artificial intelligence and other new technologies, a conference organised by the Association of Pacific Rim Universities in Taipei heard last week.

Universities will be key in bridging new emerging 'digital divides' within countries and globally in the era of innovation driven by artificial intelligence and other new technologies, a conference organised by the Association of Pacific Rim Universities (APRU) heard last week.

'Our Digital Future in a Divided World', the APRU conference held in Taipei, Taiwan, from 24-26 June, was attended by over 100 delegates, almost 30 of them presidents of Pacific Rim universities, which includes Australasia, Asia, North and South America.

Universities will have a key role in building more cross-disciplinary research to ensure the benefits of artificial intelligence can reach all populations and not just certain groups, the conference heard.

Cross-border collaboration in research and with industry, governments and policy-makers will also become more important to avoid the emergence of global haves and have-nots as technology breakthroughs are dominated by less than a dozen giant multinational companies with the power to harness university research, the funds to commercialise it, and the ability to acquire massive data sets that are the raw material of artificial intelligence, according to Pascale Fung, director of the Center for Artificial Intelligence Research at Hong Kong University of Science and Technology.



While a great deal is still unknown about how artificial intelligence (AI) and other technologies will shape the future, delegates agreed there will be significant disruption. At the same time different countries will adapt at a different pace to emerging research breakthroughs and their commercialisation or use in informing public policy.

"Digital technology is changing the innovation and value-added structure of every industry, even the most traditional ones," said Peter Cowhey, professor of communications and technology policy at the University of California, San Diego in the United States.

"The nature of digital technology is to create giant firms with economies of scale and scope at a global level," said Cowhey, co-author of the book *Digital DNA: Disruption and the challenges for global governance*.

The two global 'AI superpowers', the United States and China, with their huge technology giants such as Google, Facebook and Amazon in the US and Tencent, Baidu and Alibaba in China, "stand to gain 70% of the profits of AI", according to Fung, who notes it will fuel an "economic divide between these countries and the rest of the world".

"The companies in these two countries are able to harness their huge databases of users to feed their AI algorithms to therefore improve their engines and AI services in a way that no other countries can," Fung told the conference.

This is already becoming evident in the field of medicine which has benefited from AI-powered genetic technologies and the development of 'smart drugs'.

For example, lung cancer is the number one cause of mortality, including in non-smokers, in East Asia. According to Yang Pan-Chyr, professor of internal medicine at National Taiwan University and a former president of that institution, the prevalence of the genetic marker for this disease in the East Asian region is 55-60%, compared to 15% in Caucasian peoples whose genetic mutation is more smoking-related. Hence data and research have to be conducted separately and at scale.

The development of targeted therapies, while holding huge promise for the treatment of diseases like cancer, depends on huge datasets of different ethnic groups and their specific genetic and disease patterns.

Although the cost of sequencing a genome has gone from US\$100 million just over a decade ago to around

US\$1,000 now, transforming university research in the field of genetics, targeted treatments are developed for different ethnic and risk groups, and some groups – particularly smaller distinct ethnic groups – could be left behind in the development of such treatments.

"With precision medicine all human beings are not equal because of the genetic background, the environment, even the same patient with the same diagnosis," Yang told the conference.



A great deal of money is being invested in machine learning, a branch of AI where the software adapts autonomously to changing inputs. But Fung noted that "it's impossible for machine learning to do anything with a data size smaller than 100,000 patients", as well as "data from healthy people for the machine to learn to differentiate the two".

Sequencing the cancer genome of 100,000 cancer patients would require around US\$10 million at today's prices and is a logistical nightmare as researchers and hospitals would need to pool their data. This is already being hampered by separate developments in the regulatory environment related to big data.

The emerging regulatory divide

A new 'digital divide' is emerging in the area of data and AI governance and includes privacy and security regulations, said Deborah Elms, executive director of the Asian Trade Centre in Singapore, which monitors trade trends globally and in the region.

Such rules create barriers between those with digital technologies and significant databases and those without.

"The flow of data across the world has economic stakes," Cowhey said. "We see growing barriers to the movement and location of data networks on a global scale."



Cowhey notes that the European Union's General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR) on data privacy, including the use outside the EU of data generated within the EU, regulates private companies and disadvantages smaller companies which would otherwise lower costs of gathering data. "It could inhibit innovation," Cowhey said.

Asia currently has no particular rules on privacy "but that could be coming very fast", said Elms, referring to rules being prepared in Japan and other countries.

There are also differing rules related to data security that could "rapidly undermine all that opportunity and promise you all see", she said, adding that government regulators in key Asian countries "are not going to allow health data to move, particularly across borders".

"So if students and universities have any hope of sitting together and collaborating on the movement and sharing of patient data and having health data move around, forget it," she said, adding that often governments have no idea of the potential impact of data policies on research.

For example, China this year decreed that all data gathered by companies and institutions from China, including by foreign companies, must be held on servers within China.

Chang-Chuan Chan, dean of the College of Public Health at National Taiwan University, said: "We are way behind using data across countries and that is very bad for improving health.

"In sharing digital health data, we know there is a global divide; Africa is way behind," he added.

Emerging 'research divide'

Cowhey refers to an emerging digital divide in research where only the biggest, wealthiest and most prestigious research universities can collaborate to pool data or accumulate their own big databases for AI research.

For an equitable world economy "we cannot have the capabilities of the next generation of research networks confined to a relatively small number of research universities", he pointed out.

There were many calls for collaboration to bridge the emerging gaps brought about by digital technologies, not just between universities, but also to work with governments and companies to design policies. But others went beyond that, saying the mission of universities needs to include a much starker commitment to solving problems on a global scale.

"Universities are important assets of the whole of humankind, regardless of countries," said Seiichi Matsuo, president of Nagoya University, Japan. "In the era of the digital revolution we should reconsider the role of the university."



"We need to consider whether we regard digital science as one new area, or a wider discipline that includes a whole science" that can also create new value and benefit society, he said.

APRU is currently collaborating with Google in its 'AI for Everyone' project to address such global and societal implications of new technologies, including on the future of work and aging societies.

Urgent need to address ethics of artificial intelligence



Yojana SHARMA

Asian Director, *University World News*
July 3, 2018



Students and researchers must be better prepared to deal with ethical issues in the use of big data, robotics and artificial intelligence so that research and applications are not used for nefarious purposes, including weapons of war, a recent conference of Pacific Rim university presidents was told.

Students and researchers must be better prepared to deal with ethical issues in the use of big data, robotics and artificial intelligence so that research and applications are not used for nefarious purposes, including weapons of war, a conference of Pacific Rim university presidents heard recently in Taipei, Taiwan.

"We have to be very careful that artificial intelligence isn't stained by a very unfortunate use of the technology to decide to kill people," said Toby Walsh, professor of artificial intelligence (AI) at the University of New South Wales, Australia, speaking at the conference of the Association of Pacific Rim Universities (APRU).

The conference, entitled 'Our digital future in a divided world' and held on 24-26 June in Taipei, was attended by some 100 delegates from Asia and the Pacific, Australasia, and North and South America, 30 of them university presidents, rectors or vice-chancellors.

"One of the strong arguments around why we need to worry today about the potential use of AI in warfare is because we don't know how to build machines that can deal with the ethical responsibility of who lives and who dies," Walsh said.

"Although there are well-defined ethical principles for fighting war – international humanitarian law – we do not know how to write [software for] machines today to do that."

"A high level of ethical principles cannot be integrated into algorithms," said Pascale Fung, director of the Center for Artificial Intelligence Research at Hong Kong University of Science and Technology.

Responsibility over human lives is also a key issue in the development of self-driving cars. Understanding and managing the consequences of such technologies while they are still at the research stage is important, delegates said.

Tei-Wei Kuo, acting president of National Taiwan University, pointed to some well-known accidents caused by autonomous vehicles, sparking a debate about who is responsible. "That kind of issue will keep coming out," he told the conference. "There are a lot of issues to be resolved before we get AI on the road."



But AI ethics involves people in many disciplines. “We have to work on our entire [research] ecosystem and see where to position our research,” he said.

Pressures on ethical use are building

Ethical research is not just an issue for professionals who wish to see their research put to good use. Powerful pressures are building from outside, including from students and industry.

The risks to universities were highlighted by recent calls to boycott Korea Advanced Institute of Science and Technology (KAIST), based in Daejeon, South Korea, over a perceived collaboration in research on autonomous weapons.



A petition organised by Walsh in April and signed by more than 50 AI researchers in more than 30 countries said they would not collaborate with the university or host its professors over its partnership with defence manufacturer Hanwha Systems to set up a research centre on national defence and artificial intelligence at the university.

The call to boycott had swift, worldwide repercussions and became “one of the centre points of the discussion all the following week at the United Nations on what we need to do around the governance of autonomous weapons”, Walsh noted.

KAIST President Sung-Chul Shin reiterated at the conference that his institution “has no intention to develop autonomous weapons; the centre focuses on using AI for smart aircraft training and tracking”.

“We should implement the highest of standards in education as well as research in universities for making a bright future, otherwise we will confront the dark side of a dystopian society caused by the unintended consequences of this kind of technology intruding in every dimension – one guy with a bad mind can destroy the whole world in the coming future,” Shin said.

KAIST’s Shin noted that a wider effort was needed by universities to maintain public trust. “What we at KAIST have learned from this is that we have to pay much more attention to ethics in AI research,” he told the conference, noting that his university had quickly put out a statement that AI should not harm humans.

“We want to lead on AI ethics in the future so we would like to become a collaborator with other leading institutions around the world,” Shin said. “Because it’s not just the effort of one university.”

KAIST already has a mandatory ethics course for all students; “now we will include the ethics of AI in our ethics course”, he said.

Pressure from students, civil society

Walsh warned that although KAIST had responded “quickly and appropriately” at the time, “that sort of conversation has not finished”, adding that universities “are not off the hook by a long way”.

At the time Walsh’s petition became public in April, Shin was quick to insist that KAIST research was not to be used for weapons development, prompting Walsh to cancel the boycott call.

However, the debacle highlighted that if universities are not well prepared to confront ethical issues pertaining to new technologies, the lines will be drawn by others in the international community that could force embarrassing reversals, wastage of research resources and reputational damage to an institution.



"Engaging our students and early-years researchers in these discussions is really important," said Kathy Belov, pro-vice chancellor for global engagement at the University of Sydney, Australia. Belov, a professor of comparative genomics, noted that in the fields of biomedicine and genetics, ethical principles are ingrained in research methods, and this needs to be the case for technologies such as artificial intelligence.

"Students have really strong views around all these ethical issues and we've noticed a lot of protests on campuses about collaboration with companies involved in development of weapons," Belov said during a panel discussion. Those voices are getting louder on campus and "it is being driven more by our students than by our academics", she said.

Civil society voices are likely to get louder as well. Last year the Ethics and Governance of Artificial Intelligence Fund, which launched in January 2017 with a US\$27 million injection of funds from philanthropic foundations, including eBay founder Pierre Omidyar, announced US\$7.6 million in funding to bolster the voice of nine civil society organisations in the shaping of AI in the public interest.

Industry funding

Industry collaborations that involve funding university research in AI could also be affected by a growing backlash against military use.

Walsh pointed to the recent case at Google which should be a wake-up call to universities. Over 3,000 Google employees recently signed an open letter to protest against the company's participation in the United States Pentagon-funded 'Project Maven' to interpret video imagery with the aim of improving the targeting of drone strikes, and demanded that the project be cancelled.

In an open letter addressed to Google CEO Sundar Pichai, they demanded that Google formulate "a clear policy" stating that neither the company nor its contractors will ever develop technology for warfare. "Google should not be in the business of war," the letter said. A dozen Google employees resigned in protest before Google announced on 1 June that it would discontinue its contract with Maven when it expires next year.

Google also announced it is drafting its own military projects policy, which, according to reports, will include a ban on projects related to autonomous weaponry.

By taking a stand on a point of principle, Google has "raised the bar", Walsh told the Taipei conference. Now "many universities and increasingly people are going to

be asking the same sorts of questions about what your [university] researchers are doing and about how we are contributing to making society a better place".

"Increasingly, we will be questioned and we will be asked to call to account, just as Google was here," Walsh said. "This is an example of the sort of conversations we are going to see increasingly and the kind of conversations that you are going to have in your universities."

"We have a huge responsibility to ensure that the technologies that we work on – many of us are funded from the public purse – are for the public good," Walsh said. That includes ensuring technologies "are used to improve the quality of life for everyone and to make the planet a better place".

Hot-button issue in Japan

Military use of AI is also a hot-button issue in Japan. Jiro Kokuryo, professor of policy management at Keio University, said individual universities in Japan have made statements on whether or not they will apply for research funds from the Japanese defence ministry.



"There has been increasing awareness that the social and ethical aspects of artificial intelligence have to be addressed," said Jiro, who is also heading the Human-Information Technology Ecosystem project under the Japan Science and Technology Agency. It will look at the issue longer term and ensure that researchers and engineers in both universities and industry "are more competent to take control of the technology", he said.

He has been involved in drawing up guidelines for engineers and researchers, mainly in the academic sphere, but it needs to be extended to industry researchers, he told *University World News*.

Japan is investing heavily in automated cars, for example, where the problem of criminal responsibility for accidents is a major issue.

Turning the tide on the ebbing of public trust in higher education



Michael SCHILL

President, University of Oregon

July 20, 2018

Higher education has arguably never been more important to our citizens or to our society. Yet universities have become the epicentre for many social tensions and trust in higher education institutions is eroding in some countries. Why is this and what can be done?

Barely half of Americans responding to a survey administered by the Gallup Corporation earlier this year said that they had a great deal or quite a lot of confidence in higher education. The proportion slipped below 50% when the question specifically addressed colleges and universities.

Among members of our US Republican Party, the lack of faith was especially pronounced. Only 12% of Republicans had a great deal of confidence in colleges and universities, compared to 37% of Democrats and 22% of Independents.

A similar pattern was revealed in a recent Pew Research Center survey that reported that only 55% of Americans felt that colleges and universities had a positive effect on how things were going in the country. Among Republicans, 58% said that colleges and universities had a negative effect

on the nation. However, 72% of Democrats had a positive view, relatively unchanged during recent years.

This does not seem to be a phenomenon that is confined to the United States. Empirical findings of a modest decline in overall confidence in colleges and universities and big increases in polarisation – at least in the US – lead university presidents to ask themselves at least three questions:

- Why are we seeing these dynamics?
- What are the consequences?
- If the consequences are negative, what can we do about the situation?

Anti-intellectualism and political imbalance

In the US there are any number of factors that have caused people to express scepticism about higher education. The US is in the midst of a populist moment with the election of President Donald Trump. One element that frequently accompanies populism is anti-intellectualism and what better institution to target anti-intellectualism at than institutions of higher education.



Anti-intellectualism mixes with politics with respect to the Trump administration's views on science. Consensus among university scientists, particularly with regard to climate change and environmental phenomena, is rejected by fiat rather than by the scientific method.

But there is something more than anti-intellectualism behind the growing antipathy of conservatives and some middle-of-the-road Americans toward our universities. Colleges and universities in the United States are increasingly seen as ideologically imbalanced, with insufficient representation of or respect for people from the political right.

Having been a faculty member or dean at five major universities, I think there is some truth to this accusation. Outside of economics departments and business schools (and sometimes even within these schools and departments), we lack ideological and political diversity.

No wonder parents worry about their children not being exposed to a diversity of viewpoints, at the least, and indoctrination, at the extreme.

Common interests

A second, related dynamic is the changing nature of identity politics in our universities. Our colleges and universities mirror our nation in the sense that we are becoming more and more diverse. It is unsurprising that this diversity is reflected in a multiplication of different identity interests.

Each American university and most schools within it have a large and growing number of affiliation groups, ranging from race to gender to sexual orientation and the various intersections among these groups. While the growth of diversity has had tremendous benefits for our schools and society, it has also contributed to less consensus about common and shared interests.

Each group (student and faculty) has its own set of legitimate concerns, which generates its own distinct agenda and demands. To an outsider, it might appear that all a president does is respond to one of a multitude of group interests with little attention being directed to common interests.

As universities have become more diverse, we have focused more and more on how to make them more welcoming and inclusive. Demands for inclusion on our campuses



sometimes are also accompanied by demands that certain types of viewpoints should be off limits.

To many of us in university leadership and especially to folks outside the university these desires by some of our students and faculty members to limit what can and should be said on campus often seem to violate fundamental norms of free expression.

Added to this stew is the ever-increasing splintering of the academic enterprise into fields and subfields that are sometimes esoteric and frequently incomprehensible to people outside the academy.

Scientific breakthroughs often involve tiny steps: lay people may puzzle over the value of knowing the “charm” of a subatomic particle. Plus, the humanities’ turn toward postmodern exploration of subjectivity can be remote, confusing and even offensive to some of our constituencies.

In many ways such dynamics have made our universities much more alive and interesting. On the other hand, they have also made us more volatile and more prone to caricature.

Enter Fox News; enter advocacy groups with a primary mission to make us look silly. Enter right-wing activists like Milo Yiannopoulos or Ben Shapiro, who delight in using our commitment to free speech to hold extreme public events that bait students, and many faculty, on the left into aggressive counter demonstrations and censorship.

These spectacles are designed to cast universities in the least attractive light: hypocrites who only defend free speech we like; vassals of left ideological dogma; or inept managers of our own campus communities.

Is it any wonder that a polarised populace, led by a polarising leader, with a media of which a large share long ago gave up objectivity, would increasingly become sceptical about our universities?

Inequality

One last contributor to the lack of confidence in universities is that they are often seen as contributing to the growth of inequality in the United States rather than playing the role we celebrate as equalisers and generators of opportunity.

Our costs have gone up tremendously – particularly in the public sector as the state has retrenched. Increasingly students and parents, leery of debt after the Great Recession, have focused a critical eye on us and what we are doing.

Some believe that our administrative costs have spiralled out of control for no reason other than to feather our nests. Some believe that elite institutions' competition for the best and the brightest students and faculty members generates few benefits for them and their children.

Some complain that their children graduate into a changing economy without sufficient advising or direction. Taxpayers and parents increasingly question the value of research and the liberal arts in helping students get jobs (which they see as the overriding objective of a university).

Indeed, surveys show that the proportion of Americans who believe a college degree isn't necessary to survive in the workplace increased from 43% in 2009 to 57% in 2016.

And some believe that we educate more graduate students with more highly specialised degrees, especially in the humanities, than any job market can reasonably absorb.

Thus is it any wonder that universities are facing challenges in maintaining support among the public?

Social benefits

As university leaders we need to talk about what we can do to gain, regain or preserve the confidence of our various populations.

Is America an outlier? Can we learn something from Asia where university budgets continue to grow and where public trust remains, for now, fairly strong and tied to the benefits of economic growth and the expansion of the middle class?

If the problem is communication, what can we do better to show that what we are doing benefits society?

One of things we are beginning at the University of Oregon is a science communications centre to explore ways to get across complicated scientific information to various and diverse publics.

And, if the problem is not just communications, but substance, we can do more. At Oregon we are fundamentally re-thinking how we advise students by integrating our curricular and career advising. Parents love hearing this.

We are also adding a new unit – the Knight Campus for Accelerating Scientific Impact – with the sole purpose of moving discoveries into the market or into hospitals. Again, a way to show a direct connection between research and human life.

In any event, I am at heart an optimist. And my optimism about higher education is personal and knows no bounds. As a first-generation college graduate whose parents never had the good fortune to get an education, education has given me the opportunity to have a wonderfully fulfilling career and a good life.

As an academic, I believe that it is only through knowledge that our society will advance. Am I being too optimistic in my hope that we can get the public to understand and fall in love with us again? I hope not.

This article is taken from a talk Michael Schill gave at the Association of Pacific Rim Universities' (APRU) presidential panel at the APRU conference on 'Our Digital Future in a Divided World', held from 24-26 June at National Taiwan University, Taipei.

Schill, M. (2018, July 20). Turning the tide on the ebbing of public trust in higher education, *University World News*, Issue No. 515. Retrieved from <http://www.universityworldnews.com/article.php?story=20180713131643672>

The cost to higher education of free speech on campus



Howard GILLMAN

Chancellor of University of California, Irvine

August 31, 2018



It is hard to overemphasise how much the issue of free speech on campus has preoccupied American higher education over the past few years. The implications are enormous – both politically due to conservatives feeling campuses are hostile to their views and financially due to security costs.

What can someone say on an American college campus and what can they not say? There have been debates about this question for as long as there have been colleges in the United States. But over the past few years the controversies have intensified.

Hardly a week goes by without another attention-grabbing event. Sometimes the outrage is that a controversial speaker has been silenced; sometimes it is that a controversial speaker has been allowed to speak.

Because many political conservatives believe that American campuses are hostile to their views, we also have conservative politicians intervening in campus free-speech debates. Legislation is being debated. Lawsuits are being filed.

As a result of all of this, higher education leaders in the United States have spent an enormous amount of time managing these conflicts and trying to understand how to balance the need to defend students against discriminatory attacks and the fundamental role of universities to protect the expression of ideas.

Getting the right balance

Over the last few years leaders in American higher education did not always do a very good job figuring out this balance. But over the past two years, every American leader of higher education has been working on this issue. A president or chancellor cannot attend a meeting of university leaders without the subject of free speech on campus being a topic. The last year the entire situation has become even more complicated.

When the controversial figure Milo Yiannopoulos scheduled a talk at the University of California, Berkeley, in January of 2017, the campus expressed a commitment to let him speak and prepared for protests. But in an unprecedented

development, 150 anti-fascist 'black bloc' rioters descended upon the campus determined to instigate violence and start a riot, and that action overwhelmed the normal security arrangements of the university.

Later that year violent, racist 'white nationalists', such as Richard Spencer, demanded the right to speak at public universities, creating enormous security challenges.

In some cases the security costs for universities allowing such speech has been in the millions of dollars. At the same time, when universities do not spend the money, they are criticised for not protecting free debate on the campus.

Political interference

We are also beginning to see the federal government, through the attorney general, going after universities on the grounds that they are not doing enough to protect conservative or controversial speakers.

State legislatures are beginning to pass legislation demanding that universities take stronger steps against students who disrupt certain speakers. Many different committees of Congress have held hearings to examine whether federal funding for higher education should be tied to greater free speech protections.

Universities in the United States are now trying to figure out how to address the range of issues that have been raised. A few issues are garnering a lot of attention, but are still not resolved.

For example, every university in the University of California system has spent the last year looking at policies regulating the right of non-university speakers to speak on campus. If there are costs to the campus, how much can we charge without being accused of discriminating against certain viewpoints? What rooms must we make available?

We are also working on policies that address the efforts of some students to disrupt unwelcome speakers on campus, but these issues are complicated. When does disapproval of a speaker become an illegitimate disruption of the speakers' rights?

We are also trying to create policies that promote safety without violating free speech rights. As stated before, cost



is a big issue. When Berkeley decided to accommodate some speakers in the late summer of 2017 they ended up spending US\$3.9 million dollars to ensure security – and obviously, such a practice is not sustainable across the country.

It is clearly not legal for campuses to charge more for groups that sponsor controversial speakers than for groups that sponsor popular speakers. But there has been no clear solution to the problem of how to support all speakers without requiring universities to go bankrupt.

Long-term effects

These free speech debates could very well have a dramatic long-term impact on the perception of higher education in the United States. Because political conservatives often feel less free to express their views, we have reached a point in the United States where almost two-thirds of people who identify with the Republican Party believe that American higher education is actually harmful to the country.

American higher education cannot survive in an environment where most people in one political party believe our role is dangerous for the future. Much of the discontent over the last few years is linked to these free speech debates.

Today's debates about free speech on campus assume there is a fundamental conflict between defending the rights of all students to feel as if they are in a supportive environment and the right of individuals on a campus to express all ideas, especially controversial ones.

American higher education must resolve this debate if it is to continue to earn the ongoing support of people from a variety of backgrounds who see the value of education and research for the future of society.

Howard Gillman is author of Free Speech on Campus (Yale University Press). This is an edited version of his presentation at the Association of Pacific Rim Universities' Annual Presidents' Meeting held from 24-26 June in Taipei, Taiwan.

Gillman, H. (2018, August 31). The cost to higher education of free speech on campus, *University World News*, Issue No. 518. Retrieved from <http://www.universityworldnews.com/article.php?story=2018082811204272>

List of Presidents

Name	University	Title
Professor Tei-Wei KUO	National Taiwan University (Host)	Interim President
Professor Gene D. BLOCK	University of California, Los Angeles	Chancellor and Chair, APRU
Professor Bundhit EUA-ARPORN	Chulalongkorn University	President
Professor Nikita Yu. ANISIMOV	Far Eastern Federal University	President
Professor Sung-Chul SHIN	KAIST	President
Professor Akira HASEYAMA	Keio University	President
Professor Jaeho YEOM	Korea University	President
Professor Seiichi MATSUO	Nagoya University	President
Professor Hong HOCHENG	National Tsing Hua University	President
Professor TAN Eng Chye	National University of Singapore	President
Professor Doh-Yeon KIM	POSTECH	President
Professor David GARZA	Tecnológico de Monterrey	Rector
Professor Rocky S. TUAN	The Chinese University of Hong Kong	Vice-Chancellor and President
Professor Tony F. CHAN	The Hong Kong University of Science and Technology	President
Professor Stuart McCUTCHEON	The University of Auckland	Vice-Chancellor
Professor Santa J. ONO	The University of British Columbia	President
Professor Paul K. H. TAM	The University of Hong Kong	Acting President and Vice-Chancellor
Professor Hideo OHNO	Tohoku University	President
Professor Gary S. MAY	University of California, Davis	Chancellor
Professor Howard GILLMAN	University of California, Irvine	Chancellor
Professor Pradeep K. KHOSLA	University of California, San Diego	Chancellor
Professor Henry T. YANG	University of California, Santa Barbara	Chancellor
Dr. David LASSNER	University of Hawai'i at Mānoa	Interim Chancellor
Professor Abdul Rahim HASHIM	University of Malaya	Vice-Chancellor
Professor Michael H. SCHILL	University of Oregon	President
Professor Ian JACOBS	UNSW Sydney	Vice-Chancellor and President
Professor Yong-Hak KIM	Yonsei University	President

List of Delegates (in alphabetical order of the name of university)

Name	Name of University	Position
Professor Shirley LEITCH	Australian National University	Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Global Engagement)
Mr. Jonathan DAMPNEY	Australian National University	Associate Director, International Strategy and Partnerships
Dr. Natcha THAWESAENGSKULTHAI	Chulalongkorn University	Vice President for Innovation and New Development
Professor Victoria V. PANOVA	Far Eastern Federal University	Vice President for International Relations
Mr. Jong Ill PARK	KAIST	Executive Assistant
Professor Jiro KOKURYO	Keio University	Vice-President for International Collaboration
Mrs. Hideko SUMITA	Keio University	Administrative Director
Professor Sunhyuk KIM	Korea University	Vice President, International Affairs
Mr. D'Arcy DRACHENBERG	Korea University	Assistant Director, International Cooperation
Professor Masafumi NAKAHIGASHI	Nagoya University	Presidential Advisor
Ms. Tomomi FURUTA	Nagoya University	Administrative Staff
Ms. June IWATSUKI	Nagoya University	Project Coordinator
Professor Alan CHAN	Nanyang Technological University	Vice President (Alumni & Advancement)
Ms. Jenny HÄLLEN HEDBERG	Nanyang Technological University	Director, Office of International Affairs
Professor Luisa Shu-Ying CHANG	National Taiwan University	Vice President for International Affairs
Professor J. Bruce H. SHYU	National Taiwan University	Deputy Vice President for International Affairs
Professor Pan-Chyr YANG	National Taiwan University	Chair Professor, Department of Internal Medicine
Professor Chang-Chuan CHAN	National Taiwan University	Dean, College of Public Health
Professor Jane HSU	National Taiwan University	Chair, Department of Computer Science and Information Engineering
Professor Benson YEH	National Taiwan University	CEO & Co-Founder PaGamO/Bonio Inc.; Professor, Department of Electrical Engineering
Ms. Linda CHANG	National Taiwan University	Director for Global Alliances
Mr. Andrew TSUNG	National Taiwan University	Director for Global Engagement
Ms. Cher CHIU	National Taiwan University	Director, Global Events and Network
Professor Shih-Chang HSIN	National Tsing Hua University	Senior Vice President
Professor Ta-Jen YEN	National Tsing Hua University	Vice President for Global Affairs
Professor Andrew WEE	National University of Singapore	Vice President (University and Global Relations)
Ms. Linda CHENG	National University of Singapore	Assistant Manager, Coordination, Alliances and Communications
Professor Mayumi ISHIKAWA	Osaka University	Director, Planning Unit, Center for Global Initiatives
Mr. Yusuke HAYASHI	Osaka University	Chief, International Affairs Division, Department of International Affairs
Ms. Sachiko MIZOTA	Osaka University	Administrative Officer
Professor Kwang-Jae KIM	POSTECH	Vice President of Planning
Ms. Hyoeun PARK	POSTECH	Director of International Relations
Dr. José Manuel PÁEZ	Tecnológico de Monterrey	Vice-Rector for International Affairs
Ms. Adriana ROJAS	Tecnológico de Monterrey	Regional Director Asia Pacific
Professor WONG Suk-Ying	The Chinese University of Hong Kong	Associate Vice-President
Ms. Shally FAN	The Chinese University of Hong Kong	Director of Academic Links
Ms. Wing WONG	The Chinese University of Hong Kong	Director of Academic Links (China)
Professor Pascale FUNG	The Hong Kong University of Science and Technology	Department of Electronic and Computer Engineering
Professor Jenny DIXON	The University of Auckland	Deputy Vice-Chancellor, Strategic Engagement

Name	Name of University	Position
Ms. Debs McALLISTER	The University of Auckland	International Networks Coordinator
Professor John W. KAO	The University of Hong Kong	Vice-President and Pro-Vice-Chancellor (Global)
Professor Katherine BELOV	The University of Sydney	Pro-Vice-Chancellor Global Engagement
Professor Sawako SHIRAHASE	The University of Tokyo	Vice President
Professor Toshiya UEKI	Tohoku University	Executive Vice President
Professor Taeko MISUMI	Tohoku University	Specially Appointed Associate Professor/Coordinator
Professor Takako IZUMI	Tohoku University	Associate Professor/Program Director, APRU Multi-Hazards Program
Mr. Yasushi WAGATSUMA	Tohoku University	Director of International Exchange Division
Professor Joanna REGULSKA	University of California, Davis	Vice Provost and Associate Chancellor, Global Affairs
Dr. Victoria JONES	University of California, Irvine	Chief Global Affairs Officer
Professor Cindy FAN	University of California, Los Angeles	Vice Provost for International Studies and Global Engagement
Mr. Stephen TAN	University of California, Los Angeles	Director, UCLA Engagement Asia
Mr. Kevan WILBANKS	University of California, Los Angeles	Special Assistant to the Vice Provost for International Studies and Global Engagement
Professor Peter COWHEY	University of California, San Diego	Dean, School of Global Policy and Strategy; Qualcomm Endowed Chair in Communications and Technology Policy
Professor Eduardo VERA	University of Chile	Director of International Affairs
Professor Adi Zakaria AFIFF	University of Indonesia	Vice Rector of Finance, Logistics and Facilities
Dr. Sheena KAUR	University of Malaya	Deputy Director, International Relations Office
Professor Dennis GALVAN	University of Oregon	Vice Provost for International Affairs
Professor Shantanu DUTTA	University of Southern California	Dave and Jeanne Tappan Chair in Marketing and Professor of Marketing; Special Liaison to APRU
Dr. Anthony BAILEY	University of Southern California	Vice President for Strategic and Global Initiatives
Professor Cynthia Rose BAUTISTA	University of the Philippines	Vice-President for Academic Affairs
Professor Jeff RIEDINGER	University of Washington	Vice Provost for Global Affairs
Ms. Shahina MOHAMED	UNSW Sydney	Chief Operating Officer, President and Vice-Chancellor's Office
Mr. Laurie PEARCEY	UNSW Sydney	Pro-Vice Chancellor International
Professor Toby WALSH	UNSW Sydney	Scientia Professor of Artificial Intelligence
Professor Norimasa MORITA	Waseda University	Vice President for International Affairs
Mr. Yuzo USAMI	Waseda University	Administrative Director for Student Services
Mr. Satoshi TSUMURA	Waseda University	Coordinator, International Office
Professor Doo Won LEE	Yonsei University	Vice-President
Ms. Suhhye LEE	Yonsei University	Deputy Manager
Dr. Christopher TREMEWAN	APRU	Secretary General
Mr. Sherman CHENG	APRU International Secretariat	Director (Administration and Finance)
Ms. Christina SCHÖNLEBER	APRU International Secretariat	Director (Policy and Programs)
Ms. Jackie AGNELLO WONG	APRU International Secretariat	Marketing and Business Development Manager
Ms. Florence CHAN	APRU International Secretariat	Office Manager/Executive Assistant to Secretary General
Ms. Elaine HUNG	APRU International Secretariat	Project Manager (Events and Relations)

List of Guests

Name	Name of Organisation	Position
Dr. Deborah ELMS	Asian Trade Centre	Executive Director
Dr. Brad FENWICK	Elsevier	Senior Vice President, Global Strategic Alliances
Dr. Anders KARLSSON	Elsevier	Vice President, Global Strategic Networks
Ms. Louise LUCAS	Financial Times	Asia Technology Correspondent
Ms. Yojana SHARMA	University World News	Asia Director
Dr. NGUYEN Thi Anh Thu	Vietnam National University, Hanoi	Director, Cooperation and Development Department

Photo Album



APRU 22nd Annual Presidents' Meet

National Taiwan University

June 24-26, 2018











Association of Pacific Rim Universities (APRU)
International Secretariat

3019, 3/F, IAS Building, HKUST
Clear Water Bay, Hong Kong

☎ +852 3469 2552

✉ apru@apru.org

🌐 apru.org

🐦 APRU1997

📘 APRU1997



國立臺灣大學
National Taiwan University

Office of International Affairs (OIA)
National Taiwan University

4/F, 2nd Administration Building
No. 1, Section 4, Roosevelt Road
Taipei 10617, Taiwan

☎ +886 (0) 2 3366 2007

✉ intlprograms@ntu.edu.tw

🌐 oia.ntu.edu.tw

📘 NTUOIA