

# INTERNATIONAL HIGHER EDUCATION

The Boston College Center for International Higher Education

Number 19 Spring 2000

## **International Issues**

- 2 Facing the Challenges of the Twenty-First Century  
**Jamil Salmi**
- 4 Community and Autonomy: Key Goals for Academe  
**Zelda F. Gamson**
- 4 On the Europeanization of Higher Education  
**Helmut de Rudder**
- 7 Asia's Academic Aspirations: Some Problems  
**Philip G. Altbach**

## **Special Focus: The United States**

- 8 Financing Higher Education in the United States: An Overview  
**Thomas R. Wolanin**
- 10 Changes in the Academic Workplace  
**Kerry Ann O'Meara**

## **Special Focus: The Southern Cone in Latin America**

- 12 Argentina: Between Tradition and Modernization?  
**Monica Marquina and Leandro Habersfeld**
- 13 Impediments to Private Higher Education in Uruguay  
**Warren Roane**
- 14 The Public University in Uruguay  
**Rodrigo Arocena and Judith Sutz**

## **Countries and Regions**

- 16 Cambodia: Rebuilding the Royal University  
**Pit Chamnan**
- 17 Thailand: Two Years After the Thaitanic  
**Edward Vargo**
- 19 Armenia: Higher Education Problems and Perspectives  
**Louisa A. Antonian**
- 20 Russia: The Gap between Higher and Secondary Education  
**Anna Smolentseva**
- 22 South Africa: The Future of Research Universities  
**Joseph Stetar**
- 23 Hungary: Hungarian Reforms  
**Anthony Morgan**
- 24 Korea: Brain Korea 21—A New National Policy Initiative  
**Gilton Eun-Jun Lee**

## **Departments**

- 26 News of the Center
- 26 New Publications

## Facing the Challenges of the Twenty-First Century

### Jamil Salmi

*Jamil Salmi is education sector manager, Latin America and the Caribbean Region at the World Bank. Address: World Bank, 1818 H St., NW, Washington, DC 20433. USA.*

*It is not the strongest species that survive, nor the most intelligent, but the ones most responsive to change.*

—Charles Darwin

Imagine a university without classrooms or even a library. Imagine a university 10,000 miles away from its students. Imagine a university without required courses or majors or grades. Imagine a degree only valid for five years. Imagine ranking institutions by their degree of Internet connectivity. Imagine a country whose main export earnings came from the sale of higher education services. Imagine a socialist country that charged full-cost tuition fees in public higher education. Are these science fiction images or real-life stories of a revolution in higher education?

In the past few years, many countries have witnessed significant transformations in their higher education systems. But the tertiary education landscape is not changing as fast everywhere. The oldest university on the American continent, the Autonomous University of Santo Domingo in the Dominican Republic, is about to collapse under the pressure of its 80,000 students, who are crowded into facilities designed for 6,000 students. In this rapidly evolving world, what is likely to happen to higher education institutions unable to change?

### *The Challenges to Higher Education*

At the turn of the 21st century, three major challenges confront higher education: economic globalization, the growing importance of knowledge, and the information and communication revolution. These trends herald radical changes in a number of areas. First, a trend toward higher skills has been observed in OECD (Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development) countries and in the most-advanced developing countries. This is illustrated by recent data from Argentina, Brazil, and Mexico showing a rising rate of return for tertiary education—a reversal of earlier trends in the 1980s.

Continuing education is growing in importance because of the necessity to update knowledge and skills regularly. The traditional approach of getting a degree before starting one's professional life is being progressively replaced by lifelong education. The traditional structure of the university as a pyramid with a majority of first-degree students and a smaller group of graduate students will be replaced by an inverted pyramid with a minority of first-time students, a larger group of students pursuing a sec-

ond or third degree, and a majority of students enrolled in short-term continuing education.

The acceleration of technical progress has reduced the emphasis on the acquisition of factual knowledge per se and, at the same time, the increased importance of methodological knowledge and skills (i.e., the ability to learn in an autonomous manner). In many disciplines, factual knowledge taught in the first year may become obsolete before graduation. In this new paradigm, learning to learn is more important than memorizing specific information, and primacy is given to analytical skills and the ability to find information.

A related development is the increasing attractiveness of university degrees with an international application. In the United States, a rapidly growing number of on-line universities are reaching out to students in foreign countries. Jones International University, which already serves students in 38 countries, is the first on-line university in the world to be formally accredited. The Technology Institute of Monterey has established a virtual university with branches throughout Mexico and Latin America. Asia and Eastern Europe have seen a proliferation of "overseas validated courses" offered by franchise institutions representing British and Australian universities.

---

***Continuing education is growing in importance because of the necessity to update knowledge and skills regularly.***

---

The best universities of any country can reach out across borders by means of the Internet or satellites, effectively competing with any national university on its own territory. The California-based University of Phoenix, one of the most dynamic new distance universities in the United States, already boasts an enrollment of 68,000 students. In the United States alone, there are already more than 3,000 institutions offering on-line training. Corporate universities, of which there are about 1,000 in operation, are another form of competition.

The emergence of these new forms of competition is likely to change the nature of quality assurance. At the institutional level, it is doubtful that the principles and standards to evaluate campus-based programs can be used to assess the quality of on-line courses without significant adjustments. At the national level, countries need to develop information systems and participate in international networks to be able to evaluate the quality of the foreign programs available to their students.

New training needs and competitive challenges will require many universities to transform their governance,

structure, and mode of operation. A key aspect is the ability to reorganize traditional disciplines, taking into consideration the emergence of new scientific and technological fields, such as biotechnology and advanced materials science, that require the creation of inter- and multidisciplinary programs across traditional institutional barriers. For example, the study of molecular devices and sensors brings together specialists in electronics, materials science, chemistry, and biology.

---

***The challenges of globalization, knowledge-based economic growth, and the information and communications revolution can be seen either as terrible threats or as tremendous opportunities.***

---

The use of modern technology has just begun to revolutionize the way learning occurs. The use of multimedia together with computers permits the development of interactive pedagogical approaches. In Brazil, a few schools of medicine and engineering have been experimenting with the use of computer-based programs to teach mathematics, resulting in a decrease in dropout rates from 70 to 30 percent.

The information revolution will have far-reaching implications for how universities are organized and ranked. A May 1999 article ("America's 100 Most Wired Colleges") in *Yahoo! Internet Life* reported the results of a recent survey that assessed U.S. universities on the basis of their computer and communication infrastructure and their level of Internet use for pedagogical and administrative purposes. But university leaders must keep in mind the high cost of

information technology, not only the initial capital investment but also the recurrent budget needed for maintaining the infrastructure.

Increasingly, tertiary education institutions will need the flexibility to react swiftly to establish new programs, reconfigure existing ones, and eliminate outdated programs. Effective feedback mechanisms, such as tracer surveys and regular consultation with employers and alumni, are indispensable for this purpose. But in many countries, universities follow very rigid procedures. In Uruguay, only when confronted with competition from new private universities did the venerable University of the Republic consider establishing graduate programs for the first time.

#### *Conclusion*

The challenges of globalization, knowledge-based economic growth, and the information and communications revolution can be seen either as terrible threats or as tremendous opportunities. Countries and higher education institutions willing to take advantage of these new opportunities must actively launch meaningful reforms and innovations. While there is no one blueprint for all, a common prerequisite may be to formulate a clear vision of how the higher education system can effectively contribute to national development and how each institution should evolve within that system.

A final word of caution is warranted to signal the danger of focusing exclusively on technical progress and globalization. Adapting to the changing environment is not only about reshaping tertiary institutions and applying new technologies. It is equally vital to ensure that students are equipped with the core values necessary to live in complex democratic societies. ■

Author's Note: The findings, interpretations, and conclusions expressed in this paper are entirely those of the author and should not be attributed in any manner to the World Bank.

#### **World Bank Report on "Higher Education in Developing Countries" Released**

*Higher Education in Developing Countries: Peril and Promise* has just been published by the Task Force on Higher Education and Society, in cooperation with the World Bank. The report, prepared by a blue ribbon panel of experts, focuses on the challenges faced by higher education in developing countries. The task force members examine such central issues as higher education and the public interest, the role of systems of higher education, governance, science and technology, and general education. Co-chairs Mamphela Ramphele of South Africa and Henry Rosovsky of the United States have stressed that they wanted to provide a fresh perspective in the report. In addition to the narrative, a number of "best practice" examples are provided and

useful statistical appendices are included as well.

The Task Force and the World Bank are providing copies of the report to many of the readers of *International Higher Education*. Copies will be sent to a selection of names on our mailing list. In addition, the report is available from the World Bank's Bookshop, 1818 H St., NW, Washington, DC 20433, USA. It is also available in full-text on the Internet. The Web site is: <<http://www.tfhe.net>>.

The specific citation to the report is: Task Force on Higher Education and Society, *Higher Education in Developing Countries: Peril and Promise*. Washington, D.C.: The World Bank, 2000. 135 pp (paperback). ISBN 0-8213-4630-X.

## Community and Autonomy: What We Must Protect in the Academy

### Zelda F. Gamson

Zelda F. Gamson is senior associate, New England Resource Center for Higher Education, University of Massachusetts-Boston. Tel/fax: (508) 645-3169. E-mail: <gamson@umb.edu>.

Not so very long ago, saying that colleges and universities need to change was a radical notion. But nowadays, everyone is for changing higher education. Look at the healthcare industry, we have been told again and again in the United States. Why can't higher education restructure like healthcare? Thank heavens we resisted the urge, since there is growing recognition that the changes in the healthcare system have led to high levels of patient and physician dissatisfaction, increasing bureaucratization and the sway of insurance companies and private companies, and at the same time decreasing quality of care. A professor is sometimes described as someone who talks in other people's sleep. Maybe my teacher, David Riesman, has been talking in my sleep lately, telling me to remember his countercyclical teaching—to be suspicious when a lot of people are jumping on the bandwagon for virtue.

So I am suspicious of a lot of people who are talking about changing higher education today. Why? Because I think their kind of change will destroy the most important aspects of higher education, while perhaps marginally improving other things they, like advocates of change in the healthcare system, have been pushing—like increasing accountability and lowering costs. What are the most important aspects of higher education that we should not change? I can capture them in two words: community and autonomy. While community and autonomy are sometimes seen as opposites, I see both as necessary to maintaining the integrity of the academy. I use the terms to describe collective aspects of higher education rather than individual characteristics.

By *community* I mean relationships among and between the students, faculty, staff, and administrators that support them in their work and reinforce the fact that they are part of a worthy common endeavor that goes beyond their in-

dividual needs and interests. These communities overlap and intertwine—within institutions, disciplines, professions, and student groups. Community can be sustained by face-to-face interaction or through mediated interaction over the Internet, telephone, in scholarly papers, and through common projects. Academic communities can be enhanced and augmented by the inclusion of nonacademic groups, such as grassroots leaders, politicians, and artists. Note the appropriateness of including nonacademics in academic communities.

When I bring in the idea of *autonomy* as central to what we should not change in higher education, I am not talking about the ivory tower divorced from the larger society and its problems. For me autonomy means the ability of institutions—and particularly of the faculty—to carry out the primary mission of higher education in a democracy. That mission is to educate (not just train, as politicians and others urge) the general population for intelligent participation in the public realm and to contribute to the understanding (not just of knowledge, as urged by those who think of education as the marketing of ideas) of how physical, aesthetic, political, and social worlds work. The autonomy of higher education is worth defending because the mission is worth protecting and fighting for.

If someone comes along proposing a change in an institution, public policy, or ways of doing business, I suggest that we all ask whether it will preserve or enhance community and the autonomy of the academy. If the answer to the question is not yes, we should resist the change and fight it tooth and nail. Community and autonomy in higher education are worth defending. We in higher education should hold our heads high and tell the healthcare industry, politicians, bureaucrats, and the media that they might try being more like us! ■

Note: This essay is based on the author's acceptance speech for the Leadership Award of the Association for the Study of Higher Education, 1999.

## On the Europeanization of Higher Education

### Helmut de Rudder

Helmut de Rudder is on the faculty at the University of Lüneburg, Germany. Address: Universität Lüneburg, Institut für Schul- und Hochschulforschung, 21332 Lüneburg, Germany. E-mail <derudder@uni-lueneburg.de>.

Following a long period of expansion and structural reforms of national systems after World War II, higher education in Europe has been undergoing considerable changes in the 1980s and 1990s. Some countries are going

in similar directions, others are following quite different national policies. Beginning in the 1950s up until the European Union (EU), under the treaties of Maastricht and Amsterdam, and including the euro as a common currency of 11 countries and the reunification of Europe after 1989, the development of European integration is affecting and challenging higher education in Europe in many ways. These developments raise the question whether it is justified to speak of a Europeanization of

higher education. The easiest answer would be: yes and no, which I suggest is a correct answer. There are discernable but limited tendencies of Europeanization in higher education, but at the same time quite different national systems of higher education prevail.

This phenomenon is not limited to higher education, it is a general European condition. There are tremendous national differences that have grown up over the centuries, and at the same time there have always been emerging, changing and declining European commonalities—such as Christianity, feudalism, capitalism, absolutism, the enlightenment, democracy, colonialism, industrialization, nationalism itself, the welfare state, the rule of law, just to name a few. Social stratification and social change in different industrialized European societies have been remarkably similar. It can be said that despite deep national differences and antagonisms, the European nations and societies and their institutions are variations on some basic themes.

---

***Only since the Maastricht Treaty (1992) has general education, under which higher education is subsumed, become a responsibility of the EU.***

---

That also goes for higher education. One of the enduring European institutions is the university as it originated in the 13th century in Bologna, Paris, and Oxford. The basic model still persists. Over the centuries, it has been exported worldwide and integrated into and adapted to different cultures. The medieval universities were truly European, and they were a system: the disciplinary matrix, curriculum, methods of instruction, degrees, certification, governance and control, organizational structures, and funding arrangements were basically the same. For quite some time, the *jus ubique docendi* conferred on every Master or Doctor of any university the right to teach at any other university in Europe. And there was one common language: Latin.

In the light of the European university of the past, present European higher education institutions are but a European shadow. (Re-)Europeanization of higher education means several different things at the same time. Policymakers and planners—not just in higher education—tend to think of reality as something they control and have designed, planned, and institutionalized. But Europeanization of higher education is at least as much “what happens anyway” as it is the result of direct political action.

Though the political dimension of European integra-

tion has gained in importance especially in the last decade, Europeanization is largely driven by the economy in the context of globalization. That is why the changing European labor market is a major driving force in the Europeanization of higher education: it is increasingly a labor market for higher education graduates in fields like information technologies, business and financial management, and, lately, environmental management (“sustainability”).

Higher education institutions respond to these challenges by institutionalizing cooperation across national borders (study abroad and common degree programs), by including the European and international dimension in their courses, and by teaching courses in English (so far, that has happened in only a very few cases). Competition between institutions is on the increase, and by Europeanizing and internationalizing programs, institutions become more attractive.

The European Union has become a major player in promoting the Europeanization of higher education—through funding. Only since the Maastricht Treaty (1992) has general education, under which higher education is subsumed, become a responsibility of the EU. Mobility of students and academic staff and bi- or trilateral common studies programs (ERASMUS, SOCRATES) are a major activity. In the present phase, the EU concludes contracts directly with higher education institutions, without the mediation of national governments. For this, institutions are expected to develop a European policy. The EU aims at a participation rate in European programs of 10 percent of the student body of the member-states. Not more than .5 percent of the EU budget goes into these programs (versus about 50 percent for agriculture). EU higher education policy is definitely not aiming at creating a European system of higher education but rather at strengthening the European dimension of otherwise national systems and institutions.

---

***EU higher education policy is definitely not aiming at creating a European system of higher education but rather at strengthening the European dimension of otherwise national systems and institutions.***

---

The other major activity of the EU in higher education is contract funding of transnational research in a broad spectrum of applied fields—from garbage disposal to space technology, but hardly for European history or philosophy. The funding is attractive and undoubtedly sparks re-

search because academics and research centers get paid for conducting it. But the red tape is immense. National governments (in Germany each of the 16 state governments) and regional networks of universities employ specialists and representatives (“funding brokers”) in Brussels to penetrate the funding jungle, to get hold of EU research grants, and to provide the know-how for successful applications. Research money from Brussels has become a major funding source for academia in the member-states of the EU.

---

***Research money from Brussels has become a major funding source for academia in the member-states of the EU.***

---

Starting from the assumption that for higher education European integration does not mean unifying national systems, it follows that for exchange, mobility, and collaborative academic programs the different national systems have to be made more compatible-while preserving their identity. For this, the magic formula is ECTS, the “European Credit Transfer System,” a sophisticated network of national governments, national rectors conferences, and the European Rectors’ Conference (CRE). For the mutual acceptance of degrees, exams, and course credits, they must be comparable and it must be clear what they mean, what they comprise, and what they are worth in relation to each other. Finally, they must be harmonized. This is the objective of ECTS, and considerable progress has already been made. It is not just a matter of statistical measurement, but also of vested interests and of passing judgments. There is only a thin line between making courses, programs, and degrees compatible and making them more similar.

Besides Europeanization of higher education as a policy, there is a great deal of “creeping Europeanization”: common problems are increasingly leading to similar solutions. The financial crisis of all highly industrialized European welfare states and the expansion of higher education (“massification”) have led to an underfunding of higher education. Institutions are expected to do more with less, become more efficient, do their own fund raising (that is the new autonomy), be more accountable, and control and improve the quality of what they are doing. In detail, national and institutional solutions differ widely, but the general tendency is basically the same: what we see is a Europeanization of problems and solutions in higher education. National governments have not developed com-

mon policies, nor have national higher education systems and institutions coordinated their responses. It is more like people opening their umbrellas when it rains: similar action without coordination.

But similar responses and solutions are greatly advanced by increasing communications within higher education all over Europe. European nongovernmental organizations and associations flourish in higher education, networks grow, and electronic communication is bringing academics and their institutions closer together all the time. Slowly but steadily, something like a European consciousness, not really tangible, seems to be developing in higher education as elsewhere. It is not replacing national identity, however, and the diversity in European higher education is generally appreciated as an asset, not a drawback.

---

***The financial crisis of all highly industrialized European welfare states and the expansion of higher education (“massification”) have led to an underfunding of higher education.***

---

The limits of Europeanization in higher education are obvious. Higher education systems continue to be a responsibility of national governments (or, like in Germany, state governments), which also have to pay for them. EU-funded programs are only a small proportion of institutional budgets. After decades of expansion and regionalization of higher education, most institutions are provincial, training graduates from the region for a regional labor market. The international business administration program is just an added bonus. The large majority of students do not study abroad and could not effectively study in any other language but their own (with notable exceptions in the Netherlands and the Nordic countries). In actual fact, the European or even global labor market for graduates is limited to relatively few professional fields. But the Europeanization of Europe is on the move, the tempo is increasing, and the normative power of the European realities will undoubtedly make higher education in this part of the world more European in this century than it was in the last. ■

#### **Internet Resource**

For more information on issues related to international and comparative higher education, visit the Center’s website, located at: <http://www.bc.edu/cihe/>

## Asia's Academic Aspirations: Some Problems

**Philip G. Altbach**

*Philip G. Altbach is J. Donald Monan, SJ Professor of Higher Education at Boston College.*

Not long ago, Singapore's education minister, Teo Chee Hean, articulated his government's long-held desire to build a "world-class" higher education establishment as an underpinning for its "knowledge economy." Minister Teo makes the argument that "in a knowledge economy, intellectual capital is a prized resource" and points out that universities are the central institution in creating and maintaining a highly educated population. He aspires to make Singapore, the "Boston of the East," pointing out that the Boston area's unparalleled network of academic, scientific, and high-tech entrepreneurial resources have given it worldwide leadership in higher education and in the industries, such as biotechnology and informatics, that are so dependent on knowledge.

Singapore is not alone in aspiring to use the knowledge economy as a means of economic growth. For example, South Korea's recently announced "Brain Korea 21" program has similar aims. Asian countries have invested heavily in higher education and research, with mixed results. The links between universities and technology industries at Hsinchu in Taiwan, begun two decades ago, proved to be quite successful. Japan's Tsukuba University has had more mixed results. Peking and Tsinghua universities in Beijing have also linked with high-tech industries, and there is talk of merging the two institutions. While these, and other, initiatives have yielded impressive results, none has yet produced the "Boston of the East." There are some interesting reasons for this. One can build institutions, but it is more difficult to instill an intellectual environment of sustained creativity and academic innovation.

### *Boston's Advantages*

It is worth analyzing what has made the Boston area such a hub of academic and scientific strength over time with a view to suggesting how Boston's example may be applicable in Singapore, and elsewhere in Asia.

- *Scale.* There are some 60 academic institutions enrolling close to 400,000 students in the Boston area. These rank from Harvard and MIT at the very top, but also include other "top 50" American universities and colleges such as Tufts, Boston College, Boston University, Wellesley, and Brandeis. Specialized institutions such as Babson College in management, the Massachusetts College of Art, and the New England Conservatory add to the mix. Scale creates synergy and possibilities for collaboration as

well as competition among both academics and institutions. It contributes to an environment of ideas and intellectual vitality.

- *Competition.* The American academic system is highly competitive—for students, research funds, and prestige. The Boston area is an especially competitive environment. Institutions, and individual academics, seek to maximize their advantages. Institutions tend to be entrepreneurial in that they carve out market niches and stress their specific strengths. Bentley College, for example, has built up an information technology-based management education program. Schools that cannot survive in a competitive environment die. Bradford College recently announced that it is closing its doors because of inadequate enrollments and financial problems.

- *The private sector.* The large majority of academic institutions in the Boston area are private. They are responsible for their own funding—and survival—and have almost complete freedom to chart institutional goals and manage their own resources. The more prominent schools have large endowments that provide funds for special initiatives, scholarships for students, and the like. Harvard, with its \$14 billion endowment, is said to be the second-richest private institution in the world after the Roman Catholic Church. A half dozen other Boston area schools have endowments approaching \$1 billion each.

---

***The environment of intellectual and academic freedom that pervades American higher education generally and the top sector of the system in particular is a central factor in its success.***

---

- *Academic freedom.* The environment of intellectual and academic freedom that pervades American higher education generally and the top sector of the system in particular is a central factor in its success. Research can be conducted in any area without external constraint, and professors are free to express their views, on matters academic or nonacademic, unfettered.

- *A vibrant metropolitan environment.* Boston is itself an attraction for both students and scholars. Despite high living costs, the city's cultural resources and its reputation as a exciting place to live lure people to the area. The academic community is an important part of this environment, but Boston is also home to the nation's largest concentration of healthcare and medical research facilities, a major biotech industry, information technology firms, and other knowledge-based industries.

*Implications for Asia*

How does all of this relate to Singapore and to Asia? It takes more than central planning and government funding to ensure a successful academic and high-tech future. Kuwait has for several decades invested heavily in higher education, building an effective but hardly world-class or research-based university. A tradition of academic excellence is important, as is an environment of academic and intellectual freedom. Scholars work best in an atmosphere of freedom. Size is important, too. Small academic communities can be quite good, even world-class, but can seldom achieve the highest academic pinnacles. Take Sweden or Denmark as examples.

---

***It takes more than central planning and government funding to ensure a successful academic and high-tech future.***

---

An environment that encourages but does not dictate university development or academe's relations with industry and government has been key to Boston's academic strength. Diversification is important, too. Not all postsecondary institutions can be Harvard or MIT. There is room for different kinds of schools, with different aims, patterns of funding, varying quality. A mix of public and private initiative helps as well, providing more avenues for funding and greater possibilities for diversity and the cre-

ation of niches. The possibility of failure provides an added incentive.

Most Asian countries cannot aspire to excellence in all fields of knowledge. Choices need to be made, and here a combination of academic, public, and private decision makers may be the most effective way to determine higher education policy. A fine balance of institutional autonomy and a sense of the broader public interest is necessary for academic planning.

Singapore's aspiration to become the "Boston of Asia" will not be so easy. Boston, after all, started its academic quest in 1636. And the structural problems are formidable. Some, such as commitments to academic freedom and diversification, are attainable. Others, such as size, are more difficult, although regional consortia may be a partial answer. Singapore's substantial investments in higher education, its stress on internationalization, its growing links to some of the world's most prestigious universities, and its targeted research and training strategy all contribute to building a world-class academic system.

As Singapore, and Asia, think through strategies for participation in the knowledge economies of the 21<sup>st</sup> century, realistic approaches to higher education development are necessary. Universities are central contributors to a knowledge economy, providing both the trained personnel and the research that is necessary. Yet, universities cannot be bought "off the shelf." They require both freedom and resources. They are at the same time national and international institutions, linked to local realities as well as to the wider world of research. They require freedom to flourish, and yet must serve the public interest. ■

## Financing Higher Education in the United States: An Overview

### Thomas R. Wolanin

*Thomas R. Wolanin is research professor of education policy and of political science, George Washington University, 2134 G St., NW, Washington, DC 20052. E-mail: <wolanin@gwu.edu>.*

The most significant distinction in revenue sources for the 3,600 nonprofit institutions of higher education in the United States is between public institutions governed by one of the 50 states and private institutions governed by private boards of trustees.

#### *Sources of Revenue*

*Tuition* payments account for only 19 percent of the revenue for public institutions, but they make up 42 percent of the revenue—the largest single source—for private institutions. Tuition is a smaller but still significant part of the revenue for public institutions. In contrast to many nations, all public and private institutions of higher education in the United States charge tuition.

*State government* is the source of 36 percent of the revenue for public institutions but only 2 percent of that for private institutions. Revenue from state government is the largest single source of revenue for public institutions, which receive block grants for core functions such as their instructional program. The small portion of their revenue (2 percent) that private institutions receive from state government is usually in the form of grants or contracts awarded competitively for a specific purpose, such as a special research or training project. The states generally do not supply any general operating funds for private institutions.

*Local government* is a minor source of funding for both public (4 percent) and private (1 percent) institutions. However, the revenue to public institutions from local governments usually consists of operating funds for local public institutions, typically two-year community colleges. The revenue to private institutions from local governments is

again in the form of competitive grants or contracts for specific purposes.

The *federal government* provides a significant share of the revenue for both public (11 percent) and private (14 percent) institutions. For both types of institution, these federal revenues come in the form of competitive grants or contracts.

---

**Among the OECD countries, the United States relies much more heavily on payments from households and other private contributors and less on public support.**

---

*Private sources* provide 4 percent of the revenue for public institutions but more than twice as much (10 percent) for private institutions. The major private sources are individuals (frequently the alumni of an institution), business, and philanthropic foundations.

*Endowment income* is the source of 5 percent of the revenue for private institutions but just 1 percent of the revenue for public institutions. Typically, donations from private sources (individuals, business, and foundations) to the endowment trust are invested, and the annual income is used by the institution for operating expenses or other purposes. In effect, endowment income is another form of revenue from private sources. Combining the revenue from private sources with that from endowment income, private institutions receive a significant 15 percent of their revenue from these sources. Even public institutions get 5 percent of their revenue from such sources.

*Sales and services* provide an identical 22 percent share of the revenue for both public and private institutions. The main portion of revenue in this category comes from students who pay rent for dormitory rooms or eat in the institution's dining halls or cafeterias.

Finally, to complete this sketch of the sources of revenue of institutions of higher education, we must consider the *financial aid* provided to students through federal government programs, which totaled \$46 billion in the 1998–1999 school year. Students spent much of this \$46 billion on tuition, dormitory, and dining hall charges at institutions of higher education. In other words, some of the revenues in the categories “tuition” and “sales and services” in fact belongs in the category “federal government.” Since federal student aid funds are frequently mingled with other student funds, it is not possible to measure exactly how much of federal financial aid becomes revenue at institutions of higher education. In the final analysis, the “federal

government” share of the revenues for both public and private institutions would be on the order of 20 to 25 percent.

Clearly, all institutions, both public and private are heavily dependent on their ability to obtain funds from a variety of sources. Institutions must work to attract tuition-paying and financial-aid-receiving students. Their dormitories and dining halls must compete with the private sector for student-consumer spending. They must vie with other institutions as well as private-sector vendors for grants and contracts from the federal, state, and local governments. They must outdo other worthy causes for the favor of individual, business and foundation donors. Even the state and local support public institutions receive for general operating expenses is subject to competition. The allocation of these funds is usually driven by institutional enrollments. Public institutions must always struggle for more favorable state revenue allocations. The most successful institutions in this effort are the more flexible, dynamic and high-quality ones.

#### *Who Pays?*

Two groups pay for higher education: first, society as a whole (i.e., all taxpayers), which provides support for higher education institutions through public or government programs, and second, the private or nongovernmental sector. Private contributions to higher education can be further divided between those that come from households (i.e., students and their families) and those that come from other private sources such as individual donors, business, and foundations.

---

**Because the benefits of higher education are both public and private, contributions from the two sectors are called on to pay for higher education in the United States and other nations.**

---

Because the benefits of higher education are both public and private, contributions from the two sectors are called on to pay for higher education in the United States and other nations. There is a very large range in the shares that different countries assign to the public and private sectors. For example, in Korea 84 percent of the total expenditures for higher education come from private payments and only 6 percent from the public sector. In contrast, in Denmark .5 percent of the total expenditures for higher education come from the private sector and 99.5 percent from the public sector. In the United States, 52 percent of the total expenditures for higher education come from private

payments, which includes 38 percent from households and 14 percent from other private contributors. This level of private payments and household payments is exceeded only by Korea and Japan among OECD (Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development) industrial or developed countries. The average among OECD countries is 20 percent of total expenditures for higher education from private payments, of which 16 percent is from households. Conversely, among OECD countries the average share of higher education expenditures from public support is 80 percent.

Among the OECD countries, the United States relies much more heavily on payments from households and other private contributors and less on public support. It is also noteworthy, however, that the total expenditures for higher

education in the United States as a percentage of gross domestic product is twice the OECD average—2.4 percent in the United States versus an average of 1.2 percent for the OECD countries.

There may be a lesson here. Perhaps a system that balances support for higher education more evenly among the public, households, and other sources in the private sector results in a much higher absolute level of support for higher education. Such an arrangement enables the United States to maintain a more “democratic” higher education sector than other countries, one that encompasses a larger share of the population. For example, 67 percent of those who complete secondary school enroll in higher education in the United States, a rate much higher than in most other nations. ■

## Changes in the Academic Workplace in the United States

**Kerry Ann O’Meara**

*Kerry Ann O’Meara is coordinator of the Project on Faculty Appointments, Graduate School of Education, Harvard University, 14 Story St., Cambridge, MA 02138, USA.*

If tenure is to survive as the standard practice in the United States, traditional policy, as codified by the American Association of University Professors and outlined in the 1990 *AAUP Policy Documents and Reports*, may have to adapt to changing circumstances in the academic world. In his 1998 American Association for Higher Education (AAHE) New Pathways Series working paper, *Ideas in Incubation: Three Possible Modifications to Traditional Tenure Policies*, Richard Chait considers three possible modifications to traditional tenure practices: tenure by objectives (a reconfiguration of the probationary period), posttenure reviews that focus more on departments than on individual performance, and guarantees of academic freedom without tenure. These considerations are in keeping with the prevailing public disposition to “mend, not end” tenure.

Tenure by objectives (TBO) seeks to reduce the stress and anxiety of tenure-track faculty experience stemming from ambiguous standards; vague measures of success; and uncertainty about the appropriate mix of teaching, research, and service. The alternative is to base tenure decisions on explicit criteria, performance-based agreements, and demonstrated competence.

How does it work? At the start of a faculty member’s first year, the candidate, department chair, and a mentor committee establish a written workplan that describes performance-related goals to be achieved over the course of a probationary period. The plan outlines an appropriate weighting for teaching, research, and service—reflecting

the tenure candidate’s interests and the department’s needs and priorities. The plan also specifies what constitutes appropriate and ample evidence of proficiency in each area of faculty work. Candidates submit a portfolio of work samples to substantiate competency and goal achievement in specific areas of their workplan as part of each annual review. If the department chair and mentor committee or a panel of internal experts are satisfied that competency has been demonstrated in a particular area, the faculty member becomes “certified” in that area and it is no longer at issue for tenure.

TBO might be particularly helpful in the areas of teaching and service, where questions such as “what constitutes good teaching?” and “what kinds of service are most important?” keep candidates guessing in traditional tenure systems. It could also resolve confusion in the research area about the relative importance of quality and quantity, or refereed versus nonrefereed publications, and journal articles versus books or book chapters because the committee’s preferences would be carefully laid out in the workplan. Under TBO, candidates would continue in their positions as long as the department observed satisfactory progress toward their objectives. Instances of substantial evidence of inadequate progress would lead to nonreappointment with due notice. An upper limit of 10 years might be advisable, but the process would be driven by results rather than deadlines. Not all members of a cohort would reach the point of tenure at the same time. This option is not unlike doctoral degree programs, which delineate at the outset the requirements for the degree—including the specific mix of courses, comprehensive exams, dissertation proposal, and defensible thesis. Students finish when the requirements have been met.

Different components of the TBO system have been piloted in the United States. The Department of Small Animal Medicine and Surgery in the College of Veterinary Medicine at Texas A&M University assigns a mentor

committee to each tenure-track faculty member. A recent study by the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching found that 26 percent of the institutions surveyed had already installed a policy allowing individual faculty to negotiate the length of the probationary period. The study is the subject of the 1997 book, *Scholarship Assessed: Evaluation of the Professoriate*, by Charles Glassick, Mary Huber, and Gene Maeroff. While this option has flaws, TBO may create a more transparent process and better guidance for junior faculty than traditional tenure systems.

Posttenure review of faculty is the most popular of the proposed modifications to conventional tenure policy. In their 1997 AAHE New Pathways Series working paper, *Post-Tenure Review: Policies, Practices, Precautions*, Christine Licata and Joseph Morreale conclude that well-conceived posttenure reviews enhance faculty development; allow faculty to emphasize teaching, research, or service in their careers; match faculty career goals with institutional priorities; and clarify performance expectations. Yet, individual posttenure reviews are likely to involve extensive time and effort. They rarely result in an increase in funding for professional development that faculty desire or an ousting of nonperformers as some policymakers intend.

---

**Posttenure review of faculty is the most popular of the proposed modifications to conventional tenure policy.**

---

Chait argues that a more effective alternative might be posttenure reviews of departments, embedded in the larger context of comprehensive departmental assessment performed every five to seven years by both internal and external peer experts. The program review would include evaluation of a department's standards, criteria, and procedures used for routine or annual faculty evaluations; documentation of faculty development activities; the degree to which the department awards excellence; and the process invoked to reinvigorate or prune subpar performers. If on the basis of substantial evidence, an intensive internal and external program evaluation concludes that the department performs satisfactorily or higher, no evaluation of its tenured faculty members would be necessary. However, if the review uncovers significant problems or concerns, then the dean or provost and program review committee would institute a performance review of all tenured faculty in the department. Individual posttenure reviews could be activated under this system by a peer

determination that a particular colleague's performance was unsatisfactory. The program review option would likely be more time- and cost-effective than individual posttenure reviews because a university could review 50 departments over seven years, as opposed to review 500 faculty in that same time. Northwestern University has a nationally recognized model of program reviews, though it is not tied to posttenure review.

---

**Ensuring academic freedom is often held up as one of the primary rationales for tenure.**

---

Ensuring academic freedom is often held up as one of the primary rationales for tenure. While most colleges and universities would like to describe themselves as guaranteeing academic freedom to their faculty, in 1995 half of all full-time U.S. faculty were hired on non-tenure-track lines, and almost two-thirds of faculty at two-year institutions and one-third at four year institutions were in part-time positions. If academic freedom is primarily linked to tenure, then one-half the faculty workforce is operating without the guarantee of academic freedom. In the 1997 AAHE New Pathways Series working paper, *Academic Freedom without Tenure*, J. Peter Byrne outlines key elements of a procedure that would conceivably provide all faculty with academic freedom. The general principles articulated by Byrne have been codified by Martin Michaelson in "Academic Freedom Policy and Procedures," which appears in Richard Chait's *Ideas in Incubation*—cited at the beginning of this article.

Whether in a small liberal arts college in Ohio, at the University of Amsterdam, or at McGill University, it is challenging to find faculty evaluation systems that respond to economic realities and public demands for accountability while at the same time meeting local needs to preserve traditions of academic culture. The overall interests of the academy are best served by new ideas and robust and civil debate about the purposes of faculty evaluation and best practice. The three modifications to traditional tenure described in this article are offered in that spirit. ■

Author's Note: This article summarizes the essay by Richard Chait, *Ideas in Incubation: Three Possible Modifications to Traditional Tenure Policies*, New Pathways Series, Working Paper no. 9 (Washington, D.C.: American Association for Higher Education, 1998). The publication can be ordered from the American Association for Higher Education, One Dupont Circle, Suite 360, Washington, DC 20036-1110. Tel: (202) 293-6440, Ext. 11, fax (202) 293-0073, e-mail: <pubs@aahe.org>.

## Argentina: Between Tradition and Modernization?

### Monica Marquina and Leandro Haberfeld

Monica Marquina is a specialist in politics and education in the Department of Education at the University of Buenos Aires. She is currently a Fulbright scholar studying in the Higher Education Administration Program at Boston College. E-mail: <marquinm@bc.edu>. Leandro Haberfeld is an economist in the Center of Studies for Development Planning at the University of Buenos Aires. He is currently studying in the Higher Education Administration Program at Boston College. E-mail: <haberfel@bc.edu>.

Argentina's peculiar public university model may evoke as much horror as admiration, but no one can deny that it is almost unique: great academic and institutional autonomy; a democratic tripartite university governance structure, composed of professors, alumni, and students; periodic competitions to select professors; a free tuition policy; and a budget decided and allocated each year by the parliament. These were the main elements of the university of the golden years—a model that is today in crisis.

The last decade has been a real challenge for the universities. In a context of scarce resources and high demands for access, universities have had to contend with maintaining their traditional character or following international trends. Today, Argentina's public universities are confronted by serious problems, and the institutions seem to be unable to solve them without external aid. The main challenge for the new government is to decide what role to play in this situation.

#### *A Decade of Modernization?*

Between 1989 and 1999 Argentine university policies were marked by the concentration of resources at the federal level in order to foster major reforms. Throughout this period of financial constraints, the government applied policies associated with international trends in higher education, supported to a significant degree by international agencies. For instance, the government attempted to design a performance-indicator-based budget allocation system—with no success. It also encouraged, with good results, extensive diversification of the graduate tier, which improved the financial position of institutions in many cases. The government also created a voluntary national system of incentives to professor and researchers. Many full-time faculty members received a significant increase in their meager salaries after fulfilling specific criteria for academic productivity. Another significant change was the creation of a national agency for evaluation and accreditation of the universities.

The public universities were organized as a system, with a powerful center supplying resources and in charge of implementing the new policies. It can be said that the re-

forms were focused more on the goals of the whole system than on those of each institution. Statistical data on the university system were compiled and published; and there were attempts at institutional coordination through the creation of intermediate bodies. However, these changes were made without the genuine support of the universities, which found themselves negotiating from a position of financial weakness. In addition, the changes were not accompanied with an adequate increase in the budget. Any increase in resources for the sector in those 10 years was absorbed by the growth in enrollments and the creation of new institutions—which produced the rise in the fixed costs of the system.

The university sector as a whole took a defensive attitude in response to the attacks on its autonomy. In a context of financial crisis, the institutions neglected their internal academic and administrative operations, as well as the task of institutional development.

#### *Current Government Policy*

The administration that assumed power in 1999 recently announced its goals in higher education. In contrast to its predecessors, the current government has the potential to create a consensus with the university sector and enjoys the political support of the students and many university presidents. Moreover, the government has decided to use the parliament to enact its policies.

---

**Many full-time faculty members received a significant increase in their meager salaries after fulfilling specific criteria for academic productivity.**

---

Contrary to what one might expect, Argentine higher education policy for the coming period will follow the international trends of quality improvement, efficiency, and equity. As a central goal, the government will create a mechanism of resource allocation among the universities based on equity criteria and incentives for the institutions that show productivity improvements. It has also announced accountability mechanisms for university planning as a counterpart to autonomy and academic freedom. The government also plans to evaluate graduates and to continue with the centralized program of incentives for professor-researchers. Another goal is to look for alternative sources of funding, while retaining free tuition. Government will create mechanisms whereby students and graduates pay society back for the services they receive. Students will have to join a social service program, and graduates will be re-

quired to fulfill the terms of the “intergenerational solidarity act,” which involves financing scholarships for working-class students.

---

***The relationship between the university system and its parts—the institutions—also needs to be reexamined.***

---

#### *Future Challenges*

Without a doubt, a higher education policy defined at central levels of government will be required to rescue Argentina’s universities from the current situation. The government will have to face structural problems affecting teaching—such as inadequate academic salaries, which rep-

resent between 85 and 90 percent of each university’s budget. Another issue to be revisited is the contest system of faculty recruitment, a tremendous tool that today requires greater transparency and efficacy. The relationship between the university system and its parts—the institutions—also needs to be reexamined. A concern pointed out by several international specialists is that pressures toward greater institutional uniformity through rigid criteria or formulas may limit innovation by reducing the wealth of institutional diversity.

At present, the public autonomous universities are facing difficult circumstances. It is possible that the government will move to limit autonomy in an effort to ensure accountability and a manageable academic structure. We believe that the Argentine public university is a central part of the academic system and that it plays a central role in research as well as in economic development. Weakening the public university would be a mistake. ■

## Impediments to Private Higher Education in Uruguay

### **Warren Roane**

*Warren Roane is director of the Center for University Studies, Montevideo, Uruguay.*

The Republic of Uruguay is the administrative center of MERCOSUR, the South American economic consortium consisting of Argentina, Brazil, Uruguay, and Paraguay. This small country of three million people needs to prepare itself for this task, at a time when its only public university has been paralyzed by debate over the purpose of the university. Although Uruguay only began to experiment with the privatization of higher education in 1985, the Ministry of Education is contemplating the recognition of more than 30 private universities. These institutions are quite diverse in origins and offerings and already account for more than 10 percent of postsecondary degrees awarded annually.

The first private institution to be recognized, Catholic University, grew out of Jesuit outreach. Some institutions, like ORT, developed by building on its longtime programs in technology. Still others were formed as alternatives to the public university by disgruntled faculty at the national university—albeit while keeping their tenured positions at that university. However, most of the new institutions focus on a particular field—computer science or the MBA—and seek recognition only as a way to enhance the job prospects of graduates. Such programs are also offered by universities in Spain, Chile, and Argentina.

Uruguay is one of the last countries in the Western

Hemisphere to offer private higher education despite its historic reputation of being a modern (and model) state. Three key factors have impeded the growth of private universities: the low impact of the Catholic Church on society, a history of educational excellence, and state-imposed restrictions.

#### *The Catholic Church*

The Catholic Church has had less of an impact on Uruguay than on other Latin American countries. Absolute separation of church and state is a long-revered tradition in Uruguay. Only in modern times has the Catholic Church paid attention to this small nation; previously, it was considered an annex of the Argentine church. For example, the first archbishop was not named until as late as 1853. The first (and only) Catholic university was opened in 1985, whereas many Latin American countries had Catholic “universities” soon after the time of the conquistadors. Some see the opening of Catholic University, at the time of the dictatorship (1973–1985), as a response to the pressure of special interest groups as well as the revenge of the military on the “liberal” public university. Though it sees itself as the “mother” of the national university, only recently has the church reclaimed tertiary education.

#### *Educational Quality*

A second impediment to privatization is that there simply has been no need for other universities in the past, due to the small population size and the general satisfaction with the national university. However, public opinion on the quality of the public school system and the national university has changed dramatically. Now, despite the historic monopoly of the public university, a growing number of students and parents are “voting with their feet” and pur-

suing options other than the national university. The fact that there are more private than public secondary schools in Montevideo signals a change in postsecondary education as well since students historically have chosen to attend public rather than private secondary schools to facilitate their entry into the national university. Correspondingly, the number of students in private higher education is growing. The number of students graduating from just two private universities (ORT and Catholic University) in 1996 was 216, while 2,724 graduated from the public university.

---

***The Catholic Church has had less of an impact on Uruguay than on other Latin American countries.***

---

#### *Government Regulation*

A third factor limiting privatization is the barriers created by government. The national university has jealously guarded its position within higher education—even in relation to other state-run educational institutions. For example, the national normal school, which is responsible for primary and secondary school teacher preparation, is not a part of the university system and has long been viewed as the competition by the university's College of Education. Not surprisingly, the national university has also opposed the recognition of private universities and believes that if they must exist, they should be regulated by an autonomous body—namely, by the national university itself.

At the present time, the government regulates private tertiary education by means of a special eight-person com-

mittee. However, the national university still exerts an inordinate degree of control: only two seats go to private universities, whereas three go to the national university outright and another three to government administrators who are alumni and former employees of the state university. The national university openly admits that it promoted the law regulating privates and that its ongoing involvement in the process is “without bias.” The Ministry of Education, which is usually headed by a former rector of the national university, has put several conditions on the recognition of private universities that discourage the presence of foreign faculty and the existence of specialized institutions. In 1995, on the 10th anniversary of the founding of Catholic University, an additional 20 institutions had already been approved by the Ministry of Education, while up to 15 more were seeking approval. Nevertheless, in the latest (1997) Ministry of Education report only two private institutions are listed under postsecondary education.

#### *Conclusion*

Of the three factors shaping private higher education in Uruguay, only the third, government barriers, has remained unchanged. The Catholic Church has reasserted its traditional influence in education. Private higher education enrollments continue to increase as dissatisfaction with public schooling grows. The Uruguayan education system has changed, and it is time for the government to reflect this new reality. The government must take steps to depoliticize the recognition process, reducing the role of the national university. As former President Lacalle noted, the government must get out of the business of private tertiary education; the tutelage of the state should end. Private institutions must have sufficient autonomy from external controls to respond to local needs. They must not be burdened by the bureaucracy that has handicapped the public university. ■

---

## Challenges for Public Higher Education in Uruguay

### **Rodrigo Arocena and Judith Sutz**

*Rodrigo Arocena and Judith Sutz are on the staff of the Universidad de la República, Montevideo, Uruguay. E-mail: <roar@fcien.edu.uy>.*

Uruguay is a small South American country with a population of 3.2 million. From the end of the 19th century it was transformed by a process of massive immigration, mainly from Europe. Since the early 20th century, education has been a tool for social progress, as reflected in the early extension of free public basic education. While much has changed, some things survive—the welfare state, for instance, which the people have not al-

lowed to disappear completely. Uruguay is now the least unequal country in Latin America in terms of income distribution. Education continues to be a high priority for the Uruguayan people, and the country is second only to Argentina, in Latin America, in terms of the proportion of the age group entering university.

Until 1985, Uruguay had only one university—a public one: the Universidad de la República (UR). Nowadays there are a number of private universities, but the bulk of Uruguayan higher education continues to be represented by the UR. It is a big university in Latin American terms, with 60,000 students. The vast majority of them study in the capital, Montevideo, which has a high concentration of higher education institutions.

The distinctive characteristics of the UR are that it is totally free of charge and students may choose what to study, since there are no limitations on admissions or en-

trance examinations to any part of the university—including the medical school. UR is also the only institution of higher education that offers teaching in all the main professional fields, along with undergraduate courses in the arts, humanities, and basic sciences. The UR budget comes entirely from the state. Only recently have research and consulting contracts begun to have some significance in budgetary terms.

The UR belongs to the important historical tradition of the Latin American university reform movement. Thus the UR has full autonomy for choosing its senior administrators, and the governance of the university lies with its “citizenry”—the teachers, graduates, and students. The university’s three missions are teaching, research, and “extension” (i.e., cultural diffusion and technical assistance to support the most deprived sectors of the population). The social engagement of the public university was greatly fostered by the student movement. Since 1950, this has led to close relationships with trade unions and other social movements and strong enmities with right-wing governments.

In the early 1970s, as part of a wave that affected not only Uruguay, democratic rule was overturned by a military dictatorship that lasted until 1985. This had major consequences for public higher education, for the military government expelled the senior administration of the UR, dismissed hundreds of teachers, banned open discussion and free association, and caused the massive migration of scientists and researchers. Many programs fell into academic decline, research activities ceased in several areas, and for over 10 years the research infrastructure was not updated. On the other hand, the people’s fight for democracy found strong support among UR students and many of its faculty, which reinforced the view that the public university is the “university of the country.”

The situation for the UR has greatly improved, but major difficulties, both old and new, affect its performance. The old problems are diverse. The bulk of the student population continues to come from the middle or upper classes, in spite of efforts to facilitate the entrance of working-class young people. The “massiveness” of the UR’s structure complicates and slows down the process of change; this is particularly the case with the professional schools, whose organization hampers interdisciplinary work. The budgetary constraints are severe. Public spending on higher education is only .59 percent of GDP. Salary levels are extremely low, and competition from the private sector and from abroad transform into a Sisyphean labor the effort to build up teaching and research infrastructures and staff.

The new difficulties relate mainly to the government’s claim that the UR must continue selling “knowledge services” to obtain revenues. This is easier said than done: the country spends only .25 percent of its GDP on re-

search and development, and neither the state nor private enterprises have generated a strong demand for domestically created or applied knowledge. The UR is the only Uruguayan research university—in the Humboldtian sense—and produces 70 percent of all research done in Uruguay. The research function is especially important in a country like Uruguay, as it contributes to understanding the history and traditions of the nation, and of interpreting science and scholarship. The UR is basically the only research institution in the country and, as such, is of special importance.

A small nation like Uruguay cannot work its way out of underdevelopment without adding knowledge value to its production. That is why an “economicist” and short-term view of public higher education that strangles its research function is a real danger for the country’s future. Thus, a key political issue is to preserve and increase that function, as well as to encourage the whole society to become an active partner in the harnessing of knowledge to human development goals. ■

#### **International Higher Education On-line**

Beginning with this issue of *International Higher Education*, we are offering an important new innovation—now you can sign up to automatically receive notice of upcoming IHE publications. Sign-up is easy. Simply log on to our website <<http://www.bc.edu/cihe>> and follow the instructions in the middle of the page. Once signed on, you will receive the table of contents of each new IHE publication, with links to the full text of every article. This new service will put in your touch with our articles immediately on publication, will permit you to send our articles to colleagues, and allow you to communicate with us through the Internet.

You may not be aware that our on-line site also provides a comprehensive index of articles published in *International Higher Education*, to include links to the full text of each article. In this way, you can easily find past information concerning the countries, topics, and authors that have been previously published in IHE—a unique service valuable in research and policy analysis. In addition to the index, our website offers links to other higher education sites, to publications related to the Center for International Higher Education, and to additional information concerning higher education.

These initiatives are just a part of our effort to provide our readers with efficient electronic access to the latest information and analysis concerning higher education worldwide. The programs of the Center are supported by the Ford Foundation and by Boston College as a service to the university community.

## Willing Hands and Hearts: The Rebuilding of the Royal University of Cambodia

### Pit Chamnan

*Pit Chamnan is rector of the Royal University of Phnom Penh. Address: Royal University of Phnom Penh, Pochentong Road, Phnom Penh, Cambodia.*

The Royal University of Phnom Penh, formerly Khmer Royal University, was founded in January 1960, with a Faculty of Letters and Humanities and a Faculty of Science and Technology. The language of instruction was French. The university closed in 1975; between 1975 and 1979, under a regime that targeted the educated, most of its faculty were killed. Of those who survived, few remained once the borders opened. Deserted for almost five years, the campus became another victim of the grim civil war.

In 1981, the university reopened as a teacher training college and a foreign language institute (FLI). The purpose of both was to provide surviving graduates of primary school (grades 1 to 5) or above with crash training as teachers. In 1988, the college and the FLI merged to create Phnom Penh University, later the Royal University of Phnom Penh. In the past decade the university has grown and now includes the faculties of social science and humanities (history, sociology, philosophy, geography, psychology and Khmer literature); science (mathematics, chemistry, biology, physics, and computer science); and foreign languages (English and French).

---

***Between 1975 and 1979, under a regime that targeted the educated, most of [the university's] faculty were killed.***

---

In the undergraduate program the primary language of instruction is Khmer, although some courses are taught in French and all students are required to take three years of English or French. The university has a new library, donated by Prime Minister Hun Sen. Although only four years old, the library is already too small. Over 600 students a day use the one-floor building. The library has over 26,000 books in Khmer, French, and English, donated by embassies and foundations. The process of translating basic science texts into Khmer has been slow, in part because faculty lack adequate background in the subject matter.

The laboratory facilities in physics, biology, chemistry, and environmental studies have been reestablished more

slowly. While faculty training is an issue, poor facilities and equipment play a role. Last summer with the help of Irish volunteers a successful program was offered in lab management and experiments for high school science teachers. The university also has a computer center to serve university and departmental needs. Faculty and students also have access to the Internet through the library and the career/academic counseling office.

The University of Technology Sydney, in Australia, assisted the Royal University of Phnom Penh by providing hardware initially and helping the registrar's office to design a software program for student records and transcripts. A locally based nongovernmental organization provided additional equipment and ongoing support.

---

***Many of the students who come to the university have a clear need of remediation.***

---

The teaching staff is made up of 200 persons, 12 with Ph.Ds, 20 with master's degrees, and the remainder with undergraduate teaching degrees from Phnom Penh University. In addition, various international and nongovernment institutions as well as some private groups provide adjunct faculty, who not only teach but often serve as peer mentors. The need for faculty upgrading is both obvious and urgent. The faculty development plan stresses graduate degrees and general improvement of content and teaching methodology. Unfortunately, since government and donor support has not been available for faculty development progress is slow and erratic.

Although the teaching staff seems large relative to the enrollment, with 1 faculty member for every 4.5 students, most staff are not full-time. The average civil service salary, including that of primary teachers and university faculty, is U.S.\$20 per month. This is only about 25 percent of the World Bank estimate of the salary for a family of five living below the poverty line. In real terms, this means that even faculty who do get extra teaching hours must scramble to support their families. There are also about 176 administrative and support staff spread across three campuses. These staff must contend with the same training needs and salary issues as the teaching faculty.

Students are admitted to the university through a series of national entrance examinations held annually by the Ministry of Education, Youth, and Sport. Enrollments for the 1998–1999 academic year totaled 4,577, of which only 23 percent were women, reflecting the fact that throughout the primary and secondary subsystems the enrollment and retention of girls remain a serious problem. Many of

the students who come to the university have a clear need of remediation. Outside of Phnom Penh and other major urban areas few schools have libraries, much less laboratories. In addition, most students from the countryside have had little exposure to foreign languages. Thus, as the university moves toward a credit unit system, it is likely that somewhere near 155 credit units will be required for graduation rather than on average 120 units required in the United States.

Within the context of sharply constrained national resources and the lack of large donors, the resource issues have been persistent. To help solve them, government has recently granted the university permission to charge tuition. It is hoped these funds will be used to enhance academic quality through the rationalization and upgrading

of staff and further program development.

In a country where up to 90 percent of the educated population were killed, we have a long way to go to produce graduates with the dedication and skills needed to guide Cambodia into a secure future. But we have also come a long way. The university has been reestablished. Improvements, even if small incrementally, have a large cumulative effect. Growth has been constant: enrollments and program offerings have increased, library and laboratories reopened, faculty and staff given short-term training, and a few sent for higher academic degrees. This progress is in large measure owing to the efforts of the university's Cambodian staff, who despite difficult conditions and low pay have given willing hands and hearts to the work of building the future. ■

## Two Years after the "Thaitanic"

### Edward Vargo

*Edward Vargo has served as dean at Fu Jen University, Taipei, and Assumption University, Bangkok. Address: 66/51 Soi Sukumvit 33, Klongton, Klongtoey, Bangkok 10110, Thailand. Fax: 66-2-204-1158. E-mail: <evargo@loxinfo.co.th>.*

After Thailand floated the baht on July 2, 1997, the basically bankrupt country had to request a \$16.7 billion loan from the International Monetary Fund. With negative growth of -9.4 percent in 1998, the economy is now expected to grow 3 to 4 percent in 1999. This past September, the government did not have to take the final installment of its IMF loan. Policy makers express guarded optimism that the economy is on the way to recovery, spurred on by a stable macroeconomic environment, improved investor sentiment, and successful implementation of key legal reforms. Even so, the recovery is slower than many had hoped. Huge non-performing loans currently stand at 45 percent of total lending for the entire financial system. While re-capitalization and massive debt restructuring continue, Thailand's real per capita GDP is not expected to return to the 1996 pre-crisis level of 70,000 baht until the year 2005.

### *Budget Cuts*

Within this context, higher education in Thailand has had to face its own challenges. Early attempts to institute budget cuts have continued with belt-tightening policies on the use of office supplies and utilities, organizing or attending conferences, and opening new courses. In some individual units of public universities, extra revenues from community service projects help to purchase badly needed equipment or offset the lack of central funds in other ways. However, only larger, more popular departments have such resources with which to support themselves.

According to Brother Simeon Anupatt P. Yuttachai, Vice-President for Financial Affairs at Assumption University, the crisis has demanded new projections of monthly cash flow in order to assure completion of its new campus, now in construction for over five years. Nothing has been scrapped in the original plans, but construction has slowed down to match possible monthly payments. The campus is still scheduled for a soft opening in June 2000, with fewer buildings completed. At other universities, like state-owned Srinakharinwirot, buildings under construction are being completed, but new construction that has already gained approval has been put on hold.

---

**Like most other universities, Assumption University declared a freeze on hiring last year.**

---

### *Hiring Freezes*

Like most other universities, Assumption University declared a freeze on hiring last year. However, this policy is implemented with great flexibility so that departments under expansion may still hire additional full-time staff. State universities have a more rigid policy. Only 20 percent of the positions made available by retirement may be replaced, and the hiring freeze will stand until a new salary range for non-civil servants is set. Many have taken government incentives for early retirement in units like Ramkhamhaeng's Faculties of Law and Political Science, but the 20 percent replacement rate applies to the entire university rather than to individual units. As a result, the situation may become more labor-intensive for remaining lecturers because class sizes necessarily become larger. In departments that were overstaffed, however, the hiring freeze will not have so nega-

tive an impact upon instruction. Moreover, restructuring to eliminate duplication of services helps to pool resources and to equalize workloads from department to department.

#### *Shifts in Student Enrollment*

While Thailand's forty private institutions of higher learning have all experienced expansion in their life-span of the past 36 years, they have had to face a reduction in student enrollments since the inception of the crisis. These students are gravitating to the state-run Rajaphat Institutes, universities upgraded from former teachers' colleges like Srinakharinwirot, and the open university Ramkhamhaeng, where enrollment increased some 20 percent in the past year, for a total now approaching 100,000 students. Even a prestigious private university like Assumption, which has not experienced significant decreases in the past two years, has had a smaller number of students applying for the second semester intake than a year ago. Of course, student enrollments affect a university's cash flow. With its mass numbers of students, Ramkhamhaeng is likely to have enough funds to meet its obligations even after autonomy from government control. Conversely, a decrease in student numbers can lead to losses of income that may affect development or force some private universities to curtail existing programs.

#### *Prognosis for the Future*

Given the state of flux in which Thai society finds itself at the moment, it is hard to predict the future for Thai higher education. Many are convinced that the present government is strongly committed to quality education on all levels, despite recent criticisms of the way it is handling privatization. However, elections are slated for next year, and what the next government will do for education remains a key question. Historically, there has often been a lack of continuity in policy from government to government, with a temptation for vested interests to return to square one with each new government.

Thai universities can expect to cope with more stress, more staff pressures, and larger classes in the years to come. In a context of strong competition for qualified staff, less established universities will need stronger human resource development and better professional training of existing staff. Overstaffed Faculties will have to become leaner and meaner. For things to turn out well, universities will need a system of greater accountability and greater rewards, especially higher, equitable salaries and a good working atmosphere to maintain morale.

As Ministry control is lessened or eliminated by the year 2002, some nation-wide unit for evaluation like the National Education Commission will probably take on the role of accrediting agency. As the universities gain more independence from Ministry control, each will need to strengthen quality assurance through internal audits. At

present, external examining committees are only in place for the private universities. In the future, instructors in the public universities can expect a similar system together with performance evaluations by students like those already used in some graduate schools.

According to Brother Bancha Saenghiran, Vice-President for Academic Affairs at Assumption, private universities need to proceed with caution. They must find ways to cope with major changes outside their control. Investment must go on, crisis or not, and they must uncover new sources of funding for continued development. In order to survive, not to mention compete, they must above all raise existing programs to national and international standards.

---

***Thai universities can expect to cope with more stress, more staff pressures, and larger classes in the years to come.***

---

One positive impact of the economic crisis that Brother Bancha has observed is a wiser set of attitudes towards spending and consumerism in the general public. Students and their parents increasingly demand a stronger correlation between cost, course, and outcome. They also recognize the need for better structuring of operations across the board. They are becoming greater stakeholders in the educational enterprise than in the past. On the national level, a greater stress upon quality assurance and good governance comes not only from reflection on failed practices, but also from the new national constitution in effect since 1997. Its stress upon the timely values of transparency, accountability, and participation is leading to a shift in models in society that will also affect every aspect of education.

In *Higher Education in the 21<sup>st</sup> Century: Global Challenge and National Response*, Philip G. Altbach and Todd M. Davis have identified ten "issue clusters" as "central to current developments in higher education worldwide." The economic crisis has intensified Thai responses to some of these. With their need to find alternative funds, universities are opening more certificate programs, short-term courses, company training programs, and graduate courses. Coincidentally, these programs help meet the increasing "demand for education throughout the life cycle" so that "those in the workforce" can cope with the evolving nature of work. Likewise, the many students returning to the country as a result of the crisis may assist in finding ways "by which talent can flourish in the soils that originally nurtured it" and thus reduce brain drain. As with every crisis, opportunities lie hidden in its folds. ■

## Armenia: Higher Education Problems and Perspectives

**Louisa A. Antonian**

*Louisa A. Antonian works in the International Journalism and International Relations Department, Yerevan H. Acharian University, P. Sevak Street 7, Yerevan 375014, Armenia. Tel: (3742) 64-22-96. E-mail: <lantonian@hotmail.com>.*

**D**uring the Soviet period the higher education system in Armenia was quite well supported and funded. Unfortunately, in the transition to a market economy the universities are now struggling to survive in the free market. The social, economic, and political changes in the country have had an impact on the entire system of higher education. Some of these changes were initiated by government, others arose in response to market forces now that institutions have become more autonomous and competitive. Meanwhile, declining government support and new funding arrangements and methods have created uncertainty and volatility. Universities can no longer rely on government financing and are turning to other sources of revenue—including student tuition, management of university properties, local businesses, donors, and foreign aid organizations. Despite these challenges and many unforeseeable factors concerning national development, great efforts are being made to update the country's higher education system.

### *Governance and Funding*

A major aspect of the change process is the self-governance of institutions. There are no laws guaranteeing the autonomy and freedom of institutions of higher education, but the institutions themselves are highly centralized with significant power concentrated in the office of the rector. Faculty have only a slight involvement in governance. As a result, in many cases change has been a lower priority than simple institutional survival.

Currently, universities receive 80 percent of their revenue from tuition fees (which range from U.S.\$300 to \$1,500 per student), 45 percent of which are returned to the state budget. Only a small amount of the state's receipts are reinvested in higher education. Thus, as the government provides less money for the management of universities, the primary concern of rectors and administrators is funding. Universities have started to charge fees for the use of university properties and for various services to generate income for staff salaries.

As a result of various factors—including high unemployment rates, new career aspirations, and significant deepening of inequality in access to education—the number of young people seeking to continue their studies after high school has risen sharply. Some 80 percent of high school

students planning to go on to higher education enroll in private classes to prepare for admissions exams, at an average cost of \$588 per subject. In addition to the 15 previously operating state institutions of higher education, there are now 87 private universities and institutes. As of January 1, 1998, state institutions of higher education had enrollments of 35,900 students—19,100 state funded (i.e., tuition-free), while the rest were charged tuition. In addition, private institutions enrolled 20,000 students. The state budget for state-funded students is very low and has been declining year by year: for instance, during the 1996–1997 academic year the expenditure was just \$261 per student.

However, the absence of a clear concept of the structure of state-funded education remains a serious issue. After more than a decade of reform, the National Assembly of Armenia only recently ratified the law on education. The delay can be explained by the frequent changes within the Ministry of Education and Science as well as by the difficulties in defining the extent of state-funded education.

One of the changes involves accreditation. Graduates from private universities did not have the same standing as those from state universities. However, some of them have gained equal standing due to recent standardized accreditation procedures. This is especially true of those institutions that ensure quality and possess modern facilities and revised and up-to-date courses in such areas as business management and international law, among others.

---

***Unfortunately, in the transition to a market economy the universities are now struggling to survive in the free market.***

---

### *Curricular Change*

The demands of new social and economic development require reshaping of the curriculum. A key effort has been the increase in both the quality and number of course offerings. Since the 1980s, attempts have been made at universities to achieve a balance between economics-oriented and social science programs. These progressive developments have involved existing departments, as well as newly created ones—such as departments of political science and public affairs. In addition, universities have enrolled experts to design a curriculum that addresses the social and economic needs of today. For instance, they have introduced social science approaches in business and economics courses. In most cases, these improvements—based on Western models—have succeeded. However, some cases require more detailed research and a deeper understand-

ing of the specific context of the region. It is not enough just to transplant Western curricula, they should be transformed to work in a specific setting.

#### *Faculty Updating and Training*

The decline in funding for higher education has also affected the economic position of the faculty. University professors who have spent their careers transmitting what is already known, are not equipped to create new, advanced-level knowledge. For instance, those who formerly taught “scientific communism” may now be teaching “political science.” However, they retain traditional methods and programs. It is mostly the senior academic staff (doctoral candidates or degree holders) who are in need of an updating of their disciplinary knowledge and expertise.

However, today a reevaluation of these disciplines is under way. Universities are attempting to reorganize academic faculties by recruiting experts whose ideas are consistent with the reforms (i.e., persons with advanced training in Western universities) or by recruiting staff (from lab assistants to the highest rank of professors) on a competitive basis. The Ministry of Education and Science has also recently developed a distance-learning program to fill the gaps in expert training. Language training, especially in English, is required to enable faculty to communicate with colleagues in their field outside Armenia.

Many universities and institutes now realize that training new and old academic staff for the new curriculum will require a long-term commitment. Still, the existing environment complicates the task of faculty training. Some pro-

fessors feel on the defensive and unsure about the validity of the changes. Others, especially senior faculty, are still opposed to change. Moreover, the fact that the faculty are often forced to find outside work to supplement their salaries decreases the amount of time they can spend on teaching and research. Besides, only teaching has been broadly funded, while research funding is in very short supply. Even when a proposal is approved, after peer review, by the National Academy of Sciences of Armenia and the Ministry of Education and Science, it often dies for lack of funding. This situation has resulted in a brain drain problem for the country’s education system.

#### *An Action Plan*

Finally, to bring the universities and their faculties into line with higher education in the West, an 8-to-10-year action plan is being developed, based on the achievements and lessons of the transition period. The plan includes the following goals: 1) improve communications among universities in order to provide better coordination; 2) stimulate the formation of a dynamic system of higher education to encourage improvement of quality and expanding the range of programs offered; 3) raise the profile and value of accreditation of programs and institutions of higher education; and 4) foster and introduce innovative institutional structures and make the most effective use of new technology. ■

Author’s note: This article was supported in part by the Bureau of Educational and Cultural Affairs of the U.S. State Department. The opinions expressed here are the author’s own.

## Bridging the Gap between Higher and Secondary Education in Russia

### **Anna Smolentseva**

*Anna Smolentseva is on the staff of the Center for Sociological Studies, Moscow State Lomonosov University. Address: 11 Mokhovaya Ul., Moscow, Russia 103009. Tel.: (095) 203-60-74; Fax: (095) 203-63-34; E-mail: <anna@opinio.msu.ru>.*

The successful functioning of the educational system as a social institution requires maintaining continuity and consistency between different levels, especially secondary and higher education. This poses a challenge for educators and policymakers seeking to ensure sustainable development of a national system of education. In Russia, the interaction between secondary and higher education has become a serious problem that must be resolved in the near future.

#### *Rising Demand*

Traditionally, Russian higher education was designed to prepare highly qualified professionals or specialists. Admission to public universities, which comprise about two-thirds of all Russian universities, is based on applicants’ perfor-

mance on entrance examinations. In the last five years, the demand for higher education has grown to historic levels: in 1999, there were 246 students per 10,000 population. Nevertheless, the proportion of the population in Russia that participates in higher education (2.4 percent) is much smaller than that in most developed countries. University entrance examinations have become much more competitive. In 1999, there were more than 200 applicants for every 100 places in public universities. In the most prestigious universities, the number of applicants can amount to as many as 12 to 14 for each place.

#### *Admissions Requirements*

A major problem is the significant gap between highly demanding university entrance examinations and the insufficient levels of knowledge that school graduates possess. This gap means that secondary school graduates need additional preparation to gain admission to higher educational institutions. According to some estimates, no more than one-third of students enter university while relying solely on

the knowledge acquired in school. Another one-third take special preparatory courses; approximately one-fifth hire private tutors, and as many educate themselves.

The burden of extra work and expenses weighs heavily on secondary school students and their families. Private classes to prepare for entrance examinations cost between U.S.\$10 and \$40 an hour. Given the current economic crisis and the low standard of living of most Russians, many young people find it difficult to gain admission to institutions of higher education. Also, the system creates abundant possibilities for corruption (bribes, favors for the well-connected, etc.).

---

***Traditionally, Russian higher education was designed to prepare highly qualified professionals or specialists.***

---

The other side of this problem is that the “quality” of incoming students, in the opinion of many faculty members, is diminishing from year to year across the country. The level of students’ general knowledge and skills is quite low. They are unable to work independently and lack initiative. It can be said that students need the additional courses and tutoring, not just to pass the entrance examinations but also to prepare them for their university studies. The new regulations that prescribe strict correspondence between courses taught in secondary schools and university admission requirements have not yet raised academic standards.

Filling the gap between secondary and higher education and finding a balance between educational levels are very important issues in Russia. The dilemma is deciding how to address these issues: should we lift secondary education up to the level of higher education or should we lower the standards of admission down to current standards at the secondary level?

Meanwhile, demographic trends in Russia have moved the debate over these problems to another arena. Stiff competition for admission to universities is expected to last until 2004, when the number of secondary school graduates will begin to decrease. By 2009 entrance examinations will be meaningless because the number of secondary school graduates will be less than the number of available places in public universities (1.3 million school graduates and 1.7 million places in higher educational and secondary professional institutions). Moreover, this situation will occur in some regions (including the major cities of Moscow and Petersburg) in just four years. The reason is a demographic decline in the age cohort. All this is throwing out new challenges for Russian education and society. Which should have priority: providing advanced professional and voca-

tional education for everyone or maintaining the competition for the spaces in the university? Also, the absence of competition for admission to public universities would lead to a decline in the number of students at private universities. Only the most successful private institutions would survive (there are now 251,000 students in private universities and 3,347,000 in public ones).

An active search recently ended for strategies to resolve this and other problems in Russia. In January 2000, a new “national doctrine of education in the Russian Federation” was discussed at the All-Russia meeting of educators. The doctrine, which was developed over a two-year period, defines the issues of high priority in Russian education—namely, financing and future development. It was recently passed into law by Parliament and guarantees tuition-free professional and higher education for 50 percent of the students (those who pass a competitive examination) and tuition-free graduate education for those who pass another examination. Those who do not score well enough on the examinations will pay tuition.

To fill the gap between secondary and higher education, there is a need to change existing admission procedures in higher education institutions. One option under discussion is admissions based on secondary school graduation certificates. This system is followed in France and Germany. However, in Russia such a system would seem to be unrealizable as yet due to major discrepancies between standards of secondary education in urban and village areas. Village areas account for about 70 percent of all schools, and the quality of education there is quite poor. Another option is introducing a system of centralized national testing (as in the United States), which also has its own pros and cons.

---

***Stiff competition for admission to universities is expected to last until 2004, when the number of secondary school graduates will begin to decrease.***

---

Bridging the gap between secondary and higher education also requires greater continuity and consistency in the curricula of secondary and higher education; establishing multilayer educational institutions that include both secondary and higher educational institutions; negotiating contracts between schools and universities about cooperation; and upgrading teachers’ qualifications, among other things. Finally, a gradual transition to a 12-year school system will reduce the excessive workload on secondary school students and enhance preparation for the university by improving the quality of education. ■

## The Future of South African Research Universities

### Joseph Stetar

Joseph Stetar is professor of education at Seton Hall University. Address: Kozlowski Hall, South Orange NJ 07079 USA. E-mail: <Stetarjo@shu.edu>.

In recent decades a widely discussed aspect of higher education policy has been the relationship between universities at the center and those at the periphery—that is, between universities of the highly developed countries and those of developing countries. The debate has focused on the universities in developing countries and their disadvantage in the highly sophisticated, rapidly changing international or global knowledge network. The case of South Africa's research universities illustrates the dilemmas.

It is generally agreed that only a relatively few central, research-oriented universities are the producers in the international knowledge system. The peripheral higher education sectors in developing countries—thinly resourced, operating under adverse conditions and struggling with a lack of textbooks, libraries, and laboratory facilities—are identified as second- or third-level distributors of knowledge. Moreover, the higher education systems in countries such as South Africa often live a schizophrenic existence looking both outward and inward as they try to serve the twin masters of national relevance and international credibility.

#### *Research and Development*

South Africa is in a unique position on the African continent. Its wealth and academic traditions permit it to have “first world” universities if it wishes to do so. South Africa is a very minor player in the world of research and development (R&D). Its total R&D expenditure in 1992 was about 0.223 percent of the total world spending on R&D and it has about 0.282 percent of the world's R&D scientists and engineers. However, on the African continent South Africa is the major player, accounting for about 60 percent of all R&D expenditures and about 28 percent of all R&D scientists and engineers. As it does in R&D spending, South African universities dominate research on the continent. For example, South African university faculty publish approximately 44 percent more articles in the sciences than academics in Egypt, which is the second-most prolific country in Africa.

However, as is to be expected, the research capacity of South African universities is not evenly distributed but is, rather, concentrated in six universities: Cape Town, Witwatersrand, Natal, Pretoria, Stellenbosch, and the Orange Free State. It is evident these six universities dominate R&D in South African higher education. Moreover,

by most commonly accepted benchmarks (e.g., comprehensive faculties, extensive graduate and professional programs, R&D expenditures, faculty publications, etc.) several of South Africa's universities have the potential to be the only international-standard, research-oriented institutions, for the immediate future, on the entire continent.

Clearly several of these six universities, for whatever grim historical reasons, have the capacity, skills, and experience to provide support for policy development and implementation. These universities also have the infrastructure to supply an important portion of the basic and applied research needed to build the economy and help the nation meet the needs of its citizens. For South African higher education policymakers the questions are clear. Do you want to have institutions that seek to be at or near the center of the world knowledge system? Does the nation need such institutions? Can it afford them? Can South Africa prosper without them?

These six universities have the potential to become powerful economic engines and great magnets for attracting badly needed international investment capital. Maintenance and enhancement of their role would appear to warrant special consideration by both the South African government and the international donor communities. Unfortunately, this may not be occurring.

---

**Enrollment in South Africa's 21 universities is dropping dramatically at a time it was expected to expand.**

---

#### *The Impact of U.S. Assistance*

U.S. Agency for International Development support for South African higher education may not help to ensure that South Africa will have institutions at the center of the world knowledge network. On the contrary, the effect of that support—as currently designed—may be to place South Africa securely at the periphery. In accordance with the South Africa's Higher Education Act, U.S. aid to South African higher education is focused on trying to improve the quality of education at more than 15 historically disadvantaged institutions (HDIs). In many ways, this focus may be quite appropriate. However, because the agency excludes the research-oriented universities this approach may not provide a basis for a sustainable reform and enhancement of quality in South African higher education.

Enrollment in South Africa's 21 universities is dropping dramatically at a time it was expected to expand. In the two years preceding 1998 enrollments declined by ap-

proximately 10 percent, to 352,000, and are expected to drop even more in the next couple of years. The HDIs have borne the brunt of these declines, as far fewer black students are qualifying for university admission. Moreover, the black students who do qualify are deserting the HDIs and enrolling at the historically white institutions—especially the more research-oriented universities whose degrees are perceived (correctly, by almost any measure) to be of higher quality.

Increasingly, South Africa's more research-oriented universities are being called upon to educate the nation's

black elite while providing the technical expertise and research required for economic growth. South Africa needs to find a way to provide these universities with the support necessary to maintain their critical missions and to keep at least a few South African higher education institutions near the center of the knowledge system. ■

Author's Note: An expanded version of this paper was presented at conference sponsored by the University of the Orange Free State's Unit for Research into Higher Education in Bloemfontein, South Africa, September 1999.

## Reform in Hungarian Higher Education

**Anthony Morgan**

*Anthony Morgan is professor of educational leadership and policy at the University of Utah, USA. E-mail: <morgan\_a@gse.utah.edu>.*

Hungarian universities, like those in other Eastern European countries, have roots in the Prussian model of a strong state apparatus and a semiautonomous professoriate. During the four decades of Soviet occupation, state dominance was strengthened in an increasingly centralized system. A second important structural characteristic of Eastern Europe generally and Hungary in particular is a relatively high level of institutional fragmentation—that is, the existence of many small institutions offering a limited number of programs. The Soviet years saw a significant increase in the number of small, specialized institutions and also a separation of the research function from universities into scores of research institutes controlled by the Hungarian Academy of Sciences. These legacies of state dominance and institutional fragmentation have important implications today for the shape of reform.

Hungarian higher education reform in the 1990s has been driven by two primary forces. The first is the government's desire to have *more for less*—to expand access to higher education but at a lower cost. Expansion has been driven largely by a desire to “catch up with Europe” in both economic and educational terms. The second driving force is a reform platform formulated by reformers in both Hungary and the World Bank. The bank's increasing interest in loans to develop human capital was welcomed by some in Hungary as a means to finance badly needed improvements in the higher education infrastructure. A World Bank loan of \$150 million, negotiated in 1997, was intended to fund infrastructure needs and technical assistance for programmatic reforms.

The objectives of the joint government-World Bank reform program were to increase higher education's respon-

siveness to changing social and economic conditions, to use resources more efficiently, to mobilize nonstate resources and to create a more equitable financing system. Elements of the reform program range from the integration or merger of smaller institutions to a more flexible and transferable curriculum.

One element of reform, and a major focus of controversy, is institutional mergers. The government and the World Bank have been interested primarily in eliminating duplication and achieving economies of scale. The government stipulated that mergers would be made on a geographic rather than mission basis—that is, dissimilar institutions in common geographical areas would be merged rather than similar universities in different locations. An important implication of geographically based mergers—one that is rarely discussed at the governmental policy level—is a breakdown of the binary system and merger of different organizational cultures.

---

***One element of reform, and a major focus of controversy, is institutional mergers.***

---

An interesting dynamic in the processes shaping integration is the issue of who decides on the specific mergers. Under the previous government, proposals submitted by institutions were reviewed by a newly established coordinating body for higher education, with the final determination then being made by the government. Believing that this essentially bottom-up process had produced less than optimal results, the current government took steps to centralize the process within the ministry to a greater extent. The current integration plan calls for 41 university-level institutions being merged into 17 universities and 22 college-level institutions being merged into 13 colleges.

A second element of reform is the introduction of lay

boards at both national and institutional levels. The national board, known by its Hungarian acronym, FTT, is composed of 21 members: half nominated by the higher education sector, half coming from users such as employers and professional associations, and one government representative. The FTT is purely an advisory body to the Ministry of Education, but its powers are significant—ranging from the development of an overall strategic plan to the allocation of admission places in universities.

The rationale for including boards in the overall reform program was twofold. First, boards represented a structural solution to the reform objective of “responsiveness” to changing social and economic conditions. Boards composed of users of higher education’s products could help clarify and promote needed changes. Second, from the universities’ point of view, boards could serve a classic “buffering” function of protecting them from the vicissitudes of political forces.

Implementation of both reform elements illustrated here has been a struggle. Structurally, the Prussian model has difficulty accommodating the emergence of power in the middle—anything between the state and the professoriate. Additionally, each case illustrates the powerful legacies of the socialist system in shaping attitudes toward reform. One of the central dynamics of socialist systems has been the state bureaucracy’s control over allocation and a resulting culture of subordination. Ministry officials would not allow the FTT to function as the principal advisory

body for higher education on issues of integration or any other major policy arena. Another closely related characteristic of socialist societies is the absence of “civil society” or nongovernmental institutions occupying the intermediate space between government and individuals. Boards are a foray into this intermediate space and it has been a difficult pioneering venture in terms of legitimacy and power.

Clearly integration and other elements of reform have encountered the classic dynamics of interest group behavior found in all societies. Integration leaders come from regional universities eager to increase their influence and resources. Resistance comes from the larger and more powerful Budapest universities protecting their status. The legacies of socialism have further shaped and reinforced this dynamic through an established pattern of networks between ministry bureaucrats and institutional leaders created to cope with the constraints of a “shortage economy” characteristic of socialist countries.

After the euphoria of 1989, the realities of significant reform in higher education in Hungary have become apparent as some groups resist change and seek to protect perceived interests and beliefs. However, the legacies of socialist systems constitute deeply rooted ways of thinking and acting that lie not in the particular political system but in the social and economic structures upon which these societies were built. Many involved in higher education reform in Hungary have concluded that change will take a generation or two. ■

## Brain Korea 21: A Development-Oriented National Policy in Korean Higher Education

**Gilton Eun-Jun Lee**

*Gilton Eun-Jun Lee is a doctoral candidate in the higher education administration program, Boston College. E-mail: <leeeh@bc.edu>.*

On June 15, 1999, about 1,000 professors demonstrated in the street in Pusan, the second-largest city in Korea. Their slogan was “Withdraw Brain Korea 21!” Three weeks later, about 900 professors gathered for another demonstration in the capital, Seoul. Their demand was the same, “Withdraw BK21!” In the history of Korean higher education, there has never been a national education policy against which university professors have publicly protested.

*The Brain Korea 21 Project*

In spring 1999, the Korean government established a new national education policy to prepare Korean higher educa-

tion for the 21st century. The policy, “Brain Korea 21” (BK21), has several purposes: to develop world-class research universities, foster the creation of human resources through graduate schools, nurture quality regional universities, and reform higher education. To accomplish this, the government has decided to invest 1.4 trillion won (about U.S.\$1.2 billion) into higher education over seven years. Three-quarters of the budget will be invested in supporting graduate schools in certain fields in the natural and applied sciences, humanities, and social sciences. The goal is to develop selected graduate schools and universities into leading world-class research universities in the near future. The remaining institutions will become regional universities that will create the human resources required by local industrial societies.

The project operates on the principle of “selection and concentration.” All universities applying to the project must establish research consortia of collaborative networks among competent university researchers. Each research consortium consists of one leading university and one or more participating universities. The government provides financial resources to selected consortia.

The most distinctive feature of BK21 is that graduate students in the selected graduate schools will be the direct

beneficiaries of the project. Research funds will not go directly to professors in the form of grants. In large part the budget will be used to provide a supportive educational environment for graduate students in the form of stipends, financial support for overseas study, research infrastructure, and so on. That is the main reason why the project is called Brain Korea 21.

The government and the Ministry of Education predict that when the project is completed, the universities selected for support will have been transformed into world-class research universities. They anticipate that 2,000 graduates with doctorates and 200 with professional degrees will be produced in selected research fields each year and that the amount of scientific research registered with the Social Science Citation Index will be dramatically increased.

#### *The Pros and Cons of BK21*

BK21 is an unprecedented policy in terms of its scale and planning—ambitious in its attempt to reform and develop Korean higher education. Proponents argue that past policies in higher education finance have focused on distributing of limited resources fairly among all colleges and departments. BK21 will change the focus to efficiency of investment rather than equality of opportunity in the distribution of research funds. Supporters of BK21 also maintain that various research consortia supported by the project will create the intellectual foundation for Korean higher education and society. Furthermore, shifting the focus of higher education from undergraduate to graduate education will mitigate the overheated competition for entering top-tier universities.

The opposition to BK21 is based on concerns among many faculty about the possible negative impacts of the project. First, the opponents argue that most professors in Korea, except some in top-tier universities, have always had trouble obtaining research funds. If the traditional top universities are selected and supported by BK21, the principle of “selection and concentration” will prevent most professors in nonselected colleges and universities from getting their research funded. Furthermore, BK21 may be detrimental to fair competition among universities, reinforcing the traditional pecking order, which has long been perceived as an obstacle in the development of Korean higher education.

Second, most academics suspect that the government is trying to reform Korean higher education through the enforcement of BK21. The Ministry of Education requires a prerequisite for participation in the project: every selected university must undertake educational reforms under the direction of the Ministry of Education—such as, reducing the number of undergraduate students, hiring professors who teach only at the graduate level, and improving university curricula. Considering that most Korean colleges and universities have lacked autonomy in many ways, the

administrative devices of BK21 may further depress autonomy levels in Korean higher education.

Third, although the goal of BK21 was to strengthen research capacity in Korean higher education, critics argue that the project will seriously weaken research activities in the majority of colleges and universities because of insufficient numbers of graduate research assistants. Universities supported by BK21 will receive enough funds to support their graduate students and will thus have a great advantage in attracting well-qualified students to their programs. By contrast, most graduate schools in nonselected universities may lose students due to a relative lack of research facilities and financial support for graduate students. In fact, since the Ministry of Education announced the results of the selection process, many more undergraduate students have applied to graduate programs in the selected universities and academic fields supported by BK21.

---

***Considering that most Korean colleges and universities have lacked autonomy in many ways, the administrative devices of BK21 may further depress autonomy levels in Korean higher education.***

---

#### *Remaining Issues*

Over the objection of many academics, the Ministry of Education is proceeding with the project, with some minor modifications. Despite any problems inherent in BK21, certain universities and fields of study may receive a significant boost from the project. In economic terms, such as maximizing the benefits of limited resources, BK21 may be a rational policy that will yield visible achievements in the near future. However, the professors' protests and objections against BK21 imply a failure in the agenda-setting process. In fact, the Ministry of Education did not publicly consult with the higher education community and failed to hold any public hearings before the official announcement of the project. Moreover, other controversial issues—such as uneven development among academic fields and the overdependence on government funding—may also weaken the effort to promote academic autonomy in Korean higher education. The success or failure of Brain Korea 21 will show the effect on higher education of a development-oriented and government-controlled educational policy. ■

Author's Note: I would like to thank Dr. Sungho Lee (Yonsei University, Korea) for helpful comments on an earlier draft of this article.

## News of the Center and the Program in Higher Education

Work continues on two important Center projects. The inventory of centers and programs of higher education worldwide is mostly completed. Dave Engberg has been providing leadership to this work. We will publish the inventory as a book and will post it on our website as well. The Ford Foundation and the International Education Research Foundation have provided support for this effort. Our African higher education handbook continues to progress. Damtew Teferra is the lead researcher on this project, which will result in a comprehensive volume featuring research-based essays on all African countries. The Ford Foundation is providing support. Our collaboration with the University of Amsterdam in the Netherlands continues. The Center organized a weeklong seminar on American higher education for a group of University of Amsterdam senior administrators in Washington, D.C. and Boston this past fall. Prof. Karen Arnold, coordinator of BC's higher education program and Philip Altbach coordinated this effort, and Kevin Sayers assisted with the logistics. Patricia Maloney of the American Council on Education provided assistance in Washington.

Prof. Philip Altbach is organizing a research conference in collaboration with Harvard University's Harvard Project on Faculty Appointments, the Univer-

sity of Amsterdam, and the Gesamthochschule Universität Kassel, in Germany, on the changing academic workplace in Europe and the United States in late March. This research project, funded by the HPFA, will result in a book on faculty appointments and academic work.

The Center welcomes Dr. Julio Durand of the Universidad Austral in Buenos Aires, Argentina as a visiting scholar. Dr. Durand is a senior Fulbright scholar. Fr. Charles Beirne, SJ, the incoming president of LeMoyne College in Syracuse, New York and a longtime friend of the Center, will join the Center as visiting scholar in the late spring. Fr. Beirne was, until recently, the academic vice rector at the Landivar University in Guatemala.

The Boston College higher education administration program will welcome Fulbright-sponsored students from El Salvador, Cambodia, and South Africa to its master's program. Under the leadership of Prof. Kathleen Mahoney, the program is beginning a special emphasis on religion and higher education. This will feature a "track" in our graduate programs and a special summer seminar for incoming senior administrators in Catholic universities. Professors Karen Arnold and Ted Youn have received funding for research on Rhodes scholars. ■

## New Publications

*Guide to Higher Education in Africa.* Compiled by the Association of African Universities and International Association of Universities. London: Macmillan Reference, Ltd., 1999. 420 pp. U.S.\$65 (paperback). ISBN 92-9002-164-0. Address: Macmillan Reference, 25 Eccleston Pl., London SW1W 9NF, UK.

A comprehensive country-by-country listing of African universities, this volume is the first such reference work. Information concerning enrollments, field of study, and related issues is provided, as well as a brief overview of each country's higher education system.

*Private Higher Education in Malaysia.* By Molly N. N. Lee. Penang, Malay-

sia: School of Educational Studies, Universiti Sains Malaysia, 1999. 116 pp. (paperback). ISBN 983-9700-68-5. Address: School of Educational Studies Monograph Series, USM, Penang 11800, Malaysia.

Private higher education is one of the fastest-growing segments of the Malaysian educational system. This book includes essays on the globalization of higher education, the economic crisis and its impact on Malaysian higher education, public policy and private higher education, and related topics.

*Higher Education at the Crossroads: Tradition or Transformation?* Edited by Ingemar Fägerlind, İçara Holmestrand, and Görel Strömqvist. Stockholm: Institute of International Education, Stockholm University, 1999. 266 pp. (paper). ISBN 91-7265-

021-4. Address: Institute of International Education, Stockholm University, S-106 91 Stockholm, Sweden.

This book contains a wide-ranging discussion of contemporary issues in higher education, including quality in Scandinavian higher education, academic excellence in South Africa, mass higher education, global higher education issues, and others.

*Internationalization in Higher Education: A Paper and Seven Essays on International Cooperation in the Tertiary Sector.* Edited by Bernd Wächter. Bonn: Lemmens Verlag, 1999. 172 pp. (paper). ISBN 3-932306-33-3. Address: Lemmens Verlag, Königswinterer Str. 95, D 53 227 Bonn, Germany.

An essay dealing with the various aspects of internationalization, including governmental and institutional policies, motives and rationales, and

European patterns is followed by response essays with more specific foci such as internationalization in Finland, the global job market, the export of higher education from the Netherlands, and the African brain drain.

*Towards the European Model of Postgraduate Training.* Edited by Osmo Kivinen, Sakari Ahola and Päivi Kaipainen. Turku, Finland: Research Unit for the Sociology of Education, University of Turku, 1999. 283 pp. (paperback). ISBN: 951-29-1562-6. Address: RUSE, Hämeenkatu 1, University of Turku, Turku 20014, Finland.

Postgraduate (graduate) education is one of the most rapidly growing areas of European higher education. This volume discusses the "state of the art" in Germany, Finland, the Netherlands, France, the United Kingdom, Italy, Portugal, and Hungary. The focus of the book is, in part, on the labor market for recipients of advanced degrees.

*Faculty Misconduct in Collegiate Teaching.* By John M. Braxton and Alan Bayer. Baltimore, Md.: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1999. 238 pp. \$34.95 (cloth). ISBN 0-8018-6125-X. Address: JHUP, 2715 N. Charles St., Baltimore, MD 21218, USA.

One of the first full-scale studies of faculty misconduct, this volume defines teaching norms in different disciplines, discusses issues of misconduct, and means of dealing with it. Based on a survey of U.S. faculty members in several different disciplines and types of institutions, this volume sheds light on a topic for which there are few established norms or procedures.

*The Chicago Handbook for Teachers: A Practical Guide to the College Classroom.* By Alan Brinkley, et al. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1999. 185 pp. \$9.00 £6.50 (paper). ISBN 0-226-07512-5. Address: University of Chicago Press, 5801 S. Ellis Ave., Chicago,

IL 60637, USA.

A brief and insightful guide to undergraduate teaching by a team of U.S. faculty, this book provides guidance on such matters as preparing a syllabus, exams, the use of electronic resources, classroom discussions, and other teaching-related topics. While focused on the U.S. undergraduate classroom, the book may provide useful insights in other contexts.

*The Price of Admission: Rethinking How Americans Pay for College.* By Thomas J. Kane. Washington, D.C.: Brookings Institution Press, 1999. 130 pp. \$15.95 (paper). ISBN 0-8157-5014-5. Address: The Brookings Institution, 1775 Massachusetts Ave. NW, Washington DC 20036, USA.

A multifaceted analysis of how higher education is financed in the United States, this book provides both an overview of a very complicated financial arrangement that involves the state and federal governments, individuals and families, and many academic institutions. Kane argues that the present system does not deal with persistent inequality in access, and argues for a package of reforms.

The Publications Series of the National Center for Postsecondary Improvement, United States. The NCPI is a nationally funded research and policy institute headquartered at Stanford University. It sponsors research and publication on a variety of topics relating to current issues in American higher education. It has an active publication series and issues occasional papers, research reports, and other publications. Among the topics covered are funding issues, stratification in American higher education, quality assessment, and many others. For further information, write to the NCPI at 520 Galvez Mall, 508 CERAS, Stanford University, Stanford, CA 94305, USA.

*The University Gets Religion: Religious Studies in American Higher Education.*

By D. G. Hart. Baltimore, Maryland: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1999. 321 pp. (cloth). ISBN: 0-8018-6210-8. Address: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2715 N. Charles St., Baltimore, MD 21218 USA.

D. G. Hart analyzes the study of religion in American higher education. This topic is largely ignored by mainstream scholars, but religion has traditionally been a subject of considerable importance. Stimulated by the rise of the Protestant denominations and of Protestant colleges and universities, religion has been part of the curriculum throughout American higher education. Hart argues that at present there is a revival of interest in the study of religion.

*Higher Education in Germany: Developments, Problems and Perspectives.* By Barbara M. Kehm. Wittenberg, Germany: Institute for Higher Education Research, and Bucharest, Romania: UNESCO European Center for Higher Education, 1999. 145 pp. (paper). ISBN: 92-9069-157-3.

A brief but comprehensive survey of German higher education, this volume provides a discussion of the key elements of the academic system, including the role of higher education in society, national and state policy issues, quantitative developments, faculty structure and academic work, institutional governance, students, and the pattern of studies.

*Managing International Students: Recruitment to Graduation.* By Christine Humfrey. Buckingham, UK: Open University Press, 1999. 164 pp. (paper) \$32.95 ISBN: 0-335-20307-8. Address: Open University Press, 22 Ballmoor, Buckingham MK18 1XW, UK.

Writing from a British perspective, this volume provides a "hands on" guide to working with international students. Included are discussions of institutional planning for international study, marketing foreign study, working with international students on the campus, and related topics.

*Managing Academic Staff in Changing University Systems: International Trends and Comparisons*, edited by David Farnham. Buckingham, UK: Open University Press, 1999. 365 pp. (cloth). ISBN 0-335-19961-5. Address: Open University Press, 22 Ballmoor, Buckingham MK18 1XW, UK.

The chapters in this anthology provide an international perspective on changes in the academic profession. Case studies from a dozen Eu-

ropean countries, several from Asia and 2 from North American examine such issues as collegiality, changing employment relationships, structures of universities and the impact on the profession, and others.

*Teaching for Quality Learning at University*. By John Biggs. Buckingham, UK: Open University Press and the Society for Research Into Higher Education, 1999. 250 pp. (paper)

\$29.95 ISBN: 0-335-20171-7. Address: Open University Press, 22 Ballmoor, Buckingham MK18 1XW, UK.

A practical guide to teaching in postsecondary education, this volume deals with all of the key elements of the teaching process, including clarifying curriculum objectives, enriching large-class teaching, teaching international students, assessing quality, and others. ■

## A New Initiative in International Higher Education

### Introduction

The Boston College Center for International Higher Education provides a unique service to colleges and universities worldwide. While it has as its primary aim providing information and publications to colleges and universities related to the Jesuit tradition, it also has a broader mission to be a focal point for discussion and thoughtful analysis of higher education. The Center provides information and analysis for those involved in managing the higher education enterprise internationally through publications, conferences, and the maintenance of a database of individuals and institutions. The Center is especially concerned with creating dialogue and cooperation among academic institutions in the industrialized nations and those in the developing countries of the Third World.

The Boston College Center for International Higher Education works in a series of concentric circles. At the core of the enterprise is the Jesuit community of postsecondary institutions—with special emphasis on the issues that affect institutions in developing countries. The next ring of the circle is made up of academic institutions in the Catholic tradition. Finally, other academic institutions as well as governmental agencies concerned with higher education may participate in the activities of the Center. All of the Center's publications are available to a wide audience.

### Programs and Resources

The Boston College Center for International Higher Education has as its purpose the stimulation of an international consciousness among Jesuit and other institutions concerning issues of higher education and the provision of documentation and analysis relating to higher education development. The following activities form the core of the Center's activities during its initial period of development:

- newsletter;
- publication series;
- study opportunities;
- conferences;
- bibliographical and document service; and
- networking and information technology.

### The Program in Higher Education

The Program in Higher Education offers masters and doctoral degree study in the field of higher education. The Program has been preparing professionals in higher education for three decades, and features a rigorous social science-based approach to the study of higher education. The Administrative Fellows initiative provides financial assistance as well as work experience in a variety of administrative settings. Specializations in higher education administration, student affairs, international higher education, and others are offered. The Higher Education Program works closely with the Center for International Higher Education. Additional information about the program in Higher Education is available from Dr. Karen Arnold, Coordinator, Program in Higher Education, Campion Hall, Boston College, Chestnut Hill, MA 02167. Fax: (617) 552-8422 e-mail: <arnold@bc.edu>. More information about the program—including course descriptions and degree requirements—can be found online at the program's WWW site:

[http://infoeagle.bc.edu/bc\\_org/avp/soe/hea/HEA.html](http://infoeagle.bc.edu/bc_org/avp/soe/hea/HEA.html)

### INTERNATIONAL HIGHER EDUCATION

ISSN: 1084-0613

#### Editorial Office

Center for International  
Higher Education  
Campion Hall  
Boston College  
Chestnut Hill, MA 02467 USA  
Tel: (617) 552-4236  
Fax: (617) 552-8422  
E-Mail: [highered@bc.edu](mailto:highered@bc.edu)  
<http://www.bc.edu/cihe/>

Editor: Philip G. Altbach  
Assistant Editor: David Engberg

*Material in this newsletter may be reproduced. Please cite the original source of publication. Opinions expressed here do not necessarily reflect the views of the Center for International Higher Education.*

*International Higher Education* is published quarterly by the Center for International Higher Education. We welcome correspondence, ideas for articles, and reports. If you would like to be placed on our mailing list, please write to the editor on your business letterhead.