

INTERNATIONAL HIGHER EDUCATION

The Boston College Center for International Higher Education

Number 21 Fall 2000

International Issues

- 2 The European University President: An Unknown Species
Ulrich Teichler
- 3 The Crisis in Multinational Higher Education
Philip G. Altbach

Special Focus: The Academic Profession

- 6 The Winds of Change and Academic Staff in Europe
Jurgen Enders
- 7 Overreliance on Part-Time Faculty: An American Trend
Ernst Benjamin
- 9 Academic Freedom in Hong Kong
Philip G. Altbach

Countries and Regions

- 10 Mixed Policy Signals in American Higher Education
Arthur M. Hauptman
- 12 Reform in Belarus
Nikolai Petroukovitch
- 14 Widening Access and Raising Fees in Britain
Michael Shattock
- 16 The Foreign Invasion of Israeli Higher Education
Roxana G. Reichman
- 17 East German Universities Ten Years After
Peer Pasternack
- 18 Korean National Universities at the Crossroads
Toru Umakoshi
- 20 Current Issues in Australia
David Gamage
- 22 The Canada Research Chairs Program
Glen A. Jones
- 23 Endowing African Universities
Ellen Mashiko

Departments

- 26 News of the Center
- 26 New Publications

The European University President: An Unknown Species

Ulrich Teichler

Ulrich Teichler is professor at the Center for Research on Higher Education and Work, University of Kassel, Germany. E-mail: <cassidy@Hochschulforschung.uni-kassel.de>.

Experts agree that the role of the university president (rector, vice-chancellor, or similar title) in most European countries increased in importance and power in the 1980s and 1990s. Contributing to the growing reliance on the university president as the savior of higher education were the dissatisfaction with the effectiveness of government steering; calls for social utility and relevance in higher education; pressures for diversification and specialized profiling of institutions and programs; the need for greater efficiency amid stagnating resources and growing student numbers and research costs; loss of confidence in self-regulation of the academic profession; and increasing confidence in the potential of institutional management and leadership.

The interest Europeans have shown in reasonable revisions of the president's role is based not only on experiences in their home environment but also on reports of approaches tried in other countries. Notably, the "American romance with leadership" has sparked debates about the changing role of the university president in Europe.

A note of caution is appropriate when generalizing about the European scene. Whereas in the 1980s and 1990s, the governments of countries on the continent reduced their traditionally strong supervisory mechanisms over higher education, the British government no longer accepted the traditional autonomy of the universities. There are also major differences between countries influenced by the Humboldtian model and those influenced by the Napoleonic model as well as between individual countries.

The vast literature on changes in university governance examines the forces, expectations, and constraints affecting the university and the impressive room for manoeuvre by the individual university president. However, few publications look systematically at the way presidents think and act. Research is also scarce concerning faculty and student views on administration in higher education and the role played by university presidents.

Selective Overview of Research

Views of academics were analysed in a 1992 international survey that was coordinated by the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching. When asked whether they agreed or disagreed that "top-level administrators are providing competent leadership," university professors in Germany, the Netherlands, Sweden, and the United

Kingdom responded ambivalently—neither positively nor negatively. Junior academic staff at universities and academics at other higher education institutions had an even more negative opinion of institutional leaders.

U.S. academics at research universities do not rate their institutional leaders as more competent than do their European colleagues. However, U.S. academics at other colleges are less critical of their leaders less negatively than their European colleagues. Japanese university professors rate the competence of their university leaders most positively among the academics surveyed. A closer look, however, reveals that most Japanese academics consider the university leadership to be much weaker than do their colleagues in Europe and the United States. Japanese university leaders are not viewed as powerful and competent leaders but rather as administrators competently performing their tasks.

In a 1995 survey conducted by the Center for Higher Education Policy Studies (CHEPS) of Twente University, in the Netherlands, rectors from Germany, Denmark, France, the Netherlands, Sweden, and the United Kingdom were asked to determine the role various actors play in governance and decision making. The rectors surveyed do not consider the central administrators (i.e., themselves and other persons in leading positions) to be the dominant decision makers at institutions of higher education. Rather, they see themselves as actively involved in decision making along with other actors—such as, academics, central councils, and other administrators and councils.

Experts agree that the role of the university president (rector, vice-chancellor, or similar title) in most European countries increased in importance and power in the 1980s and 1990s.

In the CHEPS study, the rectors indicate that they are most involved in decisions on matters of the budget and the selection of administrative staff. They also see themselves as participating actively in decisions regarding institutional policy, considerably less involved in teaching and the selection of professors, and least concerned with research.

A 1994 survey conducted by researchers at the Center for Research on Higher Education and Work, at the University of Kassel, Germany is focused on the role key managers (rectors, etc.) play in the development of European Union activities. The questionnaire was

mailed to rectors but was often responded to by heads of the international offices.

In most of the countries, the international officers alone or together with academics or other administrators were viewed as the key forces. However, in Belgium, Germany, and the United Kingdom, academics were viewed as central. These findings suggest that the active participation of rectors in developing European mobility and cooperation was not an expression of managerial and strategic strength. On the contrary, the rectors seemed to have played a strong role in this area, even in countries where they had limited managerial and strategic functions.

The final example in this overview is the 1993 pilot study on the strategies and self-perception of university presidents undertaken by the Center in Kassel showing that university presidents consider having to balance their various roles the most challenging and difficult task. Presidents have to manage the formal apparatus of administration, represent divergent interest groups, be aware of major developments in teaching and research, and serve as spokespersons for the mission and dignity of the institutions. The interviewed presidents underscored that they constantly felt the need to transform formal mechanisms and procedures into informal processes of communication and negotiation.

Ideas for Future Research

A comparative survey of how university presidents perceive themselves would be a most fascinating higher education research project. Major changes in higher education have called for changes in the role of the key players in higher education institutions, but it is not known how these individuals perceive and cope with such changes. Such a study would need to explore how presidents perceive the current conditions in higher education; how they react to the new expectations; what actions they have taken; and finally, how they judge the impact of their actions.

A broad range of issues that influence patterns of decision making and administration should be explored (e.g., national cultures, the organizational character of higher education institutions, and national regulatory systems). Attention should be paid to the composition and authority of the major actors involved in higher education. The role of the president also needs to be examined.

Research on the university president ought to address personal biography and include prior professional experience, academic expertise, age and gender, political views, and other factors. These issues and factors may influence the way university presidents respond to the challenges they face and the way they decide to act.

Conclusion

Reforms of the structure and organization of higher education tend to be pursued episodically. Typically, problems are identified, measures are taken, and hopes for success run high. After a period of time, attention to the issues levels off, partly because of certain successfully implemented changes, partly because the anticipated miraculous impacts did not materialize, and partly because other issues became more relevant.

If it is true that a spirit of managerialism was a fad bound to lose momentum without a return to the status quo ante, then a study on the university president might be forward-looking by already focusing on the character of the "postmanagerial" interpretation of the president's role. One might try to establish how the views of the president differ depending on the stage of managerial debates within a given country, the period of time the individual had already been in office, and the person's ability to understand and fulfill complex roles. With this more comprehensive approach, a study on the university president might be more than just a snapshot. ■

Author's Note: This text was presented at the 12th triennial conference of the International Association of University Presidents (IAUP), 11–14 July 1999, in Brussels.

The Crisis in Multinational Higher Education

Philip G. Altbach

Philip G. Altbach is J. Donald Monan SJ professor of higher education and director of the Center for International Higher Education at Boston College.

Multinational higher education is big business, and it is about to get much bigger. Glenn R. Jones recently became the chairman and CEO of GATE, the Global Alliance for Transnational Education, an organization that has the aim of fostering and maintaining quality in cross-border higher education enterprises. This is notable because Jones is also responsible for Jones International University, a for-profit provider of on-line educational programs. GATE moved from its location at the Dupont Circle complex of higher education associations in Washington, D.C., to Englewood, Colorado, the headquarters of the Jones educational enterprises. GATE, which was largely funded by Jones, is now directly linked with a profit-making corporation in the international education business, and is unlikely to be considered

an objective arbiter of quality programs. At the same time, the British minister for higher education, Baroness Blackstone, was rapping the University of Derby for poor performance in a joint-degree program it has with an Israeli institution. A report from the Quality Assurance Agency noted that the Derby-Israel collaboration “did not secure the quality and standards of programs offered.” There have been repeated criticisms in the press of British multinational higher education initiatives in Malaysia and elsewhere. All is not well in the world of multinational higher education, and it is time for a careful look at the issues involved.

The University of Phoenix, now America’s largest private postsecondary institution, and a for-profit corporation listed on the New York Stock Exchange, has announced plans for a string of campuses around the world. Major investment capital is behind this initiative, which will have a large impact on offshore postsecondary education. The United States has so far been slow to expand overseas, and the Phoenix initiative is a sign that the Americans are moving aggressively into the international education business. Sylvan Learning and Kaplan, the test preparation company, have also begun foreign initiatives.

New Trends

Academic institutions, and increasingly business enterprises, are actively engaged in providing educational programs in other countries. The initiative is largely from the industrialized North to the middle-income or developing countries of the South. While higher education has always had an international dimension, with more than a million students studying overseas and with many collaborative arrangements among universities, this multinational thrust is a new development. There is a huge market for “offshore” academic programs since in many countries the demand for postsecondary education is much larger than the supply. This is combined with the ability to deliver programs worldwide through offshore campuses, collaboration with overseas institutions, or via distance education. There is no question but that these initiatives are needed in the context of expansion. And there is universal agreement that it is possible to effectively deliver useful and effective educational programs through new technologies and international collaboration. We need to understand all of the implications of these innovations if they are to serve the interests of students and teachers—and not simply become a vehicle for profit-making corporations.

We are in the midst of a revolution in the delivery of academic programs of all kinds, internationally. So far, commentators have focused largely on the positive aspects of the revolution. Increased access, lower costs, and the advent of a truly global market for higher education are all cited as favorable trends, especially when governments are cutting back on higher education spending at the same time that demands for access are increasing worldwide. Enroll-

ments have expanded dramatically—from 40 to 80 million worldwide in the past two decades, and with likely increases of another 20 million in the coming decade, most of it in developing countries. The means to serve these additional students must be found.

The focus here is on the problems and challenges. Our intention is to provide a needed balance to the overblown rhetoric of promise. We are not arguing that multinational and distance education are necessarily bad or that the problems outweigh the promise. Yet, it is necessary to stand back and carefully analyze the new realities.

Academic institutions, and increasingly business enterprises, are actively engaged in providing educational programs in other countries.

First, a few definitions are useful. By multinational higher education, we mean academic programs or institutions that are offered by institutions of one country in another. These may be “stand alone” branches, or collaborative arrangements with local academic institutions or business enterprises. They range from such high-end institutions as the University of Chicago Business School or France’s INSEAD—each of which have established overseas branches—to tiny schools wanting to ensure their survival through overseas initiatives. There are also examples of free-standing institutions, such as the American University of Bulgaria, which exist in one country but follow the curriculum of another country and are accredited abroad. Distance higher education includes educational programs offered entirely through the Internet and other means that do not involve the student in face-to-face classroom or laboratory experience. Again, the range of programs is immense—and so far largely unevaluated with regard to quality—from the British Open University, generally seen as the Cadillac of distance programs (OU programs include some traditional classroom elements as well as distance aspects) to Turkey’s Anadolu University, with 578,000 students. Growing numbers of students are utilizing the Internet to enroll in distance programs offered by institutions outside of their countries, often with little knowledge of the nature of the program or of the reputation of the school offering the program.

The Critique

In order to understand the new multinational and distance phenomena, a few central facts must be kept in mind.

- Multinational higher education always has elements of inequality. Institutions from the developed world are selling their products abroad, usually in developing countries. They are in general providing “off the shelf” programs that are simply used overseas. The decisions about the curriculum, standards, faculty, and requirements are all made by the sponsoring institution.
- The motive for establishing multinational higher education enterprises is almost always to make money. This is of course the aim of the growing number of for profit institutions, but it is also the case for most traditional nonprofit universities. Many, such as Australia’s internationally aggressive Monash University, are quite open about it. British and Australian institutions have been especially active internationally as a way of making up for budget cuts at home.
- Institutions like Phoenix and Jones International are not really universities, although they have the term in their titles. Rather, they are degree delivery machines, providing tailored programs that appeal to specific markets. They do not have regular faculty, nor is there the kind of participatory governance system typical of universities. They do no research, and there is no free inquiry. They are devoted to delivering a clearly defined product, and they hire employees or contractors to produce and deliver it. They should not be called universities. Perhaps a better name would be the “Phoenix Training and Credentialing Service, a division of the Apollo Corporation.”
- The multinational and distance movement does not really contribute to the internationalization of higher education worldwide. Knowledge products are being sold across borders, but there is little mutual exchange of ideas, long-term scientific collaboration, exchange of students or faculty, and the like.
- Multinational and distance institutions operate in a largely unregulated environment. Accrediting systems are trying to catch up with new developments, and government agencies, both in the sponsoring and in the receiving countries, are concerned and sometimes critical. GATE shows leaving regulation in the hands of those who own and control the new multinational and distance institutions and profit from them may not be the most effective way of ensuring quality. Higher education is, in general, notoriously difficult to evaluate. The new phenomena, using new and untried methods and extending across international boundaries, are even more unclear.
- Multinational and distance higher education are seen as “demand absorbing,” as the economists put it. They provide access at a very low price to those who seek it. It is easy for governments to permit these new institutions to enroll students—every person in a multinational or distance institution will not be attending a traditional university, where the costs are higher and government often foot, much more of the bill.
- While the trends discussed here constitute some of the major trends, there are many truly collaborative academic arrangements aimed at fostering international research, teaching, and

enhancing academic programs. For example, the collaborative degree program in management between the 28 American Jesuit universities and Peking University or the longstanding collaboration between the Johns Hopkins University and Nanjing University, both in China, are such cases.

Multinational higher education always has elements of inequality.

Conclusion

All of this does not mean that these new trends are evil. No doubt, they have a role in contemporary higher education. They will not take the place of traditional universities, but there are things that the new technologies and cross-border initiatives can do well. We must understand, however, the problems as well as the promise. So far, everyone wishes to think the best of multinational and distance higher education—a lot of money is being invested, and many see the potential of large profits. Others are happy to see students who demand access being served almost regardless of the quality of the educational experience. Still others are happy to be able to obtain a degree conveniently. Those concerned with the future of higher education and with the broader public interest need to step back and take a careful look at what is actually happening. ■

Position Announcement—SUNY at Albany

As part of a comparative higher education project (see *IHE* summer 2000 issue), the Department of Educational Administration and Policy Studies, University at Albany, SUNY, announces two Ford Foundation–sponsored assistantships of up to two years.

Candidates must gain acceptance into department’s doctoral program (with GREs). Applications are welcome from disciplines outside education.

Request application materials from Carm Colfer, ED 316, University at Albany, Albany NY 12222, USA. E-mail: <Ccolfer@csc.albany.edu>. Fax: 518 442-5084. Send a separate letter explaining interest in the competitive assistantships to Daniel Levy, Distinguished Professor (address: see Colfer; e-mail: <dlevy@wizvax.net>). Selection may start November 15, 2000; subsequent applications will be considered if possible and inquiries are welcome.

The Winds of Change and the Conditions of Academic Staff in Europe

Jürgen Enders

Jürgen Enders is senior researcher at the Center for Higher Education and Work, University of Kassel, Germany.

E-mail: <enders@hrz.uni-kassel.de>.

Higher education systems and academics in Europe are in the midst of an interesting time of change. These changes are occurring primarily in administrative staffing and in the employment and working conditions of academics. An international study conducted by the author seeks to understand these developments among the member states of the European Union. The rise of accountability to the state and the growth of managerialism in the universities are two recent developments across European higher education. While the speed and depth of these changes might differ, all higher education systems in this study have experienced or are currently experiencing similar trends. Watchwords in this context are performance and quality, competition and flexibility, and efficiency and accountability.

Current Trends in European Higher Education

Diversification is a reaction to the former philosophy of legally instituted homogeneity in higher education. *Decentralization* is moving higher education toward a system of distant steering by government that allows each institution a higher degree of autonomy. *Marketization* is an effort to build up a market-like resource allocation system and develop competition between and within higher education institutions. Paradoxically, control over higher education institutions is effectively shifting away from academic oligarchy toward greater market and state control. Among the obvious signs of market and market-like behavior that are having a growing impact on academic staff are competitiveness, a strong emphasis on productivity, the search for ever-expanding and new income streams, and drastic cost cutting. It would be misleading, however, to see the rise of academic capitalism as an undisputed global trend that is taking over higher education and destroying traditional rules and regulations. In the continental European context, many of the affiliations between academic staff and the state have remained, as well as the traditional resource distribution that maintains the tenure and governance systems. The government remains the most important actor. In some countries where social welfare, trade unionism, and collective bargaining have had a strong tradition, the marketization of higher education is counterbalanced by new corporatist approaches.

In several countries there are signs of a growing decentralization of the employment and working conditions of academics. Responsibility and decision making have shifted toward the academic workplace, in ways that vary by country. Examples include a shift of responsibility from the central government to intermediate bodies, to the local level of employer regulations and local collective bargaining, and to individual bargaining between academics and institutional representatives. Salaries, teaching loads, and other elements of time and resource allocation are becoming more flexible and are being reorganized according to institutional and individual circumstances. These developments are contributing to a growing loss of community within the academic profession.

Diversification is a reaction to the former philosophy of legally instituted homogeneity in higher education.

While the institutional level is gaining in importance in staffing issues, it would be misleading to speak of a uniform new trend in public management. In some countries public debate tends to draw a caricature of the *homo academicus* as the “lazy professor” who needs incentives and visible sanctions. Academics are seen as spoiled and narcissistic employees who must be cut down to size or as a guild-like anachronistic workforce that must adapt to the realities of corporate capitalism in higher education. In other countries, the academic tends to be seen as a *homo economicus* who can be steered by cost-centered management, which shapes the local rules, regulations, and instruments to ensure efficient work and output. The underlying assumption is that people go where the money is and that steering by the invisible hand of the market will lead to the expected outcomes.

A more sophisticated approach views institutional leadership as “soft” supervisors who design academics’ status and tasks according to their strengths and weaknesses. This is similar to the approach of staff development through human resource management.

Strategies for Reorganization

The conditions of academic life have become a moving target as strategic attempts are made to reorganize the employment conditions of an increasingly diverse academic profession. The most prominent issues involve new posi-

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/>

tions and career tracks for junior staff, job security and tenure, part-time and fixed-term academic staff, academic pay scales, flexible and performance-related income streams, declining academic salaries, human resource development and academic training, teaching standards, and work and teaching loads.

Many measures have been taken to preserve or enhance the quality of teaching and learning and of research and service under conditions of tighter financial control and to reverse rising student-staff ratios. They include restructuring the higher education system to set different quality objectives and distributing resources for various sectors, institutions, or subunits in higher education; improving the training of academic staff by reorganizing junior academic careers and career criteria; enhancing the assessment and evaluation of academic staff performance and linking them to rewards and sanctions; and redesigning the management of higher education institutions and increasing the ability to steer academic staff. Thus even in higher education we can identify methods used by other kinds of manufacturing or service companies to improve quantity or quality of output without additional resources or staff.

The obvious and serious danger of this approach is that it could threaten the core elements of the academic profession—that is, collegial decision making, autonomy in teaching and research, intellectual leadership and social prestige, and the certainty of economic and intrinsic rewards. There is some evidence that might bear out the theory of the deprofessionalization of academics: salaries are being broken into different components and seem to be on the decline; academic tenure has become an issue in many countries; teaching and research are monitored and inspected; and a casual workforce of part-time and fixed-term staff is growing at the periphery of the professional core. Last, but not least, in some continental European countries we see a change in the status of academics from that of civil servant to a more contractual relationship. This thesis, however, tends to take as reality the new rhetoric of

output-based orientation, consumerism, market-driven flexibility, and managerialism. It tends to overestimate the impact of external actors and conditions on the life of higher education while underestimating dissimilar elements in specific national contexts, as well as the adaptability, inertia, resistance, and variety of responses of academics.

The conditions of academic life have become a moving target as strategic attempts are made to reorganize the employment conditions of an increasingly diverse academic profession.

The aforementioned study is finding that, despite claims of a general erosion in academic employment and working conditions, evidence of such a trend is not as strong, consistent, or universal as previously believed.

In Search of a New Academic Professionalism

Having said this, one cannot overlook the fact that the academic profession now finds itself in a rather defensive position. For a long time, academics successfully accommodated changing environments to their aims and needs. Now, however, they are increasingly blamed for higher education's shortcomings and problems in defining a new place in the emerging knowledge society. It is therefore important that academics find a third way beyond erosion and traditionalism and seek strategies of active involvement in the ongoing process of change. So far, the traditional character of the academic profession has not been affected by the advocacy of a new model. It has, rather, been left to the ongoing process of change to create a new professionalism of the academic profession and various subprofessions. ■

Overreliance on Part-Time Faculty: An American Trend

Ernst Benjamin

Ernst Benjamin is associate general secretary and director of research of the American Association of University Professors in Washington, D.C. Address: 1012 14th St. NW, Washington, D.C. 20005.

The proportion of faculty who teach part time on American campuses has nearly doubled in the last 30 years. In 1970, only 22 percent of faculty held part-time appointments; today, at least 42 percent teach part time—more than twice the proportion of part-time workers in the overall U.S. labor force. This shift is one of the most controversial trends in American higher education.

Proponents of hiring part-time faculty assert that most are happy with their jobs and that institutions are better able to reduce costs and adjust to enrollment variations. Moreover, many part-time faculty are able instructors who focus more on teaching students than on conducting research. Critics say part-time faculty are underpaid and lack the medical insurance essential in the American system of health care. They note with concern that women, who hold just over one-third of full-time appointments, hold nearly half of part-time appointments. They argue that many part-time faculty are inadequately qualified, less productive, superficially evaluated, carelessly hired, and too easily reappointed. Finally, as part-time faculty displace full-

time faculty, fewer full-time faculty are available to work with students outside class. The data show that both proponents and critics are right in some respects.

The proportion of faculty who teach part time on American campuses has nearly doubled in the last 30 years.

Variation by Institution, Level, and Program

The use of part-time faculty varies greatly by type of institution. Whereas nearly two-thirds of community college faculty members teach part time, less than one-third of faculty in four-year institutions hold part-time appointments. The greater reliance on part-time faculty in two-year institutions partly explains the higher numbers of part-time faculty in the United States, compared to university systems elsewhere. When, however, graduate assistants are included, the proportion of full-time faculty members even in four-year institutions drops to less than half. Because part-time faculty members teach relatively more class hours per faculty member in four-year institutions, the 48 percent of part-time staff at four-year schools probably teach at least 40 percent of the classes and more than half the classes in the first two years of instruction.

Although primarily associated with lower-division instruction, part-time teaching is important to upper-division and graduate instruction, especially in vocational or professional programs. The disciplines in which 40 percent or more of the appointments at four-year institutions are part time include law, communications, health sciences, teacher education, and business. In the liberal arts, only English relies on more than 40 percent part-time faculty appointments. Of course, part-time liberal arts faculty and graduate assistants teach more students in more classes; consequently, lower-division liberal arts classes account for the majority of part-time staff.

Those who teach part time are as likely as their full-time counterparts to have earned academic achievement awards as undergraduates, but their graduate preparation varies significantly. At four-year institutions, 75 percent of full-time faculty—but only 36 percent of part-time faculty—have terminal degrees. Full-time faculty selection usually follows a national search, a campus visit, and a review by prospective colleagues and administrators. Performance evaluation is recurrent, demanding, and often includes national as well as local assessment. Selection and evaluation of part-time faculty lack these procedures and is often haphazard. Moreover, though it is easier to replace an ineffective part-time instructor, the procedures do not assure that the replacement will be an improvement.

Conditions and Costs

The conditions of part-time appointment diminish productivity and effectiveness. Part-time faculty members are seldom paid for such activities as course preparation, office hours, grading, or committee work. At research universities, where full-time faculty members spend more than two hours outside class on instruction-related activities for every hour in class, the part-time faculty ratio is one hour outside class to one hour inside. At community colleges, full-time faculty members spend about 48 minutes outside class on teaching-related activities for each hour they spend in class. For part-time community college faculty members, the time drops to only about 12 minutes outside class per in-class hour. Part-time faculty members publish less than full-time faculty, except in community colleges, where there is little research in general due to the heavy teaching loads of full-time faculty. Variations in research activity may be consistent with institutional mission, but declines in the proportion of time devoted to out-of-classroom instructional activities are not.

Part-time appointments are less expensive. With payment typically ranging from \$1,000 to \$3,000 per course, institutions can reduce per-unit instructional cost by one-half to two-thirds. But buying cheap is not always economical. Reliance on part-time faculty is greatest in lower-division liberal arts programs, where students are most in need of faculty support and are least likely to find it.

The conditions of part-time appointment diminish productivity and effectiveness.

Employment conditions for part-time faculty vary greatly by field of instruction. Part-time liberal arts faculty more often than part-time vocational faculty, lack other part- or full-time employment and, therefore, tend to be less satisfied. Their average income is two-thirds that of vocational instructors in community colleges and 55 percent of average salaries at four-year institutions. Liberal arts part-time faculty in general—nearly two-thirds of these women—report they would prefer but cannot find full-time academic appointments. These differences help explain why proponents and critics of hiring part-time faculty often talk past one another. Satisfied part-time instructors, whose outside jobs often contribute to their instructional effectiveness, more often teach in vocational programs. Dissatisfied faculty, who lack time and opportunity to maintain their professional skills, more often teach in lower-division liberal arts programs.

Policymakers commonly attribute shortcomings in faculty-student involvement to declines in full-time faculty

teaching loads rather than to increased reliance on part-timers. This thinking ignores two facts. First, instructional hours vary with institutional mission. Faculty members spend more hours in class at two-year and bachelor's-degree-granting institutions than at comprehensive or research universities. Second, as teaching loads increase,

out-of-class instructional time diminishes. Improving the quality of instruction requires that institutions that have relied excessively on inadequately supported part-time appointments increase their proportion of full-time appointments and improve the support for and quality of their part-time appointees. ■

Academic Freedom in Hong Kong—Threats Inside and Out

Philip G. Altbach

Philip G. Altbach is Monan professor of higher education and director of the Center for International Higher Education at Boston College. He has been Onwell Fellow in the Faculty of Education at Hong Kong University.

In early July, academic freedom became front-page news in Hong Kong when Professor Robert Chung of Hong Kong University, a prominent pollster, accused the university's vice chancellor of pressuring him to stop conducting public opinion polls concerning the territory's chief executive. A special commission has been appointed to look into the charges and into academic freedom generally, and Hong Kong's academics, insecure following the accession to China in 1997, are feeling even more unhappy.

It may be useful to look at this crisis from an international perspective, since many of the issues facing Hong Kong's universities are common elsewhere. Hong Kong is in an unusual position. It is precariously balanced between the norms and values of the international academic community, where academic freedom is a central conviction, and the complex reality of its special "one country, two systems" status as a part of China. China has no commitment to academic freedom, and many in Hong Kong see Chinese political and cultural norms as gradually taking over.

Colonial Influences

Hong Kong University has its roots as a colonial institution. Established in 1911 by the British, its structures and values were from the beginning British. Until relatively recently, academic power was in the hands of expatriate senior professors. British authorities, especially in the latter period of colonial rule, permitted the university academic freedom and considerable autonomy, but the institution looked to Britain rather than to Hong Kong, or to Asia, for guidance. Even today, there is a complex relationship between the university and Hong Kong society.

Hong Kong academics are especially attuned to violations of academic freedom precisely because of their special political and societal circumstances. It is admirable that the academic community remains committed to the core values of the university. These very circumstances may, however, obscure other realities affecting higher education in Hong Kong—and worldwide.

Trends Affecting Higher Education

Many trends threaten not only the traditional values of academe, but may also be problematical for academic freedom. It is useful to discuss some of them, if only to show that Hong Kong is not the only place where the ideals of the university are in jeopardy.

Managerialism

Worldwide, the traditional control of the central elements of the university by the faculty is being diminished. In the name of efficiency and accountability, business practices imported from the corporate sector are coming to dominate the universities. Governance, the traditional term used to describe the uniquely participatory way that universities work, is being replaced by management. The academic staff has had essential responsibility for the curriculum, the admission of students and the award of degrees, and the hiring and promotion of professors, and usually dominated the decision-making bodies of the university. Increasingly, managers are taking control of the levers of power. This does not make the professors happy and may, in the long run, create academic institutions that have no core academic values.

Accountability and Autonomy

Simply stated, traditional autonomy—the ability of the professoriate to control the classroom, the curriculum, and the overall conditions of academic work—is being severely constrained by accountability—the idea that those paying the costs of higher education should have the right to determine how funds should be spent. This often extends to research—professors once were able to determine their own research priorities and often to obtain funding for them. Now, funds are increasingly allocated by corporations that demand specific results. This creates problems not only for the future of basic research (which does not yield immediately usable products) but for the academic freedom to pursue research topics.

Diminishing Power

The academic profession is, simply put, losing its once dominating power over the university. Managers are making

more decisions, and external agencies, from the University Grants Committee to legislatures, are taking on roles that the professoriate once had.

Fiscal Constraints

Worldwide, universities are facing financial problems. Governments have cut back on funding for higher education, and students and their families have been asked to pay more of the cost. This has resulted in deteriorating academic salaries and declining conditions of academic work. In Hong Kong, these pressures are much less severe than elsewhere.

The academic profession is, simply put, losing its once dominating power over the university.

These, and other, trends are not happy ones for the academic profession at outset the new millennium. Yet, they are realities with which the professoriate everywhere must contend. An outsider might argue that academics in Hong Kong enjoy comparatively good conditions. Hong Kong academic salaries are reputed to be among the highest in the world, especially when one takes into account tax rates. Working conditions, despite problems, remain comparatively good. Academic facilities, including libraries and laboratories, especially in the top institutions, remain world-class—or close to it. When compared to other Asian countries, including Japan, most Hong Kong academics enjoy favorable conditions.

Why, then, the protests and the general feeling of malaise among Hong Kong academics? Part of the problem is a lack of confidence in the political future of the territory—a factor that no doubt exacerbates every perceived threat to academic freedom. The unfamiliarity of the ruling elite in Hong Kong with the norms and values of a university and the lack of constraints for violating these norms may also contribute. The fact that Hong Kong academic institutions are probably more “Western” than “Asian” makes them more sensitive to external factors than similar institutions in other Asian countries.

In a sense, Hong Kong’s academics are swimming against two powerful currents—the current of worldwide managerialism and academic bureaucratism, and the current of Asian state domination of academe. It is all the more impressive that the academic community has stood up to these powerful pressures and that the civil society in Hong Kong has made their cause a topic of concern and struggle. ■

Author’s Note: This article appeared in the *South China Morning Post* (Hong Kong), August 18, 2000. Reprinted with permission.

Mixed Policy Signals and Mixed Results in American Higher Education

Arthur M. Hauptman

Arthur M. Hauptman is a public policy consultant based in Arlington, Virginia specializing in higher education finance issues. This article is adapted from a speech he gave as part of the J. Donald Monan SJ Symposium on Higher Education held at Boston College in spring 2000. E-mail: <hauptman@erols.com>.

Higher education in the United States has a curious combination of characteristics. It has among the highest participation rates in the world, but lack of access remains the primary concern expressed by many policymakers. Degree completion rates in the United States rank in the middle to below average among industrialized nations, yet education attainment is among the highest in the world. The United States has many of the best universities and students in the world, but the quality of the average American university and student may be mediocre when compared to universities in many other countries.

Some of these seeming contradictions are not that hard to explain. As countries move to a massified system of higher education in which half or more of the age cohort continues their education beyond high school, they will see a decline in both the overall persistence and the quality of the average student as more students enroll than in more elite systems. In this regard, it would be surprising to see both participation and quality to be sustained at very high levels. Basic arithmetic dictates that high attainment and modest persistence are possible only if participation rates are high.

But this curious combination of access and quality is also a function of some particular aspects of the American approach, including: the tremendous diversity of the American higher education system, the amount of resources devoted to it, and the lack of an overall national strategy for dealing with issues facing the system.

The United States has many of the best universities and students in the world, but the quality of the average American university and student may be mediocre when compared to universities in many other countries.

Diversity of the System

America has a remarkably diverse set of higher education institutions, ranging from more than 1,000 community colleges that provide basic access at relatively low cost, to hundreds of private liberal arts colleges, to a growing range of regional comprehensive universities and a hundred or so research universities, many of them world-class. This diversity is generally regarded as a great strength of the American system as it allows for institutional flexibility in responding to changing conditions as well as providing student consumers with a dazzling range of choices.

Level of Resources

American higher education also enjoys tremendous financial support from both the public and the private sector. Higher education in the United States accounts for nearly 3 percent of Gross Domestic Product (GDP). This is among the highest levels of support for higher education of any country. Even when hospitals and research are removed to make figures comparable to systems in other countries, U.S. higher education resources per student rank among the highest in the world. The irony is that many American higher education officials feel starved for funds.

Lack of an Overall Higher Education Strategy

The very high levels of participation and quality in American higher education are especially remarkable when one considers that the United States lacks a national strategy for dealing with issues facing the sector. This lack of an overall strategy is partly a function of the division of responsibilities for higher education financing between the federal and state governments in the United States. The states bear the primary responsibility for funding public higher education while the federal government for the past several decades has taken the lead in funding student financial aid.

Many in the United States and around the world view this lack of an overall national strategy as a great strength of American higher education, contributing directly to the high level of competition among institutions for students and innovation when compared to most other countries that rely so much more on central planning. However, there is reason to believe that the mixed record of American higher education with regard to quality and access may also be tied to the lack of a strategic approach because of the mixed signals that are produced by many of the policies that are in place. These mixed policy signals often lead to an inefficient allocation of resources and to actions by institutional officials and students that are contrary to the expressed goals of the policies.

Mixed Policy Signals

Four of the more prominent of these mixed policy signals in the United States are the following:

While the stated goal of public policies is to provide more ac-

cess for the poor, most government support for higher education goes to the middle class. This is true of both federal and state policies. State funding for public institutions disproportionately benefits middle-class students, who constitute most enrollments in these institutions. In recent years, many states have become even more biased toward helping the middle class, through the creation of merit-based aid programs and prepaid tuition and college savings plans. Federal aid programs targeting the poor do not assist the number of students many people think they do. This is particularly true of the federal student loan programs, in which eligibility stretches far beyond \$100,000 in family income for students who attend high-priced institutions. The new federal tuition tax credits are also slanted toward the middle class.

Most states now fund their public institutions through formulas based on some combination of the number of students and the cost per student.

Despite much hand-wringing about exploding college costs, federal and state policies tend to encourage tuition and cost escalation rather than moderation. Most states now fund their public institutions through formulas based on some combination of the number of students and the cost per student. While cost-based formulas tend to produce more equitable allocations than the more traditional political negotiations between university officials and state policymakers, they also usually reward institutions with higher cost structures and thus may be contributing to cost increases rather than achieving efficiencies. Some federal policies also may be inadvertently contributing to tuition increases in the United States. Eligibility for student loan interest subsidies is now rightly tied to the financial need of the student. But an unintended consequence of this policy is that when students attend institutions with higher costs of attendance, they qualify for more loans and subsidies. This has led to a debate over whether federal student aid, particularly loan availability, has been a factor in university pricing decisions in the United States.

While policymakers obviously would like to see students succeed, very few public policies are designed to produce success in the form of degree completion. Although the goal is that students receive degrees within a reasonable amount of time, the policies may lead to a much different result. One reason for this dichotomy between goals and policies already has been noted: the shift to a system of massification almost inevitably entails some movement away from an emphasis on degree completion. But it also may be the case that low completion rates in the United States are a conse-

quence of federal and state policies that emphasize access and minimize the goal of success. Under federal student aid policies, students only need demonstrate “satisfactory progress” to maintain their eligibility for student aid, and the length of aid eligibility often far exceeds the usual time to complete most programs. States are more vocal than the federal government in espousing the importance of success as well as access, but state funding formulas typically are based on the number of students enrolled, not whether they complete their term and receive a degree.

Despite oft-repeated concerns about the growing imbalance between grants and loans, public policies continue to encourage increasing amounts of borrowing. For the past two decades, the growing reliance on loans as a source of financing higher education has been a persistent concern in U.S. policy debates. While student debt burdens continue to mount, the policies in place allow or even encourage more borrowing. Congress has been unwilling to raise loan limits much for subsidized borrowing because of the cost to the government, but it created an unsubsidized loan program in 1992 that now accounts for nearly half of all federal student loans, adding greatly to overall student debt burdens.

State policymakers have had less to do with this issue because states play a small role in student loans. But to the extent students at public institutions are the most frequent users of unsubsidized loans, it is doubtful whether public tuition and other charges could have grown as fast as they did in the 1990s without the ready availability of this new form of loans.

The diversity of American higher education and the level of resources devoted to it have enabled the United States to have high levels of participation and generally high quality despite having a relatively inefficient and non-strategic approach to financing. American colleges and universities have come to depend on enough money being available to meet the many demands placed upon them and to make up for inefficiencies in the system. But the resources available to higher education in the future are unlikely to be sufficient to meet the constantly growing demands on the system. The lesson here is that if American higher education is to meet the real financial challenges that lie ahead, we should consider the experience of other countries that have been more strategic in their approach to funding higher education rather than simply relying on the brute strength of having enough resources to do the job. ■

The Goals and National Policies of Higher Education Reform in Belarus

Nikolai Petroukovitch

Nikolai Petroukovitch is Lecturer, University of Contemporary Knowledge, Minsk, Belarus. e-mail: <ptrk@user.unibel.by>.

The higher education system in Belarus has been undergoing a sluggish but steady process of change since 1991. In the last few years, the goals of reform have drifted from those initiated after the collapse of the USSR in 1991, to new goals of overcoming the shortcomings of the Soviet system and bringing Belarusian higher education into line with international standards.

After declaring its independence, Belarus initiated steps to adjust its educational system to reflect the new realities of being without the support and structure of the Soviet system of higher education. The goals of higher education reform were discussed broadly in both academia and society, and the main problems facing Belarusian higher education were summarized by the minister of education of Belarus at that time:

- institutionalized and centralized organization, planning, and management;
- uneven regional distribution of institutions;
- the absence of academic freedom and university autonomy;
- absence of educational standards, assessment, and accreditation systems;
- the politicization of and lack of diversity and flexibility in curricula;

- inadequate content of the social science curricula;
- ineffective pedagogical methods and faculty training;
- lack of leadership skills and training;
- outdated means of access to information and information technology;
- the lack of international recognition of academic degrees;
- the isolation from the international academic community; and
- the gap between education and research.

The Belarusian authorities believed that, if not addressed, these problems would have negative consequences for the potential of Belarusian society in as few as five to ten years. Thus, the systemic reforms of this period were aimed at overcoming these deficiencies as quickly as possible. Some practical steps were taken: the new law on education was adopted in 1991, and the average salary of university professors increased, exceeding (for the first time in Soviet and post-Soviet history) that of factory workers.

Unfortunately, in the years since, the official goals and principles of higher education reform have drifted significantly from those originally stated. Though the authorities do not proclaim these changes to be explicitly related to an anti-Western stance, the attitudes are implied and can be inferred in state documents and in the pronouncements of state officials.

Points of Difference: 1991 versus the Present

The changes in the goals and directions of higher education reform are striking. First, there is an evident shift related to the international dimension. At present, higher education officials emphasize that, along with considering the experiences of other countries, “Belarus has to proceed first of all from its internal conditions and opportunities.” According to the report of the minister of education at the World Conference on Higher Education, the Belarusian educational system is pursuing reform by “modifying the existing system, not breaking it.” A similar idea was restated in the officially approved “Concept of Higher Education Development in the Republic of Belarus.” This document does not mention even briefly any aspect relating to the international dimension of higher education.

Today, the state has reverted to maintaining control over higher education.

It is evident that the approach of the current state authorities is contrary to that of 1991. At the same time, there are some signs that Belarusian authorities are interested in maintaining a certain level of dialogue with their Western counterparts. For example, the minister of education of Belarus participated in a conference in April 1999, promoting the principles of the “Joint Declaration on Harmonization of the Architecture of the European Higher Education System” that was signed by the ministers of education of France, Germany, Italy, and the United Kingdom.

The second radical difference between the official direction of higher education reform today as opposed to that of 1991 is the extent of the state’s involvement in and control over the administrative and other aspects of the system. In 1991, the authorities considered centralization and the lack of autonomy in higher education as drawbacks. Today, the state has reverted to maintaining control over higher education. For example, the Belarusian authorities have established new controlling and supervisory agencies, such as the State Inspectorate of the Educational System and the Interinstitutional Council on Coordination of Preparation of Highly Qualified Academics; they have also introduced state higher education standards.

The Belarusian authorities are placing private universities in particular under a great deal of pressure. In 1998, the republic had more than 20 private universities. Today, this number has dropped to 13, due partly to financial hardship (universities pay 37 percent of their income in taxes) and partly to the increasingly restrictive policies of the government.

The 1991 education law did not foresee the strict state regulation of private education policies and practices. The Ministry of Education has recently issued decrees that limit the development of and exert control over the private sector, including accreditation and degree certification. For example, the ministry requires that private universities own their facilities and that at least 50 percent of their instructors work full time. Another requirement is that private universities grant diplomas that are different from those granted by state institutions—in contradiction with the 1991 law.

The state has also interfered with admissions policies. This year a quota was placed on the number of law students admitted to universities on the pretext that “the republic does not need such a large number of lawyers.” Actually, over 93 percent of all law students at the International Institute of Labor and Social Relations stated that they did not wish to become lawyers but instead needed a legal background to be successful in business.

A serious problem for nonstate institutions in the future might be caused by Presidential Decree 39 of 7 October 1999, requiring that “commercial organizations” pay their employees salaries equivalent to those offered for the same positions by the corresponding state-run organizations. Simultaneously, the state has given a green light for state-run universities, which are supposed to provide free educational services, to charge tuition. As of 1998–1999, the state universities of Belarus were allowed to recruit up to 60 percent “paying” students (as opposed to 15 percent in 1995–1996). The content and the quality of the education offered remain the same.

The third change between the visions of higher education in 1991 and today relates to the development of administrative and leadership skills of education leaders. Virtually nothing has been done to implement this previously stated goal. The 1998–1999 master list of specializations of Belarusian universities does not include educational administration, leadership, or policy. Belarus still maintains practices from the Soviet era, when educational administrators were appointed by Communist Party bodies based on the “political maturity,” loyalty, or other (perhaps nonrelevant) qualities of candidates. The only difference is that Belarus now has what are called “presidential executives”—authorities with almost unlimited rights, personally appointed by the president to all levels of the state hierarchy, instead of by Communist Party committees.

A fourth divergence of reform goals concerns the lack of diversity and flexibility in curricula. Belarus introduced state curriculum standards in 1998 for all specializations. The curricula are approved by the Ministry of Education, which specifies the content and the structure of training specialists in great detail. In particular, the standards list disciplines that the student must study and the sequence, term, and number of contact hours for each subject.

Some national programs in the area of higher educa-

tion address specific goals—examples are “Textbooks for University Students,” “Foreign Languages,” and “Teachers.” Although there are no reliable data as yet concerning the effectiveness of such programs, their success already seems doubtful. Most respondents to a survey conducted for this report were unaware of the existence of any active national programs in these areas. This demonstrates that the programs were developed in the traditional “secluded” Soviet bureaucratic manner without the involvement of the academic community in either the development or implementation. This, in turn, implies that the programs most likely will remain on paper only.

In general, the situation is much more encouraging at the university level. Many deans, department chairs, and faculty members are reform-minded and hope to introduce curriculum changes for their faculties. This may be facilitated by introducing new courses, updating the content of

old ones, establishing links with Western universities, inviting lecturers from abroad, etc. These efforts face many objective and subjective obstacles and restrictions caused by rigid state educational laws.

To summarize, the goals of Belarusian authorities and their policies for higher education reform remain complex and contradictory. There are some signs that the authorities understand the need for reform in the context of the political, social, and economic changes in Belarus and in neighboring countries. The officially proclaimed goals of reform, however, have been strongly affected by the anti-Western stance of the current Belarusian authorities and have drifted away from those accepted soon after Belarus’s independence. The international dimension of higher education reform priorities has almost completely disappeared. The state is increasing its pressure on universities and exercises strict control over virtually all aspects of university policies and practices. ■

Widening Access and Raising Fees: Can These Policies Be Reconciled in the UK?

Michael Shattock

Michael Shattock was registrar of Warwick University. He is currently visiting professor at the Center for Higher Education at the University of London Institute of Education. Address: Centre for Higher Education Studies, Institute of Education, University of London, Bedford Place, London U.K. E-mail: <shattock@he.u-net.com>.

The internal contradictions of U.K. higher education policy have recently been paraded for all to see in two separate but connected events. The first, in May, was when the chancellor of the exchequer, Gordon Brown, an Edinburgh graduate, accused Oxford University of elitism in denying an undergraduate place to study medicine to a candidate from a state comprehensive school in the North East, an impoverished part of the country. The candidate concerned, who was excellently qualified, subsequently turned down offers of entrance to a number of other well-known universities, including Edinburgh, in favor of a place at Harvard. The accusation of elitism in admissions policies was then leveled at a group of “top” universities by a succession of government ministers, including the prime minister, and the Parliamentary Select Committee launched an inquiry into the whole question of access to higher education.

On examination the case that provoked the accusation turned out to be a particularly bad example in that the college concerned (selection is by colleges not by the university, at Oxford) had interviewed 23 candidates, all very well qualified, for five places, and the candidates admitted included two candidates from state schools and three who were from ethnic minorities. Students at the college who

had come from state schools went on television to defend the college’s selection policy, and the vice-chancellor who had in the past been congratulated by the secretary of state for education, David Blunkett, for the university’s efforts to broaden its intake, accused Gordon Brown of setting back the university’s plans for widening access by reinforcing a stereotyped image it was trying to lose. The university went into a successful media overdrive to show that offers to candidates from state schools had increased from 48 percent to 53 percent over the past five years at the expense of the independent schools, that it had recently completed a major review of its admissions arrangements designed precisely to broaden the entry, and that it had more than 30 schemes already targeted on attracting candidates from disadvantaged backgrounds. “Oxford is committed,” said the vice-chancellor, “to recruiting the best students it can identify whatever their background” but he wanted Oxford to continue to “have a reputation for being fiercely meritocratic.”

The internal contradictions of U.K. higher education policy have recently been paraded for all to see in two separate but connected events.

The second event was the publication in July of a report by professor David Greenaway, an economist at Nottingham University, entitled *Funding Universities to Meet National and International Challenges*, which argued that charging students much higher fees was the only way that U.K. universities could maintain their international standing and fulfill the national role envisaged for them in the face of a 50 percent reduction in the unit of funding from the state over the past 20 years. The report offered several scenarios but sought to protect access by the introduction of an improved income-contingent loan scheme and by using some of the additional revenue raised from fees to pay bursaries to students from disadvantaged backgrounds. The report, commissioned by Russell Group of leading universities, has attracted widespread publicity and some tangible support in the quality press.

The difficulty in which the United Kingdom finds itself is that the government believes that competition through market mechanisms will drive up standards, improve efficiency, and reduce costs—a policy it inherited from the Tories—but it also believes in social inclusion and a significant widening of access to higher education. However, while only 7 percent of the school population is in private education, these pupils make up 20 percent of the numbers taking “A” levels and 30 percent of those achieving the top grades in three subjects (the normal selection requirement of entry to Oxford, for example). In the sciences, independent schools are even more dominant—providing 42 percent of A-level candidates in physics, 45 percent in chemistry, and 47 percent in mathematics in the top grades. Research for the National Inquiry into Higher Education (the Dearing Committee) showed that, while 4 out of 5 18-year-olds from senior managerial and professional backgrounds entered higher education, no more than 1 in 10 did so from unskilled and partly skilled backgrounds. Dearing demonstrated that the breakthrough into mass higher education after 1988 did nothing to change the social mix of entering students. Naturally the “best” universities (that is, in the United Kingdom, those that are also the most research intensive) attract the best-qualified candidates and, since entry is highly competitive, they find that their entry is socially skewed. Research presented at the Royal Economic Society’s conference in July has also showed that social class has a significant impact on graduate earnings: students from advantaged family backgrounds earn 3 percent more than the less advantaged, students who went to independent schools have a similar advantage after graduation compared to students from state schools. There was also an “earning premium” from graduating from a top university—that is, a university that did well in the league tables.

Although recent research has updated the story, the general position about the impact of social class on the entry to universities has been known for many years. David

Blunkett has called it an “access challenge to both government and universities.” On taking office, he introduced fees of £1,000 but means-tested them so that students from disadvantaged backgrounds continued to enter free (the fees were abolished in Scotland following a revolt in the Scottish Parliament). At the same time, however, he removed student maintenance grants, and this represented a serious disincentive to mature students who, in general, are reluctant to utilize the student loan scheme, so that mature numbers have fallen. In May he announced a £10m fund to pay £1,000 “opportunity bursaries” from 2001–2002 together with support for university summer schools where children still at school can experience university life. More support has just been announced in the government spending review. Universities are themselves beginning to create scholarship schemes of one kind or another but it is increasingly evident that the real difficulty starts further back in persuading children from disadvantaged backgrounds to stay on at school beyond age 16 and if they do obtain good A-level qualifications to enter higher education at a time when, according to Barclays Bank a typical student owed £5,286 on graduation, a figure that has risen by 17 percent in one year.

The difficulty in which the United Kingdom finds itself is that the government believes that competition through market mechanisms will drive up standards, improve efficiency, and reduce costs—a policy it inherited from the Tories

It is against this background that the debate about the need to generate more university funding from student fees is taking place. In addition to the general distress in universities about the decline in state support for higher education and the resulting relative fall by 30 percent in salary levels, there is deep concern, first, that the fee income stream that the government introduced post-Dearing was being matched by a further reduction in state support rather than being the top-up intended by Dearing; and, second, that the funding system has, in the words of the rector of Imperial College, “echoes of the command economy of the Eastern bloc” with government controlling the number of students as well as all the funding mechanisms. The suggestion that universities might break out of this stranglehold by charging fees at serious levels is therefore doubly attractive, particularly in a university that is highly attractive to students. But there are counterarguments. Greenaway sets out the evidence on the rate of return for graduate qualifications and sees this as justifying high fees that

can be paid for out of future earnings, but the economists who addressed the Royal Economics Society were convinced that their evidence pointed to increased fees being a considerable disincentive to less-advantaged students even with a more favorable loan scheme. Moreover, while the report is notably balanced in the way it presents its arguments and in particular in the way it advocates the redirection of fee income into bursaries for the disadvantaged, it does not address the probable plight of those universities that are at the bottom of the league tables but that are addressing the government's access agenda as vigorously as those at the top are addressing its research agenda. Their position offers the sharpest conflict between the

government's twin policies of market orientation and social inclusion. The introduction of higher fees would certainly favor the top universities but at the expense of the bottom; the bottom are delivering social inclusivity, but the top are not for the reasons described above and, once freed from government constraints, might be even less likely to do so.

The debate will no doubt continue until after the next general election, but the fear must be that attitudes will polarize either because one or the other of the main political parties endorses some elements of the debate or because the argument becomes increasingly institutionally self-interested. The dilemmas it exposes are not, of course, limited to the United Kingdom. ■

The Foreign Invasion of Israeli Higher Education

Roxana G. Reichman

Roxana G. Reichman is assistant professor at Gordon Teachers College, Haifa, Israel. E-mail: <reichmanr@hotmail.com>.

There is an entirely new trend in Israeli higher education—a new diversification in the nation's system of postsecondary education. Currently, only 56 percent of the 199,000 Israeli students study at one of the country's seven main universities—20 percent at one of the colleges (including teachers education colleges), 16 percent at the Open University, and 8 percent at one of the branches of foreign universities that have opened during the last decade (most of which are British or American). There are various ways of looking at this new dynamism in Israeli higher education. It is, of course, encouraging to see that the system has almost doubled in size within 15 years. That means greater access to postsecondary education, especially for those students who have historically been underprivileged. The bad news is that some of the branch campuses of foreign academic institutions offer quick degrees, with no attention whatsoever to academic standards, no basic facilities such as libraries, computers, etc., and a teaching staff whose qualifications are sometimes questionable. Other branches make a significant effort to meet standards while at the same time answering the needs of the population they serve. The 15,000 students who could not gain access to any of the "traditional" institutions of higher education are willing to pay a tuition almost twice as high as that charged by public higher education institutions because they want to get a degree without having to give up their full-time jobs or, in some cases, without having to devote themselves to hard intellectual work. They see the degree as a means for social mobility or simply as a way to further their careers, and

they don't mind the lack of intellectual dialogue that is supposed to characterize any meaningful education at this level. It is important to stress that more than responding to an existing demand, these institutions have themselves created a new demand. The issue of accountability has not received the attention it deserves.

The Council of Higher Education (CHE) decided to open the gates of higher education to foreign institutions because of public pressure at the beginning of the 1990s. Since these institutions belong to the private sector, for which the financial bottom line is the most important criteria and where self-regulation can sometimes be almost nonexistent, the CHE realizes that developments in this arena might threaten the reputation of any degree and of any university. Five main guidelines have to be met by any foreign university in order to be recognized in Israel. These guidelines need to be analyzed in the light of the main goal, which is quality control and accountability.

The Council of Higher Education (CHE) decided to open the gates of higher education to foreign institutions because of public pressure at the beginning of the 1990s.

First, any branch of a foreign university will have to prove that the time needed to complete the degree is similar to that required by Israeli universities. The CHE does not oppose creative measures—such as, three semesters a year instead of two semesters at the traditional universities—but it wants to prevent a situation in which a degree is awarded to persons who do not have the necessary knowledge in their respective fields.

Second, all students who are accepted will either have passed the matriculation exams that are prerequisites for

admission to any Israeli university or will be 30 years of age or older. This requirement is crucial since some of the branches of foreign universities have been willing to accept all high school graduates, regardless of their credentials. Starting last year, this is no longer possible.

Third, all the institutions will offer programs that are similar to the ones the mother institution offers in their home country. This requirement presents some important advantages as well as some serious challenges regarding issues that are sometimes difficult to address. The CHE makes a serious attempt to preserve the academic level, but this colonization creates a real dilemma for the coordinators, who would like to adapt the curriculum to the needs of the local student. It makes sense for a master's student in education who wants to specialize in curriculum to analyze the existing curriculum in Israel rather than the one in Britain or in the United States—just as it makes sense for a master's student in business to analyze a local institution rather than a foreign one. In addition, the issue of academic freedom has to be addressed when faculty members are not allowed to make any changes in the existing curriculum in order to ensure that the syllabus remains similar to the one in the foreign institution. The CHE seems to have concluded that the public interest in Israel today requires stressing social mobility at the expense of academic freedom.

Fourth, the teaching staff at these institutions will be required to have qualifications that will be similar to those of the teaching staff in their country of origin. This is very important because in Israeli universities only people having a terminal degree can teach graduate students, while at the different branches of foreign universities, people with a master's degree or even people working toward one have

been found teaching graduate students studying for the master's degree. It should be noted that some of the staff from the original institutions use distance learning, and some university professors from the seven traditional Israeli universities who are looking for an extra job have joined the staff. The ethical considerations involved have not yet even been raised.

Fifth, the institutions will have to prove that they have the necessary facilities for adequate intellectual work—such as, libraries, computers, etc. This requirement will prevent foreign universities from opening small branches that consist of only a few classes, without any facilities whatsoever. As a result of this move on the part of the CHE, there was a significant change, and the picture has become quite diverse. At an October 1999 meeting of the Education Committee of the Israeli Parliament, the minister of education stated that the ministry would make certain that all foreign universities would become accountable and would be judged on their quality and relevance and that he would make decisions on this issue on an individual basis. Seven institutions had to close down during the first six months of 2000 since they were not able to meet these demands; others are in the process of closing down (the students who have started the programs will be allowed to graduate but no new students are being accepted); and still others have changed their curriculum, closed some local branches that lacked the necessary facilities, and made significant changes in their teaching staff.

One can only hope that all higher education institutions will be accountable for their quality, respond to the needs of local students, and pay more attention to the issue of academic freedom. ■

East German Universities Ten Years After

Peer Pasternack

Peer Pasternack is a researcher at the Institute for Higher Education Research, Universität Halle-Wittenberg. He is editor of Hochschule-Ost and lecturer at the Institute of Political Science, University of Leipzig. Address: Collegienstr 62B, D 06886 Lutherstadt-Wittenberg, Germany. E-mail: <pasternack@hof.uni-halle.de>.

Germany today is a country with two societies—West and East—divided by a virtual wall. Though a higher education system and society are never completely congruent, the distribution of staff and students reveals significant patterns. Only one-third of the highest-ranking professorships (C4) in East Germany are now held by East Germans, and an East German professor in a West German university is an uncommon occurrence. The propor-

tion of West German students in East Germany and the proportion of East German students in West Germany are mirror images of each other. Only 2 percent of students who were born in West Germany study at East German universities, but 14 percent of students who grew up in East Germany study in West Germany.

Apart from these factors, East German higher education institutions are characterized by both advantages and problems. First of all, the equipment at East German universities is more modern than that in many West German universities, having been almost completely updated in the last few years. The staff-to-student ratio is very favorable in many disciplines. East German academic staff are more highly motivated to teach and advise students than are their West German colleagues. These are the main advantages.

First among the important problems is the aftereffect of the changes in the university system over the last ten years. Exhaustion can be noted due to the turmoil of institutional transformation. For this reason, East German uni-

versities are not very open to further reforms. This contradicts the widespread impression of the positive experience of institutional reforms and their enthusiastic continuation. The reform fatigue is also working against the efforts of some university leaders—for example, in Dresden (Saxony), Rostock (Mecklenburg-Western Pomerania), and East Berlin. Perhaps more relevant is the fact that the academic environment in East Germany is characterized by a conservative institutional culture. It is very formal, hierarchical, preferring frontal instruction in teaching. In short, while entrepreneurial universities are not unthinkable in East Germany, they are improbable.

The equipment at East German universities is more modern than that in many West German universities, having been almost completely updated in the last few years.

A special problem caused by the transformation of the system concerns the status of middle-aged East German scientists who are now employed at universities in part-time jobs. In 1989, they were between 35 and 45 years old and had to change their focus frequently while hopping from one research project to the next. They proved to be

flexible and mobile: 60 percent of all scientists had to leave their original fields and go into another professional area or take early retirement. But now these same scientists are between 45 and 55 years old; they do not, of course, hold professorships (in Germany almost the only opportunity to have a tenured academic job) because to become a professor in Germany is only possible when the aspirant is integrated into the relevant network. But since 1989, the networks are all West German, and for a traditional academic career in West Germany the middle-aged East German scientists are now too old.

Such problems are amplified by another special situation. A lot of young East Germans prefer not to attend university after secondary school. In West Germany, approximately 30 percent of the relevant age cohort takes up studying at the university level, whereas in East Germany only about 20 percent do so. Therefore, the East German universities are not enrolling enough students (except in law, economics and medicine), and the politicians conclude there are too many academic staff. The weaker East German economy results in lower tax revenues for the East German states, and this in turn creates pressure to reduce the budget of higher education institutions. Apart from the change in structures and contents, the newly instituted academic freedom, and the opportunities for international communication, most East German academics experienced the transformation of the universities as a major cutback in jobs in higher education. Moreover, the transformation is not yet complete, inasmuch as the next round of cutbacks in jobs has already been announced. ■

Korean National Universities at the Crossroads

Toru Umakoshi

Toru Umakoshi is professor and director of the Center for Higher Education Studies at Nagoya University, Japan. During the 2000–2001 academic year he is visiting professor at Seoul National University, Seoul, Korea. E-mail: <toru@snu.ac.kr>.

Since the economic crisis of 1997–1998 Korean higher education reform has emphasized strengthening international competitiveness. The BK-21 Project introduced in the last issue of this newsletter was the first initiative taken by the Korean Ministry of Education. The second initiative is a report entitled “Development Plan of the National Universities.” Released last July, the report reexamines the role and function of national universities as part of an effort to strengthen their academic productiveness and human resources development. The 44 national universities—23 percent of four-year colleges and universities in Korea—are being strongly encouraged to restructure themselves under the guidelines of the report.

Institutional Classification

The report classifies the national universities into four types of institutions, in accordance with their role and function: (1) research universities; (2) teaching universities; (3) specialized colleges—such as institutions devoted to ocean engineering, teachers education, and physical education; (4) vocation-oriented colleges to meet the needs of local business and industry. The government would determine financial support based upon the specific purposes of each institution. Private colleges and universities compete for excess funds—a kind of “privatization” policy. Another important recommendation of the panel that put together the report is to improve the geographical distribution of higher education institutions. Consolidating or abolishing the national colleges and universities with similar departments in each of seven regional blocs is strongly urged.

Autonomy and Independence

The report also recommended a reorganization of the gov-

ernance system of the national universities. In the present system, the national universities come under the direct control of the Ministry of Education. In the report, national universities are encouraged to become “autonomous institutions” independent of the ministry. When a national university decides to become an “autonomous institution,” a governance contract is signed by the minister of education and the university president—on the condition that the president is elected through a public recruitment process, by a search committee under the auspices of the Ministry of Education.

In the report, national universities are encouraged to become “autonomous institutions” independent of the ministry.

Under the new system, the president become responsible for all matters of university administration, personnel, and finance—independent of the ministry. The president is also free to set the formula for tuition fees. Concurrently, each national university is obliged to establish a “university council” comprised of well-informed people from inside and outside the university. The university council functions as the decision-making organ of the university. As part of this reorganization, the number of clerical staff is to be reduced and staff development activities are to be strengthened.

Improving Teaching and Research

Another area of reform contained in the report is to reinforce the quality control of teaching and research activities. The national universities are being strongly encouraged to introduce new types of incentives such as a contract-based appointments, a yearly stipend system, and additional benefits to the best researchers and teachers. There is a proposal to modify the present university evaluation system run by the Korean Council for University Education, the Ministry of Education, and the Korean Educational Development Institute by establishing the Committee of University Evaluation, which would integrate the various institutional and discipline-based evaluation procedures into a standardized system.

Following the July public hearing on this report, the Ministry of Education incorporated the opinions of concerned persons into the final version. The reform agenda is to be implemented in three stages: (1) a short-term agenda (2000–2002), (2) an intermediate agenda (2003–2005), and (3) a long-term agenda (2006–2010). The ministry expects

that short-term agenda items such as the introduction of the university council and the Committee of University Evaluation will be ready in time for the 2001 government budget.

Criticism within the Professoriate

Professors from national, local (municipality), and private colleges and universities in the National University Professors Association voiced their criticisms of the report and asked the Ministry of Education to withdraw it. According to newspaper accounts, a number of professors criticized the report as a backing away from the democratic way of university governance that has been realized under the civilian governments of the past seven years. With regard to the reorganization of the national universities, the author is reminded of the bitter experience of failure in the early 1960s under the regime of President Park. ■

International Higher Education On-line

Beginning with this issue of *IHE* we are offering an important new innovation. You can sign up to receive *IHE* automatically on-line. Sign-up is easy. Simply log on to our website 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 you 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*, which includes 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.

Australian Higher Education: Current Issues and Policy Directions

David Gamage

David Gamage is associate professor and course director of the Master of Leadership and Management in Education Program, Faculty of Education, University of Newcastle, Australia. Address: School of Education, University of Newcastle, Newcastle, Australia.

Today, the Australian higher education system has become an industry earning billions of dollars, almost half of its recurrent expenditure. Massive restructuring since 1989 and corporatization of university governance have enabled the universities to be more enterprising. Now, most universities seek overseas students and market programs both on- and off-campus.

Financing the University Sector

After 1974, universities enjoyed full public funding, until the 1990s—when it declined rapidly. In 1997, out of \$8.2 billion of university revenue, federal grants comprised only 53.8 percent. In 1998, this figure declined to 50.8 percent, forcing institutions to increase student fees and higher education contribution scheme (HECS). The gradual withdrawal of government support has made it difficult for universities to balance their budgets.

University Governance

Elected heads of departments and deans have given way to appointments by vice-chancellors with a limited consultative process. Following business practices, the vice-chancellors assert the roles of chief executive officers with combined titles of vice-chancellor and president, together with wide-ranging powers to assume control. Similarly, deans and heads are given more authority to direct and manage corporate functions making them accountable to the center.

New Approaches to Quality Assurance

Between 1992 and 1995, the federal government provided a prize pool of \$198 million for ensuring quality. A Committee for Quality Assurance in Higher Education ranked the universities based on evaluations of the quality of services and achievements. In spite of doubts about the process and incentives, all universities participated due to in-built punitive effects. The low rankings in the league tables had significant commercial implications.

Even after the softening of the ranking system, some newer universities found it difficult to compete. The three-year exercise significantly depressed the morale of these institutions. But, due to complacency and lack of accountability, some universities badly needed this shake-up. A specific aim was for the universities to incorporate quality assurance mechanisms into their internal structures. Most universities, such as the University of Newcastle, adopted

triennial self-evaluation of different units followed by external reviews on a rolling basis. Later, a Course Experience Questionnaire and Student Evaluation of the Subjects were adopted as measures to ensure institutional effectiveness and customer satisfaction.

Market Orientation and Overseas Students

With the discontinuance of subsidized overseas student places and the introduction of HECS for local students, Australia decided to develop higher education as an industry for earning foreign exchange and job creation. Universities were strongly encouraged to seek overseas students as independent sources of income. With this shift, a fair number of private colleges were also established to profit from the new opportunities.

These colleges started offering programs in English and computing to prepare overseas students to enter universities, helping them with entry visas and part-time jobs. By 1999, these private colleges were able to enroll 158,000 students, earning \$3 billion. Now, it is alleged that some colleges are exploiting the students with poor-quality programs and functioning as brokers for backdoor entry to Australia, which has forced government to crack down on unscrupulous colleges.

By 1996, the universities had attracted 70,000 overseas students, and in 1997, 1998, and 1999 the commencing student numbers rose to 33,428, 37,292 and 45,012, respectively—amounting to 115,732 for the three years. With the continuing students, the total could be over 150,000, and when added to the private college figure, the total would have been around 308,000. Thus today, Australian higher education is an industry earning billions of dollars in foreign exchange from overseas students and marketing full-fee programs and HECS-liable programs to local students.

Elected heads of departments and deans have given way to appointments by vice-chancellors with a limited consultative process.

Current Issues and Policy Directions

The entire university community protested vehemently against the government cuts on funding. But, institutions had no alternative but to charge tuition fees for master's programs and establish some full-fee undergraduate places.

According to a cabinet submission by the minister leaked to the opposition and the press in mid-1999, it appears that the government is committed to further reforms—including deregulation of the university system—to facilitate a healthier growth. The minister believes that reforms will promote wealth and job creation, social inclusion, cultural dynamism, and intellectual creativity. The reforms include: abolition of current controls on student places in universities, along with empowerment of students to select where they want to study; a voucher system enabling a student to undertake his or her studies at an accredited public or private institution; tuition fees to be set by the relevant institution, along with provision for equity; student loans on market rates to be paid through the taxation system, on an income-contingent basis; federal funding for institutions that meet government policy and fiscal objectives; and new quality assurance arrangements facilitating the entry of new players to provide quality higher education services.

The latest reports indicate that the federal, state and territory ministers for education have decided to tighten the rules governing Australian universities.

In addition, the government proposes the following industrial reforms: provision for nonunion representation in future industrial bargaining, reducing award standards, provision for bargaining at faculty and administrative unit level, simplified redundancy provisions, reduction of the number and size of institutional governing bodies, three semester academic years and full-year academic workloads, reduction of the size of interview panels, promotions to positions rather than on merit, and annual authorization of union subscriptions giving the employee an opportunity to stop subscriptions.

In order to impose the above agenda, the minister announced the offer of funding up to \$259 million, for a 2 percent annual salary increase for the academics—on very strict guidelines, to be observed by the institutions. However, so far the universities and unions have resisted the radical restructuring of work places. But, the universities have found it very difficult to fund salary increases, resulting in industrial action in a number of universities.

When the minister's submission to the cabinet was leaked, pressure was brought on the government to change policy directions. In response to repeated questions by the opposition, the prime minister assured the Parliament that he would not implement the reforms relating to student voucher system and market rates of interest on student loans. As the minister did not withdraw the reform package, on further pressure, the prime minister assured the nation that so long as he was in office, those two measures would not be implemented. However, the possibility of such reforms after a general election was not ruled out.

The latest reports indicate that the federal, state and territory ministers for education have decided to tighten the rules governing Australian universities. An Australian Universities Quality Agency has also been proposed. The agreed protocols deal with the following: criteria and processes for recognition of Australian universities, operation of overseas institutions in Australia, accreditation of higher education courses offered by non-self-accrediting institutions, delivery arrangements involving other organizations, and endorsement of courses for overseas students.

Conclusion

Participatory systems of governance have given way to more corporatized models, with centralized administrations and stronger leadership demanding accountability. Higher education has become an export-oriented and market-driven industry. The industrial harmony of the 1980s and 1990s has given way to more frequent industrial disputes and industrial action. However, the new environment has forced universities to be more innovative and entrepreneurial in earning their revenue in the struggle for survival. ■

Higher Education Inventory Published

Higher Education: A Worldwide Inventory of Centers and Programs, by Philip G. Altbach and David Engberg, has been published by the Center for International Higher Education. This 341-page volume includes an analytic chapter on higher education programs and trends worldwide by Philip G. Altbach and an inventory of listings concerning 187 institutes, programs, and centers worldwide. The listings include complete addresses, e-mail information and related data, and the names of staff members and publications. The book also includes a worldwide compilation of journals in the field of higher education. This book was made possible through grants from the International Education Research Foundation of Los Angeles, and the Ford Foundation. A commercial edition of this book will be published by Oryx Press in Phoenix, Arizona, USA. The Center will also put all of the information on-line after one year. Limited numbers of copies may be obtained from the Center. There is no charge for institutions in developing countries. Others should provide payment of \$15 to defray postal and handling charges. The book itself is free. Requests must be *prepaid*, and checks made out to Boston College in U.S. dollars must be included with any orders.

The Canada Research Chairs Program

Glen A. Jones

Glen A. Jones is associate professor of higher education and chair of the Department of Theory and Policy Studies in Education, Ontario Institute for Studies in Education of the University of Toronto, 252 Bloor Street West, Toronto, Ontario, Canada, M5S 1V6.

E-mail: <gjones@oise.utoronto.ca>.

Following several years of discussion, lobbying, and speculation, the government of Canada, in its 2000 budget, announced the creation of a new university-focused research infrastructure, entitled the Canada Research Chairs Program (CRC). The program has significant implications for Canadian higher education, both because of the magnitude of the associated funding and because the CRC is one of several new programs that, taken together, signal a significant shift in the role of Canada's federal government in higher education.

Like many other governments, Canada's has grown more concerned as to whether the nation is positioned to compete effectively in the evolving, international "knowledge-based" economy. Concerns have been raised about whether Canadian universities can compete in the international academic labor market. The special challenge for Canada has been to strengthen a national research infrastructure that already relies quite heavily on university-based research activity (with a lower level of private-sector investment in research and development compared to many of its OECD peers) in the context of a provincially regulated, relatively homogeneous, publicly supported university sector that is associated with one of the highest participation rates in the world. Through the CRC initiative, the government of Canada will reinforce the central role of universities within the country's research infrastructure with the creation of 2,000 research chairs by 2005. The level of financial support associated with this new program is enormous. The 2000 budget announced an initial allocation of Can\$900 million; by 2004–2005, the program will have an annual budget of over Can\$2 billion.

The Shifting Role of the Federal Government

The CRC initiative signals an important shift in the federal government's role in Canadian higher education. For 30 years, Canada's approach to higher education policy has been extremely decentralized. Like most federal states, the responsibility for education was assigned to local provinces under the constitutional arrangement, but while federal governments in many other countries found mechanisms to assert a national influence over higher education policy, the notion of a stronger federal presence in the higher education policy was regarded as a threat to the delicate tenor

of Canada's ongoing constitutional conversation. The federal government provided only indirect operating support to postsecondary education through unconditional transfers to the provinces. The provincial governments assumed the central role in regulating and providing direct operating support to universities and community colleges.

The federal government's direct involvement in higher education policy was limited to a number of policy areas viewed as more legitimate in the sensitive context of federal-provincial relations, including research. Until quite recently, the vast majority of federal government support for university research involved allocations to three national granting councils (the former Medical Research Council, now a component function of the new Canadian Institutes of Health Research; the Natural Sciences and Engineering Research Council; and the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council). Each council operated research grant programs in which decisions on investigator-initiated research proposals were made through a process of peer review. A unique aspect of this funding arrangement was that, unlike parallel arrangements in many other jurisdictions, most of these grant mechanisms provided support for the direct costs of research activity but not for indirect costs (such as faculty time devoted to the project, university administrative costs, and other forms of overhead). Under the guise of furthering Canada's university research infrastructure, the CRC is clearly strengthening the federal government's direct involvement and influence in the higher education policy arena since the initiative focuses on central elements of the university operating budget: the faculty complement and related infrastructure costs.

Concerns have been raised about whether Canadian universities can compete in the increasingly international academic labour market.

The Allocation Process

Another important aspect of the CRC is that instead of creating a competitive process and calling for individual faculty or research network submissions, the new research chairs are allocated on the basis of prior support obtained by each institution in research grant competitions conducted by the three federal granting councils. In other words, significant levels of support are being awarded on the basis of prior relative success. Over 12 percent of all funding will be allocated to a single institution, the University of Toronto. While 57 universities are currently

positioned to benefit from the initiative, 829 (41 percent) of the 2,000 research chairs will be allocated to only 5 universities (Alberta, British Columbia, McGill, Montreal, and Toronto) with 6 percent of chairs being specially allocated to smaller universities. Given that there has been a general assumption that Canadian universities are roughly equal in quality and homogeneous in institutional form, one possible impact of the CRC program may be the emergence of a more diverse university sector with an institutional hierarchy based on research intensity.

The CRC allocation protocols prescribe the share of research chairs that will fall under each of three broad research areas: 45 percent for natural sciences and engineering; 35 percent for health; and 20 percent for social sciences and humanities. The regulations also establish a framework for the distribution of chairs between a combination of existing faculty research “stars” and new appointments, though each university will have flexibility in determining how best to use CRC funds to strengthen its research infrastructure.

While program regulations prescribe the number of chairs that each institution will receive, universities have considerable autonomy in allocating the chairs within each institution, though the procedures and timelines of this decision-making process represent another important deviation from Canada’s traditional approach to research

funding. Prior to 2000, institutional research plans were essentially a synthesis of investigator-initiated research plans with the investigator or research team as the unit of analysis. The CRC approach assumes the existence of a rationally planned and managed university research enterprise. Given that the CRC program guide was disseminated in April 2000 and university research plans had to be submitted within five months, the processes employed to develop these statements of research priorities ranged from autocratic administrative decrees to ostensibly participatory planning exercises conducted during a time period when it was difficult for many active researchers to participate. In short, the planning process was largely at the discretion of university administrators and frequently bypassed traditional academic decision-making structures.

The CRC is one of a number of recent initiatives designed to increase the research capacity of Canadian universities, including the creation of the Canadian Foundation for Innovation, the Canadian Institutes of Health Research, and a number of new provincial government research funding mechanisms. Aside from providing additional resources for university research, these initiatives will undoubtedly have an important impact on the current institutional arrangements and they signal potentially dramatic shifts in what was a unique, Canadian approach to higher education policy. ■

Endowing African Universities—Success Stories

Ellen Mashiko

Ellen Mashiko is executive director, Scholarship Division of the Tokyo Foundation, Japan. Address: Hibiya Central Building 10th Floor, 1-2-9 Nishishinbashi, Minato-ku, Tokyo 105-0003 Japan. Tel: +81-3-3502-9567; fax: +81-3-3502-9436; e-mail: <mashiko@tkfd.or.jp>; Internet: <<http://www.tkfd.or.jp/eng/scholar/index.html>>.

Following Damtew Teferra’s clear argument in this newsletter (see *International Higher Education* no. 20) in support of endowing universities on African soil, the cases of three universities may serve to demonstrate that endowments can be well managed, contribute to institutional sustainability, and lead to transnational collaboration with students, faculty and administrators throughout the world.

The three institutions are the University of Nairobi, the American University of Cairo, and the University of the Western Cape. Each institution received a U.S.\$1 million endowment under the Ryoichi Sasakawa Young Leaders Fellowship Fund (SYLFF) Program, a collaborative project of the Nippon Foundation and the Tokyo Foundation. The same conditions applied in each case—that is, the universities should be committed to managing the endowments to ensure that a predetermined portion of the earnings are returned to the capital to sustain growth over

the long-term and use disposable income to provide fellowships to graduate students in the social sciences and humanities. Each institution is empowered to administer the fellowship program and to promote follow-up programs that are separately implemented and funded by the Tokyo Foundation.

Endowing African universities is not an audacious initiative but a sound investment in the future by the recipient and the donor.

Profile of Endowments and Contributions

When the University of Nairobi received its SYLFF endowment in 1989, it already had one other small endowment for general institutional support that was established in 1970 during its period as the University College Nairobi. The university has sought additional endowments from national and international sources but has not received further contributions thus far.

In 1992, when the SYLFF endowment was presented to the American University in Cairo, there were already 45 smaller endowments for scholarships and visiting, short-term scholars. The SYLFF endowment was the largest, and SYLFF fellowships derived from the endowment became the most prestigious. Since then, the university has actively sought further contributions and currently reports 110 funds of varying amounts, including two endowed chairs and substantial foundation support for the university's Center for Arabic Study Abroad. Endowments and contributions comprise 28 percent of the university's total annual revenue.

Each institution is empowered to administer the fellowship program and to promote follow-up programs that are separately implemented and funded by the Tokyo Foundation.

The University of the Western Cape boasted a development fund, established in the early 1980s, for general institutional support, which continues to support the university's building program. The awarding of the SYLFF endowment in 1995 has been followed by the establishment of two additional endowments sufficiently capitalized to ensure in perpetuity an endowed chair in chemistry and a bursary fund for high-achieving science students. Another chair in the humanities has been jointly established with the University of Cape Town. Moreover, the university has received endowment-like fixed-term grants for a chair in information systems and a chair in management, each guaranteed for five-years. In 1999, contributions from private sources amounted to 8 percent of the University of the Western Cape's total revenue.

Effective Management Produces Growth

The establishment and management of SYLFF endowments, administration of SYLFF fellowship programs, and promotion of follow-up programs have called for close cooperation between the foundation and the universities. The relationship has shifted from guidance in the early stages of preparing for the presentation of the endowment to collaboration in the current stage of fine-tuning of fund management and administration of the fellowship programs, and program development beyond the shores of the African continent.

Issues related to endowments are not exclusive to the African continent. The conception and implementation of an endowment is not widely understood by many prospective recipients. However, the SYLFF experience of empowering the receiving institutions, ongoing collaboration between the foundation and universities, networking among more and less experienced institutions in the network, and providing follow-up programs, including professional development training demonstrates that institutions on African soil and elsewhere can indeed manage endowments and administer programs. University administrators acquire the requisite knowledge, understanding and skills that carry over to other programs. Furthermore, in an increasing number of cases, existing endowments are used as leverage to attract other contributions.

Endowing African universities is not an audacious initiative but a sound investment in the future by the recipient and the donor. The recipient commits to fulfilling the conditions put forward by the donor, which in the best cases are jointly developed, and to ensuring that the endowment is integrated into an institutional strategy and action plan for sustained growth. The donor supports the university by providing the funds and offering follow-up programs and activities that not only help ensure sustained growth but also expand the opportunities for the university beyond the parameters of the endowment. ■

Center Publications in Other Languages

Several recent books relating to the Center have been published in translated editions:

Educación superior en el siglo XXI: Desafío global y respuesta nacional, edited by Philip G. Altbach and Patti McGill Peterson. Buenos Aires, Argentina: Editorial Biblos, 2000. Paperback. ISBN 950 786 250 1. Address: Editorial Biblos, Pasaje José Giuffra 318, C1064ADD Buenos Aires, Argentina. This volume is a translation of P. Altbach and P. M. Peterson, eds., *Higher Education in the 21st Century: Global Challenges and National Responses*, published in 1999 by the Center for International Higher Education and the Institute of International Education.

La mundialización de la educación superior privada: Perspectivas comparadas, edited by Philip G. Altbach, ed. Buenos Aires, Argentina: FLACSO and Temas Grupo Editorial, 2000. Address: FLACSO, Talcahuano 1293, piso 1ro. B. C1014ADA Buenos Aires, Argentina. E-mail: <temas@ciudad.com.ar>. This volume is a translation of Philip G. Altbach, ed., *Private Prometheus: Private Higher Education and Development in the 21st Century*. Westport, Conn.: Greenwood, 2000.

In addition, Philip G. Altbach's *Comparative Higher Education: Knowledge, the University, and Development* will be issued in a Chinese-language edition by the People's Education Press, Beijing, China, in early 2001.

The Worldwide Shift of Higher Education Costs from Governments and Taxpayers to Parents and Students: A New Initiative

The International Comparative Higher Education Finance and Accessibility Project is a three-year, Ford Foundation–financed study of the worldwide shift of higher education costs from governments and taxpayers to students and parents. The project is directed by D. Bruce Johnstone, University Professor of Higher and Comparative Education at the University at Buffalo.

The study will examine the consequences of this shift of cost burden on access and participation in higher education, especially among low-income, ethnic or linguistic minority, and otherwise underrepresented populations. An underlying premise of the project is that governmental policies must somehow address the twin goals of *revenue diversification* (i.e., diminishing the financial dependence of higher education on the taxpayer) and *equity* (i.e., the goal of equal access and widened higher educational participation). These oftentimes conflicting goals call for a coordination of tuition policies, grant and scholarship programs, student loans and other forms of deferred cost recovery, means-testing and the determination of appropriately expected parental or family contributions, and provisions for encouraging private, tuition-dependent institutions.

The worldwide growth of *cost sharing* may be reflected in the introduction of tuition where the concept may have been heretofore unknown or politically unsupportable (as in Europe or most of the socialist nations of the former Soviet Union and Eastern or Central Europe). Other signs of the overall trend are policies to recover the full or more nearly the full costs of institutionally provided room and board and the shift in student financial assistance from grants to loans. Another indication is the growth of a tuition-dependent private sector (as in much of Latin America and Asia).

This trend toward cost sharing may be strongly resisted, especially in countries with long traditions of free tuition. This resistance may include both students and families of privilege, who have been the traditional beneficiaries of this form of public largesse, as well as students and families of middle and lower economic status, who may see these rising costs as another barrier to participation in higher education. Many of these countries may also lack traditions of means-tested financial assistance and student loans to maintain at least some accessibility in the face of these rising costs.

However, the absence of tuition puts an even greater burden on the government or taxpayer and may lead either to severe enrollment limitations (at least in the free or low-cost public sector) or to equally severe overcrowding and a loss of educational quality—in either case to the greatest detriment of the “nonelite.” Where tuition does shift some of the cost burden to the student or family, the absence of means-tested financial assistance and student loans to maintain at least some accessibility in the face of these rising costs may further limit accessibility. In both of the above scenarios, students may still be denied access to higher education, and these students, the economy, and the larger soci-

ety will be denied the benefit of a better-educated citizenry.

The project will create an international database on the costs of higher education borne by students and parents (e.g., tuition, other kinds of fees, room, board, travel, and other expenses), examine models of tuition and aid policies for specific countries, document emerging solutions (e.g., loans, interest subsidies, means-tested grants, tax benefits, and graduate taxes) to the *access dilemma* created by the shift of higher educational costs to students and families, prepare and commission papers on special topics related to the worldwide shift of higher education costs from government to parents and students, and establish partner centers in a number of countries.

The project has a Website at:

<<http://www.gse.buffalo.edu/org/IntHigherEdFinance>>

Interested parties may also contact D. Bruce Johnstone at

<dbj@acsu.buffalo.edu>. ■

CONFERENCE ANNOUNCEMENT

Globalization and Higher Education—Views from the South

Cape Town, South Africa, 27–29 March 2001

The conference is being hosted by the SRHE (Society for Research into Higher Education, UK & International) and EPU (Education Policy Unit, University of the Western Cape, Cape Town), in association with the five higher education universities/technicons of the Western Cape and the ACU (Association of Commonwealth Universities). The conference is a contribution to the follow-up of the UNESCO World Conference on Higher Education and has the support of UNESCO and the WCHE.

This is the first major international conference on the impact of globalization and higher education (HE), from the perspective of the South with specific focus on less-industrialized countries (LICs). The conference aims to deepen our knowledge of the variety of HE systems in transition in countries and subregions of the LICs, and to strengthen the network of HE scholars globally to facilitate the development of policy initiatives and teaching and research in the field of HE studies, especially but not exclusively in the South.

The three-day conference will be held in the attractive Waterfront area of the city of Cape Town, pre- and postconference tours to the five higher education institutions as well as the surrounding Western Cape hinterland can be arranged, and keynote speakers include leading international scholars of higher education such as Michael Gibbons, Akilagpa Sawyerr, Brian Fender, Philip Altbach, and Carmen Guadilla. Scholarships are available on application, from scholars from the South, to significantly reduce the cost of the conference fee.

The conference details and “call for proposals” for papers, symposia, and focused dialogues can be found on at <<http://www.srhe.ac.uk>>. Submission of proposals for presentations, in the form of abstracts, must reach the conference organisers by 1 October 2000.

News of the Center and the Program of Higher Education

The Center welcomes two visiting scholars for the fall semester. Dr. Armando Alcantara of the Center for University Studies at the National Autonomous University of Mexico (UNAM) in Mexico City, sponsored by the Mexican Science Council, will be a visiting scholar for the 2000–2001 academic year. Professor Tamir Horovits, chair of the Education Department at the Ben Gurion University of the Negev in Israel, will be at the Center during the fall semester.

Work on the Africa Higher Education Research Handbook continues under the coordination of Damtew Teferra. Most of the country reports have been submitted, and the project is in its editing phase. This work is sponsored by the Ford Foundation.

Those interested in applying for master's or doctoral study in higher education at Boston College should submit application materials by the end of 2000 if at all possible. Further information can be provided by Professor Karen Arnold, director of the higher education program. E-mail: <arnoldkc@bc.edu>.

New Project on the Changing Academic Workplace

With the support of the Ford and Rockefeller foundations, work has started on a new project on the changing academic workplace, in comparative perspective. The focus of the project is to illuminate new trends and issues affecting the academic profession and academic work in 14 developing and middle income countries. Among the countries included in the project are China, India, South Africa, Nigeria, Korea, Argentina, Brazil, Mexico, Russia, Bulgaria, and Malaysia. Researchers in each country will write research-based essays highlighting the key issues, and the research essays will be published in a book. The research team will meet to discuss its work at the Rockefeller Foundation's Villa Serbelloni in Bellagio, Italy spring 2001. A major research vol-

ume on the changing academic workplace will be published, based on this research. This project is an outgrowth of a smaller research effort sponsored by the Center and the Harvard Project on Academic Appointments, headed by Professor Richard Chait of the Harvard Graduate School of Education. That project, which focused on Western Europe and the United States, resulted in a special theme issue of Higher Education that will be published in early 2001.

New Book Series Announced

Two new book series have been established. These series will highlight key research and analysis in the field of higher education. Both have an international focus.

- The Greenwood Studies in Higher Education is a new book series published by Greenwood Publishers. It will feature books on all aspects of higher education. The series is edited by Philip G. Altbach. Proposals can be sent to Dr. Altbach or directly to Greenwood Publishers. Ms. Jane Garry is the sponsoring editor at Greenwood. Her e-mail address is: <jgarry@greenwood.com>.
- The RoutledgeFalmer Dissertation Series in Higher Education—this book series publishes the best research-based doctoral dissertations. The series provides a source for the best research on higher education in a timely way. It is multi-disciplinary and publishes dissertations using all methodologies. Authors are expected to modestly revise their work for publication. Books are published in hardback editions. Publication typically takes from seven to nine months, and a standard royalty is offered to all authors. Proposals for books in the series are welcome. Please contact either Dr. Philip G. Altbach or Dr. Farideh Koochi-Kamali, Dissertations Editor, RoutledgeFalmer, 29 W. 35th St., New York, NY 10001, USA. E-mail: <fkamali@routledge-ny.com>. ■

New Publications

Myth, Reality, and Reform: Higher Education Policy in Latin America, Claudio de Moura Castro and Daniel C. Levy. Washington, D.C.: Inter-American Development Bank, 2000. 115 pp. (paper) ISBN: 1886938601. Address: IDB Bookstore, 1300 New York Ave. NW, Washington, D.C. 20577, USA.

A concise summary of the key issues facing the future of higher education in Latin America, this short book is intended to provide policymakers with an overview of issues such as the expansion of higher education; the development of differentiated systems; the role of research, evaluation, and accreditation; the academic profession; and related topics. Policy recommendations are provided.

Guide to Teaching and Learning in Higher Education, edited by Pai Obanya, Juma Shabani, and Peter Okebukola. Senegal: BREDA, UNESCO. CD Version. Address: UNESCO, Regional Office in Dakar, 12 Avenue L.S. Senghor, P.O. Box 3311, Dakar, Senegal.

This material is an outcome of a series of subregional higher education workshops held in Africa. The guideline, which is published in three languages (English, French, and Portuguese), features 11 modules on almost all aspects of higher education in Africa. These well-illustrated, attractive, and exhaustive modules, with exercises and activities, profile an array of issues that cover understanding students and teachers, instructional methods and development, application of new technologies, distance learning, guidance and counseling, women issues, special needs, and evaluation. (Damtew Teferra)

Oxford and the Decline of the Collegiate Tradition, by Ted Tapper and David Palfreyman. London: Woburn Press, 2000. (paperback) ISBN 0-7130-4033-5. Address: Woburn Press, 900 Eastern Ave., London IG2 7HH, U.K.

This book examines how the Oxford collegiate tradition, which has long been integral to the British system of higher education, is being broken down and restructured by the pressures of marketization, managerialism, and massification. Although this book focuses on the oldest of the Oxford colleges, the collegiate idea has much relevance to the rest of British higher education and to the United States, Canada, and other countries as well.

In the Lap of Tigers: The Communist Labor University of Jiangxi Province, by John Cleverley. Lanham, Md.: University Press of America, 1999. 256 pp. \$21.95 (paper). ISBN 0-8476-

9937-4. Address: University Press of America, 4720 Boston Way, Lanham, MD 20706, USA.

Founded in 1958 as an effort to provide higher education to farmers and peasants, the Communist Labor University has some 100 branch campuses and survived all of the turmoils of China until the 1970s, when it fell victim to Deng's philosophy of pragmatism. This volume tells the story of this institution.

So You Want To Be a Professor? A Handbook for Graduate Students, by P. Aarne Vesilind. Thousand Oaks, Calif.: Sage, 2000. 197 pp. \$32.95 (paper). ISBN: 0-7619-1897-3. Address: Sage Publications, 2455 Teller Rd., Thousand Oaks, CA 91320, USA.

A concise "how to" guide for new entrants to the American academic job market, this book covers course development, the role of research, getting tenure, and other topics.

Student Mobility on the Map: Tertiary Education Interchange in the Commonwealth on the Threshold of the 21st Century. London: UKCOSA and CEC. 86 pp. £20. (paper). ISBN 1-870679 33 4. Address: UKCOSA, 9-17 St. Albans Pl., London N1 ONX, UK.

A comprehensive report on all aspects of international education exchange, this book covers such topics as international issues and distance education, patterns of study, the ways in which European universities can contribute to exchange and others. The focus is on the countries of the Commonwealth. Current statistical information concerning all aspects of international exchange is provided.

Higher Education in Lithuania and the Recognition of Qualifications. Vilnius, Lithuania: Department of Science and Higher Education of the Ministry of Education, 1999. 110 pp. (paper). ISBN 9986-567-28-9.

This book contains a brief survey of the Lithuanian higher education system, including current statistics and discussion of the legal basis of the system, and the history of higher education and the elements of the higher education system. The focus is on degree structures and the recognition of Lithuanian academic qualifications.

The American College in the Nineteenth Century, edited by Roger L. Geiger. Nashville, Tenn.: Vanderbilt University Press, 2000. 363 pp. (paper), \$24.95. ISBN 0-8265-1364-6. Address: Vanderbilt University Press, Box 1813, Station B, Nashville, TN 37235, USA.

The 19th century was a period of the ascendancy of American undergraduate education, yet it has to some extent been ignored

in the literature. This book deals with such central issues as the curriculum, student culture, the education of women, the role of science and agriculture, and the transition of the colleges to the era of the research universities at the end of the century.

Diversification in Higher Education, by Henry Wasser. Kassel, Germany: Wissenschaftliches Zentrum für Berufs- und Hochschulforschung, 1999. 96 pp. (paper). ISBN 3-928172-05-0. Address: Wissenschaftliches Zentrum für Berufs- und Hochschulforschung, Universität Gesamthochschule Kassel, Henschelstr. 4, D 34109 Kassel, Germany.

A series of essays around the broad theme of diversification in higher education, this book highlights issues such as university reform, short-cycle higher education, the changing relations between the university and the state, university autonomy in an era of diversification, and others. Comparisons of the United States and Europe, including Central Europe, form the basis of the analysis.

Tuition Rising: Why College Costs So Much, by Ronald G. Ehrenberg. Cambridge, MA.: Harvard University Press, 2000. 302 pp. \$39.95 (hardback). ISBN 0-674-00328-4. Address: Harvard University Press, 79 Garden St., Cambridge, MA 02138, USA.

This volume analyzes the reasons for tuition inflation in America's elite private universities. Ehrenberg argues that lack of effective administration and unbridled competition contribute to high costs, along with such issues as information technology, laboratories, intercollegiate athletics, and other factors. This book will be of interest to anyone concerned with the pricing of higher education in any country.

Higher Education in Cambodia: The Social and Educational Context for Reconstruction, edited by David Sloper. Bangkok: UNESCO Office for Asia and the Pacific, 1999. 339 pp. (paper). \$20. ISBN 974-680-165-1. Address: UNESCO PROAP, PO Box 967, Prakanong Post Office, Bangkok 10110, Thailand.

One of the few sources of information and discussion of Cambodia's reconstructed university system, this volume provides analysis of the educational system in Cambodia and how the universities fit into it, recent initiatives (mainly from foreign countries) for improving higher education, and a discussion of the new higher education action plan.

The California Idea and American Higher Education: 1850 to the 1960 Master Plan, by John Aubrey Douglass. Stanford, Calif.: Stanford University Press, 2000. 460 pp. (hardback). \$55. ISBN: 0-8047-3189-6. Address: Stanford University Press, Stanford, CA 94305, USA.

California developed the first comprehensive public university system, providing both access and quality. This volume analyzes the development of public higher education in California, focusing on the political, economic, and social elements that helped to shape the system. Of special interest is the discussion of how California dealt with the mass demand for higher education following World War II. The California case is instructive not only to understand the history of American higher education, but as an example for other countries.

Collaboration, Reputation, and Ethics in American Academic Life: Hans H. Gerth and C. Wright Mills, by Guy Oakes and Arthur J. Vidich. Champaign: University of Illinois Press, 1999. 188 pp. (paper) \$14.95. ISBN 0-252-06807-6. Address: University of Illinois Press, 1325 S. Oake St., Champaign, IL 61820, USA.

Taking as an example the intellectual relationship between sociologists Hans Gerth and C. Wright Mills, this book discusses issues of ethics, collaboration, publishing, and career development in American academic life.

Policy and Practice in Higher Education: Reforming Norwegian Universities, by Ivar Bleiklie, Roar Hostaker, and Agnete Vabo. London: Jessica Kingsley Publishers, 2000. 350 pp. (paper). ISBN: 1-85302-705-7. Address: Jessica Kingsley Publishers, 116 Pentonville Rd., London N1 9JB, UK.

This case study of higher education reform in Norway provides a comprehensive analysis of Norwegian higher education policy and the change process. Sections consider the role of the state in higher education, the development of the academic system, the academic profession, and the growth of managerialism.

Assessment in Higher Education: Student Learning, Teaching, Programmes and Institutions, by John Heywood. London: Jessica Kingsley Publishers, 2000. 448 pp. (paper). ISBN 1-85302-831-2. Address: Jessica Kingsley Publishers, 116 Pentonville Rd., London N1 9JB, UK.

Accountability means assessment, argues the author. This volume is comprehensive guide to the assessment of learning, teaching, and institutions. Focusing on the British situation, this book stresses the evaluation of student learning and related issues.

Negotiating Identity: Catholic Higher Education Since 1960, by Alice Gallin, O.S.U. Notre Dame, Ind.: University of Notre Dame Press, 2000. 269 pp. \$32 (hardback). ISBN 0-268-01489-2. Address: University of Notre Dame Press, Notre Dame, IN 46556, USA.

The relationship between Catholic identity and academic traditions in Catholic universities is a perennial issue for debate. The current debate concerning *Ex Corde Ecclesiae* has heightened the discussion. This book considers changes in Catholic higher education in the United States in the light of current trends both in academe and in the Church.

Distance and Campus Universities: Tensions and Interactions, by Sarah Guri-Rosenblit. Oxford: Pergamon Press, 2000. 312 pp \$80.50 (cloth). ISBN 0-08-043066-X. Address: Elsevier

Science, POB 211, 1000AE, Amsterdam, Netherlands.

Distance education is one of the major trends in higher education. By focusing on five case study universities in the United Kingdom, Spain, Germany, Canada, and Israel, this book provides detailed information on such issues as the role of government in the development of distance education, support systems and services, innovative features, the curriculum, and others. This is one of the first detailed studies of how distance education works in a comparative framework.

Campus, Inc.: Corporate Power in the Ivory Tower, edited by Geoffrey D. White. Amherst, N.Y.: Prometheus Books, 2000. 469 pp. \$35 (cloth). ISBN 1-57392-810-0. Address: Prometheus Books, 59 John Glenn Dr., Amherst, NY 14228.

The growing links between business and universities have finally created a critical literature. This volume provides an extended critique of the various influences of business and corporate interests on American higher education. Topics such as the commercialization of teaching and research, the role of corporations in the research enterprise of universities, and others are considered. The chapters present case studies of the role of the CIA at the Rochester Institute of Technology and the links between Ameritech and higher education in communications technology. A section of the book is devoted to how to resist these corporation trends. The authors see nothing good about the trends toward business cooperation with higher education—they see the trend as universities losing their autonomy and their own special role in society. ■

A New Initiative in International Higher Education

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.

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 Center receives funding from the Ford Foundation for its core activities as well as specific projects.

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 02467, USA. 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

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
<http://www.bc.edu/cihe/>

Editor: Philip G. Altbach
Assistant Editors: Kevin W. Sayers
Jef Davis

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.