

INTERNATIONAL HIGHER EDUCATION

The Boston College Center for International Higher Education

Number 25 Fall 2001

International Issues

- 2 The Rise of the Pseudouniversities
Philip G. Altbach
- 4 The Road to a European Higher Education Area
Hans de Wit
- 5 Manuel Castells and the Information Age
Peter Scott

Special Focus: Reform and Change

- 7 South Africa's New National Plan
David Cooper
- 9 Reform in El Salvador
James J. Harrington
- 11 Private Funding of Public Universities: The Makerere Case
M. K. Mayanja
- 13 Reforms in the Baltics
Aims C. McGuinness, Jr.
- 15 Restructuring through Amalgamation in China
David Y. Chen

Special Focus: Quality Assurance

- 16 Quality Assurance in Indonesia
M. K. Tadjudin
- 18 Quality Improvement in Chile
Ricardo Reich

Special Focus: Australia's Dilemmas

- 19 Globalization and Its Discontents: The Australian Case
William G. Tierney and Craig McInnis
- 21 Higher Education and Politics in Australia
Simon Marginson

Countries and Regions

- 22 Ethics and the Korean Academic Profession
Sungho H. Lee
- 23 The Knowledge Context in African Universities
Damtew Teferra

Departments

- 25 New Publications
- 27 News of the Center

International Issues

The Rise of the Pseudouniversities

Philip G. Altbach

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

An array of institutions, agencies, corporations, and other businesses are calling themselves universities these days. It is time to call a halt to this trend, which is debasing the nomenclature of knowledge and scholarship. Just as important, these institutions are, in many cases, providing “degrees” to people who have not studied in a university and who have not earned the academic titles. I refer here to a wide variety of organizations—including the University of Phoenix, which is now America’s largest private “university” and is accredited to offer academic degrees; Jones International University, the first U.S.-based Internet-only “university,” also accredited; Cardean University, which is part of U-Next (a company with links to Stanford, Columbia and other major universities), and “packages” courses for Internet delivery, and offers degrees in several professional fields; Motorola University, which is owned by a major corporation and offers training to employees as well as outsiders; and a variety of others. These examples are all in the for-profit sector, as are most of the new pseudouniversities, but the issue of for-profit versus nonprofit status is not the critical factor here.

These new pseudouniversities are not universities. They may offer valuable training in fields that appeal to eager customers. They may provide this training in “classes” taught by teachers in a “site-based” traditional format, provide instruction through the Internet or other new distance arrangements, or perhaps use a combination of modes of delivery. They may employ well-qualified instructors, although seldom on a full-time basis. But they do not fit the definition of a university and should not bear this title. The time has come to scrutinize the role of this new phenomenon in the universe of postsecondary education. The issue here is not the value or usefulness of the new providers of training but rather protecting one of society’s most valuable institutions—the university.

What is a University?

Defining a university is not an easy task, especially in this era of differentiation in higher education, with new and diverse institutions emerging everywhere. However, we can probably agree on a set of common functions and values. Universities, from their medieval beginnings, have been teaching institutions, encompassing most of the disciplines known at the time. Universities have been imbued with a sense of responsibility for the public good—be it preserving books in libraries, sponsoring art museums, or service

to local communities—and have seen themselves as independent places of teaching and analysis. For almost two centuries, research, especially basic research, has been a key function of a university. Professors—often, but not always, with long-term or permanent appointments—have been at the heart of the university, exercising control over the curriculum, the admission of students, and the awarding of degrees. Universities are normally expected to offer undergraduate, graduate, and professional degrees in a variety of disciplines and fields.

These new pseudouniversities are not universities.

Contemporary universities are themselves varied. The Massachusetts Institute of Technology does not call itself a university, but is one in every sense of the word. Boston College, despite its name, is a university because it offers graduate and professional degrees in many fields. Rockefeller University, a small institution that specializes in graduate training and research in the biomedical fields, calls itself a university, but might be overly specialized to warrant the title, despite its quality and reputation. Universities can be publicly owned and receive their funds largely from the government, or they can be privately controlled and responsible for their own budgets. Some are managed by religious organizations. In some countries, universities are managed by families. And there are a small number of for-profit universities, for example in the Philippines.

The Pseudouniversities

In the past several decades, an entirely new model of postsecondary institution has arrived on the scene. These new institutions do not fit the description of universities, but instead offer specialized training in a variety of areas that are in demand.

For the most part, they are for-profit entities, seeking to earn money for their owners or shareholders. Many are now corporations listed on the stock exchange. Some companies—such as the Apollo Group, which owns the University of Phoenix, and Sylvan Learning Systems—are mainly in the education business. Others, including IBM and the multinational publisher Elsevier (which now owns part of Harcourt General) are large media conglomerates or technology companies with an interest in education. Some have done quite well in the stock markets. Unlike

universities, these new institutions have as their primary goal earning a profit.

The pseudouniversities are highly specialized institutions. They do not offer programs in a wide range of subjects but rather focus on targeted, market-driven fields, and have the ability to shift focus based on student demand. So far, management and business studies, information technology, and some areas of teacher training and educational administration have been the most appealing fields. The chosen areas are those in which low-cost instruction can be offered without the need for expensive laboratory equipment. The curriculum is also subject to change. If demand falls off in one area, another can quickly be substituted.

The pseudouniversities have no permanent faculty and are staffed by managers who make decisions about both the business and the curricular aspects of the institution. Instructors are hired to provide instruction, develop web-based modules, and ensure that customers are served. Costs are kept low by hiring instructors to teach specific courses. Benefits are generally not available, and there is no commitment by the institution to those offering the instruction. Instructors lack academic freedom in the traditional sense of that term—they are hired to teach a specific content and cannot stray from it. There is absolutely no protection for teachers who might express divergent views or disagree with institutional directions or management decisions.

In the traditional universities, the concept of shared governance means the academic staff has a significant role in decision making about the institution. In pseudouniversities, there is no shared governance at all but simply management. Managers make the key decisions, with subject matter specialists brought in to develop degree structures. Power is entirely in the hands of management.

Pseudouniversities have no interest in research. Indeed, research would detract from the profit-oriented mission of the institution. It would be impossible to foster research activity with part-time instructors, scant library or laboratory resources, and no sense of academic autonomy. These institutions have no commitment to the broader public interest or the idea of service to society. Traditional universities have stressed service as a key responsibility, and both the institutions and their faculties engage in many different kinds of pro bono work. The pseudouniversities are specialized profit-making machines.

Is There a Problem?

Our purpose is not to advocate the abolition of this trend in higher education. The for-profit education sector, well established in the United States and in many other countries, is simply taking advantage of the increasingly competitive nature of education markets and the demand for specialized training in knowledge-based societies. It is, however, necessary to label these institutions correctly—

not just to ensure “truth in packaging,” but more importantly to protect the traditional universities and their critically central functions in modern society. This is no mere semantic quibble—it goes to the heart of the future of higher education.

Institutions that are not universities should not call themselves universities. They should not be permitted to offer what purport to be academic degrees. They should be accredited but not by the accrediting agencies responsible for traditional universities. In other words, these institutions should be in a clearly defined category of training institutions, clearly labeled and delineated. Customers, formerly called students, should be aware that when they are attending colleges and universities that they are studying at institutions with a set of understood norms and values, but that when they purchase a specialized training course, they are studying at an entirely different kind of institution. The qualifications earned at the new-style institutions should not be called degrees, but rather given other designations such as certificates of competency.

Institutions that are not universities should not call themselves universities.

At the same time, traditional universities must think carefully about their own missions and programs in the competitive environment of the 21st century. The tendency of academic institutions to “spin off” for-profit subsidiaries, or join consortia aimed at producing a profit, and focus increasingly on applied research aimed at bringing revenues rather than contributing to the advancement of knowledge—these are all in urgent need of examination.

For a start, let’s call a rose by its proper name. The new for-profit “universities” should be forced to change their names to something more appropriate. For example, the University of Phoenix should be called the Phoenix Specialized Training Institute (PSTI), offering a range of “professional competency certificates.” Motorola University should be the Motorola Corporate Training Institute. An entirely new accrediting structure should be set up to ensure that quality is offered to customers. If these steps are taken, universities will remain universities. Their focus on teaching, research, and service will remain intact. If we allow the pseudouniversities to proliferate willy-nilly, higher education will be debased and subject to ever increasing competitive pressures that will inevitably destroy one of society’s most valuable institutions.

The Long and Winding Road to a European Higher Education Area

Hans de Wit

Hans de Wit is vice-president for international affairs at the University of Amsterdam and editor of the Journal of Studies in International Education. Address: Universiteit van Amsterdam, Spui, Amsterdam, Netherlands. E-mail: <hansdw@bdu.uva.nl>.

The Bologna Declaration of June 19, 1999 was the start of a process that will lead to the creation of a European higher education area. The Bologna Declaration had six objectives: comparable degrees, a two-cycle degree structure, establishment of a course credit system, and promotion of mobility and common European patterns in higher education. These objectives need to be accomplished by 2010, the final completion date of the European higher education area.

The Declaration is supported by 32 European ministers of education. University leaders and students have also welcomed—although with different emphases and interpretations—the plans for a new European higher education area. The Bologna Declaration was based on a 1998 initiative drawn up at the Sorbonne, Paris, by the ministers of education of the four large countries: Germany, France, Italy, and the United Kingdom. At the time there was immediate wide support for this ambitious reform plan, but also skepticism about the prospects for realization. (See the author's article in the Winter 2001 issue of *IHE*.)

In May 2001, the ministers of education met in Prague to discuss the progress to date; the group was joined by ministers from Croatia, Cyprus, and Turkey. It was clear that while there remains a long road ahead most countries, although at varying speeds, are working on the implementation of the objectives. According to the report, *Trends in Learning Structures in Higher Education II*, prepared by Guy Haug and Christian Taugh for the Prague meeting, there is general consensus on the core objectives of the Bologna process and fears about the process seem to be rapidly diminishing. The process confirms and reinforces national priorities and is being used to accelerate, facilitate, and guide changes in the different countries. The report states that “the Bologna process is both a consequence of and a contribution to the process of integration of European higher education.”

Much of the attention after the Bologna meeting was focused on the implementation of a two-tier degree system. Several countries are working on the system—for instance, Italy and the Netherlands, where new enabling legislation has been put in place. At the Prague meeting the emphasis appeared to have shifted to the importance of quality assurance, recognition issues, and accreditation. In the communiqué issued after the meeting, the ministers

stressed the quality of education and research as crucial issues in the realization of the European higher education area. The ministers also agreed on the importance of enhancing the attractiveness of European higher education to students from Europe and other parts of the world. The readability and comparability of European higher education degrees worldwide should be promoted by the development of a common framework of qualifications, as well as by coherent quality assurance and accreditation or certification mechanisms and increased information efforts. The follow-up work to the Prague meeting, in preparation for the 2003 talks in Berlin, will focus particularly on these types of issues. The challenge will be whether institutions of higher education in Europe will be able to cross regional and national boundaries to become players in the European and global higher education market. Helmut de Rudder, in a spring 2000 contribution to this newsletter, described a provincial and rather immobile European higher education sector, but one certainly on the way to becoming more European. His optimism is quite broadly shared.

The Salamanca Convention of European higher education institutions, organized by the European University Association (EUA) in March 2001, welcomed and supported the emergence of the European higher education area and the challenges of operating in a competitive environment. The EUA was created when two organizations in European higher education merged in 2000: the Association of European Universities and the Confederation of EU Rectors' Conferences. At the same time, the institutions pointed to the importance of maintaining as guiding principles the autonomy of higher education; higher education as a public, rather than a commercial, good; and its diversity in terms of languages, systems, types, profiles, and curricular orientation. Quality assurance, compatible qualifications, and attractiveness are seen as crucial elements for the realization of the new European higher education space.

It was clear that while there remains a long road ahead most countries, although at varying speeds, are working on the implementation of the objectives.

As stated in the Salamanca convention document: “European higher education institutions recognise that their students need and demand qualifications which they can

effectively use for the purpose of study and career all over Europe. The institutions and their networks and organisations acknowledge their role and responsibility in this regard and confirm their willingness to organise themselves accordingly within the framework of autonomy.”

Students themselves did make their voices heard directly. In March 2001, the National Unions of Students in Europe (ESIB) organized an event in Göteborg, Sweden, and were successful in presenting their views at the Prague meeting in May. In the “Student Göteborg Declaration,” the students declare that they see the Bologna process as a crucial step toward a European higher education area. At the same time, the students demand guarantees that all citizens will have equal access to this area, regardless of their social background. Expanded mobility, higher quality, and increased attractiveness are seen as the important assets that the Bologna process will yield for students, but these must coincide with adequate funding for study grants and for

higher education institutions. The national unions of students have demanded via ESIB an active role as the process unfolds.

Both the institutions and the students seem to have been heard by the ministers at the Prague meeting, given the emphasis placed on the students’ issues in the communiqué. The close cooperation between ministers, institutions, and students in the realization of the European higher education area, is probably the most striking aspect of the Bologna process and crucial for its success. At the same time, keeping all parties involved and focused ensures that the process will be a long and complex one; Berlin is the next stop on the way to 2010.

Note: Texts of the Bologna Declaration, the Prague communiqué, and the *Trends* reports are to be found on several European websites. The most complete collection of documents on the Bologna process can be found at <<http://www.salamanca2001.org>>

Manuel Castells and the Information Age

Peter Scott

Peter Scott is vice chancellor of Kingston University, UK. Address: Vice Chancellor, Kingston University, River House, 53-57 High Street. Kingston upon Thames, Surrey KT1 1LQ, UK. E-mail: <p.scott@kingston.ac.uk>.

Manuel Castells, *The Information Age: Economy, Society and Culture*. Vol. 1: *The Rise of the Network Society* (1996; 2d ed., 2000), 594 pp.; vol. 2: *The Power of Identity* (1997; 2d ed., 2000), 460 pp.; vol. 3: *End of Millennium* (1998; 2d ed., 2000), 448 pp. Oxford: Blackwell, price: \$27.95. £16.99 each.

Manuel Castells’ trilogy on the Information Age, first published between 1996 and 1998, was a phenomenon—a publishing phenomenon for the simple reason that it became a best-seller demanding frequent reprints—and an intellectual phenomenon because Castells was delicately poised on the cusp between impenetrable theorizing and breathless popularizing. It is only a little unfair to say that he took the work of people like Alain Touraine and Anthony Giddens and packaged it for the audience of Tom Peters or Charles Handy.

Two of the three books have now been revised—the first, on the rise of what Castells calls the Network Society, because of the accumulation (and acceleration) of relevant data, most of which incidentally tends to confirm his broad thesis; and the third, in which Castells speculates about a new postmillennial social order, because recent events may have detracted from the power and persuasiveness of his original analysis. The second, on the reconstruction of personal identity, new social movements, and the crisis of the nation state, has remained unchanged. But it could be argued that this volume too required revision, not least be-

cause the essentially benign social movements of the 1960s (with which Castells aligns himself in personal, if not intellectual, terms) have tended to be pushed aside by the much more aggressive activism of campaigns against globalization, GM foods, animal experimentation, and the rest.

Castells’ ambition was to develop an empirically grounded, cross-cultural sociological theory of the Information Age. It was a grand ambition, in which he largely succeeded. Certainly no one can complain about a lack of data; indeed there is almost too much at times. This is both a strength and a weakness—a strength because just occasionally social theorizing is unencumbered by empirical data, which makes effective critique difficult; but a weakness because much of Castells’ data, inevitably, are high-level aggregations by national statistical agencies or from the OECD, World Bank, UNESCO, and similar organizations, which raises issues of both accuracy and comparative methodology. What he offers is very much a macroview of social and economic development, which creates difficulties because much of his analysis emphasizes the importance of interstitial, even intimate, cultural change.

Nor can anyone complain about the global reach of Castells’ analysis. His is not a frustratingly parochial mid-Atlantic view of the world, a NATO-ist perspective in which North America and Western Europe (and their outliers) still represent the cutting-edge, the Future. He pays as much attention, inevitably, to East Asia (once rampant, even tri-

umphant, but not apparently in crisis) and to the dramatic collapse of the Soviet Union, the other pivot of the post-war world. Nor does he adopt a Brussels interpretation of “Europe,” despite the importance he attaches to the European Union as a supranational organization; the Europes of the South and East are not forgotten. Castells also devotes much attention to Africa, although essentially as a threat, a continent largely excluded from the Network Society (or only linked through dysfunctional, even semicriminal, connections).

But Castells’ success depends on the third element within his ambitious project—to offer a sociological theory of the Information Age. His key concept is the “network” and the key characteristics of networks are that they are open and restlessly evolving structures, to which the various “nodes” that comprise them are ultimately subordinate. Castells does not aim to be a social theorist; it is certainly not his ambition to add to the stock of ideas about postmodernity. Nevertheless, he makes bold claims about the novelty of the Network Society, in which human beings no longer struggle for survival against primeval nature or are driven onwards by a mechanically and culturally constructed “nature” whether in its natural or fabricated forms.

There are obvious echoes of earlier writing in Castells’ account. Anthony Giddens’ concept of “structuration,” according to which structure and action are elided and combined, may be regarded as a (more sophisticated?) precursor of Castells’ network. Daniel Bell’s characterization of preindustrial society as a “game against nature,” of industrial society as a “game against fabricated nature,” and of postindustrial society as a “game between persons” is similar to the *schema* offered by Castells (and there are obvious similarities between Bell’s emphasis on the centrality of “knowledge” and Castells’ concept of “informationalism”). There may even be a whiff of Francis Fukuyama’s end-of-history thesis, although Castells does not succumb to Fukuyama’s complacent triumphalism.

Yet, despite these theoretical dependencies and borrowings, Castells’ remains among the most impressive accounts of contemporary and future society. One reason for this has already been mentioned—his masterful manipulation of empirical data to support his speculations, drawn from an impressively eclectic range of sources. A second is his ability to weave together so many different phenomena into a coherent synthesis—the information technology revolution; the gathering crises of legitimacy, whether national or patriarchal; the (final and irreversible?) globalization of markets; the rise of new social movements such as feminism and environmentalism; and so on. Castells has neither the first, nor the last, word on any of these phenomena treated in isolation; in many cases his description and analysis are frankly derivative. The novelty, and excitement, of his work are to be found in the connections

that he establishes between these various phenomena. His trilogy is its own vindication of the Network Society.

This makes it difficult to reduce Castells’ ideas to a nutshell. But his essential starting point is the information technology revolution. It was this revolution that provoked the parallel crises of capitalism and communism in the 1970s, the former successfully overcome after painful restructuring (remember Margaret Thatcher?) and the latter terminal. In a similar way, the social movements of the 1960s, although only obliquely related to (and even critical of) technological progress, flourished in the open and information-rich environments thereby created. The two came together in the new culture of “informationalism.”

After all, the G7 nations in 2000 are almost the same as the Great Powers of 1900, which may raise some doubts about the alleged fragility of nation states.

Subsequently, nation-states, reconstituted as welfare states in the 20th century, have been undermined by globalization, both socioeconomic and politicocultural, made possible (inevitable?) by information technology. Politics have been “voided of power,” which is exercised elsewhere (by the mass media with their terrifyingly complete grasp of the new “cultural codes”). Nations have been divided into the included, with the United States as its heartland, and the excluded, a new “Fourth World” without the redeeming appeals of the former Third World.

People have been divided into “programmable” and “generic” labor, and all this has been made possible by the transformation of the material foundations of social life, space, and time—in short, by the arrival of the Information Age.

Castells covers such a wide range of issues that inevitably he is exposed on some of them. However deep his scholarship . . . , he cannot be an expert on everything. In any case his, entirely creditable, desire to transcend mid-Atlanticism means that he is forced into inevitably shorthand, and arguably superficial, accounts of the histories, cultures, structures of less familiar societies. But such detailed criticisms are not only unfair; they are beside the point. Instead, criticism, if any, must be directed at Castells’ theses in their entirety.

There are two issues that I believe deserve to be raised—although as an inquiring process rather than destructive critique. The first, inevitably, is that Castells may tend to exaggerate the novelty of some of the phenomena he discusses. I have already pointed out the resemblances between his ideas and those of Anthony Giddens (a decade

ago) and Daniel Bell (a quarter century ago). And, in a more material sense, many of the phenomena he discusses in the second volume concerning personal identities, social movements, and political interdependencies were already well established in the 20th and even the 19th centuries. At times, like so many others, Castells falls into the trap of attributing to postmodernity (or, in his case, the Information Age) some of the defining characteristics of modernity.

This overestimation of novelty would not be so serious if it did not lead him, occasionally, to exaggerate how much things have changed or are likely to change. After all, the G7 nations in 2000 are almost the same as the Great Powers of 1900, which may raise some doubts about the alleged fragility of nation-states. Even in the much more volatile commercial arena the list of top multinational companies reveals remarkable continuities. Patriarchy has been in retreat for more than a century—although, paradoxically, the growing social inequalities of the Information Age may actually obstruct the advance of social egalitarianism. Politics have only been “voided of power” in terms of grand social-democratic programs of reform; they have merely reverted to their predemocratic forms of interest and influence (what Cobbett, of course, rather bluntly called “Old Corruption.”)

The second issue is that Castells is a relentless optimist—and, as such, tends to underestimate the darker aspects of the social change he describes. No place in his analysis for notions of “Risk Society,” popularized by Ulrich Beck (no reference in the extensive bibliography); no sense that “bads” are as significant as “good”; no acknowledgment that risks (or, at any rate, uncertainties) are accumulating at a faster rate than solutions (and that this is inherent in the success of science and dynamism of technology he elsewhere celebrates.) Castells is also a relentless empiricist who is careful not to predict the future, referring disparagingly at the end of the trilogy to philosophers who tried to change the world and insisting that people must be allowed to free themselves from “uncritical adherence to theoretical or ideological schemes” and to construct their practice on “the basis of their own experience.” No acknowledgment that empiricism is itself an ideological position; no acknowledgment that “experience” is itself culturally constructed—a conclusion offered weighty support by his own analysis.

Finally, what implications does Castells’ analysis have for our understanding of the possibilities for higher education? Ambiguous ones, I am afraid. On the one hand, he draws a clear distinction between “programmable” and “generic” labor, which can be read as an endorsement of the university’s traditional mission to develop reflective critical skills in its students (but also leads on to the disturbing conclusion that modern higher education systems have inevitably become mass producers of “generic” labor as well). On the other hand, his analysis of the Informa-

tion Age emphasizes the significance of multiple networks that demand not only technological sophistication but also cultural elaboration—skills that are more readily associated with technical expertise than reflective values, whether Arnoldian or “informational.”

Reprinted, with permission, from *Higher Education Digest*, no. 40, Summer 2001. *HED* is a publication of the Centre for Higher Education Research and Information of The Open University, UK. Address: 344-354 Gray’s Inn Road, London WC1X 8XP, UK. E-mail: <cheri@open.ac.uk>. (*International Higher Education* and *Higher Education Digest* occasionally share articles.)

The South African National Plan for Higher Education

David Cooper

David Cooper is associate professor in the Department of Sociology, at the University of Cape Town, South Africa. He has been seconded part time to the University of the Western Cape to direct a new master’s program in higher education policy analysis, leadership and management, based in the Faculty of Education and linked to its Education Policy Unit. Address: Faculty of Education, University of Cape Town, Rondebosch, South Africa. E-mail: <dacooper@iafrica.com>.

In February 2001, minister of education Kadar Asmal announced the National Plan for Higher Education (NPHE), without first officially passing it through his own “expert” advisory Council on Higher Education (CHE), which had made some significantly different proposals in its own discussion document in 2000. Interestingly, instead he sought, and obtained, prior approval from internal African National Congress (ANC—the ruling party) committees and the cabinet, and other “alliance” structures linked to the ANC such as the leading trade union federation and the South African Communist Party (both of which had raised political questions about his recent reforms in school education). Clearly, new processes were under way in South African higher education. Moreover, the content of the NPHE differed from a whole series of earlier policy discussion documents leading up to the higher education white paper of 1997, the definitive document prior to the NPHE.

Was the NPHE a shift in direction in terms of policy substance and process? And was it what it asserted—a real plan to transform the Apartheid-based system of higher education into a new system fulfilling the white paper goals of equity, efficiency, and social development?

Core Elements of the NPHE

The white paper of 1997 had initiated the setting up of a Branch of Higher Education within one new Department of Education, putting an end to Apartheid-fragmented governance consisting of separate branches and departments to administer universities and technikons (polytechnics) for

various urban-based “race groups” and so-called black homelands in the rural areas. However, after what might be termed a few years of policy “implementation vacuum,” the NPHE in 2001 confronted much more openly than previous documents the crises facing higher education in South Africa.

The NPHE listed massive problems of inefficiency and dislocation resulting largely (but not solely) from the Apartheid era.

The NPHE listed massive problems of inefficiency and dislocation resulting largely (but not solely) from the Apartheid era. It confronted a higher education system with unnecessary duplication among historically separate institutions for “African,” “white,” “coloured,” and “Indian,” Apartheid-designated race groups—21 universities and 15 technikons, a total of 36 higher education institutions. The NPHE document spoke openly about the inefficiencies of student graduation rates and staff research output levels of most universities and technikons. It viewed with alarm the high drop-out rates of students, due in large part to lack of student financial aid, and the falling annual numbers of first-year student university enrollments, due partly to problems in the high school system. Furthermore, the uncontrolled proliferation of private higher education institutions; the fragile governing structures and even mismanagement at a few historically black, publicly funded institutions; the skewed enrollment patterns, whereby many black and female students were underrepresented in science, technology, and business fields; and the opportunistic spread of distance learning and other modes of program development by some historically white universities—all these the NPHE viewed as having the potential to undermine the whole higher education system.

In its 100-page report, the NPHE addresses issues of access (to increase the student participation rate from 15 to 20 percent over the next 10 to 15 years); equity (with a stress on race and gender, but not class, and on inequities in the student body and especially in the academic staff); and research output (particularly for national economic development, with capacity building via master’s and doctoral degree program increases). But I would argue the thrust is located in two areas. First, there is an overarching concern by the NPHE with efficiency—particularly with respect to student outputs for the economy. For the first time, the focus is not just on student enrollments but on graduation rates as well, with financial incentives proposed to improve these. Moreover, a shift in the “shape” of the

system is proposed, to change the balance of student enrollments in humanities:business-commerce:science and technology from the current ratio of 49:26:25 to 40:30:30 over the next decade.

Second, and even more importantly, the problem of institutions in the same region with overlapping programs and functions is addressed head-on. The NPHE accepts that for at least the next five years the university/technikon divide will be retained. However, a multistage process has been set up to establish institutional program concentrations in each region. Some institutional mergers and forms of regional cooperation will be required. The NPHE document does outline a few specific mergers, but the document also calls for the setting up of a National Working Group that will report to the minister by the end of the year on the recommended forms of mergers and cooperation by region (with the only NPHE proviso that there are to be no closures of sites of learning, although sites may be restructured).

The Nature of the NPHE

The NPHE must be understood alongside the proposed new National Funding Framework and the Higher Education Quality Committee of the Council on Higher Education, which emerged in 2001 and are aimed at steering the system according to plan. However, it is debatable whether the specific method laid out will lead to appropriate academic niche developments and whether the ministry and the institutions themselves have the internal capacity to plan and effect changes in these ways.

The NPHE must be understood alongside the proposed new National Funding Framework and the Higher Education Quality Committee of the Council on Higher Education.

The NPHE document of 2001 has put itself forward as a far more nuanced policy strategy with respect to the 36 higher education institutions—involving what it terms a “planned differentiation of higher education institutions through negotiation and consensus”—compared to the proposals submitted by the Council on Higher Education to the minister in 2000. The council had put forward a restructuring proposal for a hierarchical system of three types: I) research institutions (extensive programs up to the Ph.D. level); II) institutions mainly up to master’s level, with some niche area doctoral programs permitted; III) “bedrock” institutions, with a focus on undergraduate education, and some programs permitted up to the master’s level. The council’s proposal unleashed a massive outcry in

2000—not least the accusation that it was a “return to Apartheid” because most of the historically black higher education institutions (universities and technikons) would fall under type III and most of the historically white universities (but not technikons) would fall under type I. Because of this controversy, the NPHE of 2001 came out with its interactive processes via program niches and three-year plans. However, the National Working Group, now going round the country suggesting in some regions quite significant mergers and forms of cooperation, could end up proposing far-reaching changes to the minister. Perhaps the major thrust of change will come from this working group rather than from the NPHE’s “plans, negotiations and consensus.” We shall know the results soon after the end of 2001.

The NPHE document of 2001 and the Council on Higher Education document of 2000 signify an end to what might be termed the period of “symbolic policymaking.” Prior to 2000, the new democratic government’s most important policy document on higher education, the white paper of 1997, as well as key advisory documents before

this, were involved primarily in symbolic policy—outlining the values, missions, and broad frameworks required to transform the higher education system but without any specifics on policy choices, implementation, or evaluation of results. In contrast, Council on Higher Education 2000 and NPHE 2001 signal a shift toward what can be termed “substantive, procedural, and material policy” approaches, incorporating concrete actions, implementation procedures, and resource allocation mechanisms.

For the first time, the new approaches stress efficiency and globalization and the knowledge economy. The earlier stress found in policy documents between 1992 and 1997 on equity and redress (especially in terms of “ear-marked funds” for historically black institutions) has been greatly downplayed. In this sense, South African higher education policy is coming more into line with the international higher education discourses about the “market university”—like our post-1996 national economic policies, which emphasize growth and foreign investment over economic reconstruction and basic socioeconomic needs.

University Reform in El Salvador: A New Chapter

James J. Harrington

James J. Harrington is a doctoral candidate in the Higher Education Program at Boston College. His dissertation examines the assessment and reform of higher education in El Salvador, 1993-1999. E-mail: <harrinji@massed.net>.

The reform of Salvadoran higher education, initiated in 1996, has a new set of challenges to address. Aided by the integration of education with the peace process, beginning in 1992, the reform is now approaching the end of a decade aimed at alleviating the poverty and extremes of wealth that fueled the civil war. The reform, which linked education research with public policy and created a law implementing the proposed changes, currently faces new circumstances and must adapt in order to maintain the support of the government and private sector. A real danger exists of the reform movement’s falling from favor and losing ground in the advancing democratization, modernization, and globalization of the country.

The Crisis of Higher Education

Higher education in El Salvador endured a long cycle of protest and repression. The crisis of higher education in El Salvador deepened during the 1980s. The military’s closing of the national University of El Salvador (UES) between 1980 and 1984 led to a sudden surge in the number of private universities and other postsecondary institutions. The four existing private universities were unable to meet

the demand. Faculty at the UES founded alternative institutions to meet the needs of their students. The success of these small, specialized institutions spawned an entrepreneurial growth spurt in higher education.

The closing of the national university came at a time of rising demand for postsecondary education. El Salvador had been the Central American nation most committed to economic modernization. Its burgeoning middle class and growing need for an educated workforce put the education system under increasing scrutiny and stress. During the 1970s student enrollments grew to about 30,000 students at the UES and another 10–12,000 at the four privates. By 1996 this number expanded to over 108,000 students.

By the end of the 1980s there were more than 40 universities licensed to operate in El Salvador. The national university remained the principal public institution, although the military created the Military University in 1988 to compete with the UES. The remaining institutions were private universities of varying sponsorship—churches, professional organizations, or academic faculties. Their facilities varied, but the upper tier consisted of well-established, full-service academic institutions. Some of the lower tier were accused of profiteering, despite a law prohibiting such practices.

The number of postsecondary *tecnológicos* (one- and two-year programs) also grew. By 1996 there were 29 of these schools, 16 public and 13 private. As with some newly

created universities, a number of these institutions failed to meet even minimal standards and were little more than names on a letterhead or storefront operations of questionable quality. A number were, however, serious attempts to establish comprehensive, high-quality institutions.

The Reform

The initial goal of the 1996 higher education reform law was to create standards to improve or eliminate substandard institutions. The constitution guaranteed a university education to all qualified citizens and autonomy to the UES. The higher education law of 1965 granted the power to create private institutions, and a 1972 update of the law restricted the administrative autonomy of the UES. However, these laws provided no control over quality, no means of evaluation, and no procedures for dealing with substandard facilities, programs, or personnel.

Higher education in El Salvador endured a long cycle of protest and repression.

The end of the civil war in 1992 was accomplished in an atmosphere of conciliation and commitment to a new society, with education designated as a major element of this change. An education sector assessment (1993–94) was initiated by the Ministry of Education, funded by the United States Agency for International Development and led by a team from the Harvard Institute for International Development. The follow-up policy analysis commissioned by the ministry (1995–96) resulted in the new higher education law (1996).

The law created standards and procedures for evaluation and reporting, and recommended an accreditation system. The standards measured the facilities of the institutions, including academic support facilities—library, athletic and recreational, and computer and scientific facilities. The reform law also established the criteria to judge program curriculum, requirements for matriculation and graduation, and qualifications of faculty and staff. The law empowered the ministry to license and evaluate postsecondary institutions, including the power to withhold licenses from applicants and to close substandard institutions. The same criteria were applied to universities, *tecnológicos*, and specialized institutions. The reform law has been highly successful in setting standards for new institutions and has led to the closing of eight universities following the first round of evaluations, in 1997.

El Salvador is the size of Massachusetts, with a population of just over five million. The figure of eight closings actually represents 21.6 percent of the nation's universities

(37 were operating in 1996, 29 remained following the first evaluations in 1997). The struggle to close these institutions was intense. Faculty and students had much to lose in terms of employment and future earnings. Entrepreneurial interests and political personalities applied pressure. The protests ranged from political and personal persuasion to death threats against the minister of education, Cecilia Gallardo de Cano.

The Next Step

The needs of the national university and the upper tier of privates were not addressed in the 1996 law. The national university has suffered from inadequate budgets from the time of its reopening in 1984, when its enrollment was reduced by half and it was required to become more self-sustaining. While budgets grew during the 1990s, they have not matched the growth in enrollments (to nearly 29,000 students). Earthquakes in 1986 and 2001 added severe problems for infrastructure: since 1986, four large classroom buildings have been unusable and construction of one new building was abandoned. The budget has allowed for constructing temporary space, but not for the repair or replacement of the damaged buildings.

The need to repair the infrastructure and add to the budget of the UES is recognized, as is the fact that the rigidity of the evaluation system is stifling the higher-quality institutions. These issues and the success in applying standards have become the focus for updating the law. The consensus is that the top universities have been forced to sacrifice creativity in order to respond to demands for minimum standards they already meet.

The needs of the national university and the upper tier of privates were not addressed in the 1996 law.

The proposed adjustments in higher education reform will implement the voluntary system of accreditation for institutions that have attained or maintained satisfactory evaluations, freeing them of the onerous statistical evaluation. It is hoped the accreditation process, with its self-evaluative format, will spark the creativity of these institutions and lead them to expand and improve programs, facilities, and faculty.

Higher education reform in El Salvador has achieved its original goals of instituting minimum standards. The Superior Council for Higher Education now labors to continue the reform, adapting to present needs to improve the substance of higher education beyond the statistics and encouraging further growth and development.

Makerere University and the Private Students Scheme

M. K. Mayanja

M. K. Mayanja is director of planning at Makerere University. Address: POB 7062, Kampala, Uganda. E-mail: <pddmuk@swiftuganda.com>.

The introduction of the private students scheme at Uganda's premier public university, Makerere, has turned the institution around and restored its academic viability. The story of how the transformation, referred to as the "quiet revolution," came about is as instructive as the actual changes themselves. Makerere University, however, will need to assert its independence under the new Universities and Tertiary Education Act and adopt a corporate management approach to maintain the momentum of reform.

The Crisis of Underfunding

Until the year 1991, Makerere University, which relied 100 percent on public funding for both tuition and living expenses for all its students, was the most underfunded university in the Eastern and Southern African Region. Its gross unit cost in 1984 stood at U.S.\$345 when the average unit cost in the region was U.S.\$2,000. A university professor earned U.S.\$30 per month, and many lecturers had to make ends meet by moonlighting with jobs such as driving taxis, running shops or kiosks, or teaching in secondary school. Many other academics left the country in search of greener pastures. The financial squeeze manifested itself further in deteriorating buildings, constant power failures, and breakdowns in the water supply system. Journal subscriptions declined to zero as had the purchase of chemicals, textbooks, and science laboratory equipment. Research publishing dried up.

The government was not ready to provide the funds needed by the university, nor was it ready to let the university introduce cost sharing, for fear of student protest actions. Students at Makerere University insisted on free tuition, free food, and free accommodation—and even pocket money popularly known as "boom." Every time student benefits were tampered with, they would put on their academic gowns and march to the State House or to Parliament to exact their demands. In 1990, the government abolished the students' transport allowance and introduced a "book bank" in place of a book allowance; students went on strike, resulting in a confrontation with police during which two students died. The academic staff soon realized that they were absorbing the brunt of the financial squeeze by being underpaid. They started to organize themselves into strike action.

In the meantime, the demand for university places far outstripped supply. For example, in 1990 and 1991 of approximately 6,000 candidates who met the minimum

entry requirements, Makerere University and two other new universities could not absorb more than 2,500 students. This created cutthroat competition for university places and escalated the cut-off points for admission to Makerere University. Wealthy parents resorted to sending their children abroad as the next best alternative.

Evolution of a Private Scheme

It is said that need is the mother of invention, and indeed this seems to have been the driving force behind the evolution of the private scheme at Makerere. After failing to introduce cost sharing to supplement government funds, the university decided to venture into admitting a few fee-paying students in existing programs. First, in order to get the government's blessing and ensure student noninterference, the scheme would not apply to any students already at Makerere. Second, the scheme started in 1991–1992 with a tiny number of students—just 300 out of a total of 2,418. Third, the scheme targeted relatively well-to-do parents who were sending their children outside Uganda at exorbitant cost. A consensus developed that once the university had admitted 2,000 government-funded students, it could admit private students to generate income.

The financial squeeze manifested itself further in deteriorating buildings, constant power failures, and breakdowns in the water supply system.

However, the number of private students that could be absorbed into existing programs, already running at full capacity, was limited. Departments were then encouraged to initiate additional private programs and introduce evening and distance education programs. Initially, faculties were not enthusiastic about generating income. They wanted to stick to their traditional roles of teaching and research, leaving administrators to grapple with funding. To persuade faculties to venture into income generating, it was decided to give them a lot of say in how the income generated would be spent. The central administration took less than 40 percent of the income and left the rest to the schools and under the control of the deans, directors, and heads of department and faculties. The Institute of Adult and Continuing Education inaugurated a self-sponsored external degree program in 1992 in the disciplines of commerce and education. In 1993, the School of Law and the School of Commerce seized the opportunity and launched private evening programs. In 1995, the university council sanctioned evening courses for all departments that were ready to mount them.

Makerere University formulated its first strategic plan (1996–2000) to promote this new entrepreneurial approach and adjust its administrative design to enhance the innovative process. The admission of private students, which started in a tentative way, was followed by initiatives such as the introduction of the semester system and an updated curriculum to make courses more marketable. Other changes included the decentralization of authority—including the area of finance. Finally, the legal foundations of the university have also been revised.

The question “who is in control?”—the focus of the recent Columbia University Teachers College symposium on “Privileges Lost, Responsibilities Gained: Reconstructing Higher Education,”—has a lot of relevance for Makerere University.

Funding Problems

These momentous innovations notwithstanding, Makerere University still faces considerable obstacles. The science disciplines, which involve laboratory and fieldwork as well as research, were unable to take part in the privatization drive and still remain in the underfunding trap. This means that faculties in the medical school, agriculture, technology, veterinary medicine, and the natural sciences get lower take-home pay than their counterparts in the humanities and in commerce.

The tuition fees that were fixed at U.S.\$1,500 in 1991/92 when the scheme was initiated now stand at U.S.\$800. The official salary for a professor (excluding earnings from teaching in private programs) which was adjusted to USh 1,060,000 (U.S.\$1,100) in 1996 is now equivalent to U.S.\$600, although the amount in shillings has not changed. Thus, the income that the university generates is not adequate to meet its basic needs, and its financial stresses and strains are mounting. It is also likely that some faculties have not realized the decline in the real value of the fees they generate from students and are bent on increasing student enrollments in the belief that having more students means more income.

The new Makerere University Strategic Plan for 2000/01–2004/05 has identified funding and the need to maintain academic standards as the most critical issues facing the university and has therefore recommended that a special study on the university’s funding situation be carried out as a matter of urgency within the first year of the plan period.

Systemic Weaknesses

The inability to generate income at a time when university places were in very high demand was the result of poor governance rooted in the university’s legal foundation. The legal framework based on the 1970 act and the 1975 decree created a feeble management structure. Appointments to top and middle management were within the patronage of the president and the minister of education, who had the power to give directives to the university. On the ground, authority was held by the university secretary, who was more powerful than the vice chancellor and the deputy to whom he reported. The vice chancellor lacked the power to hire or fire, nor could she or he reward or punish. The institution was steered by an executive without teeth.

The question “who is in control?”—the focus of the recent Columbia University Teachers College symposium on “Privileges Lost, Responsibilities Gained: Reconstructing Higher Education,”—has a lot of relevance for Makerere University. The momentum of reform is threatened if institutional governance and authority structure are not harmonized.

The private students scheme grew within an old governance system with systemic weaknesses, which could explain the university’s gradual drift into declining income levels that was discussed earlier. Despite the level of privatization attained, Makerere University lacked the autonomy it needed to assert itself. Both tuition fees and the government’s contribution were fixed more than five years ago and have been quietly eroded by inflation. The university has been unable to avert the downward trend, which has had a negative impact on staff remuneration.

The momentum of reform is threatened if institutional governance and authority structure are not harmonized.

A new Universities and Tertiary Education Act (2001), in which the minister of education’s powers have been diminished and the university’s autonomy enhanced, has recently been enacted, and the university is now undergoing a transitional period. However, serious doubts remain concerning the vice chancellor as chief executive of the institution.

A restructuring study of the university, funded by the World Bank, has proposed a corporate management model—with the vice chancellor as the chief accounting officer. The university secretary’s position is transformed into that of company secretary. The proposed restructuring, however, requires another amendment to the new act, and its probability of getting adopted in the near future is not assured.

Conclusion

The private students scheme has regenerated Makerere University in record time—about 10 years. In order for this process to continue, the university should move quickly to implement the new Universities and Tertiary Education Act, which enhances its autonomy and puts it in control of its own affairs. Furthermore, the university as a whole and the schools, institutes, and colleges need to become more cost-conscious and adopt a business planning approach in course design and determining fees. Finally, the restructuring study and others have emphasized the ongoing need to review and evaluate the university's delivery system and organization and determine whether further amendments to the act are required.

Education Reform in Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania

Aims C. McGuinness, Jr.

Aims C. McGuinness, Jr., is senior associate at the National Center for Higher Education Management Systems. Address: National Center for Higher Education Management Systems, P.O. Box 9752, Boulder, Colorado 80301-9752. E-mail: <aims@nchems.org>.

The human resources of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania are these countries' most valuable assets. As small countries with comparatively limited natural resources, the Baltic states' future will depend on the knowledge and skills of their people. Education reform has therefore been a priority of each country since regaining independence.

Differences among the Countries

The Baltic states are often grouped together, but the significant differences among them are reflected in education policy. Each country has a unique history and relations with other nations and cultures that have ongoing influence on national perspectives and policy. Estonian, Latvian, and Lithuanian, for example, are three highly distinct languages.

Phases of Reform

Education reform in the Baltic states is best understood in terms of phases, beginning in the late 1980s. Each country's reforms can be traced to initiatives in 1988 (if not earlier) undertaken in the spirit of the new awakening, *perestroika*, and the deterioration of Soviet institutions, during which each country experienced unprecedented grassroots engagement of educators in exploring new possibilities.

In the 1990–1992 period all three countries reestablished independence and established constitutions (based largely on earlier constitutions) and the initial legal framework for education. Enacted in the rapidly developing cir-

cumstances of 1991, these initial laws would require refinement in later years.

In the 1992–1994 period, each of the Baltic states faced extraordinary challenges in gaining economic stability and establishing new legal frameworks and institutional structures. Nevertheless, each country continued to make progress on basic elements of education reform: eliminating ideologically oriented elements within universities; developing new curricula, textbooks, and teaching materials; and developing new links with Western donors and partners.

The 1995–1996 period brought a temporary pause in the positive developments since reestablishing independence, as banking crises and economic instability drew attention and energy away from education reform. Each country attempted to shape new state policies to provide a degree of order to the previously largely decentralized and often fragmented reforms.

In the 1996–1998 period, all three countries experienced their strongest periods of economic revitalization and growth since 1991. Each country broadened the conceptual foundation for education reform and developed the second generation of legal frameworks. The laws on education first enacted in 1991–1992 were either replaced or amended significantly to reflect an increased maturity in each country's education reforms.

In late 1998, the Russian economic crisis, beginning with the devaluation of the rouble on August 17th, 1998 slowed economic growth as well as the pace of education reform of the previous two years in all three countries. Yet the commitment to reform remained strong.

Common Themes

All three Baltic states have made great strides in restructuring their higher education systems since the major changes began in 1988. Democratic principles and processes were instilled throughout the universities. A new legal framework providing for university autonomy was established, as well as a new research infrastructure, the framework for quality assurance, and a differentiated higher education system.

Previous restrictions in content and pedagogy were eliminated, especially in the social sciences and humanities, as was military training as a compulsory part of the curriculum. Dramatic shifts in academic programs were carried out, in response to changing student demands and the need to generate additional revenue from fee-paying students to offset limitations in state funding.

The narrow Soviet degree structure gave way to an award structure that is not only more flexible but also consistent with Western models and rising expectations (e.g., the Bologna Joint Declaration) for common structures across Europe and the world. The academies of science were abolished as research organizations and re-

constituted as honorary societies. Research was integrated into the universities, resulting in substantial gains in research and greatly strengthened universities. Graduate education was strengthened, especially through the integration of research and teaching at the doctoral level in contrast to the location of doctoral programs outside the universities in Soviet times.

The narrow Soviet degree structure gave way to an award structure that is not only more flexible but also consistent with Western models.

A number of issues still need to be addressed. Ways will need to be found to accommodate the escalating demand for university-level education—including alternatives such as nonuniversity “colleges.” Quality assurance requirements need to be tightened, including stronger requirements for nonpublic institutions. Reforms will need to be introduced in the financing of higher education, including the highly sensitive issue of student fees. Degree structures should be made compatible with international expectations. The changes should encompass new modes of delivery including open and distance learning and greatly expanded use of information technology throughout the higher education system. Solving the problem of retraining current professors and developing the next generation of faculty and researchers will require a variety of strategies, including strengthened doctoral programs and international affiliations. Finally, university programs in teacher education are still in need of reform.

Having granted universities substantial autonomy at the time of reestablishing independence, all three countries are now debating a stronger role for the state in setting priorities to increase the responsiveness of institutions to public priorities.

Broader Challenges

Frequent changes in governments and ministers of education, limited resources, and underdeveloped civil service laws have created serious problems in sustaining national policy leadership for education reform, and in implementing new concepts, strategies, and laws. While the Baltic states have made strong commitments to civil liberties and to narrowing the gaps in access and opportunity, there remains a need for progress on disparities between urban and rural areas, ensuring that special needs students are served,

and addressing the needs of language and ethnic minority populations

Finally, progress in education reform in the Baltic states depends on reform in other areas of public policy. These areas include reforming public administration, civil services policies, and aligning state finance policies with education reform. The ministries of finance play critical roles in education policy although not always in a way consistent with or supportive of education reform goals.

Conclusion

Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania provide excellent case studies of how states in Eastern and Central Europe emerged from the policies and ideologies of the former Soviet Union to established new education policies and institutions appropriate for democracy and market economies. Continued progress on the tertiary education reforms of the past decade will be the key these states’ ability to participate fully in Europe and the global knowledge economy.

Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania provide excellent case studies of how states in Eastern and Central Europe emerged from the policies and ideologies of the former Soviet Union to established new education policies and institutions appropriate for democracy and market economies.

Note: This review is based on reviews of education policy in each of the Baltic states undertaken in 1999-2000, by the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD). Undertaken at the request of national authorities, the OECD reviews were in-depth analyses of policy affecting all education levels and sectors – from early childhood and pre-school education through the doctoral level. Aims McGuinness served as general rapporteur for all three reviews.

The full reports on the reviews can be obtained from OECD at <http://electrade.gfi.fr/cgi-bin/OECDBookShop.storefront/> Reviews of National Policies for Education: Estonia, Code 142001041E1 ISBN 9264189963 Reviews of National Policies for Education: Latvia, Code 142001071E1 ISBN 9264192476 Reviews of National Policies for Education: Lithuania (forthcoming late 2001).



Restructuring through Mergers: The Chinese Experience

David Y. Chen

David Y. Chen is a Ph.D. candidate at the Institute of Higher Education, Huazhong University of Science and Technology, Wuhan, China 430074; e-mail: <davidcyc@263.net>.

The Chinese higher education system was established in the 1950s, fully based upon the Soviet pattern in the context of a highly centralized and planned economy. However, as the market economy was being implemented, the system characterized by a large quantity of inefficiently run and narrowly specialized professional colleges proved incapable of adapting to the new challenges. To change the system became a matter of strong public interest and concern. Sticking to the guidelines of *gongjian* (joint administration), *tiaozheng* (adjustment), *hezuo* (cooperation), and *hebing* (merger)—the main target of reform was to change the obsolete pattern under which universities were owned and run by a variety of central ministries, so as to establish a fairly decentralized, two-tiered management system in which administrative powers would be shared by both central and local governments, but with the local governments being required to play a major role.

After painstaking efforts, in 2000 the vice-premier of the Chinese government announced “the optimization of the administration structure of higher education has been basically and successfully fulfilled.” During the restructuring, 452 institutions have gone from central to local control, only 71 flagship universities are still under the jurisdiction of the Ministry of Education, and some 50 special professional institutions are temporarily under their corresponding ministries. Although the merging of universities and colleges is the most difficult course of action, a total of 612 higher institutions have been merged into 250. (It should be noted that some of these actions have been rather perfunctory.)

Hebing, or merger, as a way for improving economies of scale and creating strong, comprehensive universities, was also most controversial and eye-catching. Even though the restructuring was initiated in 1985, the essential steps were not taken until the 1990s, when mergers were used as a pilot mechanism to change the structure of higher education. There are two kinds of mergers. One is to merge smaller institutions in close proximity that share the same or similar fields of study but are affiliated to different government departments. This step is taken to increase efficiency and effectiveness, broaden discipline coverage, and tackle the problem of segmentation and provincialism. Such mergers were relatively simple procedures and were encouraged by the government and widely welcomed by the public. In May 1992, seven relatively small colleges in the area of Yangzhou city, in Jiangsu Province, were merged

to create the totally new Yangzhou University, which then became the most comprehensive and one of the largest universities. Its success has led to a number of other mergers.

But this success has not been achieved with another kind of merger—that is, mergers among larger and stronger universities, which were undertaken to build model, first-class universities. In April 1994, two major universities—Sichuan University and Chengdu University of Science and Technology—were combined. Both were spin-offs of Sichuan University and adjacent to one another. However, their merger illustrates the difficulties of such a strategy. Headaches such as renaming the institution, rearranging personnel, redistributing powers, and allocating money almost caused the merger to fail. The ups and downs of this first merger of two leading universities were seen as a warning to proceed cautiously. Therefore, even though, by 1998, 207 institutions had been merged into 84, by 1998 amalgamation among strong ones was rare.

Hebing, or merger, as a way for improving economies of scale and creating strong, comprehensive universities, was also most controversial and eye-catching.

The full-scale restructuring movement started in 1998 with a push from the campaign of government to change its own role in the market economy. Departments of the State Council were reduced in size; ministries, except for the Ministry of Education, were no longer permitted to hold and run higher education institutions. Instead, institutions were required to detach from their originally affiliated departments and find their own means of survival. Responsibility for these institutions devolved upon the localities, or was transferred to the ministry, mainly through mergers with universities already under direct ministry administration. In this period, 1,232 institutions were radically changed through decentralization and amalgamation. About 406 universities have been restructured and pared down to 171 since 1996. The process of merging universities and colleges was accelerated. In just the first half of 2000, 778 institutions, formerly affiliated with 49 departments under the State Council, were restructured.

Mergers were thought to be the shortcut to producing world-class universities. Such institutions, it was believed, should be comprehensive, large enough to handle increasing

Special Focus: Quality Assurance

enrollments, and academically prestigious. Consequently, university giants mushroomed through mergers. In particular, it was thought that medical universities were essential to first-class universities and should be incorporated into the new comprehensive universities. Almost all would-be first-rate universities were vying for medical universities to incorporate, with the result that the best medical universities were quickly absorbed and consolidated. Many ambitious universities are still seeking a medical university or, less advisedly, trying to set up medical schools of their own to avoid being perceived as inferior in the competition for resources and status in the hierarchy of higher education.

In fact, the trend toward merging large and prestigious universities has been criticized, even though it has been promoted and supported by government during the whole process. Critics have said, “bigger is not always better,” and have pointed out that just having a wide range of study fields and programs does not ensure they will be of world-class quality. However, such voices did not immediately

impede the drive toward mergers. Now, however, the consolidation of higher education institutions seems to have come to an end, in response, again, to a change in policies of the central government.

Out of the whole process, a number of lessons have been learned. One concerns the role played by government. Chinese higher education reforms have been dominated by the government, but with little attention paid to the university’s role. Consequently, institutions that were forced or were at least reluctant to undergo consolidation might well react with dampened enthusiasm as they confront the work of actually implementing the mergers. In retrospect, mergers between larger and stronger universities tend to encounter difficulties caused by the fusion of campuses with disparate cultures and the pressure of managing large-scale universities. By contrast, the annexation of smaller and weaker institutions by bigger and stronger universities is relatively easy to carry out because the institutions being incorporated have limited power.

Establishing a Quality Assurance System in Indonesia

M. K. Tadjudin

M. K. Tadjudin is chair of the National Accreditation Board for Higher Education. Address: Jl. Jenderal sudirman, Gedung C, Jakarta, Indonesia. E-mail: <tadjudin@dnet.net.id>.

Indonesia at present is experiencing a serious economic crisis, resulting in less funding for education. While it has become difficult to improve and expand education programs in Indonesia, the societal demand for higher quality output is increasing. In the current situation, Indonesia is trying to maintain the progress thus far achieved. The areas of reform that have been suggested for Indonesia—and other countries—include encouraging differentiation among institutions, providing incentives for public institutions to diversify sources of funding, redefining the role of government in higher education, and introducing policies explicitly designed to give priority to quality and equity objectives.

In operational terms this means that universities should have autonomy and practice internal quality control, while external quality control is performed by accreditation agencies. I will focus here primarily on the quality assurance of universities, especially the Indonesian experience in establishing a quality assurance system.

A New Paradigm

The quality of higher education can be controlled through internal control of academic programs, government regulations, market mechanisms, and accreditation. The quality of an institution of higher education is determined by the resources (human and material), the learning-teaching

process, and the quality of its products (graduates, research, and service). Basically, accreditation of an institution involves the evaluation of these three aspects.

At present, higher education policy in Indonesia is aimed at improving quality by focusing on relevance, academic atmosphere, institutional management, sustainability, and efficiency. Known by its acronym, RAISE, this policy was aided by a new paradigm in higher education management—one aimed at quality enhancement through increasing autonomy, improving accountability, periodic self-evaluation, and accreditation.

As part of the implementation of the new paradigm, a 20-member National Accreditation Board for Higher Education (NAB) was established in 1994 to evaluate study programs in higher education. At first, board members acted also as the reviewer; however, since 1999 reviews take place through peer review, while the board acts only as policymaker and supervisor. In the beginning, the board was a unit operating under the director general of higher education (DGHE), but since 1998 the board has functioned as an independent unit directly under the minister of national education. Because of government regulations, the budget still goes through the DGHE. A proposal to corporatize the board is still under review by the government.

The accreditation system is based on program accreditation. Due to technical difficulties the first round of accreditation involved primarily the evaluation of human and

material resources and not all programs were visited. In the future, in line with the new paradigm in education, which is oriented to student learning processes and outcomes, more weight will be placed on outcomes and learning processes than on resources; since 1999, all programs have been visited. The management of the accreditation agency was also changed to provide an emphasis on peer review, transparency, accountability, and cooperation with other national and international accreditation agencies and professional organizations. The new policy was applied first to graduate programs. Under the new system, instead of being required to fill out forms and submit requested materials, programs are asked to compile portfolios in which they are free to report what they consider to be the important and necessary aspects, including documentation. At the end, site visits will verify the portfolios submitted.

Establishing accreditation in developing countries is difficult, but in a time of economic crisis the role of accreditation is even more critical to sustain the progress thus far achieved and to make universities a credible moral force in the nation.

Challenges for Quality Assurance

Quality assurance and accreditation are new concepts for many in academia in Indonesia. The concept that the professor knows best and should be in control prevailed. For its part, the public is also not much concerned with issues of quality. Most people just want to get a degree and hopefully a good job, preferably in the bureaucracy. This means that market mechanisms for quality control in higher education do not work in Indonesia. People are not looking for the best programs, but rather for programs that will allow them to obtain a degree quickly. When accreditation was introduced in Indonesia, many state universities—especially the older ones—believed they had no need for accreditation as they were already good institutions, maybe the best in the country. Furthermore, students at universities that did not pass their accreditation reviews protested, saying that accreditation stopped them from getting a degree. It was in this atmosphere that the NAB began its work.

The first challenge for establishing an accreditation body in Indonesia was to establish a team of professionals in accreditation work. The number of qualified reviewers was limited, and those who were qualified were already overburdened with other duties. The second challenge has been to develop a system and the instruments for accreditation. Due to the constraints encountered and inadequate fund-

ing, it was decided to do accreditation of study programs instead of institutions. In Indonesia there are almost 10,000 study programs—of which 25 percent are diploma programs, 67 percent undergraduate programs, 4 percent master's programs, 2 percent doctoral programs, and 2 percent graduate diploma or specialist programs. Because of the huge number of programs, priority was given to undergraduate programs. In 1998 accreditation of master's programs started, and 366 programs were reviewed. Accreditation of some diploma and of doctoral programs will start in 2001.

After the system and instruments were developed, invitations for accreditation were sent out. However, only 1,357 study programs submitted the required forms. In fiscal year 1997/1998 another batch of 1,469 study programs responded. This means that in the first four years only 2,826 or about 30 percent of all registered programs were reviewed, all of which were undergraduate programs. Because of the shortage of funds, site visits could not be conducted properly. Only those programs that had an A or B rating in the desk evaluation phase were visited. In fiscal year 1999, due to financial difficulties only 38 programs could be reviewed. Since late 1999 the universities have been asked to contribute a nominal accreditation fee. This contribution and the budget obtained from the government made it possible to do site visits to all institutions, so that in 2000 the number of programs reviewed rose to 1,964. By the end of 2000 a total of 4,925 undergraduate programs had been reviewed—of which 9.1 percent got an A (excellent) rating, 44.8 percent a B (good), 38.9 percent a C (satisfactory), and 7.2 percent a D or failing. Of the 366 master's programs reviewed, 70.2 percent got an excellent rating, 26.8 percent satisfactory, and 0.3 percent (1 program) failed.

Because of difficulties in funding, the duration of site visits had to be shortened, causing some inaccuracies and distortion of the results. The weighting in scoring also caused some distortion, because of an overemphasis on inputs over outcomes and process. However, accreditation is considered the right way to promote quality control in education, as it pushes the universities to establish internal quality control mechanisms to attain a better quality in education.

Future Plans

As a new and foreign concept, accreditation was at first received critically, not only within higher education circles but also among students, as it was perceived as something that hampered their progress. With the new emphasis on quality through improvements in relevance and efficiency, the emphasis will also be changed from input to outcomes and processes. The paradigm of accreditation management will also change to professionalism, transparency, accountability, and cooperation with other national and international accreditation agencies and professional organizations, for better quality assurance and accuracy.

Indonesia is a large archipelago, as large as the continental United States, with 17,000 islands. We believe that the present accreditation system is too costly to maintain. Thus, plans are being made to change to institutional accreditation for selected institutions, by giving those institutions a “self-accrediting” status. These institutions will do internal accreditation of their own programs. The selection will be based on the quality of the existing programs and the existence of a good internal quality assurance system. This will decrease the burden on program accreditation performed by the NAB, without jeopardizing quality assurance.

Establishing accreditation in developing countries is difficult, but in a time of economic crisis the role of accreditation is even more critical to sustain the progress thus far achieved and to make universities a credible moral force in the nation.

Chile’s New Program for Quality Improvement

Ricardo Reich

Ricardo Reich is general coordinator of the MECESUP Program at the Ministry of Education, Government of Chile. Address: Avda. Bulnes 80, Depto. 46, Santiago, Chile. E-Mail: <rreich@mineduc.cl>.

The objective of the Higher Education Quality Improvement Program (MECESUP) is to improve the performance of Chile’s higher education system—in quality, coherence, efficiency, and relevance. The program has three main areas of focus: development and implementation of a national accreditation system; enhanced links with national development and qualitative improvement in educational services at the technical, undergraduate, and postgraduate levels; and improvement in the administration of the higher education system. MECESUP has U.S.\$245 million in funding for a period of five years from the Government of Chile and a loan from the World Bank (4404-CH). The program is one of the new generation of World Bank efforts to contribute to global development by increasing the capacity of higher education institutions to innovate and to educate.

Quality Assurance

MECESUP is supporting the development of a quality assurance system for higher education services that includes the consolidation of the national system for institutional licensing of new private institutions (at the Higher Education Council), the implementation of a higher

education quality awareness campaign, and the establishment of an accreditation framework for study programs and institutions (in technical training and undergraduate and postgraduate educational services).

For this purpose, two national accreditation commissions have been set up, at the undergraduate and postgraduate levels, to define program quality standards, implement a voluntary accreditation system, and propose a definite legal framework. At the undergraduate level, accreditation work has started with 27 programs in medicine, agronomy, veterinary medicine, biochemistry, architecture, and psychology at traditional universities that are members of the Council of Rectors of Chilean Universities, and 3 programs at new private institutions. At the graduate level, a second accreditation cycle for 65 Ph.D. programs was completed in 2000, and a new cycle for 100 master’s programs is currently under way. The accreditation system is based on autoevaluation, external peer review, and academic audit (experimental, for master’s programs). Institutional assessment and audits are also required for an institution to be eligible to receive student aid from government.

Educational Quality Improvement

MECESUP has started the operation of a “competitive fund” to promote quality and relevance in the higher education subsector, through the provision of grants to beneficiaries (presently, universities of the Council of Rectors of Chilean Universities and national technical training centers) for undergraduate programs in fields of institutional and national priority; for graduate programs, with emphasis on doctoral programs and master’s programs in the arts, humanities, social sciences, and education; for technical training programs in fields of high demand from the productive sectors; and for the improvement of the facilities, equipment, and human resources in institutions, as required to implement the programs referred to above.

The competitive fund started operation in 1999 with a first competition, in which 57 projects were selected; these are now under way (41 in support of undergraduate and 16 of graduate programs). The second round of selection, in 2000, ended with the approval of 70 new proposals. Eligible expenditures for the projects are human resources improvement (scholarships for postgraduate work in Chile and abroad, visiting scholars, short visits abroad for professors and Ph.D. students doing thesis work, and postdoctoral visitors in Chile), goods (laboratory and scientific equipment, access to information and its technologies, and new teaching-learning tools and processes), and buildings (academic space improvement). Just recently, in April 2001, a new competition has been opened, that will allocate U.S.\$52 million to institutions with relevant proposals. Project ideas are selected by the institutions, based on institutional strategic planning and priorities and national guidelines, with results and

performance indicator follow-up. There is funding available for a period of five years, at U.S.\$225 million.

Framework and Capacity Building

MECESUP is also working to enhance the legal and regulatory framework for the higher education subsector, through the definition of the appropriate roles of the universities, professional institutes, and technical training centers involved; the establishment of mechanisms to facilitate transfers of students and graduates among such

educational institutions; and the preparation of draft laws, regulations, or amendments to existing laws. Also, the program is assisting in the implementation of policy and in institutional capacity building at higher education institutions and at the Division of Higher Education, in the Ministry of Education. Finally, it has started to establish a coherent policy for public funding and the development of a funding methodology for higher education activities, including student aid. ■

Globalization and Its Discontents: Dilemmas Facing Tertiary Education in Australia

William G. Tierney and Craig McInnis

William G. Tierney is the Wilbur-Kieffer Professor of Higher Education and director of the Center for Higher Education Policy Analysis, University of Southern California. Address: Center for Higher Education Policy Analysis, WPH 701, University of Southern California, Los Angeles, CA 90026, USA. E-mail: <wg tierney@usc.edu.>. Craig McInnis is professor and director of the Center for the Study of Higher Education, University of Melbourne. Address: University of Melbourne, Victoria 3010, Melbourne, Australia.

Australia provides a good example of the problems facing public universities in an era of globalization. Unlike some countries that are still developing a system of tertiary education—or the United States, where private institutions are partially buffered from governmental regulation—Australia has had a fully developed public postsecondary system for over a century. In the recent past, the country has committed universities to serve the general citizenry rather than the elite for whom the system originally was designed. However, in the last ten years, after a period of expansion in which the system moved toward mass participation, public funding has declined significantly for Australia's 38 universities. A decade ago most institutions received over 90 percent of their funding from the federal government; today no university receives more than 50 percent from the federal government.

Such a drastic reduction in government funding has necessitated calls for dramatic changes in Australian tertiary education. There has been a concomitant scramble to recover funds, primarily by capturing full-fee tuition from Asian students. However, in surveys and interviews of academic staff over the last year we have found great concern about the future. Faculty have experienced an almost psychic exhaustion with the increase in workloads while they try to serve new revenue-generating populations, improve the quality of the institution, and maintain a viable research capacity.

In spite of the severe fiscal constraints that each university faces, we have found little evidence that any government of the future will reinvest in tertiary education

in a manner akin to a decade ago. We are also concerned over the near obsession that individuals have about the necessity of generating revenues, to the point of neglecting core business. In an era of dramatic reduction of funding, institutions need to be primed for organizational change or they will not survive. An institution's participants are unable to create the conditions for change unless they first understand the barriers to change. Accordingly, our purpose here is to examine what we believe are key roadblocks to change that retard organizational reform.

In spite of the severe fiscal constraints that each university faces, we have found little evidence that any government of the future will reinvest in tertiary education in a manner akin to a decade ago.

A key precept of academic life is that universities ought to be immune from political interference. Such an assumption does not mean that tertiary organizations are free to be nonresponsive to societal needs or unaccountable for their performance. Organizations that serve the public good must be willing to ensure that quality improvement is ongoing and measurable. However, due to changes in system-level management of higher education, Australian universities have become too much like government agencies, while at the same time being exhorted to act as free agents in the marketplace. Lacking is a strong sense of a coordinated system of responsive self-directed organizations. Rather, universities encounter political intrusion, a lack of coordination, and a disincentive for innovation. Alternatively, when universities are forced to make up the shortfall in public funding with entrepreneurial activities but are limited in their options by government regulation, institutional dissonance is inevitable.

Burdened by excessive government policy directives and regulation, a system is at risk of becoming a political football in a process that obscures the strategic choices of the institution. Yet lack of coordination from the center presents problems as well. How many universities in each region or capital city ought to offer degrees in education? How many universities ought to have an engineering faculty? An entirely unregulated system in which institutions may offer whatever they wish does not increase system effectiveness or efficiency, in a system as small as Australia's. Here the states have the potential to play a role, but for some time now their position has been somewhat ambiguous, and their financial contributions minimal. Universities need to have finite and unique visions, rather than expansive ones geared toward simply adapting to the marketplace.

Burdened by excessive government policy directives and regulation, a system is at risk of becoming a political football in a process that obscures the strategic choices of the institution.

Australian universities appear to be attempting to undertake similar activities and to fulfill similar missions. True, the University of Melbourne has created a private university and other institutions are building campuses in different countries in Asia, but the similarities are still generally greater than the differences. Furthermore, despite the preference of government for modified state intervention, it remains to be seen if universities can be dissuaded from pursuing the goal of comprehensiveness in their profiles and imitating market leaders.

Institutional differentiation does not get defined by the nature of its funding; funding gets defined by organizational mission. A clearly defined mission revolves around two key issues: (1) what are the institution's curricular offerings and style of teaching and learning; and (2) how does one define a productive member of the academic staff? In a system that has clearly differentiated missions one would not see the proliferation of the same kind of degree offerings or the same pedagogical format. When institutions have differentiated missions, the explicit expectations of academic staff will be clearer and vary by institution. A clear mission statement would enable an institution to marshal its activities in a particular direction. At best, currently, differentiation occurs only in the sense that some universities, for example, may have their staff teach more and others may hope to expand their operations in Asia in a particular manner. But the choices are less

strategic and more driven by a concern for generating capital than by a philosophical consensus about the nature of the university.

High-performance systems encourage experimentation and innovation. (See the 1999 book by William G. Tierney, *Building the Responsive Campus: Creating High-Performance College and Universities*). Such organizations differ from others that are structured around a repetitive series of activities that, in a stable environment, enable the system to function effectively. Australian universities need to become more innovative because their environment is no longer stable.

A system that encourages creative activity is not one that rewards all institutions similarly and sets mandates and targets with regard to enrollments, tuition funding, and productive activities. Rather than pursuing a "one size fits all" approach, government needs to loosen its hold on monitoring and evaluation. Institutions should increase their concern for improvement based on beliefs about institutional purpose. In a high-performance system a governing body focuses less on preventing bad things from happening and more on making good things happen. Rather than a punitive model, one develops an incentive-based model. Currently, Australian tertiary education is in danger of being mired in a system of checks and balances that depresses the entrepreneurial spirit. This rigidity is a problem for Australia in the global economy as higher education has become a major export and is crucial to the national economy.

We are currently in a period of greater pedagogical ferment than at any other time in a generation. The Internet and web-based learning have facilitated changes in teaching. Much research has been generated on how to evaluate good teaching; breakthroughs are happening with regard to the measurement of learning. There is increased evidence on how much a student learns, not only in class, but also out of class, so that the entire university environment might be thought of as a learning community.

Unfortunately, while pedagogical conversations about teaching and learning are common in Australia, little or no serious debate about the nature of the undergraduate curriculum is taking place on a sustained or systematic basis. Indeed, considerable confusion exists about the purposes and structure of the master's degree. The reason why curriculum is not being discussed is that most of the energy has been focused on either meeting new governmental requirements or creating new markets to generate capital. Fiscal needs have been placed ahead of those that are more central to the life and maintenance of the university. To offer a sequence of courses in Pakistan or to try to get students from Sri Lanka to study in Australia, for no other reason than because a market exists that will generate income, is to reduce academic life to a business; in the long term such a strategy will call into question the *raison d'être* of the university. If

students are simply consumers and the curriculum is just another product, then one might well ask whether a business might offer such services and products more efficiently.

The problems we have outlined here, while significant, are solvable. If Australia is to continue to offer an effective system of tertiary education in a global environment, the problems demand clever solutions. The onus is on the universities to come up with the solutions.

Australia: Higher Education's Place on the Political Agenda

Simon Marginson

Simon Marginson is professor and director of the Monash Centre for International Education, Monash University, Australia, and coauthor with Mark Considine of The Enterprise University (Cambridge University Press, 2000). Address: PO Box 6, Monash University, Vic 3800, Australia. E-mail: <simon.marginson@education.monash.edu.au>.

The build-up to a federal election in Australia, expected in November, has seen renewed public attention to higher education. Polls rank education and health as the two most important issues to voters. Business organizations are talking up higher education and research. Polls also show that there is significantly more support for increases in education funding than for tax cuts, though none of the leading parties has departed from the small tax-spending politics which have dominated in Australia since the mid 1980s.

Education issues have sustained considerable media attention, particularly debates over the funding of private schools and about the state of the universities. Vice-chancellors are talking about a "crisis" in university resources, pointing to an increase in average student-staff ratios from 13 in 1990 to 18 in 1999. The federal government vigorously denies there is a problem. But whether there is a change of government or not, it is apparent that the education debate has reached a turning point, with a growing momentum for renewed public investment in education.

Both sides of politics are attempting to ride this shift in national mood. In February John Howard's Liberal-National Party coalition, which has held power since 1996, gestured modestly in the direction of the knowledge economy with a USD \$1.5 billion package of "innovation" measures, to be spent over five years. The innovation policy largely reflected a high-science conception of the knowledge economy, centered on selected industry development in computer technology and biotech. The main items in the package were a doubling of the budget for Australian Research Council project grants—again, to be phased in over five years. The main non-science item was subsidization of the market in fee-based postgraduate vocational courses, mostly in business. This benefits a relatively small cohort. The government's package might be too little too

late as it fails to restore the cuts to government outlays instigated in the second half of the 1990s. If Howard loses his majority, then it is likely that education will be seen as one of the decisive issues.

In July the opposition Labor Party issued *An Agenda for the Knowledge Nation*, a broad set of policies covering all forms of education and research, but lacking detail on spending programs or implementation machinery. This is a broader conception of the knowledge economy, talking in terms of a wholesale cultural transformation. Nevertheless, it remains largely rhetorical. Labor Party leader Kim Beazley has emphasized that the "knowledge nation" policies would be introduced over a decade or more and would be subject to the prevailing fiscal constraints. He states that education would take second place to Labor's promise to "roll back" indirect taxes and maintain a budget surplus. Clearly the opposition hopes to mobilize dissatisfaction with the government's record on education, while at the same time sustaining the confidence of national and international finance. It is a difficult juggling act, and there is a danger that neither trick will be pulled off. Electorally, Labor runs the risk that many voters will see no difference between it and the government.

Nevertheless, the Labor Party is also considering research findings indicating that investment in knowledge in Australia has declined significantly since the 1980s. These research findings are contained in *Australia's Comparative Performance as a Knowledge Nation* by Mark Considine, Simon Marginson and Peter Sheehan, commissioned by the Chifley Research Centre. (These data can be accessed at www.education.monash.edu.au/centres/mcrie.) The decline in investment in knowledge shows itself both in absolute terms (that is, in relation to past Australian efforts), and in relation to international comparators. These data help to explain the electoral volatility of the education issue, and suggest that it will be difficult for future Australian governments to sustain the highly restrictive fiscal regime that has dominated education policy for a decade and a half.

In July the Opposition Labor Party issued An Agenda for the Knowledge Nation, a broad set of policies covering all forms of education and research.

The OECD index of investment in knowledge is composed of three quantities, expressed as percentages of GDP—public investment in education, private and public investment in R&D, and spending on software. Using this index, in 1985 Australia invested 6.47% of GDP in knowledge compared to 7.60% in the USA and 7.46% in the 11 leading OECD economies. By 1998, investment in knowledge in the USA had reached 8.73% and in the eleven OECD

Countries and Regions

countries was at 8.22%. In Australia it had slumped to 6.15%, with declines in both education and R&D. Unlike some other OECD economies, including those of the USA and the UK, Australia invests considerably more in physical plant and dwellings than it invests in knowledge, and this gap between “old economy” and “new economy” investment has increased over time.

In 1998, Australia invested 5.46% of GDP in education, just below the OECD country average of 5.66%. However public investment—once above OECD average levels—was at 4.34% of GDP, which was 21st out of 28 OECD countries (the OECD average was 5.00%). Private investment in education at 1.11% was the 6th highest in the OECD. In a nutshell, in the neoliberal era, Australia has successfully shifted investment from the public side to the private side. However, private investment mostly takes the form of fee payment by students and families. Fees are relatively high in Australia, especially at university level, though the impact is modified by the system of deferred payment through the tax system (the Higher Education Contribution Scheme). Thus while high private investment provides fiscal relief for government, it has failed to generate a knowledge economy relationship between education and industry. Industry investment in both research and training falls well short of OECD norms. Correspondingly, the production of public goods has been weakened. The public sector is the main provider, especially at the tertiary level; and all three public systems—schools, universities, and training—are in unprecedented financial difficulties. Given the decline in public goods, it is not surprising that there is also a growing and evident bifurcation between educational haves and educational have-nots.

The pattern of public neglect and bifurcation begins early. Australia spends only 0.1% of GDP on preschool education, and participation of four-year-olds is at one-third compared to an OECD average of 60%. In the school years, one-third of students are located in the private sector. Private schools, which on the whole are attended by more affluent families, are largely funded by the federal government; while the public schools are dependent on more fiscally constrained state governments. The private schools have been favored by recent funding allocations. Tertiary participation is above average, but the rate of early school leaving is also above the OECD average; and retention till the end of school has fallen from 77% in 1992 to 72% in 1999. Between 1995 and 1999 tertiary funding fell in Australia, one of very few OECD countries where this happened. Tertiary enrollment rates increased by an average of 23% in the OECD but only 6% in Australia. University enrollments have now stopped growing altogether, except for fee-paying foreign students. These issues will keep higher education on the political agenda for some time to come.

Ethical Practices in the Korean Academic Profession

Sungho H. Lee

Sungho H. Lee is dean of the Graduate School, Yonsei University, Seoul, Korea. Address: The Graduate School, Yonsei University, 134 Sinchondong, Soeaemoon-ku, Seoul 120-749, Korea. E-mail: <leesh@yonsei.ac.kr>.

The belief is now widespread in Korea that we are in the midst of a wave of moral collapse and ethical confusion. A lack of moral leadership is apparent not only in the government but in industry, the media, and elsewhere. College and university professors have been actively involved in the veritable explosion of interest in the relevance of ethical considerations throughout most sectors and social classes. For example, professors have asked political leaders to consider whether their decisions are taken to benefit their own political interests or those of the people. Business and industry leaders have also been asked by professors to discuss whether environmental pollution is a necessary cost of maximizing profits.

Given the spirited discussions initiated by them, it is indeed ironic that college and university professors have until recently been relatively silent on the subject of ethical questions concerning their own principles, policies, and practices. While they have been critical of other professions, they have deflected criticisms of themselves by raising the mantle of academic freedom.

Traditionally, it has been expected in Korea as in other countries that colleges and universities be founded and operated according to relatively high standards of moral and ethical obligations and principles and codes of behavior. Institutions have never tolerated plagiarism, academic sabotage, or falsification of research data. They have never allowed gross abridgements of academic freedom, incidents of sexual harassment, the selling of grades, or the use of physical violence as a means of settling disputes and conflicts on campus.

The time has come for serious scrutiny of the ethical posture and behavior of the academic profession itself.

However, the time has come for serious scrutiny of the ethical posture and behavior of the academic profession itself. Indeed, there are few aspects of contemporary Korean higher education that do not exhibit signs of ethical confusion. On topics as disparate as admissions and graduation, curriculum development and research, faculty recruitment and grade inflation, or external consulting and administration, there are some thorny ethical issues that colleges and universities need to confront.

Perhaps the area in which Korean higher education is particularly vulnerable to charges of ethical abuse relates to the research mission of professors. For example, some professors are cheating their institutions and the students by pushing for lighter teaching loads so as to devote more time to writing research papers—destined for journals created solely as vehicles for these otherwise unpublishable articles. Many professors are currently grappling with the problems associated with government or private-sector funding of research that arise when a given sponsor imposes a demand for secrecy concerning scientific inquiries. That is a situation completely inimical to the tradition of open investigation and the sharing of research findings so crucial to the discovery of new knowledge.

In July the Opposition Labor Party issued An Agenda for the Knowledge Nation, a broad set of policies covering all forms of education and research.

The faculty recruitment practices at some colleges and universities are another troubling area in need of ethical review. These practices may include the hiring of faculty who are in no way qualified but who are selected because of social connections, monetary contributions, or even academic and social class backgrounds. Another less than totally ethical practice is the failure of some institutions to provide truly open competition for academic positions. Sometimes the department decides on a new faculty member even before the vacant position has been placed on the open market for an official competition.

A third important area of ethical responsibility has to do with extrainstitutional service. In Korean higher education, two out of three academics now engage in some form of paid or unpaid consulting during the year. And consulting constitutes the primary or secondary source of supplementary income. Although a significant segment of the professoriate engages in paid consulting, most professors try to balance consulting with their teaching, research, and other institutional obligations. However, when consulting activity becomes a top priority for faculty members, they are less dedicated and involved in their teaching, research, and other institutional responsibilities.

The current preoccupation with ethics in the conduct of the academic profession is probably a result of the increased complexity and magnitude of the higher education enterprise. It would be nice to view the concerns as an illuminating exercise, one that will lend support to the collective determination of Korean higher education institutions to pay attention to ethical standards, particularly at a point in Korean history when fears are being raised of a moral collapse in society. In con-

clusion, the credibility of Korean higher education rests on the ethical standards of professoriate. Korean higher education must take the initiative in addressing such charges now to avoid future repercussions. Failing to deal with the problems now will only exacerbate them and bring on external regulation and sanctions. The most positive course of action would be to raise such issues openly and aggressively and to promote decision making enlightened by ethical reflection. In practical terms, two basic steps are required. The first of these is to change the criteria by which faculty performance is evaluated. All forms of evaluation—including government evaluation for financial support and institutional faculty evaluation for promotion and tenure—must go beyond merely calculating faculty-student ratios, counting the number of articles and books published, and tallying faculty workload and instead pay more attention to the ethics, values, and integrity of faculty performance in teaching, research, and service. The other necessary step is development of a code of ethics. At present, few Korean institutions of higher education have developed their own code of ethics, including enforcement provisions, for their members.

The Knowledge Context in African Universities: The Neglected Link

Damtew Teferra

Damtew Teferra is codirector and lead researcher of the African Higher Education Project at the Center for International Higher Education, Boston College. Address: 207 Campion Hall, Boston College, Chestnut Hill, MA 02467, USA. E-mail: <teferra@bc.edu>.

The West continues to dominate in the production, organization, and dissemination of the world's knowledge and information. The Third World, and Africa in particular, relies heavily on this knowledge and information.

Scholarly knowledge is conveyed in a variety of ways—including journals, conferences, the Internet, on-line databases, and CD-ROM. Scholarly journals remain the most important channels of communication in the knowledge distribution network. Even in this high-tech era, they continue to be vital and the most reliable avenues of knowledge delivery.

In a recent survey-based study by this author, 80 percent of the nearly 100 respondents reported having access to international journals. But close to 40 percent of the responses were qualified as "limited," "incomplete," "partial," "very few," "very old," and "unreliable access." The inadequate access to current scientific knowledge remains one of the widely

reported challenges to the development of science and technology in Africa. In the study, many respondents also described this problem as their major hurdle. We recognize that the extent of the problem varies across countries, institutions, departments, disciplines, and time periods.

Importing Knowledge

Numerous regional and international attempts are currently under way to address the problem. Beginning in January 2002, the poorest African countries, along with those in Asia and Latin America, whose per capita income is under U.S.\$1,000, will receive free Internet access to nearly 1,000 scholarly journals. This three-year initiative between six major publishing companies and the World Health Organization is expected to benefit much of Africa.

A joint cooperative initiative between four North European and 10 East African universities is another such example that will use the Internet to provide full-text articles. (For more on this, see the winter 2001 issue of this newsletter.)

The Southern African Regional Education Consortium (SAREC) has been consistently supportive of efforts to increase African universities' access to journals. Addis Ababa and Zambia Universities have received more than 130 and 240 journals, respectively, through SAREC support.

The American Association for the Advancement of Science (AAAS) has also been instrumental in furthering the acquisition of journals and CD-ROM support for numerous African universities. The University of Nigeria Library is reported to have virtually no subscriptions except those 80 journals acquired through the AAAS.

The African Virtual University (AVU), a World Bank initiative, has a major journal distribution component. Kenyatta University (Kenya), one of the institutions where the AVU first started, is currently able to access more than 1,700 journals, and this number is expected to grow to over 2,400 journals.

Cornell University also has a scheme to provide digital journals cheaply to developing countries. Universities and other research institutions in more than 100 developing countries are expected to benefit.

Exporting Knowledge

On the "exportation" end of the spectrum, a number of initiatives are under way to popularize and disseminate African published materials especially in Europe and North America and also in the region. The African Journals Distribution Program and the African Periodicals Exchange (now merged to form the African Journals Support and Development Center), African Journals Online, the African Books Collective, and the African Publishers Network are part of the drive to improve access, visibility, and distribution of African knowledge and scholarship regionally and internationally.

The Significance of the Campaigns

The aforementioned initiatives have been instrumental largely in the "import" and "export" markets of knowledge products beyond and across the continent. While, the "importation process" has eased the severity of the lack of access to scientific and other scholarly knowledge and information in several universities, the "exportation process" played a role in popularizing and increasing the visibility of African-generated knowledge and scholarship. These initiatives have been vital in transmitting scientific, technological, and other knowledge and information. All these have been good and worthy efforts.

The Neglected Link

Much of the emphasis currently focuses on the access and delivery of finished products manufactured both externally and, to a lesser extent, internally. Few regional and international schemes are directed at building a local infrastructure to promote the packaging and development of locally generated knowledge. The complex and difficult task of processing knowledge in African universities and institutions has not yet attracted many support schemes.

SAREC, supported by the Swedish International Development Authority, has been one of the few organizations to support local infrastructures. SAREC has long supported (since 1984) schemes to develop locally based scholarly publications in Ethiopia. The support has benefited more than 16 professional publications, most of them university based. Until recently, the International Development Research Centre was also supporting editing and publishing schemes to promote scientific communication in Africa.

While improving access—to international knowledge systems with the concomitant countereffort to popularize regional products—is being stressed, serious endeavors to vitalize the local infrastructure in processing knowledge generated in African universities and research institutions remain largely nonexistent.

Regionally, African universities should cooperate to strengthen major publications and launch major database initiatives.

While it is crucial to ensure access to international knowledge networks, Africa should also build its own knowledge manufacturing industry and its capacity to popularize its own handiwork. This has to be approached within the context of sustainability, capacity building, and self-sufficiency. Universities and research institutions must encourage their staff to communicate their work in public fora such as conferences, journals, databases, books, and other published formats. African universities should take the lead

in providing technical, logistical, financial, and moral support—not only to create knowledge products, but also process, package, and develop them. The support of donors is vital here.

While improving access to international knowledge systems, serious endeavors to vitalize the local infrastructure in processing knowledge generated in African universities and research institutions remain largely nonexistent.

At the national level, universities should devote serious attention to their editorial offices and their presses, for these are key to the process of knowledge creation and dissemination. Editors usually work alone, often without secretarial or administrative support in an environment less than appreciative of their work. Editors should be given more recognition; editorial offices should be revitalized in terms of human, material, and financial resources and their status upgraded. The quality and abundance of local knowledge production, organization, and dissemination to a large extent rely on the state of these manufacturing entities. Regionally, African universities should cooperate to strengthen major publications and launch major database initiatives in all streams and disciplines for local, regional, and international consumption. The work of the Association of African Universities to develop a Database of African Theses and Dissertations is one major example. African universities and institutions in collaboration with each other and also institutions overseas should make a conscious and committed effort to take up such initiatives. The initiative to collect, document, package, and dis-

seminate African-generated knowledge, information, and data—both published and unpublished—must be given strong, full, and sustained support.

Summary

To reiterate, the initiatives to promote access and delivery must consciously target the development of the infrastructure and the enhancement of the processes that make possible the production and dissemination of knowledge in African universities. Access, delivery, and development ought to be conceptualized as operating in one paradigmatic continuum.

Given the state of most African countries, many journals and university presses have either been terminated or function at their lowest capacity. The current initiatives under way to revitalize African universities should extend to invigorating the processing and development of the neglected link of the knowledge industry in the universities of the region.

NEW CENTER-RELATED BOOK

In Defense of American Higher Education, edited by Philip G. Altbach, Patricia J. Gumpert, and D. Bruce Johnstone, has been published by the Johns Hopkins University Press. This volume has as its theme the success of the American academic system. Essays on the role of public universities and their service to society, mass higher education, the American academic system in comparative perspective, financing issues, the role of the liberal arts, information technology, presidential leadership, and others are considered—all from the perspective of analyzing the challenges faced by a basically successful academic system. This book is published in paperback and is available from the Johns Hopkins University Press, 2715 N. Charles St., Baltimore, Md. 21218, USA. The paperback edition is \$24.95.

New Publications

Boren, Mark E. *Student Resistance: A History of the Unruly Subject*. New York: Routledge, 2001. 307 pp. \$19.95 (paper). ISBN 0-415-92624-6. Address: Routledge Publishers, 29 W. 35th St., New York, NY 10001, USA.

Student Resistance provides a broad historical overview of student political activism from the medieval universities to New York and Indonesia in 2000. Nationalist, conservative, liberal, and other student movements in different time periods and geographical settings are discussed.

Brooks, Ann, and Alison Mackinnon, eds. *Gender and the Restructured University*.

Buckingham, U.K.: Open University Press, 2001. 189 pp. £19.99 (paper), £65 (cloth). ISBN 0335206719. Address: Open University Press, 22 Ballmoor, Buckingham MK18 1XW, UK.

Focusing on the impact of globalization and organizational change on the role of women in higher education, this volume provides essays on globalization and gendered work cultures in universities, equity issues in Australian universities, women leaders in higher education, and management issues and women. Much of the book focuses on Australia.

Conrad, Clifton F., Jennifer Grant Haworth, and Lisa R. Lattuca, eds. *Qualitative Research in Higher Education: Ex-*

panding Perspectives (2d ed.). Boston: Pearson Custom Publishing, 2001. 710 pp. (paper). ISBN 0-536-62356-2. Address: Pearson Custom Publishing, 76 Arlington St., Boston, MA. 02116, USA.

The focus of this book is on qualitative research methods as they apply to research on higher education. Essays are reprinted from standard sources—providing a background to qualitative research methods, the philosophy of qualitative research, the use of data, issues of fieldwork, and related topics. This volume is in the ASHE Reader Series that brings together key readings on topics relevant to higher education research and teaching.

Goldsmith, John A., John Komlos, and Penny Schine Gold. *The Chicago Guide to Your Academic Career*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2001. 310 pp. \$13, £8.50. ISBN 0-226-30151-6. Address: University of Chicago Press, 1427 E. 60th St., Chicago IL 60637, USA.

Unconventionally written as a conversation among three academics, this book focuses on the key aspects of the development of an academic career—the experience of graduate school and progress through an academic career, including the challenges of obtaining and keeping a job, teaching and research, and the personal struggles faced by most academics. The perspective is American, and the authors were all trained at and teach in prestigious academic institutions, and so the experiences reflected in this book are not relevant for the entire range of academe.

Graubard, Stephen R., ed. *The American Academic Profession*. New Brunswick, N.J.: Transaction, 2001. 352 pp. \$29.95 (paper). ISBN 0-7658-0646-0. Address: Transaction Publishers, 35 Berrue Circle., Piscataway, NJ 08854, USA.

A collection of essays, originally published in *Daedalus*, dealing with aspects of the American professoriate. Among the topics considered are the role of faculty in community colleges, “culture wars” and the professoriate, challenges to scientists in universities, the information revolution, and international aspects of the profession.

Holmes, Arthur F. *Building the Christian Academy*. Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 2001. 122 pp. \$12 (paper). ISBN 0-8028-4744-7. Address: Eerdmans Publishers, 255 Jefferson Ave. SE., Grand Rapids, MI, 49503, USA.

Until relatively recently, the author points out, the history of higher education was the history of Christian academic traditions. In the past century, there has been a secularization of the universities. Holmes looks at the history of higher education and points to the main religious concerns of the universities, including the care of the soul, the unity of truth, and the role of the liberal arts. He argues that these elements remain important in the 21st century.

Huisman, Jeroen, Peter Maassen, and Guy Neave, eds. *Higher Education and the Nation State: The International Dimension of Higher Education*. Oxford: Pergamon, 2001. 256 pp. \$97 (cloth). ISBN 0-08-042790-1. Address: Elsevier Science, The Boulevard, Langford Lane, Kidlington, Oxford OX5 1GB, UK.

The focus of this volume is largely on internationalization and regionalization trends in the European Union, with one additional chapter on federal-state coordination in the United States. Issues include mobility of students and staff, national and regional dimensions, and a historical discussion of European higher education integration.

International Association of Universities, ed. *International Handbook of Universities* (16th ed.). New York: Palgrave Publishers, 2001. 3,000 pp. \$275.00 (cloth). ISBN 0-333-94513-1. Address: Palgrave Publishers, 175 Fifth Ave., New York, NY 10010, USA.

The most complete guide to the world's universities, this volume features information about over 7,300 higher education institutions in 176 countries. Data is listed by country and academic institution. Information includes addresses and e-mail, brief historical background (in some cases), student enrollments, size of academic staff, listings of faculties and key administrative staff, and related information. Full information is not available for all institutions.

Jegede, Olugbemiro, and Glenn Shive, eds. *Open and Distance Education in the Asian Region*. Hong Kong: Open University of Hong Kong Press, 2001. 452 pp. (paper). ISBN 962-7707-25-2. Address: Open University of Hong Kong Press, 30 Good Shepherd St., Ho Man Tin, Hong Kong.

An analysis of open and distance education in Pacific Rim nations, this volume discusses the use of instructional technology, including Internet availability and other distance education arrangements and programs for open education. Detailed statistical information is provided as well as a description of the institutional and other arrangements. Country-based coverage is provided for most Asian countries, including South

Asia, as well as such Pacific Rim nations as Australia, Canada, New Zealand, and the United States.

Kerr, Clark. *The Gold and the Blue: A Personal Memoir of the University of California, 1949–1967*. Vol. 1: *Academic Triumphs*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 2001. 498 pp. \$35 (cloth). ISBN 0-520-22367-5. Address: University of California Press, Berkeley, CA 94720, USA.

Clark Kerr—former chancellor of the University of California, Berkeley, former president of the University of California System, and one of the most insightful observers of American higher education—has published the first volume of his memoirs. This volume deals with the development of the University of California in the post-World War II period. Kerr brings his own insights based on a half century of leadership at the university and also a keen analysis of a key period in the university's history.

Lindsay, Beverly, and Manuel J. Justiz, eds. *The Quest for Equity in Higher Education: Towards New Paradigms in an Evolving Affirmative Action Era*. Albany: State University of New York Press, 2001. 319 pp. \$ (paper). ISBN 0-7914-5061-9. Address: State University of New York Press, State University Plaza, Albany NY 12246, USA.

Recent policy changes in the United States have forced rethinking concerning equity and affirmative action in higher education. This book examines the changing political and academic climate as it affects affirmative action. Chapter topics include judicial decisions and student admissions, the labor market for African-American faculty, and case studies of California, Texas, Hawaii, and several other states.

Muthesius, Stefan. *The Postwar University: Utopianist Campus and College*. New Haven, Conn.: Yale University Press, 2000. 340 pp (cloth). ISBN 0-300-08717-9.

The design, planning, and architecture of universities are largely ignored in the literature and yet are very important topics. This book focuses on university architecture and campus design in Europe and the United States. Chapters dis-

cuss trends in design, the links between design and curriculum, and the development of "megacampuses" in the 1960s and beyond.

Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development. *Reviews of National Policies for Education: Estonia*. Paris: OECD, 2001. 205 pp. (paper). ISBN 92-64-18607-7, and Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development. *Reviews of National Policies for Education: Latvia*. Paris: OECD, 2001. 178 pp. (paper). ISBN 92-64-18641-7. Address: OECD, 2 rue Andre Pascal, 75775 Paris 16, France.

The OECD's national policy reviews for education are well known for thoroughness and useful data. These two volumes deal with two Baltic republics and provide information and analysis on all aspects of the education system, includ-

ing postsecondary education. Special stress is devoted to changes and reforms. Statistical information as well as analysis is included.

Tschang, F. T. and T. Della Senta, eds. *Access to Knowledge: New Information Technologies and the Emergence of the Virtual University*. Oxford: Elsevier Science, 2001. 427 pp (cloth). ISBN 0-08-043670-6. Address: Elsevier Science, The Boulevard, Langford Lane, Kidlington, Oxford OX5 1GB, UK.

A comprehensive international overview of trends in information technology and virtual delivery of academic programs, this book features several case studies, including Brazil, Asia, and Africa. Chapters also discuss learning environments in a virtual context, design of curriculum, the development of Internet technologies, and related topics.

Yeager, John L., et al., eds. *ASHE Reader on Finance in Higher Education* (2d ed.). Boston: Pearson Custom Publishing, 2001. 751 pp. (paper). ISBN 0-536-62882-3. Address: Pearson Custom Publishing, 76 Arlington St., Boston, MA. 02116, USA.

All aspects of financing higher education are discussed in this comprehensive volume, including government funding, broader issues in economics and financing, institutional resources, strategic planning and resource allocation, institutional management, ethics and finance, and the international financing of higher education. The materials in this book are reprinted from standard sources, and the collection of essays is thoughtful and wide-ranging. ■

News of the Center and the Program in Higher Education

For the past three years, the Center for International Higher Education has been supported by the Ford Foundation. We are pleased to note that the foundation has renewed its support for the work of the Center for another two years. Two graduate assistants have joined the Center's work for 2001-2002. Hassan Ez-Zaim, who has been a Fulbright scholar from Morocco at Boston College, will work jointly with the Center and the Irish Institute. Michael Agganis will also join the Center. They join Alma Maldonado, Jef Davis, and Roberta Bassett, who continue their affiliations as they work on their doctoral degrees. One of the major research journals in the field of higher education, *The Review of Higher Education*, continues to be edited by Philip G. Altbach, with associate editors Karen C. Arnold and Ted Youn. The managing editor is Roberta Bassett. The journal's sponsor, the Association for the Study of Higher Education, recently renewed Dr. Altbach's editorship for an additional three years.

The Center will cosponsor, with the Monan Chair in Higher Education, the third annual Monan Symposium on Higher Education in fall 2001 at Boston College. Two speakers will be featured: John Maguire, who will speak on enrollment and competitiveness; and Henry Rosovsky, who will focus on the fate of the university as ivory tower.

Philip G. Altbach taught in the master's program in higher education at the Universidad de Palermo in Buenos

Aires, Argentina for the third time in August 2001. The program is cosponsored by the UNESCO Chair in Higher Education, held by Dr. Miguel A. Escotet. The Universidad de Palermo will publish *Comparative Higher Education*, by Philip G. Altbach, in a Spanish edition, shortly. Further information can be obtained Liberia Tecnica, Florida 683, Local 18, CP1005AAM Buenos Aires, Argentina.

Financial Support Available for Doctoral Study in Higher Education

The graduate program in higher education at Boston College, in collaboration with the Center for International Higher Education, offers master's and doctoral study in higher education. Financial assistance is available for doctoral study. The program's interdisciplinary approach is strengthened by an international perspective. For more than 30 years, Boston College has offered graduate-level degrees in the field. Five full-time faculty are affiliated with the higher education program, and it is possible for students to take advantage of courses and resources at other Boston-area institutions through our consortium. For further information, please contact Prof. Karen Arnold, coordinator of the higher education program. Her e-mail address is: <arnoldkc@bc.edu>.

Private Higher Education Initiative

The Center, in collaboration with Professor Daniel Levy at the State University of New York in Albany, is undertaking a new initiative concerning private higher education. Our goal is to highlight the dramatic new developments worldwide concerning the fastest-growing segment of higher education—private higher education. We will develop a website and related publications providing up-to-date information on developments in private higher education worldwide. Information regarding new laws, initiatives, research, and activities in the area of private higher education will be featured. Our goal is to provide information and documentation to provide those concerned with

private higher education easy access to current thinking. This project stems from our 1998 conference and the resulting book, *Private Prometheus: Private Higher Education and Development in the 21st Century*, published by the Center for International Higher Education and Ablex Publishers. SUNY-Albany has a special interest in private higher education worldwide, and is currently engaged in research and graduate training in this field. At the Center, Alma Maldonado will be responsible for work on private higher education, while at SUNY-Albany Yisa Cao will help with the research. The Ford Foundation supports this project. For further information, please contact Alma Maldonado. Her e-mail address is: <gudelupe@bc.edu>.

An Initiative in International Higher Education

Introduction

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

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

Programs and Resources

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

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

The Program in Higher Education

The Program in Higher Education offers master's 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, Champion Hall, Boston College, Chestnut Hill, MA 02467. Fax: (617) 552-8422 e-mail: Arnoldkc@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
Champion 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 Editor: Jef C. 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.