

INTERNATIONAL HIGHER EDUCATION

THE BOSTON COLLEGE CENTER FOR INTERNATIONAL HIGHER EDUCATION

NUMBER 39 SPRING 2005

International Issues

- 2 Exploiting the Professoriate and Weakening the University
Philip G. Altbach

Globalization Currents

- 3 Sharing Quality Higher Education Across Borders
- 6 GATS and the OECD/UNESCO Guidelines and the Academic Profession
David Robinson
- 7 GATS and Education: An "Insider" view from Norway
Olve Sørensen
- 9 The Rise and Fall of Transnational Higher Education in Singapore
Richard Garrett

Private Higher Education Trends

- 10 Universities: Family Style
Philip G. Altbach
- 12 Private versus Public in Romania: Consequences for the Market
Luminia Nicolescu
- 13 Analyzing a Private Revolution: The Work of PROPHE
Daniel C. Levy

Universities and Economic Development

- 14 University-Industry Partnership Reconsidered: Three Lessons
Sachi Hatakenaka
- 17 State Policies, Research, and Economic Development
Roger L. Geiger

Perspectives on China

- 18 Corruption in China's Higher Education: A Malignant Tumor
Rui Yang
- 20 China's Universities on the Global Stage: Views from University Leaders
Ruth Hayhoe and Julia Pan
- 22 World-Class Universities and Reform in China
Kathryn Mohrman

Countries and Regions

- 23 Catholic Universities in Central Europe
Marijan Sunjic

Departments

- 25 New Initiative: The Higher Education Corruption Monitor
- 25 News of the Center
- 26 New Publications

Contradictions of Academic Development: Exploiting the Professoriate and Weakening the University

PHILIP G. ALTBACH

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

Efforts to save money on higher education, especially in developing countries, are resulting in severe damage to the most central element of teaching and learning—the professoriate. The pressures of mass higher education combined with an unwillingness or inability of the state to support academe adequately, the rise of the private sector and the privatization of public universities, and an increasing differentiation of the academic system all contribute to confusion about the roles and functions of universities in a new environment. Developing countries, particularly, are caught in the contradiction. Faced with demands to enroll ever-greater numbers of students, and at the same time wanting to create high-quality universities, the pressures for mass access always trump quality. This discussion focuses on the small number of “flagship” research-oriented universities, almost always public institutions, that exist in developing countries, and the challenges they face to build quality in a difficult environment. These universities, although small in number, are essential to the future of higher education as well as to long-term success of many developing economies.

The professoriate is the most important resource for building quality, and it is being squeezed from all directions. Faculty members are asked to be more productive, which usually requires a greater teaching load. Administration is being “rationalized,” usually weakening the autonomy of the academic profession and its role in governance. Remuneration, usually inadequate, seldom keeps up with inflation, leading to the need for faculty members to supplement their incomes by additional employment. Given these circumstances, it is impossible to improve the basic work of the university—teaching and learning. No amount of administrative efficiency or private initiative can substitute for the full commitment of a talented faculty.

AN AFRICAN EXAMPLE

Makerere University, Uganda's flagship academic institution and formerly one of the best in sub-Saharan Africa, has undertaken major reforms that seem, on the surface, rational and appropriate but that in fact are undermining the academic profession at the institution and destroying its research role. In a nutshell, the university has been forced to generate more of its income due to government budget cutbacks. At the same time,

the university has come under pressure to enroll more students so as to provide opportunities for study to larger numbers. Private higher education has also undergone dramatic growth in Uganda—as in many countries—and the new private institutions have struggled to find people to teach.

Makerere responded to this situation rationally, and some would say effectively. Faculty members have been encouraged to do consulting and generate funds for themselves and the institution. Some professors have been successful in working for international organizations, and a few have built relationships with the private sector. Other faculty members teach part time in the new private institutions in order to earn additional income. These new schools are often set up near the main campus to facilitate “commuting.” In Uganda, as in most countries, the new private sector depends heavily on professors at the established public universities. In this way, the public sector is subsidizing the private sector by providing institutions with teachers they could not otherwise afford to hire.

Makerere has also set up a new teaching program as a way of generating income and supplementing the inadequate state funding.

Makerere has also set up a new teaching program as a way of generating income and supplementing the inadequate state funding. Students who did not qualify for “regular” admission or simply could not be accommodated because of limited enrollment capacity have been offered admission to a new academic track. This new track, which operates mainly in the evening, charges a relatively high tuition fee, and the university keeps the income. Classes are taught by regular Makerere faculty who receive extra payments. It is a kind of “on-campus moonlighting.” The university now has two degree tracks: one inexpensive and state supported, admitting the “cream of the crop”; and the other income generating and admitting students who either could not otherwise be accommodated or admitted. This program has been highly successful, generating considerable income and permitting the university to supplement the incomes of those teaching, and adding greatly needed funds to the institutional coffers.

IMPLICATIONS

What does all of this mean? On the positive side, participating academics are able to earn enough income to live. Additional students are given access to study, either in the new private institutions or in the “dual track” at Makerere. Consulting has brought in additional income and has in some cases linked the university to emerging enterprises in society. Makerere earns additional funds that can be used to purchase equipment, maintain facilities, and support other important aspects not covered in the state budget. Many in Uganda and elsewhere have hailed the university's income-generating strategies as a great success.

The costs, however, are substantial. Academic staff no longer have time to conduct research—being simply too busy with their other responsibilities. The culture of the institution will inevitably shift from teaching and research to entrepreneurial zeal—both on the part of individual academics and by the university itself. Generating income will count more than research, teaching, and scholarship. Those who are adept at entrepreneurship will be rewarded. The traditional markers of academic accomplishment—publication in quality journals, focusing on research topics related to a professor's own scientific interests, competing for grants relevant to these interests—become much less relevant. Faculty increasingly have neither the time nor the motivation to publish articles or engage in sustained research.

Fiscal necessity and accommodation to the market will inevitably change the nature of Makerere University. It will no longer be a university in the traditional sense of the term but will instead be a market-driven income-maximizing institution providing credentials to larger numbers of students. Professors will no longer fulfill their traditional roles. Makerere has traditionally been seen as the flagship university for Uganda, aspiring to relate to the best universities in the world. Many Makerere academics participate in the international scientific community, attending scientific conferences and working with colleagues elsewhere. In the new market-driven environment, such participation will become increasingly rare as local academics focus on income-generating activities.

Academic staff no longer have time to conduct research—being simply too busy with their other responsibilities. The culture of the institution will inevitably shift from teaching and research to entrepreneurial zeal—both on the part of individual academics and by the university itself.

The challenges discussed here are common in Africa and throughout the developing world. Makerere is a particularly good example of this trend precisely because it has been so successful in building alternative sources of income and support. If academic institutions in developing countries aspire to participate in the international scientific community and provide their students with high academic quality, the new entrepreneurial spirit will make this very difficult. Budget cutting and marketization have consequences—among them a profound change in the role of the academic profession. ■

Internet Resources

Visit our website for downloadable back issues of *International Higher Education* and other publications and resources at <http://www.bc.edu/cihe/>.

Sharing Quality Higher Education Across Borders: A Statement on Behalf of Higher Education Institutions Worldwide

This document—prepared by the International Association of Universities (IAU), the Association of Universities and Colleges of Canada (AUCC), the American Council on Education (ACE), and the Council for Higher Education Accreditation (CHEA)—was circulated as a draft to higher education membership associations worldwide for comment from May to September 2004. This final version has benefited from their commentary.

Higher education's tradition of exchanging ideas and people across borders has long served to advance its contribution to society's cultural, social, and economic goals. In recent years, there has been an impressive expansion of cross-border higher education initiatives. This expansion is characterized by two main trends. One is the growing imperative of higher education institutions to internationalize—to integrate an international/intercultural dimension into teaching, research, and community service—in order to enhance their academic excellence and the relevance of their contribution to societies. Higher education institutions have long experience in this area and are rapidly expanding their cooperation with their counterparts around the world.

The second trend is the growth of market-driven activities, fueled by increased demand for higher education worldwide, declining public funding in many national contexts, the diversification of higher education providers, and new methods of delivery. The growth of this second trend, in particular, and the complex issues it raises provide the impetus for this document.

The scope, complexity, and volume of cross-border activity¹ create new challenges and intensify existing ones. Principal among these are the need to (a) safeguard the broader cultural, social, and economic contributions of higher education and research, particularly given the critical role they play in today's global knowledge society; (b) protect the interests of students and facilitate their mobility; (c) strengthen the capacity of developing countries to improve accessibility to quality higher education, especially at a time when the gap in resources and access to knowledge between the industrialized and developing world is growing; and (d) preserve linguistic and cultural diversity within higher education.

This document is based on the belief that market forces alone are inadequate to ensure that cross-border education contributes to the public good. Therefore, it lays the groundwork for fair and transparent policy frameworks for managing

higher education across borders that are underpinned by a set of guiding principles and a process of dialogue among stakeholders. These frameworks should address the challenges we face in developing and sharing quality higher education across borders for the benefit of all and ensure that cross-border higher education's contribution to the broader public interest is not sacrificed to commercial interests.

AUDIENCES

This statement is therefore addressed to two audiences: first, higher education institutions and other providers² and their nongovernmental associations worldwide and, second, national governments and their intergovernmental organizations. It outlines the principles that the signatories believe should anchor institutional initiatives in cross-border education as well as government policies and positions in trade negotiations. It also recommends specific actions that reinforce these principles.

By endorsing this statement, the higher education membership associations listed at the end of this document signal their intention to (a) promote policies and practices among their member institutions that are based on the principles and actions called for in this statement; (b) cooperate at an international level to implement such policy frameworks; and (c) engage in dialogue with their respective governments and intergovernmental organizations so that national and international policies and practices advance these principles and realize this action agenda.

We believe that cross-border activity can make an important contribution to enhancing higher education if it is developed and delivered responsibly and effectively.

PRINCIPLES FOR CROSS-BORDER HIGHER EDUCATION

We believe that cross-border activity can make an important contribution to enhancing higher education if it is developed and delivered responsibly and effectively. We therefore set forth the following principles to guide the actions of all the stakeholders specified in this statement:

- Cross-border higher education should strive to contribute to the broader economic, social, and cultural well-being of communities.
- While cross-border education can flow in many different directions and takes place in a variety of contexts, it should strengthen developing countries' higher education capacity in order to promote global equity.
- In addition to providing disciplinary and professional expertise, cross-border higher education should strive to instill in learners the critical thinking that underpins responsible citizenship at the local, national, and global levels.
- Cross-border higher education should be accessible not only to students who can afford to pay but also to qualified students with financial need.

- Cross-border higher education should meet the same high standards of academic and organizational quality, no matter where it is delivered.

- Cross-border higher education should be accountable to the public, students, and governments.

- Cross-border higher education should expand the opportunities for international mobility of faculty, researchers, and students.

- Higher education institutions and other providers of cross-border higher education should provide clear and full information to students and external stakeholders about the education they provide.

Build a culture of ongoing quality review, feedback, and improvement by creating robust quality assurance processes at the institutional level that rely heavily on faculty expertise and incorporate the views of students.

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR HIGHER EDUCATION INSTITUTIONS AND OTHER PROVIDERS

Based on these principles, we endorse the following action agenda for adoption and implementation by higher education institutions and other providers engaged in education across borders. In order to benefit from past experience, implementation efforts should recognize and, where appropriate, build on existing legal instruments, policy statements, fora, and initiatives that are consistent with these principles and promote further research and policy dialogue.³

- Become conversant with issues surrounding cross-border education and trade to inform the exchange among associations and the associations' engagement in a constructive dialogue with governments.

- Strive to ensure that higher education across borders contributes to the broader social and economic well-being of communities in the host country; is culturally sensitive in its approach and content; and strengthens local higher education capacity by, for example, cooperating, when appropriate, with local institutions.

- Improve access to programs and courses by providing support to qualified students from other countries with financial need.

- Obtain the proper authorization to operate as a higher education institution from government or other competent bodies⁴ in the home and host countries. At the same time, governments and competent bodies should increase their collaboration, transparency, and information sharing in order to alleviate the administrative burden on higher education institutions.

- Build a culture of ongoing quality review, feedback, and improvement by creating robust quality assurance processes at the institutional level that rely heavily on faculty expertise and incorporate the views of students.

- Cooperate with their associations as well as with relevant governmental and nongovernmental bodies to develop effective quality assurance principles and practices and apply them to cross-border activities.

- Cooperate with relevant governmental and nongovernmental bodies to improve the international exchange of information and cooperation on quality assurance and recognition issues.

- Provide reliable information to the public, students, and governments in a proactive manner, particularly with respect to the institution's legal status, award-granting authority, course offerings, quality assurance mechanisms, as well as other relevant facts as suggested by codes of good practice.

RECOMMENDATIONS TO GOVERNMENTS

Meeting the challenges of cross-border education will require a concerted effort not only by higher education providers, but also by governments and competent authorities within nations. In this regard, it is vital that strong partnerships be fostered between higher education institutions and their associations, on the one hand, and governments and their intergovernmental organizations, on the other hand. We believe the cornerstone of this partnership should be a shared vision of principles and policies to govern the management of cross-border education.

Trade policy and national education policy may conflict with each other and jeopardize higher education's capacity to carry out its social and cultural mission.

Some governments seek to manage cross-border higher education through multilateral and regional trade regimes designed to facilitate the flow of private goods and services. There are three main limitations to this approach. First, trade frameworks are not designed to deal with the academic, research, or broader social and cultural purposes of cross-border higher education. Second, trade policy and national education policy may conflict with each other and jeopardize higher education's capacity to carry out its social and cultural mission. Third, applying trade rules to complex national higher education systems designed to serve the public interest may have unintended consequences that can be harmful to this mission.⁵

Thus, we believe that international agreements and policies for cross-border higher education—particularly in the context of WTO and other trade discussions—should address these limitations. They should respect the right of governments and competent bodies within nations to regulate their higher education systems; to safeguard the public investment in higher education to achieve their cultural, social and economic goals; and to promote access and equity for students.

Moreover, governments should play a constructive role in developing national and international policy frameworks that promote cross-border higher education's positive contributions to society. To this end, we recommend that governments adopt the following action agenda to complement the efforts of higher education providers:

- Engage with higher education institutions and other providers and their representative associations in dialogue about the principles articulated in this statement, particularly when elaborating trade policies.

- Promote and support academic and research partnerships and other forms of cooperation for higher education capacity-building in developing countries.

- Demonstrate a commitment to access through increased support for qualified international students with financial need.

- Cooperate with relevant governmental and nongovernmental bodies to ensure that foreign higher education providers operating within their countries are appropriately authorized and monitored.

- Cooperate with relevant governmental and nongovernmental bodies to make widely available accurate, timely, and user-friendly information on the country's higher education institutions and quality assurance and accreditation practices.

- Cooperate with relevant governmental and nongovernmental bodies to improve information tools that ensure the information referred to above is shared internationally in a systematic fashion.

Higher education across borders is a promising avenue for enhancing equity, access, and the quality of higher education.

CONCLUSION

Higher education across borders is a promising avenue for enhancing equity, access, and the quality of higher education. Realizing its potential is a shared responsibility of many stakeholders, including the associations cited and the higher education institutions they represent. We urge all engaged in planning, providing, monitoring, and negotiating higher education across borders to adhere to the principles articulated in this statement and to implement the action items. We also urge governments to bring this statement to the attention of intergovernmental organizations whose mandates include higher education and to ensure that the values, principles, roles, and responsibilities articulated in this statement guide these organizations' deliberations and actions.

By taking these steps, and working collectively, we will help address the urgent need for national and international policy frameworks for sharing quality higher education across borders and affirm the value of higher education's continued contribution to the public good.

Notes

1. Higher education across borders is a multifaceted phenomenon that includes the movement of people (students and faculty), providers (higher education institutions with a physical and/or virtual presence in a host country), and academic content (such as the development of joint curricula). These activities take place in the context of international development cooperation, academic exchanges and linkages, as well as commercial initiatives.

2. This group includes institutions and new types of higher education providers, whether they are public, private, or for-profit.

3. The following is a representative, but by no means exhaustive, sample of related existing instruments, policy statements, fora, and initiatives: UNESCO regional conventions on the recognition of academic qualifications and credentials (see www.unesco.org); UNESCO/Council of Europe Code of Good Practice in the Provision of Transnational Education (see www.cepes.ro); OECD-UNESCO Draft Guidelines on Provision of Cross-border Education (see www.oecd.org); development of the European Higher Education Area (see www.eua.be or www.bologna-bergen2005.no); Accra Declaration on GATS and Internationalisation (AAU, see www.aau.org); Joint Declaration on Higher Education and GATS (ACE/ AUCC/ CHEA/EUA, see www.unesco.org/iau).

4. The term “competent bodies” is used in order to take into account the fact that in any given country authority for higher education rests with different levels of government, nongovernmental organizations, and institutions.

5. This is particularly true given the fact that GATS, Article 1:3 is ambiguous and open to interpretation. It is this Article that is concerned with services “supplied in the exercise of government authority” where these services are defined as being supplied “neither on a commercial basis nor in competition with one or more service suppliers.” ■

GATS and the OECD/UNESCO Guidelines and the Academic Profession

DAVID ROBINSON

David Robinson is associate executive director of the Canadian Association of University Teachers. Address: 2675 Queensview Drive, Ottawa, Ontario, Canada K2H 6Z2. E-mail: robinson@caut.ca.

One of the most dramatic developments within higher education in recent years has been the rapid expansion of the “international trade” in education services. Universities and colleges have always been international in scope. Students and faculty have for centuries crossed international borders as part of their academic pursuits. But what characterizes the current environment is not so much the international migration of students and faculty, though the sheer volume of this has increased. Rather, it is the increasingly market-oriented delivery of higher education and the prominent role played by for-profit providers offering services directly across borders.

The rise of the international trade in higher education has prompted several countries, including the United States, to push for the inclusion of education services in the current round of negotiations on the General Agreement on Trade in Services (GATS). The purpose of this, ostensibly, is to create a legally binding framework that would eliminate barriers to the trade in higher education services. For instance, some countries prohibit foreign education providers from establishing branch campuses while others require that a local institution must be a partner to any foreign educational venture.

However, faculty unions around the world have expressed grave concerns about the impact GATS might have on higher education. They have argued that GATS is hostile to public services like education, treating them, at best, as missed commercial opportunities and at worst as unfair competition or barriers to foreign services and suppliers. At its heart, GATS has the potential to lock in and intensify the privatization and commercialization of higher education by requiring countries that make commitments on education services to promote unfettered competition by opening up their markets to all providers, including for-profit enterprises. Subsidies and grants provided only to domestic providers would be in violation of GATS disciplines, potentially threatening public funding of universities and colleges.

Given the proliferation of diploma mills now operating internationally, there is real cause for concern that granting unfettered market access to all foreign higher education enterprises will usher in a flood of providers of dubious quality.

QUALITY ASSURANCE IN CROSS-BORDER EDUCATION

In addition, serious concerns have been raised about the potential impact of GATS on the quality of higher education. GATS rules are designed to promote free trade in higher education services by guaranteeing market access for all providers. However, given the proliferation of diploma mills now operating internationally, there is real cause for concern that granting unfettered market access to all foreign higher education enterprises will usher in a flood of providers of dubious quality. Such worries have in fact been one reason why so many countries remain reluctant to make GATS commitments on education services.

At the same time, private education institutions operating internationally have recognized that, unlike their public counterparts, they desperately need recognized stamps of “quality.” This is because of the difficulties students, employers, and governments have in separating the diploma mills from those institutions providing a good standard of education. Not surprisingly, then, those providers and governments that have promoted free trade in education services have also been pressing recently for international rules on quality assurance.

Enter the OECD and UNESCO. The OECD has long been a champion of greater trade in higher education services and of a more market-oriented approach to its international delivery. Last October, the OECD, in partnership with UNESCO, unveiled a draft set of guidelines on quality assurance and accreditation in cross-border higher education. Immediately, the proposed guidelines unleashed a storm of protest from faculty unions concerned that the interests of academic staff had been ignored and that the guidelines were aimed at promoting private for-profit higher education.

What is astonishing about the first draft of the guidelines is that academic staff and their interests were completely left out of the mix. The draft identified six key stakeholders involved in quality assurance and accreditation—governments, higher education institutions and providers, student organizations, accrediting agencies, credential evaluation bodies, and professional bodies. Faculty did not even warrant a footnote. Academic freedom was not mentioned once. Yet, respect for faculty rights and academic freedom are key foundations of quality higher education. Without ironclad guarantees of academic freedom, the very cornerstone of critical thinking and inquiry, quality is simply impossible to establish.

What is astonishing about the first draft of the guidelines is that academic staff and their interests were completely left out of the mix.

INDUSTRIAL DEFINITION OF QUALITY

There are other reasons faculty are concerned about the guidelines. In making the case for a new international quality assurance regime, the guidelines adopt an industrial definition of quality. This concept of quality—unlike the common understanding of the word as an indicator of how good something is—means a guarantee that something meets a certain basic standard or has gone through an appropriate process of “quality control.” In an educational context, checking for quality in this sense typically means assessing institutional processes and policies against a basic standard. It actually tells the “customer”—the student—very little about how good an education will be provided. Rather, it indicates only whether every student going to that institution will get the same “product.” This provides little assurance that a good, let alone excellent, education will be received.

In addition, the guidelines reveal their commercial bias through the close correspondence between the language in the draft and the language present in GATS. For instance, Part 1 of the guidelines for governments recommends that countries: “Establish or encourage the establishment of a system of fair, transparent and not administratively burdensome registration or licensure of all higher education providers operating in their territory including distance higher education.”

The words “fair,” “transparent,” and “not administratively burdensome” correspond directly to “fair and equitable treat-

ment,” “transparency,” and “least burdensome” provisions in GATS. That the registration or licensure system should be open to all providers, domestic or foreign, public or private, is essentially a market access commitment. In effect, such wording would require foreign providers to be treated at least as well as local ones and would prevent governments and accrediting bodies from discriminating against private and for-profit providers.

NEW GUIDELINES

Faculty unions oppose the inclusion of education services in trade treaties like GATS because the provisions in these agreements can have a powerful narrowing effect on public policies and promote the privatization of higher education. While the guidelines would not be legally binding in the same way as trade agreements are, it would nevertheless set a dangerous precedent if trade-like commitments were made and legitimated in any international instrument.

This is not to deny that rules are needed to protect students and to promote quality in international education. However, as opposed to the current draft guidelines and GATS, these rules must be based solidly on educational values, not commercial objectives. This would mean developing different quality assurance guidelines that respect academic freedom and collegial governance and that explicitly recognize the right of the appropriate national bodies to determine which institutions and programs are accredited and how they are assessed. ■

GATS and Education: An “Insider” View from Norway

OLVE SØRENSEN

Olve Sørensen is a senior adviser in the Department of Higher Education in the Norwegian Ministry of Education, with particular responsibility for GATS and other aspects of international trade in education services. Address: Royal Norwegian Ministry of Education and Research, P. O. Box 8119, 0032 Oslo, Norway. E-mail: olve.sorensen@ufd.dep.no.

Following the debate on the General Agreement on Trade and Services (GATS) and education over the last few years, you might think that education was a central topic in the GATS negotiations and that countries pursued their schemes and stratagems for the education trade with great determination. In fact, the view from inside provides a completely different picture: very few countries—about 40 in all—have made any commitments or demands regarding education, and only half of those have made firm commitments concerning higher education. In terms of trade liberalization, those who have made commitments generally promise less than the policies they already have in place and request little more from others. Broadly speaking, lobbyists and other opponents of including

education in GATS seem to assume that countries follow aggressive strategies to secure markets for their own education industries. In reality, what takes place inside the GATS apparatus is completely different: an almost sleepy disregard for education matters.

It should also be remembered that GATS—the treaty on trade in services, as opposed to goods—is but a single element in the much larger package of trade talks that deal with trade in goods (GATT), intellectual property (TRIPS), government procurement, and so on. While the Doha Round of WTO negotiations should have been finished by the end of 2004, the deadline has been extended until the end of 2005, given the lack of agreement on some of the difficult topics—such as agricultural products.

SO, WHAT HAPPENS NOW?

Most participants and observers seem to expect that, once the tricky issues in the overall trade negotiations have matured sufficiently, a more or less sudden release of the deadlock will follow and an agreement will be reached. GATS is lower down on the totem pole and will take signals from the overall progress. Thus, the most likely scenario will be a “stampede” to finalize matters in the GATS segment as soon as possible after a solution has been found for the “big” issues—before everyone decides to call it quits, freezing the positions of all member countries. At the end, no one will want to be caught in a position of having made concessions without receiving any benefits in return. These challenges inspire caution around the table.

At the end, no one will want to be caught in a position of having made concessions without receiving any benefits in return. These challenges inspire caution around the table.

EDUCATION—NOT A BIG DEAL?

The education sector is never the flavor of the month in GATS. This lack of attention seems curious, both because education represents a fairly hefty volume of trade—probably close to \$40 billion a year—and because it has attracted quite a bit of public interest and concern in many countries. Mostly, public opinion on trade in education services tends to be critical. The very mention of education in connection with GATS is widely seen by the education community as consecrating education as a tradable commodity and betraying the tradition of education as a common good.

This background is probably one reason many governments try to avoid bringing the issue of education up at all. Another reason may be that most member countries, including some of the most important ones in the world of education, prefer to leave their ministries of trade or finance in tight control over all aspects of trade negotiations. Sector authorities, such as education ministries, often have a very limited say in defining

national positions or sector interests. That emphasizes the dominance of general trade policy over specific sector concerns and explains the relative unimportance of education services in the process.

THE VIEW FROM THE NORTH

Norway has chosen a much more sector-focused approach, with every ministry directly involved in the Geneva talks as well as in preparing and formulating relevant GATS policy. For the education sector, that has probably led to a more active policy than would have emerged from pure trade-based policy impulses.

The Norwegian position is, in brief, that as long as global trade in education exists and grows it needs regulation.

The Norwegian position is, in brief, that as long as global trade in education exists and grows it needs regulation. A gold rush of transnational education services without safeguards would present a serious threat to consumers (i.e., students) and to the weaker education administrations of most developing countries. At the same time, education abroad or from abroad is the only available option for the huge number of hopeful students whose governments have little hope of offering them an adequate education at home. It would be neither possible nor wise to try to ban trade in education services; the challenge is how to make use of its benefits while keeping the less desirable effects in check.

In other words, to us, GATS is a response to globalization far more than the turbocharger of global education trade. In this connection, it should be remembered that no country has as yet been lured by GATS into making giant strides toward a free market in education. Generally, members have stated a more protective position than their current practices. Should all countries suddenly decide to open their education markets only to the extent they have promised in GATS, the result would be a more restrictive market—not the heedless market liberalization feared by GATS opponents.

NORWAY'S CONCEPT OF GATS

It is probably true to say that GATS was conceived purely as a legal framework for trade regulations with well-defined terminology and prescribed procedures but little regard for the actual substance of the services to be traded. Today, some disagreement exists about the nature of GATS, certainly in education circles. Should GATS be allowed to continue to develop as a system of technical treaties and procedures, relegating concerns about the quality of future education services to other forums? Or must the work on GATS reflect joint responsibility for the global education system as well as our ability to meet the world's overwhelming need for education?

A number of critics, particularly in the developing world, have addressed both concepts of GATS. On the one hand, they would prefer education to be excluded from GATS altogether. If education is to be dealt with at all in GATS, they call for a much more serious approach to the substance of education, not just its trade aspects. On the other hand, many critics feel that the proper arenas for regulating the global education system consist of the specialized international agencies in the field—UNESCO, in particular. In our view, UNESCO represents an important partner in securing the necessary base for future development and regulation of transborder trade in education services. OECD is another, and Norway has provided a lot of political and financial support to the joint efforts of the two organizations. The primary example involves the development of international guidelines for quality assurance that will be finalized during 2005, for which Norway has chaired the working group.

UNESCO represents an important partner in securing the necessary base for future development and regulation of transborder trade in education services. OECD is another, and Norway has provided a lot of political and financial support to the joint efforts of the two organizations.

Even so, compared to the binding legal obligations of GATS, the recommendations and guidelines of UNESCO and OECD constitute much blunter instruments. Given the commercial scale and methods of the education market, the Norwegian position is that enforceable legal safeguards must comprise the most rigorous kind of regulation and that GATS offers a suitable framework. That said, international forums such as UNESCO and OECD, professional associations, NGOs, and academic institutions should have an expanded, not a reduced, role in the future development of a global education system that benefits all.

HOW CAN WE ALL HELP?

Herein lies an important responsibility. While the details of WTO negotiations will probably continue to be clouded in secrecy, vigorous informed debate, research, and academic discourse on education trade issues will carry significant weight and influence decision makers. Perhaps education is too serious a matter to be left to governments alone. ■

The Rise and Fall of Transnational Higher Education in Singapore

RICHARD GARRETT

Richard Garrett is deputy director at the Observatory on Borderless Higher Education, London. Address: Observatory on Borderless Higher Education, 36 Gordon Square, London WC1H 0PF, UK. E-mail: r.garrett@obhe.ac.uk.

In January 2005, the Singapore minister of education, Tharman Shanmugaratnam, announced a number of new initiatives. These included raising the participation rate by 2010 in the country's three domestic universities by almost 20 percent (to 25 percent of the school-leaving cohort), creating a national open university, and offering university status to selected private institutions. One of the first private institutions in line for university title is the Singapore Institute of Management (SIM). Singapore remains one of the largest markets for transnational higher education in the world and is a particularly important market for Australian and U.K. universities. Leading private institutions, such as SIM, are key local partners and have been drawn to foreign partnerships as a way of offering degrees. The latest announcements may be further evidence of the government's desire to reduce dependence on foreign higher education.

GROWTH OF TRANSNATIONAL HIGHER EDUCATION

Considering these developments, what are the implications for transnational higher education in Singapore? Extrapolating from the 2000 Singapore census, it is clear that Singapore has an aging population. The current 20-to-24-year age group is the smallest in 30 years (and a full third lower than the peak in the mid-1980s). The school-leaving cohort will rise again over the next five years, peaking around 2010, before falling back. The mid-1980s school-leaver boom saw the beginnings of transnational higher education in Singapore. The government was keen to expand access to higher education but could not grow domestic capacity fast enough. So despite a period of steady cohort decline post-1985, the transnational market in Singapore expanded significantly due to an increase in tertiary participation of the age cohort from 8 percent in 1985 to 15 percent in 1990. Participation now stands at around 45 percent. This massive expansion has only been possible through foreign provision, whether studying abroad or transnational provision. But while transnational activity was viewed as a way to stem study abroad rates and to mentor local institutions, the long-term aim was greater self-sufficiency.

In 2003, Singapore's domestic universities enrolled around 40,000 students and the polytechnics around 56,000. According to the Singapore Department of Statistics, in 2003 around 170 private tertiary providers in Singapore enrolled

119,000 students. Of those, 140 offered programs in collaboration with foreign institutions and enrolled 89,000 students in such programs (75 percent of the total). This shows the importance of transnational provision in Singapore, but all figures include students of all ages and international as well as domestic students, making an estimate of relative school-leaver participation difficult. What is certain is that new private universities and the new open university will be chasing many of the students currently on transnational programs from foreign universities. Perhaps two new foreign universities are to be established in Singapore, University of New South Wales from Australia and University of Warwick from the United Kingdom (the latter still to be agreed). This is on top of a number of existing independent foreign campuses, such as INSEAD and the University of Chicago Graduate School of Business. While these institutions (particularly the University of New South Wales) will primarily target international students, both domestic and international students (from the region) are key to transnational enrollments. Equally, transnational enrollments are diverse by age. According to the Singapore Department of Statistics, about 35 percent of private-sector tertiary enrollments were aged 30 and over in 2003, and perhaps another third were aged between 25 and 29. A government target of 60 percent cohort participation by 2010 and adult learning initiatives spurred by the proposed national open university will see longer term cohort decline offset by increased youth participation and a more active lifelong learning sector. Nonetheless, the Singapore higher education market is undoubtedly becoming more competitive.

In June 2003, SIM offered 62 programs with foreign universities, accounting for 12 percent of all registered transnational provision in Singapore and amounting to more foreign programs than offered by any other local partner.

WILL FOREIGN DEGREES BE JETTISONED?

SIM is the most significant local partner for foreign providers. In June 2003, SIM offered 62 programs with foreign universities, accounting for 12 percent of all registered transnational provision in Singapore and amounting to more foreign programs than offered by any other local partner. Foreign partners include University of London External Program in the United Kingdom, Beijing University in China, RMIT University in Australia, and George Washington University in the United States. SIM also plays a major role in distance learning in Singapore. In 1992, the organization was appointed by the government to run the Open University Degree Program (to offer distance learning in collaboration with the U.K. Open University). The now named SIM Open University Centre has ambitions to become an independent open university in its own right and is the likely core of the announced national open university. According to the U.K. Open University, the SIM

arrangement is the university's largest overseas collaboration, with over 1,000 students a year and over 4,000 graduates to date. It is not clear whether the Open University alliance is part of SIM's long-term plans, but degree-awarding powers and university title would be bound to undermine in the long term the value of transnational degree-awarding arrangements.

There are numerous private colleges and companies partnering with foreign universities to offer degrees in Singapore and most will not be in line for degree-awarding powers any time soon. But if leading providers such as SIM decide (or may be required) to jettison foreign degrees, then a significant portion of the current market will shift from transnational to domestic status. This scenario would also see some of the most experienced local partners exit the transnational market, leaving foreign institutions to develop new alliances with perhaps less competent organizations. Even if SIM and others opt to retain foreign programs in some form, it is highly likely that the number of foreign programs will be reduced in favor of a growing portfolio of in-house degrees.

In many ways, these changes are a natural process of development, and some transnational delivery is characterized by a steady extension of autonomy with a view to independence. But as a key market for leading transnational providers in Australia and the United Kingdom, the probable decline in demand for mainstream transnational delivery in Singapore over the next 10 years reinforces the need to explore new models and markets. The Singapore government clearly sees an ongoing role for elite foreign providers focusing on full branch campuses (INSEAD, Chicago, New South Wales) or niche R&D (MIT, Technische Universität München), but for mainstream transnational delivery the "golden age" may be coming to an end. ■

Universities: Family Style

PHILIP G. ALTBACH

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

A worldwide phenomenon in higher education that has been largely ignored is the ownership of private universities by families. While it is impossible to determine how many of these institutions exist, they certainly number at least in the hundreds and very likely many more. Some countries, such as Thailand, where half the private universities are family owned, have a large number. A few are respected high-status institutions that have existed for several generations, while many were recently established during the "higher education boom" of mass enrollments and do not rank at the top of the hierarchy.

The academic institutions in this category need to be examined because they are growing rapidly and although some have existed for a half century or more they are not well understood.

In some countries, these institutions are a significant part of the higher education environment. Family universities exist in the following countries at least: Mexico, Thailand, Taiwan, Japan, South Korea, the Philippines, Argentina, India, and China.

Family universities enable new and innovative educational and management ideas to be developed and tested. They give rein to charismatic educational leaders with a zeal for reform. They may also permit private higher education institutions to operate in the most private and secretive ways to make money or wield influence.

These institutions may be designed to remain under the control of families as a way of ensuring continuity and protecting income.

DEFINITIONS

Academic institutions controlled by family groups are often difficult to distinguish from other private universities. In fact, family institutions sometimes attempt to mask the reality. It may also be difficult to delineate them legally and financially. The definition in this article is a simple one—a family university is an institution established by an individual or family group in which family members remain directly involved and generally dominant in the administration, governance, financial control, and/or direct ownership of the institution. In some countries, family ownership or management may be unlawful or may be legally restricted, and as a result patterns of ownership or control are hidden. If family ownership is not considered quite respectable, institutions may not advertise it. Where academic institutions are essentially business enterprises operated for profit, ownership and financial aspects are kept opaque. The ownership and financial arrangements of private universities in much of the world are often unclear. In this respect family universities do not differ markedly from others.

MOTIVATIONS

Why do individuals and families establish and run universities? In some cases, there is a sense of philanthropy or social mission—a visionary thinker with ideas about education establishes a postsecondary institution that evolves into a family-controlled enterprise over time, especially when the founder must pass leadership on to others. Many of the best-known and respected universities that are either family owned or that stem from family roots are in this category. Universities confer prestige on those involved with them, and may be established to bring honor or status to the founding individuals and families. Entrepreneurs frequently establish universities, especially in developing countries, with the idea of earning money. These institutions may be designed to remain under the control of families as a way of ensuring continuity and protecting income. Even in countries where there is no mechanism for

profit-making higher education, family-owned institutions can be a useful means for creating employment. In some countries, universities are established for political reasons—to help build a constituency for elective office among students and others, to maintain a political base, or develop the local economy as a means of retaining political influence.

In general, family ownership is seen as a way to ensure stability and control, the ability to keep financial aspects of the institutions as confidential as possible, and to maintain the original mission or purpose of the institutions characteristics.

CHARACTERISTICS

Family universities vary considerably, and it is difficult to categorize them. Institutional control is a key element—since the family usually wishes to maintain its power and authority over the institution. Thus, family universities have structures that will permit centralized overall control of the institution. Family members often occupy senior administrative and leadership positions, especially those that relate to financial management. Powerful boards of trustees or directors, dominated by family members, that have responsibility for financial and often academic decision making are also common. Although the structure of institutional control is subject to the norms and legal regulations of particular countries, family universities generally seek to ensure the maximum amount of direct and ongoing control over all aspects of the institution. Exceptions to this pattern include institutions established by individuals or families for philanthropic or idealistic reasons that lose their family links over time—Keio University in Japan is an example.

Family universities typically have very strong and centralized administrative control and hierarchy, even in countries where this is not the norm.

Family universities typically have very strong and centralized administrative control and hierarchy, even in countries where this is not the norm. Presidents, provosts, and other senior administrative officers have great authority over the institution. Concomitantly, the academic staff, and in some countries students, have little decision-making authority. Administrative offices are very often in the hands of family members—with members of the owning family occupying the presidency and also other high positions.

Institutions may be subject to the initiatives of the family leadership group, although in some countries, such as Japan, there are restrictions on the number of family members who can serve on boards of trustees. Facing few checks and balances and little diffused academic authority, the leadership has considerable power over the direction of the institution. This authority may permit innovative programs and new ideas about management to be implemented. The university may be in a position to respond to changes in the marketplace or to

new pedagogical approaches. Or it can be subject to the whims of the controlling family, to academic fads of little value, or to schemes to make quick money. Much depends on the motivations and judgment of the family owners.

Given the centralized control and a lack of tradition of shared governance, family universities often maintain power over academic and other staff. There are often fewer guarantees of academic freedom, less scope for autonomy, and the potential for more authority over teaching styles. Family universities may be more efficiently managed because of tight central control, or they may experience whatever questionable policies are forced on the institution by the family group. These distinctive traits may also characterize other private universities—especially those at the lower end of the academic pecking order—but may be exacerbated in family-run institutions. Family ownership does not guarantee efficiency.

CHALLENGES

Family-owned universities face some significant challenges—one of the most important of which is that of continuity: what happens when the charismatic founder-educator passes from the scene? Will other family members carry on the original mission or even continue to run the institution? Will family members possess the skills to provide leadership and manage a university? Will family-owned institutions established for academic, philanthropic, or political reasons be able to sustain the founder's vision over time? Family institutions established for producing revenues may have fewer problems of continuity, but the complexity of academic institutions requires a level of sophistication that goes beyond a typical business enterprise.

Building and maintaining academic quality demands a commitment from the academic community. Recent examples of newly established universities include some that are family owned, have quickly gained a reputation for high-quality academic programs and which have developed impressive facilities. Some of the institutions that began infused with both funds and academic enthusiasm have failed, in part because of inconsistent leadership, failed to achieve their potential. Creating sustained leadership and effective long-term management causes serious problems for family-owned universities as control inevitably passes from one generation to another.

CONCLUSION

It is hard to generalize about this special type of academic institution. Some are visionary institutions established by charismatic educational thinkers. Others are founded to solidify political power, while many others are founded to earn money. In the rapidly changing and ever-expanding landscape of higher education, the phenomenon of family-owned academic institutions is one that requires understanding—and scrutiny—as an emerging category of academic institution. ■

Private versus Public in Romania: Consequences for the Market

LUMINIA NICOLESCU

Luminia Nicolescu is an associate professor at the Academy of Economic Studies, in Bucharest, Romania, and a partner, in the PROPHE Central & East European Regional Center. E-mail: lumin@pc.net.ro.

IHE devotes a column in each issue to a contribution from PROPHE, the Program for Research on Private Higher Education, headquartered at the University of Albany. See <http://www.albany.edu/~prophe/>.

Some 15 years after its creation, private higher education continues to develop alongside public higher education in Romania. On several major fronts (such as quality control, financing, and reputation) there is conflict between the two sectors. An important example, the focus here, concerns confrontation in the market place, affected by developments in legislation, policy, the economy, quality of education, and customer opinions.

THE RISE OF PRIVATE HIGHER EDUCATION

In the early 1990s, private higher education started to develop in Romania within a total legislative vacuum. Private higher education was the first to respond in quantitative and structural terms to the excess educational demand. The new private institutions absorbed much of the educational demand to which the public sector, still under a centralized organization, was unable to respond immediately. The private sector grew fast—mainly in the fields of high demand such as business, law, and the humanities—with the establishment of 83 institutions and 30 percent of total enrollments during the middle and late 1990s. However, in the first years, many of these private higher education institutions were functioning under precarious conditions, with unqualified teaching staff and thus a negative image with respect to quality. In spite of that, demand was high in the education market for the public sector as no alternative was available that was still based on the traditional elitist philosophy. But the majority of private higher education applicants choose it as a second-best option, after either failing or feeling unqualified to gain admission to the public sector. Most of these aspects of private-sector demand have been common elsewhere in the region and beyond.

The introduction of an external quality monitoring system, through the accreditation process, has led to the closing of a number of private institutions (14 in 2001), while others have been accredited. At present, 31 out of the 70 functioning privates have accredited status. Consequently, levels of quality and social legitimacy have increased, but private higher education still has the image of a profit-oriented sector that offers lower

quality education than in the public sector and attracts low-ability students. This unfavorable image, coupled with post-1995 developments in the public sector, has led to a decrease in the private higher education market share (though the raw numbers continue to rise).

THE PRIVATIZATION OF PUBLIC HIGHER EDUCATION

Public education, the only form of higher education in Romania prior to 1990, had high-quality status. It expanded after 1990, both in the number of institutions (44 to 57, 1989–2003), and in enrollments (164,507 to 457,259). The main developments in public higher education have been influenced by a reform process slow paced until 1995, gradually speeding up between 1997 and 2000, and then slowing down again after 2000.

The reform of the public sector meant a decentralization of the decision-making process and granting academic and financial autonomy. Public universities were allowed to make their own academic decisions, and this led to significant program diversification. Public institutions were allowed to raise extra funds—including tuition fees. Consequently, the number of tuition-fee-paying students greatly increased, doubling the total number of students and bringing the ratio of subsidized to paying students to 50:50 in many public universities. In fact, the process represented a privatization of the public sector that led to increased access to public higher education and thus a larger extent of market coverage by the public sector. Yet, once the public sector was allowed to develop its private side, many public universities have been blamed for excess embracing of economic motivations and for emphasizing quantity over quality. Notwithstanding such criticism, the demand for public higher education has continued to grow. Key aspects of the public privatization and transformation in Romania are also common in other postcommunist countries.

Initially private higher education grabbed a part of the market from a public sector suffering from centralization and inertia.

PUBLIC VERSUS PRIVATE HIGHER EDUCATION IN THE MARKET

Initially private higher education grabbed a part of the market from a public sector suffering from centralization and inertia. But lately the public sector's privatization has shifted the market relationship between public and private in two directions. First, many students would rather attend a public university as fee-payers than a private one, to obtain an education with a perceived better quality and a stronger reputation. So the privatization of the public universities takes place at the expense of the private ones. In 2000–2003, a 35 percent increase in total enrollments took place, while the percentage of private higher education total enrollments decreased from 29.5 to 23.3 percent.

The second direction is the increase in the number of fee-paying master's programs offered by public universities, in which access is generally free, where the so-called phenomenon of "diploma washing" takes place. This means that graduates of private universities enroll in master's programs at a public university in order to "clean" their initial diplomas, raise the credibility of their studies, and obtain final degrees from a renowned public university.

To conclude, private higher education has started to lose market share lately, as trends on quality diverge: the private sector improves due mainly to accreditation requirements, while the public sector allows its new economic freedom to claim increased market share at the expense of quality. These tendencies do not mean that private-sector quality matches public-sector quality or that private growth has ended. They do, however, suggest a new stage of Romanian private-public marketplace competition, reflecting wider regional tendencies. ■

Analyzing a Private Revolution: The Work of PROPHE

DANIEL C. LEVY

Daniel C. Levy is director for the Program of Research on Private Higher Education (PROPHE) and Distinguished Professor, at SUNY (University at Albany). Address: School of Education, University at Albany, Albany, NY 12222, USA. E-mail: dlevy@uamail.albany.edu.

Readers of *IHE* have seen a major flow of entries on private higher education in recent years. This flow reflects what can reasonably be characterized as a "private revolution." Around the world, private higher education has greatly expanded or otherwise gained prominence, often quite suddenly or surprisingly, though usually linked to wider political-economic tendencies of privatization. Complementing and often interacting with the surge in private higher education is the multifaceted privatization of public higher education.

Yet private higher education remains largely a niche field for scholarship. Mainstream higher education literature has shown academia's common sluggishness in identifying and analyzing fast-changing phenomena. On the other hand, news pieces and reports proliferate, showing little or no awareness of private higher education elsewhere or of concepts and data from the still small scholarly literature. Ad hoc impressions and heated and poorly informed polemics usually predominate while vital and multiple policy issues are at stake in country after country.

PROPHE

Against that background, PROPHE (Program for Research on Private Higher Education) was created, 2000, at the University at Albany, SUNY. It is financed mostly by the Ford Foundation.

PROPHE is dedicated to building knowledge about private higher education worldwide. Neither pro- nor anti-private, PROPHE does, however, engage major policy issues and dissemination for decision makers and the general public.

PROPHE is a network of scholars in some 20 countries. It additionally includes partner centers and emerging regional centers as well as a network of students working on dissertations on the subject of private higher education. By design, PROPHE is mostly composed of junior scholars.

To see output and activities, see <http://www.albany.edu/eps/~prophe/>. Output includes working papers, edited books, other publications, and conferences. It also includes compilations and analyses of data, relevant laws, and news features from around the world. A large bibliography (2004)—produced in partnership with Boston College’s CIHE—provides a guide for scholars and policymakers. CIHE also cooperates by allocating to PROPHE a regular column in IHE.

PROPHE is a network of scholars in some 20 countries. It additionally includes partner centers and emerging regional centers as well as a network of students working on dissertations on the subject of private higher education.

ENROLLMENTS

PROPHE’s developing database covers institutions, faculty, field of study, diploma or degree levels, geographical concentrations, and the like. Culling just system enrollments from the total picture, we get a quick feel of the breadth and intensity of the private revolution.

No region is unaffected. Postcommunist Eastern and Central Europe has moved from virtually 0 to as high as 20 and 30 percent in some countries. China is now about 10 percent private, and Mongolia and Southeast Asia have private sectors. Major developments likewise characterize South Asia and the Middle East as well. Several Asian countries with long-standing private higher education show large majority enrollments (Japan, Philippines, and South Korea). Latin America’s roughly 40 percent average also includes countries with private majorities (Chile, Brazil, and the Dominican Republic). Africa has come recently from near 0 to figures as high as 20 percent in countries like Kenya.

Analysis shows that the private revolution is much clearer and dramatic in developing than developed regions. Western Europe remains the region with the least private higher education, though interesting changes are emerging there, too, and private higher education now has a notable place in New Zealand and Australia. Furthermore, the nature as well as the size of enrollments is changing. U.S. private higher education holds rather steady, around 21 percent, but dramatic is the rise of for-profits as well as a more general commercialization of nonprofit (and even public) institutions. Japan has just begun to experiment with for-profits.

ISSUES FOR ANALYSIS

So the private higher education revolution is not about numbers alone. It is also about profound changes within the sector. A related subject for study is how private higher education fits into broader higher education reform trends internationally, from finance to governance, accountability, autonomy, accreditation, and much more. Beyond “fit” is even the question of leadership: how, how much, and where does private higher education lead major higher education changes?

At the same time, analysis shows that private higher education is far from just one phenomenon. It varies greatly across regions, across countries, and even within countries. Subsectoral variation is huge, as the for-profit versus nonprofit matter shows and as differences among religious/cultural, academic, and commercial subsectors further show. Without doubt, the most extensive and profound revolution has been occurring on the commercial side.

Analysis must be intersectoral as well. PROPHE looks at changing degrees and at the distinctiveness and similarities between the private and public sector. Comparisons include private subsectors versus public subsectors. Additional issues, often crucial for policy analysis as well, concern intersectoral cooperation and conflict. Cooperation has in many countries gone as far as formal private institution partnerships with public institutions.

PROPHE thus has an active and expanding research agenda. Yet it is a daunting challenge to try to document and analyze the private higher education revolution that is sweeping so much of the world. ■

University-Industry Partnerships Reconsidered: MIT, Cambridge, and Tokyo

SACHI HATAKENAKA

Sachi Hatakenaka is an independent researcher and consultant on higher education policy and organizational management, and is currently a Research Fellow at the Industrial Performance Center at MIT. E-mail: sachi@alum.mit.edu.

University-industry partnerships have been a hot topic for universities, industry, and governments alike. That universities should play an economic role is becoming a dominant view globally, though everyone interprets the concept differently. Universities tend to see relationships with industry as new revenue sources. Industry focuses on narrow benefits such as student recruitment or specific technical solutions. Governments, on the other hand, want universities to generate new industries or to stimulate existing ones and often see spin-offs or licensed patents as an obvious metric of success.

These respective wishes have often led to some tensions.

Many universities have become disappointed as only a small fraction of patents turn out to be lucrative. Performance metrics by governments on patents and spin-offs have led to an artificially large number of spin-offs or patents from universities—often without clear commercial success in spite of public subsidies. Complaining that universities are becoming greedy, companies demand confidentiality agreements that are hard for universities to deal with, given freely mobile students.

THE ECONOMIC ROLE OF UNIVERSITIES

My past research, which compared the experience of MIT to that of Cambridge and Tokyo (Routledge, 2004), as well as my recent research on the role of universities in regional innovation systems, suggests that universities can integrate this new economic mission into their normal business of education and research, by learning to conduct these traditional tasks differently. Universities could enable students to acquire knowledge and skills relevant in a changing world and to explore fundamental issues through research. Society will benefit, not from universities becoming more like companies but from their becoming good partners to practitioners, while remaining a separate sphere of knowledge creation and diffusion. The key is for universities to be “connected” to the real world so that their activities can be relevant.

Many universities have become disappointed as only a small fraction of patents turn out to be lucrative.

NETWORKED ACADEMICS

At the heart of any organizational capability for relevance are well-networked academics. They can be connected to the real world through consulting, joint research, conferences, or even alumni networks. Networking with industrialists enables academics to learn what the real problems are in industry and to be exposed to know-how and private knowledge that would otherwise remain hidden behind corporate walls. One Nobel Prize Laureate from MIT described consulting academics as “pollinating butterflies”; they see the problems faced by multiple companies and can offer solutions based on insight gained from such exposure.

Such networked academics can also be an effective conduit for relevance in teaching. Their role is the same as before—teaching their students basic learning skills that are helpful for the rest of their lives—but they use updated materials and topics, selected on the basis of thinking about where industry might be going. Networked academics are able to benefit from private knowledge in industry to help them decide what students should learn. Contemporary and real-life examples help motivate students in their studies and in applying their skills later. Their students would not only acquire up-to-date knowledge but would also be imbued with interest in spheres of emerging importance.

In research, networked academics have another role to play—conducting research with an eye to applications. By the time they make discoveries, they may be well aware of the potential applications of their discoveries. They belong to what the literature of science calls “Pasteur’s Quadrant”—scholars undertaking science as Pasteur did but being interested in applications, as he was.

Well-networked academics existed in all three universities that I examined: MIT, Cambridge, and Tokyo. However, the differences were found in the frequency of their activities, in how easily academics could network with the outside world, and in how successful they were in scaling up their activities by collaborating with other academics and recruiting students or postdocs. These differences appeared to arise from the ways in which the three universities managed their organizational boundaries, externally and internally.

DEFINING EXTERNAL BOUNDARIES

In Tokyo, my research took place at an early stage of on-going reforms (ca. 1999–2000), well before the university became incorporated and autonomous in 2004, and so their academics were still subject to civil service and other government regulations. While these policies did not stop enterprising academics from developing their own ties to industry, it took so much more work and effort on the part of individual academics to develop agreements with companies and establish norms about student participation and confidentiality agreements—all with virtually no help from the university. The university was good at replicating a very limited range of “acceptable” industrial partnerships, but it was not good at supporting academics in forging new ones. Universities’ organizational boundaries were more impermeable and less negotiable than in the other two universities.

The university’s boundary was fuzzy, but it was up to individual academics to define how to work with industry.

In Cambridge, which was another place where university-industry relationships were being actively debated and undergoing significant change, the rules did not dictate against networking. Indeed there was very little that academics could not do, and some academics managed to develop very deep relationships with their industrial partners, from whom they gained substantial insight and support. The university’s boundary was fuzzy, but it was up to individual academics to define how to work with industry. This can be contrasted with MIT, where there were fairly clear rules as to how much and what kind of work academics could undertake outside and in what ways collaboration with industry could be undertaken on campus. MIT’s external boundaries were well regulated and clear; there were set norms about how to work with industry, which allowed academics easily to engage in and to develop relationships with industry.

UNIVERSITIES' INTERNAL BOUNDARIES

Another difference found was the way internal boundaries were defined and managed. In Tokyo, academics readily worked with colleagues in their disciplines from other universities, but there were fewer interdisciplinary collaborations. Interdisciplinary research was often a result of individual academics purposefully electing to undertake research in new fields, rather than a collaborative venture between academics from different disciplines, though several organizational units have been created to encourage the development of new fields. In Cambridge, the college environment was helpful in encouraging interdisciplinary encounters among academics, but it was not easy to find organizational or physical space for sustaining and scaling up collaborative work. Disciplinary boundaries were not easy to cross, nor were there mechanisms to expand such interdisciplinary activities into new fields.

At MIT, there was an organizational arrangement called a "research center," which was an organizational space in which academics from different disciplines could assemble to undertake research. Research centers could expand their activities depending on their ability to attract external resources and thus recruit graduate students, postdocs, and even senior researchers. But tenured academics came from and continued to belong to traditional disciplinary communities—until the new field became sufficiently established to affect departmental boundaries. Interdisciplinary research centers also provided generic "labels" helpful to industry, whose problems are rarely confined to a single discipline.

Research centers could expand their activities depending on their ability to attract external resources and thus recruit graduate students, postdocs, and even senior researchers.

The picture I found was one in which the universities used industrial and private knowledge to nurture the future workforce and to advance science. The beneficiaries were not confined to the individual companies with whom universities worked but included the industry of the day and that of tomorrow. My conclusion is that the ability of universities to perform such an economic role depends very much on the way they define and maintain organizational boundaries, both externally and internally.

THE ROLE OF ADMINISTRATORS

In this connection, a key role in managing boundaries can be played by university administrators. Universities change slowly and do not usually tolerate unilateral decisions from administrators, but considerable room exists for administrators who understand academic values to negotiate sensibly and to modify and enforce rules that would enable academics to engage in outside activities more readily and easily. The norms and rules—about consulting or contract agreements with indus-

try—all contributed to ensuring a certain porosity in a university's external organizational boundaries.

Likewise, the administrators are the ones who hold the key to making the boundaries between disciplines more permeable by providing space and seed money for interdisciplinary activities. Administrators could also provide organizational incentives and support for individual academics and for academic units to undertake collaborations, which in turn would help promote new fields selectively in both research and education.

These are not easy tasks. What appears to be important is for the administration to comprise not only academic-administrator hybrids (academics who turned into administrators) who can understand core academic values as well as the nature of disciplinary boundaries but also industry-administrator hybrids who bring in the values of outside worlds. It helps for the administration to have such "bilingual" and "trilingual" individuals who can understand and speak all three languages of academics, industrialists, and administrators. It is these hybrids who best manage the external and internal boundaries sensibly and effectively.

So is there a role to be played by the government? I argue that there is.

THE ROLE OF GOVERNMENTS

So is there a role to be played by the government? I argue that there is. In MIT, many of the important interdisciplinary centers were established as a result of government funding. Small research grants from industry can help hundreds of small interdisciplinary projects to flourish, but there is also a critical need for larger bulk funding to develop a cohesive scientific community. Bottom-up identification of scientific agenda through proposals from individual scientists is critical, but when these can be fostered in an environment of concentrated funding, research communities develop more readily. The National Institutes of Health and Departments of Energy and of Defence were all important sources of funding for basic science in the United States, motivated by their interest in applications; these agencies were pumping federal money into the basic sciences that they believed to be relevant fields. Federal funding provided another mechanism for American universities to push the frontiers of science in keeping with Pasteur's Quadrant.

Ultimately, universities must be the ones that define their economic role, but what governments and industry do can condition the institutions' activities in critical ways. It takes all three parties to help universities become relevant to the society. ■

State Policies, Academic Research, and Economic Development

ROGER L. GEIGER

Roger L. Geiger is Distinguished Professor of Higher Education and senior scientist at the Center for the Study of Higher Education, Pennsylvania State University. Address: 400 Rackley Bldg., University Park, PA 16802-3203. E-mail: rlg9@psu.edu.

A salient theme of public policy at the start of the 21st century has been the encouragement of technology-based economic development. From member countries of the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development to developing countries, policymakers have sought schemes that would create enduring links between industry and science to stimulate innovation and growth. The vital contribution expected from science makes these policies important for universities. This has been especially true in the United States. There, individual state governments have implemented policies that should be of interest to any polity concerned with fostering technology-based economic development.

State governments have long invested in research at local universities in the expectation of producing economic benefits, beginning with agriculture. Since 1980, state policies have sought to encourage interactions between industry and universities, with the specific aim of stimulating the development and transfer of technology. Since 2000, state policies have enlarged this previous pattern with new policies aimed at technology creation rather than technology development. Such policies are predicated on a more sophisticated model of factors inducing economic growth, and strengthening the research infrastructure of universities is a key strategy.

THE STATES' PROBLEM

States perceived that the greatest potential for economic payoffs would come from additional investments in science-based research technologies. However, investing in basic research in such fields presented the same kind of pitfalls for states as it did for private firms; particularly, uncertainty whether investors could capture any value created or if it would escape as "economic spillover."

Policy considerations on this last point were shaped by the dazzling exemplar of Silicon Valley. As reflected in the policy literature, Silicon Valley possessed the advantages of agglomeration: the clustering of research universities, high-tech corporations, and smaller start-up firms not only produced a resource-rich environment in which innovation flourished, but it also retained spillovers within the region. Such clusters generated a greater collective intelligence on which participants came to depend, igniting economic growth and concentrating it as well.

Creating another Silicon Valley might be chimerical, but the rationale and policy design nevertheless followed from this analysis and have now become widely accepted. The starting point is some source of comparative advantage. Most major research universities not only possess expertise in several research technologies, but also have to some extent spawned clusters of related firms and other institutions. In order to build on these strengths, state policies aimed to augment and upgrade the research infrastructure in strategic fields. Special funding has been directed to the hiring of star-quality professors and the erection of state-of-the-art infrastructure. Expectations are that economic payoffs will occur through the creation of human capital for industry, but especially through the creation of intellectual property (IP), licensed to major corporations or more likely developed through spin-off firms. The policy thus needs to make provisions to nurture this latter process with IP offices, business incubators, management assistance for start-ups, and venture capital.

Creating another Silicon Valley might be chimerical, but the rationale and policy design nevertheless followed from this analysis and have now become widely accepted.

TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT VS. TECHNOLOGY CREATION

Although technology creation and technology development would seem to overlap, they represent fundamentally different pathways to technology transfer. Since the 1980s, technology development policies in the United States have been generally successful. They were based on a traditional model of university-industry interaction in which basic or university research served primarily to enhance the effectiveness of industrial research. The policies of the 1980s furthered such interaction by creating arrangements for collaborative research, such as engineering research centers. Such units brought university expertise to bear on problems relevant to industry; and state subsidies lowered the price enough to make it cost-effective for industry. Thus, the initiative in choosing topics for research lay primarily with industry, technology transfer took the form of expertise shared with industry, and IP was ultimately developed in industrial laboratories. Policies for technology creation differ in three important ways.

First, the role of technology creation depends heavily on universities and academic science. Basic research is the preferred task of universities, and the favored research technologies present enormous scientific as well as technological challenges. The state-sponsored institutes at the University of California are focused on biotechnology, nanotechnology, and information sciences. New York's initiatives support these same general areas but in a more dispersed fashion; for example, the state assists nanotechnology units on six campuses, public and private. Georgia created a program for broadband technology and related chip design. The appearance that these

and other states are crowding into the same areas may be misleading. Rubrics like biotechnology and nanotechnology conceal myriad specialized fields, each with unique research challenges and commercial possibilities.

Second, technology creation by its nature must aim for the highest possible quality. These intensely competitive fields resemble “winner take all” situations where the best knowledge is far more valuable than the second best. Not accidentally, state initiatives in New York, Florida, and South Carolina are called “centers of excellence.” More important, states have emphasized investments in top-flight scientists by creating special chairs to accompany these research units.

Third, states have taken the theory of agglomerations to heart. Georgia's intention was to make Atlanta a hub for broadband R&D and manufacture. Michigan dubbed its initiative the “Life Sciences Corridor.” New York consciously intended to nurture a biotechnology corridor on Long Island and a nanotechnology cluster around Albany. The extent to which these aspirations are fulfilled may never be precisely determined, but the policy thrust is notable. Universities are no longer seen as discrete organizations, but rather as parts of larger innovation systems. Greater cooperation across institutions may be a permanent legacy of these policies.

Universities are no longer seen as discrete organizations, but rather as parts of larger innovation systems.

IMPLICATIONS

These policies have brought a huge investment in the research capacity of American universities that would not otherwise have been made. All state strategies sought to employ leverage—the use of state resources to mobilize additional resources from industry, philanthropy, the federal government, and universities themselves. New York expected a 3-to-1 ratio of matching funds for its Centers of Excellence program; The California institutes were matched more than 2-to-1; and South Carolina asked its Centers of Excellence merely to match the state appropriation. Whether or not these policies prove effective in promoting economic development, they have contributed materially to the nation's capacity for fundamental research in economically strategic subjects.

On the other hand, the role of technology creation, through its dependence on IP, draws universities ever more deeply into the commercial realm. Without endorsing recent strictures against commercialization, the university's predicament should still be recognized. Universities stimulate economic activity in a variety of ways. The current emphasis by states on technology creation aims above all at generating knowledge of commercial value, in the form of IP. Creating a valuable product inevitably involves universities in the marketplace. Although their foremost and ultimately most valued function is to create intellectual capital, they can hardly avoid selling IP

to parties who can realize its monetary value. State policies to promote economic development through university research have thus tilted the balance further toward the commodification of academic knowledge. ■

Corruption in China's Higher Education System: A Malignant Tumor

RUI YANG

Rui Yang is a research assistant professor in the Faculty of Education at the University of Hong Kong and a senior lecturer in the Faculty of Education at Monash University. Address: Comparative Education Research Centre, Faculty of Education, University of Hong Kong, Pokfulam Road, Hong Kong, China. E-mail: yangrui@hkucc.hku.hk.

Broadly defined by Transparency International, a non-governmental monitoring group, as “the abuse of public office for private gain,” corruption also constitutes an element of higher education in many parts of the world. The term academic corruption in mainland China usually refers to such violations as misrepresenting one's educational background or work experience, plagiarism, distortion of research data, affixing one's name to someone else's publications, and making false commercial advertisements, as well as other acts. Yet, the scope of infractions is much broader than imagined and includes corrupt behavior on the part of individuals and groups that is actually endemic to the entire system.

Since the 1990s, corruption has seriously threatened mainland China's universities in their teaching, research, service to society, and international links and exchanges. Yet, discussions of corruption have been largely confined to exchanges on the Internet. The Chinese masses know little of these discussions. Media coverage within China remains fragmentary and superficial. The government has just begun to address this issue by instituting countermeasures. The Ministry of Education promulgated Academic Norms Regarding Philosophy and Social Science Research in Higher Learning Institutions in early September 2004.

In China, the scale of corruption pertains to almost all aspects of higher education. This article focuses on three aspects that are indicative of academic corruption in other parts of the system.

RESEARCH ADMINISTRATION

The current quality of research conducted in China often suffers due to rampant plagiarism. A professor from the Southwest University for Nationalities even refers to China's academe as a “plagiarist's paradise.” In early 2002, Wang Mingming from the Department of Sociology of Peking University became notorious because 100,000 words in his

book, *Imaginary Alien Nation*, are identical to some sections of *Cultural Anthropology*, by American anthropologist William A. Haviland. Wang, however, is just one of a list of academic cheaters. A dean of engineering at Shangdong University and a member of the Chinese Academy of Sciences (CAS), a president at Southeast University and a member of the Chinese Academy of Engineering (CAE), and a full professor and dean of law at Shanghai University, for example, were all found to have committed “serious cheating.” What distinguishes these examples is that these academics have all successfully maintained their high positions.

Corruption in research, however, goes far beyond plagiarism. Individual violations are closely related to the way the system operates. While economic and political corruption attracts widespread attention, academics avoid scrutiny due to the special nature of their profession but have also abandoned the traditional values of the university.

With regard to research funding, many academics make a great effort to apply for grants and to build up personal relationships to strengthen their chances of winning. However, large grants are usually dispersed among the most prominent scholars in the various fields. Moreover, in order to encourage research, the different levels of government and universities allow a substantial percentage of the grant money to go directly into researchers’ own pockets, and the rest of the funding can also be used quite freely for personal purposes. Similarly, decisions regarding awards, promotions, and bonuses are sometimes determined more by power than qualifications.

Some do little academic work but enjoy the powerful status of vice ministerial-level rank.

The desire for power has created academic overlords of various sorts. Some do little academic work but enjoy the powerful status of vice ministerial-level rank. A typical example involved the research on SARS in 2003. While some scientists on the mainland identified the prime culprit a few weeks before their Hong Kong peers, they did not dare to publicize their findings because the authorities had already taken a different position on the situation.

Another kind of academic overlord, according to the Chinese academics interviewed, is a director or faculty dean at a research institution who appoints people on the basis of favoritism, seizes funds for personal use, and deceives supervisors while deluding subordinates. Shanxi Institute of Coal Chemistry, affiliated to the CAS, for example, received more than 100 million yuan of funding within the past few years but produced only six international publications. The institute’s directors’ annual income, however, amounted to 10 times that of a professor’s salary. When questioned on how to increase productivity, one of the directors asked for another 200 million yuan of investment from the government. These practices

combine to create an environment in which only holding an official position can secure one’s survival in the pecking order.

ACADEMIC PROMOTION

The differentiation of the professoriate in China is unique, internationally. Professors promoted before 1988 enjoy pay and conditions otherwise only granted to high-ranking officials. Nowadays, the professoriate includes at least six to eight levels. Due to the establishment of the 985 Project, which aims at creating world-class universities, the government has invested heavily in a few select universities. Most of them have used a considerable part of the investment to attract talented staff, increase academic salaries, and restructure professorial ranks into three levels of posts.

The differentiation of the professoriate in China is unique, internationally.

The differentiation is linked to the dramatic increase in the number of professors and shows their rapid loss of status. Academic promotion is based more on personal connections than on professional achievement. According to our interviewees, this is also the case in the promotion of professors as doctoral advisers at the institutional level and in the election of CAS and CAE members, which means a readjustment of individual, group, and institutional benefits.

In sharp contrast to the decline in self-esteem of professors, the cost of CAS and CAE members has risen substantially. In order to become a member, the candidate and his or her institution spare no expense for “packaging” and relationship building. Being elected to be a CAS or CAE member means one takes on an official status as an academic authority, with pay and conditions at the level of vice minister, and control of a large amount of research funding. The criteria employed are more related to the strength of the candidate’s institution, references, alma mater, and personal contacts. The reason for universities to support these efforts is that powerful CAS and CAE members are crucial in winning a range of competitions with their peers, and thus vital to the financial strength of the institution.

DOCTORAL STUDENTS’ TRAINING

In a “great leap forward,” over the past decade the number of doctoral students increased dramatically in China. Doctoral programs benefit both academic advisers and institutions. The establishment of these programs requires permission from the Ministry of Education, which commissions panels to review applications annually. Universities often spend millions of yuan on “public relations” in support of their applications to obtain permission to launch a program. Once a doctoral program is established, academics from other programs within the institution, and even some from other institutions, use it as a basis of support for their promotion to be doctoral advisers

and for recruiting doctoral students. Since 1998, Xiangtan University, for example, has been determined to “win permission for doctoral programs at all costs,” and by 2004 this policy resulted in nine programs. As the number of doctoral students is directly linked to government appropriation, the growing number of fee-paying doctoral students is a substantial contributor to university revenues.

A related phenomenon is the relationships and subtle dealings between universities and people in business and government, many of whom are enrolled in doctoral studies, but not all of them perform the work of degree programs. Cash, power, and influence become corrupting factors and compromise academic standards. One doctoral student at the Beijing University of Science and Technology completed an entire thesis within a week. Such practices have compromised the quality of doctoral students’ training. This explains why an examiner from the Chinese Academy of Social Sciences became such a newsworthy figure when he rejected a student’s doctoral thesis in 2003.

Corruption in higher education relates closely to institutional aspects of China’s system.

CONCLUSION

Corruption in higher education relates closely to institutional aspects of China’s system. The effect on higher education development and on the entire nation’s modernization is devastating, particularly because science and education have been officially identified as strategically significant in China’s nation-building. My research has repeatedly confirmed that many Chinese diaspora scholars with good intentions to return and serve China shrink back at the sight of corruption.

Corruption also greatly hinders the internationalization of China’s higher education. It is even more detrimental to scholarly exchanges between the Chinese mainland and Hong Kong: Hong Kong has played a role as the “beachhead” of China’s higher education internationalization by providing crucial benefits to the mainland while maintaining its own sense of standards.

An analysis of corruption in China’s higher education demonstrates how the corporate “Western” managerial and market accountability mechanisms are becoming layered on top of a more traditional accountability based on personal relationships in the form of *Guanxi*. The result has been corruption of accountability procedures in China’s current higher education system. The modified Western and traditional modes of accountability operate under different sets of rules, and the two are in constant tension. This has been confirmed by an overwhelming number of respondents in my research within recent years. ■

China’s Universities on the Global Stage: Perspectives of University Leaders

RUTH HAYHOE AND JULIA PAN

Ruth Hayhoe is a professor at the Ontario Institute for Studies in Education, University of Toronto. E-mail: hayhoe@bellsouth.net. Julia Pan is a senior research officer at the Institute for Environmental Studies, University of Toronto. E-mail: jpan@oise.utoronto.ca. Address for both: OISE/UT, 6/F, 252 Bloor St. West, Toronto, Canada M5S 1V6.

The Chinese government has had a policy of giving priority funding to its top universities since 1993, when it announced the 211 Higher Education Project, which opened the way for universities across the country to make strategic bids for acceptance among China’s top 100 institutions and be funded to reach world-class standards in the 21st century. At the time of Peking University’s centenary in May 1998, the 985 World-Class University Project was launched; it has continued to concentrate high-level funding on a much smaller number of top universities.

In July 2004, we interviewed the senior vice presidents of three universities in the Shanghai area that are among the nine top-ranking institutions first selected for the 985 Project: Fudan University, Shanghai’s leading comprehensive university; Shanghai Jiaotong University, which has a high profile in science and engineering; and Zhejiang University, in nearby Hangzhou. We also interviewed the president of East China Normal University, one of two national leaders in teacher education. These university leaders agreed that Chinese universities should be taking active steps to raise China’s cultural profile consonant with the country’s growing economic role. At the same time they noted that scientific achievements and reputation have been the main focus of their efforts to reach world-class standing and that Chinese intellectuals continue to be hampered by limits on intellectual freedom—limits that constrain initiatives in the area of thought and culture. Each of these leading figures gave us a somewhat different picture of recent aspirations and achievements.

CONSTRAINTS ON THE NURTURING OF THINKERS

Fudan’s vice president described one of Fudan’s greatest strengths as a tradition of academic independence going back to its early years as a private university, which will be celebrated in its upcoming centenary year in 2005. He stressed Fudan’s responsibility for nurturing “thinkers” first and foremost, yet expressed frustration at the fact that there are still many “forbidden zones” of research on health issues such as AIDS and SARS, also in politically sensitive areas such as the Tiananmen tragedy of 1989 and the Cultural Revolution of 1966. He drew attention to the University of Tokyo’s movingly

worded new charter, put into effect in March 2003, and told us he was urging Fudan's president to have Fudan articulate a charter giving clear expression to its academic mission in time for its centenary anniversary. In terms of leadership, he expressed a quiet pride in the fact that senior appointments are now based entirely on academic criteria and explained how the president of Peking University, noted biologist Xu Zhihong, had chaired Fudan's recent search committee for dean of the School of Life Sciences, one of the areas where Fudan is particularly well known.

Shanghai Jiaotong University has an historical standing equal in prestige to that of Zheda, going back to its founding in 1896 by an outstanding Chinese industrialist keen to promote applied sciences.

A MERGED UNIVERSITY

The vice president of Zhejiang University (Zheda) in Hangzhou emphasized the university's long-standing ethos of "seeking truth" (*Qiushi*), going back to its origins as the Qiushi Academy in 1897; and the leadership of a visionary president of the 1930s, the internationally known geologist Zhu Kezhen. He noted Zheda's proven record for nurturing leaders who are both innovative and able to "get things done" (*ganhuo*). Under the Soviet influences of the 1950s, Zheda had been turned into an engineering institution, with its faculties of arts and science, medicine, and law converted into separate higher institutions. Their reintegration into Zheda in 1998 has been seen as one of the most successful university mergers of the recent period and has stimulated the leadership to move actively onto the global stage. The university has recently taken on responsibility for the Asia Pacific leadership of UNESCO's Global Universities Network of Innovation and participates actively in the Association of Pacific Rim Universities, which seeks to interact with the Asia Pacific Economic Cooperation Forum. On the cultural front, Zheda has recently appointed the Harvard-based and world-renowned Confucian philosopher, Tu Weiming, as a visiting professor. The dean of the Faculty of Education is actively developing an "area of excellence" proposal to foster Chinese culture and education for priority funding at the national level.

NEW CULTURAL INITIATIVES

Shanghai Jiaotong University has a historical standing equal in prestige to that of Zheda, going back to its founding in 1896 by an outstanding Chinese industrialist keen to promote applied sciences. Like Zheda, Shanghai Jiaotong suffered serious losses while conforming to the Soviet model, but it has built up its present preeminence through innovative program initiatives of its own, rather than by undertaking a merger. Its original strengths in basic sciences and engineering are now complemented by relatively new schools of management, humanities, media and design, public administration and international

affairs, law, and foreign languages, which highlight aspects of teaching and research that benefit from the university's rich technological traditions. It has also set up its own new medical school. The vice president emphasized the fact that the university's mission, which is undergoing continuous discussion, arises from certain widely shared basic principles—no tolerance of mediocrity, support for innovation and creativity, and a high awareness of society's trust in the outstanding quality of its graduates.

East China Normal University is a much younger institution, having been founded just two years after the 1949 revolution, based on the French/Soviet model of a normal (teacher training) university. It is nationally recognized as one of the top two institutions having a high profile in education, as well as the arts and sciences. The university's president remarked that while China's history of achievements in civilization and culture is simply incomparable, science and technology tends to dominate all contemporary discussion about universities reaching world-class standards. He outlined a national policy that will call on the comprehensive universities selected for the 985 Project to dedicate 15 percent of project funding to the humanities. Universities of science and technology, such as Shanghai Jiaotong, will be required to commit 5 percent to the humanities. Because such institutions lack a strong tradition in the humanities, they are likely to use this funding to "recruit" senior scholars from institutions such as East China Normal University, causing a kind of double threat to universities with strong humanities programs that have not yet been included in the 985 Project.

The university's president remarked that while China's history of achievements in civilization and culture is simply incomparable, science and technology tends to dominate all contemporary discussion about universities reaching world-class standards.

CONCLUSION

It would not be wise to generalize from such a small sample of universities, yet it is evident that institutions shaped by the priority given to science and technology under Soviet influence in the 1950s seem to be in the best position to take the lead in new cultural initiatives. Interestingly, six of the top nine institutions in the 985 Project are in this category, while only three are traditional comprehensive universities.

Note: The first nine leading universities included in the 985 Project include three traditional comprehensive universities, Peking University, Fudan University and Nanjing University; as well as six technologically oriented universities, Tsinghua University, Shanghai Jiaotong University, Xi'an Jiaotong University, Zhejiang University, China University of Science and Technology in Hefei, Anhui Province, and Harbin University of Technology in Heilongjiang Province. ■

World-Class Universities and Chinese Higher Education Reform

KATHRYN MOHRMAN

Kathryn Mohrman is executive director of the Hopkins-Nanjing Center, in the Paul H. Nitze School of Advanced International Studies, at Johns Hopkins University. Address: 1619 Massachusetts Ave. NW, Washington, DC 20036 USA. E-mail: kmohrman@jhu.edu.

China's leaders are eager to have a higher education system of international stature, in part to provide top-quality education for future leaders of the nation and in part to earn greater respect in the global community. In 1998, then President Jiang Zemin announced the goal of building world-class universities in China; subsequently, several top universities received special three-year grants for quality improvements under what is called the 985 Project. For example, Peking and Tsinghua Universities both received 1.8 billion yuan (U.S.\$225 million) in the first round of special 985 funding, while Fudan, Zhejiang, and Nanjing Universities received 1.2 billion yuan (U.S.\$150 million) each. These grants are awarded in addition to special support provided by the 211 Project, an effort to develop 100 top universities for the 21st century. The 985 Project reflects a conscious strategy to concentrate resources on a handful of institutions with the greatest potential for success in the international academic marketplace. Also, the 985 Project implies recognition that China will probably fail to develop 100 internationally recognized institutions, at least in the short run.

INTERNATIONAL COMPETITIVENESS

No agreed-upon definition exists of what constitutes a world-class university, although Chinese academics point most often to greater acceptance of research in international journals, especially in the natural and physical sciences. Other criteria for excellence parallel the wish list of American universities—more buildings, more publications, up-to-date laboratory equipment, star professors, and, always, more money.

The consideration of world-class status within China seems largely imitative rather than creative. In striving for international standing, top Chinese universities compare themselves with Oxford, Yale, and the Sorbonne, although they lack the centuries' long history of Western universities. In addition, many European and North American universities enjoy financial resources that Chinese universities can only envy. Thus it is unlikely that even the top universities in China can compete directly in many areas of academic life.

At the same time, China has a long tradition of scholarship, albeit of a different kind than Western research, yet few Chinese academics today talk about areas in which Chinese scholars have a comparative advantage. The emphasis on the natural and physical sciences forces Chinese professors to play

catch-up to Western research; greater attention to the humanities and social sciences could draw upon China's traditional strengths. It would be quite interesting to learn of a new definition of a world-class university that is not simply an imitation of Harvard but a creative blend of the best of East and West.

DEFINING THE WORLD-CLASS UNIVERSITY

The definition of a world-class university is a topic on which many university leaders have commented. Ambrose King, former vice chancellor of the Chinese University of Hong Kong, provides three characteristics of a great university. First, it has faculty regularly publishing their research in the top "defining" journals in their respective disciplines. Second, the graduate student body is truly international in origin. And third, the graduates are employable anywhere in the world.

A different perspective comes from Ruth Simmons, president of Brown University, in an article entitled "How to Make a World-Class University" (*South China Morning Post*, January 18, 2003). She believes that an excellent university system must be grounded in the culture of the society in which it is located. Universities, she believes, are important institutions to help societies further their specific goals. She emphasizes that "the bedrock of university quality in the United States is peer review, a system in which standards are set by leaders of the field and those leaders are themselves challenged and judged by this process."

"Great universities are not only useful in their own time but in preparing for future times."

Simmons continues by looking toward the future. "Universities promote the capacity of scholars to develop original work that is not immediately applicable or useful. Great universities are not only useful in their own time but in preparing for future times. What allows a great university to do that is as little interference from the state as possible. The role of the state is to provide resources but to give wide latitude to universities' leaders to decide how scholarship is to advance." And, finally, she cautions that "education should never become an assembly line. Once it does, you may have a certain level of production, but you will never get the volume of creative thinkers that make a democratic society work."

A third description of world-class universities is presented by Philip Altbach in "The Costs and Benefits of World-Class Universities" (*Academe*, January-February 2004). He lists a series of characteristics as benchmarks for an analysis of international competitive status: (1) Excellence in research; (2) excellent faculty with job security, appropriate salaries and benefits, and adequate facilities; (3) academic freedom and an atmosphere of intellectual excitement; (4) freedom to pursue knowledge; (5) a significant measure of internal self-governance; and (6) consistent and substantial public financial support.

In each case, these academic leaders are talking about qualitative and quantitative factors, an ethos of intellectual exploration and creativity, and a focus on the long-term role of universities as well as the short-term contributions that institutions can make to their society. An internationally recognized scholarly ethos, however, may take longer to develop than many academic or political leaders in China are willing to admit. Simply buying state-of-the-art laboratory equipment or pushing for more journal articles will not guarantee the kind of intellectual atmosphere that has developed over centuries on European and American campuses. A number of Chinese academic leaders acknowledge this reality when they say that it will take a generation to create truly world-class universities in China.

A number of Chinese academic leaders acknowledge this reality when they say that it will take a generation to create truly world-class universities in China.

THE DESIRE FOR WORLD-CLASS STANDING

The discussion of world-class universities has led analysts of Chinese higher education to ask about the long-term consequences of grafting Western academic practices onto a Chinese base. Will these changes also lead Chinese universities to adopt the highly individualistic ethos that characterizes American institutions, with all the institutional frustrations that ethos entails? Will those values spill over into the larger society with unintended consequences? Will government bureaucracies allow practices that promote academic freedom in the Western sense? Will Chinese academics continue to look outside their borders for standards of excellence, which would imply that Western educational norms are superior and that Chinese universities remain inferior? And, at the extreme, what will distinguish a Chinese university from its international peers once it achieves world-class status?

This article is based on a chapter in the forthcoming volume, *Bridging Minds Across the Pacific: U.S.-China Educational Exchanges, 1978–2003*, edited by Cheng Li, to be published by Lexington Books in March 2005. ■

Internet Resources

Visit our website for downloadable back issues of *International Higher Education* and other publications and resources at <http://www.bc.edu/cihe/>.

Catholic Universities in Central Europe

MARIJAN SUNJIC

Marijan Sunjic is professor of theoretical physics, head of the Centre for Academic Development and Cooperation, and former rector of the University of Zagreb. He was formerly Croatia's ambassador to the Holy See. Address: Faculty of Science, University of Zagreb, P. O. Box 331, HR-10002 Zagreb, Croatia. E-mail: msunjic@phy.hr.

In most Central and Eastern European countries, universities and the rest of society were ruled by the Communist Party, with the curriculum and the faculty heavily indoctrinated by a totalitarian Marxist ideology. After the collapse of communism, the region initiated the process of modernization and structural reform when possible. However, after the initial period of enthusiasm, the efforts were soon blocked or delayed—as it became obvious that the inherited problems and resistance to reforms constituted a greater challenge than anticipated. Frustration grew in many segments of society, especially among Catholic intellectuals, who were foremost among the victims of the communist regimes.

This state of disillusionment led, among other things, to the idea of establishing Catholic universities. In 1992, Peter Pazmany Catholic University was established in Budapest as a successor to the educational institutions started by the Catholic Church back in 1635. In 2000, in Rúomberok (Slovakia), a new Catholic university was set up with just two faculties (philosophy and pedagogy). In Croatia, the Bishops' Conference recently decided to establish a Catholic university, although specific details about the institution have yet to be provided.

HIGHER EDUCATION TRADITIONS

It should be noted that Catholic universities in Central Europe do not share the traditions of countries that have a long history of private higher education. This article refers to countries where public universities traditionally dominate, though many of the oldest and most prestigious universities were established centuries ago by Catholic Church authorities. In fact, the original religious schools usually form parts of public universities in Central Europe (e.g., in Austria, Germany, the Czech Republic, Slovakia, Slovenia, and Croatia), with the exception of Poland and Hungary. Some of these institutions faced many difficulties in the past: the Faculty of Theology, from which the University of Zagreb developed in the 17th century, was expelled from the university by the communist authorities in 1952, though this decision was never officially accepted by the academic community. After 1990, the process of reintegration started and was formalized in 1996 with the Agreement on the Status and Activity of the Faculty of Catholic Theology at the University of Zagreb.

DEFINING THE MISSION OF A CATHOLIC UNIVERSITY

Possible definitions of the mission of a Catholic university include (1) a denominational school of theology and related subjects, intended to train future priests and members of religious orders; (2) a university for Catholics; or (3) a standard university based on a Judeo-Christian value system.

The first definition certainly does not match the original intention of providing modern higher education free of the ideological pressures of the past. Moreover, Croatia, for example, already has two faculties of theology, as parts of the public universities in Zagreb and Split, that function relatively well with state support. While these faculties of theology share all the problems and difficulties facing the academic community, they show no intention of changing their present status.

The second definition—a university for Catholics only—is hardly feasible or desirable and is in conflict with the legislation concerning accredited higher education institutions. Furthermore, this concept might be seen as implying that public universities are not for Catholics, in spite of the fact that public universities are supported with taxes paid by the population, which is largely (in Croatia more than 85 percent) Catholic.

It should be noted that Catholic universities in Central Europe do not share the traditions of countries that have a long history of private higher education.

The third possibility is defining the Catholic university as a university based on a Judeo-Christian value system. However, if this is to be the only distinction, one could argue that *all* universities, like all institutions in our society, should share the value system accepted by the majority of the population. In this particular case that would mean that the education system should reaffirm the traditional values of European civilization—that is, the moral and ethical standards on which our democratic system is based—and this is an especially urgent task in postcommunist countries.

Therefore, the creation of a parallel (i.e., Catholic) university system might be taken by the rest of the society as an indication that Catholics are prepared to give up the desire to be in the mainstream and withdraw again into their separate institutions (“ghettos”), this time of their own free will and not under pressure and persecution as before.

POSSIBLE MODEL OF A CATHOLIC UNIVERSITY

There is little doubt in Croatia, and probably in other postcommunist countries as well, about the need for reform in higher education with greater involvement of Catholics and consideration also of the creation of Catholic universities. Precisely defining the mission of a Catholic university is certainly the crucial element of this project, but one should also analyze other aspects. Are there enough financial and intellectual

resources to support both systems of education—public and private (Catholic)—in the present economic and political context in which the Catholic Church cannot adequately support even the existing faculties of theology? One should consider not only the difficult economic situation in the region, but also the long-term erosion of the middle class and academic community in particular, including the brain drain of young intellectuals.

In order to find its place alongside the existing public universities, a Catholic university as a small private university should find its own specific niche that is both realistic and will produce optimal results.

In order to find its place alongside the existing public universities, a Catholic university as a small private university should find its own specific *niche* that is both realistic and will produce optimal results. Excellence will play a decisive role. One possible model would be for the university to concentrate on the final stages of the academic program—postgraduate and doctoral studies—with small and carefully selected groups of qualified graduate students, thus avoiding expensive, massive undergraduate programs and related financial and personal challenges. With a modern and flexible structure, these academic centers of excellence could enhance their resources and activities in teaching and research through international collaboration and exchange with similar institutions, as well as working with intellectual elites within the country. Also, the positive impact of this project would be immediate and cost-effective, both in the academic community and in the society.

Obviously, determining the feasibility of Catholic universities in Central Europe and their most effective structure will require careful consideration of several nontrivial questions: definition of mission, available intellectual and financial resources, and possible political and social implications. ■

The Higher Education Corruption Monitor

Corruption in all of its many forms has become a central issue in higher education worldwide. Rapid expansion, fueled by growing demand for access; dramatic increase in private higher education providers; the marketization of many aspects of higher education; and the financial problems faced by institutions and teaching and administrative staff have all contributed to a variety of corrupt practices. Academic corruption can be found in all countries but is especially prevalent in countries facing severe economic hardships and resultant pressure on their higher education systems, in systems with little external supervision and inadequate quality assurance mechanisms, and in countries in which there is a good deal of societal corruption.

Because of the academic tradition of probity and reliance on objective and meritocratic values, the problem of corruption is especially important for higher education. Academic institutions and the professoriate claim a special status in all societies—the right to academic freedom, individual and institutional autonomy, and a high social prestige. Universities, after all, are responsible for educating the next generation of leaders, conducting scholarly research, and providing objective social analysis. As the national competitiveness in the global economy comes to increasingly depend on the quality of knowledge generated and on the quality of education provided by a country's higher education institutions, the costs of academic corruption become considerable.

The dictionary definition of corruption will suffice for academe: "impairment of integrity, virtue, or moral principle; inducement to wrong by improper or unlawful means." Corruption in higher education can occur at both institutional and systemic levels and influences university examinations, the conferring of academic credentials, the procurement of goods and services, academic and administrative staff recruitment and promotion, budget allocation and utilization, property management, and the licensing and accreditation of institutions. Instances of academic corruption may involve bribery; facilitation of cheating and impersonation; the establishment of diploma mills; forgery and falsification of examination results, degrees and credentials; patronage, cronyism; and professional misconduct among teachers.

The primary goal of the Higher Education Corruption Monitor is to shed light on corrupt practices of all kinds in different countries, provide resources on current research on corruption in higher education, and serve as a forum for information exchange. The Monitor will collect and, in some cases, summarize news reports, documents, legal testimony, university reports, conference materials, research articles, and other kinds of documentation, and make the data available through a dedicated website. The Monitor will also collect information on policies and initiatives of international agencies and on various measures and reforms undertaken in different countries to address the challenges of corruption in higher education. The Monitor will link its website with websites of other institutions and agencies interested in the topic and with other on-line resources on corruption in order to avoid duplication and at the same time provide maximum attention to the issue. From time to time, the Monitor may issue reports on specific themes relating to corruption in higher education. The Monitor will not seek to verify each item placed on its website but will make every effort to choose reputable reports. The website will be part of the Center for International Higher Education's widely used website.

The Monitor will be coordinated by Natia Janashia, graduate assistant in the Center for Higher Education (e-mail: janashia@bc.edu).

News of the Center

HIGHER EDUCATION JOURNALS DIRECTORY

A new directory of journals in the field of higher education can be found on the Center's website. It includes 169 publications from 31 countries on all continents. The journals all specifically focus on higher education. The predominant language of publication is English, but more than a dozen languages are represented. Information concerning place of publication is provided, and there is a link to the websites of many of the journals. The directory dramatically shows the expansion of the field of research and analysis concerning higher education worldwide. We plan to update it, and welcome comments from our readers and especially would like to know about additional journals. Please e-mail Roberta Malee Bassett (bassett@bc.edu), the directory's compiler, with your comments and additions.

NEW DIRECTORY OF HIGHER EDUCATION CENTERS AND PROGRAMS

We are now preparing an updated edition of our 2000 directory of higher education centers and programs. Deirdre McMyler (e-mail: mcmylede@bc.edu) is coordinating the project. The new edition will update information in the 2000 version and will provide data on centers and programs not included earlier. Much has happened in the field of higher education, and the new edition will reflect these changes. We hope that colleagues worldwide will assist us by providing information and responding to our request for information and updates. The 2000 edition is still available on request from the CIHE for those in developing countries and for sale to others by Oryx Press, a division of Greenwood Publishing, 88 Post Road West, Westport, CT 06881, USA.

ACADEMIC CORRUPTION INITIATIVE

Academic corruption is an increasingly important problem facing many academic systems. The Center will highlight this problem in a new initiative, the Higher Education Corruption Monitor, that will provide information on this topic from sources around the world. Coordinated by Natia Janashia, a graduate assistant in the Center for Higher Education (e-mail: janashia@bc.edu), this project will feature a website focusing on corruption issues, as well as articles in *IHE* from time to time. Additional information can be found in an article in this issue, "The Higher Education Corruption Monitor."

RESOURCE CENTER ON INTERNATIONAL HIGHER EDUCATION

The CIHE is beginning an initiative that will provide summaries of research and information about key issues in international higher education to practitioners in the field. This new program will meet a need articulated by the international education community in the United States for timely and well-organized information about resources and research in selected fields of international education. The specific areas for research will be identified in collaboration with key professionals in the field of international higher education. Partners for this new initiative include the American Council on Education, NAFSA: Association of International Educators, and the Institute of International Education. Liz Reisberg will direct this new program (reisberg@rcn.com). Work will begin soon and we expect to have a new website available in a few months. We welcome ideas for topics that should be explored and reported.

BOOK SERIES

The CIHE is associated with two book series in higher education. The Routledge Dissertation Series in Higher Education publishes some of the best doctoral dissertations concerning higher education. This series is unique in that it provides an outlet for top-quality dissertations to be published. Among the recently published titles are the following: Michael Nugent, *The Transformation of the Student Career: University Study in Germany, the Netherlands, and Sweden*; Peiyong Chen, *Acting "Otherwise": The Institutionalizing of Women's/Gender Studies in Taiwan's Universities*; Sachi Hatakenaka, *University-Industry Partnerships in MIT, Cambridge, and Tokyo*; and Gregory Cascione, *Philanthropists in Higher Education: Institutional, Biographical, and Religious Motivations for Giving*. Further information about the series can be obtained from Ben Holtzman, Editor, Routledge Publishers, 270 Madison Ave., New York NY 10016, USA. E-mail: Benjamin.Holtzman@taylorandfrancis.com; or from series editor Philip G. Altbach.

Higher Education: The Global Context is a new book series published by a new publisher, SensePublishers. Higher education worldwide is in a period of transition, affected by globalization, the advent of mass access, changing relationships between the university and the state, and the new technologies, among others. Higher Education: The Global Context provides cogent analysis and comparative perspectives on these and other central issues affecting postsecondary education worldwide. The series is sponsored by the Center for International Higher Education at Boston College and is edited by Philip G. Altbach. The publisher is SensePublishers, headquartered in Rotterdam, the Netherlands. SensePublishers will make all of its books available electronically without cost on the Internet. To obtain paper copies, however, it will be necessary to purchase the print edition. Books will be published in paperback editions and will be priced competitively. For further information about SensePublishers, contact Peter deLiefde, SensePublishers B.V., P.O. Box 21858, 3001 AW Rotterdam, Netherlands (e-mail: peter.deliefde@sensepublishers.com) or go to the website (www.sensepublishers.com).

New Publications

Becker, William E., and Moya L. Andrews, eds. *The Scholarship of Teaching and Learning in Higher Education: Contributions of Research Universities*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2004. 338 pp (hb). ISBN 0-253-34424-7. Address: Indiana University Press, 601 N. Morton St., Bloomington IN 47404, USA. Based on case studies at Indiana University, a major public research university, this book focuses on Ernest Boyer's ideas on the importance of teaching in academic work, measurement of teaching excellence, and the contributions of teaching to scholarly work. Chapters discuss innovations in this area in

various departments and programs at Indiana University.

Broadhead, Richard H. *The Good of This Place: Values and Challenges in College Education*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2004. 204 pp. \$25 (hb). ISBN 0-300-10600-9. Address: Yale University Press, POB 209040, New Haven CT 06520, USA.

This volume contains a selection of essays on a range of themes relating to contemporary American higher education, including academic freedom and free speech, residential education, challenges facing undergraduates, among others.

Delamont, Sara, and Paul Atkinson. *Successful Research Careers: A Practical Guide*. Maidenhead, UK: Open University Press, 2004. 211 pp. (pb). ISBN 033521201-8. Address: Open University Press, McGraw-Hill House, Shoppenhangers Rd., Maidenhead, Berks SL6 2QL, UK.

A guide to professionals in higher education seeking to pursue a research career, this volume focuses on mentoring, publication, the process of writing, assessment, and other topics. The data and cases are from the United Kingdom, but the themes are relevant internationally.

Dew, John Robert, and Molly McGowen Nearing. *Continuous Quality Improvement in Higher Education*. Westport, CT: Praeger Publishers, 2004. 208 pp. \$39.95. (hb). ISBN 0-275-98389-7. Address: Praeger Publishers, POB 5007, Westport, CT 06881, USA.

Continuous improvement, another trend in the management of higher education institutions, is the focus of this volume. U.S. accrediting standards mandate that universities should be concerned about monitoring and improving their practices continually, and the authors advocate the use of focus groups, self-assessment, benchmarking, and involving students and faculty in the tasks of improvement.

Herndon, Peter, and Robert E. Dugan, eds. *Outcomes Assessment in Higher Education*. Westport, CT: Libraries Unlimited, 2004. 349 pp. \$50 (pb). ISBN 1-59158-098-6. Address: Libraries Unlimited, POB 5007, Westport, CT 06881, USA.

The theme of this volume is higher education quality as reflected through outcomes assessment. A range of themes relating to assessment and accountability are considered, including a number of practical guides to effective assessment by institutions and individual faculty members. The focus is on the United States, except for one comparative chapter.

Kahlenberg, Richard D., ed. *America's Untapped Resource: Low-Income Students in Higher Education*. New York: Century Foundation Press, 2004. 197 pp. (pb). ISBN 0-87078-485-4. Address: Century Foundation Press, 41 E. 70th St., New York, NY 10021, USA.

Noting that two-thirds of young people from the wealthiest quartile of the American population enter college, as opposed to only one-fifth from the poorest quartile, this volume focuses on the need to increase the proportion of students from low-income families in U.S. higher education. Essays discuss the key issues of affordability of higher education for low-income students, improving academic preparation and performance, and the need to increase the proportion of low-income students at the most selective colleges and universities. While this book focuses entirely on the United States, the issue of participation by low-income populations is relevant everywhere.

Observatory on Borderless Higher Education. *Mapping Borderless Higher Education: Policy, Markets, and Competition*. London: Association of Commonwealth Universities, 2004. 404 pp. (pb) ISBN-085143-187-9. Address: Association of Commonwealth Universities, 36 Gordon Sq., London WC1H 0PF, UK.

The OBHE provides some of the most up-to-date and useful information available on international trends in higher education, especially with regard to patterns of cross-border programs and institutions. This book includes reports on such issues as patterns of private growth, transnational markets for higher education, GATS and its implications, trends in the trade of educational services, share price trends among private providers of higher education, and other related themes. Additional information concerning the OBHE can be found on their website (www.obhe.ac.uk).

OECD. *Internationalization and Trade in Higher Education: Opportunities and Challenges*. Paris: OECD, 2004. 316 pp. ff50 (pb). ISBN 92-94-64-01504-3. Address: Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development, 2 rue Andre Pascal, 75775 Paris 16, France.

A comprehensive analysis of cross-border higher education in the three OCED regions—Asia-Pacific, Europe, and North America—this book features detailed essays on each region discussing patterns of student flows, distance education, branch campuses, and other initiatives. Several informative overview chapters provide analysis and statistical information on patterns of international trends in higher education throughout the OECD. This book is one of the most complete surveys of the topic available.

Pawlowski, Krzysztof. *Rediscovering Higher Education in Europe*. Bucharest, Romania: UNESCO-CEPES, 2004. 145 pp. (pb). ISBN 92-9069-180-X. Address: CEPES, 39 Stirbei Voda, Bucharest, Romania.

A broad-ranging essay on the future of higher education, focusing on Europe and particularly on Poland, this volume considers the American challenges to European higher education, the role of knowledge and research, the management of universities, and other topics. The experience of the author as the founder of a private university in Poland informs the analysis.

Powar, K. B., and K. L. Johar, eds. *Private Initiatives in Higher Education*. Yamuna Nagar, India: Sneh Prakashan, 2004. 283 pp. Rs. 500. U.S.\$30 (hb). OSBN 81-901986-1-0. Address: Sneh Prakashan, 521-L Model Town, Jamuna Nagar 135001, India. Focusing on India's large and expanding private higher education sector. Among the topics analyzed are the legal environment for private higher education, the trend toward incorporating universities as businesses, the commercialization of higher education, and private technical education. One section discusses international trends in private higher education.

Rüegg, Walter, ed. *A History of the University in Europe: Universities in the Nineteenth and Early Twentieth Centuries (1800–1945)*, vol. 3. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004. 746 pp. \$150 (hb). ISBN 0-521-36107-9. Address: Cambridge University Press, Edinburgh Building, Cambridge CB2 2RU, UK.

The third volume in a comprehensive analysis of the history of European universities, this book focuses on the 19th and first half of the 20th centuries. Among the areas of concentration are themes and patterns of university development, including the revolutions in such European countries as Germany, Russia, and France in the 19th century. A section deals with the structure of academic development, examining the management of academic institutions, the role of the professoriate, and the diffusion of European models outside of Europe. Students, ranging from student movements to admissions, are considered. A final long section deals with the disciplines—this is especially relevant because the modern academic disciplines emerged during this period. This volume is perhaps the most complete consideration of European higher education during the period that saw the emergence of the modern university.

Tight, Malcolm. *Researching Higher Education*. Maidenhead, UK: Open University Press, 2003. 257 pp. (pb). ISBN 0-335 21117-8. Address: Open University Press, Shoppenhangers Rd., Maidenhead, Berks. SL6 2QL, UK.

An overview of the field of research in higher education, this volume is one of the first efforts to examine the sources of information and analysis on higher education as well as the methodologies of research and

common topics of analysis. The book excludes North America—a major exclusion since much of the research and publication come from that region—and focuses only on material in English from other parts of the world. The topics analyzed here include research on the student experience, course design, system policy, institutional management, academic work, quality issues, and several others.

Tinkler, Penny, and Carolyn Jackson. *The Doctoral Examination Process: A Handbook for Students, Examiners, and Supervisors*. Maidenhead, UK: Open University Press, 2004. 228 pp. (pb). ISBN 033521305-7. Address: Open University Press, McGraw-Hill House, Shoppenhangers Rd.,

Maidenhead, Berks SL6 2QL, UK.

Based on the British-style doctorate, this book provides a practical guide to all aspects of the doctoral examinations—including selection of examining committee members, organizing the exam, assessment, and others. Perspectives from examinees are included.

Wolf-Wendel, Lisa, Susan B. Twombly, and Suzanne Rice. *The Two-Body Problem: Dual-Career-Couple Hiring Practices in Higher Education*. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2004. 196 pp \$42 (hb). ISBN 0-8018-7451-3. Address: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2712 N. Charles St., Baltimore MD 21218, USA.

Half of American academics have spouses or partners who are also in the academic profes-

sion. Policies relating to the recruitment, employment, and promotion of dual-career couples is a subject of considerable importance. This volume explores policies and practices of U.S. colleges and universities—including split and shared positions, non-tenure-track and adjunct positions, and other accommodations. By looking at a range of institutional policies, the authors provide information and analysis concerning the topic.

AN INITIATIVE IN 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. 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.

We are convinced that an international perspective will contribute to enlightened policy and practice. To serve this goal, the Center publishes *International Higher Education*, a book series on higher education, and other publications. We sponsor occasional conferences on key issues in higher education and maintain a resource base for researchers and policy-makers. The Center welcomes visiting scholars for periods of study and reflection. We have a special concern for academic institutions in the Jesuit tradition worldwide, and more broadly with Catholic universities. The Center is also concerned with creating dialogue and cooperation among academic institutions in industrialized nations and in developing countries. We are convinced that our future depends on effective collaboration and the creation of an international community focused on the improvement of higher education in the public interest.

OUR WEBSITE

The Center's award-winning website is a useful source of information and analysis on higher education worldwide. All back issues of *International Higher Education* are available, and an index provides easy access to articles by topic and country. Center publications are also available, and links to relevant higher education websites and information are provided. We are a featured e-link of the World Bank and other agencies.

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

THE PROGRAM IN HIGHER EDUCATION IN THE LYNCH SCHOOL OF EDUCATION, BOSTON COLLEGE

The Center is closely related to the program in higher education at Boston College. The program 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. It features a rigorous social science-based approach to the study of higher education, combining a concern with the broader theoretical issues relating to higher education and an understanding of the practice of academic administration. The Administrative Fellows initiative provides financial assistance as well as work experience in a variety of administrative settings. Specialization is offered in higher education administration, student affairs and development, international higher education, and other areas. Additional information about the program is available from Dr. Karen Arnold, coordinator of the program in higher education, Lynch School of Education, Campion Hall, Boston College, Chestnut Hill, Massachusetts, 02467, USA. Fax: (617) 552-8422. E-mail: arnoldkc@bc.edu. More information about the program—including course descriptions and degree requirements—can be found on-line at the program's website: http://infoeagle.bc.edu/bc_org/avp/soe/hea/JEA/html.

EDITOR

Philip G. Altbach

ASSISTANT EDITOR

Salina Kopellas
Deirdre M. McMyler

EDITORIAL OFFICE

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

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. There is no charge for a subscription.

ISSN: 1084-0613

Our work is supported by the Ford Foundation and by the Lynch School of Education at Boston College. We are indebted to these funders for core sponsorship.