

INTERNATIONAL HIGHER EDUCATION

THE BOSTON COLLEGE CENTER FOR INTERNATIONAL HIGHER EDUCATION

NUMBER 41 FALL 2005

Internationalization Trends

- 2 Cross-Border Education: Not Just Students
Jane Knight
- 3 International Students at Indian Universities
Veena Bhalla
- 4 Foreign Universities in India
Sudhanshu Bushan
- 5 International Trends in New Zealand
Vikash Naidoo
- 6 National Regulation of Transnational Higher Education
Line Verbik and Lisa Jokivirta

Markets and Finance

- 8 Innovations in the Allocation of Public Funds
Jamil Salmi and Arthur Hauptman
- 9 In Trouble with Fees
Michael Shattock
- 11 Manpower Planning and University Enrollments in Singapore
Pang Eng Fong and Linda Lim
- 12 Markets, Accountability, and Privatization in the United States
Peter Eckel, Lara Couturier, and Dao Luu

Private Higher Education and Privatization

- 14 The Impact of Public-Sector Privatization in China
Yingxia Cao and Daniel C. Levy
- 15 Private-Public Dynamics: Graduate Education in Uruguay
Pablo Landoni Couture
- 17 Dual Privatization in Georgian Higher Education
Marie Pachuashvili

Countries and Regions

- 18 Mexico's Brain Drain
Sylvie Didou Aupetit
- 19 Afghanistan: Transformation, Reform, and Renewal
William G. Tierney

Departments

- 20 An Anniversary: The Center for International Higher Education
Philip G. Altbach
- 23 Center Publication Series
- 23 New Publications

Cross-Border Education: Not Just Students on the Move

JANE KNIGHT

Jane Knight is an adjunct professor at the Comparative, International, Development Education Centre, Ontario Institute for Studies in Education, University of Toronto. E-mail: janeknight@sympatico.ca.

Over the next 20 years the demand for higher education will definitely outstrip the capacity of some countries to meet domestic need. The Global Student Mobility 2025 Report, prepared by IDP Education Australia, predicts the demand for international education will increase from 1.8 million international students in 2000 to 7.2 million in 2025.

By all accounts these staggering figures present enormous challenges and opportunities. As students continue moving to other countries to pursue their studies, they will remain an important part of the international dimension of higher education. But student mobility cannot satisfy the hunger for higher education within densely populated countries wanting to build human capacity and thus fully participate in the knowledge society—hence the emergence and exponential growth of cross-border education programs and providers. These new types of providers, forms of delivery, and models of collaboration will offer students education programs in their home countries.

PROGRAM AND PROVIDER MOBILITY

During the last few years, the movement of education programs and providers across national boundaries has created a hotbed of activity and innovation. The Observatory on Borderless Higher Education (www.obhe.ac.uk) tracks these new developments and recently reported on the following initiatives. Laureate Education (formerly Sylvan Learning Systems) has purchased (fully or in part) private higher education institutions in Chile, Mexico, Panama, and Costa Rica and owns universities in Spain, Switzerland, and France. Dubai has developed a “Knowledge Village” in the Dubai Technology and Media Free Zone; and to date the London School of Economics, India’s Manipal Academy of Higher Education, and the University of Wollongong from Australia are offering courses through franchising agreements and branch campuses. Phoenix University has become the largest private university in the United States (owned and operated by the Apollo Group company) and is now operating or delivering courses in Puerto Rico, Canada, the Netherlands, and Mexico. The Netherlands Business School (Universiteit Nijenrode) recently opened a branch campus in Nigeria, and Harvard is developing two branch-campus initiatives—one in Cyprus and the other in the United Arab Emirates. Jinan University will be the first Chinese university to open a branch campus outside of China—in Thailand.

Three Canadian universities are formally working with the

Al-Ahram Organization, a large private conglomerate, to establish the Al-Ahram Canadian University, in Egypt. The Canadian University will complement the German, American, and British universities that are already operating in Egypt. The franchise agreement that offers the distance MBA program of Heriot-Watt University from the United Kingdom, through the American University in Egypt, illustrates the complexity of some of the new arrangements among partners. Another example involves the partnership between the Caparo Group, a UK firm with interests in steel, engineering, and hotels and Carnegie Mellon University (US) to set up a new campus in India. In terms of volume alone, in 2002, Australian universities had over 97,000 students enrolled in 1,569 cross-border programs, as of June 2003, Hong Kong had 858 degree-level programs from 11 different countries operating in SAR, and Singapore had 522 degree-level programs from 12 foreign countries.

In addition to these few examples, hundreds of new initiatives have developed in the last five years. Higher education providers, including institutions and private companies, deliver their courses and programs to students in their home countries using a broad range of delivery modes. New programs are being designed and delivered in response to local conditions and global challenges, and new qualifications are being conferred. Clearly it is no longer just the students who are moving across borders. The world has now entered a new era of cross-border education.

THE NEED FOR RELIABLE DATA

There is a serious lack of solid data on the volume and type of cross-border programs and provider mobility. Institutions and national education systems have invested a lot of effort to gather reliable data on student mobility, but only in the last five years are countries and international organizations starting to track program and provider mobility. Australia, New Zealand, and, more recently, the United Kingdom have been gathering statistics from their recognized higher education institutions on cross-border education provision. The lack of common terms and systems of gathering data creates a huge challenge in trying to compare this data. Moreover, the paucity of information from both sending and receiving countries on program and provider mobility creates an undesirable environment of

To our Non-US readers:

Due to a mailing error, many readers outside of the United States did not receive our summer 2005 issue (number 40). We are therefore including a copy of this issue along with our new fall 2005 issue. We apologize for any inconvenience. If this is a duplicate issue, please give it to a colleague or library. We are, by the way, able to send IHE to libraries without cost.

speculation, confusion, and often misinformation. This can undermine confidence in the quality and dependability of cross-border education provision and impedes the analysis needed to underpin solid policy and regulatory frameworks.

ISSUES AND IMPLICATIONS

The national-level issues related to registration and licensing of cross-border providers, quality assurance, accreditation and recognition of qualifications affect individual providers and, especially, higher education institutions. The quality of academic programs starts with the provider delivering the program. Most higher education institutions employ adequate quality assurance procedures for domestic delivery but not necessarily for all the aspects of cross-border delivery. Working cross-culturally in a foreign regulatory environment and, potentially, with a partner can raise new issues—including academic entry requirements, student examination and assessment procedures, workload, delivery modes, adaptation of the curriculum, quality assurance of teaching, academic and sociocultural support for students, title and level of award, and others. Quality issues also need to be balanced with the financial investment and return to the source provider. Intellectual property ownership, choice of partners, division of responsibilities, academic and business risk assessments, and internal and external approval processes constitute only some of the issues the higher education institutions need to resolve.

The growth in the volume, scope, and dimensions of cross-border education may provide increased access and promote innovation and responsiveness of higher education, but these developments also bring new challenges and unexpected consequences. The current realities include the fact that unrecognized and rogue cross-border providers are active, that much

It is important to acknowledge the huge potential of cross-border education but not at the expense of academic quality and integrity.

of the latest cross-border education is driven by commercial interests, and that mechanisms to recognize qualifications and ensure quality of the academic courses and programs are still not in place in many countries. These realities present major challenges to the education sector. It is important to acknowledge the huge potential of cross-border education but not at the expense of academic quality and integrity. Higher education is not the only sector that needs to look at ways to guide, monitor, and regulate the movement of education programs and providers. It needs to work in close cooperation with other sectors and to play a pivotal role in ensuring that cross-border education reflects and helps to meet individual countries' educational goals, culture, priorities, and policies. ■

International Students at Indian Universities

VEENA BHALLA

Veena Bhalla is on the staff of the Association of Indian Universities. Address: 16, Comrade Indrajit Gupta Marg, New Delhi 110 002, India. E-mail: aiuisis@yahoo.co.in.

Transnational movement of students is obviously the most visible and, perhaps, most significant manifestation of the internationalization of higher education. Since the early 1990s the number of students crossing their national borders for acquiring knowledge and skills has steadily increased. The number of students entering developed countries has shown a considerable rise. Unfortunately, this has not happened in the case of India, which has the third-largest higher education system in the world and, therefore, is a potential exporter or provider of education, at least to the Third World.

Presently, international students from about 125 countries are pursuing various undergraduate, postgraduate, and research programs in India at recognized universities and institutions. The countries that provide the international students can be grouped into two categories: first, developed countries that are technologically advanced and economically strong and have good facilities for higher education and training (e.g., the United States, United Kingdom, Canada, Australia, countries of the European Union, and Japan); and second, the less-developed and developing countries that have limited facilities for education—not only in professional fields such as engineering, medicine, and management—but also in science, humanities, social sciences, commerce, and law.

Data collected by the Association of Indian Universities over the period 1992–1993 to 2003–2004 suggest the number of international students coming to India steadily increased during the first half of the 1990s, with a peak of over 13,000 being achieved in 1993–1994. Subsequently there was a steady decrease, with a marked fall occurring in 1996–1997; by the end of the millennium the number had halved. This trend was probably due to the fact that while many developed countries, and especially the United Kingdom and Australia, were aggressively marketing their educational ware, India was inactive in this regard. However, the number of international students increased during 2001–2002, after India adopted a more positive approach, possibly suggesting a reversal of the trend.

More than 95 percent of international students in India come from the developing countries of Asia and Africa. The countries that sent the most students in 2003–2004 are Malaysia, Nepal, Iran, and Kenya (about 500 each), followed by Mauritius, Sri Lanka, the United States, and Ethiopia (over 300 each). Significantly, during 2003–2004 there has been an increase in the number of students from East Asia, the Middle East, South and Central Asia, Southeast Asia, northern

Europe, and North America. The largest number of students are from South and Central Asia (2,102) followed by East Africa (1,465). The countries that sent increased numbers of students in 2003–2004 include Bahrain, Kuwait, Oman, Saudi Arabia, the United Arab Emirates, Iran, Malaysia, Vietnam, Sudan, Ghana, Ethiopia, Mauritius, Canada, and the United States.

The same period (2003–2004) has seen a decrease in the number of students from North Korea, Syria, Yemen, Bangladesh, Bhutan, Nepal, Sri Lanka, Thailand, Eritrea, Kenya, Somalia, Tanzania, and Uganda. In the same year, the largest number of students came from Malaysia (806). In 2003–2004, the largest number attended the Manipal Academy of Higher Education (2,031), followed by the University of Pune (1,416) and the University of Delhi (1,077).

International students prefer to join educational institutions located in metropolitan cities like Delhi, Mumbai, Chennai, and Pune. They join colleges located in smaller towns only for professional programs. As is to be expected, the international student population in India is not equally distributed over the country or in the various disciplines. Students prefer the western (especially Maharashtra) and southern parts of India. This is due to more congenial social and cultural environments.

To make Indian universities more attractive to international students will require a variety of improvements. Indian universities must take steps to provide better infrastructure and facilities to international students. The country's academic structure needs to "internationalize" the curricula and become more flexible. The University Grants Commission is promoting the export of education through its Committee for the Promotion of Indian Higher Education Abroad. Significantly, at this point the private universities and colleges are the ones making efforts to attract students by providing good infrastructure and other facilities. ■

Foreign Universities in India: Market-Driven New Directions

SUDHANSHU BHUSHAN

Sudhanshu Bhushan is senior fellow and head of the Higher Education Unit, National Institute of Educational Planning and Administration, 17B Sri Aurobindo Marg, New Delhi 110 016, India. E-mail: sudhanshu@niepa.org.

A new direction for the higher education system in India consists of market-driven transnational provision of education through the mobility of programs and educational institutions. At present this phenomenon is symbolic and market driven, and as yet there is no policy guideline on foreign universities. Given the strong demand for foreign degrees by

Indian students, market-driven trends may dominate in the future. In the absence of government regulation of foreign universities the new trend is posing problems with respect to quality. It increases the risk and uncertainty for the holder of qualification as the recognition of degrees is found to be absent. Moreover, the marketization promotes the commercialization of higher education.

THE PRESENCE OF FOREIGN INSTITUTIONS

An analysis of the presence of foreign institutions with respect to the country of origin, program types, and modes of operation reveals interesting facts. At present only the United States and the United Kingdom have shown interest in collaborating with Indian partners. Of the 131 institutions in the sample, 59 institutions partnered with UK universities and 66 institutions partnered with US universities. There are other potential countries such as Australia, New Zealand, and Canada that are constantly watching the developments and the government stand on any regulation regarding foreign education providers. At present these countries are organizing educational fairs. They also have representatives to attract Indian students to their respective countries. They lack collaboration with the Indian education system, as they do not find any enabling laws for the legal operation.

Out of the total sample of 131 institutions in India, 107 were providing vocational programs, 19 technical programs, and only 5 general education. In the vocational category, management programs were the most popular. Business management and hotel management constitute approximately 80 percent of the total number of programs. Information shows that Maharashtra has the maximum number of programs in hotel management. Delhi has the maximum number of programs in business management. In technical programs, at present not much interest is shown, although 19 institutions were active in technical sectors as well.

Analysis of 50 institutions shows that the maximum number (30) of programs are offered under twinning arrangements. This is one of the preferred methods for foreign institutions to attract international students to the home country. Twinning is a relatively cheap option, as part of the program is undertaken in the host country. The programmatic collaborations (18) consist of joint-program and joint-degree provision by the institutions of the home and host countries. Indian partners prefer to design programs with the inputs received from the foreign institution, thereby making the arrangements highly cost competitive. In this mode Indian private partners prefer to collaborate when they get a brand name of a foreign university to award the degree. There are only two franchised institutions in India. There are no offshore campuses in India. The opening of a branch campus requires an investment in terms of infrastructure. Some study centers of UK universities were also found to be operational in India.

Analysis of student perceptions indicates that the practical, market-oriented nature of programs, flexible curricula and

examinations, attractive evaluation systems, and good job prospects constitute the strong factors leading to growing enrollments in foreign-degree programs.

RATIONALE AND MECHANICS

A number of rationales may explain the presence of foreign institutions in India. There is a growing demand for foreign degrees, triggered in part by the international mobility of knowledge workers. The supply constraint in the public provision of higher education has opened up the market for private providers of education. They found an opportunity to link up with foreign universities to provide foreign degrees that attract the students for programs that could be easily marketed. The other side of the picture is that the foreign providers willing to collaborate saw this as an opportunity to sell education. However, the mechanics of operations are not guided by com-

There is a growing demand for foreign degrees, triggered in part by the international mobility of knowledge workers.

petition.

What is the context of the market-driven trend of the growing number of foreign higher education providers in India? There is neither recognition of foreign degrees in India nor any mechanism in place for the mutual recognition of degrees abroad or at home. The holder of a foreign degree earned in India may find it difficult to achieve job security, thereby increasing the uncertainty of a professional career. There is at present no system of quality assurance and accreditation of cross-border education operating in India. An important aspect is that private higher education partners rely mostly on guest faculty. It is also not clear who bears the responsibility—private institutions in India or the foreign collaborators and providers of foreign degrees. Nevertheless, enthusiasm among Indian students for foreign degrees has supported the commercialization. Some of the aspirants for foreign degrees choose to earn foreign degrees in India at a relatively lower cost than for the same degree earned abroad.

The concern for policymakers in India is that the new market-driven trend backed by strong demand defies the domestic regulatory system, which clearly stipulates that only universities established under central or state control have the authority to confer degrees. On the other hand, regulating foreign education providers amounts to accepting their existence, amending the University Grants Commission act and setting standards and quality assurance for cross-border education. All these issues might put pressure on the government to improve the competitiveness of public universities, which would in turn amount to committing resources for higher education. As the resources are limited for funding public universities, a market-driven trend might lead to further privatization. Given such possibilities, government finds it convenient, instead, to gloss over the presence of foreign universities. However, given pres-

sure from international agencies to regulate and put in place the mechanism for quality assurance the government might in future accept the presence of foreign universities without getting ready for the competition they will create. Under these circumstances, the long-term dynamics of foreign universities in India would thus lead to commercialization without raising competitiveness in the system. ■

Strengthening International Education in New Zealand

VIKASH NAIDOO

Vikash Naidoo is the international relations officer in the Office of the Pro Vice-Chancellor (International) at the University of Auckland in New Zealand. E-mail: viknaidoo@gmail.com.

International education, primarily in terms of international student recruitment, has been a rapidly growing industry in New Zealand. While in 1995 it was responsible for NZ\$530 million (US\$370 million) in foreign exchange, by 2003 it was estimated to have created over 20,000 jobs and contributed NZ\$1.7 billion (US\$1.1 billion) to the local economy. Approximately 31,000 international students were enrolled at New Zealand's tertiary institutions in 2003 compared to a mere 4,000 in 1995. For a small country with only 8 universities and 20 polytechnics (as community colleges are known in New Zealand), such growth especially in a relatively short time frame is quite substantial. Furthermore, although there are relatively small numbers of international students in New Zealand's tertiary institutions, these students comprise a similar proportion of the total tertiary roll as they do in countries such as the United States and Canada.

Complementing this economic dimension of international education, the development of deeper educational relationships with other countries has enriched New Zealand's social, cultural, and political networks. Recognizing the role of international education as an established sector of the New Zealand education system, the government has recently committed NZ\$21 million (US\$15 million) over the next four years to support its development. In particular, this new funding is focused on developing the government's educational diplomacy in key countries, attracting high-quality doctoral students to study in New Zealand, and creating an innovation fund to support New Zealand education providers in new product and service development—all with the aim of enhancing New Zealand's reputation as a high-quality education provider on the international scene.

Through "education diplomacy," the government is setting up seven offshore education counselor positions to develop stronger and deeper linkages with those parts of the world rec-

ognized globally as centers of educational excellence. The first four positions are being located in Beijing (from February 2004), Washington DC (from mid-2005), Brussels (late 2005), and Kuala Lumpur (early 2006). Details on the location of the other three positions are yet to be released. The intention is that these counselors will be able to identify and share best practice in the field of international education between New Zealand and education providers in each of their respective locations.

The International Doctoral Scholarship Program, funded by the government, is designed to provide financial support to doctoral students undertaking research. In 2005, the year of its introduction, 40 such scholarships were awarded to students from designated countries in North America, Latin America, Europe, Asia, and the Middle East. Over the next two years, the program will be progressively expanded, with the aim that by 2007 up to 100 doctoral scholarships will be awarded annually to applicants irrespective of country of origin. The objective behind this program is to share New Zealand's excellence with the rest of the world and to bring the best students from other countries to share their knowledge with New Zealand. Complementing this program, the government has also decided that from January 2006, all international students applying for doctoral studies at a New Zealand university will not be subject to international differential fees. This means that even if an international student does not gain a scholarship, they will be able to study for a New Zealand PhD at subsidized domestic fees. Similarly, from January 2006, school-aged dependents of international PhD students studying at New Zealand universities will not have to pay international tuition fees to attend New Zealand schools.

Through "education diplomacy," the government is setting up seven offshore education counselor positions to develop stronger and deeper linkages. . . .

The third initiative, the Innovation Fund, will support New Zealand education providers to develop new markets, new business models and structures, new delivery options for international education including offshore campuses, online programs and twinning arrangements with offshore education providers as well as the development of new educational programs. It is recognized by the government that insufficient innovation can be a detriment to the competitiveness and sustainability of the New Zealand's export education industry. Hence, the overall objective of this fund is to assist with the development of value-added activities. During the first four years, the fund will primarily target encouraging offshore initiatives. Compared to other competing countries, New Zealand currently relies almost exclusively on onshore delivery of international education. In encouraging offshore initiatives, the government is looking at diversifying risks. Similarly, the development of offshore education should benefit the sustain-

ability of onshore education by acting as a marketing presence and providing potential pathways for international students to come study in New Zealand.

These three initiatives are aimed at keeping New Zealand's international education sector competitive in an increasingly dynamic industry. However, it is to be acknowledged that these policies are not a means to an end. The New Zealand government recognizes this reality and understands that its investment needs a long-term focus. Hence, we can expect to see more investment in the future. ■

National Regulatory Approaches to Transnational Higher Education

LINE VERBIK AND LISA JOKIVIRTA

Line Verbik is a research officer and Lisa Jokivirta is deputy director at the Observatory on Borderless Higher Education, 36 Gordon Sq., London, WC1H 0PF, United Kingdom. E-mail: l.verbik@obhe.ac.uk and l.jokivirta@obhe.ac.uk. URL: www.obhe.ac.uk .

Transnational higher education is not a new phenomenon, but the pace of its global expansion is a new development. (*Transnational* is used here to designate higher education provided by one country in another and excludes provision where just the students travel abroad.) As foreign delivery becomes increasingly widespread, countries are facing a growing need to regulate this type of provision. Although many countries have yet to establish a clear regulatory framework for the import and export of transnational higher education, ambitions to regulate and offer quality assurance for this type of provision are an emerging international trend.

Transnational higher education serves different purposes in different countries. Overall, the perceived benefits of transnational delivery include domestic capacity building, broader student choice in education systems facing resource constraints, minimizing the resources flowing out of the country, reducing brain drain, and enhancing innovation and competitiveness in the sector. However, provision has a tendency to be concentrated in certain subject areas (e.g., business and information technology). While such provision undoubtedly meets a need, it is unclear to what extent it seriously addresses the development agenda of the host country and thus contributes to real capacity building. Experience with foreign education of low quality has made some countries wary of this type of provision and has prompted them to work on making the sector less of an open and easy market for foreign institutions. Concerns have frequently been raised over the quality of transnational provision, the impact on national authority over higher education, and unfair competition with domestic institutions.

Through a substantial research project, the Observatory has

made an attempt to categorize regulatory frameworks for imported transnational provision into six main models. When a significant discrepancy exists between regulations and recognition (e.g., there are no legal barriers but recognition of foreign qualifications is virtually impossible), this is indicated (see “very restrictive” model). Many countries allowing transnational provision have a separate framework to address the recognition of foreign/transnational qualifications.

This article is not intended to provide an exhaustive examination of national regulatory approaches but rather an overview of different models and emerging trends. Some countries will not fit perfectly into a category. Not only is very little statistical data available about transnational provision (few countries systematically collect information on this type of activity), but it is also one of the most rapidly changing fields of higher education. The discrepancies that often occur between the letter and practice of the law are worth noting. The authority over regulation can also be unclear, given that many countries have a decentralized system where individual states or regions control the higher education sector.

Transnational higher education serves different purposes in different countries.

REGULATORY MODELS

No regulations. There are no special regulations or control of foreign providers, which are free to operate without seeking permission from the host country. Examples include: Czech Republic, France, Malta, Mexico, Nigeria, Russia, Serbia, and Sri Lanka.

Liberal. Foreign providers must satisfy certain minimum conditions prior to commencing operations (e.g., official recognition in the home country). Examples include: Argentina, Bahrain, Estonia, the Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Peru, Slovenia, Sweden, Switzerland, and the United Kingdom.

Moderately liberal. The importing country is actively involved in licensing and (in some cases) accrediting transnational providers. This model requires that foreign institutions gain accreditation or other formal permission by the host country (e.g., Ministry of Education) prior to commencing operations. This category is diverse, ranging from compulsory registration to formal assessment of academic criteria. Requirements are generally straightforward and nonburdensome. Examples include: Australia, Bangladesh, China, Egypt, Hong Kong, Israel, Jamaica, Pakistan, Singapore, and Vietnam.

Transitional—from liberal to more restrictive. A more restrictive regulatory framework is gradually being introduced. Changes in legislation can include: compulsory registration and/or accreditation through the national system in order for foreign institutions to be allowed to operate and/or for their degrees to be recognized, requirements to establish a presence

in the country, and criteria for collaboration between domestic and foreign institutions, as well as other factors. Example: India.

Transitional—from restrictive to more liberal. New legislation aimed at removing restrictions for foreign institutions wishing to operate in the country is being introduced. The new guidelines usually follow a period where regulations have practically ruled out transnational provision. In some cases, restrictions are only lifted in specified areas (e.g., South Korea), in others changes apply to the entire country (e.g., Japan). Examples include: Japan and South Korea.

Very restrictive—regulations concerning permission to operate. The government or another authoritative higher education body imposes strict requirements on foreign providers. Such institutions may be required to establish a physical presence in the country (i.e., franchised provision is not allowed), only institutions or programs accredited by the host country’s agency are authorized, and foreign providers must change their curricula to be in line with domestic provision, and other factors. Examples include Bulgaria, Cyprus, South Africa, and the United Arab Emirates.

Virtually impossible recognition for qualifications obtained through transnational provision. The government does not recognize foreign qualifications obtained through transnational provision. Foreign institutions wishing to grant recognized degrees must become part of the national system (this option may not be straightforward). Examples include: Belgium (francophone) and Greece.

Emerging capacity-building model? If not legally mandated by the importing country, it is suggested that foreign institutions could increasingly be expected to adopt a development-based rhetoric to secure external support and funding from both the importing and exporting countries. Institutions are increasingly aware that to boost capacity, safeguard institutional reputation, and assist in the strengthening of domestic systems, a long-term commitment to the country through sustainable partnerships or other investment is required.

THE MAIN FINDINGS AND OBSERVATIONS

The general trend appears to be allowing the import of transnational provision but increasingly attempting to regulate this type of activity. A trend toward adopting any one particular model, however, has not been detected.

There are signs that the issue of providing locally sensitive but sustainable transnational education will be of growing importance for exporting and importing institutions and countries.

A potential trend exists toward developing regulatory frameworks at the regional and international levels, although the actual impact remains less clear.

The Observatory would be grateful for information on countries not listed here (particularly those outside the English-speaking world), as well as any feedback on the examples provided. For further

details, please refer to the two-part report “National Regulatory Frameworks for Transnational Higher Education: Models and Trends” at www.obhe.ac.uk. ■

Innovations in the Allocation of Public Funds

JAMIL SALMI AND ARTHUR HAUPTMAN

Jamil Salmi is coordinator of the World Bank's Tertiary Education Thematic Group. Arthur Hauptman is an independent public policy consultant specializing in higher education finance issues. Address: The World Bank, 1818 H St. NW, Washington, DC 20433, USA. E-mail: Salmi: jsalmi@worldbank.org; Hauptman: hauptman_a@yahoo.com. This article is drawn from a forthcoming World Bank paper on allocation mechanisms.

In recent decades, a growing number of countries have sought innovative solutions to the substantial challenges they face in financing tertiary education. One of the principal challenges, the demand for education beyond the secondary level, is growing in most countries around the world far faster than the ability or willingness of governments to provide adequate public resources.

The reasons for this rapid increase in demand are numerous. First, in virtually all countries, the economic value of attaining a tertiary education, as measured by rates of return or other factors, is growing faster than the economic returns accruing to those who receive a secondary education or less. Second, in many cultures strong social pressures are exerted on students for moving beyond the secondary level of education based on nonmonetary factors such as greater social standing and prestige in the community—sometimes even better marriage prospects for girls. Third, many countries are attempting to increase the relevance of tertiary education curricula as governments and tertiary education institutions deemphasize certain fields with low levels of labor force demand, such as public administration and education, in favor of fields more closely linked to emerging labor force needs, such as information technology, engineering, and science.

The demands placed on public resources are typically intense as governments around the world face challenges across the board in providing better health care, housing, transportation, agriculture, as well as the full range of education. In this context, tertiary education is often far from the highest priority for public funding in both industrial and developing countries.

Countries and institutions around the world have responded to this mismatch between available public resources and the growing demand for tertiary education in several generic ways. The most frequent response has been to mobilize more resources, principally by introducing or raising tuition fees as

a means of increasing cost sharing. Another related response has been to seek increased private resources through the commercialization of research and other private uses of institutional facilities and staff. A third, perhaps less commonly found response, has been an increased reliance on bonds and other forms of creative financing that allow for greater public or private partnerships to provide services related to tertiary education activities.

A related trend has been the development of a variety of innovative allocation mechanisms that allow both public and private funds to go farther in meeting the challenges that tertiary education systems face around the world. Our recent study found these innovative mechanisms cover a broad range of approaches:

1. Funding methodologies for recurrent expenses and capital investment have evolved in a number of countries from the more traditional negotiations of budgets between governments and institutions to increasingly sophisticated funding formulas that aim to insulate allocation decisions from excessive political pressures and encourage desired institutional behavior.

2. As has recently happened in Colorado, some “demand-side” voucher systems have been created in which institutional operating subsidies will be distributed through a voucher given to all undergraduates. In some cases, the allocation of fixed funds to institutions is based on the characteristics of enrolled students, an approach that might be referred to as “supply-side” vouchers.

The growing diversity of funding sources has been an important response by governments and institutions to the mismatch between demand and resources.

3. Performance-based funding mechanisms have been adopted in a number of countries. A portion of funding may be set aside to be distributed to institutions on the basis of a series of performance measures. Performance contracts are negotiated between governments and institutions. Competitive funding is introduced that encourages innovation, greater academic quality, and strengthening institutional management capacity. Another approach includes financing mechanisms that directly pay for results, either as part of the basic funding formula or as a separate set of payments of institutions.

4. In some countries financial aid has been substantially expanded for students with high levels of financial need or academic merit to allow for financing strategies that use higher fees to increase overall institutional resource levels, including student aid in the form of vouchers to stimulate competition among institutions—as an alternative to publicly funded but institutionally administered student aid programs.

5. In a number of countries tax benefits have been created to help students and their families offset the expense of tuition fees, as well as family allowances primarily designed to cover

the living costs associated with attendance in tertiary education.

6. In many countries around the world student loans have been expanded—including the development of various income-contingent repayment schedules in a half dozen countries over the past two decades in which repayment levels are tied to the amount borrowed and the income of borrowers once they complete their education. Another approach includes a series of creative financing arrangements by which the initial funding of mortgage-type student loans is leveraged to provide higher capital levels through modern financing techniques.

These innovative approaches for allocating public funds hold the promise of helping countries improve the access, equity, quality, relevance, and efficiency of their tertiary education systems. But policymakers and institutional officials must be careful to recognize the obstacles of successful implementation of these innovative approaches—including administrative capacity, transparency, and political feasibility.

LESSONS FROM INTERNATIONAL EXPERIENCE

Resource mobilization and allocation mechanisms. The growing diversity of funding sources has been an important response by governments and institutions to the mismatch between demand and resources. Similarly, countries should rely on a mix of allocation mechanisms to achieve the objectives they seek for their tertiary education systems.

Mix of allocation instruments. While linking budget allocations to some measure of performance should be a guiding principle, the selection of allocation instrument should depend to a great degree on the policy objectives being sought. Some allocation mechanisms are much better at achieving certain objectives than others. In addition, what works well in one country will not necessarily work well in another. Many of the more innovative allocation approaches require strong government structures and adequate public-resource bases. Many developing and transition countries lack these basic essentials and thus must look to other approaches that do not have these requirements for success.

Policy objectives. Policy discussions in many countries often tend to devolve into general discussions of the need for more access or better quality or greater efficiency. Without precise and accurate definition of the objectives being sought, these policy discussions can easily slide into advocacy exercises in which more of everything is better, with little or no prioritization of goals or objectives.

Links with systems of quality assurance. Governments should be careful not to establish too rigid a relationship between the results of evaluation and accreditation and the amount of funding going to tertiary education institutions. A more effective approach may be to make participation in evaluation and accreditation exercises a criterion for access to additional public funding, rather than a determinant of the amount of that funding.

Political feasibility. Many financing reforms, including establishing or increasing tuition fees, replacing scholarships with student loans, or authorizing private tertiary education institutions to operate are controversial measures. Political difficulty should not be used, however, to delay implementing necessary and important reforms. Expert studies, stakeholder consultations, public debates and press campaigns should be used to minimize the risks of opposition and resistance.

These rules for the road should help stakeholders in developing, transitional, and industrialized countries make the right choices for achieving successful allocation strategies for tertiary education. ■

The Trouble with Fees

MICHAEL SHATTOCK

Michael Shattock is a visiting professor at the Institute of Education, University of London and is a former registrar at the University of Warwick. E-mail: shattock@he.u-net.com.

On May 5th the new Labour government was returned to office with a parliamentary majority reduced from 161 to 66. While the dominant themes in the election were clearly the Iraq invasion and immigration, the decision to raise tuition fees for higher education students in England was the third most important issue on the doorstep. It was vociferously opposed, with conviction, by the Liberal Democrats, who could and did mobilize the student vote. The issue was also opposed, although one might have thought against their natural instincts, by the Tories. The issue was so controversial that it was only won by the government, even with its previous majority, by 5 votes in the House of Commons in 2004, and very obviously it would not have succeeded if it had been delayed until after the election.

It is difficult to see why the decision was so controversial. Fees of £1,200 are already in force for 2005–2006 for every undergraduate higher education student in England; and the new decision, while raising the fee level in 2006 to up to £3,000 (depending on the charge levied by the university), does not demand an up-front payment on entry because the fee is to be paid after graduation on an income-contingent basis, with the government paying the fee at entry. Under means-test arrangements students from disadvantaged backgrounds can receive up to £2,700 per annum in maintenance grant. Students will thus be better off during their period of study under the new arrangements and will only be required to pay after graduation providing they are earning over £15,000, as against the current average graduating salary of about £19,000. A strong, secondary argument in favor of the new scheme is that it requires the middle classes, which benefit disproportionately from the higher education system both in terms of entry (over 70 percent of the higher education student population is from the professional and managerial classes)

and from salaries and career prospects on graduation, to contribute more to the costs of higher education than lower income groups, which benefit much less but nevertheless have to contribute to the costs through the tax system.

The new scheme, however, was opposed by an alliance of those who believe that higher education should be free and those who saw it as a “stealth tax.” A further strand of opposition came from those who opposed a variable-fees policy. The universities had campaigned for fees to be raised to alleviate the continuing financial stringency. The rector of Imperial College had publicly demanded that fees should be raised at Imperial to £10,000 per annum if the college was to remain internationally competitive. Variable fees introduced a market element—in fact only a tiny majority of institutions chose not to charge the full £3,000—but also left open in the future the prospect of the fee levels being allowed to increase.

To get the variable-fee policy through, the government had to concede two control mechanisms. The first was that a bursary contribution must be made, out of the fee income, to all students from disadvantaged backgrounds, and a new agency, the Office of Fair Access (OFFA), was set up to give approval to individual universities’ plans to charge fees against their proposals for bursary payments. The second was the creation of an independent commission to review the fee policy in 2009 and an agreement that no increase could be introduced except with the approval of Parliament after the commission had reported.

Thus, although one might see the introduction of variable fees as a further, timid, step in the marketization of higher education, the control on higher education numbers has not been relaxed to prevent the most prestigious universities from expanding (and enriching themselves) at the expense of the rest. Moreover the two control mechanisms themselves provide opportunities for future market interventions and uncertainty that severely limit the original intentions of the scheme.

The most frequent response has been to mobilize more resources, principally introducing or raising tuition fees as a means of increasing cost sharing.

In March OFFA published the bursary levels that universities were offering. They showed an astonishing range with as a general rule the most prestigious institutions (that receive the fewest suitably qualified candidates from disadvantaged backgrounds) offering bursaries of around £3,000 per annum and those institutions that have the least competitive intakes (and therefore the most candidates from disadvantaged backgrounds) offering between £300 and £500. Within these extremes there is a clustering around £1,000 to £1,500 per annum with very few post-1992 institutions exceeding £1,000 per annum. The institutional pecking order, established by the league tables, is thus replicated in the level of bursary offers, although it is becoming clear that there will be discretion with-

in most university offer levels to recognize particular student circumstances. Some universities are also offering a range of extras such as free laptops, vouchers for bicycles, and cash incentives.

Surprisingly, however, a market in bursaries has stimulated concerns about the danger of intake shortfalls, and the combined risks of not benefiting fully from the fee increase and of the imposition of a “claw-back” by the Funding Council if targets are not met. As a consequence, universities are now plunging into a scholarship market (“golden hellos”) to attract students with high A-level scores irrespective of social class, also to be funded out of fee income. No list of scholarships

Some universities are also offering a range of extras such as free laptops, vouchers for bicycles, and cash incentives.

available has been published but two conclusions can be drawn: the first is that the competitive market at the admissions stage has been greatly intensified and the second that overnight the student process of selecting universities for application has become immeasurably more complicated. Financial incentives have been added to more traditional concerns of choosing the right course, getting admission to a university whose league-table placement might help employment prospects, or picking a university in a particular location. The bureaucratic costs for each institution in managing these operations will further deplete the benefit of the additional income to be derived from the new fee structure.

The situation is further complicated by the fact that decision making on higher education is a devolved function to Scotland, Wales, and Northern Ireland. In Scotland, the Liberal Democrats made it a condition of entering a coalition government with Labour that the decision in 2001 to introduce fees should be resisted, and the Scottish Executive has continued to follow this principle with the new structure. This has prompted special arrangements to charge English students choosing to enter Scottish universities, one or two of which are heavily dependent on an English intake. In Wales, where half of Welsh students choose to study in England, a complex consultation process is being undertaken to determine whether Welsh students studying in Wales will pay fees. In both Scotland and Wales, the universities are concerned that the additional income apparently becoming available to English universities will make them less competitive in terms of salaries and research ratings. In Northern Ireland, still ruled from Westminster because of the present standoff in Northern Ireland politics, the decision to move to the new fee structure has been taken, but because of considerable cross-border student traffic this will create tensions with the Irish Republic, which has so far resisted the recommendations of an OECD review of its higher education system to charge tuition fees.

There is a temptation to see all this as presaging a widespread move in Europe to charge tuition fees, and indeed, a recent European Commission document could be seen as encouraging such a development. But as the narrowness of the vote in the UK House of Commons shows and the continued resistance in Scotland and Wales, the introduction of a substantial tuition-fee element to first-degree work undertaken by home students is deeply controversial, even in the most market-led higher education system in the European Union and even when the scheme is designed in a way that might not be thought unattractive to students. With its reduced majority, the Blair government may even find it difficult to retain the newly introduced system when Parliament reviews it, as it is committed to do, in 2009. At the very least it is unlikely that the advocates of raising the £3,000 limit much in 2009 will be successful, and, as a consequence, the government will find itself under renewed pressure from the universities for a larger public investment in higher education. ■

Manpower Planning and University Enrollments: The Debate in Singapore

PANG ENG FONG AND LINDA LIM

Pang Eng Fong is practice professor of management at Singapore Management University. E-mail: efpang@smu.edu.sg. Linda Lim is professor of corporate strategy at the University of Michigan. E-mail: lylim@bus.umich.edu.

Faced with growing resource constraints, many countries are grappling with the issue of how best to allocate resources to publicly funded universities. Quite a few governments have used manpower planning models to guide policies regarding university enrollments and resource allocation. These models typically derive educational enrollments from projected manpower requirements based on forecasts of economic growth. Recent public debate on university admissions policy in Singapore raises anew the question of the effectiveness of the manpower planning model that Singapore (and many other countries) relies on to guide university intakes. The Singapore government is committed to giving its universities greater autonomy over financing and student admissions to enable them to develop into world-class institutions. It has pledged that it will not require full financial independence of publicly funded universities. Nevertheless, the government continues to direct university admissions to ensure the output of graduates matches projected skilled manpower needs.

UNIVERSITY AUTONOMY

The stated goal of university autonomy may, however, not cor-

respond to the manpower planning model that has influenced university admissions and funding for the past 30 years. The model was useful while Singapore's mass-manufacturing-driven economy was catching up to developed-country levels of industrial development. Today, rapidly changing technology and skill requirements make it harder to discern the way ahead, even for the world's most adroit, anticipatory nations and world-class multinationals.

In most countries where the government provides the bulk of the funding for universities, individual universities make these policy decisions. "University autonomy" means that each institution decides what degree programs to offer and their course content; how many and on what criteria students are admitted to each program; how much is charged for tuition; the types and terms of faculty recruited; and how faculty, students, and the university itself are evaluated.

MARKET SIGNALS

How do universities make these decisions? They depend on market signals from employers who hire their graduates; students and their parents who choose (and pay for) degree programs; and the demand for and supply of academic manpower in various specializations. This market responsiveness ensures flexibility and efficiency in resource allocation.

If employers do not hire the graduates of any particular university or degree program or if the salaries they offer are too low, students and parents will shift their demand (and tuition revenues) to other universities and courses whose graduates are better rewarded in the job market. Faculty in specialized, high-demand areas will experience a rise in salaries, which will attract academic talent into those areas.

These supply-and-demand alterations do not always take place instantaneously or smoothly, but the market functions well on the whole. In producing academic excellence and technological innovation, these changes also absolve governments (who fund universities) of blame should universities misjudge market signals and make the wrong decisions.

Employers look for higher-order thinking and communication skills, and more recently, IT skills. They value employees with the capacity to learn, relearn, and unlearn. They also seek a diverse workforce in terms of training, outlook, and subject knowledge. Business leaders who sit on the advisory committees of American universities often counsel against training undergraduates in specific narrow and especially novel fields. They stress instead basic disciplines and breadth of course work because highly specific skills and knowledge can quickly become obsolete.

HOW UNIVERSITIES RESPOND

Highly rated and market-responsive universities offer a variety of degree programs and produce a wide range of graduates. Unlike Singapore, where manpower planning is skewed toward engineering and business, top British and American universities produce few business graduates at the bachelor's

level. At the University of Michigan, for example, less than 400 out of an annual total of 5,000 graduates are business majors. Yet the vast majority of its graduates find employment in the business sector.

Students and their parents want equitable and transparent access to higher education, a fair admissions process, flexibility in course selection, good-quality instruction, government or private-sector financial assistance, and good jobs upon graduation. Universities, for their part, want continued government funding but with autonomy over enrollments, fees, admissions standards, student and faculty recruitment, and course curricula. The institutions compete for top-quality faculty and seek to recruit well-qualified graduate students to advance research agendas and assist in undergraduate instruction.

The government continues to direct university admissions to ensure the output of graduates matches projected skilled manpower needs.

PROMOTING EQUITY AND EFFICIENCY

Equity and efficiency should be the criteria for evaluating the various stakeholder interests while determining policies on student admissions and tuition. Tuition-based funding borne mainly by students themselves is efficient because it produces a better match between supply and demand for particular university places and for particular types of graduates. The courses students choose will reflect their own intellectual preferences and expected lifetime income. On a yearly basis, the courses are likely to be “closer to the market” than manpower plans based on projected economic growth rates. Tuition-based funding is also equitable since the individual graduate is the main beneficiary of the higher lifetime income and nonpecuniary benefits afforded by the person’s university degree.

In developed economies, many students pay for university tuition by taking out loans from the government or the private financial sector. Involving banks in providing loans will help allocate resources more efficiently, since they can charge higher interest rates for more risky courses of study. In Singapore, however, it may take a while to change mindsets. Accustomed to highly subsidized education, families and students remain reluctant to take loans to finance education.

We believe a market-based system of allocating university places, funded primarily by tuition paid by students themselves, is both efficient and equitable. Such a system improves the performance of universities themselves and encourages academic excellence, to the benefit of society as well as graduates and employers. All stakeholders—the government, employers, parents, students, universities, academics and the public—will adjust to this system if it is allowed to evolve.

The deterministic manpower planning models that have served many countries well, including Singapore, are no longer appropriate as guides to resource allocation. It is time to introduce more market-based and flexible mechanisms into university enrollment planning. ■

US Privatization, Accountability, and Market-Based State Policy

PETER ECKEL, LARA COUTURIER, AND DAO LUU

Peter Eckel is associate director for institutional initiatives, Center for Institutional and International Initiatives, American Council on Education. Address: 1 Dupont Circle, Washington, DC 20036, USA. E-mail: peter_eckel@ace.nche.edu. Lara Couturier is the former research director of the Futures Project and now an independent consultant. Dao Luu was an intern at the American Council on Education.

In the United States, the relationship between state governments and public colleges and universities is being redefined with new notions of autonomy and accountability and highly market-driven funding policies (often referred to as “privatization”) as the centerpieces. These new patterns have implications for both public and independent colleges and universities. The American Council on Education convened three roundtable conversations of presidents and other higher education leaders to explore the implications of this changing relationship. The following points emerged from those discussions and appear in the paper, “Peering around the Bend: The Leadership Challenges of Privatization, Accountability and Market-based State Policy.”

Business is not “as usual.” Situations and strategies unthinkable just a few years ago are becoming increasingly commonplace. For instance, a few business and law schools at public institutions are moving toward privatization, distancing themselves from both the states and their parent universities. Public universities are seeking “enterprise status” to become quasi-public institutions. One southern governor offered deals to his public institutions to privatize, removing them from state authority and state funding.

Innovative (but untested) policies are emerging. Policies labeled as decentralization, tuition deregulation, vouchers, public corporations, state enterprises, charter colleges, and state compacts are appearing, reflecting the changing perception of the role and function of public higher education. These assumptions, long based on the premise that higher education is a public good, are being replaced by a public belief in higher education primarily as a private individual good. However, the policy labels and their definitions vary, making it difficult to understand what is truly happening.

Higher education leaders must reconcile two competing policy tensions. One set of policies encourages expansion and rising expectations of higher education’s many services to society. In many states, public officials see higher education playing a central role in addressing state economic and social needs, in addition to traditional education and research roles. The other set of policies encourage contraction and fiscal restraint. State support is not expanding commensurate with institutional needs, and in some states it is even declining. Institutional leaders find themselves in difficult situations because they can-

not respond adequately to both demands concurrently.

“Privatization” of public higher education is a solution garnering significant attention, and it is most likely the wrong strategy. Despite recent high-profile examples, becoming private (in this context understood as a reliance on private revenue sources rather than public funds) is not a feasible option for most institutions. One public research university president estimated that his institution would need to increase its endowment by \$7 billion to replace lost state funds. Public higher education is also reluctant to sever its historic ties to the state, as doing so sends unfavorable messages to policymakers and the public that the institution no longer views itself as a public asset. Instead, a handful of public institutions are striking middle ground through a type of hybrid public/independent status such as public corporations found in Maryland and state enterprises found in Colorado.

In many states, public officials see higher education playing a central role in addressing state economic and social needs, in addition to traditional education and research roles.

The historic distinctions within American higher education—public and private (not for profit)—are being challenged. In many ways public institutions are acting like private ones and vice versa. Whereas public institutions have previously received a majority of their funding from the state, these institutions now increasingly rely on private revenue. The *Chronicle of Higher Education*, for example, reported that of the 22 institutions engaged in fund-raising campaigns in excess of \$1 billion, 15 are public institutions. Private institutions, on the other hand, are increasingly shaping state policy to their benefit, particularly regarding access to state financial-aid programs and public capital funding. These financial and policy changes are reducing a number of factors that once highlighted important differences and creating new key distinctions among institutions, such as those based on economic and prestige indicators. American higher education may be seeing a new set of meaningful classifications emerge, such as “public-independent” or “private-dependent,” indicating historical source of control combined with the level of financial dependence on public resources.

The competition stiffens. While American higher education has traditionally been competitive and market driven, emerging state market-based policies are further intensifying the competition. Public and independent institutions of all types and sizes are facing increased market pressures. Those that are small and focused on undergraduate education often find they must play by the same rules as large diversified research institutions that offer a range of undergraduate, graduate, and professional programs. Market-based policies will clearly favor some types of institutions over others by diminishing the role of state support in higher education and will advantage entre-

preneurial or historically self-reliant institutions. The increased competition may be creating more problems than it is solving. Entrepreneurial or commercial activities may provide the additional resources individual institutions need to fulfill their public purpose. However, when all institutions pursue the same set of competitive strategies, no one gains an advantage. Institutions run harder to stay in place. The cumulative effect of competition may also work against important social objectives such as affordability and access. Institutional leaders at both public and independent institutions face the difficult task of striking a balance between public or historic objectives and the pressures of the competitive marketplace, which may not be wholly compatible.

STRATEGIES FOR MOVING FORWARD

Some potential strategies for university leaders to address these difficult challenges are beginning to emerge. First, institutions should connect explicitly and intentionally to state needs. Colleges and universities must demonstrate through action that they understand the fiscal and social problems their states and regions face and that they have the capacity to contribute needed solutions. Second, leaders should intensify meaningful cooperation with other colleges and universities and with outside groups. Beyond collaboration in research and back-office functions, institutional leaders also can work collaboratively to shape public policy more effectively. Finding ways to build strong ties with the business community, alumni, parents, and leaders of civic, philanthropic, and nonprofit groups is an important policy strategy. Third, leaders need to

A handful of public institutions are striking middle ground through a type of hybrid public/independent status such as public corporations found in Maryland and state enterprises found in Colorado.

choose the right language to reframe the issues. The language that higher education is accustomed to using when describing key policy issues, such as “autonomy,” may be counterproductive. For example, higher education might be better served by talking about “more flexibility”—freedom from counterproductive regulations in managing its institutions—rather than about “increased autonomy”—with its implicit overtones of lessening public stewardship. Finally, campus leaders and policymakers need to be mindful of adopting others’ solutions too quickly. It is tempting to adopt strategies that seem to be working elsewhere; however, state context matters. What’s happening in one state may not be the best solution for another state. For example, the state fiscal framework and the mix of public and private institutions in each state shape available options.

CONCLUSION

Higher education leaders face the difficult challenge of balancing immediate concerns with the need to position their institu-

tions and the higher education sector for an uncertain future. Questions such as how does one balance the pursuit of public purposes with the demands of a competitive marketplace? or how can higher education's key values be articulated and reaffirmed as steadfast priorities given the new environment and the constantly changing nature of public policy? will need to be addressed if American higher education is to preserve the best of its traditions and capitalize on the opportunities that lie before it.

Author's note. This article is based on a paper, the fourth in series of essays, capturing three roundtable conversations among 40 leaders of American universities and colleges and other higher education leaders. The essays can be found on the website of the American Council on Education (<http://www.acenet.edu/bookstore>) under Leadership and Institutional Effectiveness. The project was supported by Fidelity Investments. ■

China's Private Higher Education: The Impact of Public-Sector Privatization

YINGXIA CAO AND DANIEL C. LEVY

Daniel C. Levy is a Distinguished Professor at the State University of New York and director of PROPHE. E-mail: dlevy@albany.edu. Yingxia Cao is a PROPHE doctoral research associate. E-mail: yisacao@hotmail.com. Both authors are in the Department of Educational Administration & Policy Studies, SUNY-Albany. Address: Education Building, SUNY at Albany, Albany, NY 12222, USA.

IHE devotes space each issue to contributions from PROPHE, the Program for Research on Private Higher Education, headquartered at the University of Albany. See <http://www.albany.edu/>.

As in many countries, the emergence of private higher education initially seemed rather apart from the development of public higher education in China. The public sector could not meet the increasing demand for higher education, and the private sector thus helped fill the gap. However, as private higher education has grown more robust—and as public higher education has partly privatized—competitive intersectoral competition has become more dynamic.

THE GROWTH OF PRIVATE HIGHER EDUCATION

Chinese private higher education reemerged in the late 1970s, after having been abolished in an earlier period, and has now expanded enormously. Whereas only a handful of private institutions, with limited enrollments, existed in 1980, by 1999 the number of private institutions had reached 1,270—outnum-

bering public institutions by three to four hundred. Private enrollments grew to over one million, giving China one of the largest private higher education sectors in the world. Estimates on the private sector's share of total enrollments have ranged from a fourth to even a third, although only about 40,000 of these students were in programs recognized by the Ministry of Education and thus permitted to grant bachelor's or associate degrees.

The dawn of the new century is witnessing an important change in the development of China's private higher education. Although the number of private institutions and their enrollments decreased for the first time in 2000, the decline lasted just a year. At the same time, the number of private institutions with the standing to offer degrees has more than doubled, from 89 to over 200, and overall private enrollments are resuming their substantial growth. These characteristics suggest an upward trend in many private institutions' quality and capacity.

Scholars and practitioners generally agree that the resurgence as well as initial development of private higher education took advantage of the public sector's failure to meet the rapidly growing demand (of students and employers alike), because of institutional inertia, financial shortfalls, and policy restrictions. In contrast, the private sector proved eager and flexible enough to absorb some of the new demand. While these dynamics have been common in many countries, they do not fully explain the more recent shifts in Chinese private higher education development (which have parallels in other countries).

These colleges are owned (at least partially) or managed by private parties, classified by government as part of the private sector, but affiliated to public universities.

THE PRIVATIZATION OF PUBLIC HIGHER EDUCATION

The striking public-sector privatization presents at least three challenges to private higher education development in China. One challenge involves the introduction of affiliated colleges since 1999. These colleges are owned (at least partially) or managed by private parties, classified by government as part of the private sector, but affiliated to public universities. They become a new type of provider, often with competitive advantages (conferred through their public university) over the existing independent private institutions in prestige, size, financing, and level of education provision. Although established with private financing and under independent management, affiliated private institutions usually receive important academic resources and gain enhanced reputations from the prestigious universities to which they may be linked. They are allowed to grant baccalaureate degrees, without having to go

through the usual accreditation procedure. In comparison to the public universities to which they are affiliated, these institutions are permitted to enroll a considerable number of students with lower entrance examination scores but at much higher tuition rates. Consequently, many independent private institutions are left with a greatly diminished ability to attract students and investments.

A second critical challenge is the privatization of public-sector financing, which allows public institutions to expand enrollment capacity quickly. This obviously undercuts private higher education expansion. The two major privatized financing sources for public higher education consist of tuition and bank loans. While tuition compensates for the state's decreasing allocation, bank loans allow public institutions to garner as much as hundreds of millions of dollars. Such funds pose extraordinary enrollment challenges to private higher education because public institutions enhance their existing programs and add new programs and campuses.

A third challenge to China's private higher education involves public institutions' privatized management style, which imitates private business as well as the private higher education sector by adopting a market orientation. Public institutions not only improve their efficiency in management but also update their curriculum and programs, based on market demands. Private institutions thus have to reexamine their management efficiency and compete with public institutions in certain marketable fields that used to be the private sector's exclusive profitable domain.

THE MODIFICATION OF PRIVATE HIGHER EDUCATION

As the challenges from public-sector privatization modify China's private higher education development, two key trends emerge. One trend is the bifurcation of private institutions. Some institutions accumulate enormous resources, upgrade their educational quality, update program provision, enroll thousands of students, and thus gain considerable prestige and recognition while competing with public, affiliated, and other independent private institutions. But more and more independent private institutions experience hardship from the fierce new competition. Closings and mergers (from positions of weakness) are increasing.

The second trend is that the future of independent private institutions is increasingly obscure because of the rapid spread of degree-granting affiliated colleges. As the latter enjoy certain inherent advantages, numerous nonprestigious independent private colleges thus often need to accept the weakest applicants, in nondegree programs. The competition is especially difficult because China is experiencing a gradually shrinking pool of high school graduates who fail to gain admission to public universities.

While China's private higher education used to take advantage of the limited public provision, the new intersectoral competitive dynamics now present a challenge to private higher

education's growth. This trend is also significantly modifying the development pattern and shape of the country's private higher education sector. ■

New Private-Public Dynamics: Graduate Education in Uruguay

PABLO LANDONI COUTURE

Pablo Landoni Couture is a professor at the Catholic University of Uruguay and a PROPHE affiliate. Address: Av. 8 de Octubre 2738 Montevideo, URUGUAY CP 11600. E-mail: plandoni@ucu.edu.uy.

Uruguay was the last country in Latin America to authorize private higher education institutions. Current regulatory and financing arrangements contribute to a still rather limited private-public competition but that may be changing, and the graduate level is a key locus of such new competition.

A NEW PRIVATE SECTOR

Private higher education was not allowed in Uruguay until 1985, when the government authorized the founding of the Catholic University. Ten years later, a new regulation was passed, opening the way for ample private growth.

Since 1995, 17 private higher education institutions have been recognized by the state. In the past 10 years, the sector has expanded and now offers 98 academic programs at the undergraduate and graduate levels. Uruguay's private sector now holds 12 percent of total national enrollments, although this percentage remains far below the private sector's share in Chile, Brazil, and other countries in the region, some of which have more than half the enrollments in the private sector.

The venerable University of the Republic (Universidad de la República) is the country's only public university. It has a rather open admissions policy, and it does not charge tuition. As a consequence, the private sector is constrained in its ability to attract students, especially from low- and middle-income families. This dual nature of the system, in terms of finance, is the main reason why private-public competition at the undergraduate level remains limited.

GRADUATE EDUCATION

From the beginning, Uruguay's private higher education institutions developed programs at the graduate level. This focus contrasts with the almost exclusive undergraduate emphasis of early decades in the private sector in most Latin American countries. Uruguay's private higher education leaders saw graduate education as an area in which they could successfully compete with the public university.

The University of the Republic has mostly followed the traditional Napoleonic model inherited by a good number of pub-

lic universities in Latin America. A major feature at this university is its organization into professional schools (*facultades*) with five- or six-year programs (seven in medicine). In that context, graduate programs have been limited to few fields of study (largely medicine and basic sciences) until recently. In 2001, the institution regulated graduate education, introducing a key policy change for the sector: allowing tuition for professional graduate programs. This approach makes the situation in Uruguay similar to that in Argentina, where tuition, avoided at the public undergraduate level, is common at the public graduate level. Given that most Uruguayan programs at the doctoral and even master's level have an academic profile and thus do not charge tuition, competition among institutions for graduate students in professional programs is producing new private-public dynamics.

Private universities have from the start pursued a different path, with most undergraduate programs requiring just four years, in a baccalaureate format—following the US model (programs in law are an exception). Their academic focus has been to develop programs in areas with high market demand, like business administration and computer sciences. The same areas of knowledge have been developed at the graduate level. Other fields of study with important private enrollments include education and psychology, due to public failure to develop successful programs in those areas. All this is fairly typical for private higher education development in Latin America, except that Uruguay's private-sector development started later.

In the last decade, graduate programs have expanded rapidly in both sectors of higher education.

In the last decade, graduate programs have expanded rapidly in both sectors of higher education. In 2002, 1,354 students were admitted to all institutions at the graduate level, 32 percent of them to private institutions. In the same year, 35 percent of graduates came from the private sector. Clearly, the private share of graduate enrollments far exceeds the private share at the undergraduate level.

In terms of programs at the graduate level, the University of the Republic accounts for 81 percent. The public share is high, largely because of the health sciences. The public university offers education in 86 specializations in medicine and nursing. Leaving those aside, the private share of Uruguay's graduate programs constitutes 34 percent.

At the doctoral level, only the public university offers authorized programs. Nevertheless, private universities are developing PhD programs jointly with international universities. Some of these programs are under review by public authorities. At the master's degree level, the private-sector's share encompasses 33 percent of the total number of programs.

NEW PRIVATE-PUBLIC DYNAMICS

Private-public relationships in Uruguay's graduate education are changing due to the increased competition, among institutions, for graduate students (and revenues) in professional programs.

The foremost example is the field of professional graduate programs in business administration, including MBAs. Challenges for the public university come not only from private universities but also from foreign universities and distance-learning providers. In 2002, the private sector enrolled 54 percent of the graduate students in the field of business administration.

The extent to which a traditional public university has been forced by the private institutions to compete is an interesting aspect of privatization. In areas under competition with institutions outside the public sector, a generally easily accessible and hitherto free university, completely subsidized by the state, needed to develop organizational structures and strategies quite different from those long dominant at the public university.

The public university's actions aimed at the new graduate-level competition have focused on advertisements, hiring international faculty, and "coercive isomorphism." For an institution that enjoyed a monopoly for more than 150 years, developing an advertisement campaign was a novelty. For the last three years the public university, fully financed by the community, has placed expensive paid advertisements in the press during the registration period. To improve the quality of the programs, the public university has hired international professors, as the leading private institutions were already doing.

Along with competing openly, the public university has tried to prevail by pushing through the government regulatory agency that oversees private higher education new requirements for private graduate programs, which will increase the costs of those programs. However, new standards that may augment private costs might also bolster the quality, legitimacy, and thus attractiveness of the programs to the students both sectors want to lure.

CONCLUSION

The private higher education literature highlights the diversification effects produced by private growth. A relevant factor for private development is public-sector failure. In Uruguay, it is clear that private universities took advantage of limited public development in professional graduate education. A fresh private-public dynamic has emerged as the public university decided to charge tuition for professional graduate education. With open competition, the institution has been forced by the market to engage in private-sector-like strategies and behavior to attract students.

The impact of private higher education development in other areas—undergraduate and academic (as opposed to professional) graduate programs, especially at the doctoral level—is still mitigated by the dual nature of the system, with a fully

subsidized public sector and a private side that does not receive public funding.

Experiences elsewhere in Latin America are mixed. Uruguay seems to follow developments in countries like Argentina, with a dominant public sector and small niches of competition including graduate education. Nevertheless, private and public institutions are increasingly engaging in a new competitive dynamic as private enrollments grow and the public university gets involved in some privatized endeavors. ■

Dual Privatization in Georgian Higher Education

MARIE PACHUASHVILI

Marie Pachuashvili is a Ph.D. candidate in political science at Central European University in Budapest, Hungary and a PROPHE affiliate. E-mail: pphpam01@phd.ceu.hu.

In postcommunist countries, a significant transformation of the higher education landscape has taken place since the collapse of communism—in the form of diminished state involvement in funding, provision, and governance. The extent and shape of the shift varies by country, but all postcommunist countries witness former public monopolies challenged by some form of privatization. There is usually dual privatization: (a) the growth of private institutions and (b) the introduction of tuition fees and increased businesslike behavior at public universities. Georgia has experienced both forms of privatization.

Like many countries in the region, Georgia has almost no history of private higher education. Georgian private institutions first appeared in 1991. Yet, by the 1992–1993 academic year 131 such institutions already existed. The collapse of the Georgian economy and decline in state support for public institutions contributed to diminished public-sector enrollments (an apparent parallel to trends in Central Asian and Baltic countries). Several new public institutions opened, but the public sector saw a 20 percent overall decline in the first half of the 1990s. This period represented the time frame of private institutions' founding and most intensive growth. The expansion of the comparatively large private sector peaked at 34 percent of total enrollments in 1995–1996.

PUBLIC-SECTOR PRIVATIZATION

Since that peak, however, private-sector enrollments have fallen in relative and even in absolute terms. While the first fall is not unusual in the region, the second is. Demand for publicly provided education, by contrast, has increased since 1997–1998. Just as the rise in private higher education reduced public enrollments, public-sector reform is now taking a toll on the private higher education sector.

There is one leading element in the public-sector reform: the growing body of self-financed students, which is a striking aspect of privatization within the public sector both within and beyond the region. Authorization for this change came in 1993. By 2002, 43 percent of the public sector's students paid tuition, and the share has risen each year. Student payments represent the major source of income for some public universities. For instance, in 2001–2002, student tuition revenues at Tbilisi State University and the Medical University were, respectively, two and three times higher than funds received from the state.

The dependence of public institutions on student tuition fees has blurred the distinction between the activities and missions of the two sectors in Georgia. In an attempt to attract more fee-paying students, public institutions have tried hard to stay attuned to labor-market fluctuations by providing training in fields like information technology, law, business administration, and foreign languages. Today, most public educational organizations run programs in law and economics. In addition, besides the official Georgian language of instruction, courses are offered in Russian, English, German, Armenian, and Azeri. Such ethnic appeal has been a hallmark of private higher education, often frowned upon by national public institutions. Thus, the new involvement of public universities is a significant development.

According to the 2004 law on higher education, successful candidates receiving the state financial grant can choose from among all accredited institutions, both public and private.

Additionally, by introducing vouchers for financing higher education, the Georgian government intends to encourage even more marketlike behavior on the part of public institutions and to promote competition between and within the two sectors of higher education. According to the 2004 law on higher education, successful candidates receiving the state financial grant can choose from among all accredited institutions, both public and private. This would further blur public-private differences, at least in reference to accredited private institutions. Furthermore, neither public institutions, which long held a monopoly, nor private institutions, which enjoyed a period of rather easy growth during the 1990s, would fare well without being competitive—both inter- and (largely) intra-sectorally.

CONCLUSION

In summary, extensive privatization of the previously public higher education system has been taking place in Georgia since 1989. The shift relates to the creation and growth of a distinct private sector as well as to public institutions increasingly supplementing public funding with private resources, mostly through tuition. The Georgian case corresponds in key respects to developments in the region, but it is striking for

several reasons. One is the absence of a tradition of private higher education. Second is the comparatively large private higher education share of total enrollments. Third is the relatively vigorous privatization of public education financing. Both the second and third developments stimulate striking private-public mixes, dynamics, and competition. ■

Mexico's Brain Drain

SYLVIE DIDOU AUPETIT

Sylvie Didou Aupetit is a researcher at Mexico's Centre for Advanced Research and Studies and is head of UNESCO's Chair on Quality Assurance and Emerging Providers of Tertiary Education. E-mail: didou@cinvestav.mx.

The Mexican press constantly expresses its concerns about brain drain, but, perhaps because its impact has been officially underrated, the matter has so far not appeared on the education research or policy agendas. While brain drain is calculated to involve only 5 percent of the students granted postgraduate studies abroad, that estimate is low—for the following reasons: (1) because it is based on findings from a sample used to evaluate the National Council of Science and Technology (CONACYT) scholarship program over the past 30 years; (2) because it does not incorporate the *free movers* who have used alternative mobility channels to study abroad; (3) because the mobility of highly qualified personnel includes, other than the academic market, additional fields of endeavor such as, for instance, the productive sector; and (4) because the intention expressed by young Mexican PhD holders to remain in the United States after obtaining their degrees has increased (notoriously) in recent years—almost matching the preference of Argentines and Chileans with US doctorates to remain abroad. Given these factors, the brain drain estimation would vastly surpass 5 percent. However, to reach a reliable approximation of the phenomenon would require mobilizing financial and human resources and organizing joint cooperative programs—to develop linkages between highly skilled Mexican institutions and institutions located in their countries of origin—as well as recognizing the existence of a vexing problem that the public authorities have opted to ignore.

FROM CONVENTIONAL POLICIES TO NO POLICIES?

Paradoxically, while academic circles and antigovernment groups are expressing renewed alarm about the “exodus of talented minds,” the policies established 10 years ago to combat the trend are coming to an end. In the early 1990s, the PACIME Program (“in support of Mexican science”), cofinanced by the World Bank and the Mexican government, was set up in an attempt to repatriate doctoral graduates from abroad and invite interested foreign scientists into the country.

PACIME was a conventional program, aimed at repatriation or medium-term stays, but it also focused on the multipolar flow of highly qualified human resources which was partially substituting the bipolar South-to-North dynamic. Under favorable international circumstances (the collapse of the Soviet bloc, the extended crisis in Cuba, and the difficult return to peace in Central America), the program's success was striking. Not only did it attract a significant number of Mexican and foreign doctoral degree holders, but it also encouraged national state universities desiring to enhance their research capacities to enlist the services of these repatriates and visitors.

The apparent results were not sufficient, and once the PACIME program was terminated, the repatriation and invitation efforts went into decline. Mexico received 299 foreign academics in 1994 and only 49 in 2002. Jaime Parada, director of CONACYT, recently attributed this decline to the lack of a specific budget. His statement probably indicated the end of a policy that, despite its traditionalism, showed immediate and positive results. Will another kind of program take its place? There is nothing to point in that direction, but the situation calls for answers to several questions.

Paradoxically, while academic circles and antigovernment groups are expressing renewed alarm about the “exodus of talented minds,” the policies established 10 years ago to combat the trend are coming to an end.

Does a country with substantial inflows of money from its citizens abroad not also need the academic assistance of its most educated expatriates? Can it be that Mexico lacks the means for utilizing the experience accumulated abroad (inside and outside Latin America) through brain bank or the organization of scientific and productive diasporas? Is it that Mexico can only perceive the brain drain—a term that forms part of the national rhetoric in lieu of a more neutral expression, such as brain circulation—as a form of treason against the motherland, an absolute loss of capacities, or an inevitable consequence of neocolonialism and thus fail to understand the double meaning of both risk and opportunity?

STRATEGIC CHALLENGE

A country such as Mexico experiences many challenges especially under the present circumstances. Some are well known—the result of asymmetric professional working conditions between Mexico and its main trade partners, the difficulties faced by the national academic market in absorbing young doctoral degree holders, as well as all the country's bureaucratic, credit, and fiscal requirements, which discourage the creation of business enterprises.

However, the significance of some other issues is underestimated, despite their relevance in the context of nonterritorial recruitment dynamics and “circulating elites.” Developed

countries are applying aggressive policies to recruit PhD holders, while developing countries have not yet substantially improved the working conditions offered. Mexico has adopted quality assurance policies, and, recently, pilot initiatives for the convergence of higher education systems, international harmonization of domestic degrees, regional equivalency in professional training—in the framework of bilateral or multilateral agreements, such as NAFTA. Consequently, the recruitment of Mexican postgraduates regardless of where their degrees were obtained, has become less risky for international employers. Those factors point to a scenario in which white collar migration will rapidly increase.

The situation described above calls for strategic decisions. One decision would have to involve national postgraduate scholarships. Mexico is providing funding for doctoral students in fields with a greater probability of obtaining employment abroad than of returning home. Another factor is the reestablishment of strategic linkages with scientific and productive communities abroad, based on the results achieved in Argentina, Colombia, El Salvador, and Venezuela, as well as in South Africa, China, and India. Still another area involves a science policy more focused on national priorities and on the expansion and reproduction of scientific communities and entrepreneurial groups. The goal is that the relations with Mexicans living abroad will help to consolidate an official program for the reform of a national science system. ■

Transformation, Reform, and Renewal in Afghanistan

WILLIAM G. TIERNEY

William G. Tierney is Wilbur Kieffer Professor of Higher Education and director of the Center for Higher Education Policy Analysis at the University of Southern California. Address: Waite Phillips Hall, Univ. of Southern California, Los Angeles, CA 90089, USA. E-mail: wgtiern@usc.edu.

Afghan higher education is undergoing enormous changes after a generation fraught with conflict, university closure, and severe damage to the infrastructure of Afghanistan's universities. Postsecondary institutions have suffered from several significant problems over the past quarter century. Many of the most talented faculty fled the country—first during the Soviet invasion, then during the years of fighting by the Mujahidin, and most recently during the era of the Taliban. Faculty who stayed in the country suffered from professional isolation not only with peers outside Afghanistan but also with colleagues at other institutions within Afghanistan. Many faculty were killed or exiled; others were driven underground. Higher education became highly politicized, ideologized, and sectarianized. Postsecondary campuses became war zones.

The result was that the infrastructure was damaged, looted, or destroyed.

THE INFRASTRUCTURE OF THE SYSTEM

Afghanistan's higher education system remains one of the most centralized in the world, although a weakened or nonexistent infrastructure limits the capacity to manage the system. Such centralization permits standardized policies and procedures, but it also weakens the authority and innovativeness of the chancellors and faculty on the 19 campuses. Universities do not have budgets, and all requests involving income, hiring, and new departments must be requested through the Ministry of Education. Students are accepted not by the respective universities but by the ministry. The ministry also determines the size and placement of an incoming class.

The ministry controls the budgets for all postsecondary institutions with a total annual operating budget of slightly more than US\$9 million. About 65 percent of the budget covers the costs of housing and feeding students in dormitories. Tuition is not charged at any university. The result is that postsecondary institutions are dependent upon the largesse of non-governmental organizations for structural improvements.

The number of institutions—currently 19 four-year institutions and 18 two-year institutions (which are equivalent to teacher training institutes)—has continued to expand, resulting in considerable discussion about the inefficiencies within the system. Some institutions are quite small, with fewer than 500 students, and their capacity to increase is limited due to their geographic isolation. At the same time, Afghanistan currently has less than 0.15 percent of its population in higher education, a statistic among the lowest in the world. There are currently 36,000 undergraduate students, 17 percent of whom are women. The estimate is that within five years over 100,000 students will desire a postsecondary education. The system is not well positioned to deal with such a rapid expansion. In addition to the physical devastation suffered by many campuses, during the Taliban regime hundreds of thousands of books were destroyed. No university presently has what might be considered a minimally acceptable number of books for a postsecondary library. Buildings remain in serious need of repair. No institution has more than 100 computers.

THE DIVERSITY OF THE POPULATION

The challenged infrastructure must respond to the needs of a culturally and ethnically diverse population. There are four major ethnic groups in the country and two major languages. The diversity of cultures is a social fact that is to be honored; at the same time, given the recent history of the country, language and culture are also significant topics of contestation. Which language is to be used as the medium of instruction, for example, is an unsettled question with many different answers. Although English is the most widely spoken foreign language in Afghanistan, the extent of Afghans' fluency varies widely.

Hopeful signs do exist for higher education in Afghanistan. In the last four years, over 2,500,000 refugees from neighboring countries have returned to the country, one of the largest repatriation movements in modern history. Many of these refugees are children. Along with hundreds of thousands of children who remained in Afghanistan and were denied schooling under the Taliban—including, of course, girls—students are now flocking to schools. With the encouragement of the ambitious Back to School Program, the last two years have seen millions of children pour into elementary and secondary schools, as citizens embrace education as a path to a better future. The challenge for higher education is to accommodate this influx of students over the next decade. Issues to be resolved include language of instruction, curriculum, and degree standards. Funding to support institutions must be procured. And faculty must be able to respond to student demand, institutional needs, and the national context.

CHALLENGES FACING FACULTY

As with many professional sectors in the country, the events of the past 25 years have profoundly affected the professoriate. At present, the postsecondary system has approximately 2,200 faculty in four-year institutions. Slightly more than 50 percent have a bachelor's degree, less than 6 percent hold a doctorate, and 12 percent of the faculty are female. The problematic state

The challenge of higher education is to accommodate this influx of students over the next decade.

of the academic profession in Afghanistan has had a serious impact. First, early in their careers faculty have no sense of what it means to be an academic. Second, senior faculty base their understanding of what it means to be an academic from experiences of over a quarter century ago. Third, faculty in general have limited expectations of their colleagues and evince no sense of ownership over critical matters such as academic freedom, curriculum development, faculty-student relationships, or intended outcomes for degree programs. Finally, the professoriate is no longer viewed as a respected calling but instead is a poorly paid civil service job.

This state of affairs is demonstrated in numerous ways. No university offers a master's or doctoral degree. Students complain that most instruction stifles creativity and critical thinking. Faculty show little respect for student opinion; indeed, if a student challenges a faculty member in class or disagrees with a professor's point of view, students run the risk not only of having their class grade lowered but also being threatened with retribution, even violence. Unacceptable behavior such as nepotism, bribery, plagiarism, and sexual harassment have been reported as commonplace. Academic freedom is absent. Students and faculty can be disciplined for exercising free speech. By no means do all faculty exhibit such aberrant behavior. However, the related problem is that there are no accepted

standards to deal with this sort of behavior.

Regardless of the shortcomings of graduate education in developed countries, it is commonplace to assume that when students complete their graduate training, they have learned a professional ethic about what it means to be an academic. When an individual assumes a faculty position, that ethic is further called upon in the specific institution, college, and department. Such training has been largely absent in Afghanistan for 25 years. One ought not to be surprised at the current conditions. A professional ethic of the faculty is not something that arises without explicit cultivation.

CONCLUSION

Clearly, a great deal of work awaits those who desire to improve higher education in Afghanistan. At the same time, one ought not to forget the progress made since the fall of the Taliban in December 2001. Buildings that were closed are now open. Faculty who were silenced have returned to the classroom. The explosion in applications for college is evidence on the part of the young of their desire to learn. Indeed, the university students resemble college-age students everywhere—showing energetic, inquisitive, optimistic, and impatient attitudes.

Everyone acknowledges that the problems in higher education will not be resolved overnight. Indeed, without consistent and significant external support, and the willingness within Afghanistan to restructure the system, the road will be very long. But education has long been considered a way out and a way up. For Afghanistan to put in place an indigenous model of what they want to be as a nation, then the universities will have to play a major role. Without a functioning higher education system, it will be impossible to generate the expertise and knowledge needed to rebuild a country with a vast history and troubled past. ■

Ten Years: The Center for International Higher Education and *International Higher Education*

PHILIP G. ALTBACH

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

The Center for International Higher Education (CIHE) and its flagship publication, *International Higher Education (IHE)*, are entering their 11th year of activity in 2005. It is appropriate to look at what has been accomplished and how higher education has changed in the past decade. We started

our work in 1994 with the aim of providing objective and analytical perspectives on higher education worldwide. We had, from the beginning, a special focus on developing countries and a commitment to higher education in the Roman Catholic tradition—reflecting Boston College's Jesuit roots. We wanted to highlight countries and regions that received little attention from analysts and in the research literature. We were motivated by a commitment to the “public good” and the perception of universities as central institutions that produce and transmit knowledge. Higher education is not simply a commodity to be sold for a profit—these convictions separate our perspective from those of many contemporary analysts of higher educa-

We were motivated by a commitment to the “public good” and the perception of universities as central institutions that produce and transmit knowledge.

tion.

CIHE started with limited resources from Boston College, some big ideas, and notions for ways to serve a higher education audience worldwide. From the beginning, we were committed to communication, publishing, and networking—feeling that the sharing of information and insights is central to analysis and reform. We are also committed to ensuring that communication is a two-way street—and we have featured the work of researchers and commentators from many countries and regions. We have tried, in our own way, to break with the idea that the only knowledge that is worthwhile comes from the wealthy academic systems of the North. We have also tried to feature the work of younger researchers and scholars in the field—students in the field of higher education at Boston College as well as many others worldwide.

These ideas resonated with Dr. Jorge Balan at the Ford Foundation. For 9 of our 10 years of existence, the Ford Foundation has been a steady supporter of our work, making it possible for us to publish our books and *IHE*, and to sponsor several research projects. We have also received additional assistance from, among others, the Toyota Foundation, the Rockefeller Foundation, the Carnegie Corporation, the MacArthur Foundation, and anonymous donors.

CIHE has always been an integral part of the Program in Higher Education Administration in the Lynch School of Education (LSOE) at Boston College. CIHE's activities depend on the master's and doctoral students in the higher education program who have a special interest in international higher education. Some of these students have received financial help from CIHE and have provided staff and research assistance. Many have graduated and have gone on to careers in higher education in the United States and in other countries. At least 25 students have been sponsored by the Center and perhaps double that number have chosen to focus on international higher education as part of their graduate education at Boston College. The faculty members in higher education have provided steady support for the CIHE, as has the administration of

the LSOE and of Boston College. The J. Donald Monan SJ Chair has also backed my work and has been instrumental in providing a resource base for the CIHE as well. Strong local institutional support has been combined with external funding to make our work possible.

COMMUNICATION

Our commitment to knowledge dissemination led to two early initiatives, the establishment of a quarterly publication and a website. *IHE* has published 40 issues and is now well established as a key resource worldwide for information about higher education. We send the paper edition of *IHE* to more than 2,500 readers in some 80 countries without charge. *IHE* is also available on the Internet, and many more readers access it electronically. All *IHE* articles are available in full text on the web, and readers are assisted in locating relevant material through an interactive index. *IHE* articles are now frequently cited by researchers and others and are reprinted in publications worldwide—a strong indication of our impact. Almost immediately after the establishment of the Center, we started a website focusing on international higher education issues. This pioneering website, one of the first in the field, links up with many others, and is considered a major resource—it has won several awards and is widely used. It is a featured link of several prominent organizations. Indeed, the CIHE appears at or near the top of the major search engines such as Google and Yahoo, indicating its early advent and prominence as a tool for knowledge in the field. We have recently started a new website-based initiative, called the International Higher Education Clearinghouse, with the cooperation of the American Council on Education, the Institute of International Education, and NAFSA, to focus in-depth on key international higher education issues as a way of serving practitioners worldwide. A similar initiative, the Higher Education Corruption Monitor, is a website that features news and analysis on the unfortunately growing phenomenon of corruption in all aspects of academic

The CIHE appears at or near the top of the major search engines such as Google and Yahoo, indicating its early advent and prominence as a tool for knowledge in the field.

life.

The products of our research have been disseminated in the form of books and other publications. We have, through our grant support, been able to provide copies of the 13 books we have published to readers in developing countries without cost. We have been able to arrange for translated editions of most of our books in other languages—notably Spanish, Chinese, and Japanese.

As part of our networking effort, we have hosted visiting scholars from around the world, including Lebanon, Jordan, India, Japan, China, Russia, Mexico, Argentina, the Netherlands, South Africa, Nicaragua, and elsewhere. We have worked with research centers and agencies in other countries

and have an informal collaborative agreement with the Center for the Study of the University at the National Autonomous University of Mexico.

RESEARCH AND PUBLICATIONS

In the past decade, the CIHE has sponsored research projects on several important themes in higher education. Typically, we have recruited researchers from a dozen or so countries to research a theme, then brought the research group together for discussions, followed by revision of the essays and their publication as a book. These research conferences have taken place at Boston College, Nagoya University in Japan, and the Rockefeller Foundation's Bellagio Study Center in Italy. We have sponsored research on private higher education, the changing academic workplace and the academic profession, the future of Asian higher education, and most recently the role of research universities. In all cases, we have had a special focus on developing countries. We have also directed smaller research projects on reforms in Japanese higher education, women's higher education, corruption in higher education, and other topics. We prepared a guide to journals in the field of higher education everywhere and developed an inventory of all higher education programs, research institutes, and centers worldwide. We track the literature on higher education through short reviews of new books in *IHE*.

AFRICA FOCUS

Under the leadership of Damtew Teferra, research assistant professor at Boston College and a graduate of the BC higher education doctoral program, the CIHE sponsored two major Africa projects, *African Higher Education: An International Reference Handbook*, and the *Journal of Higher Education in Africa*. The journal is cosponsored by the Council for the Development of Social Science Research in Africa, based in Senegal. We sponsor INHEA—the International Network on Higher Education in Africa—a major website focusing on African higher education issues.

THEMES

The CIHE has concentrated on several themes, reflecting our broader commitments, our sense of some of the key issues in higher education, and the interests of our students and researchers. Our topics in the past decade have included private higher education and the privatization of public higher education (some of this work has been in cooperation with the Program for Research on Private Higher Education at the University at Albany), the academic profession and the changing academic workplace, globalization and internationalization in higher education, the future of Asian higher education (in collaboration with Nagoya University in Japan), the role of the research university in developing countries, Catholic higher education, corruption in higher education, and women's higher education.

The Center enters its second decade with a continuing commitment to serving the higher education community worldwide with thoughtful analysis, networking possibilities, and providing access to the growing research literature on higher education. For the immediate future, we have identified several focal points for our work. Our ongoing research project on research ("flagship") universities in developing and middle-income countries will provide insights into the challenges facing academic institutions seeking to build research capacity and work in the top ranks of academe worldwide. Our International Higher Education Clearinghouse and the Corruption Monitor are building web-based resources that are of use to the field. We plan to develop a handbook for academic leaders in developing countries that will serve as a resource for new administrators and policymakers.

The Center's work is inspired by the conviction that higher education is an essential part of any successful society and that the university plays a central role in social and economic development everywhere. Much more than just a tool for career development and individual benefit, higher education is truly a public good. ■

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

Publication Series Center for International Higher Education

Philip G. Altbach. *Comparative Higher Education: Knowledge, the University and Development*, 1997. (Commercial edition published by Ablex Publishers. Asian edition published by the Comparative Education Research Centre, University of Hong Kong. Japanese-language translation published by the Tamagawa University Press, Tokyo, Japan. Chinese-language translation published by the People's Education Press, Beijing, China.)

Philip G. Altbach, ed. *Private Prometheus: Private Higher Education and Development in the 21st Century*, 1999. (Commercial edition published by Greenwood Publishers, Westport, Connecticut. Spanish-language translation published by Centro de Estudios Sobre la Universidad, UNAM, Mexico. Japanese-language translation published by the Tamagawa University Press, Tokyo, Japan.)

Philip G. Altbach and Patti McGill Peterson, eds. *Higher Education in the 21st Century: Global Challenge and National Response*, 1999. (Published in cooperation with the Institute of International Education, New York. Spanish-language translation published by Editorial Biblos, Buenos Aires, Argentina.)

Philip G. Altbach and David Engberg. *Higher Education: A Worldwide Inventory of Centers and Programs*, 2000. (Commercial edition published by Oryx Publishers, Phoenix, Arizona.)

Philip G. Altbach, ed. *The Changing Academic Workplace: Comparative Perspectives*, 2000. (Also published as a special theme issue of *Higher Education*, vol. 41, no. 1-2, January-March, 2001.)

Philip G. Altbach and V. Selvaratnam, eds. *From Dependence to Autonomy: The Development of Asian Universities*, 2002. (Commercial edition published by Kluwer

Academic Publishers, Dordrecht, the Netherlands. Japanese-language edition published by Tamagawa University Press, Tokyo, Japan. Chinese-language edition published in Taiwan. Asian paperback edition published by De La Salle University Press, Manila, Philippines.)

Philip G. Altbach and Yoshikazu Ogawa, eds. *Higher Education in Japan: Reform and Change in the 21st Century*, 2002. (Also published as a special theme issue of *Higher Education* 43, no. 1, January, 2002.)

Philip G. Altbach, ed. *The Decline of the Guru: The Academic Profession in Developing and Middle-Income Countries*, 2002. (Commercial edition published by Palgrave Publishers, New York and London.)

Glenda Kruss and Andre Kraak, eds. *A Contested Good? Understanding Private Higher Education in South Africa*, 2003. (Co-published with PROPHE, University at Albany.)

Alma Maldonado-Maldonado, Yingxia Cao, Philip G. Altbach, Daniel C. Levy, and Hong Zhu. *Private Higher Education: An International Bibliography*, 2004. (Commercial edition published by Information Age Publishers, Westport, Ct.)

Francesca B. Purcell, Robin Matross Helms, and Laura Rumbley. *Women's Universities and Colleges: An International Handbook*, 2004. (Commercial edition published by Sense Publishers, Rotterdam, the Netherlands.)

Philip G. Altbach and Toru Umakoshi, eds. *Asian Universities: Historical Perspectives and Contemporary Challenges*, 2004. (Commercial edition published by the Johns Hopkins University Press, Baltimore, Maryland. Japanese language edition published by Tamagawa University Press, Tokyo, Japan. Chinese language edition published by China Ocean University Press, Qingdao, China.)

Philip G. Altbach and Daniel C. Levy, eds. *Private Higher Education: A Global Revolution*. (Commercial edition published by Sense Publishers, Rotterdam, the Netherlands.)

Private Higher Education: A Global Revolution

This new book, copublished by CIHE and PROPHE, is now available. This 300-page paperback features 59 articles concerning private higher education that originally appeared in *International Higher Education*. There is also an original introduction by Philip G. Altbach and a conclusion by Daniel C. Levy, who are the editors of this book. Copies are available free of charge to readers in developing countries. Please write or e-mail the CIHE with your request. Readers elsewhere may purchase the book from Sense Publishers, POB 21858, 3001 AW Rotterdam, the Netherlands (<http://www.SensePublishers.com>). This volume is the second in our new series on private higher education. The first, *Private Higher Education: An International Bibliography*, coedited by Alma Maldonado et al., is also available.

New Publications

Barr, Nicholas and Iain Crawford. *Financing Higher Education: Answers from the UK*. Routledge, 2005. 314 pp. £20.99 (pb). ISBN 0-415-34857-9.

The authors of this book are influential economists who have played an important role in the new British fee policy for higher education. They argue that fees are justified both in terms of ensuring that those who benefit from higher education pay for it and to provide funds for the government to pay for higher education

Berg, Gary A. *Lessons from the Edge: For-Profit and Nontraditional Higher Education in America*. Westport, CT: Praeger Publishers, 2005. 213 pp. \$42.95 (hb). ISBN 0-275-98258-0. Address: Praeger Publishers, 88 Post Road West, Westport CT 06881, USA.

One of the few books to look in detail at the new for-profit institutions in the United States, this one focuses on the University of Phoenix and DeVry University. Author Berg focuses on how these institutions work, and what their goals are and how they are implemented. Such topics as the organization of

the institutions and the curriculum, the rhetoric of the for-profit sector, and the faculty are considered.

Bleak, Jared L. *When For-Profit Meets Nonprofit: Educating Through the Market*. New York: Routledge, 2005. 179 pp. \$70 (hb). ISBN 0-415-97417-8. Address: Routledge Publishers, 270 Madison Ave., New York, NY 10016, USA.

An analysis of four U.S. universities that established for-profit subsidiaries—Babson College (Babson Interactive), Duke University (Duke Corporate Education), Columbia University (Fathom), and New York University (NYUonline), this book examines the impact of the for-profit enterprises on the home institution. Issues such as governance, curriculum, the culture of the institution, and related issues. Impacts and success of the for-profit subsidiaries were varied.

Bradley, Richard. *Harvard Rules: The Struggle for the Soul of the World's Most Powerful University*. New York: HarperCollins, 2005. 375 pp. \$25.95 (hb). ISBN 0-06-056854-2. Address: HarperCollins Publishers, 10 E. 53rd St., New York, NY 10022, USA.

An attack on Harvard president Lawrence Summers, this book discusses Summers' administrative and intellectual style and also looks into the culture and politics of Harvard during the past half decade. Discussing the particular organization of Harvard University, the author looks at the internal and external consequences of the Summers' presidency.

Brodie, H. Keith H. and Leslie Banner, eds. *The Research University Presidency in the Late 20th Century: A Life Cycle/Case History Approach*. Westport, CT: Praeger, 2005. 347 pp. (hb). ISBN 0-275-98560-1. Address: Praeger Publishers, 88 Post Rd. West, Westport CT 06881, USA.

A volume in the American Council on Education's valuable higher education series, this book focuses on the tribulations of the president of the American research university. The approach of the book is unique—analytic chapters concerning the “life cycle” of the president are provided. These are followed by short commentaries by eight presidents of key universities. This book is quite valuable for understanding presidential leadership.

Consejo Superior de Educación (Chile). *Calidad en la Educación* [Quality in Education] No. 21: El Aseguramiento de la Calidad de la Educación Superior [Quality Assurance in Higher Education]. Santiago, Chile, December 2004. 370 pp. 5,000 CLP. ISSN 0717-4004. Address: Marchant Pereira 844, Providencia, Santiago, Chile.

A volume is comprised of 21 essays, with a primary (though not exclusive) focus on the Chilean experiences of evaluation, accreditation, and related quality assurance activities. A list of higher education theses and dissertations produced by graduates of Chilean universities in the period 2001–2003, as well as a list of books published by Chilean university presses in 2004, round out the volume.

Douthat, Ross Gregory. *Privilege: Harvard and the Education of the Ruling Class*. New York: Hyperion, 2005. 288 pp. \$24.95 (hb). ISBN 1-4013-0112-6. Address: Hyperion Books, 77 W. 66th St., New York, NY 10023, USA.

This book is a memoir of life as a student at Harvard University by a conservative student journalist. Among the topics discussed are social and political student life, elitism, and student escapades.

Ezell, Allen and John Bear. *Degree Mills: The Billion-Dollar Industry That Has Sold Over a Million Fake Diplomas*. Amherst, NY: Prometheus, 2005. 315 pp. (pb). ISBN 1-59102-238-X. Address: Prometheus Books, 59 John Glenn Dr., Amherst NY 14228, USA.

As this book shows, fake degrees and diplomas constitute a big business in the United States—the authors estimate that sales exceed \$500 million annually. The authors show that many prominent people have fake degrees and that the enterprise is highly damaging to higher education. This book discusses how the “industry” works, who purchases degrees, what is being done to enforce standards, and how legitimate academic institutions are affected.

Evans, Mary. *Killing Thinking: The Death of the Universities*. Continuum, 2005. 172 pp. £22.50 (pb). ISBN 0-8264-7313-X. A critique of “marketization” in higher education in the UK context, this book argues that the regime of competition and regulation has destroyed creativity, and has shifted the higher education from genuine education to imparting skills perceived as useful to the employment market.

Fagerlind, Ingemar, and Goren Stromqvist, eds. *Reforming Higher Education in the Nordic Countries*. Paris: International Institute for Educational Planning, 2004. 265 pp. (pb). ISBN 92-803-1267-7. Address: IIEP, 7-9 rue Eugene Delacroix, 75116 Paris, France.

The authors begin their book by asking what happened to the “Nordic model” of higher education in the globalized world of the 21st century. They focus on national responses to European Union initiatives and the changing realities within the Nordic countries. Case studies of Denmark, Finland, Iceland, Norway, and Sweden are presented.

Hahn, Carola and Ute Hanzehdorf, eds. *Wegweiser Globalisierung—Hochschulsektoren in Bewegung. Länderanalysen aus vier Kontinenten zu Marktchancen für deutsche Studienangebote*. (Guide to globalization: The higher education sector in transition: Analyses from countries on four continents of market opportunities for German higher education) Kassel, Germany: Verlag Winifried Jenior, 2005. 366 pp. (pb). ISBN 3-934377-75-0. Address: Verlage Winifried Jenior, Lassallestr 15, D-34119 Kassel, Germany.

From the perspective of the expansion of German higher education activities abroad, this study focuses on conditions in 9 countries of interest to German higher education exporters. The research looks at market conditions and other aspects of academic systems relevant to overseas study programs. The countries considered are Namibia, South Africa, Jordan, Singapore, Vietnam, Russia, Turkey, Brazil, and Mexico.

Halimi, Suzy. *L'enseignement supérieur au Royaume-Uni*. Paris: Ophrys, 2004. 176 pp. (pb). ISBN 2-84120-109-0. Address: Ophrys Publishers, 10 rue de Nesle, 75006 Paris, France.

An overview and analysis of contemporary British higher education, this volume discusses recent reports that have affected higher education in the United Kingdom, the new culture of evaluation, issues relating to access, the politics of research, current debates about financing, and other issues. This book provides a French perspective on developments in Britain.

Hersh, Richard H. and John Merrow, eds. *Declining by Degrees: Higher Education at Risk*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2005. 244 pp. (pb). ISBN 1-4039-6921-3. Address: Palgrave Macmillan Publishers, 175 Fifth Ave., New York NY 10010, USA.

A critical analysis of American higher education, this volume features discussion of such topics as the state of liberal arts education, market pressures on higher education, an examination of academic quality, the curriculum, issues of access and retention of students, and others. Among the authors are many prominent analysts and educators.

Huisman, Jeroen and Marijk van der Wende, eds. *On Cooperation and Competition II: Institutional Responses to Internationalization, Europeanization, and Globalization*. Bonn: Germany: Lemmens Verlag, 2005. 247 pp. (pb). ISBN 3-932306-68-6. Address: Lemmens Verlag, Matthias-Grünwald-Str 1-3, D-53175 Bonn, Germany.

A volume in the valuable Academic Cooperation Association's publication series, this book discusses contemporary developments in the European Union regarding internationalization of higher education and related issues. Most of the chapters describe the programs in European countries relating to these themes. Among the countries included are England, Norway, Greece, Austria, the Netherlands, and Germany. A European-wide perspective is also provided.

Hunt, Thomas C. et al., eds. *A Handbook of Research on Catholic Higher Education*. Greenwich, CT: Information Age Publishers, 2003. 362 pp. (pb). ISBN 1-59311-058-8. Address: Information Age Publishers, 80 Mason St., Greenwich, CT 06830, USA

A comprehensive series of essays concerning key issues facing Catholic colleges and universities. This volume discusses such topics as the faculty at Catholic universities, the campus ministry, university-community partnerships, finance and fund raising, the curriculum and its philosophical base, the history of Catholic higher education, and others. The focus is on the United States.

Iacobucci, Frank and Carolyn Tuohy, eds. *Taking Public Universities Seriously*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2005. 613 pp. \$55 (pb). ISBN 0-8020-9376-0. Address: University of Toronto Press, 10 St. Mary St., Toronto, ON M4Y 2W8, Canada.

This book, which stems from a symposium held as part of a review of postsecondary education in Ontario, provides a wide-ranging consideration of the challenges facing public higher education in Canada and worldwide. While most of the chapters focus on Canada, there are several that deal with the United States, Australia, and the United Kingdom, and all of the themes are relevant every-

where. Among the topics considered are access and equity, governance, graduate study and research, performance-based budgeting and other financial issues, student loans and related issues of financing studies, and others.

Ilchman, Alice Stone, Warren F. Ilchman, and Mary Hale Tolar, eds. *The Lucky Few and the Worthy Many*. Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press, 2004. 208 pp. \$34.95 (hb). ISBN 0-253-34476-X. Address: Indiana University Press, 601 N. Morton St., Bloomington, IN 47404. USA.

The process of selecting winners for highly competitive scholarships is the focus of this book. The editors argue that it is very difficult to select a small number of winners from the many highly qualified applicants for such scholarship programs as Rhodes and Marshall. The challenges of ensuring the selection process, including organizing panels, conducting interviews, and making decisions are considerable and are examined by the contributors.

Jones, Glen A., Patricia L. McCarney, and Michael L. Skolnik, eds., *Creating Knowledge, Strengthening Nations: The Changing Role of Higher Education*. Toronto, Canada: University of Toronto Press, 2005. 290 pp. Cdn\$60 (hb). ISBN 0-8020-3856-5. Address: University of Toronto Press, 10 St. Mary St., Suite 700, Toronto ON M4Y 2W8, Canada.

The focus of this internationally oriented volume is on the relationship between higher education and economic development and entrepreneurialism. The book attempts to balance the economic and non-economic objectives of higher education.

Kasozi, A. B. K. *University Education in Uganda: Challenges and Opportunities for Reform*. Kampala, Uganda: Fountain Publishers, 2003. 190 pp. \$36.95 (pb). ISBN 9970-02-342-X. Address: Fountain Publishers, POB 488, Kampala, Uganda.

This book provides a wide-ranging discussion of the challenges facing Uganda higher education. Among the topics discussed are patterns of growth, financing issues, curriculum reform, global forces on Ugandan higher education, management and structural patterns, and the challenges of quality.

Kennedy, James C. and Caroline J. Simon. *Can Hope Endure? A Historical Case Study in Christian Higher Education*. Grand Rapids,

MI: Eerdmans Publishing, 2004. 271 pp. \$29 (pb). ISBN 0-8028-2870-1. Address: Wm. Eerdmans Publishing, 255 Jefferson Ave. SE., Grand Rapids, MI 49503, USA.

A case study of Hope College in Michigan, this book provides information about the origins and historical transformation of a rather typical Protestant liberal arts college in the United States. Hope College was founded as part of the Dutch Reformed Church in America and has over time changed to adapt to circumstances. One of the focuses of the book is how the institution has managed to retain its Christian heritage.

Kezar, Adrienna J., Tony C. Chambers, and John C. Burkhardt, eds. *Higher Education for the Public Good: Emerging Voices from a National Movement*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 2005. 342 pp. \$40 (hb). ISBN 0-787973-82-2. Address: Jossey-Bass Publishers, 989 Market St., San Francisco, CA 94103, USA.

An effort to refocus the debate about higher education in the United States on the public good, this volume argues that higher education contributes significantly to broader public goals in society. Beyond educating people for both economic and civil life, colleges and universities contribute to a social charger for society. Among the themes discussed in the book are the state and the public good, the role of trusteeship, faculty roles and rewards, and institutional leadership. While this volume focuses exclusively on the United States, there is relevance to other countries.

Knezevic, Bozana. *Program Evaluation in Higher Education*. Frankfurt am Main, Germany: Peter Lang, 2005. 292 pp. \$57.95 (pb). ISBN 3-631-52828-0. Address: Peter Lange Publishers, Eschborner Landstr. 42-50, D-60489 Frankfurt am Main, Germany.

The focus of this book is the improvement of the curriculum on higher education. Using action research, it is argued that active learning, and democratic evaluation are appropriate ways of handling internal evaluation.

Krotsch, Pedro. *Educación Superior y Reformas Comparadas* [Higher Education and Comparative Reforms]. Buenos Aires, Argentina: Universidad Nacional de Quilmes, 2001. 196 pp. ISBN 987-9173-54-6. Address: Roque Sáenz Peña 180 - Bernal - (B1876BXD) Pcia. de Buenos Aires.

A comparative analysis of the problems for

higher education of change, innovation, and reform represents the main focus of this book. The author introduces the concept of comparative higher education in the context of innovation and reform; provides an overview of the more general field of higher education studies; explores key examples of analytical frameworks for understanding higher education; reviews contemporary developments in higher education in the industrialized world; and zeroes in on an analysis of important developments in the Latin American and Argentine higher education contexts.

Lang, James M. *Life on the Tenure Track: Lessons from the First Year*. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2005. 186 pp. \$18 (pb). ISBN 0-8018-8103-X. Address: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2715 N. Charles St., Baltimore MD, 21218, USA

This book is a memoir, written in diary style, of the first year of teaching in an American college. Among the topics discussed are the tenure system, the challenges of teaching, faculty politics, and others. The style is engaging.

Leslie, W. Bruce. *Gentlemen and Scholars: Colleges and Community in the "Age of the University"*. New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction, 2005. 312 pp. \$29.95 (pb). ISBN 1-4128-0458-2. Address: Transaction Publishers, 35 Berrue Circle, Piscataway, NJ 08854, USA.

A historical study of 19th century American undergraduate colleges, this book shows how four institutions developed from their Protestant denominational roots into a more national orientation as the United States became industrialized in the latter 19th century. Leslie argues that the most successful of these institutions adjusted to national economic and social trends, while others retained their more parochial roots.

Levy, Daniel C. *To Export Progress: The Golden Age of University Assistance in the Americas*. Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press, 2005. 407 pp. (hb). ISBN 0-253-34577-4. Address: Indiana University Press, 601 N. Morton St., Bloomington IN 47404, USA.

A multidimensional analysis of assistance provided mainly during the 1960s and 1970s by the Ford Foundation, the U.S. Agency for International Development and the Inter-American Development Bank to Latin American higher education, this book looks at motivations of donors and recipients, successes and failures, of a range of develop-

ment assistance programs.

Lin, Xiaoqing Diana. *Peking University: Chinese Scholarship and Intellectuals, 1898-1937*. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press, 2005. 233 pp. (hb). ISBN 0-7914-6321-4. Address: SUNY Press, 90 State St., Albany NY 12207, USA.

Focusing on the development of academic disciplines and curriculum, this book examines the formative years of China's most influential and oldest modern academic institution, Peking University. The interplay between Western academic knowledge and Chinese ideas is discussed.

Luhanga, Matthew L. et al. *Strategic Planning and Higher Education Management in Africa: the University of Dar es Salaam Experience*. Dar es Salaam, Tanzania: Dar es Salaam University Press, 2003. 225 pp. \$36.95 (pb). ISBN 9976603959. Address: Dar es Salaam University Press, POB 35182, Dar es Salaam, Tanzania.

This book provides a detailed discussion of the strategic planning process that took place at the University of Dar es Salaam during the 1990s. The nature of the planning process is discussed as is the nature of the plans themselves and the process of implementation. Implications for other African countries are also provided.

Martin, Robert E. *Cost Control, College Access, and Competition in Higher Education*. Cheltenham, UK: Edward Elgar, 2005. 258 pp. (hb). ISBN 1-84376-953-0. Address: Edward Elgar Publishers, Glensanda House, Montpellier Parade, Cheltenham, GL50 1UA, UK.

Economist Martin focuses on the complex relationship between the desire for U.S. higher education to maximize their prestige while at the same time serving their students. Taking into account competition, increasing costs, endowment issues, and other factors, he develops a model for cost containment while serving the "social contract" the students.

Merrifield, Susan R. *Readin' and Writin' for the Hard-Hat Crowd: Curriculum Policy at an Urban University*. New York: Peter Lang, 2005. 139 pp (pb). ISBN 0-8204-5508-3. Address: Peter Lang Publishers, 275 Seventh Ave., New York, NY 10001, USA

A case study of the establishing of an urban public university in the United States.

Establishing in 1964, Urban State University was supposed to be a "poor man's Harvard." This volume discusses the problems and challenges encountered by the institution, with special attention to curricular issues.

Muche, Franziska, Maria Kelo, and Bernd Wächter. *The Admission of International Students into Higher Education: Policies and Instruments*. Bonn: Germany: Lemmens Verlag, 2004. 175 pp. (pb). ISBN 3-932306-62-7. Address: Lemmens Verlag, Matthias-Grünewald-Str 1-3, D-53175 Bonn, Germany.

This volume presents a detailed analysis of how the admission of international students is administered in several countries, including the United States, Switzerland and several others, and a consideration of the key elements of admissions policy. This book will be of great value for academic institutions concerned with the processes of admissions in a changing international environment.

Muche, Franziska, ed. *Opening Up to the Wider World: The External Dimension of the Bologna Process*. Bonn: Germany: Lemmens Verlag, 2005. 133 pp. (pb). ISBN 3-932306-67-8. Address: Lemmens Verlag, Matthias-Grünewald-Str 1-3, D-53175 Bonn, Germany.

This book considers the ongoing Bologna process in European higher education from an international perspective. The focus of this book is on how other regions of the world—including the United States, India, Africa, Latin America, and Australia—view the process and how they might fit in. Consideration is given to the prospects for non-European students in the new arrangements and how admissions and related issues can be handled.

Newman, Frank, Lara Couturier, and Jamie Scurry. *The Future of Higher Education: Rhetoric, Reality, and the Risks of the Market*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 2004. 284 pp. (hb). ISBN: 0-7879-0972-9. Address: Jossey-Bass Publishers, 989 Market St., San Francisco, CA 94103, USA.

The final report of the Futures Project, headed by the late Frank Newman, this book provides a very useful overview of broad trends shaping higher education in the United States. Its relevance, however, is global, since the issues facing the United States are common in most countries. An overall theme of the book is the "problem of the market"—the negative implications of the marketization of higher education. Among

the themes discussed are how competition is distorting the public purpose of higher education, the problems of autonomy and accountability, student learning, and the role of service.

Nkulu, Kiluba L. *Serving the Common Good: A Postcolonial African Perspective on Higher Education*. New York: Peter Lang, 2005. 182 pp. \$59.95 (hb). ISBN 0-8204-7626-9. Address: Peter Lange Publishing, 275 Seventh Ave., New York NY 10001, USA

Using Julius Nyerere's ideas about education for the common good, this volume examines how African higher education can help to solve the cultural, economic, political and social problems of the 21st century.

Odin, Jaishree K. and Peter T. Manicas, eds. *Globalization and Higher Education*. Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press, 2004. 265 pp. \$27 (pb). ISBN 0-8248-2826-7. Address: University of Hawaii Press, 2840 Kolowalu St., Honolulu, HI 96822, USA.

Stemming from a conference on the ideologies of globalization, this book analyzes a range of topics relating to how globalization affects higher education. Among the topics considered are the impact of the internet on the professoriate, a critique of the neoliberal agenda for higher education, lessons from for-profit higher education, globalization, access to higher education, corporate challenges, the role of the new technologies, and others.

Ogren, Christine A. *The American State Normal School*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2005. 310 pp. (pb). ISBN 1-4039-6838-1. Address: Palgrave Macmillan, 175 Fifth Ave., New York, NY 10010, USA.

Between 1870 and the 1900s, public normal schools were responsible for the education of many school teachers in the United States. More than 200 contemporary colleges and universities stem from these normal schools. This history discusses teacher education, gender issues, and related issues in analyzing the history of these institutions.

Orfield, Gary, Patricia Marin, and Catherine L. Horn, eds., *Higher Education and the Color Line: College Access, Racial Equity, and Social Change*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard Education Press, 2005. 228 pp. (pb). ISBN 1-891792-59-8. Address: Harvard Education Press, 8 Story St., Cambridge, MA

02138, USA.

A broad consideration of race in American higher education, this book examines the affordability of higher education for members of minority groups, racial diversity on campus, standardized assessment and higher education, race and gender inequality in the 50 states, the role of higher education in social mobility, and related issues.

Potts, Anthony. *Civic Leaders and the University*. Bern, Switzerland: Peter Lang, 2003. 407 pp. \$56.95, ff61.40. (hb). ISBN 3-906769-54-2. Address: Peter Lang Publishers, POB 350, CH 2542 Pieterlen, Switzerland.

This book explores the relationship between regional political leaders and the development of two universities in Australia. The focus is on the role of civil and political leaders in the development and support of academic institutions. The case studies provide detail concerning the interplay between politics, concepts of development, and the establishment of universities.

Schuman, Samuel. *Old Main: Small Colleges in Twenty-first Century America*. Baltimore, Md: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2005. 280 pp. \$39.95 (hb). ISBN 0-8018-8092-0. Address: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2715 N. Charles St., Baltimore MD 21218, USA.

This analysis of the situation of small liberal arts colleges in the United States is based on case studies of 12 institutions out of a total of 600. The case study schools include public and private, and prestigious and less famous institutions. Schuman points out that these colleges are different from the mainstream of American higher education and that they face particular problems and challenges. He is also convinced of the importance of these colleges.

Shulman, Lee S. *Teaching as Community Property: Essays on Higher Education*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey Bass Publishers, 2004. 242 pp. (hb). ISBN 0-7879-7201-0. Address: Jossey Bass Publishers, 989 Market St. San Francisco, CA 94103, USA.

Carnegie Foundation president Shulman argues for the primacy of teaching in higher education in this series of essays.

Stevens, Robert. *University or Uni: The Politics of Higher Education in England since*

1944. London: Politico's, 2004. 196 pp. £15.99. ISBN 1-84275-102-6. Address: Politico's, 215 Vauxhall Bridge Rd., London SW1V 1EJ, UK.

Author Stevens has held academic positions in the United Kingdom and in the United States and focuses in this book on analyzing a half century of British higher education policy. He argues that government has taken ever-greater interest in higher education and that the academic system is increasingly seen as central to the success of the economy. Universities have become less independent.

Vest, Charles M. *Pursuing the Endless Frontier: Essays on MIT and the Role of Research Universities*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 2004. 291 pp. \$24.95 (hb). ISBN 0-262-22072-5. Address: MIT Press, 55 Hayward St., Cambridge MA 02142, USA.

Recently retired MIT president Vest focuses on some of the central issues facing research universities from the perspective of the MIT experience. Among the topics considered are relationships between university and industry, national security and higher education, excellence and access, the implications of the digital age, and others.

Weston, Timothy B. *The Power of Position: Beijing University, Intellectuals, and Chinese Political Culture, 1898-1929*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 2004. 325 pp. (hb). ISBN 0-520-23767-6. Address: University of California Press, 2120 Berkeley Way, Berkeley, CA 94704, USA.

Beijing University, China's key academic institution, has been centrally involved with Chinese politics since its establishment in the late 19th century. This volume focuses on intellectual and political trends in the university, on the scholars who were involved in shaping those trends and broader political thought in China, and how the university interacted with society during a key period in Chinese political development.

Wulff, Donald H and Ann E. Austin, eds. *Paths to the Professoriate: Strategies for Enriching the Preparation of Future Faculty*. San Francisco: Jossey Bass, 2004. 300 pp. (hb). ISBN 0-7879-6634-7. Address: Jossey Bass Publishers, 989 Market St., San Francisco, CA 94103, USA.

A useful compilation of current thinking and programs concerning the reform of doctoral education in the United States, this

book features discussion of career paths of doctoral recipients, strategies for academic career socialization, the development of graduate students as teaching scholars, and a variety of new programs for doctoral education. While this book focuses on the United States, it may be relevant to others concerned with developing doctoral education.

PUBLICATIONS FROM JAPAN ON HIGHER EDUCATION

The Research Institute for Higher Education at Hiroshima University, the oldest such center in Japan and one of the government-funded Centers of Excellence, regularly publishes books and journals in English concerning Japanese and international higher education. The annual *Higher Education Research in Japan* provides English translations from the

Institute's quarterly Japanese-language publication, *Daigaku Ronsho*. The 2005 issue includes articles on fixed-term arrangements for Japanese professors, social stratification and higher education in Japan, and the academic profession. Articles on comparative themes are also published. *Higher Education Forum*, also published annually, collects articles from leading scholars in the field of higher education in Japan and elsewhere or topics of general relevance. The 2005 issue includes articles on social stratification, the Bologna process, mass higher education in China and Japan, and other topics. *Globalization and Higher Education*, edited by Akira Arimoto, Futao Huang, and Keiko Yokoyama, features analyses of themes on globalization in Australia, Germany, China, Japan, and the Nordic countries. Another vol-

ume with an international theme is *Enhancing Quality and Building the 21st Century Higher Education System*. Stemming from an international conference, this book features mainly chapters concerning Japan but also includes several analyses of other Asian countries. Further information can be obtained from the RIHE, 1-2-2 Kagamiyami, Higashi-Hiroshima 739-8512, Japan. The fax number is 81-82-422-7104.

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.

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, Champion Hall, Boston College, Chestnut Hill, Massachusetts, 02467, USA. Fax: (617) 552-8422. E-mail: <arnoldkc@bc.edu>. More information about the pro-

gram—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>. International Higher Education is available full-text on our website. The Boston College Center for International Higher Education provides a unique service to colleges and universities world wide by focusing on the global realities of higher education. Our goal is to bring an international consciousness to the analysis of 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 policymakers. 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.

EDITOR

Philip G. Altbach

ASSISTANT EDITOR

Salina Kopellas

EDITORIAL OFFICE

Center for International
Higher Education
Champion Hall
Boston College
Chestnut Hill, MA 02467
USA

Tel: (617) 552-4236

Fax: (617) 552-8422

E-Mail: highered@bc.edu

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

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.