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News from the Tenure Front

Cathy A. Trower
Cathy A. Trower is a research associate at the University of Maryland at College Park. She is currently working on a national study on tenure funded by the Pew Charitable Trusts, where she has spent the past year and a half researching tenure and its alternatives. E-mail: ct71@vmoil.umd.edu.

THE STATISTICS
It should be noted at the outset that tenure systems are the predominant employment practice at most U.S. colleges and universities. According to the most recent study published by the U.S. Department of Education, tenure systems exist in 71 percent of all higher education institutions. Indeed, virtually all public research, private research, public doctoral, and public comprehensive institutions had tenure systems for full-time instructional staff. In fall 1992, 58 percent of all permanent full-time instructional faculty and staff had tenure. Another 24 percent were on the tenure track.

THE HEADLINES
“Tenure faces biggest test as debate spills beyond academe and UT regents order tenure reviews.” “Academic job security threatened as anti-tenure wave sweeps U.S.” “New concerns over the meaning and value of tenure.” “Tenured and untouchable.” “Tenure: Not Just Job Security.” These are some of the headlines from newspaper stories and magazine articles across the United States.

THE ATTACK
Business Leaden. Tenure, a bulwark of academic life is currently under attack from constituencies both inside and outside academe. “Why should faculty enjoy lifetime employment security when virtually no one else has it?” pondered the former IBM vice president, now “downsized” into early retirement. Given the recent layoffs of enormous numbers of business professionals, academia’s tenure system seems, at best, anachronistic. “Academia is much more out of step than we ever were before with the commercial sector,” says Derek Hodgson, provost and vice president for academic affairs at Mississippi State University.

Boards and Legislators. Frustrated trustees are asking questions. How can we manage effectively during difficult financial times with tenure policies that restrict our ability to move resources fluidly? Have the costs and benefits of tenure changed since its inception to current times? Has traditional tenure outlived its usefulness, its purpose? Recently, collegeboard members across the country have questioned tenure policies in light of fiscal realities. They wonder what to do when market demand shifts from one program to another, or from one campus to another. In 1995, the Arizona Board of Regents, together with the faculty and administrators at Arizona’s public institutions, began discussions about these issues. The board became concerned that the state’s universities were not being responsive to changing societal demands and that the presence of tenure raised issues of effectiveness and credibility with the general public.

The University of Minnesota Board of Regents found itself in a similar situation in 1996, complicated by the state legislature’s holding $6.6 million in abeyance pending tenure reform. There, the faculty senate proposed several modifications to the traditional tenure system—including, but not limited to, the recognition of outreach as a criterion for tenure, posttenure review with the possibility of salary reduction for poor performance; tightened standards for term appointments; the ability to extend the probationary period to nine years; a provision to tie tenure to base salary; and a simplified disciplinary procedure. The state legislature felt that the faculty recommendations “fell short” in three areas: an unclear link between performance and compensation; insufficient flexibility on the part of the university in response to programmatic needs in a changing environment; and a “cumbersome” and “complex” posttenure review process that was “virtually unworkable.”

The regents proposed that 8 of the faculty’s 12 proposed motions be fully accepted, and that revisions be made in three areas to meet the requests of state officials. Specifically, the regents wanted greater flexibility for faculty compensation, the imposition of discipline when “adequate cause” exists, and the ability to terminate faculty appointments if reassignment or retraining were impractical in the event of programmatic changes. Feeling that the regents’ draft proposal substantially reduced or eliminated tenure guarantees in five key areas, the faculty rejected it and signed enough union cards to trigger a state labor order that froze all employment conditions at the University of Minnesota.

Junior Faculty. “The tenure process seems unfair and arbitrary. All of the tenured slots are occupied; we can’t get into the club. Tenure attainment is virtually impossible,” lamented many junior faculty. Indeed, when asked about the academic career, these new and aspiring faculty revealed serious reservations about tenure, but identified the tenure process as their most urgent concern. They commented that expectations are constantly changing, that everything is
vague, ambiguous, and illusive. The process itself is seriously flawed and, because it is such a high-stakes decision for both the institution and the individual, it is essential that the process be restructured.

**THE RESPONSE**

Institutional responses to the attacks on tenure have ranged from maintaining the status quo to overhauling the system, with most institutions taking some actions in between those extremes. In a recent survey with 280 respondents from four-year institutions, 31 percent report no changes to the traditional tenure policies on their campuses. The remainder, however, report modifications, including posttenure review (29 percent), hiring faculty on long-term nontenure-track appointments (24 percent), stop-the-tenure-clock provisions for probationary faculty (10 percent), lengthening probationary periods (5 percent), and imposing tenure quotas (5 percent). Fifteen percent of respondents report their institutions have no tenure system; these colleges hire faculty on multiple-year contracts.

**THE FUTURE**

It seems likely that tenure systems will continue to be attacked until the general public, board members, legislators, and junior faculty feel that significant reform has occurred. Major modifications to traditional tenure, including the overhaul of tenure codes, will continue to occur at the less selective institutions, while the elites are likely to continue working at the margins and create new faculty employment tracks. In addition to those modifications previously mentioned, it appears that there are several prime candidates for tenure reform including:

- uncoupling tenure and academic freedom — that is, finding other ways to protect academic freedom for all faculty;
- the creation of more options for faculty — that is, offering an array of employment practices from which faculty may choose, as well as incentives for faculty to forego tenure;
- changes in pretenure policies such as “tenure by objectives”; and
- changes in the locus of tenure such that faculty become tenured in departments or disciplines, rather than in institutions.

Whatever the future holds for tenure policies, one fact is clear. Institutions are making changes in traditional tenure systems in response to constituents who believe that employment policies and practices must evolve as institutions adapt to the constantly changing outside world.

**NOTES**

Brain Drain of African Scholars and the Role of Studying in the United States

Damtew Teferra

Damtew Teferra is a doctoral student in the School of Education, Center for International Higher Education, Boston College. Address: Campion Hall, 140, Commonwealth Avenue, Chestnut Hill, MA 02167, USA; fax: (617) 552 8422; e-mail: teferra@bc.edu.

The term “brain drain” is often used to describe the flow of scholars from one country—especially a Third World one—to another—usually a developed one. There has been some controversy over the concept. Some refute concerns over brain drain as emotional nationalistic nonsense while others urge a serious commitment by developing countries particularly in Africa to staunch their serious brain drain. While one school of thought treats brain drain as an extreme form of institutional nomadism another views it as a circulation of skilled labor in the emerging interdependent global economy.

The International Dimension of Brain Drain

Since the mid-1960s and, in particular, during the 1970s, the geographic structure of the brain drain process noticeably changed, the developing countries becoming its “nutrient medium.” During the period from 1961 to 1980, more than 500,000 scholars from the developing countries moved to the United States, Great Britain, and Canada.

In Eastern Europe brain drain is a very recent phenomenon. For many decades brain drain was largely unknown to the former Soviet Union and existed as a thin stream in a relatively weak current of ethnic emigration involving mainly Jews and Germans. Emigration itself was either ignored or regarded by the society as a phenomenon incompatible with the socialist system or even as high treason. The state of brain drain has now reached a crisis level due to the liberalization of immigration laws in these countries. It costs U.S.$2.5–5 billion in annual potential loss to Russia alone. Between 1981 and 1991, 50,000 high-skill specialists left Bulgaria while Hungary has lost 15 percent of its scientists and specialists and Poland 10 percent of its total scientific personnel.

In Asia, the loss of 15,000 medical doctors in 1980 cost India U.S.$144 million. The Chinese Communist revolution of 1949 and the recent incident in Tiananmen Square, which resulted in immigration measures by the U.S. government stimulated brain drain from China. The Asian student population in the United States grew by more than 8 percent over a period of 15 years from 1974/75 to 1991/92, which is indicative of the growth of the pool of potential stay-ons.

AFRICAN SCHOLARS IN THE UNITED STATES

With its diverse and huge higher education system, scholarship opportunities, and less-stringent immigration policies, the United States has been a more attractive market for pursuing scholarship than the rest of the Western world. It should be pointed out that the United States still has a more favorable immigration policy for trained professionals.

Opportunities for higher education, especially graduate studies, are extremely limited and fiercely competitive at home. Thus, there is a steady flow of African immigrants to the United States in pursuit of academic excellence. In 1986/87 over 31,000 African students traveled to the United States: 48.2 percent from the west, 20.9 percent from the east, 17.3 percent from the north, and 16 percent from the south. For the last four decades Nigeria, Egypt, South Africa, Ethiopia, Kenya, and Liberia stood as the leading sendernations. Roughly 41 percent of African students were studying at the graduate level during the 1987/88 academic year while 55 percent were at the undergraduate level.

Many sources and personal observation support the view that most African scholars and students prefer to stay in the United States rather than other Western countries. In Addis Ababa University, Ethiopia—where the author has worked for over 10 years—of about 20 faculty from the Physics Department who left for Ph.D. studies—all almost all to the United States—nonreturned. It is, however, inter-
esting to note that almost all who studied in Europe, the old East Bloc, and Scandinavia returned. The Mathematics Department also suffers from the same problem and has to recruit fresh graduates almost every year. These trends correspond quite well with the general view that immigrant scholars of science background have better job opportunities in the American market than do their counterparts in the humanities and social sciences.

It must be remarked that job opportunities, whether professional or otherwise, are far better for African scholars in the United States than in Europe, where the unemployment rate is high. This is one of the major factors that keeps professionals in the United States. A lenient immigration policy, better job prospects, and less segregating sociocultural setting attract African scholars to stay in the United States.

Many sources and personal observation support the view that most African scholars and students prefer to stay in the United States rather than other Western countries.

**With its diverse and huge higher education system, scholarship opportunities, and less-stringent immigration policies, the United States has been a more attractive market for pursuing scholarship than the rest of the Western world.**

**Economic Benefits:** Many African scholars value the opportunity of working abroad in areas of their expertise, which usually comes with good financial remuneration. Still the cost of employing these scholars is often lower for the recruiting body than employing their Western counterparts. Western scholars have become so expensive that, even purchasing a round-trip ticket for external examiners has become almost impossible for most African institutions.

The movement of African scholars within the region, however, is not always full of happy stories. The massive outflow in some countries of southern Africa has reached such staggering proportions that it has caused severe shortages of personnel. Zambia, Malawi, and Zimbabwe had a flood of scholars to Botswana, South Africa, Swaziland, and Namibia, creating severe shortages at home.

**Efforts to Halt Brain Drain**

Various national, regional, and international efforts are now underway to curtail the problem. Recently, in one prominent international initiative, the United Nations Development Program and the International Organization for Migration have undertaken to attract African scholars who are resident in the United States to work in Africa. Through the TOKTEN (Transfer of Knowledge through Expatriate Nationals) program, UNDP recruited many professionals including Africans in developed countries to volunteer their services for short, well-prepared consultancy assignments in their countries of origin. A number of African governments have also taken measures to attract their schol-
ars living abroad by providing free housing, duty-free status, and other benefits.

Some ill-advised national initiatives to avert the wave of immigration have, however, resulted in adverse consequences. Strict regulations hindering the exodus of scholars and students, as a measure to curb brain drain, ended up discouraging prospective returnees.

The motivation of African scholars to study in the United States and stay on later is a result of complex economic, political, social, cultural, and personal matters.

SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS
The motivation of African scholars to study in the United States and stay on later is a result of complex economic, political, social, cultural, and personal matters. The impact of each factor varies from country to country and from individual to individual.

Many African countries are now undergoing economic hardships exacerbated by political turmoil and social instabilities making it difficult for scholars to return home. Furthermore, the news from home on suppression of dissidents by governments aggravated by the ever-declining support for public services discourages potential returnees.

African governments should wholeheartedly embrace the fact that scholars are the center of development, self-reliance, and sustainability. This should be accompanied by the commitment of more resources and autonomy, responsibility, academic freedom, and good working facilities, not only to encourage those scholars abroad to return but also to discourage those at home from fleeing, ultimately strengthening the nation-building capacity.

REFERENCES
a role in evaluating scholarship.

International validation of academe has deep roots in Hang Kong, as well as in other Asian university systems. Foreigners serve as members of Hang Kong’s University Grants Committee along with local people, and are frequently involved in the evaluation of academic programs. It is assumed that Hang Kong’s small and relatively new higher education system needs external review, and that local people do not have the skills necessary for this task. Only one institution, the University of Hang Kong, is more than a half-century old. The seven university-level institutions do not have deep roots. Part of the logic of external evaluation stems from the colonial tradition, which is predicated on the idea of external control. It is also assumed that what exists in the metropole is better. It is assumed that local academic standards cannot be trusted.

Local scholars seek to publish their work abroad. They look to the methodological and substantive interests of the international scientific community, thus ignoring local topics and needs. Everyone is looking abroad because they are forced to conform to international scientific norms.

Many Hong Kong scholars find it difficult to publish in the major international journals. Those whose first language is not English face challenges in writing for journals in the United States or Britain. Topics relevant to Hang Kong may not appeal to journal editors in the West. Asia and the region, while recognized as important, somehow seem less central. There is an interesting contradiction here. Research relating to Hang Kong and the region is given some emphasis by funding agencies and evaluators. The current system focuses academic attention on the traditional centers of academe in North America and Europe. Asia and the region, while recognized as important, somehow seem less central. There is an interesting contradiction here. Research relating to Hang Kong and the region is given some emphasis by funding agencies and evaluators. At the same time, local or regional publications are considered less prestigious. Emerging academic centers of excellence in Japan, Taiwan, and Singapore are considered peripheral. China has only recently emerged as a focus of concern. It is, of course, easiest to measure what is already legitimized and clearest to evaluate. The most prestigious journals and publishers are in the West. Concentration on Western sources ignores publications that may be relevant to Hong Kong and to Asia, but that might be more difficult to evaluate.

Hang Kong is not alone in its slavish obeisance to Western ideas and institutions. Throughout the region, people look outside Asia, and especially to the academic power centers in the United States and Britain for respectability. Universities throughout the region encourage their faculty members to publish in Western journals, take sabbatical and research leaves in the West, and generally follow the leadership of American and British academe. In Taiwan, for example, an article published in English in a Western journal, even a journal of lesser status, is valued more highly than a local publication.

The increasing use of English for scholarly communication in the region makes it easier for an
Asian academic community to emerge. Journals in English exist in Taiwan, Japan, and of course in Hang Kong and Singapore. Even China now publishes scientific journals in English. There is also room for scholarship in indigenous languages. In Japan, scientific communication goes on in Japanese and in English.

There is an urgent need for change. For this to occur, it is not necessary to reject international standards of scholarship or to turn inward. The fact is that Asian academic systems have grown in quality and sophistication. The infrastructures of scholarship are emerging — journals, book publishers, databases, and the like. Local and regional scholarship should be recognized as legitimate and worthy of positive evaluation. Once publication in local journals becomes accepted for academic promotion, those journals will improve. Indeed, with positive leadership, it is possible to instill in local journals high academic standards, a reviewing system that will protect quality, and an overall commitment to excellence. Reviewers from the region and the West can be used, but with the terms of reference determined by Asian editors rather than Westerners. The circulation of local journals will grow, and such journals will achieve recognition throughout the region, and eventually in the current centers in Europe and North America.

As another equally positive result, Hong Kong, and Asian, scholarship will be legitimized by these developments. Research on important local topics will expand and receive recognition, increasing the available knowledge base. Local scholars will cease to feel constrained by the topical and methodological interests of the West, and will be free to pursue locally relevant research. The time has come for Hang Kong, and Asia, to declare intellectual independence from the West. This does not mean jettisoning the ideals of quality scholarship and objective evaluation, but rather applying those standards locally and recognizing and encouraging excellence at home.

---

**Academic Cultures in Singapore and Hong Kong: Some Personal Impressions**

**Allan Walker and Peter Bodycott**

Allan Walker is associate professor at the Chinese University of Hong Kong. Shotin, Hong Kong. Peter Bodycott is senior lecturer at the Hong Kong Institute of Education, Hong Kong. E-mail: adwalker@cuhk.hk; bodycott@bcied.edu.hk.

There is a tendency among many Western academics to view Southeast and East Asian countries as an undifferentiated “Confucian” group. One example of this is the simple linking of “Asian values” to the economic success of countries such as Singapore, Hang Kong, South Korea, Japan, and Taiwan. While there may indeed be some common explanatory factors behind the development of these societies, what is often ignored is that the economies have achieved prosperity through varying routes. Diverse social, political, economic, and cultural structures have formed that serve to differentiate outwardly similar countries and influence their organizational environments and those who work in them. That is, institutions of each nation have developed their own shape, and culture and these, at different levels and emphasis, are worthy of reflection.

Our focus here is on the difference in academic cultures between Hong Kong and Singapore. On the surface, one might expect the academic cultures in the two countries to be almost identical given their colonial heritage. After all, Singapore was a British colony for many years and Hang Kong remains so today, that is, until July 1997. Although Hang Kong is presently a British colony and will soon become a special administrative region within the Peoples Republic of China, here it will be referred as a country for ease of comparison. Both countries share a predominantly Chinese culture, have burgeoning economies, few natural resources except their people, and are located roughly in the same part of the world. Yet, in terms of our own experience, both have developed quite different academic environments.

Before describing what we see as some of the differences, it should be noted that our discussion is based on personal impressions only and, as such, is limited by our individual circumstances. While we have both worked in Singapore and Hang Kong, our experience is restricted to faculties of education in particular institutions, and therefore, we do not seek to generalize across all institutions or even across academic disciplines.

The most obvious difference we have found between
academic cultures in Singapore and Hong Kong is the dominant expectations in terms of research, publishing, and teaching.’ In all three areas, Hong Kong academics appear to be under greater pressure than their Singaporean counterparts.

The most obvious difference we have found between academic cultures in Singapore and Hong Kong is the dominant expectations in terms of research, publishing, and teaching. In all three areas, Hong Kong academics appear to be under greater pressure than their Singaporean counterparts.

Since the early 1990s, Hong Kong academics have been pressured to compete increasingly for scarce external funding, mainly from the University Grants Council (UGC). The acquisition of extremely competitive external funding has been explicitly built into promotion criteria and, increasingly, departmental funding formulas. As a result academics have been forced to reevaluate their traditional work practice in terms of emphasis, international relevance, and quality. One side effect of the growing importance of external funding in Hong Kong appears to be a move toward greater research collaboration with overseas researchers and even other Hong Kong institutions. As far as we are aware, academics in Singapore have yet to experience similar pressure with regard either to professional practice or departmental resources. Fewer external research funding opportunities are available in Singapore, perhaps reflecting a less intense emphasis on large-scale, internationally relevant research projects. While valuable research is conducted in Singapore, in our experience, it is more likely to be personally motivated rather than institutionally or structurally driven and focused on local in-school rather than international issues.

Differences in emphasis on acquiring external funding carry over to expectations for teaching and publishing in international journals. Recent centralized reviews of teaching quality and open exhibition of student evaluations have added to the stress on Hong Kong academics and forced them to balance their roles carefully. Although pressure to research, publish, and teach more effectively certainly exists in Singapore, it appears much less intense than in Hong Kong. The primary role of academics in Singapore remains focused on teaching, internal research, and service to the local community. Certainly, the Singaporean academic culture, while still rigorous, appears less stressful because it lacks the harsh externally imposed pressure to acquire and produce. Hong Kong academics have much greater demand placed on them to publish widely in refereed journals than their Singaporean counterparts. Newly established links between productivity, funding, and career advancement in Hong Kong have driven home a message all too common in Western universities: “publish or perish.” Indeed, some have perished, and those who remain have quickly learned to play the often selfish game of collecting numbers at the expense of professional sharing and internal collaboration.

A further difference exists in the type of research that is encouraged. Although both Singapore and Hong Kong academics approach local school issues, the tradition in Hong Kong includes considerably more open criticism and debate of policy and political issues than is common in Singapore. In Singapore, academics appear to avoid research that targets political issues or that unduly criticizes government policy. This is probably due to the different forms of government in the two countries. Singapore has a very centralized government that does not actively promote debate and criticism of government policy. Hong Kong, however, has a tradition of open debate, and academics become actively involved in commenting on and criticizing government policy. This is particularly so in the Chinese press. In terms of academic culture, the environment in Hong Kong produces a more openly critical academic community both in public comment and research. Whether change in sovereignty will effect this openness remains to be seen. The academic culture in this sense may be seen as a reflection of the more general societal cultures of the two countries. Singapore has a centralized government and education system with relatively tight control over many facets of society in general, whereas Hong Kong is often characterized as one of the least-regulated societies in the world.

Newly established links between productivity, funding, and career advancement in Hong Kong have driven home a message all too common in Western universities: “publish or perish.”

The most obvious difference between the academic cultures discussed here lies in externally imposed demands for accountability and productivity. In the case of Hong Kong, this is due mainly to the number of institutions and...
the intensive competition between them. There are now seven universities in Hang Kong that offer various qualifications in education-related disciplines and teacher education. There are also two other tertiary institutions offering qualifications in education: the newly restructured Institute of Education and the Open Learning Institute. Singapore has two fully fledged universities, and only one of these offers teacher education degrees; however, like Hang Kong, education degrees are also offered by the Singapore equivalent of the Open Learning Institute. To gain research and operational funds, status, and the best students, Hang Kong institutions must compete not only with each other but also with an increasing number of international universities. This has contributed to a shifting of the academic culture toward productivity and increased quality of teaching. The picture in Singapore is quite different. Internally, the Singaporean institution has a near monopoly and has yet to feel the bite of competition in attracting students and funding, teaching quality, and research productivity. Put simply, the lack of competition and subsequent lesser value placed on measurable outputs minimizes the pressure on Singaporean academics, creating a more comfortable place to work.

The academic cultures in Singapore and Hong Kong, while differentiated, share many similarities with academic cultures in the West.

Perhaps a deeper factor influencing the shape of the academic culture is that Hang Kong remains a British colony and, as such, more directly inherits trends and policies experienced in the United Kingdom. The considerable restructuring and production emphasis experienced in U.K. higher education are reflected in the policies and structures in Hang Kong, despite differences in economic conditions. Singapore, on the other hand, although an ex-British colony, appears to have moved beyond direct or overt British policy influence and to have set more of its own direction.

These differences are indicative only of the diverse academic cultures in Hang Kong and Singapore. There are, of course, others that we have not touched upon, such as language, bureaucracy, collegiality, and deeper cultural practices related to conflict resolution. There are also similarities. Both cultures, for example, have in place a system of confidential staff appraisals in which the heads of department write reports on tenured staff with regard to their productivity, teaching, and so on. These reports go into confidential files that are not accessible or shared with the staff member involved. Equally, education, as a discipline, has a rather low status in both countries when compared to hard science faculties. Both academic cultures have strong service traditions and relatively tight links with the ministry of education.

From our perspective, the academic working culture in both countries offers different types of reward and opportunity, and success is largely determined by the ability of the individual academician to recognize and work within the parameters of the specific cultural context. In this respect, the academic cultures in Singapore and Hang Kong, while differentiated, share many similarities with academic cultures in the West.

NOTE

The Professor and the Sensei: Faculty Roles in the United States and Japan

Robert Birnbaum

Robert Birnbaum is professor of higher education at the University of Maryland at College Park. He has served as a senior administrator in both the United States and Japan. Address: College of Education, Benjamin Bldg., University of Maryland, College Park, M.D. 20742, USA.

Survey data collected by the Carnegie Foundation in its comparative study of the academic profession in 15 countries indicate some differences and similarities in the activities, preferences, and productivity of faculty in Japan and the United States. These comparisons provide a unique lens through which to view the relationship between faculty culture and national culture.

Faculty in the United States are more likely to work in a research university and more likely to have a doctoral degree than are faculty in Japan. Yet although their total workloads are roughly comparable, Japanese faculty spend 50 percent more time on research, are much more likely to have interests primarily in teaching, and publish almost twice as frequently as their U.S. counterparts. How do these differences between Japanese and U.S. faculty be explained?
In prewar Japan there were many kinds of postsecondary institutions. However, only a small number were identified as universities and were authorized by the government to conduct research. Nonuniversities were defined solely as teaching institutions, and their faculty were not considered to be members of the academic profession. After the war, all higher education institutions gained equal legal status and were given responsibility for research as well as teaching. The new institutions tended to follow the patterns of the older prestigious universities. In Japan, scholarship is for universities, teaching is for schools, so teaching is less prestigious than research. To be a member of the academic profession is to do research.

Peer review in Japan is not only virtually nonexistent but for many perhaps also virtually inconceivable.

Although the publication of research is a central element of the professional role in Japan, the meanings of both “research” and “publication” may differ from those in the United States. One major difference is that these activities in Japan for the most part take place outside the framework of peer review. Peer review in Japan is not only virtually nonexistent but for many perhaps also virtually inconceivable. Japanese faculty have many of their articles automatically accepted in their own university journals, present unjuried papers at professional association meetings, and may even publish their own classroom materials as books. Why is peer review not widely practiced? Among other things, the nature of Japanese culture makes it difficult, if not impossible, for a junior faculty member to criticize the work of someone who is senior. It is not merely that an unhappy senior faculty member in Japan (as in the United States) could have a major impact on a career of junior faculty member, but rather both junior and senior faculty would find such assessments to be embarrassing, inappropriate, and disrespectful. In addition, the Japanese emphasis on norms of equality, avoiding conflict, and maintaining the status of all members who have been admitted to the group prevents members of the group from criticizing the work of another member. Japanese are more likely to base publication decisions on a logic of fairness than a logic of quality. Fairness provides equal opportunities for all who choose to participate, requires the making of no invidious comparisons, maintains harmony, and saves face.

A number of other factors distinguish faculty expectations and careers in Japan from those in the United States. Each reflects a cultural reluctance in Japan to engage in the kinds of critical assessment on which the U.S. academic system is presumed to depend. The most obvious examples include the appointment of almost all faculty to immediate tenure, appointment of many faculty to their positions through sponsorship rather than contest, and the lack of institutional review of faculty teaching or research activities.

It would be a caricature to say that the U.S. culture values individualism, assertiveness, heterogeneity, suspicion of authority, and commitment to an ideal-related ideology, while Japanese culture values group identification, harmony, homogeneity, respect for authority, and a commitment to an other-related ideology. Nevertheless, these tendencies are clearly present, and they have led the academic profession in somewhat different directions in the two countries. In the United States the accuracy-cohesion trade-off is likely to be made in favor of accuracy because institutional legitimacy depends on being seen as a producer of valid knowledge.

But in Japan, institutional legitimacy depends more on the linkages universities forge with employers and governmental agencies, and the networks that scholars establish with other social institutions and between themselves, than on their contributions to knowledge. The accuracy-cohesion trade-off is thus more likely to favor cohesion because it legitimizes institutions as a producer of socialized graduates able to assume their proper role in Japanese society. Faculty must publish and attend academic meetings to conform to the expectation of the professional culture, but creating valid knowledge may sometimes be secondary to maintaining social interactions and relationships.

A difference in the ways faculty members in both countries are addressed may provide a metaphor for the cultural distinction. In the United States, Dr. Smith would commonly be referred to by students, and by nonintimate acquaintances, as Professor Smith. In Japan, Dr. Tanaka, although also having the rank of professor, would likely not be addressed by students and nonintimate acquaintan-
Chinese Higher Education Reconsidered from the U.S. Experience

Min Weifang and Chen Xiangming

In the past six months we have twice visited the United States to look at developments in American higher education in order to draw lessons for the current reforms in Chinese higher education. These visits, short as they were, helped us to get a better understanding of U.S. higher education, which in turn shed light on many of the issues we have been wrestling with in China. In this article, we offer some reflections on aspects of American higher education that we find relevant and useful in the Chinese context.

THE PYRAMID STRUCTURE

The U.S. higher education system, the biggest system in the world, basically reflects the requirements of the United States job market. The demand for human resources manifests itself in a pyramid structure, with a large number of institutions that train the general labor force at the bottom and a smaller number of research institutions that produce advanced specialists at the top. In contrast to the U.S. structure, the Chinese counterpart before the 1980s could be viewed as a small inverted pyramid. There were more university-level students than technical/vocational students.

With the transformation from a centrally planned economy to a socialist market economy since the 1980s, the inverted pyramid is now in the process of being overturned. By 1994, out of the 1,080 regular higher learning institutions, 453 were short-cycle institutions with an enrollment of 1.3 million. The rest were teacher training institutions with an enrollment of 1.5 million undergraduate and 127,935 graduate students. By 1995, 1,156 adult higher education institutions had been established with an enrollment of 2.57 million students. This figure does not include the annual 100,000 graduates with a diploma obtained through self-study. In addition, over 800 nonstate postsecondary institutions have been created.

However, the percentage of university students in the population is still only 0.44. With rising living standards, parents' high expectations for their only child, and the cultural value placed on school learning, the demand for higher education in China far exceeds the current capacity of the institutions.
THE DECENTRALIZATION OF ADMINISTRATION
During our travels in the United States, we were struck by its decentralized system. The federal government gives a great deal of autonomy to the states and institutions of higher learning, ensuring equal access, fair handling of student aid programs, and protection of certain fields of study through legislation, financial support, and research contracts. China has much to learn from the U.S. experience in this regard. Before the 1980s, Chinese higher education, like everything else in the country, was highly centralized and tightly controlled by the government. Worse still, the institutions were sponsored by three independent parties: the State Education Commission, the central ministries, and the local authorities. This overlapping system resulted in lack of communication and cooperation between the central and local governments, which led to a surplus number of single-field institutions, redundancy of specialties and institutions, overly narrow fields of study, waste and misuse of already scarce resources, narrowly trained personnel, and lack of initiatives on the part of institutions and faculty.

Since the 1980s, the central government has been giving greater latitude to local authorities and institutions. At present, an institution has the right to choose its own specialties, decide its own student enrollment, and appoint faculty. The job market for graduates is currently managed through mutual negotiations between employers and graduates. The three sponsors of higher education have been working together to achieve a more efficient and effective educational enterprise. The central government takes care of institutions that have a leading position in the national landscape, focus on a certain profession, or are difficult to manage by one locality. All the rest are taken care of by local authorities.

MOBILIZATION OF RESOURCES
The problem of financial constraints is shared by all the U.S. institutions we visited. Because of the economic austerity and the end of the Cold War, both federal and state funds are shrinking as a proportion of university budgets. As a result, universities have to resort to various means to raise funds. Chinese universities are facing even more serious financial constraints, indicated by low teacher salaries, shortage of funds for instructional expenses, and declining subscriptions to academic journals. Since government allocations to higher education have been declining proportionally, universities have been diversifying funding sources, including implementation of cost-sharing and cost-recovery policies. Since 1989, for the first time in 40 years, institutions began to experiment with charging tuition and fees from students. The long-standing notion of free higher education has become so deeply entrenched in China that it is very difficult for people to accept paying for education both financially and psychologically. To alleviate this problem, some universities have set up work-study programs for poor students, and the government is giving scholarships and loans to students in need.

CONCERNS OVER THE QUALITY OF UNDERGRADUATE EDUCATION
Many U.S. scholars we encountered expressed their great concern over the quality of undergraduate education. In China, we face similar problems of lowering admission standards to attract students to some institutions (especially private ones), and inadequately teaching quality due to undue emphasis on research in some top universities. In addition, other problems loom large on the horizon. Because of the heavy influence of the former Soviet Union, the narrowly defined fields of study have produced short-sighted students both in knowledge and skills, and the curriculum still does not allow much room for individual differences and interdisciplinary learning. Recently, many Chinese institutions have been cutting obsolete and redundant specialties, merging related ones, expanding applied programs, and creating interdisciplinary fields of study.

During our trips many U.S. educators talked about learning from the cooperative spirit of Chinese culture. In our discussions, we heard the view expressed that, in addition to knowledge and skills, undergraduate education should develop a good attitude in students for interpersonal cooperation and social responsibility, which is thought to be one of the successful aspects of Chinese education. These comments made us rethink our own cultural tradition and the present situation in China. Traditionally, Chinese culture is a group-oriented one in which students are encouraged to help each other in learning.

However, as the economic reforms progress, competition and an emphasis on achievement have taken hold among Chinese students, who have become more and more individualistic—like their U.S. counterparts. As they compete with each other for entrance to the few formal institutions, they have gradually lost the tradition of friendly cooperation. Ironically and sadly, what our U.S. colleagues sing praises of is exactly what we are losing in China. Recently, Chinese educators have been engaged in a heated discussion on how to improve students’ zushi (quality), in order to prevent students from losing their sense of moral responsibility, humanistic concerns, and Chinese cultural traditions.
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Higher education in Ukraine—as well as many other countries comprising the former Soviet Union—is undergoing its second revolution of the 20th century. The first took place in 1917 and accelerated in the years following World War II, especially under Josef Stalin, who imposed a socialist and Russified system of higher education upon Ukraine and the other Soviet republics. Ukrainian higher education throughout much of the 20th century lacked the intellectual pluralism—particularly in the social sciences and humanities—essential for institutional vitality due to the ideologically oriented, strong central planning, control, and demands for academic orthodoxy.

The second revolution is currently underway in Ukraine. This revolution seeks to restructure higher education radically and profoundly. It seeks to alter substantially, if not eradicate, the official state dogmas through a more pluralistic approach. Driven by newly introduced powerful market forces the Russified higher education system is increasingly viewed as irrelevant to the needs of an independent Ukraine. This is the context in which Ukrainian private higher education finds itself in the 1990s.

As of May 1996, nearly five years after Ukrainian independence, the number of licensed private colleges and universities exceeded 120.

As of May 1996, nearly five years after Ukrainian independence, the number of licensed private colleges and universities exceeded 120. These institutions, which enroll about 2 percent of the country's 800,000 college students, have the potential to fill the gaps in the Ukrainian national system of higher education. Ukrainian private institutions of higher education are responding to the rapidly changing economic conditions. Through curricular innovations in business, law, education, and medicine these institutions are responding to the academic, economic, religious, and cultural needs of the newly independent and democratizing society.

Since the emergence of an independent Ukraine in December 1991, dramatic social, religions, and cultural changes have also encouraged the proliferation of private institutions. Linguistic and religious groups, buoyed by the increased freedoms, have expressed interest in establishing private institutions of higher education to further religious or cultural goals. For example, the Greek Catholic Church and other religious groups, especially in western Ukraine, sought (unsuccessfully) to secure a license from the state to establish private institutions. Indications are they may renew such initiatives in 1997. Similarly a new institution, the International Christian University, has begun operations in Kiev.

The majority of Ukraine's private institutions are located in the eastern and southern sections of Ukraine around the cities of Donetsk, Zaporozhje, Kharkov, and the Republic of Crimea, which are home to about 11.5 million ethnic Russians in Ukraine. In the nine Ukrainian-speaking regions in the west and north there are only a few private universities. Moreover, in such important Ukrainian-speaking areas as Volynskaya, Chernovitskaya, Nikolayevskaya, and Uzhgorodskaya there are no private institutions of higher education. Even in Kiev, which is the center for the Ukrainian private higher education movement, only the public Kiev Mohyla-Academy appears to fully use Ukrainian as the language of instruction. Ironically, it appears that state policies of the early 1990s that sought to increase the usage of Ukrainian as the medium of instruction and provide more Ukrainian content in higher education actually spawned the establishment of Russian-language and culturally oriented private universities as havens for the sizable number of Russian-speaking inhabitants.

FINANCING PRIVATE HIGHER EDUCATION

Under current regulations the Ukrainian government classifies all private universities as for-profit organizations, and taxes their income (e.g., tuition, fees, grants) at a rate of about 70 percent. In addition to paying these onerous taxes private institutions need to support daily operations, meet standards for state-controlled licensing and accreditation, and cope with the old Soviet administrative command-and-control philosophy practiced in the Ministry of Education. It is within this context that the initial surge in the development of private higher education is rapidly giving way to financial realities. The need to rationalize the system, avoid duplication, and coordinate efforts suggests that numerous institutional consolidations and closings are on the horizon. The Darwinian theory of private higher edu-
cation institutions is evident, and there will soon be a major shake-up in that sector. Unless Ukrainian private higher education receives technical assistance with planning, begins to form appropriate consortial arrangements among its members, and can fashion more favorable relations with the Ministry of Education, it is in greater danger of extinction than overdevelopment.

Undercurrent regulations the Ukrainian government classifies all private universities as for-profit organizations, and taxes their income (e.g., tuition, fees, grants) at a rate of about 70 percent.

Direct financial support for private higher education from the national government in Kyiv is virtually nonexistent, and public policy defining such support is unclear. Even though the Ministry states that government policy generally precludes the provision of direct financial support to private higher education, there is considerable evidence that a handful of private universities in the Kyiv region are receiving indirect government support through subventions to provide virtually free instructional and administrative space. It is not clear why some institutions are granted this indirect but important support while others are denied it. The fundamental question “what is the public policy for state funding of private higher education?” remains unanswered.

Several private higher education institutions outside Kyiv have also been able to secure support from local (e.g., city, regional) government authorities. The support from local government frequently takes the form of indirect subsidies such as providing relief from local taxes and provision of instructional facilities. In other instances, private institutions contract with local government to provide educational services in exchange for direct financial support. The Donetsk Humanitarian Institute, for example, received a direct appropriation from the city government in return for providing educational services to school teachers.

Though local government financial support for private higher education is still rare, several factors in the relationship between higher education and local authorities may encourage an expansion of this form of subsidy.

CONCLUSION

The future of Ukrainian private education is far from certain. Many questions need to be addressed. Can Ukrainian private higher education survive without financial support from the state? How should private institutions negotiate with the central government while offering an alternative to the state monopolized institutions. Nevertheless it is evident that the emerging Ukrainian private sector of higher education has made its presence felt. By its example, private higher education is, in turn, making the entire Ukrainian system of higher education stronger, more flexible, and more responsive.
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Compared to many other jurisdictions, the basic structure of higher education in Ontario has remained remarkably stable for the last quarter-century. There seems to be little doubt that these structures and mechanisms are about to change, but like most of the history of higher education in Canada’s most populous province, these changes will undoubtedly take place with little sense of common direction or system planning. More than anything else, these changes will represent responses to the intersection of the current provincial arrangements and the new political landscape.

Higher Education in Ontario

There are a number of rather unusual characteristics associated with higher education in Ontario. First, like several other Canadian provinces, Ontario has one of the highest participation rates in postsecondary education in the world, rates that have continued to increase in almost every year of the last decade. Second, almost all of this activity is in publicly funded institutions. There is no significant private sector except in the area of vocational education. Third, Ontario has two distinct higher education sectors corresponding to two institutional types: the 17 universities and the 25 colleges of applied arts and technology (CAATs). The CAATs have no mandate to provide transfer programs, and the two sectors are treated differently and separately by government. Fourth, all institutions in each sector are treated as equals under government policy. There are no formal institutional hierarchies within the two sectors and even targeted funding programs have utilized an allocative formula or mechanism designed to treat all institutions within each sector the same. Finally, Ontario universities enjoy a very high level of institutional autonomy. Government controls the amount that will be given to the sector and indirectly controls the level of tuition fees. However, almost all public support is in the form of general operating grants, and institutional shares are determined by an allocative formula designed by the sector.

Given the clear sectoral divisions within Ontario higher education, the lack of systemwide planning or system rationalization is perhaps not surprising. What is unusual is that the same is true at the sectoral level of discussion. The combination of high levels of institutional autonomy, sectoral intermediarv bodies, and the checks and balances associated with the allocative funding mechanism served to inhibit certain types of change, including any form of institutional differentiation that might be associated with attempts at sectoral planning or rationalization. With high participation rates, institutions generally recognized as providing a quality education, and the lowest per-student expenditures on postsecondary education of any Canadian province with the possible exception of Nova Scotia, it is difficult to argue that there is a direct relationship between planning and success. Yet it is certainly true, as Michael Skolnik has argued, that at a policy level Ontario’s higher education might be described as “just drifting.”

Given the clear sectoral divisions within Ontario higher education, the lack of systemwide planning or system rationalization is perhaps not surprising.

The Changing Political Landscape

In its provincial politics, Ontario has taken sudden turns to the left and right during the last decade. The election of the New Democratic Party, with its roots in social democratic philosophy, led to a series of new policies designed to increase social equity and strengthen the role of provincial unions. Bob Rae’s government became best known, however, for the “Social Contract,” a policy initiative designed to reduce government expenditures and guarantee jobs by allowing management in the broader public sector to designate unpaid holidays for public employees. Since the legislation effectively ignored collective bargaining rights, the Rae government soon found itself ostracized by both public- and private-sector unions.

Defeating the Rae government in 1995, Ontario took a sudden turn to the right. The new conservative government, led by Michael Harris, moved quickly to initiate what it has called a “Common Sense Revolution” in Ontario politics. Welfare programs were reformed, employment equity policies were largely dismantled, and huge cuts in the number of public servants were announced. The reaction from labor groups, as well as a broad range of social and educational organizations, has been extremely negative. Public servants, who survived a three-year wage freeze including new unpaid holidays under the “Social Contract,”
now found themselves employed by a government that planned to cut well over 10,000 jobs. The 55,000 Ontario Public Service Employees Union went on strike for five weeks in February and March of 1996 with arrangements for severance, rather than salaries, as the major element of disagreement. A wide conglomeration of labor and social organizations have organized a series of “Days of Protest” in different Ontario cities designed to demonstrate opposition to the policies of the Harris government, including a two-day protest on October 25th and 26th in Toronto where the entire transit system was shut down on a workday.

POINTS OF INTERSECTION
In its first budget speech of November 1995, the Harris government decreased the allocations to each sector of Ontario higher education by 15 percent and increased migration fees by 10 percent (with an additional 10 percent of flexibility in the university sector). Since that time the government has also completely deregulated foreign student fees, abolished the intermediary body in the university sector, and created a systemwide advisory panel review of postsecondary education in the province, designed to address such questions as the appropriate relationship between sectors and the appropriate balance of public and private support for the funding of higher education. These initiatives have led to some of the most dramatic changes in Ontario higher education in the last two decades. Most of these changes are obvious reactions to the new financial environment: cutting expensive programs, especially in the CAAT sector; reducing staff; increased competition for enrollment, especially in the university sector; and a rationalization of institutional fee structures in universities. There are clear signs of greater institutional differentiation.

In its provincial politics, Ontario has taken sudden turns to the left and right during the last decade.

I would argue that there have also been three more subtle changes in the basic structural arrangements of Ontario higher education. The first has been the decreasing emphasis on the sector as a unit of authority and an increasing focus on institutional interests, a response to modest forms of deregulation and gradually increasing competition between institutions. Sectoral interests are abandoned as some institutions argue for full deregulation of tuition fees and the development of a more hierarchical system, a line of thought clearly associated with institutions that view themselves as forming the top level of any new institutional hierarchy. The abolishment of the Ontario Council on University Affairs has clearly changed the structural arrangements of the university sector.

The second is a growing sense among higher education pressure groups that they are powerless to influence public policy. This phenomenon is partly a function of a government that simply does not seem to respond to pressure groups, especially those on the left of the political continuum, but it is also a result of the fact that the government has moved on so many fronts at the same time that the interests of any single sector are crowded together with the interests of many others. The interests of faculty and students of higher education have almost become a subset of a much wider range of concerns including welfare reform; the funding of schools, labor policy, and equity policy. Financial concerns at the institutional level have also served to strengthen the movement toward faculty unionization at a number of universities, and several new faculty unions have been formed in the last year, the most recent at Brock University.

The third has been an increasing interest in viewing Ontario higher education as “system” rather than simply a collection of institutions and sectors. The creation of a new advisory panel with a systemwide mandate is an obvious example of this phenomenon, and the very existence of the panel has served to stimulate a discussion of systemwide issues. The government is also about to fund a series of new university-CAAT collaborative projects, and there seems to be a growing interest in at least parts of CAAT and university sectors to find ways of working together.

All of these obvious and more subtle changes signal the end to the quarter-century of stability in the structural arrangements of Ontario higher education. On the other hand, the “drifting” nature of Ontario higher education continues; this previously stable network of arrangements and mechanisms is now moving, but there is no clear sense of direction and some concern as to whether there is anyone at the wheel.
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When Côte d’Ivoire became a sovereign nation in 1960, President Félix Houphouët-Boigny’s first priority was to develop an educational system that would train a cadre of Ivoirians capable of taking over the reins of the rapidly growing Ivoirian economy. The basic structure of higher education was developed in the 1960s and was closely modeled on the French system. There was a university and six grandes écoles, which offer courses in specific fields.

The effort was so successful that in one generation sufficient Ivoirians were educated to completely Ivoirianize many sectors. In fact by the 1980s, the university was producing too many graduates, in certain fields, notably the humanities and the social sciences, to be absorbed by the civil service and the educational system—which had been the two most important employers for graduates in these fields. The only areas in which there are still shortages of qualified Ivoirians are the technical fields and the commercial sector.

As early as the mid-1970s some Ivoirian leaders saw the anomaly in a developing African economic system that emphasized a classical academic education and began efforts to reform the still nascent system. In 1977, an educational reform law was passed but never applied. In 1984 and again in 1989 further attempts at reform occurred, but the times were not ripe for reform.

In 1990, the university erupted in turmoil as part of the general movement toward political pluralism. It was not the first time university students and professors had confronted the authorities. However, this time the confrontation lasted for years instead of days or weeks. The root cause was that by the 1980s the lycées were spewing out thousands of baccaléiers (high school graduates) who were ill-trained for any work but ready to enter the university, particularly the humanities and social science faculties, in ever-increasing numbers. As a result, the university’s student body had grown to more than four times its original capacity of 7,000 students. At the same time, the physical plant, staff, and budget had remained almost static for more than two decades. Scholarships were cut; dormitories, dining halls, and classrooms became overcrowded.

Academically, the university also began to slide. Budgets for libraries and laboratories diminished to almost nothing. Professors could not cope with the growing number of students. With so many strikes, the number of hours in class dropped drastically and coursework was truncated. Even when a young Ivoirian graduated, a degree from the National University of Côte d’Ivoire had become worthless both internationally and within the country.

In the midst of all this tumult, the Ivoirian government began to move once again toward badly needed changes in education. The first step was a general consultation with hundreds of Ivoirians concerned with all levels of formal education. The results were published in May 1994. Then a reform law for higher education was passed in September 1995.

But even before the law was passed there was evidence of physical change at the university. In 1991 and 1992, two new university campuses were established in Abobo-Adjamé, a northern Abidjan suburb, and Bouaké, the country’s second-largest city. In mid-1994 renovations of the physical plant started after years of deterioration.

The September 1995 law had the following specific objectives:

- to professionalize educational and research activities,
- to optimize the use of human and financial resources,
- to introduce a contractual system between the state and the various structures of higher education, and
- to give more autonomy to institutions of higher education.

The first objective is an implicit recognition that academic standards and productivity have fallen drastically. The contents of course work and the degree requirements no longer meet generally accepted international standards. Research by Ivoirian academics varies greatly, but overall the amount of research and its quality have diminished over the years.

Of the other objectives, the one calling for a contractual system is the most radical because it implies the development of a system of accountability and oversight of the academic community, both students and faculty. To accomplish this, a National Commission for Evaluation of Higher Education will be created in 1997. Its goal will be to oversee the fulfillment of the “contracts” between the government and the institutions of higher education. In the purely educational arena it will play a role similar to the regional accrediting commissions that ensure academic standards in the United States. Its actual form has not been finalized, but it will be a permanent structure with an administration and governing council whose personnel will be heavily recruited from the private sector.

During the 1995–96 academic year, the first “reform” introduced a new pilot program in two faculties grouping courses into modules with unité de valeurs (i.e., credit hours) to be earned in order to pass from one year to the next. At
In May 1996 the administration of the university system was decentralized. The three campuses became autonomous universities. The post of rector was abolished, and the vice rectors in charge of each campus became the presidents of the new establishments. New governing councils are also being created that will have stronger representation from nontraditional sectors in civil society.

In October 1996 the traditional faculties and the various institutes and research centers were abolished and replaced by a variety of structures—the primary one being the unité de formation et de recherche (UFR), in which almost all teaching and research will be based. The creation of new regional university centers (incipient universities) and continuing education centers will also be based in the universities. Already two new campuses in Daloa and Korhogo have been created under the administration of Abobo-Adjame and Bouaké respectively.

The cynics say that old wine is being put in new bottles. That is true to a certain extent. But renewing the vigor of the public system of higher education will not be easy without putting asunder the old structure—some of which have become sinecures for people no longer actively engaged in teaching and research. It remains to be seen if these measures can really restore quality and vitality.

However, the most important “reform” in higher education during the past decade has taken place outside the public system, almost hidden from sight. In response to the failure of the system to meet the new realities of the 1980s, private schools emerged to give practical training to failed high school students who could not find work. The courses offered are what would appeal to private-sector employers: accounting and office systems technology (still called secretariaship here), public relations and communications, computer literacy, computer science, and electronics technology, resulting in a junior or senior high school diploma.

Over the past decade, these private institutions have also moved up to the tertiary level as high school graduates opted for programs in the same subject areas but leading to a Brevet de Technicien Supérieur (BTS), a diploma equivalent to the American AA/AS degree. In 1996, a third of the 1996 high school graduates, 5,650 out of 16,041, asked the government to secure them a place in one of these schools rather than a university or grande école.

Why the change? Ivorian students and their parents have finally understood that government is no longer a reliable source of employment and that a university degree does not necessarily lead to employment in the private sector where the new jobs are emerging. The Ivorian government has also recognized the usefulness of these private institutions and the education they offer. Therefore, it has worked out a system whereby it pays the difference between the university tuition (which is nominal) and the normal tuition fees of the institution that the student attends. The government now supports about 11,000 students in BTS-level programs in private schools. Therefore, it is an effective subsidy to these institutions that gives them a financial security and allows them to develop more programs.

Is privatization the wave of the future for higher education in the Côte d’Ivoire? For technical and commercial education it has already happened. Will private universities be created? It remains to be seen, but it has already happened in other parts of West Africa.

Assistance for African Higher Education:
The Association for the Development of African Education (DAE)
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African universities are struggling to emerge from a decade of crisis characterized by rapid growth, unsustainable financial arrangements, heavy staff losses, frequent labor unrest and campus closures, institutional deterioration, waning relevance, and declining educational quality. In numerous countries, university graduates are less capable and less qualified today than they were 10 years ago, and university research output has almost ceased. As a result, many African universities produce neither the skilled human resources nor the new knowledge necessary to guide national development in the years ahead. At risk is nothing less than the region’s future capacity to manage its own affairs at an acceptable standard.

Responding to this challenge, 40 bilateral, multilateral, and private donor agencies from Europe and North America have launched a bold experiment in interagency coordination. To increase the effectiveness of their assistance to the education sector in sub-Saharan Africa, they
have formed a loose consortium intended to facilitate information exchange, glean guidance from the lessons of their collective aid experience, and improve the impact of their development funding through more informed and coordinated action. This consortium, known as the Association for the Development of African Education (DAE), has evolved into a significant forum for dialogue between donor agency representatives and African education leadership on the priorities and modalities for human resource development on the continent.

The work of the DAE is carried out in a dozen working groups formed around key educational themes. Each working group is managed separately by a lead donor agency that serves as coordinator and convener of the group. The DAE is supported by a small secretariat that issues a newsletter, maintains a database on some 1,100 donor projects supporting African education, and organizes the annual meetings. This secretariat initially operated out of the World Bank, but has now been established as a more autonomous and donor-accountable office under the auspices of the International Institute for Educational Planning in Paris.

Among the working groups, the Working Group on Higher Education (WGHE) has attracted increasing attention and participation as a result of its constructive focus on complex tertiary education issues that concern donors, governments, and university leaders alike. This interest reflects growing recognition that African universities contribute significantly to education sector development and national capacity building on the continent. Universities set the standard for primary and secondary education, training teachers, administrators, researchers, and policymakers in the education field. Universities are also the principal source of the skilled leadership and technical expertise needed to guide national development. University-trained human resources, together with the research and policy analyses they produce, constitute fundamental inputs for national capacity building.

WGHE has established itself as a forum for the exchange of information, experience, and ideas among donor agency staff and higher education leadership in Africa. A growing number of agencies, now some 15, have been regularly represented at WGHE meetings. Half a dozen agencies have contributed studies for discussion or helped to finance analyses commissioned by WGHE. To date, 18 different reports have been published and distributed. In the process, WGHE has become a recognized advocacy resource on African higher education.

WGHE, which is coordinated by a World Bank staff member, has held nine meetings to date, all in Africa. The Association of African Universities (AAU) has regularly participated, together with a significant number of invited African university leaders and experts. These meetings, initially cohosted by locally based donor agencies, have been organized in collaboration with specific universities. Since 1993, the AAU has held consultative meetings with donors in conjunction with WGHE meetings. In this way, the WGHE is developing into an important regular forum for cooperation in African higher education.

Over the longer term, it is anticipated that these efforts will contribute to greater quality and relevance of university education and research in many African higher education systems. Three intermediate steps are necessary to produce these results. First and foremost, progressive gains in the stability and sustainability of higher education financing throughout the region must be pursued. At the same time, greater effectiveness in the management of human and financial resources within African universities is needed in order to maximize the benefits from these scarce inputs. Finally, greater consistency and long-term vision in donor and governmental support programs for African universities will be required for the institutional transformations and developments necessary to keep African centers of higher learning on a par with their sister institutions on other continents.
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During the 1980s, a new awareness of the need for internationalization of the American campus took hold in universities nationwide. The traditional study abroad program based in a foreign language department or run by a specialized organization was insufficient to the challenges posed by rapid globalization; what was needed, it was thought, were coordinated, innovative university-level interdisciplinary initiatives, as well as a move from isolated department-level programs toward intra-institutional cooperation.

Recognizing this need, Boston College (BC) created the Office of International Programs (OIP) in 1991. OIP was given a broad mandate to coordinate efforts and promote a global emphasis across the university and to develop institutionwide study, research, and service opportunities abroad for students and faculty. The result of this initiative is that in 1997 BC has a network of more than 40 active international partnerships; faculty and administrators are traveling in unprecedented numbers—last year alone more than 30 faculty and administrators visited partner universities to evaluate curriculum and develop research collaborations; the proportion of BC undergraduates studying abroad has more than doubled; and we have the added value of more than 50 exchange students annually from top universities worldwide—across all levels and disciplines—contributing to the international energy on campus. More than 400 Undergraduates will participate in semester, full-year, summer, or intersession programs abroad in 1996–97. With the exception of a successful Irish Studies—administered exchange with University College Cork, until 1991 BC students traditionally withdrew from the university to study abroad with the help of the Foreign Study Office, which was created in the early 1970s. Undergraduate participation in study abroad in externally administered programs grew from 6 students in 1970 to 200 in 1990. In its survey of 1995 and 1996 the Chronicle of Higher Education listed BC among the top 15 doctoral institutions in the number of students studying abroad.

Key to accomplishing our objectives has been the establishment of programs in important developing world regions, programs with universities having complementary curricula across the disciplines. In 1997–98 BC will administer programs—many with Jesuit institutions—in such non-traditional destinations as China, Ecuador, Hong Kong, India, Japan, Korea, Morocco, Mexico, the Philippines, Poland, Russia, and South Africa.

The success of BC in international development is based on a strategy of innovation and small, flexible infrastructure. Increasingly, our partner universities are offering strong on-site support for visiting students, enabling BC to serve students abroad at low cost. Moreover, offset student exchange ratios that replace outgoing students with tuition-paying undergraduates generate budget resources adequate to provide excellent on-site benefits, financial aid, research and travel support for faculty, fellowships enabling exchange students and scholars to join the BC community, and related programming on and off campus. These partnerships also provide opportunities for graduate students through assistantships and fellowships. Examples include a pioneer program with Eichstatt Catholic University in Germany, under which a graduate student in history is teaching a course in post-modernism, and a new Madrid program that provides two graduate fellowships for summer language study in Spain.

An example of a model partnership funded largely by the exchange of undergraduates is that with the University of Amsterdam. UA's broad English-language curriculum allows the exchange of undergraduate and graduate students in arts and sciences, management, education, and law. Faculty from a wide range of disciplines are involved in short- or long-term joint teaching and research projects. Creative curriculum development will be demonstrated by a forthcoming semester-long undergraduate program in Amsterdam to focus on Flemish art, a program involving collaboration between BC and UA faculty that involves the world’s foremost Rembrandt scholar. A BC-UA administrative exchange is coordinated by BC's Center for International Higher Education. Currently, the sociology departments of the two universities are engaged in a faculty exchange. Other faculty in such diverse fields as physics, law, and accounting are also participating in visits or exchanges.

Undergraduate international programs at BC are designed to promote academic maturity and independence. In order to prepare students for rigorous immersion programs abroad, we provide comprehensive orientation programs prior to departure and on-site support to guide students through academic challenges. For example, in many countries, less emphasis is placed on continuous assessment than on final exams—which may range from a four-hour written exam to a ten-minute oral—requiring students to take a more long-term view to learning than they would at home. While the prospect of working in a
dramatically different academic setting may seem daunting, the benefits of this type of experience in intellectual and personal growth can be enormous. In order to ensure fair and consistent transfer of credits and grades, BC is working with our partners worldwide to develop harmonious assessment procedures following the model of the European Community on the implementation of a standard credit (ECTS) system. As part of this process, BC is currently conducting a nationwide research project, in conjunction with Association of International Education Administrators to analyze current U.S. assessment methods for international study to propose more regularized policies and procedures nationwide.

By creating new curriculum for students and programmatic opportunities for students and faculty, BC aims to make the international experience an integral part of university life. Developments on campus include new courses taught by directors of the foreign study office and OIP for outgoing and returning students; a “peer-advising” program in the OIP and an “International Assistant” program in the Intercultural Office together actively involve more than 100 returning students in counseling, promotion, and program development. The International Letter, published three times a year by OIP, informs faculty about international opportunities at BC, highlights research with an international focus, and provides a forum for discussion on global issues.

Fostering the involvement of BC faculty, deans, and other administrators in international programming has been a particularly rewarding area of development. Faculty are advising students to study abroad with ever-growing enthusiasm and understanding, traveling to destinations they would never have visited five years ago, participating in interdisciplinary-on-campus roundtable discussions on global issues — ranging from the arts, civil society, and children’s rights, to the sciences — and pursuing collaborative research projects with colleagues at partner universities worldwide. Academic departments are responding to OIP initiatives by creating departmental international committees; and faculty, deans, and administrators from all divisions of the university are active in the OIP advisory committee.

OIP is also committed to promoting alliances with public- and private-sector organizations. It works with a wide range of government agencies and businesses to provide international internship programs, career services, and lectures. Management students enroll in BC-administered summer internships in France, Australia, China, and Ireland; nursing students complete community nursing projects in destinations as diverse as Australia, Ecuador, and Scotland; and international teaching practicums are available around the world. Our Jesuit and Catholic links enable us to provide service opportunities for our students here and abroad: our first three students have returned from a pioneer program at the Ateneo de Manila University that combines academic work with a month-long community service project; incoming international students are involved in OIP service projects in a local school, food pantry, and retirement home.

News of the Center for International Higher Education and the Program in Higher Education at Boston College

The Program in higher education has been designated by Boston College as one of its “nationally competitive” doctoral programs and has been authorized to add one new faculty position. The Program will conduct a search for a faculty member shortly. Additional funds for student support have also been provided. Boston College’s University Academic Planning Council, charged with strengthening the University for the 21st century, specifically recognized the Higher Education Program as worthy of additional support.

The Administrative Fellows Program, part of the Higher Education graduate program at Boston College, has organized a well-received series of lectures on higher education issues. This year’s series is cosponsored by the J. Donald Monan, SJ Chair. The speakers include Patrick Seyon, former president of the University of Liberia, Roger Geiger of Pennsylvania State University, Julie Reuben, Kai Ming Cheng, and Richard Chait of Harvard, Lester Goodchild of the University of Denver, J. Brazzile of Spelman College, and others. Administrative Fellows are graduate students in higher education who are funded for their graduate study at Boston College and assist in various administrative offices on campus and participate in a seminar series relating their work to their academic studies.

The editorial office of the Review of Higher Education is located in the Higher Education Program at Boston College. Philip G. Altbach is editor, and Karen Arnold and Ted Youn serve as associate editors. Liz Reisherg, a doctoral student in higher education, is the managing editor. The Review is one of the central research journals in the field of higher education.

James JF Forest, the Center’s technical assistant for nearly three years, has been hired as technology specialist for the National Center for Urban Partnerships. The Urban Partnerships Program is an initiative sponsored by the Ford Foundation to help urban students successfully complete baccalaureate degrees. NCUP helps create city-wide partnerships that include K-16 educators and representatives from community, corporate, and political sectors.
New Publications


Once again, tenure has become a topic of considerable debate and controversy in the United States. It seems that every couple of decades, criticisms are raised concerning the tenure system. The current attacks coincide with the fiscal problems facing many colleges and universities. This book makes the case for tenure, and focuses largely on the surrounding legal issues. The authors include many of the key thinkers on tenure and academic freedom.

(PGA)


This annual publication is the most comprehensive survey of trends in international education. It focuses mainly on the United States, but there is also data on flows of students to and from other countries. Comprehensive statistics on foreign student numbers studying in the United States, trends and patterns, detailed information on host American universities, and many other topics are covered in this volume. A very useful section on “understanding the international student” that features attitudes and values of international students in the United States is included. Brief analyses of the data included are provided as well. This is the most important single resource for understanding trends in the area of international students and international education in the United States. (PGA)


James L. Bess has edited a thoughtful collection of research-based studies that focus on teaching. The overall theme is on motivation for teaching and the issues that relate to it. Among the topics considered are assessment and evaluation, the impact of faculty backgrounds on teaching motivation, organizational cultures and their impact on teaching, and leadership and motivation. While all of the examples are from the United States, this book has wider relevance precisely because of its overall stress on motivation issues.

(PGA)


Most of the world’s regions are discussed in this informative volume. Essays dealing with East Asia, Latin America, Africa, and Western Europe are included, along with country studies of China, the United States, South Africa, Australia, Mexico, and several others. The authors include experts on the academic systems about which they write. The focus of the book is on change and the challenges facing universities worldwide. This volume is part of a series sponsored by the American Council on Education and published by Oryx Press. Further information on the series is available from the publisher. (PGA)


The American research university grew to its present stature in the period following World War II. Thishookfocusses on the implications of the relationship between the U.S. government and higher education during this formative period. During the war and in the years following it, American universities were harnessed for military and intelligence purposes. In addition, the period of represssion of Communists in the 1950s had significant implications for higher education. The Cold War and the University considers these topics from a critical perspective. Among the specific topics considered are the Cold War and the shaping of American history, the implications of the period on area studies, earth science research during the Cold War era, and others. The authors, including David Montgomery, Noam Chomsky, Immanuel Wallerstein, and Laura Nader, are among the most prominent leftist intellectuals in the American academy.

(PGA)


Despite the confusing title of this book, it is a thoughtful discussion of diversity and differentiation in the higher education system of seven important industrialized countries. In addition to case studies of Australia, Canada, the United States, Finland, Germany, the Netherlands, Sweden, and the United Kingdom, there are four excellent comparative essays by Burton R. Clark, Guy Neave, Frans van Vught, and by the volume’s editors. This volume is an excellent model for the comparative study of higher education in that it includes several comparative analyses and a wealth of case study data that use the perspectives developed in the comparative chapters. This book is part of an ongoing series of volumes on higher education published by Elsevier Science in cooperation with the International Association of Universities. (PGA)

The authors present a collection of well-articulated concepts of teaching and learning, alongside the choices—some riskier than others—that academics must make in order to achieve a high level of teaching proficiency. Unfortunately, as one reads through the chapters, a key omission becomes apparent—there is no discussion of effective usage of teaching tools, be it chalkboard, overheads, multimedia, or the Internet. The range of utilities available to the teacher is expanding rapidly, but this is a double-edged sword. Those academics who are confident in their abilities to learn, to adapt, and to utilize new technologies do so at some risk of undermining the effectiveness of their classroom instruction. Those who are just now entering the field, or are technologically timid, desperately need help to deal with the daunting challenge of using educational technology effectively. In both cases, research-based training is needed, and a chapter or two in this book would certainly have been well received. However, the book is otherwise reasonably comprehensive, and should be a welcome addition to graduate preparatory courses for teaching, as well as a useful guide for both new and seasoned academics. (James Forest, Boston College)

A New Initiative in International Higher Education

Introduction

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

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

Programs and Resources

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

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

The Program in Higher Education

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