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Academic Freedom and Human Rights: A Neglected Perspective

Joseph H. Saunders
Joseph H. Saunders is Associate Counsel responsible for academic freedom research and advocacy at Human Rights Watch in New York. Address: 350 Fifth Avenue, 34th Floor New York, NY 10118-3299 USA. Phone: (212) 290-4700. Fax: (212) 736-1300.

On May 26, 1998, the Serbian parliament abolished the centuries-old autonomy of Serbian universities. Under pressure from the Milosevic government, the parliament passed a law that deprives faculty members throughout Serbia of their long-held right to participate in the selection of rectors, faculty deans, and governing boards, and effectively cancels—subject to renegotiation—the contracts of all professors and other teaching staff. The most dramatic changes under the new law have taken place at the University of Belgrade, which in recent years has been a center of student protest and is home to a number of prominent faculty critics of the government. At least 15 faculty deans there have been replaced by members of Serbia’s ruling political parties, including a number of high-ranking party officials. Professors critical of government policies have come under fire and protests against the new law have been violently dispersed.

In Cuba, two independent researchers, Dr. Felix A. Bonne Carcasses and Dr. Marta B. Roque Cabello, are among four leaders of a pro-democracy group who have been imprisoned for over a year for the peaceful expression of their views. Prior to the arrests, the group, called the Internal Dissidents’ Working Group for the Analysis of the Cuban Socioeconomic Situation, had publicly urged Cubans to abstain from voting in the upcoming elections and had issued a paper titled “The Homeland Belongs to Everyone.” The paper criticized an official Communist Party discussion paper on the Cuban economy, and argued that greater democratization is a prerequisite to effective economic liberalization.

In 1997, Dr. Ahmed Subuh, a professor of education at al-Azhar University in Gaza, was arrested at his home by Palestinian Authority security forces and held in detention for over four months. The arrest came shortly after Dr. Subuh had administered an examination to students in which, among nine short essay questions asking students to analyze the interplay between social and educational problems, he included a question asking students to address the impact of corruption in either the university administration or the Palestinian Authority. Security forces subsequently raided Dr. Subuh’s home and seized the exam papers of the students.

In dozens of countries, academics continue to be targeted when they publicly criticize government authorities, are active in political opposition parties or citizens’ groups, or seek to investigate subjects deemed “politically sensitive” by the authorities. Reprisals against such individuals include censorship, denial of the right to travel to international conferences, arbitrary dismissal, and, in the worst cases, imprisonment and torture. Due to the high public profile of universities and of the academics who are involved, such attacks often play an exemplary role, serving as a warning to individuals throughout society that dissent and political opposition will not be tolerated. As George P. Hagan has noted: “Universities and academics owe it to themselves to minimize their political involvement. But it is hard to expect academics to remain politically neutral when their rights as citizens might well be at stake if they remained aloof from direct and active political involvement.”

In many cases, it is not merely an individual student or academic who is targeted, but the university itself. In principle, the university is an institution open to all on the basis of merit, and should serve as an important intellectual resource not only to governments and industry, but also to individuals and interests independent of the state. In practice, as in Serbia today, attacks on campus-based critics and politically motivated government interventions often threaten to turn the university into an institution that exclusively serves the interests of state authorities.

International human rights standards offer academics a principled basis for resisting authoritarian political pressures and defending the institutional autonomy necessary for academic excellence.

International human rights standards offer academics a principled basis for resisting authoritarian political pressures and defending the institutional autonomy necessary for academic excellence. The most directly relevant right is freedom of expression, which includes “freedom to seek, receive and impart information and ideas of all kinds, regardless of frontiers.” This is the bedrock of academic freedom. A university fulfills its mission when academics are not forced to support an official line, an economic agenda, or a political ideology, but rather are free to use their talents to advance human knowledge and understanding.

Although pressures to limit critical inquiry and academic debate can come from diverse quarters, the arbi-
trary exercise of government power continues to represent the most significant threat to the academic community. Because the great majority of universities around the world are public institutions or are dependent on government funding, and because such institutions typically are viewed by governments as “prime instruments of national purpose,”4 governments have considerable power to influence what takes place on campus and an incentive to wield that power. Although one might have hoped that abuses would end with the cold war, experience has proven otherwise.

While many scientific associations have long had active human rights programs, little work is being done by academics in the humanities and social sciences. This may be slowly changing—new groups like the academic freedom committee of the Middle East Studies Association (based in the United States) have emerged in recent years—but there is still a pressing need for new commitments of time and resources.5 In particular, academics can and should make a contribution to public awareness and understanding of the values served by free expression. To date, international attention to this basic right has understandably emphasized artistic freedom and freedom of the press, essential attributes of a free society. Relatively little attention, however, has been paid to the crucial role played by academic institutions, dedicated to inquiry, information, and ideas, in preserving and giving meaning to the right.

By visiting or attempting to visit students and scholars in prison, raising money for their legal defense and medical needs, raising their cases with governments and international organizations, academics ensure that their colleagues are not forgotten. By joining with colleagues to speak out against politically motivated dismissals and other attacks on the autonomy of academic institutions, academics fulfill an important part of their mission as educators.

**Notes**


5. Much of this work is now available on-line. The academic freedom page on the Human Rights Watch website (www.hrw.org), periodically updated, includes a list of relevant links.

---

**Market Models, Managerial Institutions, and Managed Professionals**

**Gary Rhoades**

Gary Rhoades is professor and director, Center for the Study of Higher Education, University of Arizona, Tucson AZ 85721, USA.

The trend throughout much of the world is movement toward a U.S., “market-based” model of higher education. A related development is an increased role for management within individual institutions. What is overlooked in the promotion of such public policy shifts is the implications for social relations and social stratification in the academy and in society. Market models and managerial institutions bring with them a restructuring and renegotiation of social relations such that faculty are increasingly managed, stratified professionals. Moreover, this privatized, corporate model of American higher education has similar implications for social relations and social stratification in society at large.

The market model of U.S. higher education privileges certain markets over others. Over the past two decades it has reflected Reaganomics. It is “supply-side” higher education, focused more on employer than on student markets, and more on the needs of large private, transnational employers than on the needs of medium and small private and public employers. Supply-side policies are more suited to global than to local, national, and regional economies.1

Such a model is ill-suited to enabling higher education to play a role in addressing current economic challenges. Two patterns define present economic developments: (1) increased polarization within (and among) societies, between haves and have-nots; and (2) the emergence of regional trading blocs. The supply-side market model of higher education has little to offer in the way of either mitigating socioeconomic polarization within countries or facilitating the balance of cooperation and competition among countries. Indeed, such neoliberal policies in U.S. higher education have exacerbated polarization in the academy, which is related to polarization in the broader economy. Monies are being disproportionately allocated to high-tech fields more than to fields with large numbers of students going into middle-class service and helping profession careers. The decline of various service-related fields in higher education such as social work, library science, nursing, and education corresponds to the decline of the middle class. Moreover, supply-side higher education undermines the support for various academic fields (e.g., foreign languages, humanities, social sciences, education) that are arguably central to effective cooperation among countries in regional trading blocs. In the United States, internationalization of the curriculum tends to mean the development of applied master’s degree programs in business and engi-
With a supply-side, market model of higher education comes change in the production process, in ways that make institutions increasingly managerial in their configuration.

With a supply-side, market model of higher education comes change in the production process, in ways that make institutions increasingly managerial in their configuration. Over the past two decades the greatest growth in professional personnel in U.S. higher education has been among support professionals, what I have called “managerial professionals.” Who are these people? The most traditional category on U.S. campuses is student services personnel, who provide all sorts of services to the burgeoning, changing student population. With increased emphasis on the use of new information and instructional technologies, various professionals and technical workers have emerged. Similarly, the increased emphasis on entrepreneurial activities has led to growing numbers of professionals in development (fund raising) and technology transfer. Increased accountability pressures, in turn, have led to growing numbers of assessment and institutional research professionals. What is happening is a decentering of faculty. Producing students, research, or outreach now involves a wide range of campus professionals.

There are two points here. First, in U.S. universities, professors are no longer the only profession on campus. The faculty’s share of professional positions on campus has declined—from about 64 percent in 1977 to about 55 percent in 1989, and falling. A second point is that managerial workforces are not cheap. There is not only a shifting of where costs in American higher education are being incurred—from faculty to support professionals and administrators—but also an increased cost per student that accompanies these changes. Some public research universities have seen an absolute decline in faculty numbers over the past five years, more than counterbalanced by an increase in numbers of administrators and support professionals, leading to increased institutional expenditures. Managerial personnel cost more than faculty.

The U.S., “privatized” model of higher education also brings with it a degree of stratification uncommon in most Western democracies, and a pattern of social relations on campus that is foreign to most countries. Stratification is so steep that on the same campus there are entry-level faculty in one field who can make more than full professors in another field. And income dispersion is increasing. Moreover, social relations on campus are increasingly corporatized, as faculty find their time, work, and the products of their labor increasingly controlled by managers, who have extended their discretion at the expense of professional autonomy, and arguably of the public interest. Neither pattern is an easy fit for most Western democracies.

How best is the public interest served? With the U.S. market model comes the assumption that managers, like fathers, know best. Or as the saying goes, “What’s good for business is good for America.” The corporate model of higher education places great discretion and faith in management. Other interests are simply given no place at the table, in contrast to the corporatist arrangements of many universities around the world. In the United States, the entrepreneurial prestige and “profit” interests of individual universities have become in some sense counterposed to the public interest (as is also evident in U.S. health care, with “managed care” companies).

Thus, for all its dynamism, entrepreneurial activity, and research productivity, the U.S. system has its own challenges. Those who would draw on the market model would do well to learn from our experience. In closing, I would note that at the turn of the last century the societal challenge was to mitigate the excesses of industrial, monopolistic capitalism. In the United States, “independent” professions emerged that in many ways played that role. The failure to meet that challenge in many countries contributed to tremendous social upheaval and world war. Now, at the turn of this century we again face the challenge of mitigating economic excesses, this time of global, hypercapitalism. The more higher education is modeled and reconstructed on a private, corporate market model, the less it can play such a mitigating role, and the more it itself contributes to the sharp polarization that promotes social upheaval. There are alternatives. American higher education has played other roles, and linked itself to other markets (e.g., student markets, and local economics). It has not only responded to, but pump-primed those markets, as did the post-World War II GI Bill, which expanded opportunity, promoted upward mobility and social progress, and solidified a middle class. It was an investment that higher education systems across the world could use today, that acknowledged the value of higher education, not simply economically, but socially.

Notes
Quality Assurance for Distance Learning in a Global Society

Ronald A. Phipps


Cyberspace, the electronic marketplace, Internet, World Wide Web, the information highway, e-mail, the digital highway, virtual learning, information technology—all of these terms are used to describe, explain, or illustrate a phenomenon that is inexorably transforming the worldwide higher education enterprise. Don Tapscott declares: “Today we are witnessing the early, turbulent days of a revolution as significant as any other in human history. A new medium of human communications is emerging, one that may prove to surpass all previous revolutions—the printing press, the telephone, the television, the computer—in its impact on our economic and social life.” Carol Twigg, James Mingle, and Robert Hetrick of Educom predict that by the end of the decade, there will be one billion users of the Internet—considerably more than the conservative estimate of about 50 million today. Moreover, higher education will no longer take place within the silos of individual institutions (or even their virtual equivalents). Instead, higher education will occur within a dynamic global marketplace of customers and suppliers.

Technology-mediated distance learning comes in a variety of forms and defies the creation of a clear taxonomy or clear definition of providers. Trying to grasp this remarkable phenomenon is akin to holding on to quicksilver. Technology is constantly being upgraded, software is being developed, and alliances are being formed—all at an astounding rate. The landscape of technology-mediated learning is an ever-changing mosaic.

Although technology-mediated distance learning is offered by thousands of individual traditional institutions, a growing number of consortia and brokering arrangements among traditional institutions, hundreds of corporate universities, and the military branches, some of the first institutions established solely and specifically to provide technology-mediated distance learning were established outside of the United States in countries such as China, France, India, Indonesia, Iran, Korea, Spain, and South Africa. One of the first institutions of this kind is Open University in Great Britain, which was established in 1969. Since then, 30 other open universities have been established throughout the world. The number of students served is impressive. For instance, in 1995, the China TV University System enrolled 30,000 students, the Anadolu University in Turkey enrolled 577,804 students, and the Universitas Terbuka in Indonesia taught 353,000 students. These institutions are major higher education providers in their countries.

There appear to be four interrelated phenomena accompanying the rapid growth of information technology’s impact upon the global postsecondary education community. These cultural and technological catalysts are pervasive and transcend the various characteristics of providers of postsecondary education. They are: the emergence of lifelong learning, efforts to make instruction more learner-centered, the desire to provide access irrespective of where a student lives, and the development of “knowledge media.”

Lifelong Learning

The world has changed in ways that make lifelong learning more of a necessity than an appealing phrase. In their book, The Monster Under the Bed, Davis and Botkin note that in an agrarian economy, education for young people between 7 and 14 was sufficient to last 40 years of a working life. The industrial economy expanded the age range of students to between 5 and 22. In the information economy, the rapid pace of technological change requires education to be updated throughout our working lives. People have to increase their learning power to sustain their earning power. Lifelong learning is the norm that is augmenting school-age education.

Learner-centered Instruction

Mingle points out that, traditionally, higher education is organized around the needs of the providers, where a “place” to conduct research and teach is supplied. The standards for conducting research and teaching, including faculty workload, space for labs, etc. are centered on the provider and professional needs. These concerns, however, are not the concerns of a “learner-centered” environment. The concept of learning productivity, coined by Bruce Johnstone, former chancellor of the State University of New York, is at the heart of the shift from “teacher-centered” to “learner-centered” delivery systems—and it possesses three fundamental character-
istic. It is, to a greater degree, self-directed; it is more focused and purposeful; and it employs the appropriate level of faculty mediation. In talking to his colleagues regarding the role of the faculty in a learner-centered environment, Robert Swain asserts the following:

The real roles of the professor in an information-rich world will not be to provide information, but to guide students wading through the deep waters of the information flood. Professors in this environment will thrive as mentors. They will use the best skills they have now to nudge students through the educationally crucial task of processing information, problem solving, analysis, and synthesis of ideas—the activities in which our time can be best spent.

Providing Access
For several years, it has been recognized that learning does not only have to take place on a college or university campus. In 1994, the U.S. government announced its intention to establish by the year 2000 the National Information Infrastructure (NII), which is essentially a broad-band digital network. One fundamental requirement is that the applications of the NII extend into homes and workplaces as well as colleges and universities. A plethora of courses and entire academic programs are already being provided to students in venues away from the campus, particularly in a student’s home or workplace.

Knowledge Media
The term “knowledge media” was proposed by Marc Eisenstadt to describe the convergence of telecommunications, computing, and the learning or cognitive sciences. “Knowledge media are about the capturing, storing, imparting, sharing, accessing and creating of knowledge.” The combination of technologies coupled with our understanding of the learning process will fundamentally change the relationship between people and knowledge. This medium is not just a technical format, such as a CD-ROM or e-mail, but encompasses the entire presentational style, how the user interfaces, the accessibility of the medium, and the degree of interactivity. Knowledge media provide the opportunity to change the emphasis from the classroom and teaching to the individual and learning. In short, with good learning materials, effective networks, and proper support, students can learn better at home than in class.

What is Quality?
There is not universal agreement within the international higher education community regarding the definition of quality. Debate continues about the relative merits of input variables, process variables, and outputs as they relate to student learning and institutional effectiveness. Nevertheless, it is tempting, and in many ways convenient, to use the instructional processes and activities of “traditional” higher education as the benchmark upon which technology-mediated distance learning is judged. In effect, by comparing technology-mediated learning to the traditional ways in which students are taught in colleges and universities, there is an implicit assumption that traditional higher education is the paragon of quality and any deviation from that model represents “less” quality. To be sure, there is something to be said about the rich culture of higher education. On the other hand, using the status quo as a framework for evaluation of quality of technology-mediated distance learning leaves little room for realizing the enormous potential and impact of information technology.

This is not to suggest that the pedagogy used for centuries be abandoned. The teaching-learning process of higher education has long been a combination of face-to-face meetings—ranging from tutorials to large lectures—asynchronous communications (such as written assignments), and guided independent work (like reading and laboratory assignments). Through the application of information technology, however, a wide variety of options are now available and, although these fundamental pedagogies are still part of the teaching-learning process, they are reconfigured and enhanced.

The world has changed in ways that make lifelong learning more of a necessity than an appealing phrase.

Moreover, there is no disagreement that colleges and universities are in the “knowledge” business. Yet, the traditional focus on the acquisition of knowledge—embodied in the degree to which institutions possess human, information, physical, and financial resources—is being challenged. Because of information technology and the extraordinary wealth of information that is now
commonly available, it is appropriate to address the extent to which institutions are able to access knowledge and use it in the teaching-learning process. Indeed, what information technology does best is deliver content and provide access to information and to other people.

Thus, while recognizing that higher education enterprises create knowledge and disseminate knowledge through a variety of pedagogies, it is suggested that the policies and practices of traditional higher education need not be used as the sole point of departure for an understanding of quality. Instead, although informed by the fruitful heritage of traditional higher education, the following practices are offered as appropriate quality assurance strategies to be considered when learning takes place at a distance. Each of these strategies focuses particularly on the needs of the learner, enjoys support from a number of practitioners of distance learning, and is found in a growing body of literature.

**Teaching Methods**

**Interactivity.** A substantial body of evidence suggests that the more interactive the instruction, the more effective the learning outcome is likely to be. The key ingredients appear to be the availability of the instructor—whether through direct person-to-person contact or through electronic means—and the intellectual engagement of the student, regardless of the method of engagement.

**Modular Learning.** Considerable evidence exists that individualized instructional approaches emphasizing small, modularized units of content, mastery of one unit before moving to the next, immediate and frequent feedback to students on their progress, and active student involvement in the learning process are consistently effective in enhancing subject matter learning over more traditional learning formats such as lecture and recitation.

**Collaboration.** Learning is enhanced through cooperation and reciprocity among students. The learning process involves collaboration and a social context, with students working together. Sharing ideas in a group setting improves thinking and deepens understanding. Study groups, collaborative learning, group problem solving, and discussion of assignments can be dramatically strengthened through technology-mediated learning.

**Learning Styles.** Students learn in many different ways and bring to the learning activity varied talents and experiences. Technology has the enormous potential to enable students to learn in a variety of ways. Technology-mediated distance learning can provide dramatic visuals and well-organized print; encourage self-reflection and self-evaluation; and promote collaboration and group problem solving.

**Faculty Involvement**

Contacts between Faculty and Students. Chickering observes that faculty contact in and out of class is very important in student motivation and involvement. The concern of faculty often helps students get through rough times and continue their studies. Computer conferencing, e-mail, and the World Wide Web increase opportunities for students and faculty to converse and exchange work much more speedily than before and more thoughtfully and “safely” than when confronting each other in classroom or faculty office.

**Courseware Development.** Courseware is, by and large, produced either by individual faculty (or groups of faculty members) on campuses or in commercial enterprises—or a combination of both. Regardless of the source of courseware development, the knowledge, skills, and competency levels should be clearly defined and determined or approved by faculty possessing the appropriate academic and professional experience. Also, with respect to courseware developed commercially, the institutions should validate the academic quality of the materials and ensure that the courseware is consistent with the goals and objectives of the institution's curriculum.

---

**Knowledge media are replacing the professor as the student's primary source of information.**

---

**Information Access.** Knowledge media are replacing the professor as the student’s primary source of information. Since faculty are no longer the major source of information, of particular importance is the ability of faculty to guide students through the morass of the Internet to identify the reliability of information. In addition, faculty should be capable of identifying or creating courseware that evokes student motivation, and encourages interactivity, collaboration, and modular learning activities.

**Faculty Selection and Training.** Not every faculty member will have the skills and temperament for technology-mediated learning. In addition to careful selection of faculty members, proper training with respect to
learner needs and the use of technology is essential. Training needs to be continuous because of the changing requirements of technology.

**Support Services**
An integrated team—such as computer service technicians, counselors, site administrators, distribution clerks, and library resource personnel—is needed to support faculty efforts.

**Learning Resources.** Libraries and learning resources are being transformed by technology. The rapid pace of replacing traditional libraries and resource centers with computer networks and on-line retrieval systems requires that students and faculty, staff, and administrators be provided ongoing orientation and training sessions for accessing information.

**Student Services.** There is a growing movement for colleges and universities to contract for student services, including registration, business office, financial aid, and bookstore functions. Institutions that use outside sources must be diligent in ensuring that students receive clear, complete, and timely information regarding institutional requirements, assumptions about technological competence and skills, technical equipment requirements, and availability of support services and that students have easy access to services. Of particular importance is technical assistance for students so that the technology becomes a “transparent” conduit of knowledge.

**Infrastructure.** Ensuring that students participating in learning activities do not experience interruptions or problems in communications, the institution’s technological infrastructure needs to be continually monitored and, if appropriate, enhanced. Major components include expanded network capacity, addition of dial-in ports for remote access, enhancement of e-mail, file-serving and other centralized services, creation of a software library, and enhancement of network security.

**Assessment of Learning**
Outcomes Assessment. Almost two decades ago, Howard Bowen observed that in higher education true outcomes in the form of learning and personal development of students are on the whole unexamined and only vaguely discerned. It is becoming increasingly important (and some would say imperative) for institutions participating in technology-mediated distance learning to identify a clearly understood set of outcomes, and especially student knowledge, skills, and competency levels. Once these student learning outcomes are identified, reliable and valid methods for measuring their achievement should be developed. As the concept of “seat-time” becomes less and less relevant, especially as a proxy for student learning, externally validated outcomes—preferably determined through multiple measures—provide the institution and its constituents evidence that learning has taken place.

These quality assurance strategies represent many of the best practices used by experienced providers of distance learning combined with teaching-learning methods that have withstood the test of time in colleges and universities around the world.
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The Idea of the Service University

Arlid Tjeldvoll

Arlid Tjeldvoll is professor of education at the University of Oslo, Norway. Address: Institute of Educational Research, University of Oslo, POB 1093, N-0317 Oslo, Norway. E-mail: <arild.tjeldvoll@ped.uio.no>.

The “service university” as a university model is increasingly debated internationally. The most salient characteristic is its similarity with a market-driven enterprise. To survive, a service university has to develop products that are competitive in a knowledge market. According to the research literature, the internal and external factors pushing a university in the service direction are: ideological changes, the current state of scientific knowledge, the students, the administration, and the state. University development in the service direction has been particularly strong in Australia, New Zealand, Canada, the United States, and the United Kingdom, but the trend is global and has also reached the shores of Scandinavia. The universities of Oslo and Stockholm both exhibit policies in accordance with the international trend. However, the development is more pronounced in Stockholm than in Oslo. Sweden is fighting its way out of a recession, and has to develop more efficient knowledge production and goal-effective higher education. Norway, with an affluent oil economy, is developing in a more relaxed way. In the rest of Europe the situation varies. While the University of Twente in the Netherlands can be seen as a prototype of a successful service university, universities in both Germany and France seem to be moving more slowly in their market orientation.

To survive, a service university has to develop products that are competitive in a knowledge market.

The trademark of a research university—independent production of scientific knowledge—is obviously challenged by the service university model. In the wake of postmodernism and the critique of positivism, the earlier division of knowledge into distinct disciplines is no longer generally accepted. The university’s monopoly on knowledge production is under challenge by several external agents—specialized research sites, frequently labeled “mode-2 production of knowledge.” The quantitative success of universal higher education creates teaching quality problems for the university. The qualitative success produces numerous well-qualified graduates who return to society as researchers, in jobs where they compete with their alma mater in knowledge production. The end of the cold war implied a clear ideological victory for the liberal market economy as an overall paradigm for society. It has become increasingly difficult for the state to cope with public expenditures. The welfare state is eroding, and the state has become an increasingly unfaithful patron for the university. Hence the public research university finds itself in the unusual situation of being forced to take direct and major responsibility for its budgets. It is forced to become entrepreneurial in order to stay in business.

The university’s monopoly on knowledge production is under challenge by several external agents.

Serving society is nothing new for the university. Indeed, such service has historically been its overall mission. The rise of the service university model is particularly dramatic in the public university’s changed relationship to the state, which has possible consequences for its institutional autonomy and academic freedom. Trying to imagine future consequences for the university from the current service development, three possible scenarios come to mind.

The Degenerating Service University

In this scenario, the university, through its professors and administration, is unable to convince the state patron of the rational and democratic necessity of giving sufficient public funding to attract and keep professors for high-quality teaching and independent research. The university is neither able to compete successfully for research grants from public and independent foundations, nor to find new sources of funding in the higher education and applied research markets. Gradually, this institution will likely be forced to recruit a less-qualified staff. In the competition for fee-paying students, it will most likely recruit students with fewer academic qualifications and lower fee-paying capacity. This university will most likely fall into a vicious circle, degenerating into a school of low quality and reputation, at the risk of being closed down.

The Service University Supermarket

The second scenario envisions a research university transformed by the principles of a business enterprise. Research policies and curricula of this institution are
designed to be competitive with other higher education institutions in meeting the needs expressed by private business and public bureaucrats. Teaching programs will typically consist of tailor-made short courses demanded by business clients and professional studies required by the state. All research will be applied research responding to the information needs of the public and private market. There will be no tenured positions and hardly any need for philosophers, sociologists, or critical political scientists and economists. Most staff will be part-time or specialists under contract. The university leadership and administration will have similar competencies as successful business corporations.

The Academic Service University
In this scenario, the university has acknowledged the new ideological and financial reality—in particular, the unfaithfulness of the state. Unlike the “degenerating university,” it has succeeded in finding other funding sources. It has been able to maintain the best possible relations with the state as an on-going important client. It has also successfully competed for the research programs offered by foundations and been able to identify niches in the market for its research and education products. By its own initiatives, it has achieved financial independence. It is able to produce competitive revenue-generating services for public and private clients, resulting in a budget that makes it possible to sustain independent research and educational policies and programs. Different from the “supermarket university,” it consciously uses its budget to keep up with international academic standards. Teaching programs in the arts and sciences are maintained, and its researchers are free to carry out critical research on the state bureaucracy and corporate life. Professors’ salaries are decent and competitive, signaling a continued high social status for research and higher education. The “academic service university” has been able to strike a balance between individual academic freedom, institutional autonomy, and accountability toward taxpayers and business. At the same time as it is serving these clients, it is creating the financial independence that enables it to carry out its critical function in a democratic society.

Research on the Service University
At present there is an international network of 14 universities in 10 countries attempting to produce case studies of the level and character of service university development in their countries. At the Oslo and Stockholm universities specific projects concerning the relationship between the university and its clients, university leadership, budgeting, the role of professors and continuing education—in a comparative perspective—are ongoing.

Linking Funding, Student Fees, and Student Aid: An Alternative to Cost Recovery

Arthur M. Hauptman

Arthur Hauptman is a prominent consultant and author specializing in higher education finance and public policy issues. He has taught in the higher education program at Boston College, and has worked recently in Jordan on issues of cost recovery in higher education. E-mail: <hauptman@erols.com>.

In the past quarter century, most developed and developing countries around the world have moved toward a system of financing higher education that is based on the principle of cost recovery. Under a cost recovery approach, tuition fees are set as a proportion—typically less than half—of the educational cost per student. Most or all of the remaining costs per student are then covered by government funding.

Cost recovery represents a significant improvement over the process it replaced in most countries where government allocations were largely based on the political strength of the institution. Fees were low or zero reflecting the philosophy that higher education is strictly a public good. One problem with the low or no tuition fee approach, however, is that it fails to reflect the private benefits college students receive in the form of higher incomes by virtue of their college attendance and graduation. In addition, a minimal tuition fee strategy may result in lower levels of college participation if it is combined with relatively low levels of government support for higher education. Cost recovery addresses these problems by increasing student fees to more nearly reflect the private benefits that students receive and by increasing resources devoted to higher education.

But for all of its advantages, cost recovery creates its own set of problems. For instance, the procedures tend to encourage institutions to raise funds privately and build these funds into their expenditure base as a means for increasing the revenues they receive from student fees. For this reason, cost recovery creates incentives for institutions to increase their costs rather than moderate them. Similarly, setting fees as a percentage of costs per student may encourage institutions to restrict their enrollments—thereby increasing their costs per student—and thus possibly augmenting the public revenues they receive. In short, cost recovery can lead to higher costs per student and less access.

Another criticism of cost recovery is that it tends to reinforce the inequities already existing in a country’s higher education structure. Under cost recovery, institutions with high levels of resources per student tend to receive the most...
funds, while traditionally underresourced institutions continue to get shortchanged in the funding process. In that regard, cost recovery is more reactive than strategic in that it accepts financing structures as they are rather than providing strategic direction as to where they should go.

The question of whether the financing structure for higher education is strategic or reactive extends beyond the issue of cost recovery. Most countries tend to be incremental in their approach to financing higher education and thus reinforce the structure that already exists. The distribution of public funds to institutions mirrors previous patterns. As a result, very little strategic planning occurs in the financing process.

Moving Toward a More Strategic Model
The lack of a strategic approach in most countries is also reflected in the lack of coordination among the various public policies for funding institutions, setting student fees, and providing student financial aid. Institutional funding and fee setting are usually viewed as processes to maintain or improve the quality of institutions, whereas student aid bears the burden of improving access. As a result, governmental policies for distributing funds to institutions and setting student fees often work at cross-purposes with student aid policies and programs designed to provide greater access to disadvantaged students.

In the past quarter century, most developed and developing countries around the world have moved toward a system of financing higher education that is based on the principle of cost recovery.

To address these shortcomings, countries should consider moving to a more strategic model of financing higher education that links funding, tuition fees, and student aid policies with overall economic trends. It is also important that government policies for higher education finance take economic trends into account and remain flexible enough to respond to changing economic conditions. A more strategic model along these lines might include the following features:

- Overall tuition levels at public institutions would be set as a percentage of measures of ability to pay—such as median family income or income per capita—rather than on the basis of cost per student. Fees are typically thought of as a means for financing institutions. As a result they are likely to increase over time at a rate that is different from people’s ability to pay for college. Under a strategic approach, fees would increase over time in line with economic conditions rather than institutional growth.
- If tuitions vary by field of study, the variation would be a function of national priorities and labor force needs more than cost differentials. In countries where fees are not uniform across all fields of study, they typically are set on the basis of which programs cost the most. But cost differentials among fields of study may bear little relationship to relative labor force needs and shortages. In a strategic model, countries would set fee differentials to encourage students to enter fields of high national priority, including meeting current and projected labor force shortages.
- Institutions should receive more funds for the disadvantaged students they enroll than for higher-income students. Most countries make no distinction among groups of students in the funding of institutions, relying instead solely on student aid to provide access to disadvantaged groups of students. More progress on access would be achieved if a portion of institutional allocations were access based as well.
- Government officials would explicitly consider what proportion of public funding for higher education should be devoted to student aid. Typically, student aid levels are now a residual of many other decisions. To be strategic, fee increases should be accompanied by some policy that explicitly reduces the amount of government funding of institutions and at the same time deliberately increases student aid funding.
- Student aid policies should be designed to provide a safety net for the most disadvantaged students when tuitions increase for whatever reason. The formulas in most student aid programs do not fully match the increase in fees, thus adversely affecting access for the most disadvantaged students. Student aid policies should instead be designed to protect the most disadvantaged students from the adverse effects of higher fees.
- Countries should recognize the impact of the economic cycle on higher education funding by reserving a portion of funds in good economic times to be used when less public funds are available. The financing of higher education in most countries essentially ignores the reality of the economic cycle by failing to plan for economic downturns. Conversely, countries should consider borrowing funds during economic hard times to be repaid once the economy recovers.

The steps listed above would constitute a much more strategic approach to the financing of higher education than the systems currently in place in most countries and would thus significantly enhance the ability of countries to finance higher education.
Financing Higher Education in Asia: Patterns, Trends, and Policies
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The Asian Development Bank (ADB) is preparing a new policy framework for its work in education. To provide background information for policy formulation, the ADB commissioned a series of thematic and country papers on trends and issues in the education sector. Higher education is among the domains that has received attention. This article highlights some features from the ADB paper on education financing in the region.1

Diversity and Commonality
The ADB has 37 developing member countries, which display considerable diversity. Populations range from just 7,000 in Nauru to 1,200,000,000 in China. GNP per capita ranges from U.S.$200 in Nepal to U.S.$22,500 in Singapore. Moreover, the group includes states that remain officially committed to a socialist ideology (People’s Republic of China, Lao People’s Democratic Republic, and Socialist Republic of Vietnam), while others (e.g., Kyrgyz Republic, Cambodia, Mongolia) have officially abandoned socialism, and yet others (e.g., Fiji, Malaysia, Philippines) have always had capitalist societies. Because of such diversity, few policy formulations can be uniformly applied to the whole of the Asian region. It therefore becomes necessary to identify particular policies that are appropriate for particular subregions, countries, and even provinces or districts.

Yet the region also displays some overarching commonalities. For example, almost all societies confront issues concerning the role of the state in education. Likewise, almost all societies face issues related to expansion of access, and to supply of and demand for highly trained personnel.

Almost all societies confront issues concerning the role of the state in education. Likewise, almost all societies face issues related to expansion of access, and to supply of and demand for highly trained personnel.

The Asian region has accompanied other parts of the world in the global shift in policy. According to a 1994 World Bank report, in the late 1980s in only 20 countries did tuition fees account for over 10 percent of recurrent expenditures. Sub-Saharan Africa, North Africa, the Middle East, and Eastern Europe had little or no tradition of cost recovery in public higher education. However, public-institution fees exceeded 10 percent of recurrent expenditures in one out of five Latin American countries and in half of the Asian countries.

As the 1990s progressed, in some parts of Asia fees increased further. In China, for example, the average regimes. Moreover, this development has been apparent even in countries that have long operated capitalist economies but that have had government-protected education systems. The chief manifestation of the change, as noted in previous issues of this publication, has been the advance of privatization in countries as different as Singapore and India.2

Fees in Public Institutions
The 1980s brought a worldwide trend toward the introduction of and increase in fees in public higher education. This was in direct opposition to the view dominant in the 1950s and 1960s that public education, particularly at lower levels but also including higher education, should be free of charge. The chief justification was that education was a major route for social mobility, and the possibility of poor people being excluded from education by fees was considered inequitable.

By the 1990s, this notion had been widely abandoned. This was not only because of financial stringency but also because of the realization that fee-free education at the tertiary level, far from being equitable, was likely to be inequitable. Young people from richer socioeconomic groups are more likely than their counterparts from poorer socioeconomic groups to attend tertiary institutions, and subsidies for higher education are therefore more likely to benefit the rich than the poor.
fee in 1995 had reached 25 to 30 percent of recurrent costs. In Singapore, differential fees were charged by academic discipline. In the arts and social sciences, fees were increased from 10 percent of the recurrent cost in 1986–87 to 20 percent in 1992–93, and the government has declared its intent to raise fees further to 25 percent.

Grants and Loans

People who oppose such increases in fees usually do so on the grounds that fees are likely to exclude individuals from the poorest segments of society. Part of the response by policymakers has been to provide an array of support schemes, including grants and loans. Grants may be linked not only to incomes but also to academic performance and to efforts to attract students to particular types of training.

The 1980s brought a worldwide trend toward the introduction of and increase in fees in public higher education.

Loan schemes are much less efficient as a mechanism for cost recovery than is widely assumed. They usually contain a substantial proportion of hidden grants through subsidized interest rates, leniency for low-income students, and tolerance of default on repayment. In addition, loan schemes may demand substantial administrative costs.

Because of such factors, much attention during the 1990s has focused on ways to improve the efficiency of loan schemes. In Hong Kong, for example, the government was advised in 1996 to simplify administration and raise interest charges. When the scheme was initiated in 1969, loans were interest-free. However, in 1987 a 2.5 percent charge was introduced, and a 1996 report recommended that this should be raised to between 5.8 and 8.5 percent.

Institutional Revenue-Earning Schemes

Higher education institutions in Asia are increasingly required to secure additional funds from other sources. Many institutions now solicit donations from alumni; many encourage professors to undertake consultancy services; and some are moving into direct business ventures. Prosperous societies are obviously better able to support such initiatives than impoverished ones, though the irony is that institutions in prosperous societies have in general faced less need to secure independent revenues because their governments are better able to provide substantial funding. In the marketing of skills, institutions and individuals specializing in applied science and commerce generally have more opportunities than their counterparts specializing in history or philosophy.

Vietnam is among the countries in which higher education institutions have been forced, by escalating costs and the inadequacy of revenues from the government, to earn independent incomes. In 1991, Vietnam’s College of Construction added 28.3 percent to its budget by taking on external contracts. Comparable figures were 22 percent for the Foreign Languages University, 11 percent for the College of Mining & Geology, 10.5 percent for the Teachers Training College of Vinh, and 4.2 percent for the Technical Teachers College No. 1. Critics observe that such activities deflect the staff from their primary missions as specialized providers of higher education. Advocates usually agree, but point out that the activities at least permit the institutions to survive in harsh economic climates.

An example from a very different climate exists in Singapore. Although the country has a strong economy and has had continued government budget surpluses, even in Singapore the 1990s have brought a philosophy that higher education institutions should develop their own sources of revenue and reduce dependence on the government. In 1991, appeals were launched by Singapore’s two universities for newly created endowment funds with a target of $S1 billion. The government contributed $S500 million, and agreed to match up to $S250 million during the following five years if the universities could secure that amount from nongovernment sources.

Privatization

Some observers view the privatization trend positively. For example, the World Bank has stated that:

Private institutions are an important element of some of the strongest higher education systems to be found today. . . . They can respond efficiently and effectively to changing demand, and they increase educational opportunities with little or no educational cost. 3

However, others have pointed out that the private sector includes opportunists and charlatans as well as reputable providers. In addition to local entrepreneurs, the opportunists include some ventures that have bases in North America, Europe, and Australasia but that market their wares in Asia. The 1990s have seen a rash of joint ventures and overseas operations in such countries as Malaysia and Japan, some of which are of very questionable quality and that offer degrees not accredited in their home countries. Laissez faire policies to-
ward the private sector may also exacerbate problems in the labor market. In the Philippines, permissiveness produced an overproduction of graduates in some fields and underproduction in others.

These comments imply that some government oversight is needed in the sector. In most countries, public institutions will continue to educate the majority of students; but government planners can usefully promote coherence in the sector as a whole by facilitating flow of information on the costs and quality of different courses, and by establishing procedures for accrediting degrees from private institutions.

Future Directions
Returning to the theme with which this article began, patterns of financing for higher education in Asia display both commonality and diversity. The ADB works primarily with governments, and must operate within the framework of national contexts and policies. At the same time, the ADB and other international agencies can exercise leadership in facilitating change. The challenge is to tailor approaches to particular needs in specific situations and at particular points in time.

Many of the trends in Asia can also be found in other parts of the world. However, the Asian region does have some distinctive emphases. One, as noted, is in the scale of cost recovery through student fees. Another aspect is in the mix of institutions. The World Bank identifies Asia as “the continent where differentiation efforts have been the most extensive and most effective.” This remark chiefly referred to the mix of conventional and distance-learning universities, and to the balance of public and private operations. Some systems are also differentiating between the nature and role of specific institutions. Institutions in the United States have long been divided into ones with a primary focus on teaching as opposed to others with a strong research function. A similar form of differentiation is being developed in China and India, for example.

The question is then what can be expected during at least the early years of the 21st century. While prediction is always difficult and dangerous, several factors seem to be clear:
- Expansion. It seems probable that continued expansion will be a major feature. This will be particularly obvious in the socialist states that currently have low enrollment rates, including China, Laos, and Vietnam. Many capitalist states will also make renewed thrusts to reach higher enrollment rates. Economic downturn will threaten the scale of expansion, and in many contexts restructuring and improved efficiency will be needed.
- The Public-Private Mix. Countries such as South Korea and the Philippines already have such a high proportion of private higher education that it seems unlikely that the proportion will increase further. However, the private sector is likely to become increasingly evident in such countries as China, India, Kazakhstan, Uzbekistan, and Vietnam.
- Fees and loans. No sooner do populations become used to fees exceeding 10 percent of recurrent costs than authorities begin to talk of raising fees above 20 percent. It seems probable that present trends of cost sharing will continue. They will be supported by loan schemes of various kinds, and renewed attention will be given to the efficiency of those schemes.

Notes
4. Ibid., 30.
Ranking Universities in China: Same Game, Different Context
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As an important part of the process of evaluating higher education, university ranking has grabbed increasing attention worldwide. From a global perspective, it parallels the development of higher education, and has long been practiced in economically advanced countries, such as Germany, Japan, the United Kingdom, and the United States. Asian and Pacific countries, like Australia and Hong Kong, have followed suit.

University ranking can act as a catalyst for change, but can also be misleading. Merits and faults aside, it is certainly very influential. Not only do people from all walks of life show great concern about results of the process, but it even exerts influence on the international reputation of the higher education system in a specific country, against a backdrop of globalization.

As part of its reentry into the world community, China now conducts regular university ranking. Assessments conducted by the administrative organizations, however, are used as guidelines, are not made known to the public, and therefore, cannot provoke much public interest. Outcomes resulting from independent assessments, however, especially when made public through the media, are gaining increasing attention from the whole society, due to the close connection to universities’ reputations.

Governmental Ranking

Governmental ranking involves the order in which the government selects some universities as “key points” for growth, or as institutions enjoying special policy privileges. From 1954 to 1963, China established 68 “key-point institutions” of higher learning. Although interrupted by the Cultural Revolution, by 1981 96 institutions had been placed on the list. Of these, the then State Planning Commission and the Ministry of Education selected 16 in the 1984–85 academic year, which were approved by the State Council. The institutions thus targeted for the improvement of their teaching and research capacity during the Seventh Five-Year Plan included Peking University, Tsinghua University, Fudan University, Xi’an Jiaotong University, Shanghai Jiaotong University, University of Science and Technology of China, Beijing Medical University, People’s University of China, Beijing Normal University, and Beijing Agricultural University.

From 1995 onward, the State Education Commission has selected those institutions that will be the focus for investment (known as the 211 Program) by the national and/or provincial governments, in an effort to ensure standards, under conditions of limited overall finances. The institutions are selected according to their overall conditions and potential. In actual practice, this ranking not only serves to improve teaching and research, but also sets good examples for less-favored institutions.

The weaknesses of government ranking, however, derive from the highly planned economy and the correspondingly heavily centralized system of higher education. As China has adopted a free-market economy, under which the national government stops running higher education directly and moves to assume more of a steering role, rankings of this sort seem less and less appropriate.

University ranking can act as a catalyst for change, but can also be misleading.

International Ranking

International ranking is based on quantitative indicators provided by academic research. In 1987, the Institute of Science in the Chinese Academy of Management Science first did a quantitative assessment of the scientific level of Chinese comprehensive universities (in both the mainland and in Taiwan). They used the statistics provided by the Science Citation Index (SCI) of the Institute for Scientific Information to count, by university affiliation of authors, scientific articles published in internationally recognized scholarly journals from 1983 to 1985. The top 10 institutions were Peking University, Taiwan University (Taiwan), University of Science and Technology of China, Nanjing University, Fudan University, Beijing Medical University, Nankai University, Beijing Normal University, Shanghai Medical University, and Jilin University.

Another fairly influential ranking has been conducted by the China Institute of Scientific and Technical Information. It publishes statistics on scientific articles each year, with a university name list based on the statistics collected from SCI, the Engineering Index, and Index of Scientific and Technology Conference Papers, as well as 1,200 Chinese scholarly journals.

On the basis of 1991–1993 statistics, China also listed the top 10 universities to win the State Natural Science Award, the first 20 to win the State Invention Award, the State Scientific and Technological Advancement Award, and the State Education Commission Award for Scientific and Technological Achievement. Universities that have received research grants over 100 and 50 million yuan were also
listed, together with those whose annual output of scientific and technological production exceeded 100 and 50 million yuan.

Naturally, proponents of international ranking try to legitimate the system by using internationally practiced quantitative indicators and methods. As social and cultural institutions, however, contemporary universities are deeply embedded in their societies. This dilemma means that the ranking scheme is simply not powerful enough to measure the weaknesses and strengths of Chinese universities; moreover, the indicators employed are confined to only certain aspects of institutions of higher learning.

Features, Issues, and Future Expansion of Chinese Graduate Education
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Since the resumption of graduate education in China in 1978, the system has experienced a remarkable development. Within the short period of 17 years between 1978 and 1994, 460,000 graduate students were admitted—19.7 times as many as the 23,400 students admitted between 1949 and 1965, before the Cultural Revolution. Between 1978 and 1994, 313,000 graduate students graduated (280,000 with master’s degrees and 17,000 with doctoral degrees)—15 times as many as before the Cultural Revolution.

This development merits attention because it is not only unprecedented in China in speed and scale, but because it is also rare in the history of graduate education worldwide. According to available statistics over 17 years (1978–94), China increased its graduate enrollments from 10,900 to 128,000, while the United States, Britain, Japan, and the Soviet Union spent 20, 29, 34, and 31 years reaching the same or similar levels of development respectively.

While stressing the achievements in Chinese graduate education, we should also pay attention to its features, issues, and future trends.

Structural Features

From a historical perspective, the evolution of Chinese graduate education has been influenced by many foreign models. The five generations of returning foreign-educated students have had a special role in the process. In the past half century, Chinese graduate education has successively been under the influence of the Soviet Union and the United States due to the impact of Soviet-educated students ("fourth generation") and of American-educated students ("fifth generation"). Thus the current system of Chinese graduate education is somewhat of a hybrid of the Soviet and American systems, combined with some elements indigenous to China itself. Its administrative structure is more like the Soviet model, while its degree structure bears a resemblance to American counterparts.

There are two main features of the Soviet-inspired pattern: first, the government still has a prominent role in graduate education nationwide, though
a rigid state-control model has given way to a state-supervision model in accordance with the transformation from a planned to a market economy in recent years. Authority for administering the overall affairs of graduate education is shared by two parallel state administrative organs—the State Education Commission and the Academic Degrees Committee under the State Council, each with its own vertical administrative structure and responsibilities and functions. Generally speaking, the former is in charge of graduate admissions, training, management, and job allocation while the latter takes care of the formulation of degree standards, review and approval of institutions, programs and dissertations, and degree conferment. Moreover, in China both institutions of higher learning and research institutes undertake graduate education and have to pass strict and complicated application procedures to obtain authorization from the government. This is mainly attributed to the Soviet-inspired system introduced in the 1950s, which de-emphasized the role of research in universities and stressed the centralizing of research in research institutes.

With regard to the degree structure, patterning after the American model is apparent. Three official levels—bachelor's degree, master's degree, and doctor's degree—plus an unofficial level of postdoctoral work constitute the current Chinese degree structure. However, a nondegree special graduate program exists that is similar to the probationer-researcher and probationer-teacher in the Soviet system. The other American influence is in the development of a research orientation since the early 1980s.

The evolution of Chinese graduate education has been influenced by many foreign models.

Major Issues
Alongside the achievements in graduate education, there are also deficiencies in its developmental course due to many societal factors.

Of the 390,000 full-time faculty in regular institutions of higher education in 1994, only 2 percent held a doctoral degree, 20 percent a master's degree, 49 percent a bachelor's degree, and 30 percent had attended short-cycle courses and had undergone some undergraduate training. In contrast to the United States, Chinese graduate education is characterized by a high degree of overspecialization and narrowness, both of which have implications for quality.

An imbalance exists in almost all aspects of graduate education. For example, the portion of master's degrees is too large (94 percent) while that of doctoral degrees is too small (6 percent). The proportion of students in traditional and basic disciplines such as history, literature, the natural sciences, engineering, and medicine is too large (82 percent), while the percentage in newly emerging and applied disciplines such as economics, business, and law is too small (18 percent). A majority of graduate programs and degrees awarded are concentrated in the thriving southeast coastal and northeast areas (over 70 percent). Conversely, remote and economically backward provinces are severely underrepresented. Female students account for less than one-fourth of enrollments at the master's level and one-tenth at the doctoral level.

Alongside the achievements in graduate education, there are also deficiencies in its developmental course due to many societal factors.

Expansion in the System, 1995–2020
Projected growth in graduate education depends on the growth rate of the economy and of the relevant age group. If graduate enrollments follow the historical average annual undergraduate enrollment growth rate of 7.6 percent, China would reach an enrollment ratio of 0.15 percent by 2000, 0.43 percent by 2010, and 0.81 percent by 2020. If, however, economic and demographic trends produce a more rapid expansion in graduate education (9.8 percent), the enrollment ratio would reach 0.19 percent by 2000, 0.64 percent in 2010, and 1.47 percent in 2020. By 2020 total enrollments would be 1,455,000, although the enrollment ratio would still be only 1.47 percent. However, this enrollment could be considered enormous given that if 25 to 30 percent of them graduate annually, the graduate degrees awarded would number around 400,000. This is similar in scale to the United States—the largest graduate system in the world—which annually awards about 300,000 master's degrees, 35,000 doctoral degrees, and 70,000 professional degrees.
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May 4th, 1998 marked the centennial of Peking University. As part of the celebration, the university hosted an international forum entitled “Higher Education for the 21st Century.” In attendance were 94 university presidents and representatives from 92 renowned universities in over 20 countries worldwide—including Oxford University, Harvard University, Stanford University, Moscow University, Melbourne University, Tokyo University, Taiwan University, and Hong Kong University, to name only a few.

The forum had four themes: 1) missions and roles of the university of the 21st century, 2) teaching and learning for the 21st century, 3) university-society relationships in the 21st century, and 4) university administration and finance for the 21st century. All speakers agreed that, with the emergence of a global knowledge-based economy, the university is taking on an ever more important role in the world. As an “engine” of social development, the university has contributed greatly to the transmission, processing, dissemination, application, and creation of knowledge. Having moved from the margins to the inner ring of society, the university has been very active in the training of high-quality students, the advancement of scientific research, and the overall development of society.

The speakers also pointed out that in the face of the new opportunities and challenges of the information age, the university needs to develop new strategies in teaching and learning. The traditional teacher/textbook/classroom-centered education needs to give way to a more open education that is available to a broader student body, with modern technology as a pedagogical tool. While encouraging students to learn independently with the help of the Internet and multimedia equipment, the speakers cautioned, educators should also provide opportunities to students for the interpersonal interaction that is vital for the fostering of humanistic values and moral development.

During the forum, the relationship between the university and society was a central topic among the university presidents. While exploring ways for the university to serve the needs of society, all the speakers emphasized the necessity of ensuring autonomy and independence for the university. Only in this way could the university carry on basic research, teaching, and other activities aimed at seeking the truth that may not have immediate use for society but are indispensable in the long run.

To survive and prosper in changing times, the university should make special efforts to preserve its cultural heritage while promoting the internationalization of higher education worldwide.

In the area of university administration and finance, the speakers also provided many insights and suggestions for improvement. To face the challenges of the new era, the university needs to streamline its internal structure so that its management can become more efficient and effective. The relationship between teaching and research should be adequately balanced, and universities should share resources. To increase funding for the university, government should increase its investment while implementing cost-sharing and cost-recovery policies as well as mobilizing funds from all sectors of society.

In sum, the speakers concluded, as it enters the new century, the university is facing many opportunities and challenges. To survive and prosper in changing times, the university should make special efforts to preserve its cultural heritage while promoting the internationalization of higher education worldwide. In this global endeavor, understanding and cooperation among universities is essential.

Higher Education on the WWW

Have you missed or lost an issue of the International Higher Education newsletter? Current and back issues, as well as news of the Center and up-to-date on-line resources and links related to comparative and international higher education are available on the World Wide Web. For more information visit the Center’s website, located at:

http://www.bc.edu/bc_org/avp/soe/cihe/
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In Korea, private four-year colleges and universities outnumber by far the public ones, enrolling more than three-quarters of all students. No one can deny that, for the past half century, the private institutions of higher education in Korea have made a considerable contribution to the economic, social, and cultural development of the nation. However, many private institutions are today faced with such serious problems as financial constraints and a degrading of the quality of education. These problems became even more pressing since December 1997, with the beginning of the nation’s economic crisis and the relief loan from International Monetary Fund.

From the outset, private colleges and universities in Korea have depended mainly on student tuition fees in their financial management. At present, the tuition fees make up on average 63.2 percent of the entire finances of private institutions. However, it is well known that many institutions depend for more than 95 percent of their finances on tuition revenues. In particular, private institutions located in provincial areas have had the hardest time with tuition-based financing. Many students, more than 30 percent in some institutions, have dropped out to transfer to institutions in the Seoul metropolitan area.

Government financial support for private institutions dates back only a few years. In 1990, for the first time, the government appropriated financial support for private four-year institutions—0.29 percent of the entire education budget. In 1997, this was raised to 0.76 percent, but this was provided disproportionately. About 54 percent of the government appropriation was offered to the top 10 institutions among the 124 private institutions. In Korea, most institutions of private higher education have no profit-making enterprises. Only a few universities, such as Yonsei and Hanyang, raise funds from building leases and other proprietary business activities.

On the other hand, endowment to private institutions has not been successful. Each and every private institution has desperately sought donations. A few top-level elite institutions have had some success in collecting contributions from their alumni and major corporations, but with the so called “IMF crisis” such contributions were suspended. Some private institutions obtained a multitude of foreign and domestic loans, which further aggravated their financial difficulties due to the devaluation of the Korean currency and the higher interest rates charged by domestic banks.

In sum, all the above-mentioned restraints have driven private institutions in Korea into financial crisis. At present, more than one-third of private institutions are deeply in debt, being liable for more than U.S.$14 million. Indeed, in March 1998, one large private comprehensive university located in Seoul went into bankruptcy, and some other institutions are now rumored to be on the brink of insolvency. In July 1998, the government, which has sole authority over the establishment of higher education institutions, permanently shut down two private four-year institutions because of financial deficiency and poor academic management.

Faced with such imperatives, both government and the private institutions are now considering all possible countermeasures. For example, the government has urged four-year colleges and universities to combine academic departments into larger divisions under the veil of education reform and with the bait of government financial support as a reward. And, each institution is asked to establish its unique character, in terms of structure, management, and curriculum. Along with such restructuring of internal academic administration, some comprehensive universities are now being encouraged to establish new professional graduate schools in such major fields as medicine, engineering, business administration, public administration, education, and law. In addition, an expansion and strengthening of the existing evaluation system of colleges and universities has been proposed—a system instituted in 1983 by the Korean Council for University Education and modeled after the American accreditation system.
The solutions discussed above are obviously quite important, for they will have a great impact on the survival of private institutions. However, several additional new problems have arisen. The government in Korea has always declared its support for the autonomy of private higher education. The government outwardly claims to stand for autonomous decision making by each institution on the adoption of the new division system, creating new professional schools, and so on. But, in practice, no institution has resisted such steps. The private institutions in Korea in their long history have grown so accustomed to accepting government suggestions as a way of protecting themselves from any potential unfair treatment from government. Such a pretense of autonomous uniform policy among private institutions extends throughout all parts of institutional management such as tuition policy, faculty recruitment, admissions, curriculum development, and internal governance. The authentic restructuring of private colleges and universities requires authentic autonomy of higher education institutions.

In July 1998, the government, which has sole authority over the establishment of higher education institutions, permanently shut down two private four-year institutions because of financial deficiency and poor academic management.

Another serious obstacle to restructuring private colleges and universities is the conflict between the private and the public sectors, and among the private institutions themselves. In practice, there are no substantial differences between public and private institutions in Korea, except that the public institutions are wholly government supported but the private ones are not. Institutions in both sectors are set up to be huge comprehensive “department store” institutions. They have not considered their location, the type of students enrolled, their resources, or, more importantly, their missions. It is high time for each institution to reconsider and reaffirm its role and reasons for existing. It is the right path for private institutions to follow to regain the public’s trust. In addition, more systematic principles of management and governance should be developed in all corners of institutional life.

Further Privatization in Japanese Higher Education?

Akiyoshi Yonezawa

Akiyoshi Yonezawa is assistant professor in the Research Institute for Higher Education at Hiroshima University. Address: 1-2-2 Kagamiyama Higashi-Hiroshima 739-8512 Japan. E-mail: <yonezawa@ipc.hiroshima-u.ac.jp>.

Japan has one of the largest systems of private higher education in the world. More than 65 percent of high school graduates continue their studies; of these, over 70 percent are enrolled in private colleges and universities. Although private institutions receive about 10 percent of their financial resources from public funding, most public expenditure on higher education is allocated to the national and local public universities. The extensive private sector of Japanese higher education is currently threatening the status and viability of the national universities (all of which are public), which have been regarded as essential both for equality of access and the development of scientific research.

Within the national government, there are two different positions on higher education reform. On the one hand, the Ministry of Education has overall responsibility for the operation of the national universities and for the administration of local public and private universities. Therefore, the ministry is attempting to strengthen the quality assessment system for national and local public institutions as well as for private universities, in accordance with its bureaucratic orientation. On the other hand, other parts of government, such as the prime minister’s office, respond more to the corporate sector’s demands for privatization and deregulation of public services. This office, as well as others, recommends the privatization of national universities on the grounds that this would improve quality by introducing direct market competition. The argument for deregulation also emphasizes the necessity to make information on the quality of universities available for more informed consumer choice.

This controversy within the government complicates the discussion of quality assessment in Japanese higher education. Despite their lack of sophisticated understanding of the character of higher education, the other ministries have continuously pressed for the privatization of the national universities. In contrast, the Ministry of Education has persisted in trying to strengthen its formal assessment system to obtain necessary information for decision making in the al-
location of public expenditures on higher education. This controversy began in 1984 when the National Council on Educational Reform was established as a temporary advisory group on the initiative of then prime minister Yasuhiro Nakasone. The objective at that time was decentralization and the introduction of market competition into what had become a rather stodgy educational system, despite its powerful role in the rapid economic development after the World War II. Following the recommendation of the National Council on Education Reform, the Ministry of Education established the University Council in 1986 as an advisory group of experts including representatives from industry and labor unions. The policies of the University Council basically followed the orientation of the earlier National Council on Educational Reform with regard to deregulation and market competition. At the same time, the University Council recommended the introduction of a “self-monitoring and self-evaluation” system to all institutions—national, local public, and private. The Council argued that continuous self-monitoring and self-evaluation are essential for revitalizing universities and improving the quality of teaching and research, as well as a way of ensuring that universities fulfill their social responsibilities. This recommendation was put into effect in the June 1991 amendment of the Standards for the Establishment of Universities, which required universities to make efforts to enhance and maintain self-evaluation systems for teaching and research. Under this system, internal and external assessment programs are designed and carried out principally by the individual higher education institutions.

Japan has one of the largest systems of private higher education in the world. More than 65 percent of high school graduates continue their studies; of these, over 70 percent are enrolled in private colleges and universities.

The members of the University Council strongly supported this policy of diversified, decentralized systems of assessment of the individual universities as consistent with institutional preferences for academic freedom and autonomy. According to the latest survey conducted by the Research Institute for Higher Education at Hiroshima University in 1998, 83.7 percent of the national, local public, and private universities have already implemented programs of self-monitoring and self-evaluation, while 15.1 percent of them have introduced some form of external assessment.

In 1998, 83.7 percent of the national and local, public and private universities have already implemented programs of self-monitoring and self-evaluation.

The Japan University Accreditation Association (JUAA) has also had an important influence on these activities. In 1992, the JUAA published guidelines for self-monitoring and self-assessment and introduced a voluntary external evaluation program in 1996. However, most of the leading universities preferred to design their own unique approaches, rather than simply following JUAA guidelines. From the mid-1990s on, the discussion of quality assurance in higher education has been revitalized from another source—the downsizing of Japanese public administration. In response to discussions of recommendations for the restructuring of the national government made by Prime Minister Ryutaro Hashimoto, some education officials have argued strongly for the privatization of all national higher education institutions. For example, in April 1998, an advisory group of economists of education published a report under the auspices of the Economic Planning Agency supporting the privatization plan, and arguing that fair market competition between the national universities and private universities is essential for improving the quality of Japanese higher education. In October 1997, Kiyoshi Mizuno, the chief executive officer of the Administrative Reform Council (the special committee for the restructuring of national government), issued a most striking statement calling for the privatization, as pilot cases, of Tokyo University and Kyoto University, the two most highly regarded national universities. In his view, these universities would likely survive as “administrative corporations,” independent of government jurisdiction even under conditions of severe market competition. As to their financial support, there was no clear statement. The Ministry of Education, the Association of National Universities, and the two universities issued
statements in opposition, calling attention to the important role of the national universities in the field of education and research. In addition, the ministry tried to reply to criticisms of public higher education by developing a more systematic evaluation and quality assurance program. This policy was basically extended to the local public and private sectors as well.

The University Council recently published its own interim report in June 1998. While supporting the role of the national and local public universities, the Council recommended the establishment of a new centralized assessment body that would gather and publish data necessary for fair competition among national, local public, and private universities. This new body would be independent of both the government and the universities.

In its final report of December 1997, the Administrative Reform Council withdrew its recommendation for the immediate privatization of the national universities, while leaving the issue open for continuing discussion. There is no clear evidence that the quality of education and research in the private higher education sector is now equal to or superior to that in the public sector. At the same time, especially as to educational quality, it is quite difficult to identify clear distinctions between national and private institutions.

The Society for Research into Higher Education: Advising UNESCO

Heather Eggins
Heather Eggins is executive secretary of the Society for Research into Higher Education. Address: Society for Research into Higher Education, 3 Devonshire St., London W1N 2BA, UK.

The work of the Society for Research into Higher Education is fast coming into prominence as the international nongovernmental organization that UNESCO now consults on matters relating to research into higher education. However, it has been making information about higher education issues available to universities and to government alike for well over 30 years.

Its aims are twofold: it exists to stimulate and coordinate research into all aspects of higher education, and aims to improve the quality of higher education through the encouragement of debate and publication on issues of policy, on the organization and management of higher education institutions, on the curriculum, and on teaching and learning methods.

The international nature of the Society is important, and, indeed, distinctive. There are a number of national societies worldwide that address some if not all of the range of issues pursued by the Society—the Association for the Study of Higher Education (ASHE) and the American Association for Higher Education (AAHE), for instance—but there is no other organization specifically founded for an international membership. SRHE’s vice-presidents and fellows are drawn from the international community: Martin Trow is a fellow and Elaine El-Khawas a vice-president.

The Society has always had some U.S. corporate members, such as Johns Hopkins University, but the benefits offered in terms of free journals that come as part of the membership and huge discounts off the Society’s books (some 35 percent) are not widely known by university libraries and educational research schools in the United States. The Society has a well-established joint imprint—SRHE/Open University Press—with some 90 titles in print and publishes three quality journals—Studies in Higher Education, Higher Education Quarterly, and Higher Education Abstracts.

The Society, an independent charity, derives its income from subscriptions, sales of books and journals, conferences, and grants. Its corporate members are institutions of higher education, research institutes, professional, industrial, and governmental bodies: its individual members include professors, researchers, managers, consultants, and

Japanese higher education has relied heavily on the private sector, whose main funding source has been tuition fees.

Japanese higher education has relied heavily on the private sector, whose main funding source has been tuition fees. The fact that the majority of voters with bachelor’s degrees graduated from private institutions might eventually undermine the current advantageous situation of national universities. The introduction of a centralized quality assessment body will be a critical turning point in Japanese government educational policy, especially with respect to the national universities. However, it has yet to be determined whether the new policy will improve the quality of the national universities enough to allow them to compete in an openly competitive market system.
students. A register of its members’ research interests and publications is published on a two-yearly basis—the next copy is being compiled now and is a valuable research resource.

The Society’s activities are wide-ranging, including networks on specific issues such as student development, funding, further education/higher education, vocational higher education, postgraduates, and managing innovation. Frequent seminars and conferences are also held on a variety of themes. The next annual conference, at Lancaster University, England, in December, will examine the issue “the globalization of higher education.”

The most recent development has been the involvement of the Society in the UNESCO World Conference on Higher Education. As an NGO of UNESCO, SRHE has been invited to send a full delegation to the conference, and the director, Heather Eggins, will be presenting at the conference.

The Society sees an important international role in encouraging research to be undertaken into higher education and disseminating the findings, and is currently working with UNESCO to ensure that the actions that arise out of the World Conference will enable a better flow of information to be established worldwide between researchers in higher education and policymakers whose decisions shape higher education.

For information about membership see the Society’s website at <http://www.srhe.ac.uk/srhe/>.

The Association of Jesuit Colleges and Universities: Service for the Jesuit Higher Education Community

Charles L. Currie, S.J.


The Association of Jesuit Colleges and Universities (AJCU) was established in 1970 for the “support and promotion of Jesuit higher education by facilitating cooperative efforts among and providing services to its member institutions, providing a forum for the exchange of experience and information, and representing the work of Jesuit higher education at the national and international levels.”

We are a service, not a policy organization. The service focuses on relationships, first among the 28 Jesuit colleges and universities in the United States, and then with Jesuit higher education institutions around the world, with other higher education associations (especially here in Washington), with the Congress and federal government, and with Church and Society of Jesus officials.

In our office in Washington, we are surrounded by pictures from all 28 campuses to remind us who our bosses are. Every day we receive reports and publications from across the country telling us of the many good things happening in Jesuit schools today. It is a fascinating story, not only of very different, but of very similar institutions doing interesting, important things, trying new ideas, attempting solutions to difficult problems, looking to the future with optimism and creativity. I see an increasing sense of a network of women and men already working together, and who want to work even more closely together. Part of our job is to facilitate that.

The 28 presidents look for ways to collaborate even as they engage in friendly competition. In so doing, they look for input from the 30 conferences, many of which regularly consult among themselves (e.g., by e-mail listserves). A number of conferences are working with one another. For example, the Conference of Deans of Adult and Continuing Education and the Conference on Information Technology are cooperating on a distance-learning project involving all 28 institutions. They are exploring the possibility of a national and international distance-learning network of Jesuit institutions. The Conference of Library Directors and the Conference on Information Technology recently held a joint meeting to discuss their common concerns. Members of these conferences like being able to work together in support of one another and toward common goals.

Twenty-six Jesuit business school deans recently established a joint MBA program with Peking University in China. A number of our schools have important linkages with Jesuit universities throughout the world. I recently met with leaders of the 23 Latin American Jesuit universities to investigate ways that we can collaborate to address global concerns like poverty, development, and the environment.

There is a growing sense across the country and indeed around the world that Jesuit alumni and alumnae have something special to share. We are part of a worldwide group of men and women who have experienced a Jesuit education in about 190 Jesuit colleges and universities operating in 66 countries. In the United States alone, there are about 1.5 million living graduates, over 40,000 of whom graduated this past spring.

These are just a few comments on the reality of the partnership that is Jesuit higher education today, and on the legitimate pride we can have in being part of an ongoing success story.

More on the AJCU and member institutions can be found at: http://www.ajcunet.edu/
The Bertelsmann Foundation’s Center for Higher Education Development

Detlef Müller-Böling

Detlef Müller-Böling is director of the nonprofit Center for Higher Education Development. Address: P.O. Box 105, Carl-Bertelsmann-Str. 256, D-33311 Gütersloh, Germany. Phone: 49/5241–9761–21 or 49/5241–9761–4. E-mail: <susanne.dopheide@bertelsmann.de>.

To initiate and support reform in the German higher education system, the Bertelsmann Foundation and the German Rectors’ Conference founded the Center for Higher Education Development in 1994. The CHE seeks to define politically independent objectives, to develop concrete strategies to realize these objectives, and to test the extent to which change can be introduced. As a nonprofit limited-liability company, the Center is in a position to act independently of individual or political interests. Furthermore, the CHE is committed to the common good in both financial and idealistic terms.

The overarching objective of the CHE is to promote the efficiency of German universities and their capacity to evolve. Structural problems within the postsecondary system—such as increasing numbers of students and underfunding—require revolutionary changes in educational policy. This will involve the breaking of longstanding taboos. These include, among other things, decreasing state regulation, improving research and teaching conditions, reorganizing access to postsecondary education, introducing tuition fees, delegating responsibility to all levels of the system and privatizing certain parts, strengthening postsecondary management, and, finally, bringing alternative principles and models of higher education into consideration.

The CHE regards itself as both a think tank and a consultant to higher education. Its objectives are to develop models for performance-oriented and competitive management of higher education, and to foster acceptance of these new management approaches within institutions of higher education and in society at large. In this context it is necessary to examine higher education practices and initiatives in other countries and consider their relevance and transferability to the German setting.

Three different approaches characterize CHE’s work: creating pilot projects involving individual postsecondary institutions and relevant state agencies; introducing concrete reform proposals into the public debate on such issues as higher education access and financing; and organizing symposia and workshops to further the exchange of information between higher education institutions.

The CHE describes the university of the future as being autonomous, academic, competitive and based on competitive market principles, each one with its own distinctive profile. The goal of the “pilot” projects is to define these principles and integrate them into the German higher education system. These basic elements fall into several broad areas.

Organization

The area of university organization concerns designing the leadership and the administrative structure of universities so as to achieve institutional autonomy with public accountability. Central aspects include the support of strategic and developmental planning, the trial decentralization of administration, and the creation of more effective and efficient administration processes.

Performance Standards

The purpose of this area is to improve the leadership capacity of universities through a comparative analysis. Developing performance standards will create a basis for comparison of higher educational institutions both nationally and internationally. The object is not only to foster competition, but to create measures that are fully comprehensible for three target audiences: high school graduates, employers, and university heads.

Efficiency

The CHE encourages universities to make efficient use of their financial resources. This will require changing to a system in which cost awareness and budget responsibility are central.

Competition

Competition among universities can only be promoted and supported if an appropriate framework is in place. Without the creation of competitive elements in the German system, increased performance cannot be expected. Successful competition would be reflected in student demand and the willingness of students to pay fees. Thus, CHE’s activities in this area focus on university access requirements and introducing tuition fees.
Altbach Named Guest Professor at Peking University

At a ceremony at Peking University on September 18, 1998 in Beijing, China, Philip G. Altbach was appointed Guest Professor of Peking University. In making this appointment, Dr. Min Weifang, executive vice president of the university and director of the Institute for Higher Education, noted Professor Altbach’s impact on the study of comparative education and higher education in China through his writings that have been translated into Chinese, and expressed the university’s commitment to international cooperation. He spoke of his hopes for collaboration between the Center for International Higher Education at Boston College and the Institute of Higher Education in Peking. Other speakers discussed Altbach’s commitment to international cooperation in education and his research on Asian higher education and related issues.

During his visit to Beijing, Dr. Altbach gave two lectures at the Institute of Higher Education, and also lectured at the Institute of Comparative Education at the National Center for Educational Research, a division of the Ministry of Education. He met with the editors of Educational Research, China’s main academic journal in education, and discussed collaboration with editors at the People's Education Press. He also visited Tsinghua University, known as the “MIT of China.”

Peking University is China’s oldest and most prestigious university. It is celebrating its centenary this year. Its 20,000 students study on a park-like campus in the western “university district” in Beijing. The Institute of Higher Education, which offers both master's and doctoral programs in the field, is one of only three such centers in China offering advanced degrees. The Institute also does research on key issues of higher education and works with the Peking University administration.

Letter to the Editor

There are some important factual errors in Edward Vargo's article, “Thailand’s Economic Crisis Slows Down Public and Private Higher Education” (no.12, summer 1998). He describes the current situation in such a dismayingly pessimistic way that I feel it necessary to offer corrections.

While it is true that the Thai government has imposed austerity measures and that universities are facing financial difficulty at this time, the government's policy is to minimize the negative effects on education and health care. Therefore, there has been no pay cut or freeze on salary increases of public university professors, nor has there been an outright ban on seminars or conferences, either overseas or within the country.

Moreover, what is a crisis for some is an opportunity for others. Thai public universities have been asking for autonomy from the government for more than two decades, almost succeeding five years ago when a bill to accomplish that went to Parliament but did not pass. So now Thai universities are using this financial crisis to ask the government again to let them become state universities that are not part of the government bureaucratic system, and hence not within the civil service system as well, just like Suranaree University of Technology and two other state universities. So, it is not the case, as stated by Edward Vargo, that “Thailand’s public universities have finally agreed to privatize by the year 2002.” We are the ones who want to change our administrative status, and this is not exactly privatization as the term is generally known.

Sakda Prangpatanpon
Associate Professor and Chair, Educational Foundations Department, Faculty of Education, Burapha University, Bangsaen, Chonburi, Thailand

Erratum: There was an editing error in Edward Vargo's article. The sentence: “Academic seminars and conferences can NOT be organized on campus, within Bangkok, or up-country,” should read: “Academic seminars and conferences can NOW be organized ONLY on campus or within Bangkok, BUT NOT up-country.”

In Memoriam:
Thomas O. Eisemon

On April 21, 1998 Thomas O. Eisemon, a pioneering scholar and World Bank officer in international higher education, died after an illness. Tom completed his doctorate in comparative education at the University of Wisconsin in 1973 under my direction, and I had the pleasure of working with him in the subsequent years. He had a distinguished career, first with the UNESCO Institute for Education, then for almost two decades as a professor at McGill University in Canada, and finally at the World Bank, where he was a Senior Education Specialist, and most recently head of the Bank's office in India.

Tom's doctoral dissertation concerned India, and he had a lifelong interest in and commitment to India. His work on Indian higher education added significantly to the literature. While at the World Bank, Tom was instrumental in several higher education reform efforts in Central and Eastern Europe, and he wrote cogently on post-Soviet higher education developments in that region. Tom Eisemon had a lifelong dedication to scholarship and to the practical improvement of education. He was, for example, research team leader for a project on the external efficiency of education for the Harvard Institute for International Development.

Few people combine Tom’s commitment to educational improvement and reform with an ability to engage in thoughtful research and publication. I counted Tom as a friend and will also miss him as a colleague as well as for his contributions to the field of international higher education.

Philip G. Altbach
New Publications


This book stems from one of the annual seminars at the Aga Khan University in Pakistan. The focus is on the role of higher education in socioeconomic development. Several chapters focus on Pakistan, and there are chapters on the public and private sectors in higher education, and the Open University. Other chapters consider Malaysia, Central Asia, and Africa. Topic-based contributions deal with management and business education, the university and basic education, governance issues, private higher education, liberal and functional values in higher education, and others. One of the few books dealing with higher education in developing countries published recently, this volume is a valuable contribution. (PGA)


This book consists of articles reprinted from AIU’s weekly publication, University News. The articles provide a useful overview of the contemporary issues of concern in Indian higher education. Among the topics considered are adult education, the university and social transformation in India, rural education, the socioeconomic context of higher education, women’s equality and the role of women in development, and science policy. University News is the main periodical that deals with higher education issues in India. (PGA)


This book stems from a regional conference on higher education in Latin America that was held in Cuba in 1997. The volume consists of a status report on Latin American higher education by Carlos Tunnermann Bernheim, and the final report of the conference itself, along with several other presentations made at the conference. (PGA)


A collection of papers dealing with a variety of aspects of higher education in Latin America—prepared for the UNESCO-sponsored regional higher education conference held in Cuba in 1997—this book contains valuable material on current developments in Latin America. While several of the chapters deal with regional issues, most concern individual countries. The two main themes are the relevance of higher education and the issue of quality, evaluation and accreditation. (PGA)


A collection of papers dealing with government funding of higher education in India, this slim volume focuses on the financial constraints experienced by higher education and advocates, generally, increased government concern for higher education. (PGA)


A critical discussion of how the cold war and its politics influenced American academe, this volume features discussions of such topics as the role of area studies and how scholarship about the world’s regions was harnessed to cold war aims, the role of the social sciences, foreign economic policy and cold war politics, the rise of corporate sponsorship of research, and similar topics. An interesting essay by anthropologist Franz Boas on “scientists as spies,” originally written in 1919, is included. The perspective of this book is highly critical of U.S. cold war involvements and the role of American higher education in them. (PGA)


A series of essays on many of the key issues facing American higher education, this volume highlights the role of the presidency, the faculty, and the role of scientific research. The authors are among the most respected commentators on the contemporary American university. A chapter, by Henry Rosovsky and Inge-Lise Ameer, on the professional conduct of academics, highlights an important but little discussed topic. This volume assumes that the American university is a basically healthy and useful institution. (PGA)


The changes in Chinese higher education in the past two decades have been dramatic. This volume discusses most of them in a comprehensive way, and is a major contribution to our knowledge of contemporary higher education in China. In 20 substantive chapters, experts from China, Hong Kong, Taiwan, Britain, and the United States analyze such topics as faculty development, reforms in the administration and finance, scholarly productivity of Chinese scholars and scientists, the trend toward privatization of higher education, gradu-
ate employment, and others. Unusually, there are three chapters focusing on the role of women in Chinese higher education.

All of the chapters are carefully researched, and several are unusually frank about higher education developments, including an incisive chapter on the 1989 student movements. The overall picture is one of substantial change that is pushing the higher education system, which now enrolls 3 million students, even more in market directions. Rigid centralization is a thing of the past, and several of the chapters point to the significant inequalities in the higher education system. A useful summary of the World Bank’s higher education reform in China report is included.


Sociologist David Riesman is one of the most thoughtful analysts of American higher education in the post–World War II period. This volume, originally published in 1980, remains relevant today. Among the topics considered in this volume of essays are the decline of faculty dominance, students as “consumers” of higher education, student protest, and related topics. The main concern of On Higher Education is with students, and especially with the idea of consumerism on campus. (PGA)


This volume contains documents relating to the reform of the laws governing Polish higher education. It provides insights into the policy discussions relating to higher education in Poland. (PGA)


This unique volume, which stems from an issue of Daedalus magazine, considers the changes that have occurred in four academic disciplines in the United States. The book begins with an extraordinarily useful historical essay on the American university from 1945 to 1995 by Thomas Bender. The disciplines discussed are economics, English, philosophy, and political science. Each discipline is considered by three different authors from a variety of perspectives. (PGA)


This special issue of American Behavioral Scientist focuses on the issue of tenure in American higher education. Editor William Tierney, who has written widely on this topic, discusses the debates and rationales for tenure. Other contributors deal with various aspects of the tenure debate, which is quite active now, including the link between tenure and academic freedom, early career issues and tenure, the issue of citizenship in the academic community, and others. All of the contributors are sympathetic to the idea of tenure. (PGA)


With so much discussion of the funding of higher education taking place, this theme issue of the European Journal of Education provides 10 articles on the financing of higher education in Europe. Case studies from Austria, France, the United Kingdom, and Finland are included. Several general articles on student aid schemes, equity issues in funding reform, and the costs of financing higher education in Europe and two articles dealing with the United States are also part of this issue. (PGA)


This book provides the first full-scale discussion of academic freedom in Indonesia, and it comes at a particularly important time of transition in that country. Issues such as book censorship, political background checks of academics and students, the criminalization of dissent, the ban on student political activity, on-campus ideological indoctrination, restrictions on academic inquiry and expression, and other violations of the norms of academic freedom are discussed. The analysis is well documented, and the overall description is chilling. The report called on the new government in Indonesia to end the Soeharto-era restrictions. (PGA)


The focus of this book is on how technology is changing scholarly and scientific communication, and by implication the role of libraries. A group of distinguished observers and participants discuss the impact of technology on libraries and academic institutions in general. All agree that the coming digital environment will bring profound changes. There is less agreement about how this change will take place. Chapters examine liberal education and technology, how libraries are affected, the role of the World Wide Web, and related topics. (PGA)
News of the Center and the Program in Higher Education

The Center is pleased to announce its collaboration with the Centre for Higher Education Research and Information of the Open University, United Kingdom. Previously called the Quality Support Centre, the Centre is concerned with issues of quality in higher education, including an EC-funded project focusing on Central and Eastern Europe, and an OECD project on quality management and decision making. The Centre’s informative publication, Higher Education Digest, reprints material from International Higher Education. IHE plans to use material from their publications as well. We look forward to a mutually productive relationship. We are also pleased to report our informal collaboration with the new Center for the Study of Higher Education at Nagoya University in Japan.

Our Center has received support from the Ford Foundation for its programs. This assistance will help us to expand the scope of International Higher Education.

For further information, please contact the Center for International Higher Education, 207 Campion Hall, Boston College, Chestnut Hill, MA 02467, USA. Fax: 617/552-8422.

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

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

Programs and Resources

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

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

The Program in Higher Education

The Program in Higher Education offers 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/hea/HEA.html