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International Perspectives on Leadership Development

Robin Middlehurst

Robin Middlehurst is professor of higher education and head of the Centre for Policy and Change in Higher Education at the University of Surrey, Stag Hill, Guildford, Surrey GU2 7XH, UK. E-mail: r.middlehurst@surrey.ac.uk.

Maintaining and enhancing “competitiveness” is a policy objective of most if not all governments, whether state or national, with respect to their higher education systems. It is also of concern to institutions themselves. Doubtless, competitiveness means different things in different parts of the world; in some places it will assume mainly local and regional dimensions, for others the competitive arena is clearly global. However, the issue of competitiveness is rising on the political agenda as the impact of globalization is felt more keenly. For higher education there are two key dimensions of competitiveness: the positioning of institutions and higher education systems in an international higher education arena and institutions’ contributions (through research, teaching, and engagement with society) to the economic and social positioning of their countries and regions in a global context. Both of these dimensions are the focus of higher education reforms in different parts of the world.

The United Kingdom has embarked on a series of reviews of its higher education system over the last six years in order to achieve reforms that some see as necessary and others as contested. The most recent government report was published in February 2003. The competitiveness of the higher education sector and the institutions within it are a major theme within this latest strategy document. The issue of competitiveness is addressed, as one would expect, in chapters on research, teaching, knowledge transfer, access, and participation. However, what is of particular interest for this article is the proposal to establish a “Leadership Foundation for Higher Education” with a specific role to enhance the competitiveness, efficiency, and effectiveness of U.K. higher education. An important task of the foundation, in serving senior institutional leaders, managers, and governors, would be to reach out internationally and across sectors so that individuals, institutions, and professional networks can collaborate, learn, and exchange good practice. Encouraging such permeability across the boundaries of the academy acknowledges the changes that are emerging in an increasingly “borderless world.”

Some countries have long traditions of training and development for the academic leaders and professional administrators and managers who govern their higher education institutions, whether at departmental or institutional levels. The United States probably leads the way in the quantity and variety of programs on offer with some (such as the Fellows Program of the American Council on Education) having a track record that extends over 30 or more years. In other countries, too, particular institutions have carved a niche in higher education management research and development; and interuniversity bodies (such as the Australian and South African Vice-Chancellors’ Committees or the European Association of Universities) have designed and mounted programs to meet management training and development needs. However, the concept and shape of the United Kingdom’s Leadership Foundation appears to be somewhat different from the leadership and management development approaches in other parts of the world, so its features may be of interest beyond the United Kingdom.

The LeadershipFoundation is conceived primarily as an “intelligent commissioner and broker” of developmental opportunities for senior staff, accessing and collaborating with the leading thinkers and practitioners from across the world. The outline plan suggests that this foundation should have four core areas of activity: individual development; institutional capacity building; a “futures lab”; and acting as champion and coordinator for leadership, governance, and management development in the higher education sector. These four core areas are in effect overarching themes, each of which has a number of more focused strands of work.

**Competitiveness means different things in different parts of the world; in some places it will assume mainly local and regional dimensions, for others the competitive arena is clearly global.**

The individual development strand includes flagship programs (for different levels of leadership, management, and governance); brokerage of exchanges, visits, and international projects; and more personalized development opportunities such as mentoring or action learning. Institutional capacity building includes benchmarking exercises, twinning arrangements, an awards program and the acquisition or design of relevant learning resources such as case studies and simulations. The futures lab encompasses environmental scanning, research, and spaces for policy debate on the “modernizing agenda” for higher education. Each of these strands of work must be designed with international and cross-sector possibilities in mind.
The fourth strand, acting as champion and coordinator, is perhaps geared more particularly to the U.K. political context, although other higher education systems may still find some resonance with their own situation. This strand commits the Leadership Foundation to raising the public and political profile of higher education leadership and management practice, not only as a worthwhile field of research but also as a distinct area of practice that has lessons to offer as well as to learn across public and private sectors. The issue of coordination addresses the need for synergy and cross-fertilization between the disparate initiatives that exist in the United Kingdom to enhance management practice in higher education.

The futures lab encompasses environmental scanning, research, and spaces for policy debate on the “modernizing agenda” for higher education. Each of these strands of work must be designed with international and cross-sector possibilities in mind.

The Leadership Foundation is at an early stage of development and there is much work to be done to make the concept operational. However, at a time when international and cross-sector collaborations are growing, exciting possibilities lie ahead. This kind of leadership and management development initiative—which is likely to involve a wide range of activities—can be used to promote and enhance collaborations and can also be used as a space for learning about the realities of cross-cultural and cross-sectoral collaborative management. Consortium arrangements such as the Worldwide University Network or Cardean University are growing—and there are already examples of success and failure. Is it not timely and opportune to use international leadership and management development opportunities as vehicles to discuss the lessons of experience and debate and develop the possibilities for tomorrow?

Author’s note. Comments on this article and ideas for international collaborations in the territory of leadership, management, and governance of higher education are welcomed. The author can be contacted at the e-mail address above.

Trade Talk—à la Four Modes
Jane Knight

Even though many would claim that trade in higher education is not a new phenomenon, the inclusion of education in the General Agreement on Trade in Services (GATS) is introducing new issues for the higher education sector. One of the unexpected consequences is the growing use and perhaps unconscious adoption of trade language and trade policy frameworks in higher education.

The purpose of this brief article is to address the issue of “trade creep” in the language and concepts fundamental to postsecondary education and to introduce the notion of “education models” for cross-border education as alternatives to the “trade modes” used in GATS.

As more attention is given to trade liberalization and the international dimension of higher education, we are seeing the term internationalization being used as shorthand for increased commercial delivery of education across borders. In particular, cross-border education is being described in terms of the four modes. The four trade modes are, in fact, very helpful in the effort to understand how GATS approaches trade in higher education services; however, they have significant limitations in reference to the variety of ways that higher education is moving internationally. This article focuses on the limitations of the trade approach and proposes an education approach to cross-border models of education.

Terminology
First, a few words about terminology. Internationalization at the nation, sector, or institution level is broadly defined in GATS as “the process of developing/implementing policies and programs to integrate an international, intercultural or global dimension into the purpose, functions and provision of post-secondary education.” Cross-border education is seen as one subset of internationalization strategies.

Trade Modes
Four methods of trade supply used in GATS. Mode 1: “cross-border” supply focuses on the service crossing the border, which does not require the consumer to move physically. Examples in higher education include dis-
rance education and e-learning. Mode 2: “consumption abroad” refers to the consumer moving to the country of the supplier, which in education means students pursuing all or part of their education in another country. Mode 3: “commercial presence” involves a service provider establishing a commercial facility in another country to provide a service. Examples in higher education include branch campuses or franchising arrangements. Mode 4: “presence of natural persons” means persons traveling to another country on a temporary basis to provide service, which in education would include professors or researchers.

There is no criticism implied regarding the central features of the four modes for trade services. On the contrary, it is quite an accomplishment to develop a generic framework to apply to the supply of commercial services for the 12 major service sectors and 160 subsectors included in GATS.

The concern about these four trade modes focuses on the fact that they do not capture or reflect the full range of cross-border education activity occurring as part of development aid projects, academic partnerships, as well as commercial initiatives. As more attention is given to the analysis of the major actors, stakeholders, rationales, and benefits of cross-border activity and as one examines the implications for quality assurance, credential recognition, accreditation, funding, and access, it is of critical importance that these matters are addressed for the larger picture of cross-border education, not just the four trade modes.

The growth and changes in cross-border education are staggering. New types of providers, new methods of delivery, new learners, new partnerships, new financial arrangements, new types of awards, new policies, and new regulatory frameworks exist. These changes present new challenges as we seek to conceptualize cross-border postsecondary education and higher education. Using a trade framework to categorize cross-border activity is one approach, but given these new developments and the emerging issues, it can be argued that a trade framework is too limited and an education framework is needed. The next section focuses on the process of developing a conceptual framework to address the complexity and scope of cross-border higher education.

Cross-border Higher Education Framework

The first task is to define key concepts. Cross-border refers to the crossing of national jurisdictional or geographic borders. Higher education refers to academic programs and activities related to full-time, part-time, or continuing education where an award or credit of some kind is granted. Terms such as transnational, offshore, and borderless education are often used to describe education that moves across borders. However, because the notion of jurisdictional borders is increasingly important (and controversial) in the regulation and provision of higher education, the concept of cross-border is used.

One of the first questions to ask is what are the defining factors or principles for a conceptual framework.

One of the first questions to ask is what are the defining factors or principles for a conceptual framework. Many come to mind—what elements of education move across borders, who moves, how does the movement occur, why does education move, where is it happening, who is funding it, who is regulating it, and so on. Given the changing nature of the rationales driving cross-border education, the mixed modes of delivery, and the worldwide scope of delivery, the “why, how and where” were eliminated as the defining factors. Emphasis was placed on “what” moves across borders and on the variable of who or where the award or qualification was granted. This last point acknowledges the key issues of licensing, registering, accreditation, and quality assurance of education delivered across borders.

The term education models is used to differentiate but also to provide some reference points with the term trade modes. Four categories or models are used to classify “who or what” moves across borders: people, providers, programs, and projects or services.

Model 1: people. The first category covers the movement of people, whether they are students or professors/scholars/experts. Students taking credit- or award-based programs through a semester or year abroad, internship or research programs, and full programs abroad are included. Funding can be through exchange agreements, sponsorship through scholarships from government,
public or private sources, and self-funded. The movement of professors, scholars, and experts can be through teaching and research activities, technical assistance and consulting assignments, sabbaticals, seminars, and other professional development activities. These types of initiatives can be self- or institution funded, based on exchange agreements, involve contracts and fee-for-service, or are supported by public and private funding. This category includes a broader range of cross-border activities than Modes 2 and 4.

**Model 2: providers.** The key factor in this category is that the institution or provider moves to have physical or virtual presence in the receiving country. The so-called foreign or international provider has academic responsibility for the program and awards a foreign degree. The provider may or may not have an academic or financial partner in the receiving country. Branch campuses, stand-alone foreign institutions, and some franchise models are examples. The providers can include private and public, for-profit or nonprofit educational institutions, organizations, and also companies listed in the Global Education Index developed by the Observatory on Borderless Higher Education.

**Model 3: programs.** The program, not the student, moves in this category. The delivery of the program is done through a linkage or partnership arrangement between international or foreign and domestic providers. The credit or award is normally granted by the receiving partner or country and in some cases this could involve a joint or double degree. (If a foreign degree is involved then model 2 is applicable.) All types of institutions, organizations, and companies could be involved in a variety of partnership arrangements that can be commercial or noncommercial in nature.

**Model 4: projects and services.** There are a wide range of education-related projects and services that need to be considered when analyzing cross-border education and that are not included in the trade modes. Such projects could include a diversity of non-award-based activities such as joint curriculum development, research, benchmarking, technical assistance, e-learning platforms, professional development, and other capacity-building initiatives especially in the information technology area. Award or credit-based programs are not included in this category. The projects and services could be undertaken as part of development aid projects, academic linkages, and commercial contracts. All types of education institutions, organizations, and companies are included.

This framework is a “work in progress.” It is purposely generic in order to be relevant to many different countries, jurisdictions, cultures, and education systems and to include the diversity of cross-border activities and providers. The categories will have to be porous as not all new developments fit neatly into four conceptual groups. Ideally, the framework will be used as an alternative to the trade modes and will help the education sector to (1) analyze policy implications for issues such as quality assurance, funding, equity of access, accreditation, and recognition of credentials at the national and international levels; (2) study the relationship of cross-border education with trade agreements and trade policy; (3) examine the different and common trends and issues within and among categories; (4) determine the major actors and stakeholders and level of provision within each category; and (5) help to ensure that the international dimension of postsecondary education, specifically cross-border, is not conceptualized only as a commercial activity.

---

**Why the United States Will Not Be a Market for Foreign Higher Education Products: A Case Against GATS**

**Philip G. Altbach**

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

The United States will not be a major export market for higher education products and services from other countries. Rather, the United States is a major exporter of education—from standardized tests such as the Graduate Record Exam to U.S.-style management education—and it benefits tremendously from the 547,000 students from other countries attending higher education institutions in the United States. It is estimated that foreign students contribute $11 billion to the U.S. economy—making higher education the nation’s fifth-largest service export. Worldwide, the OECD estimates that the market for educational services exceeds $30 billion, very likely an underestimation. Free trade advocates and the for-profit education sector in the United States, along with similar groups in some other rich countries, have been advocating that the world education market be opened up completely and regulated by the new General Agreement on Trade in Services (GATS) of the World Trade Organization. GATS would guarantee
that markets in educational services (including offering postsecondary degrees and certificates, testing and evaluation, on-line educational programs, and many others), be open to exporters and importers without much restriction among the countries signing on to the protocols. The details are now being debated within the WTO.

It is worth looking realistically at the prospects for educational “free trade.” The fact is that the United States will remain a major beneficiary, and that, even with completely open markets, providers in other countries would have little scope to make major inroads into the huge U.S. postsecondary education market. The argument here is that furthering opening the world market for educational products and services will benefit the United States by facilitating making exports while other countries will continue to have little potential for penetrating the well-developed and very complex American education market. The United States has a huge educational advantage at the postsecondary level. Not only is it by far the largest academic system in the world, but it is widely perceived as being the best. It is highly unusual for a country to claim both the mass market and the elite market, but in higher education this is the case. Further, the United States has advantages not only in its traditional colleges and universities but also in the ancillary education markets such as testing, specialized training, the control of knowledge networks (such as Lexus-Nexus), and others.

The American higher education system is not only large, it is also diverse and efficient.

Elements of Advantage
The American higher education system is not only large, it is also diverse and efficient. There are educational providers serving every type and level of study—from prestigious research-based graduate schools to community colleges. Specialized trade schools provide training to meet specific needs, from computer technicians to architectural design. Few niche markets exist in the United States for foreign institutions to serve. Further, with few exceptions, there is no shortage of places in the American system for students. While the competition is fierce for the top undergraduate colleges and universities, and for admission to the best medical, law, and business schools, qualified students can gain admission to an institution in their field of interest—even if not necessarily at top-ranked institutions. Interestingly, in those few fields where capacity is limited in the United States, such as medical education, Americans who cannot gain entry at home go abroad to study. Foreign medical schools have not, however, entered the U.S. market. It is unlikely that foreign providers will be able to succeed in penetrating this large and diverse educational market.

Most American academic institutions, public and private, are dependent on enrollments to survive and prosper, and thus they have learned how to locate students.

Despite domestic criticism of the inefficiency of American academe, in fact U.S. colleges and universities are both efficient and market-savvy. They tend to be nimble in figuring out their niche in the system and in offering programs that will appeal to their particular audience. When interests shift, so, too, do institutional priorities. Most American academic institutions, public and private, are dependent on enrollments to survive and prosper, and thus they have learned how to locate students. The academic system is so diversified that institutions exist in specific markets—Harvard does not compete with the University of Massachusetts and could be described as bringing in a different universe from Lesley University, which is located just across the street in Cambridge. Foreign institutions would have a very difficult time operating in this diverse system, particularly given the challenge of adjusting to the constantly changing educational marketplace.

Americans happily buy automobiles made in other countries, but they do not like foreign educational products. While most of the half million foreign students in the United States are studying for degrees, few of the 143,000 American students who go overseas are studying for degrees—they typically spend a semester or even less abroad. Foreign universities would not find a receptive audience among American students. They would have to demonstrate they offer a quality product like Honda or a prestigious name brand like BMW. The fact is that American academic institutions are the name brands worldwide. Not since Americans went to Germany more than a century ago to study for the doctorate, before the Ph.D. was offered in the United States, have Americans been lured abroad.
The English language also helps to ensure American academic dominance. English is the world language of science and scholarship, and English is increasingly the language of instruction overseas. While there is a market for education in English in many countries, there is no market in America for education in other languages.

Entering the U.S. higher education market would be very expensive for foreign providers. Local institutions generally have good facilities, and foreign schools would need to make major investments in facilities, marketing, staffing, and the like. Few local institutions in the United States would see an advantage in partnering with foreign schools to set up joint programs. The Open University, a highly respected British institution using distance technologies and related nontraditional instructional techniques recently entered the U.S. higher education market—despite major investment it failed and has closed its American operations. This is an example of the problems of successfully entering the U.S. market.

A Free Market That Is Not Free
For these and other reasons it is unlikely the foreign providers will be successful in the United States. Thus, the further opening of higher education markets worldwide will help U.S. institutions without any reciprocal direct benefit to other countries. American institutions already have advantages in overseas markets, advantages that further liberalization will only reinforce. Other countries should not make the mistake of thinking that by legislating free trade in education through GATS they would get into the U.S. market. The only outcome will be to permit increasingly aggressive American educational providers greater access to foreign markets.


John Aubrey Douglass

By last January the Labour government under Prime Minister Tony Blair issued a significant white paper outlining potentially sweeping changes in how British universities might be funded and regulated. If embraced by lawmakers, this treatise will mark a continuation of waves of reform that have induced major paradigm shifts and experiments in system building since World War II.

Reforms in the 1960s created a binary structure of universities and polytechnics, built upon the premise of a reformed secondary school system and the proliferation of further education colleges—essentially vocational institutions with a university preparatory function. For over 20 years this model gave a sense of order and was part and parcel of a drive by government ministers to elevate the role of higher education in British life.

By 1992, all English higher education institutions were given the title of research universities.

By the late 1980s, with the rise of Thatcherism, however, a series of changes collapsed this binary vision. By 1992, all English higher education institutions were given the title of research universities. Thatcher and her successor, John Major, also launched the beginning of the end of rather liberal allocations of public funds for university building and created an array of bureaucratic accountability models focused on research and teaching quality. Perhaps, most importantly, this era marked the end of a consensual and collaborative relationship between the national government and the higher education community.

The Promise of New Labour
With the election of “New Labour” in 1997, many within England’s higher education sector pined for a major shift away from the Thatcher model. They had tired of growing enrollments, shrinking budgets on a per student basis, and the growing structure of burdensome accountability reviews.

Yet the arrival of New Labour under Blair did not result in a challenge to the Thatcher model. Indeed, the 1997 Dearing Report, a commissioned study under John Major’s government, cited the need for financial stability and increasing access. While enrollments in England exploded between 1989 and 1997, public funding per student declined by some 36 percent. To ease the financial crisis, the Dearing Report argued for the introduction of a tuition fee of £1,000 per year at all higher education institutions in England (approximately $1,580 in today’s dollars). To the surprise of many, the Labour government embraced this quick-fix source of additional funding for higher education in 1998.
Enter the new white paper offered by the Department for Education and Skills and largely shaped by its new secretary, Charles Clarke. The Labour government previously set a goal of increasing access to higher education to 50 percent of the 18-to-30-year-old population by 2010 (a curious age cohort and one not used previously by the OECD, for example). New Labour clearly sees the higher education sector as not sufficiently concerned with expanding access, parochial in its interests, and for the most part staunchly against any and all necessary reforms.

Yet Blair and others are also deeply enamored of the glow of the knowledge economy, by higher education’s essential role for economic competitiveness, and its centrality for expanding social economic mobility and further eroding England’s class structure.

The Shape of the New White Paper
The white paper, entitled “The Future of Higher Education,” offers a number of new initiatives, most falling into two general categories. The first is a desire both to increase funding and to diversify the sources. This plan includes a substantial promised boost in funds—6 percent increases per year over the next three years for both teaching and research—representing a total three-year commitment of £2.3 billion (or approximately $3.6 billion). But like other recommendations in the white paper, the devil is in the details on how these funds will be distributed.

To some degree, the promise of increased funding is a sweetener to induce acceptance of a more controversial proposal. The white paper offers a daring plan: by 2006, fees may be set by each institution, but capped at a maximum of £3,000. Furthermore, borrowing from the Australian experiment in fees, students would not pay this fee upfront. Rather, they would pay through the national tax system at an interest rate pegged to inflation, and repayment would begin only after graduates achieved an annual income of £15,000.

Within this mix are not only universities but also the vast network of further education colleges that are explicitly asked to bear the largest burden in increasing enrollments by offering a growing number of higher education courses and a relatively new, largely terminal, and mostly vocational two-year higher education degree: the new “foundation degree.”

Another Agenda?
What is missing in this expansive proposal? Perhaps most apparent is any overt discussion of the need for more formal mission differentiation among higher education institutions. Rather, the white paper recommends increased research funding to “top” departments and institutions and makes a vague reference to restricting the title of “university,” in what is clearly an opening move regarding mission differentiation.

Can the United Kingdom afford some 110 research universities, all competing for the same pound? The bulk of the higher education sector thinks it can—and has inherent interests to keep it that way. But Clarke clearly thinks this current paradigm spreads too little money among too many institutions, resulting in unacceptable levels of mediocrity.
Governments generally favor differentiation because it promises cost containment and a coherent strategy for building high-quality institutions. But clearly the English higher education sector remains largely antagonistic to this agenda. The prospect of the fee structure alone creates great uncertainty for a majority of England’s higher education institutions over what to charge. Many oppose the proposal, including a substantial and vocal portion of Blair’s cabinet, some of whom have offered blustery threats of resignation if the scheme is adopted.

And in this tension lies the rub. A major and vocal opponent of the fee scheme is the chancellor of the exchequer, Gordon Brown. In the realm of parliamentary politics, Brown is an appointment of Blair’s and is also a political rival with substantial powers regarding budgeting. Add to this the instability of Blair’s government with the onset of war with Iraq (at least at the time of this writing) and it becomes clear that the fate of the white paper is uncertain.

China’s New Private Education Law

Fengqiao Yan and Daniel C. Levy

Fengqiao Yan is associate professor at the Graduate School of Education, Peking University, Beijing, China and a PROPHE collaborating scholar. E-mail: fqyan@gse.pku.edu.cn. Daniel C. Levy is SUNY Distinguished Professor, State University of New York at Albany, and PROPHE director. E-mail: Dlevy@uamail.albany.edu.

PROPHE devotes a column in each issue to a contribution from PROPHE, the Program for Research on Private Higher Education, headquartered at the University at Albany. PROPHE and the CIHE are partners in a cooperative effort supported by the Ford Foundation to build and disseminate information about private higher education globally. See http://www.albany.edu/~prophe.

The private education law, promulgated on December 28, 2002, is China’s first national legislation on private education. The law covers all educational levels, although we are focusing on the three articles (16, 53, and 55) that cover higher education. The law’s main thrust concerning higher education is to provide a legal framework to facilitate private growth and initiate a longer process to accredit, merge, dismantle, and change institutions at that level.

Notwithstanding the centralism of Chinese national politics, the evolution of this law has been remarkably meandering. As opposed to having a clear blueprint from which to work, the government has generally reacted to society- and market-driven growth. Private higher education has emerged and evolved in the absence of a clear legal framework. However startling this development may seem for China, the phenomenon of the rapid expansion of private higher education, followed by a delay in establishing a legal framework, has become a common occurrence internationally in recent decades.

China’s initial legal recognition of private education, in the 1982 constitution, was vague in encouraging not just state but “other entities.” Though private education was allowed for the first time in 30 years, the constitution left it vulnerable to ambiguities and threats. This contributed to bureaucratic misconduct, lawsuits, and a yearning for greater clarity or support. For example, private institutions have complained that government agencies are levying fees arbitrarily. Students have been demanding the same discounts in transportation fares that their public counterparts receive and reimbursement of tuition fees if their institutions go bankrupt.

Debate over the proposed law was vigorous, pitting proponents of private higher education against opponents of the private sector. In a scenario seen elsewhere in the developing world, the growth of the private sector involves colleges that are seen as academically inferior to the public universities clashing with the established traditions and standards of the public universities. Private institutions are criticized for focusing on profits and showing little concern for quality. Arguments in support of the private sector center on economic freedom, property rights, competition, choice, and access.

Government positions have varied within different local, provincial, and national contexts. The generally supportive national posture toward privatization stems from the belief that China needs to expand enrollments rapidly yet not at public expense—a common reason for government support of private growth in Asia and beyond.

China’s private sector is both decentralized and localized. When China adopted its higher education expansion policy in 1999, the central government delegated the accrediting authority of non-degree-granting institutions to the provincial governments. This change has helped to elevate many institutions that previously provided only “self-study programs” to prepare students for the national examinations. These programs are situated outside the category of accredited degree programs.

As of 2002, only 4 private colleges had been authorized to award the bachelor’s degree and 129 a “sub-bachelor’s” degree. The more than 1,200 other private colleges lacked official government authorization and were only allowed to offer self-study programs. All told, the private sector
accounts for 10 percent of China’s higher education enrollments.

Within the private sector, the legal distinction between for-profit and nonprofit education is neither clear-cut nor consistent. The 1995 education law regarded education as a nonprofit enterprise. However, in reality private institutions registered with the Industry and Commerce Bureau have been allowed to make a profit and need to pay taxes. These for-profits usually provide short-term training programs—such as instruction in foreign languages—but cannot offer degrees. Private institutions registered with the Bureau of Civil Administration are nonprofit and largely tax exempt. But even in nonprofits, investors and managers expect an economic return on their investment and efforts. A vital feature of the 2002 law, which focuses on nonprofits, is article 51’s clause that grants permission for “reasonable economic return from net income after deducting costs, development funds, and other items stipulated by the government.” The law calls such returns a governmental reward rather than a profit. These provisions mark a compromise on a hotly debated issue. The Ministry of Education is considering the complex matter of how to determine what represents a reasonable economic return. Another provision of the 2002 law gives individuals and corporate entities favorable tax treatment if they donate to private institutions (article 47).

The legal challenges concerning nonprofit and for-profit institutions relate to the way Chinese private education today differs from its pre-1949 predecessor. Back then, most private colleges were church-affiliated or supported by philanthropy, and the owners were dedicated to pursuing religious beliefs or other educational or social missions. In contrast, most owners of private colleges today seek to maximize revenues. In its shift from a more values-oriented to a commercially driven higher education system, Chinese private higher education fits into a global trend.

Since the 1982 constitution, several official documents have furthered the promotion of private education. In 1993, the Communist Party and the government became more explicit in encouraging, supporting, directing, and regulating private education. In 1997 the government issued the first regulations concerning private education, which reaffirmed private education’s nonprofit nature. However, the 1997 regulations gave the priority to levels other than higher education (e.g., vocational, adult, and preschool), and the national government, concerned about quality, reiterated strict standards and procedures for the establishment of private colleges.

The 2002 law thus is part of the ongoing struggle to come to grips with the legal issues concerning private higher education in its current state and in the future. The law takes a position on several ambiguous and controversial issues such as finance, the relative status of public and private institutions, tax policy, economic return, and property rights—although the State Council still must determine specific regulations and might devolve further authority to the provincial governments. A separate regulation (March 1, 2003), also mostly intended to promote the private sector, concerns schools jointly invested in and run with foreign partner institutions. Yet other sensitive issues remain unresolved, such as the status of public-private hybrids.

Understandably, implementation of a far-reaching and sometimes ambiguous law is often even harder and more complex to implement than the mere formulation of the law. In any event, the 2002 law is a double-edged sword, aiming both to promote and regulate private

The International Role of U.S. Recognized Accrediting Organizations

Judith S. Eaton


In fall 2001, the Council for Higher Education Accreditation (CHEA) surveyed the 78 institutional (regional and national) and programmatic accreditors in the United States that are recognized by the CHEA and U.S. Department of Education. The purpose of the survey was to learn whether and to what extent these accreditors operate internationally.

General Findings

The 53 accreditors who responded to the 2001 survey included 5 national accreditors, 6 regional accreditors, and 42 specialized/professional accrediting organizations. Twenty-nine of the organizations (62.9 percent) indicated that they were operating internationally. This included all 5 (100 percent) of the responding national accreditors, all 6 (100 percent) of the responding regional accreditors, and 18 of the 42 (42.8 percent) responding specialized accreditors.

These 29 organizations were accrediting 461 institutions and programs in 65 countries outside the United States as of fall 2001. They also accredit 9 non-U.S. institutions operating within the United States. Two of the 53 organizations have separate standards for accrediting internationally.
The predominant type of international activity varies with the type of accreditor. For example, regional accreditors are more involved in accrediting U.S. institutions operating outside the United States, while specialized accreditors are more active in accrediting non-U.S. programs operating outside the United States. Almost all the international activity of U.S. accreditors is with site-based operations. Only two specialized accreditors reported reviewing distance-based offerings and each accredits one distance-based operation.

Almost all the international activity of U.S. accreditors is with site-based operations.

U.S. Institutions and Programs Outside the United States
Sixteen of the 53 responding organizations (30.1 percent) accredit U.S. institutions or programs operating outside the United States. This includes 2 of 5 national accrediting organizations (40 percent), 5 of 6 regional accrediting organizations (83.3 percent), and 9 of 42 specialized accrediting organizations (21.4 percent).

These 16 organizations accredit 225 U.S. institutions or programs operating outside the United States. National organizations accredit 9 operations; regional organizations accredit 194 operations; and specialized organizations accredit 22 operations.

Non-U.S. Institutions and Programs Outside the United States
Twenty-four of the 53 respondents (45.2 percent) are accrediting non-U.S. institutions or programs operating outside the United States. This includes all 5 (100 percent) of the national accreditors (100 percent), 2 of the 6 regional accreditors (33.3 percent), and 17 of the 42 specialized accreditors (40.4 percent). These 24 organizations accredit 236 institutions or programs: national organizations accredit 37 operations; regional organizations accredit 11 operations; and specialized organizations accredit 188 operations.

Non-U.S. Institutions and Programs Inside the United States
One national organization accredits three operations and four regional organizations accredit six operations. None of the responding specialized organizations accredit institutions or programs in this category.

Separate Standards
Two of the 53 responding accreditors (3.7 percent) have developed separate accreditation standards for review of institutions or programs outside the United States. Both are specialized accreditors.

Site-based or Distance-based Operations
Of the 23 accreditors that responded to this question, only 2 specialized organizations indicated that they reviewed distance learning operations, and each had accredited one such operation. All other institutions and programs were described as site-based operations.

Discussion
The 2001 CHEA survey indicates that U.S. accreditors have a considerable international presence, with 29 organizations accrediting 461 institutions and programs in 65 countries outside the United States and 9 non-U.S. operations in the United States. Conversations with the accreditors and with quality assurance colleagues in other countries strongly suggest that there will continue to be some demand for U.S. accreditation.

As U.S. accreditors expand their international operation, they are increasingly part of discussions about appropriate mechanisms to assure quality in an international setting. This discussion usually revolves around three questions: should we maintain our primary reliance on nation-based quality review organizations and expand communication and formal agreements among countries to address the quality of higher education? Do we need international standards to assure the quality of higher education? What is the role of the World Trade Organization and the General Agreement on Trade in Services (GATS) negotiations on liberalization of trade in services that include higher education and quality review?

The 2001 CHEA survey indicates that U.S. accreditors have a considerable international presence, with 29 organizations accrediting 461 institutions and programs in 65 countries outside the United States.

CHEA’s recent conversations with U.S. accreditors indicate that, in general, U.S. accrediting organizations prefer to expand communication and cooperation with nation-based quality assurance bodies to address quality internationally. While not a formal position taken by CHEA or U.S. accrediting organizations, this does suggest a preferred approach at this point in a complex and evolving conversation.
In contrast, organizations that are central to quality review of higher education in an international setting, such as the International Association of University Presidents (IAUP) and the International Network of Quality Assurance Agencies in Higher Education (INQAAHE), believe that international standards are needed for quality in higher education. These organizations focus on the growing globalization of higher education and the call for shared understanding about quality judgments in various countries.

Some supranational organizations are giving increasing attention to quality assurance as well. These include UNESCO, the World Bank, and the Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development. In general, these organizations favor the development of regional or international quality standards as they focus on the role of higher education in the economic development of individual countries.

In this context, the GATS negotiations on liberalization of trade in services are also producing considerable debate—and, in some quarters, consternation—about whether and how quality review of higher education should be addressed in an arena dedicated to trade issues. This concern focuses on whether trade negotiations about “liberalization” will ultimately produce additional regulation of higher education and quality review treated as commodities for consumers. The higher education sector sees itself as offering an experience of considerable depth and complexity (as opposed to a commodity) and sees its students as vital contributors to a community of learning (rather than as disconnected consumers of some commodity).

Many issues and questions confront U.S. accreditors and those engaged in accreditation and quality assurance in many other countries. The continuing expansion of higher education and quality review in an international setting will be accompanied by an ongoing and robust international conversation intended to address these issues and answer the questions.

This article is based on Letter from the President, August 2002 available at the CHEA website www.chea.org.

Evaluating and Rewarding Professors: Mexican Style

**Philip G. Altbach**
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Evaluating professors is a hot topic worldwide. Assessment, accountability, and differential rewards are on the agendas of universities and governments. In most countries, however, little real evaluation of academic work occurs and only modest levels of accountability exist. Academic staff are rewarded based on rank and length of service rather than on their individual performance. Indeed, such an evaluation process flies in the face of tradition and sometimes of established labor-management practices.

For at least a segment of the Mexican academic profession, a complex set of evaluative mechanisms exists, tied directly to salary and remuneration. It is worth taking a look at Mexican practices, which might have relevance elsewhere. We will focus on two important public universities—the Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México (UNAM), perhaps the world’s largest university with 245,000 students, and the Universidad Autónoma Metropolitana (UAM), a large prestigious public university with 46,200 students. Both are located in Mexico City. The practices discussed here resemble those at many other public universities, but not in Mexico’s growing private higher education sector.

This discussion relates mainly to professors with full-time appointments; they comprise just one-third of the teaching staff at UNAM. The rest are part-time staff who receive a modest payment for each course they teach and participate only to a minor extent in the governance of the university. UNAM is similar to most other Mexican universities in this respect. UAM is exceptional in that a majority of its teaching staff have full-time appointments. It should be noted that “full-time” staff may also teach courses at other, usually private, universities or do consulting or other kinds of work to supplement their incomes.

Prior to 1990, Mexican universities, in common with most academic institutions worldwide, did little or no evaluation of faculty performance in determining salary levels. Professors were paid by rank and length of service, with few variations by discipline to take account of market factors. This system precluded any way of rewarding highly productive faculty—or giving a negative message to underachieving faculty. Further, the base salary of Mexican academics is quite low—too low to sustain a middle-class lifestyle or to retain the best
people in the universities. The academic system needed
to introduce both accountability and differentiation, and
to reward the most productive professors. The goal of
the new evaluation schemes was to improve the quality
and performance of Mexican academics, and it was for
this reason that the government provided funds to create
the new programs. There was also recognition by
academic leaders that remuneration had to be increased.
There is a certain contradiction in these two goals—
increasing salaries and introducing evaluation—and this
has had implications for implementation.

Prior to 1990, Mexican universities, in
common with most academic institutions
worldwide, did little or no evaluation
of faculty performance in determining
salaries levels.

The Internal Reward System
Currently UNAM and UAM offer a complicated set of in-
come supplements on top of salary, based on performance
and other criteria. This set of arrangements has produced
a differentiated income structure. The system that has de-
veloped over the last decade has gotten quite complex and,
many argue, nonfunctional in parts. Some academics
refuse to participate in the numerous evaluation commit-
tees and boards, claiming that the reviews use up time
and money that, they say, could be better spent in support
of research. The criteria for rewarding professors are criti-
cized as being too narrow. Another charge is that politics
and favoritism toward members of particular factions has
become part of the evaluation process in some fields and
institutions. Some have argued that this evaluation sys-
tem promotes the “survival of the fittest,” stimulating
unhealthy competition and discouraging collaborative
research, and is, these critics say, the crassest form of
privatization of academic work. UAM is currently engaged
in a major review of the structure of academic appoint-
ments and remuneration.

As noted, everyone receives a base salary that is not
related to performance—and is quite low. Many
universities have established their own set of monetary
rewards and “top up” payments to faculty members.
Criteria for assigning salary increments were originally
designed to reward productivity, mainly in research, but
these rewards have to some extent become entitlements
given out to all but the weakest. Other persons denied these
monetary rewards include faculty members who have
fallen out of favor with senior administrators, with the
political or academic factions in charge of the department
or institution, or with the evaluation committee.
Productivity was usually measured by the number of
articles or books published, with a premium placed on
publishing in international journals: a locally published
article was worth much less than one published abroad in
English. Innovative teaching methods were not taken into
account, nor was “outreach” such as publications aimed
at a mass audience or public service. The omission of
teaching from performance reviews is due in part to the
difficulty of measuring effective teaching. Satisfactory tools
for evaluating teaching do not exist anywhere, and
developing useful criteria might be especially difficult in
Mexico’s bureaucratic environment.

The university’s internal reward system, instituted
with the intention of providing a more adequate income
to the professoriate, in part achieved its goals. However,
the system has been subverted by non-merit-based criteria
and an overly narrow scope of measurement. Once on the
“merit” list, a person was seldom removed. If productivity
was judged deficient in an evaluation period, an increment
might be omitted, but participation in the system
continued. What started as merit-based reward
arrangement became just part of the remuneration
package.

CONACYT and SNI
Another and more important source of salary for a small
group of Mexican academics is the system to promote na-
tional scientific productivity organized by the National
Council for Science and Technology (CONACYT), a gov-
ernment-funded organization. CONACYT has its own
national system of researchers (SNI), a network of the most
highly productive scholars and researchers in all of the
disciplines who are given significant remuneration supple-
ments in recognition of their work. Only a small propor-
tion of Mexican academics, 3 percent of the total number
and about 10 percent of the full-time faculty (for example,
2,352 at UNAM and 410 at UAM) are part of the SNI sys-
tem. Selection occurs through a peer review system, and
maintaining membership is based on continuing produc-
tivity. Membership in the SNI system confers prestige in
addition to providing more income. One of the reasons
for the establishment of the SNI system was to encourage
the best Mexican academics to remain in Mexico.
CONACYT recognizes research productivity—focusing
mainly on publications but also on external grants. As
with internal evaluations, teaching at the undergraduate
level and service are not considered to be relevant criteria to measure productivity. The SNI system seems to work reasonably well. The awards are recognized as based on merit (however narrowly defined), and the members of the national network are viewed as among the best scholars and researchers working in Mexican higher education.

Conclusion

These reward arrangements have created a partially merit-based system for academic remuneration in a segment of Mexico’s universities. The arrangements show that it is possible, in a highly bureaucratic academic system resistant to basic structural change, to implement a reform that had two goals—to raise salaries for the most productive professors and to provide a way to measure productivity. Unfortunately, the system itself has become rather rigid and, at least at the university level, no longer provides evaluation based on merit. It is just a standard way to supplement the inadequate basic salaries. The criteria for evaluation, both internally in the universities and in CONACYT, are overly narrow in scope and fail to recognize all aspects of meritorious and relevant academic work. Academic salaries, woefully inadequate, have been raised in many instances. For a few of the most productive faculty, salaries have been significantly improved. The idea of remuneration based on merit has been widely recognized—a significant achievement in a bureaucratized academic system.

Academic salaries, woefully inadequate, have been raised in many instances.

UAM is currently rethinking its reward structures. Perhaps these discussions will lead to the creation of a system that works better and provides a more effective merit-based reward system. Mexico is an example of a country that has taken evaluation seriously, creating a very complex set of arrangements that provide at least some of the necessary elements of evaluation in the context of a highly politicized and bureaucratic academic system. In context, it is not a small achievement. Other countries can look at Mexico’s interesting experiment with merit-based salaries through the back door. There are lessons, both positive and negative, to be learned.

Note: Manuel Gil-Antón has also written about this theme in his “Big City Love The Academic Workplace in Mexico,” in P. G. Altbach, ed., The Decline of the Guru: The Academic Profession in Developing Countries (New York: Palgrave, 2003).

Catholic Universities Ponder Globalization

In early December 2002, more than 300 leaders of Catholic universities worldwide met at the Vatican in Rome to discuss the implications of globalization for Catholic higher education. The conference was co-sponsored by the International Federation of Catholic Universities (IFCU) and the Vatican’s congregation for Catholic Education. Globalization has special implications for church-related institutions, as they have a special mission that is both global and spiritual in nature but at the same time at odds with many of the forces of the “market” that are often integrally linked with globalization.

One of the unique features of the church-related institutions attending the conference is the concern for keeping values at the center of the academic equation and a desire to avoid being drawn completely into the commercialization that characterizes much of contemporary higher education. Navigating the complex realities of both kinds of globalization—that motivated by a focus on social justice and spiritualism and at the same time being subject to the globalization of the market—is not easy. The papers and discussions featured a combination of concerns with understanding the nature of a Catholic university in a changing societal environment, in linking theological issues to contemporary higher education challenges, and maintaining a focus on social justice issues in an era of “marketization.”

The realities faced by these 300 institutions from all continents is, of course, quite varied. The realities faced by Catholic universities in non-Catholic environments are different from those in Catholic countries. The problems of Catholic institutions in developing countries are also unique. All were united by a commitment to understand globalization and to navigate constructively in this new context. The conference’s final statement stressed harnessing the forces of globalization so that, for example, the revolution in information technology can be used to strengthen solidarity rather than the commercialization of knowledge.

Additional information is available from IFCU, 21 rue d’Assas, 75270 Paris, France. The papers given at the conference will be available, as will be the final statement. E-mail: loic.roche@bureau.fiuc.org

Internet Resources

Visit our website for downloadable back issues of International Higher Education and other publications and resources at http://www.bc.edu/cihe /.
International Ph.D.s: Exploring the Decision to Stay or Return
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The core debate over Ph.D. recipients from abroad who earned their degrees at U.S. institutions of higher education centers around the question: who (and how many) stayed in the United States, and who (and how many) returned home? To explore this question, we undertook a study, “Ph.D.s—10 Years Later.” Maresi Nerad and Joseph Cerny were the principal investigators for this study, which was funded by the Mellon Foundation. Our national survey examined the career paths of nearly 6,000 Ph.D. recipients who completed their doctoral degrees in the United States between 1982 and 1985 in six fields of study (biochemistry, computer science, electrical engineering, English, mathematics, and political science). Of the international respondents, the largest proportions were in electrical engineering (38 percent) and mathematics (30 percent). The largest group from a single country in both fields came from Taiwan, followed by India. In electrical engineering the third-largest group was from Korea; in mathematics, the third-largest group was from Canada.

The study revealed that around 40 percent of our international respondents were working outside the United States, most in their home countries, at the time of their first jobs after earning their doctorates (not including positions such as postdoctoral fellowships). This percentage increased by about 15 percent 10 to 14 years after Ph.D. completion. The jobs with which they began their careers reflect an interesting interplay between their own doctoral ambitions, the fields in which they studied, and the relative employment structures and markets in the countries in which they chose to reside.

While, overall, 40 percent of the Ph.D.s from abroad returned home to start their post-Ph.D. careers, there was, in fact, considerable variation by field of study, region of origin, and even subregion. Exit rates were the highest for those with Ph.D.s in English and political science, with between one-half to two-thirds leaving the United States. The rates were lowest for technological fields (computer science and electrical engineering), fields in which international Ph.D.s are concentrated, with only around a quarter leaving the United States for their first jobs. There was extensive variation among those who left, depending on geographic region of origin. Those from Africa, Central and Latin America, Canada, and Australia were the most likely to return home for their first jobs, with almost two-thirds making this choice.

In contrast, only around a third of the East Asians and Europeans chose to return home for their first jobs. Finally, South Asians were the least likely to return home, with less than one-tenth leaving the United States.

Variations in the first job location choice was not necessarily consistent by region. For example, while most of the Japanese (four-fifths) and Koreans (two-thirds) left the United States for their first post-Ph.D. jobs, only a fifth of those from Taiwan or Hong Kong had done so. Return behavior was not necessarily consistent by country. While none of the 22 computer scientists from Taiwan returned home for their first jobs, almost half of the 25 mathematicians did. On the other hand, 90 percent or more of the Indians in these same fields chose to remain in the United States. Thus, first job location data for the Ph.D.s from abroad are a combination of broad regional trends, with considerable variation by field, country, and other factors.

What factors helped determine the choices on initial job locations made by international Ph.D. holders? Was the deciding factor, as the economic literature suggests, the relative economic conditions in the United States and at home? Was it, as other work suggests, directly linked to U.S. immigration policies? Was the return influenced by specific actions taken by the home governments? Were the factors personal rather than economically or politically motivated, such as the desire to be close to one’s friends and family, to live in one’s own culture?

Our national survey examined the career paths of nearly 6,000 Ph.D. recipients who completed their doctoral degrees in the United States.

The answer, as may be expected, is “all of the above.” However, the one overwhelming trend that ran through the “return” data was this: a predetermination to return, powered by the pull of existing ties. A large number of Ph.D.s from abroad seemed to know by the end of their doctoral studies whether they were seeking to stay in the United States, or to return home, but this was not true in all cases. Those who returned home were somehow “bound” to return, through the strong pull of their ties to cultural values and preferences, to friends and family, to their employers or governments, or to personal values such as the desire to contribute to their nation or society.
Overall, those who stayed in the United States tended to be younger and less likely to be married with dependents upon completion of their Ph.D.s. Gender played a role in biochemistry and mathematics, with the women being relatively more likely to stay in the United States than to return. Fewer than 20 percent of the women with Ph.D.s in mathematics left; almost 50 percent of the women who stayed were mathematicians. Conversely, the women with degrees in English were much more likely to leave than to stay. Two-thirds of the women with Ph.D.s in English left, and more than a third of all the female Ph.D. recipients from abroad who returned home were in the field of English. The men exhibited the opposite behavior (compared to the women). Slightly more than 50 percent of the men with Ph.D.s in mathematics left, as opposed to 25 percent of the electrical engineers.

The “principal source of doctoral funding” emerged as another crucial factor distinguishing these two groups. More than a quarter of those who returned home had been funded through sources such as their national governments or their employers. Conversely, as much as 90 percent of those who stayed had financed their education primarily by working as teachers and research assistants.

Finally, the two groups stated opposing career goals at the time of Ph.D. completion. The returnees in biochemistry, computer science, and electrical engineering were much more likely to indicate an interest in academic employment than those who stayed in the United States. Conversely, in fields where the primary career of choice among Ph.D.s was overwhelmingly an academic job—namely, English, mathematics, or political science—those who stayed were much more likely to indicate a preference for an academic career, compared to those who returned home.

The thinking behind the decision to stay or to return was echoed in the reasons listed by the respondents as the most important factors in choosing their first jobs. Comparing those Ph.D. recipients whose first jobs were outside the United States with those whose first jobs were in the United States, there were important differences in motivations. Equally important to both groups were these key considerations: “use of my doctoral education,” “work that interests/challenges me,” or “great opportunity to do research.” However, those in computer science, electrical engineering, and mathematics who left the United States were less likely, as compared to those who stayed behind, to list considerations such as salary, career ambitions, or organizational prestige. The Ph.D. holders from abroad who left or were leaving the United States were also less likely, irrespective of discipline, to indicate that they chose their first jobs because of a “limited job market” or because it was the “only job offered.” Finally, in a telling clue as to why some of the Ph.D. recipients went back home, those working abroad were typically more likely than those who stayed to point to “proximity to parents, relatives, or friends” or “contribution to society” as important considerations influencing their first job choices. This held true for all fields. Clearly, these nonpecuniary considerations, while not necessarily relevant to the particular jobs they chose, were very important considerations in their decisions to return home.

Venezuelan Higher Education: The Trend toward State Control
Orlando Albornoz

Venezuela has a well-developed higher education system that was characterized by expansion during the period from 1945 to the end of the century. This growth went from almost zero to what many believe is excess capacity, capturing most of the country’s education budget and leaving the basic and secondary levels of education underfunded. The system grew mostly in terms of traditional indicators like the number of institutions, students, and degree recipients. Missing was expansion in the area of science and technology. That is to say, the system was successful from the perspective of training institutions but not in the direction of sustaining the needs of knowledge-generating institutions. This low level of knowledge production explains why Venezuela has never been a regional pacesetter like Argentina, Brazil, or Mexico but has only been a decent follower, like Chile, Peru, or Colombia.

The government that came to power in 1998 brought along a new vision for higher education, although not new in innovative terms—quite the contrary. The system had been developing in the direction of decentralization. The new government, however, is trying to centralize the system along the lines of the only state-controlled
system of higher education in Latin America and the Caribbean—that is, the system in Cuba, where the state rules the country’s institutions, including all of higher education.

An Overview

The Venezuelan higher education system follows a typical diversified pattern. Until 1953, the system was rather small and centralized. In that year the private sector, through the influence of American oil companies as well as in response to local demand, opened up with the creation of the first two private universities. In 1958 with the advent of democracy, after 10 years of military rule, the state higher education system expanded and developed, although not without encountering many problems. The guerrilla movement of the 1960s emerged from the large public universities. In the early 1970s the government intervened, implementing a number of university reforms.

The higher education system is divided into universities and nonuniversities. The latter include colegios and institutos universitarios, which are institutions with three-year academic programs. Universities are professional institutions and most of them offer graduate studies and currently account for almost all academic research conducted in the country. In fact, a limited number of them, the so-called autonomous universities and the Venezuelan Institute of Scientific Research, carry out most of the science and technology research. Law, education, business administration, and the social sciences constitute the fields of most interest to students.

The private sector of Venezuelan higher education is quite strong and includes several types of institutions.

The private sector of Venezuelan higher education is quite strong and includes several types of institutions. While some are dedicated to three-year programs, others are regular universities with five-year degree programs. Although a number of institutions have ended up as simple business entities, others are quite committed to entering the academic sphere. However, so far no private institution in the country can compete with the major public universities in knowledge production. Private institutions strictly conform to the teaching model, with research, as stated, restricted to the large public institutions. The universities run by the state are divided into the old traditional universities created in the 19th and early 20th centuries and the universidades experimentales, created after 1958. The present government controls these latter universities through the appointment of new authorities. The government has not interfered in the rest of the system—the autonomous public universities and the private institutions.

Many Venezuelans believe that the current government’s intervention in the higher education system constitutes a setback, even though everyone agrees that the system needs an overhaul.

Obstacles to Modernization

Many Venezuelans believe that the current government’s intervention in the higher education system constitutes a setback, even though everyone agrees that the system needs an overhaul. Funds are being squandered because of the privileges granted to many professors. In fact, professors are paid according to the national job classification system. Many very clever academic entrepreneurs use their positions at universities to further their own personal interests. The new government has not touched these privileges and is unlikely ever to do so. To the contrary, it has increased salaries and privileges and is not exercising power to bring about academic change, appearing only interested in changes in the ideological arena. The government has created a Ministry of Higher Education. The top authorities at five of the experimental universities are appointed by the government, which is pressing to bring the whole higher education system under state control. However, the government has as yet said nothing about the private sector.

It must be noted that, in more than one way, President Hugo Chávez is a very peculiar leader, though perhaps he just belongs to the long line of Latin American autocrats. Even though he first tried to come to power in 1992 via a coup d’état, he returned in 1998 as a democratically elected leader. He then immediately broke with the political tradition of Venezuelan democracy, imposing his own vision. At the end of 2002, he was very much under attack. Old political forces have come back and the country is polarized. Unfortunately, the higher education system finds itself in the middle of this struggle. Venezuela might be an example of how political events can guide the course of higher learning. Chávez’s government is anti-intellectual, antielite, antitechnology, anti-internationalization, and of course antiglobalization. By trying to change the ideological and political base of society while not getting involved in the technicalities of educational reform, the Chávez...
government may dismantle Venezuelan higher education without providing opportunities for the necessary modernization of the whole education system. If current trends continue, Venezuela’s complex and diverse higher education system may come to resemble the centralized Cuban system.

The Immediate Future

Chávez, who sees himself as a kind of reincarnation of Simon Bolívar and clone of Fidel Castro, his political mentor, seems to have embraced the idea of being the leader of a world revolution against capitalism. In October 2002, Chávez declared his vision for Venezuelan education in a speech before the young members of the Federación Bolivariana de Estudiantes in a Caracas theater: “No classroom in Venezuela should be without a Bolivarian student brigade.”

Many people would argue with the current government’s approach to higher education. But time will tell if Chávez is right. In the meantime it will be quite interesting to watch the Venezuelan higher education system going backward, from decentralization to centralized control, from diversity to homogeneity, from political and ideological pluralism to the one-dimensional fundamentalism of an indoctrination-based approach to education and, in fact, to the whole social and political system.

Critics are concerned that the current charter encourages ethical and educational compromises that are potentially harmful to higher education and the general public, especially as it relates to the historic mission of fostering democracy and important values such as equality, academic freedom, or the pursuit of knowledge. Social commentators note that this orientation to the market and economic goals is a worldwide phenomenon and even more prevalent within developing countries where economic advancement has become the cornerstone of political and educational agendas.

Compromising the Charter between Higher Education and Society

Adrienna Kezar
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Over the last two decades, various social critics and leaders worldwide have noted a disturbing trend in higher education: the collective or public good, historically an important component of the charter between higher education and society, is being compromised. According to critics, higher education is forsaking its role as a social institution and is functioning increasingly as an industry with fluctuating, predominantly economic goals and market-oriented values. Increasingly, the production of workers is the primary goal. Publicly funded colleges and universities are now encouraged to privatize selected activities, becoming for-profit entities with economic engines and with private and economic as opposed to public and social goals. This shift has been called the industrial or entrepreneurial model.

Empirical Evidence

Recently I conducted a meta-analysis of the research on these trends toward privatization and commercialization (industrial model) to examine the broad claims by social critics. In short, the evidence does support claims that some sectors of higher education in the United States have become industrialized, particularly research and comprehensive institutions and institutions with Division I athletic teams.

Studies document that corporate language and practices have replaced traditional academic administration in which educational values such as truth, equity, autonomy, and mission are central to decision making. This shift in language and values has translated into many new approaches such as outsourcing, restructuring, and responsibility-centered budgeting. Research privatization is growing yearly at exponential levels. Several scholars have traced the increasing vocationalization of the curriculum and disenfranchisement of faculty, as evidenced by the declining number of full-time and tenure-track lines and growing numbers of part-time and contract faculty.
Costs/Benefits

While these shifts have occurred, studies of costs and benefits show virtually no positive outcomes from the corporatization of management. Privatization and commercialization of research has been demonstrated to have a host of negative outcomes including: a decline in basic research; a reduction in the importance of teaching on many campuses; conflicts of interest, such as faculty having financial interests in research that has affected the integrity of scholarship; and loss of community intellectual property. The disenfranchisement of faculty (through the growth in part-time and contract faculty) also has led to cutbacks in student advising, limited student-faculty contact, decreased involvement in campus governance, among other outcomes. The vocationalized curriculum and weakened teaching have resulted in a decline in the humanities and nonapplied social science fields as well as in the holistic and critical thinking pedagogies that have been demonstrated to be essential for citizenship education and the education of leaders. Yet, there are also benefits from the shift to the industrial model. The privatization of research has increased funds for research, improved laboratories and facilities, and provided additional funding for students. The growth of vocational fields and distance learning has provided access to higher education to greater numbers of individuals.

The disenfranchisement of faculty (through the growth in part-time and contract faculty) also has led to cutbacks in student advising, limited student-faculty contact, decreased involvement in campus governance.

Lost Promise

Although proponents of the industrial model claim it will save money, expenses and tuition have risen during the period that this model has been in place. In the late 1990s, a commission was created by the U.S. Department of Education to investigate the rising cost of higher education. The commission found that in the 20 years between 1976 and 1996, the average tuition at public universities increased at a rate well above inflation, from $642 to $3,151, and the average tuition at private universities increased from $2,881 to $15,581. Tuition at public two-year colleges, the least expensive of all types of institutions, increased from an average of $245 to $1,245 during this period. This occurred simultaneously as federal policy shifted the burden for paying for college to students and their families by awarding fewer and smaller Pell grants and increasing the available loans. Many of the proclaimed benefits of the new industrial model are simply not being realized.

Questions for Leaders

Because the industrial model and new charter affect the traditional social and public purposes of higher education and the known costs appear to outweigh the benefits, it is important for leaders worldwide to engage in discussion on the issues. Dialogue about the charter is long overdue, and it is time to develop a new vision of higher education’s mission and values. Leaders need to deal with a number of questions.

How can we create a charter for higher education that honors economic and social private and public goods?

To what degree should higher education adapt to market forces and which historic functions and longer-term public interests should it retain? How can we create a charter for higher education that honors economic and social private and public goods?

To what degree should higher education become private and what would be the impact of this shift? Is public higher education part of the state or is it independent? What type of autonomy or regulation should be practiced?

How can we conceive of private and public goods in complex ways that will sustain the social role of higher education? It is important not to dichotomize public and private or social and economic interests. Studies illustrate how private goods benefit the public in the form of higher salaries and stability of employment, improved health of college graduates, and better consumer decision making among college graduates.

How can we reconcile market-oriented values with traditional academic values? For example, academic freedom, access and equity, excellence and integrity, and dedication to inquiry are important elements in the effort to fulfill the public mission. Which values should be upheld and reinforced as higher education partners with other groups representing different value systems? How can these values be maintained?
Will Merger Magic Work for Hong Kong?

By Gerard Postiglione

Gerard Postiglione is associate professor in the School of Education at the University of Hong Kong. Address: University of Hong Kong, Pokfulam Rd., Hong Kong, China. E-mail: GERRY@hKU.HK

Real and perceived globalization has deepened university participation in the knowledge economy and led universities to consolidate their advantages. This consolidation takes many forms, and Hong Kong is now examining the possibility of cross-institutional consolidation. While consolidation of departments and programs is not new to Hong Kong, its mainland parent has gone further in recent years by consolidating a large number of colleges and universities. By 2000, 612 colleges and universities on the Chinese mainland were consolidated into 250 institutions.

Some argue that economies of scale will not in themselves ensure quality, especially if the institutions that are being combined are themselves overstaffed with redundant personnel. These mega institutions have been labeled grand academies (da xueyuan), and doubts have been expressed about the benefits. It has been pointed out that the world’s first-rate institutions of higher education are not produced by government projects of consolidation. In the light of a slowing economy, it looks as if Hong Kong is also set to move down the path of consolidating universities, despite major reservations being expressed by staff and university heads. The pressure to merge universities in some parts of the world depends greatly on the degree of state power over universities, and in the case of Hong Kong and mainland China, will determine to a large extent whether mergers actually occur.

Until mainland China began to merge its colleges and universities beginning in 1999, Hong Kong’s main universities, each with about 10,000 students, were larger than over 90 percent of those on the mainland. Now, however, mainland institutions like Zhejiang University, with over 50,000 students, are increasingly common and have come to resemble giant state campuses in the United States. Tiny Hong Kong, with only two universities until 1990, added on four more universities before it reached the current total of seven by 1997. This ensured that 16 percent of the relevant age group could get a degree place.

Soon after Hong Kong’s return to China, a review was made of the higher education system. Known as the Sutherland Report, this review took a hard look at the well-endowed university system within a period of economic decline. Knowledge economics called for a need to expand postsecondary education even further, so the current enrollments could be doubled, but all through self-funded community college places. The Sutherland Report further suggested that Hong Kong work to concentrate its tertiary resources in a few institutions. Although the “M” word was not mentioned in the report, it was not long before merger scenarios were being floated. The most salient of these came from the then vice-chancellor of the Chinese University of Hong Kong, just before he was appointed as Hong Kong’s first minister of education. On October 4, and again on October 7, he confirmed a merger of his old university with the Hong Kong Science and Technology (and the nearby Institute of Education—a sprawling campus also funded by the University Grants Committee). It is assumed that the merger will “result in a world-class university.”

Knowledge economics called for a need to expand postsecondary education even further, so the current enrollments could be doubled, but all through self-funded community college places.

Given the economic backdrop in Hong Kong and the emergence of Shanghai and Beijing as world-class cities aspiring to have world-class universities (staffed on a fraction of the Hong Kong cost), the need for some restructuring of higher education in Hong Kong is widely accepted. The move to merge is seen by some as a way to deal with budgetary constraints and pressures to increase quality. Yet, the manner in which the mergers are being planned in Hong Kong has met with strong opposition (see http://merger.ust.hk/public/index.php). While the mainland is accustomed to a command economy and centralized decision making, Hong Kong academics, most of whom have been trained overseas, easily find fault with such authoritarian tactics. Regardless of the potential merit, albeit doubtful, of the merger, the manner in which it was announced actually facilitated organized opposition—making further mergers highly unpopular. While the current educational reform in Hong Kong calls for school-based governance and promotes participatory methods and democratic development in the community, the decision to merge universities was made in a different spirit.

The issue of how two of Hong Kong’s top universities will merge will probably take some time to unfold. This process will be important to follow because it relates directly to the question of university
autonomy and, more specifically, to the question of whether universities are established by law or by government. Hong Kong's universities (with the exception of the Open University) receive most of their funds from government.

Are Hong Kong colleges too quick to think merger? Is it a convenient solution, providing a corporate touch within this commercial enclave? Are there other alternatives, such as alliances and consortia? Without a careful assessment, can one make a sound judgment? It was no doubt uplifting to Hong Kong's pro-merger group that two universities in Britain (University College London and Imperial College) announced their intention to tie the knot at the same time that the Hong Kong announcement was made. Before long, however, the London merger was cancelled. In fact, it appears this is less the exception than the rule. After 20 years of hearing about the predictions of massive mergers across universities, few actually occurred. The record shows that planned mergers fail all the time. Cases include Stanford University and the University of California at San Francisco over the merger of their health systems. Alfred University and the State University of New York College of Technology at Alfred have also ended discussions of a possible merger.

**The issue of how two of Hong Kong’s top universities will merge will probably take some time to unfold.**

The fact is that mergers are a risky business. Among the most pronounced reason for exercising caution is the possibility of alienating alumni, donors, long-term friends and supporters. It will not be beneficial if they perceive the danger of their university losing its identity, or at least of some its autonomy, as well as possibly ceasing to exist. Hong Kong's oldest institution, the University of Hong Kong, plans to remain as it is, probably for these very reasons. Because it has a larger and more influential alumni, it can more easily raise funds and may even be advantaged in privatizing when the Hong Kong economy brightens again.

The motivation to merge as a way to reach world-class status is understandable, but how realistic is it? If the government is willing to push through such a merger, why not go further and merge all eight of its publicly funded colleges and universities, or go even further and invite Peking, Tsinghua, and Fudan Universities to join?

---

The Retired Academics Database

**By Jocelyn Law**

Jocelyn Law is on the staff of the Advertising Department, Association of Commonwealth Universities. Address: E-mail: rad@acu.ac.uk.

The Association of Commonwealth Universities (ACU) is concerned with academic mobility at all levels. The ACU has just launched a new initiative, the Retired Academics Database (RAD), aimed at strengthening staff recruitment and retention specifically in the developing world.

Universities in developing countries have faced a number of problems in recent years. As the Association of African Universities itself recognizes, the rapid expansion of higher education in many countries has highlighted an increased need for good-quality teaching (www.aau.org/releases/declaration.htm). But these countries have steadily been losing promising students and staff to overseas universities and international companies. Universities have also had to face the major impact of the HIV/AIDS crisis, as reported in a March 2, 2001 article in the *Chronicle of Higher Education*.

RAD is a database of retired academics and university administrators drawn from around the world. We know that university staff are often keen to continue teaching after they have formally retiend and that they relish the opportunity to work overseas. The service will match these academics to vacancies universities are encountering particular difficulty in filling; although this would not be a permanent solution, these academics and administrators will provide cover for between a semester and two years while a university seeks a permanent replacement.

Due to the international nature of the scheme, RAD is a web-based initiative. University staff wishing to work overseas can register by using an on-line form, making the process quick and easy, in whatever part of the world they happen to be living. The website also contains resources and links providing further information about the scheme and working abroad. Universities will submit a request for university staff through an on-line enquiry form or by fax, and the ACU will search the database for suitable matches. Details of relevant candidates will be passed to the institution, which will then select an applicant to appoint. Universities will have to pay a small fee to use the service in order to cover administrative costs.

Piers Pennington, who is head of the ACU’s academic recruitment unit that is running RAD, stated that “RAD has the potential to make a real difference in universities that urgently need to fill key posts. At the same time, the scheme offers university staff a unique opportunity to continue teaching and to experience different countries and cultures.”
Information about RAD is available at www.acu.ac.uk/adverts/rad, or via e-mail, at rad@acu.ac.uk. Those interested in RAD can register on the RAD information e-mail list to receive updates on the scheme’s progress by simply sending an e-mail with “RAD Information Email” in the subject box. Piers Pennington can be contacted at RAD, by telephone, at +44 (0) 20 7380 6739, or by fax, at +44 (0) 20 7383 0368.

Reinventing Singapore:
Changing a Country’s Mindset by Changing Its Education System

Paul FitzPatrick
Paul FitzPatrick is a consultant with the Singapore Human Resources Institute. He is also a feature writer with the Times newspapers UK. E-mail: conceptsasia@singapore.com.

“Singapore is a fine city” proclaim the T-shirts on sale in Singapore’s central tourist district. This is, of course, a reference to the rules and regulations that exist here and that are famous throughout the world. Coming from a country where we are not even obliged to carry identity cards, I was initially somewhat apprehensive about living in Singapore. Such was my paranoia that jaywalking during my first week upon arriving caused me to take refuge in a shopping mall for 15 minutes, convinced that I had been spotted by a cruising police patrol!

In his 2001 publication, “Why Asians Are Less Creative than Westerners,” Asian academic Ng Aik Kwang suggests that, although well intentioned and indeed effective, punitive sanctions can inhibit independent thinking as well as creative expression. In his view, if people are conditioned to respond to prods and punishments they are prone to becoming passionless and passive and developing conformist tendencies, traits that are liable to stifle their creative potential. Relying upon others to organize our lives by telling us what we can and cannot do may also undermine the basic principle of innovation, which is developing a sense of self-reliance, a belief in oneself, and, of course, a willingness to take control of one’s own life.

How would you react if it was suddenly announced that a building of some architectural significance in the center of New York or Boston was to be demolished to make way for an office block? When a billboard went up outside one of Singapore’s ancient buildings informing people that it was to be replaced with a high-rise glass and steel structure, only four people even bothered to inquire why. This, however, wasn’t a serious proposition. It was simply set up as an experiment designed to test levels of social acquiescence. It served to demonstrate that Singaporeans simply didn’t feel that it was their place to question the judgment of city planners.

Mindful that too much of a nanny state can be a bad thing, the Singapore government is trying to encourage Singaporeans to loosen up and think for themselves. In response to this, various government initiatives have been set up to promote independent thinking skills and creative expression. Most recently, a government review committee came up with a new economic model for Singapore. The model is based on new economy thinking, namely that economic growth in the future will be based around “knowledge” and other intangible concepts. Connecting ideas will become more important than the ideas themselves. Future growth will be driven by creativity, innovation, and the ability, to use a popular cliché, “to think outside the box.” According to the review committee the most effective way of changing mindsets is through the education system. Consequently, it recommends that Singapore’s education formula needs to move from uniformity to diversity, from rigidity to flexibility, from conformity to resilience, and from molding to empowering.

Singapore has three universities: the National University of Singapore, Nanyang Technological University, and the recently created Singapore Management University. In a country that places so high a premium upon academic excellence, competition for places is particularly intense. To place this in context, it is said, for example, that Singapore’s top 50 percent of young people matches the top 10 percent in many other developed countries in terms of educational attainment. Singapore’s education system is consistently ranked as being one of the best in the world. However, the concern now is that it is too exam and knowledge oriented, which is conducive to producing “cookbook” graduates who, despite having good exam results, lack the ability to think for themselves or to be innovative.

In response to this, Singapore’s three universities are reviewing their admissions criteria and also their teaching methodologies. Specifically, rather than just looking at raw grades, admissions tutors are being encouraged to look at the whole person, both in terms of their past achievements and in terms of their potential. Among the proposals are aptitude tests as well as awarding credits for project work and for extracurricular activities. Proposed curriculum changes include the introduction of multidisciplinary
degrees and allowing science, engineering, and medical students to take arts modules. One specific concern of the review committee is the perception of Singapore as a "mono-discipline" country where sciences and engineering predominate. Other proposals include reducing lecture hours in favor of facilitated learning and the introduction of open-book exams.

But it's at Singapore's newest university, Singapore Management University, where the real groundbreaking changes are taking place. SMU has dispensed with lectures entirely in favor of facilitated learning, and soft skills development is now part of the academic curriculum. Emphasis is placed upon developing leadership, team skills as well as creative thinking, and emotional literacy. SMU also considers it important that students are given space to develop specific strengths and even passions. In other words the university has redefined the concept of the learning experience to encompass nonacademic pursuits. Likewise the university is placing greater emphasis upon breadth by allowing students to cover more disciplines, albeit in less depth. The idea is to encourage them to identify the connections between disciplines, enabling students to gather and synthesize knowledge from different fields. A curriculum that is broad based is also seen to offer more perspectives, thus promoting independent learning and creative exploration. As well as being motivated to read more widely, students will find it easier to apply different modes of inquiry to a wider range of academic as well as nonacademic issues. The university's stated aim is to harmonize academic rigor with soft skills training. By moving away from a structured learning model, SMU hopes that their graduates will be better equipped to contribute to an innovation-driven economy.

**SMU has dispensed with lectures entirely.**

At the same time, there's little point in changing the philosophy of higher education without changing what precedes it. Changing mindsets requires starting at the preschool level. The government has been pushing concepts such as creativity and emotional literacy at secondary, primary, and kindergarten levels for some time now. Plans are underway to retrain teachers. The review committee recommends a shift away from "time efficient methodologies" to facilitated learning that is designed to nurture flexible mindsets. In other words, the emphasis will shift from the teacher to the learner. Also, at the junior college level, A Levels are under review. The review committee considers them to be too rigid and content focused. One possibility that is being mooted is a French-style baccalaureate with greater emphasis upon an integrated style of learning. Like the universities, more flexible teaching methodologies are being adopted at secondary, polytechnic, and junior college levels. In other words, the entire ethos underpinning education in Singapore is being recast.

---

**Singapore's three universities are reviewing their admissions criteria and also their teaching methodologies.**

You don't transform what was little more than a distant colonial outpost and a collection of small fishing villages 40 years ago into Asia's Garden City metropolis with one of the world's most competitive economies in just three decades, without some direction from the top. In this respect, Singapore's achievements are unsurpassed. Singapore's emergence as a leading industrialized nation during the 1960s and 1970s had a lot to do with the government providing direction. Policies were formulated by ministers and civil servants, and goals were set and usually achieved. But the concern among Singapore's political leaders is that this has instilled in its citizens a conformist and "safety first" instinct that is ill-suited to today's needs. This is why they are trying to transform Singapore from being just a productive society into a creative and risk-taking society. In other words, after years of telling their citizens what they can and cannot do, they now want them to do their own thing and to be different. According to Prime Minster Goh Chok Tong, "we must get away from the idea that it is only the people at the top who should be thinking and the job of everyone else is to do as they are told." This view was endorsed by Senior Minister Lee Kuan Yew, who expressed concern that a lack of independent thinking might limit Singapore's capacity to respond to the challenges of the information age. According to David Lim Tik En, minister of state for defense, we must develop the capacity to tolerate failure. We must also teach our young people that failure is an opportunity to learn rather than an opportunity lost. But above all we must teach them to ask, "why?"

I no longer feel the compulsion to hide in shopping malls. In reality fines for jaywalking are rarely enforced. Even the rules pertaining to chewing gum are under review. Meanwhile, water dispensers recently started to appear in Singapore's subway stations. Accompanied by a sign warning people that if water was spilled outside a designated area, the dispensers would be withdrawn. Water was spilled and the dispensers were subsequently withdrawn. Old ways of thinking die hard!
News of the Center and the Program in Higher Education

Palgrave-Macmillan Publishers has published *The Decline of the Guru: The Academic Profession in Developing Countries*, edited by Philip G. Altbach. This book stems from a research project funded by the Ford Foundation. Three additional essays from the project, dealing with Central and Eastern Europe, will appear as a special theme issue of *Higher Education* in 2003. Earlier, the Center published a limited paperback edition of this book—copies remain available on request from readers in developing countries. The Center has started a new initiative on women’s higher education worldwide, with Francesca Purcell and Robin Helms providing the leadership. The project’s first product will be a comprehensive inventory of women’s colleges and universities—in preparation for which an international survey has recently been sent out. One of the Center’s most important research efforts, *African Higher Education: An International Reference Handbook*, will be published in June by Indiana University Press. This book, coedited by Damtew Teferra and Philip G. Altbach, is 900 pages in length. Copies will be made available without cost to African libraries, researchers, and policymakers. This project was funded by the Ford Foundation. Work is continuing on *The Past and Future of Asian Universities*. This volume, which features essays on major Asian countries, stems from a project coordinated by Philip G. Altbach and Toru Umakoshi of Nagoya University in Japan. It was funded by the Toyota Foundation with additional funding from the Japanese Ministry of Education and the Japan Foundation Asia Center.

The Center will copublish—with the PROPHE Project at the State University of New York at Albany—*A Contested Good? Understanding Private Higher Education in South Africa*, edited by Glenda Kruss and Andre Kraak. This book grew out of a research conference held in South Africa. It will be made available free of charge.

The Center has recently appointed several new staff members. Laura Rumbley is a research associate who is pursuing her doctorate in international higher education. Most recently, she was United States vice consul in El Salvador. Philippa Thiuri will be joining the Center in September from a position at Simmons College. A Kenyan, she is interested in women’s higher education. Robin Matross Helms has joined the Center as assistant editor of *International Higher Education* and research associate. She will be working on the women’s higher education initiative. Continuing Center staff include Alma Maldonado-Maldonado, Francesca Purcell, Roberta Malee Bassett, and Hong Zhu. Dr. Damtew Tefera, formerly a research associate at the Center, has been appointed research assistant professor at Boston College. He is coeditor-in-chief of the newly launched *Journal of Higher Education in Africa*.

The Center’s work continues to be supported by the Ford Foundation and by Boston College.

New Publications


A case study of the University of the Western Cape in South Africa, this book provides a discussion of how this university developed from a small institution during the apartheid era to a university aimed at serving South Africans previously excluded from higher education. The development of academic policy as well as the impact of apartheid and of later developments on students and the academic community are discussed.


An engaging critique of the “new orthodoxies” in higher education, this book discusses what the author calls the ideologies that shape contemporary thinking on higher education. He discusses the “pernicious ideologies” of entrepreneurialism, “never mind the quality,” the “academic community,” and the idea that the university can do everything for everyone. He argues that by carefully thinking about its goals and purposes, the university can perform well and serve society—and itself.


This is a reprint of a key volume on academic governance and university organization. The book features
chapters from a social science perspective on such topics as job satisfaction among faculty leadership in higher education, motivation of academic employees, models of organization, and related topics. While the data come from the U.S. experience, the themes are of broad interest.


This book assesses the different approaches employed by four major external funding agencies toward capacity building in South African higher education institutions. It presents key observations in the form of strengths and weaknesses of respective models of capacity building in each institution, differences of structure among the institutions, and the issue of sustainability, among others.

(Damtew Teferra)


Increasing the number of minority (African-American and Hispanic) faculty at American universities has been a policy goal for several decades. However, minority faculty continue to be underrepresented. This volume, based on a survey of more than 7,000 high-achieving minority students, analyzes why these students do not choose academic careers.


Based on a case study of an Australian university, this book argues that global economic and other forces stress a male-oriented academic culture that pervades higher education in the Anglo-American countries. The analysis includes interviews and qualitative analysis of the case study institution relating to male-dominated academic work styles, administrative arrangements, and other aspects of academic life.


Aimed at providing analysis for academic leaders faced with decisions about information technology issues in universities, this book discusses the role of IT in university finances, on teaching and research, and on other aspects of the academic enterprise. While the analysis is focused on the United States, the issues are relevant to universities in most countries.


This book is a critique of the modern university, claiming that the research university has misplaced its values and now contributes to the degradation of the environment and other social ills. The book discusses the history of the research university and proposes a new philosophy of higher education to deal with these perceived problems. Neither the argument nor the solutions are especially convincing.


A wide-ranging discussion of the various ethical elements of the American profession, this book deals with such issues as traditions of academic freedom and shared governance and the implications of this tradition for ethics, the rights and duties of individual professors, the rights of the faculty in shared governance, academic freedom issues for students, and other topics. While written from the perspective of the United States, the issues discussed in this book have wide relevance.


This comprehensive one-volume encyclopedia analyzes all aspects of the role of women in higher education, from the history of women’s participation in higher education to psychological and sociological factors. Women as students, faculty, and administrators are considered. The role of women in the curriculum, for example, in women’s studies, is included. While the coverage is predominantly from a U.S. perspective, this volume will be relevant to anyone concerned with women in higher education.

William Massy, former financial vice president of Stanford University, analyzes what he sees as the major problems facing higher education and then argues that assessment of institutional and academic performance will make possible cost containment that is needed in the current environment. He provides examples of U.S. universities that have engaged in this process of assessment and containment.


This book presents a very interesting debate on the institutional change that Mexican universities are currently facing. It includes chapters by Hugo Casanova, Humberto Munóz, R. Domínguez, Javier Mendoza, Roberto Rodríguez, Angel Díaz Barriga, and Alejandro Canales. Most of the authors discuss the topic of institutional change from the perspective of politics, including the political implications of institutional change for universities. They also incorporate many elements from a socioeconomic perspective and other issues such as governance, the reform agenda, evaluation policies, and the role of academics, among others. (Alma Maldonado)


This book contains a series of essays on universities in the polar regions of the world, including Canada, Alaska, Greenland, northern Japan, Finland, Russia, Norway, and Sweden. The relationships of these universities to the development of the North are discussed.


An analysis of political struggles in Mexico’s most important academic institution, UNAM, over more than a half-century, this volume explores the relationship between the national government and the university and internal politics within the university. The complex interplay between students, the academic community, and the government is analyzed by focusing on several flashpoints of controversy, including the dramatic events of 1968.


A set of papers from two international conferences on the broad topic of student services and expectations in an increasingly “student-centered” higher education environment, this volume features discussions on such topics as appropriate student expectations from universities, student views about university management, marketing to students, legal aspects of student services, and others. Countries such as Australia, Denmark, the Czech Republic, Belgium, and others are included.


The first full-scale study of the academic profession in U.S. community colleges, this book discusses demographic factors, attitudes concerning institutional and professional involvement, curriculum and instruction, and other aspects of this key segment of the higher education system. Community college faculty are compared to professors in other segments of the system.


This superbly illustrated and well-organized book provides the higher education institutions in the Eastern Cape, South Africa, with strategic cooperation scenarios for postsecondary education. Such issues as student inflow and outflow, research capacity and collaboration, program cooperation, funding formulas, and the role of ICT are extensively discussed. (Damtew Tefera)

One of the few full-scale studies of part-time academic staff available anywhere, this Canadian study analyzes all aspects of the lives and careers of part-time staff, including work patterns, salary, teaching responsibilities, attitudes toward a range of issues, and others. Based largely on a survey of faculty in Ontario universities, opinions of part-time staff are discussed. The special problems of women receive attention. Although this book focuses on Canada, the analysis is highly relevant to other countries, since part-time faculty are a growing part of the academic profession worldwide.


An analysis of aspects of Thai higher education by the dean of the Faculty of Education at Chulalongkorn University, this book discusses such topics as academic administration, graduate education, social change and higher education in Thailand, the characteristics of university students, and others.


A detailed study of the admissions process at a prestigious American university, this study provides analysis of how admissions decisions are made. The research is based on a year-long inside analysis. The competitiveness of the admissions process described in this book is limited to the elite sector of American higher education.


Providing a critique of postmodernism as it applies to higher education, this book argues from a left perspective that the values of higher education are being lost in the rush toward marketization and privatization. Discussing contemporary British higher education, the authors provide a critique of the policies of both the Conservatives and New Labour. This is a thoroughgoing critique and analysis of higher education policy.


ERASMUS, the massive European Union student mobility program now serving more than 100,000 students annually, was made a part of the broader SOCRATES administrative structure recently. This volume provides several evaluations of ERASMUS from a variety of perspectives. The discussions include the views of academics concerning the program, student experiences with employment following the program, the policies of higher education institutions participating, and a discussion of patterns of participation in ERASMUS.


A discussion of the international implications of IT on higher education sponsored by the Academic Cooperation Association, this volume features discussions on virtual mobility, the role of IT in Australia's market-oriented international policy, mobility and virtual learning, quality assurance and virtual learning, and other topics. The focus of this book is mainly on Europe.


This new World Bank report focuses on the role of postsecondary education in the creation and sustaining of the knowledge society. Underlying its argument is a conviction that knowledge is a major driver of economic development and that higher education institutions play a central role in ensuring that countries are able to participate in the knowledge society. Among the topics considered are the challenges of the expansion of higher education, the role of the marketplace and the state, information technology, and others. The focus of the report is on developing and transitional societies. Statistical information is provided.

UNESCO-CEPES PUBLICATION PROGRAM EXPANDS

The UNESCO European Center for Higher Education, headquartered in Bucharest, Romania, has expanded its publication program. It sponsors Higher Education in Europe, a quarterly journal published in three languages (English, French, and Russian). The journal is published by Kluwer Academic Publishers. The CEPES series, Papers on Higher Education, presents shorter studies dealing with a range of topics. Among the 2002 publications in this series are: Lazar Vlaseanu and Lewis Purser, From Words to Action: Approaches to a Program (2002), 237 pp. (pb); John Taylor
An Initiative in International Higher Education

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

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

The Program in Higher Education in the Lynch School of Education, Boston College
The Center is closely related to the program in higher education at Boston College. The program offers master’s and doctoral degree study in the field of higher education. The program has been preparing professionals in higher education for three decades. It features a rigorous social science-based approach to the study of higher education, combining a concern with the broader theoretical issues relating to higher education and an understanding of the practice of academic administration. The Administrative Fellows initiative provides financial assistance as well as work experience in a variety of administrative settings. Specialization is offered in higher education administration, student affairs and development, international higher education, and other areas. Additional information about the program is available from Dr. Karen Arnold, coordinator of the program in higher education, Lynch School of Education, Campion Hall, Boston College, Chestnut Hill, MA 02467, USA. Tel: (617) 552-4236 Fax: (617) 552-8422 E-Mail: <arnoldkm@bc.edu>. More information about the program—including course descriptions and degree requirements—can be found on-line at the program’s website: <http://infoeagle.bc.edu/bc_org/avp/soe/hea/JEA/html>. International Higher Education is available full-text on our website. Web-based subscriptions are also available.