

INTERNATIONAL HIGHER EDUCATION

The Boston College Center for International Higher Education

Number 33 Fall 2003

International Issues

- 2 Updated Definition of Internationalization
Jane Knight
- 3 Defending Academic Freedom as a Human Right
Balakrishnan Rajagopal

Special Focus: "World Class"—Meanings and Implications

- 5 The Costs and Benefits of World-Class Universities
Philip G. Altbach
- 9 Evolving Great Universities in Small and Developing Countries
Pang Eng Fong and Linda Lim

Special Focus: Accreditation—The Debate Continues

- 10 U.S. Higher Education: Long Reach Abroad with Tight Borders at Home
Thomas J. La Belle
- 12 Cambodian Accreditation: An Uncertain Beginning
David Ford
- 14 American Accreditation of Foreign Universities: Proceed—with Caution
Barbara Brittingham

Special Focus: Private Higher Education

- 15 Russia: Alliances with State-Run Organizations
Dmitry Suspitsin
- 17 The Gulf: Privatization and Americanization
James Coffman

Countries and Regions

- 19 High Fee Market for Australian Universities?
Simon Marginson
- 20 Japan's National Universities and Reform
Martin Finkelstein
- 22 Will New Higher Education Legislation Be Approved in France?
Christine Musselin
- 24 Chinese Universities and the Central Government
Kathryn Mohrman

Departments

- 25 News of the Center
27 New Publications

Updating the Definition of Internationalization

Jane Knight

Jane Knight is adjunct professor at the Comparative International Development Education Centre, Ontario Institute for Studies in Education, University of Toronto. Address: 62 Wellesley Street West, Suite 1906, Toronto, Ontario, Canada M5S 2X3. E-mail: janeknight@sympatico.ca.

For over 20 years now, the definition of internationalization has been the subject of much discourse. Internationalization is not a new term. The term has been used for centuries in political science and governmental relations, but its popularity in the education sector has really only soared since the early 1980s. Prior to this time, international education was the favored term and still is in some countries. In the 1990s, the discussion on using the term international education centered on differentiating it from comparative education, global education, and multicultural education. Today, in the first decade of the 21st century, another set of related terms is emerging that includes *transnational education*, *borderless education*, and *cross-border education*.

The term *borderless* first appeared in Australian and U.K. reports in 2000. Basically, the term refers to the blurring of conceptual, disciplinary, and geographic borders traditionally inherent to higher education. It is interesting to juxtapose the term borderless education with *cross-border* education. The former term acknowledges the disappearance of borders while the latter term actually emphasizes their existence. Both approaches reflect the reality of today. In this period of unprecedented growth in distance and e-learning education, geographic borders seem to be of little consequence. Yet, there is growing importance attached to borders when the focus turns to regulatory responsibility, especially related to quality assurance, funding, and accreditation.

New Working Definition

It is interesting to look at the way in which definitions can shape policy and how practice can influence definitions and policy. Given the changes in the rationales, providers, and the delivery methods of cross-border higher education, it is important to revisit the question of definition and ensure that the meaning reflects current changes and challenges. It is increasingly clear that internationalization needs to be understood at the national and sector level as well as at the institutional level. Therefore, a new definition is needed that encompasses both levels and the dynamic relationship between them, as well as reflecting the realities of today.

A challenging part of developing a definition is taking into account its application to many different countries, cultures, and education systems. This is no easy task. At issue is not developing a universal definition but rather ensuring that the meaning is appropriate for a broad range of contexts and countries of the world. Thus it is important that a definition does not specify the rationales, benefits, outcomes, actors, activities, or stakeholders of internationalization as these elements vary across nations and from institution to institution. The critical point is that the international dimension relates to all aspects of education and the role that it plays in society. With this in mind the following working definition is proposed:

Internationalization at the national, sector, and institutional levels is defined as the process of integrating an international, intercultural, or global dimension into the purpose, functions or delivery of postsecondary education.

The term borderless first appeared in Australian and U.K. reports in 2000. Basically, the term refers to the blurring of conceptual, disciplinary, and geographic borders traditionally inherent to higher education.

Key Concepts

The above specific terms and concepts were carefully chosen for the proposed working definition of internationalization. The term *process* is deliberately used to convey that internationalization is an ongoing and continuing effort. The term *process* denotes an evolutionary or developmental quality to the concept. Process is often thought of in terms of a tripartite model of education—input, process, and output. However, the concepts of input and output were intentionally not used in the above definition—even though in today's environment accountability and therefore outcomes are stressed. If internationalization is defined in terms of inputs, outputs, or benefits, it becomes less generic as it must reflect the particular priorities of a country, an institution, or a specific group of stakeholders.

International, intercultural, and global dimension are three terms that are intentionally used as a triad. International is used in the sense of relationships between and among nations, cultures or countries. But we know that internationalization is also about relating to the diversity of cultures that exist within countries, communities, and institutions, and so

intercultural is used to address this dimension. Finally, global, a controversial and value-laden term these days, is included to provide the sense of worldwide scope. These three terms complement each other and together depict the richness in the breadth and depth of internationalization.

International, intercultural, and global dimension are three terms that are intentionally used as a triad.

The concept of integration is specifically used to denote the process of infusing or embedding the international and intercultural dimension into policies and programs to ensure that the international dimension remains central, not marginal, and is sustainable. The concepts of *purpose*, *function*, and *delivery* have been carefully chosen and are meant to be used together. Purpose refers to the overall role and objectives that higher education has for a country or the mission of an institution. Function refers to the primary elements or tasks that characterize a national postsecondary system or individual institution. Usually these include teaching, research, and service to society. Delivery is a narrower concept. It refers to the offering of education courses and programs either domestically or in other countries. This includes delivery by traditional higher education institutions but also by new providers such as multinational companies that are often more interested in the global delivery of their programs and services than the international or intercultural dimension of a campus or research and service functions.

One of the previous definitions that has been widely used to describe internationalization is “the process of integrating an international or intercultural dimension into the teaching, research, and service functions of the institution.” This definition does not conflict with the updated definition: in fact the opposite is true, the definitions are very complementary. Because the new definition includes the national and sector level and also the growing number and diversity of new education providers and delivery methods, the more generic terms of purpose, function, and delivery are used instead of the specific functional terms of teaching, research, and service. By using the more general terms, the proposed definition can be relevant for the sector level, the institutional level, and the variety of providers in the broad field of postsecondary education.

Internationalization and Globalization

The dynamic relationship between internationalization of education and globalization is an important area of study. In order to acknowledge, but not oversimplify the complex and rather contentious topic of globalization, parameters need to be established to frame the discussion. For the purposes of this discussion a nonideological definition of globalization is adopted: the flow of technology, economy, knowledge, people, values, and ideas . . . across borders. Globalization affects each country in a different way due to a nation’s individual history, traditions, culture and priorities. Globalization is positioned as a multifaceted phenomenon and an important environmental factor that has multiple effects on education.

Globalization clearly presents new opportunities, challenges, and risks. It is important to note, however, that the discussion does not center on the globalization of education. Rather, globalization is presented as a process impacting internationalization. In short, internationalization is changing the world of education and globalization is changing the world of internationalization. In fact, substantial efforts have been made during this past decade to maintain the focus on the internationalization of education and to avoid using the term globalization of education. This has had mixed results but some success has been achieved in ensuring that the relationship between these two terms is recognized, but that they are not seen to be synonymous and are not used interchangeably.

Defending Academic Freedom as a Human Right: An Internationalist Perspective

Balakrishnan Rajagopal

Balakrishnan Rajagopal is the Ford International Assistant Professor of Law and Development and director of the Program on Human Rights and Justice, Massachusetts Institute of Technology. E-mail: braj@mit.edu.

Defenders of academic freedom in the United States have argued for it as a professional or constitutional right of the individual or, less frequently, as an institutional right of the academy. Its practice has been quite vigorous in this country, especially when compared with its fate in closed political systems such as China’s. Since the terrorist attacks of September 11, 2001, however, perceptions of threats to academic freedom have changed. Now, it seems, the war on terror has extended to academia.

Before one can defend academic freedom, however, it must be defined. A principal question is whether it limits an academic's freedom to expressive and associational activity in that person's field of specialization, or whether it provides for a general freedom to engage in any expressive activity that does not constitute a violation of existing laws. Does it, for example, prohibit an engineering professor from expressing her views on war in the classroom? An unduly narrow definition of academic freedom does not fit its historical development in the United States. Nor does it reflect the role of the academic as a citizen.

But how real is academic freedom for all academics in the United States right now, regardless of their national backgrounds and citizenship status?

Historically, academic freedom in the United States was influenced by 19th century German ideas, but it has been defended at least since the formation of the American Association of University Professors and the adoption of its 1915 *Declaration of Principles on Academic Freedom*. But how real is academic freedom for all academics in the United States right now, regardless of their national backgrounds and citizenship status? Should it concern us that foreign-born U.S. academics have fewer rights than their native-born peers? If so, how should we react? I will argue that it is important to protect the academic freedom of everyone in U.S. academia, including the foreign born. A startlingly high number of foreign-born academics and students are in the United States, and therefore, many people could potentially be affected adversely by ill-conceived measures that interfere with basic rights. Such a possibility must concern us all in the current political climate. Since foreign-born faculty, researchers, and students are not entitled to full constitutional protection under U.S. domestic law, the only way to ensure academic freedom for them would be to argue for it as a human right.

How serious is the threat to academic freedom and how widespread is it globally? Worrying signs suggest that as freedom of expression, opinion, and association come under threat as a result of the global war on terror, academic freedoms are also being targeted. In the United States, some academics have reportedly been pressured because of their views on the antiterror war. A number have been singled out for being unpatriotic and dangerous by conservative foundations; others have been more directly challenged over their selection of course materials or their opinions.

As I noted, a major concern is that in the United States, many academics may potentially be subject to harsh laws that do not provide basic guarantees of rights. A 1999 survey by the U.S. Department of Education reported that out of a total of 590,937 faculty members in the United States, 94.4 percent were U.S. citizens, and 5.6 percent were noncitizens. This statistic is important, because in the United States, as in many other countries, not all constitutional rights automatically apply to noncitizens. Partly because of this difference in the treatment of citizens and noncitizens in the domestic laws of many countries, most countries have agreed upon a universal set of minimum human rights that apply to everyone in their territories.

But how secure is academic freedom as a constitutional right for U.S. citizens? As I said above, it has traditionally been defended in the United States on two grounds: as a constitutional and legal right of the individual under the First Amendment and as an institutional right of the academy. As the U.S. Supreme Court famously stated in 1967 in *Keyishian v. Board of Regents*, "academic freedom . . . is . . . a special concern of the First Amendment, which does not tolerate laws that cast a pall of orthodoxy over the classroom."

A better approach is to defend academic freedom as a human right.

Human Right to Academic Freedom

As I have pointed out, a focus on constitutional rights for individuals remains inadequate for protecting the academic freedom of all scholars in the United States. A better approach is to defend academic freedom as a human right. To say that something is a human right is to assert two things: first, that protecting such a right does not depend on national legal systems, but on international law; and, second, that transnational action, including that by international agencies, becomes legitimate for protecting such rights. In the current political climate, only this argument has a reasonable prospect of ensuring uniform respect for the academic freedom of all scholars working in American institutions of higher education.

Academic freedom can be asserted as a human right in two ways. One is to defend it as a human right to free expression; the other is to defend it as a human right to education. Freedom of opinion and expression are protected as human rights by Article 19 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights (ICCPR), a treaty ratified by most countries, including the United States. The right to education is guaranteed by Article 13 of the International Covenant on Economic,

Social, and Cultural Rights (ICESCR), which most countries have ratified, although the United States has not. The ICCPR does not subject the right to hold opinions to any restriction, while freedom of expression can be curtailed only on specified grounds, such as protection of public order or national security, through legal measures that are deemed necessary. The covenant therefore subjects academic freedom to restrictions similar to those imposed by U.S. law. For example, the United States could legitimately discriminate against noncitizens under the ICCPR and prevent the application of Article 19 to private educational institutions. For noncitizen scholars working in the United States, this does not provide extra protection.

The effort to defend academic freedom as a human right makes sense from a theoretical perspective as well.

In 1999, through the ICESCR, the United Nations recognized academic freedom as part of a human right to education. As the organization's Committee on Economic, Social, and Cultural Rights stressed, the "right to education can only be enjoyed if accompanied by the academic freedom of staff and students." The committee further emphasized that, in its experience, "staff and students in higher education are especially vulnerable to political and other pressures which undermine academic freedom." This approach—recognition of the importance of core civil and political rights, such as academic freedom, for the protection of economic, social, and cultural rights such as education—is an interesting and innovative way to defend academic freedom. Unfortunately, the covenant does not mention in any detail issues such as individual academic freedom, university autonomy, or the right of members of academic institutions to participate in self-governance. Such matters are left for the jurisprudence of the committee.

The effort to defend academic freedom as a human right makes sense from a theoretical perspective as well. There are at least two ways to understand academic freedom. One is as an individual right, a collection of all the expressive freedoms that any member of the academic community has as an individual, including the rights to free expression, opinion, and association. This view defines academic freedom as a subset of a larger category that needs no special protection. The United States, where academic freedom is subsumed under the First Amendment, takes this approach, as does South Africa, where the constitution mentions it as part of the right to free expression.

A second way to think about academic freedom is as a right to education that has individual and collective dimensions that can only be discharged through complex relationships between students, faculty, institutions, the government, and the society. In this sense, academic freedom is not only an end, as it is under an individualistic conception. It is also the means for realizing other important ends, including individual freedoms that go beyond expressive freedoms to encompass all freedoms such as nondiscrimination. The ICESCR expressly states that education "shall be directed to the full development of the human personality."

Indeed, a human right to education injects an ethical dimension into academic freedom by broadening the objectives of education. That is, academic freedom exists so that individual professors and their institutions can pursue important educational objectives. Conversely, the right to academic freedom can be defended as an essential part of a right to education. In other words, academic freedom is not simply an individual right to something, but it is also a collective right for the realization of important societal goals. In our global age, these goals are themselves global, embodied in the idea of human rights.

A different version of this article appeared in *Academe*, the journal of the American Association of University Professors.

The Costs and Benefits of World-Class Universities

Philip G. Altbach

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

Everyone wants a world-class university. No country feels it can do without one. The problem is that no one knows what a world-class university is, and no one has figured out how to get one. Everyone, however, refers to the concept. A Google search, for example, produces thousands of references, and many institutions call themselves "world class"—from relatively modest academic universities in central Canada to a new college in the Persian Gulf. This is an age of academic hype, with universities of different kinds and in diverse countries claiming the exalted status of world class—generally with little justification. Those seeking to certify "world classness" generally do not know what they are talking about. For example, *Asiaweek*, a respected Hong Kong-based magazine produced a ranking of Asian universities for several years until their efforts were so widely

criticized that they stopped. This article attempts the impossible—to define a world-class university, and then to argue that it is just as important for academic institutions to be “national” or “regional class” rather than to seek to emulate the wealthiest and in many ways most elitist universities.

This article attempts the impossible—to define a world class university.

Charles W. Eliot, president of Harvard for almost 40 years in the late 19th century, when asked by John D. Rockefeller what it would take to create the equivalent of a world-class university, responded that it would require \$50 million and 200 years. He was wrong. At the beginning of the 20th century, the University of Chicago became a world-class institution in two decades and slightly more than \$50 million—donated at the time by Rockefeller himself. The price has ballooned, not only because of inflation but because academic institutions have become immensely more complex and expensive. The competition has also become much fiercer. Now, it might take more than \$500 million along with clever leadership and much good luck.

There are not many world-class universities. Higher education is stratified and differentiated. We are concerned here only with the tiny pinnacle of institutions seeking to be at the top of national and international systems of higher education. In the United States, the number of top universities is small. The Association of American Universities, generally seen to be the club of the elite, has just over 50 member universities (many of which are not world class), a number that has grown only modestly since it was established in the early 20th century—out of a total of more than 3,500 academic institutions. Even in the United States, very few universities have managed to claw their way up to the top echelons. In other countries, the number of top-tier institutions is also limited, even when, as in Germany, all universities are basically treated the same in terms of budgets and mission by the government. The most elite universities are located in a small number of countries—in the mid-1980s, the *Asian Wall Street Journal* listed among the top 10 only 4 not in the United States (Cambridge and Oxford, Paris-Sorbonne, and Tokyo).

It is, of course, the judgment of others that carries a university into the rarified ranks of world-class institutions, and no one has figured out how to conduct an appropriate international evaluation. We do not provide such guidelines here, but this discussion may be the first step toward at least developing relevant criteria.

Definitions

Few have attempted to define a world-class university. The following characteristics are by no means agreed upon by teams of experts—this is an effort to create some benchmarks that will provide the basis for debate and analysis. The dictionary defines world class as “ranking among the foremost in the world; of an international standard of excellence.” Fair enough, but in higher education, who decides? We can at least point to some relevant characteristics necessary for world-class status.

Excellence in research underpins the idea of world class—research that is recognized by peers and that pushes back the frontiers of knowledge. Such research can be measured and communicated. But if research is the central element, other aspects of a university are required to make outstanding research possible. Top-quality professors are, of course, central. And to attract and retain the best academic staff, favorable working conditions must be available. These include arrangements for job security—many countries call it tenure—and appropriate salaries and benefits, although academics do not necessarily expect top salaries. The best professors see their work as a “calling”—something to which they are committed by intellectual interest and not just a job.

Excellence in research underpins the idea of world class—research that is recognized by peers and that pushes back the frontiers of knowledge.

Academic freedom and an atmosphere of intellectual excitement is central to a world-class university. This means that professors and students must be free to pursue knowledge wherever it leads and to publish their work freely without fear of sanction by either academic or external authority. Some countries permit unfettered academic freedom in the nonpolitical hard sciences, but place restrictions on it in the more sensitive social sciences and humanities. In most countries, academic freedom also extends to expression of opinions by members of the academic community on social and political issues as well as within the narrow confines of professional expertise.

The governance of the institution is also important. World-class universities have a significant measure of internal self-governance and an entrenched tradition, usually buttressed by statutes, ensuring that the academic community (usually professors, but sometimes including students) has control over the central elements of academic life—the admission of students, the

curriculum, the criteria for the award of degrees, the selection of new members of the professoriate, and the basic direction of the academic work of the institution.

Adequate facilities for academic work are essential—the most advanced and creative research and the most innovative teaching must have access to appropriate libraries and laboratories, as well as to the Internet and other electronic resources. With the increasing complexity and expansion of science and scholarship, the cost of providing full access becomes ever higher. While the Internet has meant some cost savings and has eased access to many kinds of knowledge, it is by no means a panacea. Facilities go beyond labs and libraries—staff and students must have adequate offices as well.

Academic freedom and an atmosphere of intellectual excitement is central to a world-class university.

Finally, and central to the academic enterprise, adequate funding must be available to support the research and teaching as well as the other functions of the university. Not only is maintaining a complex academic institution expensive, support must be consistent and long-term. The cost of maintaining a research university continues to grow because of the increasing complexity and cost of scientific research. Universities cannot benefit from many of the productivity increases due to automation—teaching and learning still generally require professors and students in direct contact. Funding is a special challenge in the present environment because governments are disinvesting in higher education in many countries. Academic institutions are everywhere asked to pay for an increasing part of their budgets through tuition and fees to students, generating funds by consulting and selling research-based products, and other revenue generating activities. The fact is that public support is necessary for research universities everywhere. Only in the United States and to a lesser extent Japan do private research universities of the highest rank exist. And in the United States there are significant government subsidies through government research grants and access to loans and grants to students. The top private institutions have significant endowments as well. The American tax system, which provides for tax-free donations to nonprofit institutions such as universities, is a major factor in permitting the growth of world-class private universities. Research universities have the ability to generate significant funds through a variety of

means, but there is no substitute for consistent and substantial public financial support. Without it, developing and sustaining a world-class universities is impossible.

Caveats

A realistic and objective perspective is needed when thinking about world-class institutions of higher learning. For most countries, even large and relatively wealthy ones, only one or two world-class universities are possible or even desirable. For many countries, a world-class university is beyond the ability of the nation to support. Research universities are at the pinnacle of a differentiated academic system in a country—the rest of the system is just as important as its top.

Even the best universities are not the best in everything. Harvard does not rank at the top in engineering, for example. It might be more appropriate for many countries and institutions to focus on building world-class departments, institutes, or schools—especially in fields that are of special relevance to the national or regional economy or society. For example, Malaysia has focused on such disciplines are informatics and rubber technology, areas that are important to the local economy. A small number of highly ranked institutions are somewhat specialized. For example, the California Institute of Technology is a small university focusing almost exclusively on the sciences, yet it ranks fourth in the United States according to *U.S. News and World Report*. The Indian Institutes of Technology, which specialize in limited fields, are highly regarded in India and internationally. At the same time, these institutions provide educational opportunities in a wide range of disciplines, permitting students to choose and ensuring the possibility of interdisciplinary work.

A realistic and objective perspective is needed when thinking about world-class institutions of higher learning.

No one has figured out how to rank universities internationally, or even within countries in ways that are acceptable to the academic community or that can withstand serious critiques. There are many rankings of academic institutions—and these generally emphasize the characteristics relating to research university status. Yet, few of these have been conducted by official organizations or reputable research organizations. Newspapers or magazines have done most and, as noted, only a few are taken seriously. Thus, we have neither national rankings

that make sense nor a widely accepted definition of what a world-class university is so that such an institution can be recognized or, for that matter, aspired to. It is not enough to quote what U.S. Supreme Court Justice Potter Stewart said about pornography, “I know it when I see it.”

Overemphasizing attaining world-class status may harm an individual university or an academic system.

Overemphasis

Overemphasizing attaining world-class status may harm an individual university or an academic system. It may divert energy and resources from more important—and perhaps realistic—goals. It may focus too much on building a research-oriented and necessarily elite university as the expense of expanding access or serving national needs. It may set up unrealistic expectations that harm faculty morale and performance.

The concept of a world-class university reflects the norms and values of the world’s dominant research-oriented academic institutions—especially the United States and the major Western European countries. The idea is based on the German research university that came to dominate academic thinking at the end of the 19th century, especially with the acceptance of this model in the United States, Japan, and other countries. While all of the world’s universities are essentially in the Western tradition, the world-class ideal of the research university is a special variation of that tradition. The American sociologist David Riesman observed in the 1950s that U.S. universities were missing out on diverse academic goals and ideas because of a “meandering procession” that almost all were following in an effort to become like Harvard, Berkeley, and a few other key research-oriented institutions. The same criticism can be made now, as universities around the world seem to be orienting themselves to this single academic ideal. Institutions, and nations, need to carefully assess their needs, resources, and long-term interests before launching into a campaign to build world-class institutions.

Universities operate in both national and global contexts. The world-class idea is in the global sphere. It assumes that the university is competing with the best academic institutions in the world and is aspiring to the pinnacle of excellence and recognition. National and even regional realities may be different. They

relate to the need of the immediate society and economy and imply responsiveness to local communities. The nature of academic performance and roles may differ when relating to these different contexts. To label one world class while relegating the others to the nether regions of the academic hierarchy is perhaps inevitable, but nonetheless unfortunate. How to relate to these varying realities is not easy, but it is of central importance.

Perspectives

The debate about world-class higher education is important. Government and academic planners in countries such as China, where several top universities are self-consciously trying to transform themselves into world-class institutions are considering the topic. In other countries, such as in South Korea, people are giving serious attention to the idea. Britain, traditionally the home of a number of top institutions, worries that it is losing its competitive edge.

The world-class debate has one important benefit—it is focusing attention on academic standards and improvement, and on the roles of universities in society, and of how academic institutions can fit in a higher education system within a country and in the global academic universe. Striving for excellence is not a bad thing, and competition may spark improvement. Yet, a sense of realism must be a part of the equation, and sensitivity to the public good as well. The fuzziness of the concept of a world-class university combined with the impossibility, so far at least, of measuring academic quality and accomplishment makes the struggle difficult. Indeed, it might well be the case that the innovative energies and resources of higher education should be focused on more realistic and perhaps more useful goals.

Acknowledgments: This article has benefited from the ideas and writings of Wang Yingjie of Beijing Normal University, Pang Eng Fong and Linda Lim of Singapore Management University, and Henry Rosovsky of Harvard University. I am also indebted to the ideas of Edward Shils, Max Weber, and John Henry Newman concerning the nature of the university. ■

Internet Resources

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

Evolving Great Universities in Small and Developing Countries

Pang Eng Fong and Linda Lim

Pang Eng Fong is professor and director of the Wee Kim Wee Center at the Singapore Management University. Address: SMU, 469 Bukit Timah Rd., Singapore 259756, Singapore. E-mail: efpang@smu.edu.sg. Linda Lim is professor of corporate strategy and international business at the University of Michigan-Ann Arbor. E-mail: lylim@umich.edu.

These are challenging times for most universities, particularly public universities in developing countries. Budget constraints have compelled many to cut costs and programs. At the same time, changing expectations have thrust upon them new functions and roles. In East Asia, for example, public universities are expected to become more research oriented and link up with industry to enhance national economic competitiveness. To do so effectively, it is assumed they must aspire to “world-class” status and transform themselves into institutions that can compare favorably with the best in the West.

And the best in the West, it is widely accepted, are in the United States. U.S. universities are rightly renowned for their excellence and creativity. Their research has spawned ideas and products that have changed America and the world. Less well known is the fact that American colleges and universities are highly differentiated in size and orientation. Their diversity allows specialization and gives the system resilience. American universities, especially the research-oriented ones, however, are not without their critics. Detractors have indicted them for being too focused on research to the detriment of their teaching and public service obligations.

The U.S. Model: Can It Be Emulated?

The issue for universities in small or developing countries is whether the U.S. research university model is the right one to emulate, given that it has evolved in response to particular conditions and circumstances. A related question is whether less-well-endowed countries are prepared to give their universities the resources over an extended period of time to enable them to compete for faculty with highly ranked U.S. universities.

In most other countries, national universities are state-funded comprehensive institutions. They don’t have the scale and diversity of the United States or its ready access to a huge global pool of scholarly talent or to ample research funds from private as well as state sources.

In U.S. research universities, faculty research in most scholarly disciplines is evaluated in terms of publication in peer-reviewed academic journals. In this process, scholars in the same field review research paper submissions and decide whether they are worthy of publication in a particular journal. The most “highly ranked” journals tend to be those with the “purest” disciplinary focus.

Faculty whose interest is interdisciplinary and topical, or in place-specific or policy-oriented research, may have difficulty getting published in the top “internationally refereed” journals, thus defined. Research questions important in small and developing countries may not be of interest to the global discipline. And empirical data may not be available for sophisticated testing methodologies to be used.

Much depends on the subject area or discipline concerned. In pure science, there may be only a single global benchmark for research excellence. But in the humanities, social sciences, and many professional disciplines, global disciplinary benchmarks may not adequately capture local and regional specificities.

In most other countries, national universities are state-funded comprehensive institutions. They don’t have the scale and diversity of the United States or its ready access to a huge global pool of scholarly talent or to ample research funds from private as well as state sources.

Intangibles

The “global standards” that are the hallmark of U.S. research universities may be adapted with some effort by other countries. More difficult to replicate are the intangibles such as the strong tradition of academic research and debate, protection for academic freedom, intellectual autonomy, faculty governance, and cultural tolerance and diversity.

These intangibles both encourage research and enable teaching pedagogies that interactively engage students and lecturers in critical thinking and open discussion. They attract people to join the profession despite monetary rewards often substantially below those in other sectors and professions.

*Special Focus: Accreditation—The Debate Continues**The Importance of a Local Core*

In East Asia, as in other regions, universities are part of the national intellectual capital. While there is growing acceptance that foreign ideas and talent are necessary, it is also important to nurture a core of local faculty to give stability, local character, and cultural and intellectual rootedness to publicly supported universities.

Foreign scholars hired mainly for their orientation toward publication in international refereed journals are unlikely to have the knowledge, interest, or incentive to advance locally relevant research.

Evaluating faculty for promotion primarily on the basis of research publications in “top international (disciplinary) journals” may discourage place-specific applied research and publication. Such an approach deprives the nation of local knowledge and policy-relevant research. It also impoverishes the intellectual climate and cultural life, and stunts the development of local capabilities.

Foreign scholars hired mainly for their orientation toward publication in international refereed journals are unlikely to have the knowledge, interest, or incentive to advance locally relevant research. Some may use their positions to enhance their own global mobility. The best outcome may then be an institution no different from that of a local branch campus of a foreign research university. The country would be subsidizing research by foreigners for the world market. While it may add luster to the scholarly reputation of the foreigners, the research that is published may be quite irrelevant to the needs of the country that finances it.

In many Asian countries, a large number of local and foreign private educational institutions already exist to satisfy private demand for manpower training. National state institutions must play other roles that for-profit, especially foreign, institutions cannot—that is, research (especially place-specific research), and engagement with the community and with policymakers. This social and public role is vital to the development of civil society and the quality of life.

Balancing Global Standards and Local Needs

The challenge for small and developing countries aspiring to create world-class institutions of higher learning is to balance international academic standards with

national needs and local identity and culture. For example, Singapore, which has three universities, can become the place in the world to learn about Southeast Asia in particular disciplines, by developing local channels for research publication by local and foreign scholars that become global standards in their particular scholarly niches.

As in Europe, Australia, and Japan, local institutions and scholars must play an active role in defining truly global—as distinct from derivative American—standards. At the same time, scholars who choose to conduct the kind of research favored by international refereed journals should continue to do so. Flexibility, sensitive adaptation, and time to adjust and mature are key to getting the best out of the U.S. research university model.

Fortunately, some of the best features of the model are neither costly nor time consuming to implement. They include: more nuanced admissions, student and faculty evaluation criteria—away from narrow reliance on grades, journal article counts, and numerical rankings and point scores; a shift from state direction to faculty control of academic life and institutions; and the vigorous contention of different ideas, perspectives, and people, in the context of “safe spaces” for all intellectual discourse. Countries that want world-class universities should also be prepared to make appropriate social and political adjustments.

U.S. Higher Education: Long Reach Abroad with Tight Borders at Home

Thomas J. La Belle

Thomas La Belle is executive director, International and Area Studies, at the University of California, Berkeley. Address: 360 Stephens Hall, U.C. Berkeley, Berkeley, CA 94720-2300. E-mail: tlabelle@uclink.berkeley.edu.

In the article, “Academic Colonialism in Action: American Accreditation of Foreign Universities” (*IHE*, no. 32, summer 2003), Philip Altbach doesn’t see problems in establishing U.S. institutions abroad, but he does see U.S. accreditation of institutions in other countries as a means of international colonialism and standardization. In response, this article argues, first, that it is unreasonable to disconnect the spread of U.S. higher education abroad from accreditation and, second, that the U.S. accreditation process also needs to be seen as a way of limiting foreign institutions from operating in this country.

The Demand for U.S. Accreditation

It seems clear that through collaboration, exchange, and technical assistance, U.S. institutions have influenced the practice of higher education abroad for more than 50 years. This includes the offering of degrees, certificates, and diplomas through branch campuses and on-line courses. It also includes the recent largescale extension of for-profit institutions abroad aimed at purchasing and partnering with host country universities that sometimes provide the facade for U.S.-based operations. Combined with institutions from other countries also offering courses of study beyond their borders, there is often considerable competition to meet high demand for postsecondary study. With so many institutions active, it shouldn't be surprising that some desire U.S. accreditation for both self-protection from competition and to adopt what are perceived to be more-advanced U.S. practices. Demand for U.S. accreditation by foreign universities is also sought for at least two other reasons: so foreign students can more easily transfer to U.S. institutions and, more rarely it seems, so that they can operate a branch campus or offer programs at a distance in the United States.

Demand for U.S. accreditation by foreign universities is also sought for at least two other reasons: so foreign students can more easily transfer to U.S. institutions and, more rarely it seems, so that they can operate a branch campus or offer programs at a distance in the United States.

Foreign Institutions Seeking a U.S. Presence

With U.S. institutions so active abroad, one might think it would be logical for foreign universities to be similarly active here. In reality, however, there seem to be relatively few international institutions operating in the United States. Take Mexico, as an example. Given the long border uniting the two countries physically, and the large Hispanic population in the United States, one might expect Mexican universities to offer programs here. There are some Mexican institutions (Universidad de Monterrey, Universidad de las Americas, the Fundacion de las Americas-Puebla, and the Instituto Tecnologico de Monterrey) accredited by the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools (SACS), the agency in this country that claims to have sole authority for accred-

iting institutions south of the border. Nevertheless, only one, the University of Mexico appears to have a branch or offer programs in the United States. That institution, however, in existence in San Antonio since 1944, is not accredited.

While other foreign institutions have a presence in the United States, their number and visibility are minimal.

While other foreign institutions have a presence in the United States, their number and visibility are minimal. In effect, the same accreditation that legitimizes institutions abroad is used as a screen in the United States to prevent foreign institutions from operating here. Beyond the U.S. value system, which acts as a constraint against such operations, the process required to operate in the United States is expensive and time consuming, and there is no assurance that the investment will result in a business success. If an unaccredited institution from another country wishes to open a branch campus in the state of California, the following steps must be taken: secure a business license from the secretary of state; meet the laws of the state for issuing degrees and diplomas; become accredited as an institution; and, depending on what programs are offered, be accredited by a particular professional accrediting organization (e.g., nurses, school teachers, and physical therapists).

Let's assume that this fictional institution has its business license and wants to open a branch in California and is not accredited by the Western Association of Schools and Colleges (WASC). Its opening is governed by California's Private Postsecondary and Vocational Education Reform Act of 1998, along with the state's Code of Regulations. The application that needs to be filed looks like it came from an accrediting organization. It requires, for example, a statement of mission, organizational structure, governing board, degree programs, faculty, and methods of instruction. The issues that must be addressed include ensuring academic freedom, means for guaranteeing student rights and confidentiality, class size, policies on governance, tuition and fees, physical facilities, library resources, student services, a business plan, providing appropriate access to information, curricula, policies regarding financial aid, student loans, graduation requirements, general education requirements, transfer policies, and so on.

U.S. Accreditation as a Barrier

Beyond filing the application, which reeks of U.S. assumptions about educational structure and organization, the institution needs to begin the process of becoming accredited by WASC. The phases to the WASC process include establishing a viable track record of several years as a functioning institution, followed by a two-year eligibility phase, and then a four-year candidacy period. While these processes are underway, the institution must be in operation and hence financed, including the implementation of the elements mentioned above.

A niche in the higher education marketplace must be found to enable the institution to support itself financially during this period. Competition with California's public higher education system, along with the extensive number of private institutions in existence there, requires a study of potential student demand, up-front funding, solid planning, and considerable luck. Success depends, among other things, on the programs and their quality, the institution's credibility and legitimacy, tuition and fees (and financial aid), geographic access; and comparative advantage to the student. For example, will the international institution bring name recognition to legitimate its offerings? Will the institution have unique expertise or provide internships or a career connection in either the United States or in the institution's home country?

U.S. accreditation provides protection for the dominance of U.S. higher education.

Conclusion

U.S. accreditation provides protection for the dominance of U.S. higher education both abroad and at home. It helps to standardize practice (e.g., Carnegie unit, letter grading, and academic calendar) elsewhere based upon U.S. institutional traditions. It enables foreign institutions to stand out from their local counterparts and foreign competition based on U.S. values and legitimacy. And, such accreditation enables foreign institutions to transfer students to U.S. institutions as well as, potentially, to offer courses at a distance or through branch campuses in the United States. Finally, holding U.S. accreditation at arm's length for those institutions seeking to operate in the United States further legitimates and protects U.S. dominance at home. As suggested at the beginning, it's the long-term interaction between and among U.S. institutions and others, along with U.S. accreditation, that has fed the demand for accreditation abroad. In effect, U.S. accreditation is only one aspect of the ongoing globalization process, one that has interactive and reinforcing twists and turns. ■

Cambodian Accreditation: An Uncertain Beginning

David Ford

David Ford assists with curriculum development in the Department of Chemistry, Royal University of Phnom Penh. Address: Chemistry Department, Royal University of Phnom Penh, Russian Blvd., Phnom Penh, Cambodia. E-mail: dford@online.com.kh.

Much-needed, long-recommended legislation for accreditation of higher education institutions in Cambodia has recently been passed, which it is hoped will provide a framework for the orderly development and expansion of the higher education sector. However, some last minute amendments made to the law by the executive level of the government may mean that it does not achieve its intended purpose.

Cambodian higher education is on the periphery of the international scene—barely able to access it, let alone participate or contribute to it. The system is so small and poor that it is of little interest to the international market in higher education. Few international providers have entered, perhaps also discouraged by “unofficial costs,” estimated at 30 to 40 percent. The postsecondary sector is small by international standards at about 51,000 students, or about one-twentieth and one-thirtieth the size of the higher education sectors of Vietnam and Thailand, respectively. But a demographic bulge of babies born since the conflict will soon create a huge need for higher education places. Public institutions are handicapped by low civil service salaries and the historical legacies from Cambodia's extraordinarily turbulent recent past. Almost all of the recent growth has been in the private sector. But in the absence of a legal framework or clear recognition and accreditation procedures most of these institutions, with only a few notable exceptions, are offering a narrow range of similar business-related courses with quality that varies from good to appalling.

In 2001, the Ministry of Education, Youth, and Sport (MoEYS) requested and obtained a major grant from the World Bank to develop a new legal framework for higher education that would define institutions, establish a mechanism of national accreditation, allow public higher education institutions to become more autonomous, establish a credit transfer system, and rationalize the scholarship program. At the request of the MoEYS, experts from Australia, the United States, and France consulted extensively with stakeholders and presented a draft law to the Council of Ministers in March 2002. The promise of a World Bank loan and reform project that would have addressed many of the systemic weaknesses was given as an incentive. But the loan was

dependent on the establishment of a regulatory environment such as the new legislative framework would have provided.

There was a long delay before the government responded, during which an unprecedented number of institutions gained official recognition. Until recently, official recognition of private institutions has not followed a clearly defined process. In July 2002, parts of the new draft higher education law were excerpted and passed as a subdecree, on the “Criteria for Establishing Higher Education Institutions.” But unfortunately, the new law proved to be an impotent policy instrument since some institutions that the MoEYS reviewed and failed to recommend—due to lack of adequate curricula, facilities, or academic faculty—were, nevertheless, subsequently “established.” Since the first private postsecondary institution was recognized in 1997 there have been only one or two new institutions recognized per year. But in 2002 there were 12. Like many Asian countries, Cambodia has a long history of autocratic leadership and decisionmaking that sometimes goes against official stated policy.

More recently, key features of the draft law were amended by the Council of Ministers; their removal effectively eliminated the independence and broad stakeholder participation of the proposed Accreditation Committee of Cambodia (ACC) and its nomination committee, resulting in a greater concentration of central control in spite of the government’s stated policy direction toward decentralization. The MoEYS rejected the proposed amendments, but the law was subsequently passed by the Council of Ministers, as amended, on March 31, 2003.

Until recently, official recognition of private institutions has not followed a clearly defined process.

The new accreditation body and its secretariat are now centered in the Council of Ministers and staffed by civil servants. The participation of other stakeholders, like donors, was reduced to a possibility of invitation only and, in the case of committee members with previous experience in accreditation in other countries, reduced to advisers. The final form of the law is a model of central government control, which is similar to the system of Cambodia’s immediate neighbors, Vietnam and Thailand—neither of which could be said to have independent accreditation bodies. Members of the ACC have already been appointed by the government without apparent reference to the nomination procedure outlined in the new law.

These events might be interpreted in several ways. On the one hand, the World Bank loan might not have represented an incentive to the Cambodian government, which may have been unwilling to increase the national debt to finance developments in a sector that serves the wealthiest two quintiles of the population. On the other hand, the notion of an independent ACC challenged some well-established traditions of hierarchy and power.

It is an unfortunate consequence of the last 30 years of civil disorder and Cambodia’s lack of the human resources that laws are being written by foreign experts with assumptions of meritocracy and independence that challenge cultural traditions of hierarchy and power.

Are these events unexpected? Perhaps in light of the extensive consultations and the assurances from “the top” that there were no serious difficulties with the draft version, the last-minute amendments are surprising. Are these events unprecedented? It is an unfortunate consequence of the last 30 years of civil disorder and Cambodia’s lack of the human resources that laws are being written by foreign experts with assumptions of meritocracy and independence that challenge cultural traditions of hierarchy and power. A similar pattern of events has occurred in the forestry sector, demobilization of the military, anticorruption legislation, and international adoptions legislation. In all of these cases, new laws that have challenged powerful, politically connected vested interests have been obstructed, or if legislation was passed then actual enforcement has been weak.

The immediate effect of the amendments to the new law is the loss of the World Bank loan that would have financed most of the reforms necessary to strengthen higher education and, in particular, the public part of the sector. These include most importantly an independent and professional ACC, as well as upgrading staff, improving management, and strengthening libraries and IT networks.

It remains to be seen how the new ACC will function. Due to chronic shortages of human resources, people with the necessary expertise are not available locally and without external funding, it seems unlikely that they will be easily recruited. Most of the original draft law remains unchanged. The requirements for accreditation are still in place—

including definitions of institutions, minimum standards, the necessity for a foundation year, credit transfer, and transparent financial procedures. If they are applied fairly, then the new law may still achieve its intended purpose of providing a regulatory framework for the sector. But if the ACC simply becomes a paper tiger—or worse, a tollgate—then official accreditation may have little effect on improving the quality of the higher education sector.

A weak higher education sector does not bode well for Cambodia's future. There is increasing recognition of the importance of higher education in national development. Cambodia is tipped to be the first "least developed country" to join the WTO in September of this year, and its participation regionally is increasing. Graduating 7 to 10,000 students every year from narrow, weak programs almost certainly means that however bright the students, they will be ill-equipped to satisfy the development needs of the country or compete internationally.

American Accreditation of Foreign Universities: Proceed— with Caution

Barbara Brittingham

Barbara Brittingham is deputy director, Commission on Higher Education at the New England Association of Schools and Colleges. Address: NEASC, 209 Burlington Road, Bedford, MA 01730, USA. E-mail: bbrittingham@NEASC.org.

In the summer 2003 issue of *International Higher Education*, Philip Altbach argues against American accreditation of colleges and universities in other countries. He writes that as an academic superpower, the United States should not practice this kind of "academic invasion" and that granting American accreditation abroad is an act of "academic colonialism." While I agree with many of his observations, I wish to support a somewhat different conclusion.

Regional accrediting agencies are approached regularly by institutions abroad. The motivations vary, in part because American regional accreditation is both the gold standard and not well understood. Sometimes the reasons relate to marketing or "branding," as when institutions ask what form they have to fill out for accreditation so they can get an .edu Internet address. Another inappropriate reason for seeking regional accreditation occurs when an institution mistakes it for an ISO 9000-like international stamp of quality. Indeed,

interest and sincerity and even eagerness on the part of the applying institution should not be sufficient reason for American accreditors to become involved. Nor should the siren call of international travel for staff or team members motivate us into accrediting institutions abroad.

What, then, are the appropriate reasons? The clearest case for accrediting abroad involves places that identify themselves as American-style institutions of higher education. Attaining American regional accreditation validates their claims and is of great worth locally, given the paucity of consumer information and secondary school help for students choosing a higher education institution. In an article in the January/February 2003 issue of *Foreign Affairs*, "Hate Your Policies, Love Your Institutions," John Waterbury, president of the American University of Beirut, argues eloquently for this validation in places where institutions claiming to offer American-style education are otherwise essentially unregulated. Indeed, this consumer protection role is one of the functions American accreditation serves at home.

Also, just as in the United States, the standards of regional accreditation, when appropriate to the founders' goals, can provide a useful framework for new institutions abroad, as they develop, from ideas to degree programs to institutions of higher education with the probability to endure and improve. Because regional accrediting standards are the articulated expectations of the community of (American) higher education—and not a set of bureaucratic regulations—those wishing to begin new universities find that the standards provide a useful roadmap and that the process of peer review offers collegial support and feedback.

The challenge here concerned defining American-style higher education or the limits to which American accreditation should appropriately be applied.

The challenge here concerned defining American-style higher education or the limits to which American accreditation should appropriately be applied. The widespread adoption of taught courses, credit systems, and even forms of (something like) general education means that these curricular structures, at least by themselves, do not define American-style higher education. Increasing variation in regionally accredited institutions at home also makes defining what's American about American higher education more challenging. How do Americans define American-style

higher education? Experience suggests there are as many definitions as there are American academics considering the question—maybe more.

Another key question, and one to which Altbach alludes, is whether regional accreditors have the capacity to accredit institutions of higher education in other countries. Language is one issue; I would argue that regional accreditation ought not to consider institutions other than those using English as a principal language of instruction and operation. Even if visiting teams can be composed to work in another language, commissions and their staff will have incomplete access to the information about the institution.

Capacity issues must also include the ability to help the team visitors and the commissions deal with local regulations and local culture, at least at some level. To what extent should the system accommodate—or even encourage—adapting an American-style institution to local conditions? Inherently, having the capacity to address considerations will make the process more expensive, and the cost must be borne largely by the institution seeking accreditation or some beneficent third party.

I would argue that regional accreditation ought not to consider institutions other than those using English as a principal language of instruction and operation.

Accrediting institutions abroad is not the only international activity of American accreditors—and arguably not the most important. Hosting international visitors who want to learn from us as they build their own system is one useful way that American accreditors work internationally. We also help build capacity elsewhere by serving internationally on accreditation boards, participating in the on-site visits, and working with colleagues in their locations while they create an accreditation system to serve their country. National systems of accreditation (government systems all, unlike the United States) are developing throughout the world. And, as Altbach suggests, the ability of countries to work together regionally through their quality assurance systems has great potential to support the mobility of students and scholars, the cooperation of institutions, and a multidimensional international agenda for higher education. ■

Russian Private Higher Education: Alliances with State-Run Organizations

Dmitry Suspitsin

Dmitry Suspitsin is a research assistant at Pennsylvania State University and is a PROPHE collaborating scholar. The study on which this article is based was sponsored by the Social Science Research Council. Address: 410 Boucke Bldg, International Programs, Pennsylvania State University, University Park, PA 16802, USA. E-mail: das336@psu.edu.

IHE 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. See <http://www.albany.edu/~prophe>.

Russian private higher education is about a decade old. While it shares many features of private sectors of higher education worldwide, one of its prominent traits is hardly addressed in the private higher education literature: considerable public involvement in the creation of Russian private higher education institutions and continued association of private institutions with various state-supported organizations and public resources.

There are currently over 500 private institutions (as compared with 620 public ones), accounting for roughly 10 percent of enrollments in higher education. Generally located in metropolitan and large urban centers—such as Moscow, St. Petersburg, Kazan, and Novosibirsk—these institutions mainly offer market-related programs in economics, law, psychology, sociology, social work, business administration, and other fields that do not require much investment in equipment and research infrastructure. They are characterized by responsiveness to the needs of the labor market, flexibility of course offerings and curricula, frequent use of learner-centered instructional methods, heavy reliance on part-time faculty, tuition dependence, loose admissions requirements, limited concern about research, and many other features typically ascribed to private institutions worldwide. Only a handful of Russian nonstate institutions have acquired a reputation for high-quality education, with the majority offering degrees that are still questioned by employers and the general public. Like private higher education elsewhere and unlike the privatization in industry, Russian nonstate higher education institutions were not created by turning public institutions into private but rather by organizing new institutions, virtually from scratch.

Russia's private higher education institutions are commonly referred to as "nonstate" institutions in legal documents and in public discourse, connoting the state's limited role and its separation from the private sector.

While nonstate institutions are not funded by the central government, they receive considerable support and resources from other state-run organizations and agencies, and their connection to the governmental structures is much closer than they declare it to be. In fact, various state-related organizations have been actively participating in the process of founding private institutions. Their participation was particularly pronounced in the early years of Russian private higher education development. According to the law, nonstate institutions can be established by organizations, individuals, or the mixture of the two. At present, roughly half the institutions have mixed founding entities, while a quarter come from organizations alone, and only the remaining quarter are founded by private individuals.

Only a handful of Russian nonstate institutions have acquired a reputation for high-quality education, with the majority offering degrees that are still questioned by employers and the general public.

Various central government structures are involved in founding private institutions. Among their founders and cofounders, particularly in Moscow, it is not unusual to encounter state ministries and committees and subcommittees of the state Duma (parliament). In the provinces, regional and local administrations and city authorities are also frequent founding organizations. While some of these governmental organizations are necessary for nonstate institutions in symbolic terms, others bring real, palpable assets. The assistance from the government does not typically involve direct funding but rather provision of access to other resources, such as physical plant and buildings. Institutions created in such a way usually are very willing to publicize their connection to the government to gain stability and social acceptance.

Perhaps the most active actors in the founding of nonstate institutions are the state-supported, public colleges and universities, and specialized research institutes and academies, including the Russian Academy of the Sciences, the Russian Academy of Education, and academic, research-oriented institutions operating under the auspices of various ministries. According to the Association of Nonstate Institutions of Higher Education, over half the nonstate institutions of higher education include these academic public institutions as founding or cofounding entities.

Considerable variation exists in the kind of interaction between public and private institutions and in the influence of the founding public universities and research

institutions over governance affairs of the private ones. A sizable number of nonstate institutions were created based on decisions of public universities' academic councils or of motivated high-ranking administrators—particularly rectors, deputy rectors, and deans. In such instances, the newly established private institutions have a public university and private individuals (e.g., rectors) among their founding entities, and they are typically housed within public institutions, sharing all the resources of the founding public university—including libraries, sports facilities, dormitories, research laboratories, and other assets. Although they are separate statutory bodies legally, many nonstate institutions established in this way are quite dependent on their founding public counterparts, informally governed by rectors of public institutions, and in effect operating as branches of these public institutions. Other nonstate institutions are administratively independent and are engaged in mutually beneficial relationships with their parent public institutions.

The fact that many institutions are established by private individuals or businesses may often give a misleading impression of independence from state-run organizations. In reality, many of these institutions are closely linked to governmental structures through networks of formal and informal connections and seek to take a share of public resources. Indeed, the informal involvement of government officials in the governance of private companies, including higher education institutions, is very common in Russia. Private businesses often seek closer ties to officials and coopt them into closer association with their companies. Additionally, these linkages manifest themselves through nonstate rectors' connections with the government in cases when the rectors are former public officials who still retain extensive contacts in the government.

Many of these institutions are closely linked to governmental structures through networks of formal and informal connections and seek to take a share of public resources.

Thus many “private” or “nongovernment” higher education institutions in Russia are heavily dependent on interlocking relationships with the government and various publicly run organizations. In a country with extensive statist traditions, this nexus may be a necessary condition for the legitimacy and survival of nonstate higher education institutions. ■

Higher Education in the Gulf: Privatization and Americanization

James Coffman

James Coffman is director of International English and Professional Programs at the University of California, Davis Extension. Address: UC Davis Extension, 1333 Research Park Drive, Davis, CA 95616. E-mail: jcoffman@unexmail.ucdavis.edu.

The six-member nations of the Gulf Cooperation Council (GCC)—Kuwait, Saudi Arabia, Bahrain, Qatar, the United Arab Emirates, and Oman—are undergoing an astonishing development of their higher education landscapes that has attracted keen interest on the part of other Arab countries. In line with their increasingly freewheeling and booming private sectors, higher education has been characterized over the last five years by exponential growth in the number of institutions, a dependence on the private sector to provide education that meets the needs of the market, and the unquestioned dominance of the American university model.

Growth in Demand

The populations of the GCC nations are rising dramatically as the result of an overall annual growth rate of over 3 percent. Roughly 60 percent of the population is under 16 years of age. Until the mid-1990s, the governments focused most of their attention and resources on handling the exploding numbers at the primary and secondary levels. The production of university graduates was of considerably less urgency, as these countries had grown accustomed to the luxury of importing foreign experts to perform the necessary technical and managerial functions. Indeed, universities in the Gulf rarely date back more than 30 years; and in the case of Bahrain and Oman, their two public universities came into existence just 17 years ago. When throngs of secondary graduates began pouring out of the schools in the mid-1990s demanding university training, Gulf governments found themselves hard-pressed to satisfy the demand through existing institutions.

As Gulf nations have sought rapid modernization over the last 30 years, they have all made the education of females—a recognized hallmark of modernity—an element of their educational policies, albeit within the strict guidelines of Islam and traditional tribal customs. Females are still very rarely permitted by their families to go abroad for university study, thereby making local study their only option. Thus, while tens of thousands of Gulf males go to universities abroad and relieve local universities of some of their burden, the exploding number of female graduates must be educated in their

countries. In general, about 60 percent of graduates of Gulf universities today are female (although only a small percentage of these graduates ever enter the workforce). And the fact that most public higher education in the Gulf is segregated by sex makes the university enterprise more expensive in terms of its efficient use of faculty, staff, and facilities.

World events of the last two years have given a strong impression to Gulf nationals that the United States is no longer a safe and welcoming place for them to live as university students. The number of GCC students applying to U.S. universities has dropped significantly. Some GCC governments have decided to transfer a large portion of their scholarships hitherto designated for study in the United States to Canadian universities. Although the exact numbers are not yet known, it is certain that at this time many students who would have normally gone abroad to study, either on scholarship or on their own funding, are staying in their countries and seeking Western-quality programs locally. This has further increased demand.

A final factor contributing to the exploding demand for higher education is the growing population of children of the enormous expatriate communities living long-term in the GCC. In Saudi Arabia and Kuwait, expatriates make up over half of the population; in Qatar and the United Arab Emirates, noncitizens make up a full 80 percent of the population. Once considered temporary guestworkers, these groups have gradually become more entrenched and have raised families in country. The first waves of thousands of their children coming out of secondary schools are now seeking university places in the Gulf. As they have usually been excluded from public universities as noncitizens, the private sector is their only option.

All the GCC nations have, in the last five years, come to see the authorization and expansion of private higher education institutions as the solution to their educational woes.

Privatization as the Solution

In a remarkable concurrence in policy, all the GCC nations have, in the last five years, come to see the authorization and expansion of private higher education institutions as the solution to their educational woes. Saudi Arabia, Kuwait, Bahrain and Oman have all seen their first private universities open within the

last two years, with strong public support and praise by their governments. Some are purely local institutions funded by investors, while others are either joint ventures with foreign universities or satellite campuses of the latter. While the recent decision by Cornell University to set up a full-fledged medical school campus in Qatar has received much attention, a long list of less high-profile projects are in the works, involving U.S., Canadian, British, Australian, and Indian universities seeking to cash in on a very promising market. The United Arab Emirates, the first GCC country to authorize private higher education, now finds itself in possession of a dizzying array of private institutions that are quickly eclipsing the government universities. The governments of Qatar and the UAE have set aside tracts of land in order to create high-prestige “university cities” to attract Western universities. In a budding rivalry, Qatar and the UAE have both announced their ambitious desire to become the regional pole for world-class higher education, eventually attracting students from the Maghreb, the Levant, the Indian subcontinent, and beyond.

Gulf governments see privatization as more than a simple solution to unmanageable numbers; they have also vaunted private higher education as a means of ensuring the quality of instruction and the relevance to market needs that have been missing from public universities.

Gulf governments see privatization as more than a simple solution to unmanageable numbers; they have also vaunted private higher education as a means of ensuring the quality of instruction and the relevance to market needs that have been missing from public universities. Few Gulf education officials will dispute the fact that their universities have been characterized by mediocre faculty, outdated teaching methods, and poor materials and facilities. The region’s secondary and university graduates have always lagged far behind graduates in East Asia and other developing nations. As indigenization of the workforce has become a priority in every GCC country, the fact that local graduates of public universities lack the required skills has become painfully obvious. The prevailing notion today is that private institutions will be in competition with each other and more in tune with the needs of the private sector, thereby guaranteeing courses of study of international standard leading to employment.

The American Model Rules Supreme

The most striking characteristic of the rapidly evolving Gulf higher education sector is the wholesale adoption of the American university model as the sole standard. While the British and Australians have set up a number of degree programs and even campuses in the Gulf, they still operate in the shadow of the American behemoth that has already gained preeminence throughout the region. (The continental Europeans are completely absent from the landscape.) In his excellent description of the worldwide impact of the demand for American accreditation of foreign institutions, Philip Altbach states that the “imprimatur of U.S. accreditors is perceived to give a significant advantage to foreign institutions.” (*IHE*, no. 32, summer 2003). Nowhere is this more true than in the Gulf, where not only is American accreditation highly sought, but any quality university program of study must be as thoroughly American as possible, from its American name to its curriculum, faculty, and campus architecture. Among the dozens of private universities established in the region within the last three years, it would be difficult to find a single one that has not publicized either its partnership or affiliation with an American university or the fact that its curriculum has been designed in cooperation with an American institution. Kuwait’s first private university, opened in 2002, proclaims that “the University of Missouri at St. Louis is providing the institution with curriculum development assistance, as well as an exchange program.” The new Al Mazoon College for Management and Applied Sciences in Oman announces on its website that the institution has signed an affiliation with the University of Missouri-Rolla, which has approved its curriculum and syllabi. The private universities now springing up in conservative Saudi Arabia are all seeking an American imprimatur through some sort of collaboration.

This headlong rush toward adoption of the American educational model has certainly been facilitated by the Gulf region’s lack of a strong academic and intellectual tradition outside of Islamic studies. With little of the historic and cultural inertia that one would find in the Levant or the Maghreb, there is no real resistance to this Americanization of higher education. The cultural and religious strictures to be respected in each country—in fundamentalist Saudi Arabia in particular—tend to center around the logistics of segregation of the sexes and the inclusion of mandatory culture and religion courses. But they do not constitute a major obstacle to the adoption of the American model and the Western notion of secular science. Even the use of English as a medium of instruction has been embraced without reservation, in contrast to the bitter confrontations in other parts of the Arab world over the use of former colonial languages over Arabic.

Countries and Regions

The Gulf region is one of economic dynamism, cosmopolitanism, and lofty ambitions. With their self-confidence and heady optimism, they may well succeed in building up a solid base of American-model, largely private universities that will offer the type and quality of training that the millions of students in the region will find seductive. As an alternative to spending years in the United States, it is very possible that in coming years thousands of students from India, Pakistan, Iran, Turkey, Egypt, and Palestine will seek their American degrees in Qatar, Kuwait, or the UAE in universities devoid of American students. In a region in which the United States is both admired and detested, these institutions could end up playing a cultural and political role they haven't yet considered.

High Fee Market for Australian Universities?

Simon Marginson

Simon Marginson is director of the Monash Centre for Research in International Education at Monash University, and an Australian Research Council professorial fellow. Address: Faculty of Education, Monash University, Victoria 3800, Australia. E-mail: simon.marginson@education.monash.edu.au.

The Australian government has announced a major reform of fee structures and loan arrangements in higher education, to be introduced from 2005. The plan modifies Australia's income-contingent, government-administered Higher Education Contribution Scheme (HECS); extends government-backed student loans to the private sector; and creates the first large-scale, full-fee market in undergraduate education. It would generate a significant cost shift from government to students and their families. However, the new policies have yet to pass the Senate, the Australian upper house.

Before the Reforms

Two decades ago government was almost the sole funding source, and tuition was free. By 2001, following the HECS and fee-based markets in international and postgraduate education beginning in the late 1980s and the entrepreneurial transformation of the 1990s, governments covered only 47 percent of costs and student fees and charges, 37 percent.

In total, 35 percent of the costs of Australian universities were met by national government grants for teaching domestic students; 17 percent were financed by students through the HECS; other government income, mostly for research, made up 10 percent; and other private income, 28 percent. Finally, 11.4 percent was collected from international students.

The HECS functions in effect as a low-interest loan for tuition. Managed by government, not the universities, and set at standard rates varying by discipline—it covers a varying proportion of actual costs, with the balance paid by government—the HECS is repaid through income tax once the ex-students' annual income reaches threshold level. The HECS debt accumulates and is adjusted annually via the inflation rate, with no other interest charge. One-fifth of students pay the HECS at a discounted rate. Monies equivalent to student HECS obligations are passed from government to universities as income. The HECS is a relatively painless form of tuition charge: studies have suggested that for full-time students, deterrent effects are almost neutral as to student socioeconomic status, though the level of the HECS has been raised since these studies were carried out.

New Policies

Under the Liberal-National party government's proposals, outlined by education minister Brendan Nelson, HECS-funded higher education has been fixed at a maximum "learning entitlement" of five years. Universities will vary the HECS as they see fit, up to 30 percent above present standard levels and as low as zero to boost enrollments. The University of Sydney has already announced that it will fix all HECS charges at the maximum rate and many others are expected to follow. To "sweeten" the increase in HECSs the government has promised to raise the income threshold triggering HECS repayments by 23 percent.

The HECS is a relatively painless form of tuition charge: studies have suggested that for full-time students, deterrent effects are almost neutral as to student socioeconomic status, though the level of the HECS has been raised since these studies were carried out.

In addition to HECS undergraduate (bachelor-level) places, universities will also be able to offer full-fee places to undergraduates for 50 percent of all places in each course. Many of these places are likely to be filled as the government will introduce a Higher Education Loan Program (HELP) to cover student fees. HELP loans will be subject to interest based on inflation plus 3.5 percent and will be extended also to approved private-sector institutions. The new policies would establish a viable fee-based market in both the prestigious public universities, especially programs with high private

returns such as law and medicine, and the private sector. Public universities now enroll 98 percent of all higher education students, but under this scenario the private sector will grow significantly.

Part of the promised increase in public funds is conditional on changes to governance structures, the introduction of performance management, and the replacement of collective bargaining with individual contracts.

The higher-status “sandstone” universities of Sydney, Melbourne, Queensland, Adelaide, and Western Australia and the newer postwar foundations of New South Wales and Monash are expected to be the chief beneficiaries. They would charge the top HECS rate and offer many full-fee places, ploughing increased private revenues into research programs, while becoming less dependent on high-volume sales of international education. Other institutions would generate less private revenues; and the promised increases in public funding, via regional loadings, the conversion of marginally funded places to full funding, increments for good teaching performance (agreed indicators are yet to be devised), and higher grants per student would be insufficient to compensate for a shortfall in revenue.

Part of the promised increase in public funds is conditional on changes to governance structures, the introduction of performance management, and the replacement of collective bargaining with individual contracts. Some vice-chancellors are pessimistic about their ability to secure these changes. Other changes in the policy package include scholarships for low socioeconomic-status-background students, albeit at only U.S.\$1,500 per year; extra places in teaching and nursing, where there are shortages; initiatives to better university teaching; funds for promoting international education in new markets, and subsidizing off-shore enrollment by domestic students, financed by increased visa charges (strongly opposed by the universities); and the extension of audits by the Australian University Quality Agency to off-shore operations that have been the subject of recent controversies.

However, the main changes are the variable and increased HECS, full-fee places, and the HELP scheme and its extension to the private sector. This is a bold neoliberal reform that shifts the ground from under the subsidized HECS as a near universal and equitable basis for financing domestic students, substituting a high-cost status market, with direct buyer-to-seller relations, at the

center of the system. The university sector would be remodeled to resemble secondary schools, where almost 40 percent of students are in private institutions, led by a high-fee independent sector modeled on British schools.

The proposed policies have the support of the Australian Vice-Chancellors’ Committee. However, student and faculty groups are opposed; the package conflicts with a long equity tradition in universities and is publicly unpopular; and the policies have yet to be passed by the upper house in the Australian Parliament (the Senate), where there is an antigovernment majority. The federal opposition, the Labour Party, opposes full-fee places and the proposed increases in HECS, and would introduce a modest increase in public funding instead. Some kind of package will eventually pass the Senate, as Australian universities are in financial difficulties, but whether the main features will survive Senate negotiation is unclear.

Japan’s National Universities Gird Themselves for the Latest Wave of Reform

Martin Finkelstein

Martin Finkelstein is professor of Education at Seton Hall University and was visiting professor, in 2002–2003, at the Research Institute for Higher Education, Hiroshima University, Japan. Address: Department of Education Leadership, Management and Policy, 418 Kozlowski Hall, Seton Hall University, South Orange, NJ 07079. E-mail: finkelma@shu.edu.

The foundation of Japan’s national universities is about to be shaken—perhaps a lot, perhaps only a little, depending on whom you ask—by a “new” reform initiative of a scope perhaps not seen since the Allied occupation post–World War II. Betting that the “key” to the future economic resurgence of Japan lies in the creation of a world-class infrastructure for research and development at its national universities, the Ministry of Education has undertaken two major concurrent initiatives designed to introduce competitive market mechanisms into the system: (1) the authorization for the national universities to incorporate as public corporations with a Board of Trustees, independent (at least theoretically) of the ministry; and (2) the authorization and incentive for academic units across the public system to move away from the tenure system toward fixed-term contracts as the basis for faculty appointments. Both these reforms are widely viewed (although not explicitly advertised as such) as a new phase in the “Americanization” of the Japanese system.

During the 2003–2003 academic year, I spent seven months as a visiting professor at Hiroshima University, one of the “major” national universities, and witnessed the transition firsthand.

The Before

For those less familiar with the Japanese system, we begin with the basic observation that it is much more continental European (specifically Germanic) in organization (without the *Länder*) than American. It is a quintessentially bureaucratic system, animated by rules for autonomous operation of self-contained academic units. The Ministry of Education interacts directly with individual academic units on the various campuses of the national universities—variously known as faculties (focused on undergraduate education), graduate schools, and research institutes and centers. These units are relatively independent of the university campus administration, a minimalist infrastructure that resembles university administration in the United States at the turn of the 20th century—albeit minus the all-powerful president (in Japan, the national university president resembles the titular head of a “loose” confederation of warlords who owe their only true allegiance to the king—the ministry bureaucracy. They operate quasi-autonomously, but within the web of “royal” rules and regulations established by the ministry and enforced by unit administrators who serve as the “in-residence” eyes and ears of the ministry.

Over the past decade, the Japanese national universities have been refocusing their energies on becoming world-class centers of research, science, and technology.

Over the past decade, the Japanese national universities have been refocusing their energies on becoming world-class centers of research, science, and technology. So, organizationally speaking, the major development over the past decade has been the growth in the sheer number (and small size) of such autonomous academic units at the national universities, particularly research units (variously labeled institutes or centers, of which any specialized academic field may boast at least several) and graduate schools. Unlike most other nations, the public sector in Japan has *not* been asked to assume major responsibility for expanding access to the younger generation. Indeed, in Japan, it is the large and explosively growing private sector that has over the past generation expanded to absorb the masses—now 500

institutions compared to the 99 national universities. And when enrollment plunges over the next decade, it will be the private sector that will be most vulnerable; and the national universities will be able to pursue the national goal of research excellence relatively undisturbed by market forces.

The Japanese academic profession has had the best of all worlds—a marked insularity from market forces and an extraordinary continuity in financial support.

At least in the public sector, then, the Japanese academic profession has had the best of all worlds—a marked insularity from market forces and an extraordinary continuity in financial support. Tenure has been a basic condition of employment (appointment); and there has been remarkably little pressure on the public sector. In part, this is the way of all social institutions in Japan—taking on a life of their own and being relatively impervious to changing external circumstances—as much as any defining characteristic of the university sector, *per se*. Moreover, and this is a defining characteristic of the Japanese enigma, this relative insularity coexists with an historically well-developed and lavishly (government-) supported program of bringing foreign scholars to Japan and sending Japanese scholars abroad.

The After, or the In-Between

To what extent will Japanese higher education be reshaped in the image of American higher education? How “independent” of the ministry will these new corporate entities be? Who will the trustees be and how will they be selected? Will a new breed of president emerge at the public campuses, reminiscent of the William Rainey Harpers and Nicholas Murray Butlers of the American university, or the corporate CEOs of today’s U.S. research universities? Will corporatization give rise to a vast administrative infrastructure in the Japanese universities, heretofore barely discernible, that will compete with the traditional faculties for influence in academic decision making? Will the introduction of performance funding, a nontenure system, and other market mechanisms increase faculty mobility and research productivity? Or, will it lead to the “casualization” of academic labor as we have seen in the United States and Australia and the increasing specialization of the faculty role along functional lines (teachers only, researchers only, program administrators only)? Will academic life become radi-

cally different for the new generation of Japanese academics who will be called upon to lead the Japanese system to world-class status? To what extent will the tenure (or nontenure) revolution be consummated, or successfully resisted by the faculties? And, even if successfully implemented, will a fixed contract system lead to any more mobility and productivity than a tenure system? This is a dubious outcome if we take the results of the Harvard Project on Faculty Appointments seriously (see, for example, Richard Chait's book, *The Questions of Tenure*). More generally, will these American forms actually transform Japanese academic culture or merely superimpose themselves as an external shell on a functionally autonomous system? Can competition be infused into an inherently noncompetitive and bureaucratic culture?

These are very uncertain times for Japanese academics. The older generation approaches the implementation of these reforms with considerable trepidation—probably the first such period in a half century. And the younger generation remains silent, working harder than ever and wondering about paradise lost.

Will New Higher Education Legislation Be Approved in France?

Christine Musselin

Christine Musselin is a professor at the Centre de Sociologie des Organisations FNSP-CNRS, 19 rue AmÉlie, 75007 Paris, France. E-mail: c.musselin@cso.cnrs.fr.

Although no new legislation has been enacted since the Savary Act of 1984, French universities have undergone some major transformations within the last two decades. They have coped with a second wave of massification (the number of university students increased by 72 percent between 1980 and 2000), introduced many job-oriented curricular reforms, enhanced their interaction with the local environment, and, above all, become institutions with more governance, after the introduction of four-year contracts between each university and the Ministry of Education at the end of the 1980s. These developments were able to occur even without modification of the 1984 law—although the law was often described as incompatible with strong university governance because it introduced additional deliberative bodies, increased the number of elected members within them, and prevented professors from exercising a position of power.

Nevertheless, there is a limit to what can be achieved within the existing constraints. The tensions over the transformations that have been launched mean the existing regulations need at least to be adjusted. Some current rules and statutes have clearly become counterproductive, retarding the emerging institutional autonomy of French universities. This situation has been criticized and discussed by many French academics involved in university management.

Some current rules and statutes have clearly become counterproductive, retarding the emerging institutional autonomy of French universities.

Most of the measures included in the draft version of the higher education modernization act that was circulated in late spring 2003 in France were intended to address the existing obstacles. Unfortunately, the ministry's timing for initiating this project (i.e., future legislation) coincided with the government's push for a reform of the pension system. As a result, the Ministry of Education faced demonstrations from many high school teachers over the extension of the retirement age as well as over two further measures (the decentralization of some technical high school staff and retrenchments on nonteaching staff positions). The project received a rather cool reception, and many union representatives expressed their concerns about the lack of a preliminary consultation process. In order to concentrate on just one front, the minister, Luc Ferry, decided to withdraw the project for a while and to delay its negotiation until fall 2003.

Interpreting the Negative Reactions

At first glance, the uneasy reaction to the first draft is quite difficult to understand. First, this project, contrary to many past reforms, is not directed at completely reforming the French university. Its content is indeed much more dedicated to continuing an already existing trend, following policies introduced by the previous (socialist) government. Second, and of course linked to this first reason, most of the proposed measures (with few exceptions) are not new. They suggest modifications that were developed, presented, and discussed in recent years and that everybody expected to find. Alternatively, the new law would stipulate already implemented reforms—such as the introduction of the licence, master's, and doctorate structure as the new way to organize study programs in France. Moreover, very few of the measures

are compulsory. Most of them offer universities the possibility, if they wish to, of changing their status, merging with others, or redefining their internal structure, etc.

Thus, even if the way the project was prepared can be criticized, the content of the draft should not, by itself, evoke so much dispute and should not have led some university councils to pass motions opposing it. It is quite surprising to see university bodies voting against a whole project (not only against some measures of it) that is intended to give universities greater autonomy and to allow them to make decisions they cannot presently make without the agreement of the ministry. One should probably not exclude from consideration the view that these reactions are directed more at the government's appetite for reforms and cuts in the whole French public system (of which universities are a part in France) than at the project itself.

Nevertheless, this opposition can also be understood as a response to certain other aspects of the project that, first, were not part of the debates until now or, second, cannot be considered as a simple loosening of existing constraints. The creation of "strategic boards" (*comité stratégique de pilotage*) in charge of defining the general development policy and budget of a university, with no representatives from the particular university sitting on the board, clearly created opposition of the first type. The French Conference of University Presidents reacted negatively to this point, and this measure will probably be redesigned or abandoned if the project comes under discussion in the fall.

This is seen by some opponents to the new act as risking the dismantlement of "French higher education as a national public service."

But two other proposals that have evoked opposition of the second type, are more significant because they both entail a large potential for change: the introduction of global budgets and the development of assessment processes on the outcomes of the four-year contracts (between universities and the ministry). With these two measures, the project clearly associates more autonomy in university management with more accountability and with output-based evaluation. If they were to be implemented the measures could bring about some important changes because up to now evaluation in France has essentially been input-based: the ministry assesses the quality of the projects presented by the universities (strategic plans, research projects, and curricular programs, etc.) rather than the results

produced by these projects. With the new act, "effective results" could be preferred to "good projects."

This is seen by some opponents to the new act as risking the dismantlement of "French higher education as a national public service." This could indeed occur if the ministry does not develop efficient evaluative processes. But one can also argue that if the ministry succeeds in developing results-based assessment, the control of the state over higher education would be even more effective than it is now, since the evaluation of outcomes (judging the attainment of objectives and the processes by which they are reached) often exerts a more constraining effect than the control on inputs.

On the whole, even if some aspects of the project comprise a potential for substantial change, the overall goal still has to do with continuity and the further expansion of institutional autonomy, rather than with radical and brutal transformation. Furthermore, the project clearly does not aim simply at giving more autonomy to university leaders but simultaneously increases accountability and involves rethinking (and not suppressing) the role of the state.

Some measures included in the project could benefit from reformulation, improvement, or modification after discussion, but it would be a loss to the system to reject this new act completely.

The Outlook for a Needed Project

No doubt, some measures included in the project could benefit from reformulation, improvement, or modification after discussion, but it would be a loss to the system to reject this new act completely. The French university system would then remain in its current "in-between" situation, where the central ministry is no longer in a position, and lacks the legitimacy, to mobilize the traditional steering instruments associated with centralized control and where universities are more autonomous than before but in many aspects remain very dependant on central decision making.

Will the claims about the procedural weakness of the project (the lack of previous consultation) be stronger than the need for its substantive content? Will the general distrust of the Raffarin government among French academics lead the latter to reject an act they would have looked at with less reluctance if it came from another government? These are some of the questions that will receive answers by the fall in France. *A suivre !*



Center and Periphery: Changes in the Relationship between Chinese Universities and the Central Government

Kathryn Mohrman

Kathryn Mohrman is executive director of the Hopkins Nanjing Center, Johns Hopkins University School of Advanced International Studies. Address: Johns Hopkins University School of Advanced International Studies, 1619 Massachusetts Ave NW, Washington, DC 20036, USA. E-mail: kmohrma1@jhu.edu.

As China moves toward a market system, the relationship between government and individual universities is changing dramatically. Today, university leaders can make many—but not all—decisions, reporting their results to the Ministry of Education. This shift of authority is not yet complete, however, so no one is quite sure what can and cannot be done. In addition, China is wisely pursuing pilot projects rather than wholesale reform, providing somewhat greater predictability while still changing academic life dramatically.

Financial Reforms

Universities today must raise the majority of their operating funds from such nongovernmental sources as research grants, tuition, gifts, sale of services, and income from university-run enterprises. Sometimes these revenues represent as much as 80 percent of their annual budgets. In addition, campus administrators now have substantial leeway in allocating those funds.

The trend away from the center has been reinforced by a significant reduction in the number of universities receiving support from the national government. The 211 Project (100 top universities for the 21st century) focused central resources on key universities, leaving the rest on their own. And, as the Shanghai government contributes an increasing amount to some of its universities, those institutions are under both central and municipal control.

Chinese university leaders now spend much of their time worrying about finances, a change that is not just fiscal but cultural. In traditional Chinese society, scholars were at the top of the status hierarchy and merchants near the bottom. Today, scholars have become merchants in order to support the academic enterprise. The worry, of course, is the risk of going too far in responding to market demands. Where does one draw the line? Both campus and government officials worry that traditional academic values are being marginalized in the relentless pursuit of money.

Academic Reforms

New interdisciplinary programs are being created on campuses to address specific opportunities, from environmental engineering to international business, and to counteract the narrowness of many traditional programs. Key universities also are encouraged to become more comprehensive. Formerly specialized universities can now branch out into new fields that perhaps may be more attractive and lucrative than their original missions.

Many campuses are creating general education programs, and some are even allowing students to enroll without declaring a major at the outset. Universities offer a long list of general education courses designed to encourage creativity and critical inquiry. Unfortunately, the examination system still puts a premium on memorization, so students who have opportunities for a broader education may have formed their intellects by rote rather than innovative thinking.

Many academic reforms parallel American higher education. It's almost as if some university leaders are saying, "The United States has the best higher education system in the world so let's adopt American models." The danger is that programs that work well in one culture may be a mistake in another.

Many campuses are creating general education programs, and some are even allowing students to enroll without declaring a major at the outset.

Structural Reforms

Many Chinese universities have gone from an organizational system in which all departments reported to an academic vice president, to one in which schools and colleges have been instituted to put decision making closer to the individuals involved. Chief academic officers on those campuses must be ecstatic to have fewer direct reports, although the additional structural layer increases the bureaucracy at a time when institutions are seeking greater efficiency.

One emerging change is the development of a credit system. Since transfer is virtually unheard of in Chinese higher education, the credit system gives students greater flexibility in their degree programs. They can graduate whenever they have the proper number and arrangement of credits rather than following a lockstep curriculum. Combined with the lifting of the age limit of 25 years for enrollment, the credit system makes Chinese universities more open to older and part-time students.

The Question of Autonomy

The degree of flexibility seems to vary from one campus to the next, from one week to the next. We are seeing a hybrid system with both old and new elements. Key universities must raise most of their own money, but the central government controls enrollments and tuition levels, thus determining the income stream from student resources. Similarly, the number of faculty members in each program is determined centrally, so the expense side is also out of the hands of campus decision makers. What's more, the Ministry of Education assigns individual students to universities and majors. Certainly there is discussion between ministry and campus officials, but the final say comes from the center.

Individual campuses can create their own curricula, but any new concentrations must be on the Ministry of Education's list of 248 approved majors. In fact, many reforms occur within previously approved programs because a new track can be determined at the campus level while a new program must go to government authorities. Some universities, however, are part of experimental efforts that allow them to make more decisions unilaterally.

Observations

It is a time of great opportunity as well as substantial uncertainty. The Ministry of Education creates study groups to recommend good practices in both curricular and managerial

arenas; savvy academic administrators "touch base" regularly, with the result that reforms look quite similar across campuses. But Chinese politics are hard to predict so what is permissible today may not be tomorrow—and vice versa. The government clearly believes it is devolving authority, but universities do not always feel that they have increased power. Ministry officials are also uneasy about the dangers of institutions using their autonomy to chase after profits rather than enhance academic quality. In addition, even if top officials support reforms, bureaucrats within the ministry might remain engaged in areas that have technically been delegated.

We are seeing a pragmatic trial-and-error method for university reform, with rapid adoption of successful experiments across the nation. One scholar described it as *mo shi guo he*—groping for stones while crossing the river. Another remarked that this is a unique moment in which everything is in flux, but five years hence the relationship between government and campus may become codified. The pace of change, and the opportunity for change, may diminish.

In most policy systems, authority once devolved is hard to take back. With any luck, Chinese university reform will nourish an intellectually vibrant and internationally competitive higher education system. ■

News of the Center and the Program in Higher Education

Editorial work on *The Past and Future of Asian Universities*, edited by Philip G. Altbach and Toru Umakoshi, is mostly complete. The Johns Hopkins University Press will publish this volume, which features essays on 12 Asian countries and was funded by the Toyota Foundation and the Japan Foundation. The Center's women's higher education initiative continues. Graduate assistants Francesca Purcell and Robin Helms are currently completing collection of data for our questionnaire on women's universities worldwide. We plan additional activities as well. For the past seven years, the CIHE has hosted the editorial office of the *Review of Higher Education*, one of the main journals in the field of higher education. The *RHE* is edited by Philip G. Altbach, with BC professors Karen Arnold and Ted Youn serving as associate editors. Roberta Bassett is the managing editor. Our term of editorship ends in January 2004, and the editorial office will move to the University of Houston, with Amury Nora as editor. The journal's publisher is the Johns Hopkins University Press.

Our bibliography on private higher education in international perspective is also nearing completion. This project is cosponsored with the Program on Research in Private Higher Education (PROPHE) at the University at Albany. Alma Maldonado-Maldonado is the coordinator of this project at CIHE, assisted by Hong Zhu. We expect to publish a book based on this bibliography by the end of 2003. PROPHE will continue the project with a website and additional research. CIHE and PROPHE copublished Glenda Kruss and Andre Kraak's edited volume, *A Contested Good? Understanding Private Higher Education in South Africa* in July as a contribution to international awareness of the growing phenomenon of private higher education. This book was distributed to several hundred key readers worldwide. It is available, from the CIHE, without cost to colleagues in developing countries.

Philippa Thiuri, a citizen of Kenya, joins the Center as a graduate assistant. She will also be working on her doctorate in higher education administration. Other graduate assistants working with the CIHE in 2003–2004 include Hong Zhu, Alma Maldonado-Maldonado, Roberta Bassett, Robin Helms, Francesca Purcell, and Laura Rumbley. Francesca Purcell was awarded a School of Education research scholarship to pursue her dissertation research in the Philippines. Her work relates to women's higher education in the Philippines. Alma Maldonado-Maldonado, who is writing her dissertation on Latin American higher education research networks, has been appointed assistant professor in higher education at the University of Arizona, beginning in 2004. Jef Davis, who previously served as a CIHE graduate assistant, has moved to Tucson, Arizona, where he is working on his doctoral dissertation. Dr. Damtew Teferra, the editor-in-chief of the new *Journal of Higher Education in Africa*, also serves as a research assistant professor at the CIHE. He has recently returned from Africa, where he was a keynote speaker at conferences in South Africa and Ethiopia.

CIHE director and Monan professor of higher education, Philip G. Altbach, will be a visiting professor at the University of Hong Kong in December 2003. He will also speak at a conference at Xiamen University in China at that time. Dr. Altbach will participate in a conference on doctoral education sponsored by the UNESCO European Center for Higher Education in Bucharest, Romania, in September. He is also a member of an OECD advisory group, which met in Paris in June. He is working with Dr. James Forest, a graduate of the higher education doctoral program and former CIHE staff member and currently an associate dean at the United States Military Academy at West Point, on a major higher education reference volume to be published by Kluwer Academic Publishers. *American Higher Education in the 21st Century*, coedited by Philip G. Altbach, Robert Berdahl, and Patricia Gumpert, has appeared in a Chinese-language edition published in Taiwan.

The CIHE continues to be the home for the RoutledgeFalmer Dissertation Series in Higher Education, a major book series that publishes many of the best doctoral dissertations in higher education. Several Boston College dissertations have been published in the series, including James Forest's thesis on the role of teaching in comparative perspective, Rev. John Chen's dissertation on the history of Beijing's first Catholic university, and Damtew Teferra's thesis on scientific communication in African universities within the context of external support and national needs.

The CIHE continues to receive its core funding from the Ford Foundation, with additional support from Boston College.

The African Higher Education Reference Handbook is now available

Indiana University Press has published *African Higher Education: An International Reference Handbook*, edited by Damtew Teferra and Philip G. Altbach. This 864-page volume has essays on 54 African countries and 13 themes—including academic freedom, HIV/AIDS and higher education, and financing, among others. It includes a bibliography of books, articles, and dissertations relating to African higher education. This is the most comprehensive source on this topic and will be of interest to anyone concerned with the future of African universities. A limited number of copies are available without cost to scholars based in Africa and others who are involved with higher education. Please request copies from Dr. Damtew Teferra (e-mail: teferra@bc.edu). The book is available for sale from Indiana University Press, 601 N. Morton St., Bloomington, IN 47404-3797, USA. The price is \$89.95.

Books available from CIHE

Several CIHE books remain available without cost to persons in developing countries. Please contact the Center if you wish to receive any of these books. These publications include:

Philip G. Altbach, ed., *Private Prometheus: Private Higher Education and Development*, 1999.

Philip G. Altbach and David Engberg, *Higher Education: A Worldwide Inventory of Centers and Programs*, 2000.

Philip G. Altbach, ed., *The Changing Academic Workplace: Comparative Perspectives*, 2000.

Glenda Kruss and Andre Kraak, eds., *A Contested Good? Understanding Private Higher Education in South Africa*, 2003.

International Higher Education remains available on the Center's website. We have updated our index so it is possible to find all past articles printed in *IHE*—the index is organized by topic and country for easy access.

New Publications

Borgman, Christine L. *From Gutenberg to the Global Information Infrastructure: Access to Information in the Networked World*. Cambridge: MIT Press, 2003. 324 pp \$21.95 (pb) ISBN: 0-262-52345-0. Address: MIT Press, 5 Cambridge Center, Cambridge MA 02142, USA.

Winner of the American Society for Information Science award, this book provides a multifaceted analysis of aspects of the global information infrastructure. The topics discussed include the relationship of books and libraries to the new information infrastructures, aspects of access to information, the role of digital libraries, how local institutions can fit into the global structures, and others. This book offers an international perspective relevant to universities.

Cascione, Gregory L. *Philanthropists in Higher Education: Institutional, Biographical, and Religious Motivations for Giving*. New York: RoutledgeFalmer, 2003. 165 pp. (hb). ISBN: 0-415-93361-7. Address: RoutledgeFalmer Publishers, 29 W. 35th St. New York, NY 10001, USA.

An analysis of philanthropic giving in American higher education, this study examines the motivations for giving, the kinds of people who make donations, the autobiographies of donors, and related factors. A special focus is on the religious motivations for giving to colleges and universities. This book will be relevant to understanding how people are motivated to donate to higher education.

Eckel, Peter D. and Adrienna Kezar. *Taking the Reins: Institutional Transformation in Higher Education*. Westport, CT: Praeger Publishers, 2003. 193 pp. (hb). ISBN: 1-57356-514-8. Address: Praeger Publishers, 88 Old Post Rd. West, Westport CT 06881, USA.

Based on a study of significant academic change at 23 American universities, this volume discusses the role of leadership in fostering change. The authors discuss what they see as key elements in the change process, including institutional cultures, the development of strategies for change, and others. Elements of the case studies are used to illustrate successful (and unsuccessful) change.

Fischer, Steven Roger. *A History of Reading*. London: Reaktion Books, 2003. 383 pp. £19.95. (hb). ISBN: 1-86189-160-1. Address: Reaktion Books, 79 Farringdon Rd., London EC1M 3JU, UK.

While not directly on the topic of higher education, this volume provides an analysis of the history of reading in many different cultures and periods, including a discussion of the role of publishing, the impact of reading on educational reform, libraries, and related issues. The contemporary period, with the expansion of reading on the Internet and new roles for technology, are also analyzed. This broad and critical analysis provides an excellent overview of an important topic.

Levin, Richard C. *The Work of the University*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2003. 288 pp \$24.95 (hb). ISBN: 0-300-10001-9. Address: Yale University Press, POB 209040, New Haven, CT 06520, USA.

A potpourri of speeches to a variety of audiences, this book consists of short essays on topics such as the role of liberal education, higher education and the economy, community service, and others. Because Levin is the president of Yale University, there are naturally a number of essays that focus on Yale.

Marga, Andrei. *University Reform Today*. Cluj, Romania: Cluj University Press, 2003. 292 pp (pb). ISBN: 973-610-160-6. Address: Cluj University Press, 24 Gh. Bilacu St., 3400 Cluj, Romania.

Andrei Marga, a university rector and former minister of education of Romania, provides a broad perspective on issues relating to university reform in the Romanian context. Such issues as university autonomy, the brain drain, the cultural and economic aspects of change in higher education, and related topics are discussed. One of the few analyses of Romania, this book is also relevant to other "transitional" countries in Central and Eastern Europe.

Miroiu, Michaela. *Guidelines for Promoting Gender Equity in Higher Education in Central and Eastern Europe*. Bucharest, Romania: UNESCO-CEPES, 2003. 107 pp \$15 (pb). ISBN: 92-9069-174-8. Address: CEPES, 39 Stirbei Voda St., RO-70732 Bucharest, Romania.

Perhaps the first study focusing on higher education and gender equity in Eastern Europe, this short book defines issues relating to gender equity and then discusses key topics in the Eastern European context. Among the subjects considered are the role of gender studies in universities, and the specific circumstances relating to gender relations in universities in postcommunist transitional economies.

Robins, Kevin and Frank Webster, eds., *The Virtual University? Knowledge, Markets, and Management*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press, 2002. 332 pp (pb). ISBN: 0-19-925793-0. Address: Oxford University Press, Great Clarendon St., Oxford OX2 6DP, UK.

The focus of this book is on the expanding role of technology on higher education, but the framework is wider. Contributors look at the impact of globalization, pressures from the economy, mass higher education, managerialism in administration, and related broad factors in the context of the role of technology. The perspective is critical and most of the data come from the British experience.

Siegel, David J. *The Call for Diversity: Pressure, Expectation, and Organizational Response in the Postsecondary Setting*. New York: RoutledgeFalmer, 2003. 230 pp (hb). ISBN: 0-415-94503-8. Address: RoutledgeFalmer Publishers, 29 W. 35th St., New York NY 10003, USA.

Diversity—ensuring a range of ethnic and racial variety among students and faculty—is a topic of considerable importance and controversy in American higher education. This book is a study of how diversity issues are handled at a major U.S. research university. The study looks at patterns of organizational response to diversity issues in several of the schools within the university.

Taha-Thomure, Hanada. *Academic Freedom in Arab Universities: Understanding, Practices and Discrepancies*. Lanham, MD: University Press of America, 2003. 144 pp \$27 (pb). ISBN: 0-7618-2498-7. Address: University Press of America, 4501 Forbes Blvd., Lanham, MD 20706, USA.

This book provides a general discussion of the concept of academic freedom in the West and in the Arab world and a case study of the views of a small group of Arab professors on this topic. The book is marred by many editing and other errors.

Teferra, Damtew. *Scientific Communication in African Universities: External Assistance and National Needs*. New York: RoutledgeFalmer, 2003. 170 pp. (hb). ISBN: 0-415-94530-5. Address: RoutledgeFalmer Publishers, 29 W. 35th St., New York, NY 10001, USA.

Focusing on two related topics in the context of African universities, this volume analyzes the role of scientific communication and especially how information technology has affected communications, and the related issue of how external assistance has played a role in the communications revolution in Africa. The author discusses how African scholars and scientists work and the role of scientific communications in their research.

Tiron, Stefan, Coordinator. *Higher Education in the Republic of Moldova*. Bucharest, Roma-

nia: CEPES-Unesco, 2003. 113 pp. \$20,£22 (pb). ISBN: 92-9069-175-6. Address: CEPES, Stirbei Voda 39, RO-70732 Bucharest, Romania.

An overview and analysis of higher education in Moldova, this book may be the only detailed information available in English on the subject. Among the topics considered are the historical development and structure of the higher education system, governance patterns at both the governmental and institutional levels, faculty structure and academic work, students and graduates, and related subjects. ■

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.

Our Website

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

The Program in Higher Education in the Lynch School of Education, Boston College

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

INTERNATIONAL HIGHER EDUCATION
ISSN: 1084-0613
Editorial Office
Center for International Higher Education Campion Hall Boston College Chestnut Hill, MA 02467 USA Tel: (617) 552-4236 Fax: (617) 552-8422 E-Mail: highered@bc.edu http://www.bc.edu/cihe/
Editor: Philip G. Altbach Assistant Editor: Robin Helms
<i>Material in this newsletter may be reproduced. Please cite the original source of publication. Opinions expressed here do not necessarily reflect the views of the Center for International Higher Education.</i>
<i>International Higher Education</i> is published quarterly by the Center for International Higher Education. We welcome correspondence, ideas for articles, and reports. If you would like to be placed on our mailing list, please write to the editor on your business letterhead. There is no charge for a subscription.