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The Deteriorating Guru: The Crisis of the Professoriate

Philip G. Altbach

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

Universities worldwide are becoming marketized, privatized, differentiated, and otherwise changed to meet the demands of an academic environment that stresses accountability and mass access. Higher education is increasingly seen as a “private good”—a commodity that should be subject to the logic of the market. These changes have had a profoundly negative impact on the academic profession—the heart of any academic enterprise. Working conditions and career paths for the academic profession are deteriorating. Universities often cannot attract the “best and brightest” and may even have problems luring the “reasonably intelligent and above average.”

The real crisis will be how to maintain an academic environment that will attract able scholars and scientists to the universities and at the same time recognize the challenges of mass higher education and the financial realities of the 21st century. At present, academic systems are without thinking damaging the core of the university by ignoring the needs of the professoriate. Those responsible for decision making, (e.g., senior administrators, boards of trustees, and government officials) are ignoring the academic profession as they grapple with the increasingly difficult problems facing higher education. It should be recognized that without a strong, committed academic profession, higher education cannot provide effective teaching or top-quality research. In knowledge-based economies, universities must have academic staff who are well qualified, well trained, and committed to academic work.

Traditional Realities

Not long ago, in the more successful academic systems, academics could plan on a career that was reasonably secure and offered the satisfactions of teaching and some research. Many saw university teaching as a “calling” and were attracted to the life of the mind. In the United States, most were appointed to tenure-track positions that led to secure jobs once the rigorous review process for promotion to tenure was completed. In much of Europe, academics had appointments to the civil service and the job security and status that came along with that status. Salaries were not high and did not match the incomes of other professionals with similar qualifications, but they permitted a middle-class lifestyle. There was little serious evaluation of academic performance, but a general conviction existed that almost all academics were doing a decent job. Academics enjoyed a high degree of autonomy as well as fairly secure academic freedom. The few research “stars” were rewarded mainly with high status rather than large salaries, and most were teachers who did little research. Even in many developing countries—such as India, China, Nigeria, and others—aademec was an honorable profession that, even if ill paid, provided high social status and job security.

Some would argue that it is high time for professors to be forced to compete and be subjected to the same pressures as in other occupations. Accountability and evaluation will, it is argued, get rid of unproductive “deadwood.” It is not so simple as that. The traditional culture of academe worked reasonably well, even in the context of mass higher education. Academics had a degree of autonomy, and the academic community decided on such matters as curriculum, the organization of studies, and the like. In a few places, such as Italy, the structural problems of the academic system and the conservatism of the professoriate created problems. But generally, the academic system provided acceptable quality of teaching and produced research. The conditions of academic work, even without high salaries, were generally acceptable. The academic profession attracted bright scholars who appreciated the special circumstances of university life. The combination of intellectual freedom, autonomy, and a relative lack of day-to-day accountability created an environment in which creative work could be accomplished.

Universities have responded to societal pressures by changing the nature of academic work dramatically.

New Circumstances

Much has changed almost everywhere in the past several decades. Universities have responded to societal pressures by changing the nature of academic work dramatically. Academic salaries have not kept up either with inflation or with remuneration in other professional fields. In many countries, there is no longer the expectation of a secure career. In the United States, fewer than half of new academic appointments are tenure track and full-time. Many are part time while others are a new category of full-time term positions. A decline in the number of full-time jobs means greater competition, and this has led to some unemployment of new Ph.D. graduates. Many of the most able Ph.Ds are taking jobs in other fields, including government and business where salaries are better and there is better chance for a secure fu-
ture. A growing divide exists between the minority of tenured faculty and the rest, creating a kind of two-tier academic profession.

Everywhere, increased accountability has subjected academics to bureaucratic controls and has weakened academic autonomy.

In other countries, the situation is similarly grim. The traditional employment security of the academic profession is being weakened by moving academics from the civil service. In Britain, tenure was abolished as part of a major university reform aimed at making the entire academic system more competitive. In Germany, most new academic appointments do not permit promotion, forcing many academics to compete for new positions at other universities. In Central Europe and the countries of the former Soviet Union, the traditional academic profession has been greatly weakened by changes in working conditions, deteriorating salaries, and loss of status. It is common in developing countries for academic salaries to be so poor that even full-time professors must hold more than one job. In Latin America, traditional reliance on part-time teachers has prevented the emergence of an effective professoriate.

Everywhere, increased accountability has subjected academics to bureaucratic controls and has weakened academic autonomy. As universities have become more oriented to student interests and market demands, traditional academic values have been undermined. The rise of the private sector in higher education—the fastest growing segment worldwide—has meant further deterioration of the profession because private institutions seldom provide full-time positions nor do they provide much security of tenure. A profession that thrived on autonomy and a certain detachment from direct competition is now exposed to the vicissitudes of the market.

Consequences
The future of the academic profession is uncertain, which is a problem for the success of the academic enterprise generally. What will attract bright young people to study for the doctorate when the careers—and salaries—available are marginal at best? Will academic work continue to be organized in a way that supports and rewards basic research? How will the traditional links between teaching and research be maintained so that those responsible mainly for teaching will keep abreast of current developments in their fields? Universities depend on a full-time professoriate—not only to teach but also to participate in governance and curriculum development. New patterns of managerial control vitiate traditional patterns of collegial governance and further weaken both the morale and the commitment of the academic profession. Academic morale is deteriorating in many countries, and many have noted declines in both the abilities and the numbers of those pursuing doctoral study with the aim of joining the professoriate.

The Future
Without an able and committed professoriate, universities will fail in their major mission—to provide high-quality teaching and engage in research. Without a doubt, there must be adjustments in academic work and in the organization of universities to meet the needs of mass higher education and of the knowledge economies. Further differentiation in professorial roles, more extensive measurement of academic performance, and greater flexibility in appointments are probably necessary. If the academic profession continues to decline, higher education may continue to produce graduates, but the intellectual quality of those graduates and their ability to participate in society will be placed in question. Just as important, the basic research that universities have produced will be less innovative and valuable. The future of the university lies in the hands of the professoriate.

The Opportunity Cost of the Pursuit of International Quality Standards

Judith S. Eaton
Judith S. Eaton is president of the Council for Higher Education Accreditation (CHEA). Address: CHEA, One Dupont Circle, Room 510, Washington DC 20036, USA. E-mail: chea@chea.org.

During the last several years, spurred in part by the World Trade Organization (WTO) and the current round of negotiations of the General Agreement on Trade in Services (GATS), efforts to establish a single set of international standards for higher education quality have picked up considerably. WTO/GATS sets the stage for attention to international standards by (1) including higher education as a “service” to be regulated for purposes of trade and (2) calling for “liberalizing” (expanding) trade in higher education by removing restrictions to market access and barriers to competition.

GATS does not specifically call for international quality standards for higher education as part of a trade
regime. However, two multinational organizations—the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) and the Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD)—in part reacting to GATS, are developing government-based international quality standards on the premise that these standards are essential to colleges and universities seeking to be full participants in a global society. Their efforts build on earlier work undertaken by, for example, the International Association of University Presidents (IAUP) to establish a “Worldwide Quality Register”—a means to scrutinize accreditation and quality assurance organizations based on a set of quality standards.

OECD has joined forces with UNESCO to establish an international database of reliable or “recognized” higher education institutions.

Two Major Efforts to Establish International Quality Standards

UNESCO, through its Global Forum on International Quality Assurance, Accreditation and Recognition of Qualifications, has developed a Global Forum Action Plan that would include an “education regulatory framework” for higher education quality, perhaps through updating and expanding the various UNESCO conventions to operate as “educational agreements providing international standards in the context of the growing liberalization of trade in services.” The plan also calls for development of national and regional quality assurance capacity, information tools for students, and sustainable development of higher education systems.

OECD has joined forces with UNESCO to establish an international database of reliable or “recognized” higher education institutions. OECD also seeks to develop nonbinding guidelines for cross-border higher education, intended to provide student protection, to assure clarity of information and to encourage accreditation and quality assurance cooperation among countries. The guidelines may address higher education institutions, quality assurance and accreditation organizations, recognition and credential evaluation agencies, and professional bodies.

The likely outcome of these efforts remains to be seen. Government-based solutions to international quality issues are attractive to some countries as they expand their international higher education activity. And, if there is to be international regulation of higher education quality, a number of countries prefer that this take place outside WTO/GATS. The key actors, UNESCO and OECD, are large, complex organizations with diverse constituents, and arriving at consensus will be time consuming. And, given the diverse constituencies, there is the risk that “success” may be a paper tiger: vaguely worded standards of quality that are not sufficiently robust to build trust and confidence in their reliability.

Moreover, these efforts take place in a complex environment of other—perhaps competing—efforts at standard setting driven by geographic area, mode of educational delivery, or the traditions of individual countries. Europe is engaged in a major effort, based on the Bologna Declaration, to develop regional quality standards for higher education. There are discussions of regional quality initiatives—for example, in Latin America and the Gulf states. The International Council for Open and Distance Education (ICDE), based in Norway, has developed international quality standards for distance learning. In the United States, with its long tradition of institutional autonomy, academic freedom and self-regulation of academic quality through private accreditation bodies, many people remain concerned that international quality standards may erode these traditions so vital to the success of U.S. higher education. How might these alternative efforts and traditions be reconciled—or at least coexist?

Whether or not these efforts to establish international quality standards can succeed, there are significant opportunity costs associated with their pursuit.

Opportunity Costs

Whether or not these efforts to establish international quality standards can succeed, there are significant opportunity costs associated with their pursuit. By creating an environment where attention to higher education quality in an international setting is defined almost exclusively by a debate about a single set of standards, the key actors, however inadvertently, draw energy away from other vital quality issues.

The first opportunity cost relates to developing countries. Focus on international standards appears to be at the price of the key actors giving enough priority to the needs of individual countries. At a recent OECD/UNESCO meeting in Paris, those assembled were told that at least 40 percent of UNESCO member nations lacked a reliable quality assurance capacity. How can individual countries benefit from international standards in the absence of a robust national capacity? To the contrary, they may be harmed. Absent individual nations in a position to assert their own values and culture
through their own quality assurance enterprise, the development of international standards may be dominated by more developed countries, perhaps choking off the traditions of countries that enjoy fewer resources. Although the UNESCO plan acknowledges this need, it is not clear that addressing it is a priority.

The second opportunity cost relates to higher education institutions. The focus on international standards as a government activity appears to be at the price of the key actors providing vital support to the development of a strong international voice for higher education institutions worldwide. UNESCO and OECD, organizations of governments, at least thus far prefer working outside the ambit of higher education and for the most part do not engage institutional leaders, policymakers, and academics in their deliberations. Yet, colleges and universities are among the oldest “international” institutions in the world, and their advice about whether to implement international quality standards might be quite useful. The development of international standards without the involvement of the academic community raises fundamental questions about whether such standards will ever be taken seriously—unless they are forced on institutions by government.

The third opportunity cost relates to other initiatives that these actors might undertake if they were not focusing on international quality standards—initiatives that might provide greater added value than the debate about international standards. One conspicuous example is attention to the worldwide flourishing of dubious providers of higher education: “degree mills” and “accreditation mills.” An international dialogue and frame of reference to address shoddy higher education in an international setting are badly needed. It is difficult for any single country to address this. Legal constraints are one factor here and technology is another—distance delivery of degree mills cannot be effectively addressed by a single country. The key actors would help all of higher education by working with institutions and accreditation/quality assurance organizations around the world to develop means to (1) identify rogue providers, (2) develop tools to aid students and the public in distinguishing between rogue and reliable providers, and (3) explore effective practices to discourage rogue providers.

**Conclusion**

The multinational actors described here are devoting significant energy to creating international quality standards for higher education. While it is too soon to determine whether these efforts will be successful, it is not too soon to acknowledge that there are significant opportunity costs associated with these efforts. Important quality-related issues that these actors could profitably address are receiving little, if any, attention. These include aiding developing countries in building national quality assurance capacity, contributing to the creation of a strong international voice for academic institutions about higher education quality, and addressing such pressing issues in the international environment as identification of degree mills and accreditation mills.

---

**Accra Declaration on GATS and the Internationalization of Higher Education in Africa**

*Editor’s note: The following declaration was issued by a conference held in Accra, Ghana in April, 2004. Participants from 16 African countries discussed the implications of GATS and internationalization and agreed on the following document. The conference was organized by the Association of African Universities, UNESCO, and the Council on Higher Education (South Africa). It is presented here to provide an African perspective on the continuing worldwide debate on GATS and related issues.*

**Preamble**

It is imperative to reaffirm the role and importance of higher education for sustainable social, political and economic development and renewal in Africa in a context where ongoing globalisation in higher education has put on the agenda issues of increased cross border provision, new modes and technologies of provision, new types of providers and qualifications, and new trade imperatives driving education. Higher education in Africa has to respond to these challenges in a global environment characterised by increasing differences in wealth, social well-being, educational opportunity and resources between rich and poor countries and where it is often asserted that ‘sharing knowledge, international co-operation and new technologies can offer new opportunities to reduce this gap (“Preamble to World Declaration on Higher Education for the 21st Century,” 1998, p. 19).

We participants in this workshop on the Implications of WTO/GATS for Higher Education in Africa assembled in Accra, Ghana from 27-29 April 2004:
Recalling

- the “Universal Declaration of Human Rights” (1948), Article 26, paragraph 1, which affirms that ‘Everyone has the right to education’ and that ‘higher education shall be equally accessible to all on the basis of merit
- the World Declaration on Higher Education for the 21st Century (1998), which affirms the role of higher education in the ‘consolidation of human rights, sustainable development, democracy and peace, in a context of justice’, and which asserts that ‘international co-operation and exchange are major avenues for advancing higher education throughout the world’, and further that the ‘principles of international co-operation based on solidarity, recognition and mutual support, true partnership that equitably serves the interests of the partners and the value of sharing knowledge and know-how across borders should govern relationships among higher education institutions in both developed and developing countries and should benefit the least developed countries in particular’
- the “AAU Declaration on the African University in the Third Millennium” (2001), which calls for ‘the revitalisation of the African University and for a renewed sense of urgency in acknowledging the crucial role it should play in solving the many problems facing [the] continent’, and which urges African universities to ‘give priority to effective and positive participation in the global creation, exchange and application of knowledge’ and urges African governments to ‘continue to assume the prime responsibility for sustaining their universities, in partnership with other stakeholders’ because of the ‘critical role of universities in national development’

Noting

- the negative impact of decades of structural adjustment policies and inadequate financing on the viability of higher education institutions as teaching and research institutions in Africa
- the fact that the regeneration of higher education institutions in many African countries is at an early and vulnerable stage
- the fact that regulatory regimes for the licensing/registration, quality assurance and accreditation of higher education institutions and programmes are underdeveloped in many African countries or in early stages of development accompanied by problems of poor resourcing and capacity
- the fact that various forms of internationalisation in higher education, including cross-border provision, are already underway and that national, regional and international mechanisms to foster and regulate international co-operation in higher education have been established by national governments, by regional associations and by UNESCO and other bodies
- the ambiguities, silences and lack of clarity in GATS provisions, the lack of transparency in GATS deliberations, and insufficient knowledge and understanding of the full implications of GATS for higher education, especially in developing country contexts

Declare

- a renewed commitment to the development of higher education in Africa as a ‘public mandate’ whose mission and objectives must serve the social, economic and intellectual needs and priorities of the peoples of the African continent while contributing to the ‘global creation, exchange and application of knowledge’ (“AAU Declaration on the African University in the Third Millennium”). We therefore caution against the reduction of higher education, under the GATS regime, to a tradable commodity subject primarily to international trade rules and negotiations, and the loss of authority of national governments to regulate higher education according to national needs and priorities.
- continued support for multiple forms of internationalisation in higher education which bring identifiable mutual benefits to African countries as much as to their co-operating partners in other countries and regions. We therefore re-affirm our commitment to reducing obstacles to international co-operation in respect of knowledge creation, exchange and application, to the enhancement of access to higher education and to increasing academic mobility within Africa itself.
- a commitment to the strengthening of national institutional capacity and to developing national and regional arrangements for quality assurance, accreditation and the recognition of qualifications, and to greater co-operation and exchange of information on quality assurance issues relating to cross-border provision, including active support for and participation in activities to give effect to the Arusha Convention and to NEPAD objectives.
- a commitment to engagement with the political, educational and economic implications of GATS for higher education in Africa. We therefore call on African governments and other African role players to exercise caution on further GATS commitments in higher education until a deeper understanding of GATS and the surrounding issues is developed and a more informed position is arrived at on how trade related cross-border provision in higher education can best serve national and regional development needs and priorities on the African continent.
Resolve to
• promote greater availability of information on GATS and Higher Education in Africa, and more debate and discussion among relevant stakeholders in order to increase understanding of the potential dangers and/or opportunities from having cross-border higher education regulated by GATS.
• promote further research on the nature and extent of cross-border provision in Africa and on quality assurance and accreditation systems appropriate for the development of higher education in Africa.

Wars, Geopolitics, and University Governance in the Arab States
André Elias Mazawi
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Universities in the Arab states expanded considerably, from 10 universities in 1939, to 47 in 1975, and to 184 in 2003. In 2004, 40 of the 149 universities affiliated with the Association of Arab Universities were private. Whereas there were roughly 30,000 students in 1945, 5 million were registered in a “tertiary course” in 1999 (out of a population of 240,000,000). Enrollment rates range from 7 percent of the 18-to-23 age group in Sudan to 49 percent in Libya. Gender inequality is most pronounced in Yemen and Iraq, placing women at a disadvantage, while at Gulf universities women are over-represented. According to the 2003 Arab Human Development Report, universities are overcrowded, underfunded and “lack a clear vision.”

Universities, Civil Wars, and Military Conflicts
Political instability, civil wars, and military conflicts affect the governance of Arab universities in many ways. Following independence or military coups, higher education institutions were brought into the orbit of the state’s agenda. The appointment of university presidents and deans and the election of student unions are regulated, restricting participation in university affairs. There is no separation between universities and the state, with the exception of Lebanese and Palestinian universities.

In Sudan, the prolonged civil war triggered extensive brain drain, leaving many university departments devoid of senior academic staff. The consequences for the quality of research and teaching are incalculable. Moreover, following a 1989 coup, Sudanese universities founded during the 1990s were part of Arabization and Islamization policies, fueling conflicts over the aims of higher education in a country populated by different cultural and sociolinguistic groups.

In Lebanon, as in Algeria, universities were affected by civil wars during the 1970s and 1990s, respectively. In Lebanon, the civil war “fragmented” universities as a result of assaults on infrastructure, faculty, and students. Munir Bashshur observes that during post-civil-war reconstruction an effort was made to accommodate cultural and political diversity, while striking a balance between the state’s supervisory role and the universities’ autonomy. In a country where all universities are private save one, about half the student population is enrolled on the various campuses of that one public university. A book by Mahmoud Abu-'Ishsha, The Crisis of Higher Education in Algeria and the Arab World {Arabic} Beirut: Dar Al-Jil, 2000, presents a professor’s candid description of university governance in the context of political conflict and division and the precarious state of academic ethics, quality, and standards.

The worldwide contested and opposed American and British-led military invasion and occupation of Iraq in spring 2003 triggered student rallies and heated demonstrations on university campuses across the Middle East and beyond.

Across the region, military spending weapons purchased from Western countries, coupled with Western hegemonic machinations and dependent regimes and depleted resources, have decimated generations of students and academics and intensified brain drain. Wars and geopolitical conflicts have exacted their toll as well. Iraq’s invasion and occupation of Kuwait in the summer of 1990 resulted in extensive damages and destruction to Kuwait University. Subsequent U.N. sanctions imposed on Iraq hampered teaching and research in universities for over a decade. Faculty and students lacked access to up-to-date publications, computers and software, textbooks, and international conferences. The increased incursion of the Iraqi state during the 1990s into university administration and decision making sought to contain the repercussion of the sanctions within Iraq.

The worldwide contested and opposed American and British-led military invasion and occupation of Iraq in spring 2003 triggered student rallies and heated
demonstrations on university campuses across the Middle East and beyond. The war has inflicted heavy casualties and losses on a weakened Iraqi civilian population. With the collapse of the Baath regime, the looting of universities and other facilities ensued. With hostilities still ongoing, the occupying authorities hastened to control universities and other state institutions, implementing a wide-scale “de-baathification” policy. At the same time, U.S.AID was funding partnership programs with American universities. In the Chronicle of Higher Education (September 12, 2003), Daniel del Castillo reported that “thousands of professors and all university deans and presidents” were “dismissed” from their positions by occupation authorities. Earlier (September 5, 2003), del Castillo had also reported that an American former college president, and current president of a consulting firm, was appointed as “senior adviser to oversee the Iraqi Ministry of Higher Education and Scientific Research,” with “broad powers to set a course for the future of higher education.” The long-term impact on higher education governance in Iraq of the American-British military occupation is difficult to predict at this time. Many people recognize that any developments determining the structures of the Iraqi state will affect not only eventually prevailing future academic models but also the status and autonomy of Kurdish universities operating in Iraq’s northern provinces.

**The Geopolitics of Academic Models**

Within this context, the shift from the continental to the American academic model in some Arab countries deserves attention. The continental academic model is based on year-long required courses and end-of-year exams. Prevalent in North Africa, and partially in Lebanon and Syria, it is mainly a legacy of French colonial rule. The American academic model, built around a credit-point course system, includes mandatory and elective components and more frequent exams.

---

**The first Gulf War also indirectly affected Jordan’s higher education system.**

The first Gulf War also indirectly affected Jordan’s higher education system. Private university ventures were undertaken by Jordanians and Palestinians forced to leave the Gulf. Facilitated by economic restructuring policies, the number of universities doubled, fueling debates regarding the quality and regulation of private higher education.

On the West Bank and Gaza Strip, Palestinian universities emerged from the early 1970s onward under Israeli military occupation, within the context of the Palestinian struggle for national self-determination. Since the Intifada erupted in 2000, universities continue to be critically affected by the stagnation of political negotiations between Israel and the Palestinians. Israeli military operations exact heavy human and infrastructural losses, hindering the proper carrying out of research, teaching, and exams. The isolation of the West Bank from the Gaza Strip prevents students, faculty, and officials from moving freely between and within regions to attend universities. System planning, coordination, admissions, and staffing are stalled.

---

**The shift from the continental to the American academic model in some Arab countries deserves attention.**

---

The seeds of the continental model were briefly introduced in Egypt following Bonaparte’s 1798 military invasion and occupation. The model took root under vice-regal rule, surviving British rule and the British-controlled monarchy. It became the academic norm in post-1952 republican Egypt. During the 1950s and 1960s, Egyptian professors acted as carriers of the continental model, coupled with pan-Arab ideology, into other Arab states, notably Libya and the Gulf states. These movements counteracted the influence of American, British, and French institutions operating in Egypt, Lebanon, and Sudan, as well as monarchic Arab regimes. The founding of the Khartoum branch of Cairo University and the Arab University of Beirut were part of this power struggle. Egyptian academics were also instrumental in the operation of nascent Gulf universities.

From the early 1970s onward, under the impact of revenues generated from the “oil boom,” Gulf universities expanded, adopting the credit-point system. This shift gradually eroded Egyptian academic influence. Yet, it also signaled greater U.S. and U.K. involvement in the Gulf in the 1980s; and an involvement intensified by local economic restructuring policies introduced in the 1990s, following the first Gulf War. The establishment of American and other private universities in most Gulf states during the 1990s crowned this process, leading James Coffman to observe, in the fall 2003 issue of International Higher Education, that the American academic model “rules supreme” in Gulf universities. One American consultant in the United Arab Emirates noted that a new university is “designed to reflect the typical design of colleges and universities in the US . . . to facilitate transfers to US institutions and entrance to US graduate programs.”
Gulf universities are being structurally “synchronized” with American universities, while exposure to other Arab, most notably Egyptian, universities is being considerably narrowed in scope. Some view these shifts as reflecting globalization and internationalization trends in higher education, in an increasingly competitive market. Yet, one should also consider the geopolitical corollaries. The Americanization and privatization of Gulf universities are occurring in conjunction with regional and global realignments of strategic military and economic alliances. The mechanisms underpinning this process still await solid research, not only with respect to the role academic models play in mediating foreign policies but also the impact academic models exert on regional economic and political (dis)integration.

Universities in the Arab states are precarious and contested institutions.

Reconceptualizing Globalization and Internationalization

Universities in the Arab states are precarious and contested institutions. Colonial legacies, state authoritarianism, civil wars, and military conflicts weaken their societal and economic impact, expectations to the contrary notwithstanding. Academic freedom, university autonomy, quality of higher education, and the enduring brain drain raise grave concerns. State administrators often prevail in decision making, at the expense of faculty and student participation, regardless of the academic model in place. In The Ontology and Status of Intellectuals in Arab Academia and Society (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2001), M’hammed Sabour shows that modes of governance and administration reproduce within universities clientelism and patrimonial relations.

The impact of wars and geopolitics on university governance, as illustrated above, points to the urgent need to refine the concepts of globalization and internationalization, taking into account the dynamic of wars and the subtleties of geopolitical struggles in any credible account of university restructuring. The economic retrenchment of the state and the corporatization of universities represent just one aspect of a story dominated by economic rationality and discourse. Military and geopolitical conflicts unleash other forces associated with globalization and internationalization, leading states to implement policies that play a hegemonic role in university reforms. States are retrenching, economically speaking, but they have not yielded the trenches. At this juncture, whither universities?

Palestinian Universities Under Siege
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In a comprehensive review of the history and problems of Palestinian higher education, the late Professor Ibrahim Abu-Lughod points out that “Palestine’s institutions of higher education were developed under the most trying social, political, and economic circumstances, the result of a military occupation determined to disempower Palestinian society” (Palestinian Higher Education: National Identity, Liberation, and Globalization, Duke University Press, 2000). These conditions have prevailed from the start of the June 1967 Israeli occupation until today. The story of how Palestinian education has withstood the cumulative effects of a harsh military occupation needs to be told because it illustrates both the resilience of the Palestinian people and the futility of Israel’s politics of force.

“Palestine’s institutions of higher education were developed under the most trying social, political, and economic circumstances, the result of a military occupation determined to disempower Palestinian society.”

Eleven Palestinian universities, 5 university colleges, and 26 community colleges operate in the West Bank and the Gaza Strip, serving a population of 3.5 million people. Nearly all the institutions were established after 1971, when a small university opened its doors in Hebron. According to the 2002 census, 3,474 teaching faculty serve 83,408 students at all Palestinian higher education institutions.

By 2003, nearly three years into the Intifada and as a result of Israel’s major military assault against Palestinian society (curfews, closures, checkpoints, house demolition, forced entry, and destruction of public buildings—including the two ministries of education), Palestinian institutions of higher education suffered serious human (24 teachers, 194 students, and 7 employees killed and 1,245 students injured) and material losses (estimated at $4.85 million). Overall casualty figures are in excess of 3,000 dead and nearly 20,000 injured.
Societies can easily recover from material destruction. However, damage to human capital—in the form of death, injury, psychological impairment, malnutrition, school dropouts, and the emigration of skilled labor—can have irreversible consequences at the level of individual families. As a result of income compression, nearly 20 percent of the student body in Palestinian higher education is no longer able to pay its fees.

Access to higher education institutions by students and faculty has become very difficult as a result of long curfews and other drastic restrictions on freedom of movement. In many cases, however, university faculty began to communicate with their students via the Internet in an attempt to overcome Israeli-imposed restrictions on freedom of movement. A new phenomenon of distance learning began to emerge, leading to a student-centered kind of education. In some cases, universities tried to find alternate venues for holding classes and seminars in neighboring cities. The problem here is that not every student has access to e-mail and many students are scattered in villages away from urban centers.

The financial crisis facing higher education presents a much more difficult challenge.

So strong is the belief in the positive value of education that most students would brave checkpoints, curfews, and life-threatening restrictions in order to arrive at their schools. At the same time, most of the faculty, despite the fact that they have not received their full salaries for months on end, would also put up with tremendous difficulties to meet their classes. Simply attending school and meeting classes become major acts of defiance, turning universities and schools into sites of resistance. In addition, families pool their limited resources to help defray the costs of education for their sons and daughters.

The financial crisis facing higher education presents a much more difficult challenge. A 2003 World Bank report (“Two Years of Intifada: Closures and Palestinian Economic Crisis”) states that “Palestinian institutions face the worst financial crisis over the last thirty odd years and their continued operation without emergency assistance is in serious doubt.” Some institutions will reduce offerings, increase class size, and rely on part-time or unqualified instructors. An exodus of qualified faculty was already under way even before the Intifada. The crisis has exacerbated this phenomenon as capable teachers begin to look for better-paying opportunities in the various nongovernmental organizations working in the country.

Some universities have moved in the direction of setting up new degree programs and graduate programs that have higher tuition rates. They also began relaxing admissions requirements as a way of increasing revenue. Library holdings have begun to decline and journal subscriptions are not being renewed mainly as a result of lack of funding and the unreliability of postal delivery. All of these factors eventually will lead to a precipitous decline in quality, something that Palestinians can ill afford and may take many years to remedy.

In general, the Ministry of Higher Education has tried to deal with this crisis in three ways: tuition and fees have increased sharply as a percentage of the overall budget (now at 70 percent); a student revolving-loan fund was initiated to enable needy students to obtain low-interest loans to cover tuition; a voucher system was also created, although not yet implemented, whereby universities receive public funding by cashing in student vouchers.

The Ministry of Higher Education has succeeded in the creation of an autonomous, semiofficial commission responsible for the accreditation and licensing of new programs and institutions. This commission reviews existing criteria, develops new criteria for accreditation, and produces procedures for an ongoing assessment of all programs that grant academic degrees. All this is based on a two-tier methodology of self-evaluation and external review.

Other possible developments, including streamlining, the modernizing of management systems, and the establishment of consortia are being delayed because of the crisis. These measures relate mostly to the financial crisis and are aimed not only at trying to make do in abnormal conditions but also in the long run, paving the way for future reform. It is not clear whether these measures will enable the universities to withstand the cumulative effects of a protracted war situation and an endemic financial crisis.

As the World Bank report points out, any society that has undergone such a massive and debilitating assault would have collapsed long ago.

As the World Bank report points out, any society that has undergone such a massive and debilitating assault would have collapsed long ago. The fact is that the Palestinians have shown incredible resilience in the face of adversity. How long they can continue to suffer is not clear especially since a political resolution of the conflict with Israel still appears very far off.
State-University Power Struggle at Times of Revolution and War in Iran
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Universities in Iran are part of the state structure. They are founded, financed, and governed by the state, although state-controlled private institutions have emerged in recent years. At the same time, the university has been a major center of opposition and revolt against the state. Students are a main force challenging the state. More than half a century of unceasing student struggles for democracy and freedom in Iran has been to some extent documented. Throughout this bloody struggle, the objectives and scope of the student opposition to the state have changed. While the student movement was reformist (demanding the constitutionalization of the monarchy) until the mid-1960s, beginning in the early 1970s, and especially during the revolutionary crisis of 1977–1979, students campaigned for the overthrow of the monarchy.

Today, 25 years later, students are calling for a referendum to separate state and religion and, thus, to bring an end to the reign of Islamic theocracy. This power struggle has taken place in the context of two wars: first, an internal ideological and political battle over the rule of Islam versus the rule of secularism and democracy. This struggle was, in the realm of education, known as the “Islamic Cultural Revolution” (1980–1987), which aimed at fusing religion and education by Islamizing all aspects of education from teacher-student relations to textbooks, curricular, and administration. Second, there was an external war—the invasion of the country by Iraq, which had been supported by the United States (1980–1988).

Iranian students, both in Iran and abroad, played a prominent role in the overthrow of the monarchy. However, while Khomeini emerged as the leader of this revolution and became the architect of the Islamic theocracy, the campuses remained in the control of radical and leftist students and faculty. They closed down the headquarters of the secret police from the campuses and abolished the surveillance system the shah had installed at all universities. Leftist students and faculty, most of them secular, by then were in control of the campuses. Radical students and faculty claimed both legitimacy and the right to run the institutions. This legitimacy had been won through decades of unceasing struggle under the most difficult conditions; the universities are known in Iran as *sangar-e azadi* (bastion of freedom).

The Khomeini Era

Khomeini, despite his popular base and a history of opposition to the shah, was far from being a historical match for the students. The universities, rather than the seminaries, were seen as the ‘bastion of freedom.’ As a result, the new regime was initially very cautious in its attempt to control the campuses. While the government was increasingly using its administrative power to rule over the campuses, students continued to resist. As a result, a situation of *dual power* emerged. Students were in control of the classroom, the physical space, and campus politics. The state was the owner and administrator at the top. The Islamic regime did not tolerate this state of dual power, although it was not yet in a position to use violence in order to conquer the campuses. One tactic was to subdue the most important institution, Tehran University, by conducting Friday prayers on its campus. In order to conduct this nationally televised event every week, students, faculty, and staff were forced off campus and security forces controlled the entire space on Thursdays and Fridays. However, even this abuse of state power could not bring the campus under full state control.

**While the government was increasingly using its administrative power to rule over the campuses, students continued to resist.**

By the end of 1979, Khomeini was growing impatient with the universities. In his New Year’s message on March 21, 1980, he ordered an attack on the universities. On April 18, Khamene’i, in his Friday Prayer sermon, ordered a holy war (jihad) against the students. He accused the students of turning the campuses into “war rooms” against the Islamic state. After the prayers, armed gangs attacked three campuses. Within the next few days, the gangs wounded hundreds of students and killed at least 24. Students were driven off the campuses, and the government took over all the premises.

The assault on the universities was soon called the Islamic Cultural Revolution. Khomeini appointed a Cultural Revolution Council to lead the project of integrating the universities into the Islamic state. Campuses were closed down for two years, and all the students, faculty, and staff considered disloyal to the Islamic state were purged.
Islamization

The process of “Islamization” of higher education coincided with Iraq’s invasion of Iran. What is unique, and peculiar, about higher education in Iran is the presence of two overlapping forces causing chaos, unrest, confusion, and turmoil. First, the process of Islamization under the rubric of Islamic Cultural Revolution (1980–1987) seized the public policy space. Second, the country was entering into a war for which neither country was prepared or had a reason to wage (1980–1988). In order to concentrate on the war, the Islamic state tightened its political grip internally. This included, among other things, unprecedented control over universities, the suppression of national minorities demanding autonomy, and more aggressive Islamization of gender relations. It should be emphasized that the changes that transformed the universities in Iran would have taken place even without the Iran-Iraq war; the war only speeded up the process, silenced opposition groups, and further legitimized state control. Therefore, in this context, the war and the Islamic Cultural Revolution should be considered as two sides of the same coin—both diverging sharply from the democratic path that universities and the society dreamed of following.

One mechanism for controlling the campus was to readmit students after conducting a full check on their political loyalties.

One mechanism for controlling the campus was to readmit students after conducting a full check on their political loyalties. Government agents would go to the addresses where students had lived to find out whether they and their family members had attended the local mosque before the revolution. New students were admitted only if a “local investigation” could prove that they were loyal to Islam and the Islamic regime. While nonloyal students and faculty were purged, those who had defended the regime and volunteered for fighting in the war against Iraq were admitted through a system of quotas—including members of the armed forces, families of martyrs, and war veterans. This quota policy pursued two objectives: using the admission of applicants devoted to the Islamic regime to create a safe social base for the state within the unruly student body; and providing a very important material incentive to those who participated in a war that had become extremely unpopular.

The Islamic Cultural Revolution led to the silencing of the campuses. Students not affiliated with the government were no longer allowed to form any organizations, write slogans, post any writing anywhere, or distribute literature. Muslim student associations were given the mandate to spy on students and faculty. Academic freedom, which had been won through the struggle against the shah’s regime, came to an abrupt end. Repression was so extensive that the student body for the first time since 1941 turned apolitical. By the end of the decade, however, the era of postwar “reconstruction” began with immense consequences for universities. In response to the growing social unrest, a devastated economy, and a ruined society, the state pursued a policy of “relaxation” and “reversal.” In practice, on campuses this meant easing gender segregation and reopening most of the disciplines to women. Lack of financial and human resources forced the state to halt the gender segregation of university classrooms by using dividers or simply separating female/male students by a curtain. Some faculty members were invited back to resume their teaching, even if the state was in doubt concerning their loyalties to Islamic doctrine. Many purged students were also invited to apply so as to be considered for admission.

The policy of relaxation of the iron fist of the state did not extend to the governance of universities. The institutions had to be loyal to the state and its ideological and political line. The ideal Islamic university, as designed during the Islamic Cultural Revolution, should not aim at achieving autonomy from the state. Since the Islamic theocracy aims at the unity of state and religion, the education system should also combine knowledge and religion. This is expected in both state-run and the expanding private institutions of higher education. These tenets continue to shape the policy of the state, although there are differences between the two major factions—conservatives and reformists—that are contending for power on the campuses.

A situation of relaxation prevails everywhere from the enforcement of women’s dress codes, to censorship of the media, to limitations on foreign trade.

A situation of relaxation prevails everywhere from the enforcement of women’s dress codes, to censorship of the media, to limitations on foreign trade. In the case of the universities, state control is challenged by various forces, especially the faculty and the students, the latter being the main force in turning the campuses into the site of struggle against the state. It is also important to note that the conservatives have lost credibility and support everywhere. The population has been on the
offensive since the late 1990s. This offensive mood manifests itself in everyday resistance in public spaces, where people openly challenge the values, symbols, language, and repressive organs of the theocratic state. Thus, much like the situation in the monarchical regime, while the state is still in charge of the administration of public universities and while private institutions are administratively and politically loyal, the student body has seriously challenged the state, and some have called for the overthrow of the regime through a nationwide referendum. Under these conditions, while the political atmosphere of the campus has changed, faculty and students enjoy no academic freedom and there is a noticeable absence of university autonomy.

Student Reactions
Ironically, soon after the end of eight years of war with Iraq (1988), Islamist students began protesting the policies and practices of the government, its corruption and repression, and its inability to improve the economic conditions of the country. A decade later, these “unruly subjects” (i.e., students) began a major uprising, in July 1999, in response to a brutal midnight attack on a dormitory by security forces. The six-day protest shook the Islamic state, but was violently suppressed. On the fourth anniversary of this uprising (July 2003), the student movement was even more radical. Some of the slogans called for the overthrow of the Islamic theocracy. Now, 25 years after the revolution, the student movement is calling for separation of the state and religion. It aims to achieve this goal through a national referendum, which is expected to put an end to a quarter century of Islamic theocracy.
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Research on private higher education, from studies by Daniel Levy onward, has analyzed private-sector challenges to public dominance in higher education. As the contemporary Kenyan case shows, however, we now also see public-sector challenges to recent private growth. Worldwide, one challenge lies in the public rules or regulations, such as accreditation. Another, the subject of this article, lies in the (partial) privatization of public universities.

Kenyan private higher education has a longer history, compared to most of Africa, and antedates the public privatization movement. The private sector’s accelerated expansion, rising status, and official recognition from the late 1980s led to concern and reaction from the public sector. Private universities in Kenya grew in number, going from 3 to 17 in just two decades. In comparison, there have been only 6 public universities during the four decades since independence. As elsewhere in Africa, private expansion sprang forth largely due to the public system’s failure to meet the demand for higher education. Private higher education has registered steady increases in enrollment. Some universities—such as the United States International University (USIU), the largest of the privates—have waiting lists of applicants. Public universities responded to this development by mounting privately sponsored Module II programs. Such programs are increasingly common not only in Africa but also in Eastern Europe and other regions that have seen rapid emergence and growth of private higher education and now see public-sector reaction.

For one thing, tuition is as high in Kenya’s Module II programs as in similar programs at Kenya’s private universities (sometimes even higher because the publics have the advantage of more qualified staff, better facilities, and, crucially, name recognition). The public Module II programs include some fields only peripheral to the curriculum at private universities in Kenya (medicine, engineering) but that privates in some countries have been able to build up over time. The Module II programs include some that have been “safe havens” for privates (e.g., business). For instance, while total enrollments at the USIU (popular for its business courses) was 2,931 in 2002–2003, Module II business programs at the largest public institution, the University of Nairobi (UoN), alone enrolled 2,683 students. Overall, just over half of UoN’s 27,839 students were enrolled in Module II programs. All its (1,220) nondegree (diploma) students were in Module II, and at the postgraduate level there were twice as many as in regular programs. Thus, in 2002–2003, the university raised U.S.$15,914,639 from these programs. This is
equivalent to two-thirds of direct government funding and one-third of the university’s total income. At Kenya’s four major private universities, tuition income averages 72 percent of total income.

One result is that while public universities increase their enrollments and financial health—thanks to privatization—and despite there being three times as many private as public universities, the private share of enrollments is declining. From 20 percent in 1999 and 16 percent in 2001, the enrollment share fell to 13 percent in 2003. Privatization of the publics thus appears to be occurring at the expense of private growth. The sustainability of this tendency is contestable, but all indications are that enrollments in the Module II programs have yet to surge. This point does not negate the fact that private enrollments continue to grow (by 16 percent over the last three years) and that the public-sector increase has much to do, as in China, with previously low public enrollments.

In conclusion, while private higher education claims internationally to represent the entrepreneurial alternatives and future growth, Kenya shows the limitations of this trend. It appears that public and foreign institutions might fight for entrepreneurial terrain, thus placing a fresh challenge before private universities.
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The gap between the high demand for and low supply of higher education has created pressure to open Israel’s institutions of higher learning to a wider circle of potential students. This pressure, accompanied by economic strains, has instigated changes in the system. The awarding of academic degrees was no longer the exclusive role of Israeli universities. Privatization, begun in 1974, was joined by globalization in the mid-1990s. The entire process occurred in four stages over 30 years: the establishment of the Open University (1974), academization of the teacher training colleges (1981), passage of legislation concerning the status of colleges (1995), and the opening of foreign university extensions (1998).

Establishment of the Open University, 1974

The Open University delivers courses leading to the B.A. by means of long-distance teaching. In contrast to other institutions of higher learning, its minimal entrance conditions—no high school matriculation diploma or college entrance examinations are required—permit all applicants to be accepted. The number of students studying at the Open University reached almost 25,000 in 2003. The median age of its students—30 to 35—is higher than that of students at the universities. The Open University enrolls a larger proportion of students: about 25 percent versus 9 percent, respectively. In addition, the geographic spread of its students is wider, with students residing throughout the country, although the ethnic distribution of its students resembles that found in the universities. The Open University is autonomously governed, is state supported with funds provided by the State Planning and Grants Committee, and operates by the authority of the Council of Higher Education. As of the 1990s, the university has been licensed to award a master’s degree in a limited number of disciplines.
Academization of Teacher Training Colleges
Since 1981, teacher training colleges in Israel have experienced a process of academization—that is, the transformation into colleges with the authority to grant B.Ed. degrees. A similar process is under way in North America and in Europe. The practical implications of academization in Israel include the four-year (formerly three-year) course of study, programs devised according to Council of Higher Education recommendations, a rising level of the teaching staff competence, and the establishment of more rigid admission criteria (e.g., a full matriculation diploma, college entrance examinations, and a personal interview). This process stimulated an increase in the number of applicants during the 1980s (10 times the number applying in the 1970s) and provided a new route to earning an academic degree and, subsequently, an M.A.

These colleges, which charge high tuition fees, receive no financial aid from the Planning and Grants Committee but remain under the jurisdiction of the Council of Higher Education.

The Opening of Private Colleges
Economic, social, and political constraints gave birth to an amendment of the Council of Higher Education Law in 1995 that allowed the opening of colleges licensed to award academic B.A. degrees. This law authorized the founding of 14 regional academic colleges in Israel's periphery. Although these institutions were originally treated as subsidiaries of the universities, they have since acquired autonomy. In addition, 3 private colleges were founded. These colleges, which charge high tuition fees, receive no financial aid from the Planning and Grants Committee but remain under the jurisdiction of the Council of Higher Education. In 2000, attendance reached 53,089, as compared with 113,010 in the universities. With respect to the 20-29-year-age group, in 2000, about 10 percent of students attended universities whereas 4.3 percent attended colleges. We can conclude that academic recognition of the colleges stimulated a rise in the number of students studying for a B.A. at these institutions. It is estimated that in 2003, the number of students studying toward a B.A. at colleges will be greater than the number studying toward the same degree at universities.

Extensions of Foreign Universities
Privatization of higher education has brought about a significant increase in the number of individuals holding a B.A. degree. A large percentage of these graduates also aspire to continue their studies to advanced degrees, particularly the M.A. Although the universities lack the capacity to absorb the majority of these applicants, the Council of Higher Education refused to permit the colleges to award advanced degrees for some time. Due to growing demand and sustained privatization, the globalization of higher education received greater impetus. These trends eventually brought about the establishment of extensions of foreign universities in Israel.

Privatization of higher education has brought about a significant increase in the number of individuals holding a B.A. degree.

The Council of Higher Education has since licensed several of the foreign universities interested in entering the Israeli market to teach courses leading toward the acquisition of academic degrees. In 1998, legislation was passed that required these extensions to operate under Council of Higher Education oversight. About 25 extensions—from universities in the United States, the United Kingdom, Europe, and Africa—currently operate in Israeli, with about 9,000 Israel students enrolled in their programs.

At the turn of the 21st century, the system continues to evolve: colleges that were permitted to grant B.A. degrees are requesting licenses to grant M.A. degrees. The Council of Higher Education, loath to relinquish its monopoly, raised barriers and issued negative responses. Yet, just as economic, social, and political forces combined to legitimize the colleges’ award of B.A. degrees despite the obstacles put up by the Council of Higher Education, these same forces are again acting in favor of the colleges. In April 2003, three teachers colleges were licensed to award M.Ed. degrees; in July 2003, other private colleges were licensed to award M.A. degrees.

The major implication of privatization and globalization in higher education is the benefits of greater distribution of knowledge and of making that knowledge accessible to a broad population that had previously been deprived of this opportunity.
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Vietnam has a population of over 80 million. The country’s promise and potential are embodied in its young people, the generation born after 1975; about 65 percent of the population is under the age of 30. The decree on family planning, issued by the government early in 2003, sets no limit on the number of children couples can have. Though the birthrate has remained stable at 2 percent per year, this change in policy will likely lead to an increase in the birthrate for the foreseeable future. Vietnam has been successful in universalizing primary education and aims to make lower secondary education universal in the next 20 years. Demand for upper-secondary education will increase, which will then place additional strain on an already overburdened higher education system.

Overview of Nonpublic Higher Education

In 1986, after a decade of poverty and starvation caused by a half century of war, a U.S.-led trade embargo, and failed policies, the government implemented sweeping economic reforms known as doi moi. The private sector, previously forbidden in a Marxist-Leninist economy, was encouraged to develop, albeit incrementally. It soon became apparent that the spirit of the economic reforms also applied to universities and colleges as a way to meet the rapidly growing demand for tertiary education. From 1991 to the 2001–2002 academic year, the total number of higher education students in Vietnam jumped from 190,000 to nearly 1 million. Added to this number are about 200,000 freshmen—a 7 percent increase over last year—of which 24,500, or 12 percent, will attend nonpublic institutions.

There are two different types of nonpublic educational institutions in Vietnam. Semipublic facilities are owned and operated by the state and a public authority at the central, provincial, district, or communal level, while people-founded institutions are owned and managed by nongovernmental organizations or private associations such as trade unions, cooperatives, youth organizations, and women’s associations. There may soon be a third type of nonpublic institution, which will be owned and operated by private individuals.

The first and only foreign-owned university campus, established by the Royal Melbourne Institute of Technology (Australia), opened in fall 2003 in Ho Chi Minh City. RMIT University Vietnam offers undergraduate programs in computer science, information technology and multimedia, software engineering, and commerce, as well as graduate programs in leadership and management, tertiary teaching and learning, and business administration. A new campus (Saigon South), which will accommodate 3,000 students, is currently being built at a cost of $15.5 million through loans from the Asian Development Bank, the International Finance Corporation, a benefactor, and RMIT.

Nonpublic institutions have proven to be an effective alternative means of increasing access to higher education.

Nonpublic institutions have proven to be an effective alternative means of increasing access to higher education. They account for more than 20 percent of the total number of higher education institutions in Vietnam and accommodate ten percent of the nation’s students. Majors are offered in English, business, management, computer science, and technology. The majority of students at nonpublic institutions come from wealthy families. The admissions criteria (i.e., the total score on three exam subjects) are usually not as demanding as those at public universities. In many cases, for example, the total score is only half of what is required by the public institutions.

Current Issues, Challenges, and Recommendations

The Second Regional Seminar on Private Higher Education, organized by the UNESCO Asia and Pacific Regional Bureau for Education in June 2001 in Bangkok, identified several problems related to people-founded higher education in Vietnam—such as a lack of long-term strategic planning, insufficient
administrative oversight, and a shortage of policies that are specific in nature and issued in a timely fashion.

There is not yet a well-developed legal infrastructure that defines the precise relationship between nonpublic institutions and the Ministry of Education and Training (MOET). Since 1993, when the first nonpublic university was officially established, MOET has issued only one regulation on people-founded institutions. The fifth draft of provisional regulations on semipublic and private institutions was discussed at a meeting held in December 2002 at the ministry. The draft consists of numerous conflicts and inconsistencies between chapters and articles such as those on mission and ownership. Participants were resentful about prematurely discussing the draft in detail, comparing the current state of affairs with “putting the cart before the horse”—in reference to regulations on higher education in Vietnam that do not yet exist.

The lack of a regulative framework and an accreditation system has adversely affected public confidence in the nonpublic sector. Administrators at a number of nonpublic universities and colleges have abused their power, taking financial advantage of both students and their parents. The Taiwan Asian International University (AIU), for example, which was established in cooperation with Hanoi University of Foreign Languages in 1995, turned out to be a hoax. After five years of operation, AIU left more than 2,000 students and their families with no place to go after losing hundreds of thousands of dollars. This led to the removal of MOET vice minister, Vu Ngoc Hai. In another incident, Dong Do University recruited twice as many students as capacity allowed.

There is a pressing need to require nonpublic institutions of higher education to be subject to routine auditing and to submit transparent annual financial reports. Clearly, there is a pressing need to require nonpublic institutions of higher education to be subject to routine auditing and to submit transparent annual financial reports. In addition, there should be healthy competition between public and nonpublic higher education institutions for government grants. While public institutions are encouraged to carry out entrepreneurial activities to increase their revenue, it is unfair to leave nonpublic institutions on their own while in fact they are easing the burden of excess demand on the state.

Given the dismal state of nonpublic higher education, the government should establish a special task force that would consider relevant experience of other countries. Japan, South Korea, the Philippines, and Indonesia have a long history of private education. China, Vietnam's role model in some respects, recently passed a private higher education law that could serve as a useful guide. Instead of holding more conferences on provisional regulations with heated debates that are often unproductive, Vietnam must take a much more practical and proactive approach in order to learn from other countries' successes as well as their mistakes—in the finest tradition of comparative education.
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Private higher education in China has been a contested terrain with regard to control and autonomy. Private universities are calling for a loosening of government controls. Government officials argue that the private sector requires vigorous supervision and control. Both sides can cite convincing reasons, but neither can convince the other.

Private universities have been complaining that the government has maintained too much control over everything, giving them little autonomy. For example, institutions cannot decide what programs to offer or how many students to admit, and they cannot issue their own degrees. They are also critical of the government pulling the carpet from under them: the government in recent years has allowed public universities to set up private colleges—called second-tier colleges—that use state property and rely on the reputation and resources of public universities to run profit-making education businesses.

Today, there are 300 second-tier colleges, and the number is increasing fast. The first such organization was formed by Zhejiang University. Called City College of Zhejiang University, the college was jointly owned by Zhejiang University, which sent in its administrators and teachers; by the Postal University of Hangzhou, which offered its campus as the site of the college; and by the local government, which provided one-third of the funding. Government officials consider second-tier universities to be an effective way to expand opportunities. In Zhejiang, more than 33 percent of higher learning opportunities are provided by the private universities and second-tier colleges. Private universities, however, see this
policy as a clear violation of the 2002 Law for the Promotion of Private Education, which establishes that private schools and universities are to be privately established and administered.

**Government officials claim that private universities seek to manipulate official policy in the interest of profit making, in the process damaging or undermining the rights of students and parents.**

In contrast, government officials claim that private universities seek to manipulate official policy in the interest of profit making, in the process damaging or undermining the rights of students and parents. They complain that private universities lack “self-discipline.” Government officials see themselves as standing on higher ground to safeguard student interests and to monitor the behavior of private universities. It is thought that controls are needed or chaos would ensue.

Who is at fault? How can one find the right mix between government control and autonomy for private universities? Private universities see their priorities as based on market needs and believe they should be allowed to operate on market terms, with their admissions policies and program offerings driven and regulated by the market. They stress that they are not public universities. In contrast, government officials, who are responsible for potential crises, see education as too sensitive and delicate an arena to allow big mistakes to occur. Therefore, government officials insist on executing close supervision of private higher education. Private university presidents have been asking how government supervision can be maintained without strangling the vitality of private universities. Government officials have been asking how autonomy can be granted to private universities without creating chaos. These are issues that seem very difficult to resolve in China today.

The 2002 Law for the Promotion of Private Education was praised for the support it gave private education. However, in October of last year, participants at a conference in Nanjing bemoaned the fact that the “winter of private education” had set in—first of all because this law had been so very unimplementable. It is called an “immature law,” with many details still under intense debate, especially the clause that “private investors can admit students until after public universities have admitted theirs. They can now easily be charged with running “illegal operations,” since many activities that were once considered “borderline” and were dealt with by government offices with “one eye closed and one eye open” have become illegal under the law. Government officials in many local areas have been deliberately vague about their attitudes toward private education.

The new law requires many government offices to make definitive decisions on the performance of private schools and universities. Private universities thus have charged that the new law fails to give private universities the expected protection but rather opens the way for government schools, state banks, and local governments to combine resources to edge out private universities. A sense of crisis has been looming for many private universities, which came into existence in the 1980s and have been growing since then. The collaboration between public universities and local governments in setting up private colleges has instantly taken away the advantages of private institutions, which were able to respond to the needs of the economy with their highly flexible administrative structure and programs.

In summary, the passing of the private higher education law has not created a big boom for private universities. The balance between autonomy and control is hard to maintain. Private universities in China will need many years to establish their credibility and reputation and gain the autonomy they have coveted. They face competition on all fronts and now have an even bigger challenge of surviving the advent of pseudo-private second-tier colleges.

---

**International Students in Russia**

**Anna Smolentseva**
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Presently, about 100,000 international students are enrolled at Russian higher education institutions. Their expanding numbers are considered one of the most important trends in Russian tertiary education. Policy makers emphasize that higher education, along with oil, has the potential to become a key export industry in the Russian economy that will earn billions of dollars, as is the case in the United States, Australia, and other countries. However, currently the presence of international students in Russia yields only about U.S.$150 million annually.
Overview

The Soviet system of international education had virtually broken down by the early 1990s, and only in recent years has the number of international students in post–Soviet Russia begun to increase. Over the last decade their number has more than doubled, and qualitative change has taken place as well. In Soviet times, most foreign students studied tuition free under intergovernmental agreements. Today, international education is not oriented toward Soviet propaganda, but rather toward economic benefit, which means that the majority of international students pay tuition. Foreign students represent an important source of nonstate financing, which enables many Russian higher education institutions to survive under conditions of financial constraint.

The countries of origin of international students have also changed over the last years. Whereas in the early 1990s, citizens of the Commonwealth of Independent States (CIS)—the countries that were at one time part of the Soviet Union—comprised the majority of international students, at present they make up about one-third of the total number of foreigners studying in Russia. Approximately the same number of students are from Asian countries, mostly China. Other places of origin include the Near East and North Africa (12.8 percent), Europe (7.5 percent), Africa (5 percent), and Latin America (3 percent). But the situation may differ among universities. For example, at Moscow State University, an institution with a strong international reputation, the share of foreigners is about 10 percent of the total student body, almost half of them from the CIS and Baltic countries (45 percent), and another half from Asia (49 percent).

The most popular fields of education for international students have not changed significantly; these remain engineering, medicine, economics, business administration, and the humanities.

The policy is based on the conviction that Russian institutions of higher learning have traditionally provided higher education for foreign students and still have the potential to achieve a significant place in international higher education. In Russia, it is believed that the attraction of Russian higher education lies in its high quality, qualified faculty, and comparatively low tuition fees and cost of living. Surveys on international students in Russia have shown that the quality of Russian higher education is one of the most important reasons that foreign students choose to study in Russia.

Russia’s active participation in international education and attracting foreign students would support the long-term economic and political interests of Russia in the world and especially in those developing regions that have had strong ties with the USSR, Russia, and Russian education. In addition to the economic benefits, the hope is that Russia will also gain the opportunity to exert political influence in those regions. Thus, the plan is to continue with the system of Russian federal fellowships for foreign students studying in the country. A related effort will be the attempt to expand the influence of the Russian language and Russian culture by establishing a network of Russian centers abroad and through export of education. At the institutional level, foreign students would represent, above all, a stable source of income. However, all those goals will be very hard to achieve for many reasons.

Challenges

The most important challenge involves quality assurance and degree recognition. In fact, Russian degrees are not recognized in the developed world or in a number of developing countries—such as India, which refused to acknowledge Russian diplomas in 2002. That is why studying in Russia does not make sense for many potential students. Nevertheless, joining the Bologna process, which occurred in 2003, should foster the convertibility of Russian degrees and strengthen the position of Russia in the international educational market.

Another barrier to increasing the number of foreign students in Russia is language. The Russian language lost the status won for it by the Soviet Union, making education in Russia inaccessible for foreigners. But even after learning Russian in their home countries or in preliminary language courses in Russia, many foreign students enrolled in Russian higher education institutions lack the necessary proficiency in the
language to take full advantage of their studies. To resolve the language problem, some universities are starting pilot programs that offer courses in certain foreign languages—English, French, and German.

Other issues include the absence of information on education in Russia for prospective students, the inability of most Russian universities to compete on the international market, and the lack of marketing skills. Surveys have shown that most foreign students come to Russia on the recommendation of family members or friends, or are sent by their governments.

One of the perils facing international education is the avid desire of some institutions to earn money by enrolling tuition-paying students (most Russians are able to study for free). International students have thus become one of the vital sources of revenue. Some universities are ready to overlook everything in order to get a student who pays money. They wink at a student’s educational qualifications, achievements, and progress while studying. This approach influences the general level of the student body of an institution and the quality of education.

Other issues include the absence of information on education in Russia for prospective students, the inability of most Russian universities to compete on the international market, and the lack of marketing skills. Surveys have shown that most foreign students come to Russia on the recommendation of family members or friends, or are sent by their governments.

In addition, conditions on campus—housing and the overall level of services—particularly in some regions, cannot be seen as an asset of Russian higher education. Furthermore, the personal safety of international students, especially those from Africa and Asia, is a serious issue in many Russian cities.

These problems raise concerns about the policy of attracting international students to Russian universities. Undoubtedly, the major famous institutions are able to compete and attract good students who are eager to study and complete their degrees. But there are students who enroll at other Russian universities and do anything but study. A number of reports have appeared in the press about international students, mostly from developing countries, who are involved in illegal business activities or narcotics distribution. In the absence of work permits or adequate support from their governments, families, or sponsors, international students have to earn a living by all means possible.

In conclusion, today Russia is outdone by many countries in the number of international students in its higher education system. Also lacking in Russia is the understanding that a policy of attracting foreigners will require much effort, financial resources, and time. In Russia, the current situation with regard to international students and future prospects has not been examined well enough and will require serious research.

**International Higher Education in Russia: Missing Data**

Alex Kuraev-Maxah
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Throughout its history, the Soviet Union was widely considered to be a “closed society.” Examples of the country’s profile include restrictions on foreign travel, a lack of transparency, and keeping the outside world ignorant about conditions within the country. A common thread was the lack of publicly available data or the provision of false data on a variety of topics. Perestroika put an end to that isolation and opened doors to the global integration of the former Soviet nations. However, some of the old Soviet habits die hard. Anyone involved in research on higher education in Russia knows it is very difficult to obtain accurate statistics on the subject. The database on foreign student mobility continues to be restricted and problematical, which makes it impossible to assess internationalization of Russian higher education.

**The Current Situation**

The former Soviet leadership proudly proclaimed the USSR to be a world leader in higher education, providing impressive statistics on the numbers of foreign students studying in the country. Fact sheets from Soviet times claim that “all the advantages and high quality of Soviet education attracted in 1989 over 130,000 foreign students from more than 160 countries.” At the same time, specific information concerning this topic was considered classified and thus kept in the “restricted section” of the Federal State Archive. Even today, the data have yet to be released.

Given the right to engage in international cooperation on the institutional level by the 1992 Federal Education Act, Russian universities initiated a nationwide movement to attract foreign students. For the last decade, data collection concerning international students has occurred at the institutional level and been submitted to the Ministry of Education. It would be reasonable to
assume that with the introduction of reforms in the management of the Russian university system, the issue of data inaccessibility would be eased.

This change has not, however, taken place. Statistics on foreigners studying in Russia reported in local publications are very limited and are often contradictory. Based on the same data source, the Ministry of Higher Education, two national statistical reports show very different figures for the total number of foreign students in Russia in the 2000–2001 academic year: 95,957 and 61,426, respectively. The same problem of inconsistency characterizes almost all of the published information on international students in Russian universities.

Next comes the question of how foreign students are counted in Russia and, to a certain extent, attempting to analyze that process creates more questions than answers.

Data Collection

Next comes the question of how foreign students are counted in Russia. To a certain extent, attempting to analyze that process creates more questions than answers. First, all the approximately 35,000 students from the former USSR republics studying in Russia are now classified as foreigners—identified as students from the “near abroad.” Confusingly, published statistics in Russia usually present the annual numbers of students from close and distant foreign countries separately, providing no unified system for counting the total number of international students.

Another difficulty is the complexity of the Russian university system, in which anyone taking evening classes or external courses is considered an “enrolled student.” A person might live and have a full-time job in the Ukraine, return to Moscow twice a year to pass exams and collect course materials, and still be counted as a fully enrolled foreign student from Europe. Trainees or researchers from abroad are also counted as students, even if they are students in their home countries. The official website of the Russian Ministry of Education, invites foreigners to come and study in Russia, presents 13 different categories available in the Russian higher education system for foreign students. It is difficult to make sense of these different categories.

If Russia is to take advantage of the many opportunities for collaborative research and internationalization, there needs to be better access to pertinent and useful data and more accurate statistics.

International Network for Higher Education in Africa Launched

A new initiative called the International Network for Higher Education in Africa (INHEA) has recently been launched here at the Center for International Higher Education. The Network is intended for use by scholars, experts, practitioners, policymakers, funding organizations, students, and others engaged in research and development on higher education in Africa. As interest in higher education in Africa grows and as research and related publishing expands, this new resource will provide valuable information and strengthen communication and collaboration.

Many institutions and organizations are engaged in activities that relate to higher education development in Africa. These activities include research and advocacy, conferences and workshops, cooperative relationships with and among African institutions, and other efforts to gauge the state of higher education institutions in Africa. Most organizations focusing on Africa operate independently and often are unable to exchange information with others. The creation of this forum permits the easy changes of ideas, data, and news of activities and initiatives.

The Network features centers and institutions around the world that are engaged in work on African higher education. It also provides a list of experts and researchers (and their contact addresses) engaged in higher education in Africa. An effort will be made to provide information on current and upcoming higher education conferences and meetings that have relevance to higher education in Africa.

The Network also provides a rich source of bibliographical information that includes references to books, articles, and reports, as well as doctoral dissertations on African higher education. The references are conveniently organized by country and theme. Also provided are higher education profiles for every country in Africa. References and country profiles will be updated as regularly as possible.

The idea for INHEA stems from the Center’s two major initiatives concerning African higher education—African Higher Education: An International Reference Handbook, and the Journal of Higher Education in Africa (JHEA). The network may be accessed at http://www.bc.edu/inhea. The Network is directed by Dr. Damte Teferra, founding editor-in-chief of the Journal of Higher Education in Africa and senior editor of African...
Family Education and Access to Latin American Higher Education
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While 95 percent of each age group enrolls in grade one, less than 10 percent of the Latin American adult population has attained higher education. Nevertheless, only half of the applicants admitted into higher education are the first in their families to attend a university. The difference shows the impact of family education level in determining educational attainment. One out of every five students starting first grade will eventually be admitted into higher education.

Ultimately, about half of the population in each age group will attain only primary education, given their low reading comprehension levels (mainly those students from families with lower levels of education). On average, one-third of each age group will graduate from high school and one-fifth will reach the minimal reading and reasoning levels required for being admitted into higher education. The outcome is somewhat better in the six countries with the highest reading achievement levels in Latin America—where about half of each age group graduates from high school and one-third is admitted into higher education. In these countries educational attainment is also linked to family education.

The close linkage between educational attrition rates and family income or educational level is shown in household surveys now available in most Latin American countries. Household surveys show that students from wealthy families keep studying at the university during their 20s, while at that age youngsters from poorer families have already dropped out of school (most males in the poorest quintile have already joined the labor force).

Furthermore, high school graduates’ access to their preferred (free or subsidized) public university and career depends on their score on a national entrance exam (that is influenced by family education). To succeed in the examination system—the vestibular in Brazil or aptitude entrance tests in Chile, Colombia, or Costa Rica—families “invest” in good private secondary schools and pay for their children to attend “cram high schools” (preuniversitarios, similar to the Japanese jukus), to prepare for entrance exams. Those who can pay for private education or coaching (solely for the purpose of passing the entrance exams) tend to secure entrance into specific universities and careers. In addition, the public primary and secondary school system is abandoned by the elites (even the bureaucrats managing the public education system are usually alumni of private schools and send their own children to private schools).

The impact of family background increases at each stage of the selectivity process, and peaks for those accepted at subsidized universities.

The rapid expansion of higher education has not reduced the impact of family background. The gap between the percentage of Chilean males (15 years of age or older) with higher education (13.9 percent) and the corresponding percentage for parents of students that signed up for the entrance exam (33.6 percent) is greatly reduced. Research carried out on the Chilean admissions process in 1998–1999 sheds light on the role of family background, and the findings are likely to be replicated in other Latin American countries. Chile has a national entrance exam for admission to all publicly financed universities (monitored by a national university board). In December 1998, 107,663 of the high school graduates (about 44 percent of the 18-year-old population) signed up for taking the Academic Aptitude Test (PAA), and one-fourth (26,239) were eventually admitted in the 1999 academic year (a similar number enrolled in nonsubsidized private higher education institutions). There were also 52,715 students from older age groups that took the PAA exam in December 1998 (most of them had taken a PAA exam before), of whom almost half (22,281) were admitted in the 1999 academic year. In both groups of candidates, family background was closely associated with admission.
percent) shows the rapid expansion and the critical impact of family education.

But this gap is also linked to low education levels of parents of students who are not completing primary or secondary education (parents with poor education are unable to help their children master basic skills). Most of the 40 percent of fourth grade students who cannot understand a 100-word passage (and eventually drop out or barely graduate from primary education) had parents with less than secondary education according to the socioeconomic analysis of the national test for that grade. Given the link between parents’ education and economic income it can be concluded that few students from families with an income below the national average sit for the entrance examination for subsidized universities. Most of the 23,000 students who graduated from high school in 1998 but did not sign up for the entrance exam had less-educated parents.

The entrance examination shows an association between students’ achievement (at the end of secondary education) and parents’ education. One-third of the students (57,909) revealed a low ability to understand written questions and to carry out relatively straightforward reasoning (the test is focused on ability rather than knowledge). Parents of those students (scoring below the minimum required for admission to subsidized universities) have less education (only 17.1 percent had higher education) than parents of the average student that sit for the entrance exam (33.6 percent).

Family education is also linked to the ability to invest in preparing for an additional entrance exam.

Family education is also linked to the ability to invest in preparing for an additional entrance exam. The education of parents of older students who had taken the PAA exam previously (35.7 percent with higher education) was somewhat higher than the average parent of students who signed up for the entrance exam (33.6 percent). This difference is consistent with the education of parents of 26,664 students who scored over the minimum (required for admission to subsidized universities) but realized that their chance of being accepted in their preferred field or university was remote and thus did not apply for admittance in 1999. Their families were also more educated (39 of the parents had higher education) than the average parent of students who signed up for the entrance exam.

In summary, students mastering basic abilities are being promoted to upper educational levels and eventually admitted into higher education. At the same time, education enrollments at all levels are increasing at a rapid pace. This rapid expansion is reflected in the finding that half of the students being admitted into universities are the first in their families to enroll at a university. However, further expansion of the higher education system will require an increase in achievement levels in primary education, both on grounds of quality and equality.

Note: The full version of this analysis of the Chilean admissions process (in Spanish) can be downloaded from the IIDE website www.iide.cl/publicaciones/libros.
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Papua New Guinea, one of the world’s least-developed countries, has set in motion a plan to try to improve the quality of its universities, but it will have to struggle against poverty and low capacity to achieve the necessary changes.

The higher education sector in Papua New Guinea (PNG) is mixed and disorganized in structure. Each of the six universities (four public, two private) was based on separate enabling legislation, with enrollments ranging from 400 to 3,000 full-time students. Most of the 26 institutions of higher education are single-discipline institutions (8 are teacher education institutions and 8 are health education institutions). Higher education enrollments are estimated to number 6,345, representing about one percent of the 19-to-24-year age cohort. The numbers enrolled at the universities have increased by 22 percent since 1997.

Key Challenges

The lack of clear accreditation procedures means that most of these institutions, with only a few notable exceptions, are offering a narrow range of similar courses with quality that goes unchecked and probably varies from good to very poor. PNG’s Commission for Higher Education has adopted a new framework for accredita-
tion of higher education institutions. The commission is intended to give universities the leading role in determining how the sector will develop in the future. A certain amount of rationalization in higher education is being achieved through the amalgamation and affiliation of smaller colleges with larger institutions and by closures. The Ministry of Higher Education, Research, Science and Technology, which oversees the sector and works with the Commission for Higher Education and the Office of Higher Education, provides policy advice, coordination, planning, and other services. Although the commission has taken the lead role in formulating policy concerning academic quality assurance and institutional accreditation, progress has been slow, hampered by lack of finances and also lack of commitment from some of the institutions themselves. Some international providers have entered the higher education market to fill existing gaps, but most offer small business-related and distance-education courses. The main overseas involvement comes through the two church-based private universities that rely heavily on the expertise of expatriate staff.

The country is extremely fragmented with more than 800 distinct cultural groups, each with its own language.

Although rationalization is taking place, it is difficult to organize anything on a national scale in PNG. The country is extremely fragmented with more than 800 distinct cultural groups, each with its own language. About 85 percent of PNG’s population, estimated at 5.3 million, live in isolated scattered rural settlements. Literacy rates are low, at about 45 percent and even lower for English literacy (the language of instruction in PNG), at about 29 percent. It can be difficult to get reliable statistics about the country but the United Nations estimates that only 23 percent of PNG 15-to-19-year-olds are enrolled at secondary school and 31 percent of 5-to-14-year-olds, at primary school.

There are doubts among key players, such as the Commission for Higher Education and the Office of Higher Education, that universities have the capacity to undertake the necessary work to improve quality. Public institutions are handicapped by low salaries and demoralized staff. PNG’s own brand of nepotism, known as wantokism, undermines the higher education sector as it does public life generally. Although there has recently been much public condemnation of corruption, people are still appointed to jobs on the basis of their family and clan connections rather than their ability to perform. At the same time many students are awarded places in academic programs on the basis of whom they know and not what they know.

Universities struggle to produce coherent and transparent strategies in curriculum content and design, teaching and learning, and assessment. Some universities and the CHE have been working closely with overseas’ universities, especially those with church affiliations in neighboring Australia and nearby Philippines. The two private universities of PNG’s six universities have strong links with Catholic and Adventist international communities.

Accreditation Policy

A National Higher Education Quality Assurance and Accreditation Committee set up by the Commission for Higher Education and with representatives from all PNG’s universities took nearly three years to finalize the new accreditation policy. A variety of stakeholders were involved in the process, but the main thrust came from within the universities themselves. Their final recommendations were adopted by the commission and publicly launched by the prime minister in November 2003.

The new accreditation methodology is in line with international trends, with self-evaluation and peer review central to the process. Universities will need to find suitably qualified people to make up a pool of experts from which a committee will be drawn up to visit an institution and ascertain its suitability for accreditation.

The universities and higher education sector will have to struggle to create a timetable for implementation and find a budget to pay for it.

The six universities will be the first institutions to undergo accreditation. In the PNG system all higher education–level programs offered at institutions will need to be affiliated to one of the universities. The new process creates great challenges. The universities and higher education sector will have to struggle to create a timetable for implementation and find a budget to pay for it. PNG is currently undergoing one of its frequent periods of fiscal restraint. In 2003, universities did not get their full allocation of funding from the government to pay student tuition fees and living expenses. A repeat performance is expected this year.
Universities and Development

PNG universities have the potential to offer education, training, and research programs that can support the country’s development. A labor force is being trained, especially for basic and secondary education and the country’s health needs, as well as future government, civil service, and business leaders. PNG universities also believe they should impart cultural values, attitudes, and ethics that can help to construct a healthy civil society and support good governance and a democratic political system. Another objective is to produce graduates who are keen and able to contribute to their immediate communities and the country.

However, there are many problems facing universities: overcrowding, limited or obsolete libraries, insufficient equipment, outdated curriculum, and underqualified teaching staff, to name just a few. Until quality is improved, graduating students every year from weak programs almost certainly means that, however committed or capable the students, they will be ill-equipped to satisfy the development needs of the country or to compete internationally.

The Challenge of Ontario’s Double Cohort

Sue Winton and Glen A. Jones

The “double cohort,” a perhaps unfamiliar concept outside Ontario, Canada, has been a source of angst for tens of thousands of students, their parents, and the province’s postsecondary institutions since 1997. This concept refers to the unique situation of two cohorts graduating from high school at the same time. The challenge of accommodating the double cohort in Ontario’s universities and colleges ultimately forced the government to fund a dramatic expansion of postsecondary education.

In 1995, a neoliberal government led by Premier Mike Harris was elected in Ontario under the campaign slogan “Common Sense Revolution.” Canada’s unique federal structure and decentralized approach to educational policy made it possible for this new provincial government to move quickly to reduce the government’s expenditures on education, increase university and college tuition fees, and reduce taxes.

In June 1997, Ontario’s Ministry of Education and Training announced that it would eliminate the 13th year of schooling with the introduction of a new four-year secondary school curriculum, effective September 1999. The new curriculum would be phased in one year at a time, but the plan also created a situation in which two cohorts would graduate from high school in 2003: one from the old five-year secondary program and one from the new four-year program. The challenge of accommodating the double cohort in Ontario’s universities and colleges prompted new policies and promises from the provincial government.

Following the government’s announcement, Ontario’s colleges and universities expressed concerns about their capacity to accommodate substantial increases in enrollment.

The Need for Expansion

Following the government’s announcement, Ontario’s colleges and universities expressed concerns about their capacity to accommodate substantial increases in enrollment. In addition to the double cohort, demographic changes associated with the baby boom echo and an overall increase in postsecondary participation rates were also expected to increase demand. The advocacy groups of Ontario’s colleges and universities—the Association of Colleges of Applied Arts and Technology of Ontario (ACAATO) and the Council of Ontario Universities (COU)—argued that substantial investment in capital projects, technology, academic infrastructure, and operating grants were crucial.

In the 1999 budget, the government announced the SuperBuild Growth Fund. The new fund would consolidate Ontario’s entire infrastructure spending under one program. Over $740 million was allocated to postsecondary institutions to build and modernize in anticipation of an expanded student population; $660 million of the total was designated for new capital projects, but with private sector contributions this amount was expected to increase significantly. In May 2000, the SuperBuild investment in new capital and facility renewal was increased in hopes of creating 73,000 new student spaces.

While the higher education sector welcomed new capital funding, university and college leaders became increasingly concerned about the absence of increased government commitments in the form of operating grant support for expansion. With the double cohort only three years away, the operating grant announcements for 2000–
2001 did little but raise the level of anxiety. Only modest funds were directed toward expansion. The government also announced that tuition fee increases for most programs would be capped at 2 percent each year over the next five years.

**Funding Expansion**

By late 2000, both the ACAATO and the COU were considering how best to lobby the government for increased operating funds. The COU published a brief arguing that provincial grant increases were needed to hire faculty and meet the demands of increased enrollment. ACAATO established a funding advocacy group that included business, community leaders, students, and alumni.

In May 2001, the government announced a three-year commitment to increase operating grants in direct proportion to the projected enrollment growth and an additional $100 million to address current and deferred maintenance expenses. Funding was also committed to improve equipment and facilities for apprenticeship programs in colleges to double the number of new students in skilled trade programs. Plans for the creation of a new public University of Ontario Institute of Technology were also announced.

The double cohort was now receiving considerable attention in the popular media, and the postsecondary sector signaled that the government's announced funding plans were inadequate.

The double cohort was now receiving considerable attention in the popular media, and the postsecondary sector signaled that the government's announced funding plans were inadequate. With only two years before the double cohort graduated from secondary school, leaders within the decentralized higher education policy sector struggled to plan for what might become the largest single-year expansion of postsecondary education in the province’s history, without knowing whether a government that was ideologically committed to reducing the size and role of the public sector would provide the necessary funding.

The target of these plans was also moving. By spring 2002, it became apparent that the estimates of the number of new spaces needed to meet the increased demand were too low. Both community college and university enrollments had already exceeded projections. The number of applications for the fall were also higher than anticipated. ACAATO ran ads in newspapers across Ontario that called for an immediate infusion of $125 million per year into community colleges to meet the demands of the double cohort.

The double cohort had become a political pressure cooker. Several Ontario university campuses were now among the largest construction sites in the nation. Media reports focused on the concerns of parents, the intense competition among secondary students for high grades, the increased stress within schools associated with a new curriculum, and the uncertainty of how many students would be admitted to postsecondary institutions in 2003. With an unusual level of political capital at their disposal, institutions signaled their willingness to respond as soon as the government committed the necessary funding.

**With an unusual level of political capital at their disposal, institutions signaled their willingness to respond as soon as the government committed the necessary funding.**

The 2002 Budget

The 2002 budget committed the government to providing full average cost funding for enrollment growth. It also announced a new round of SuperBuild capital funding, a new equipment and renewal program for the community colleges, and increased funding for apprenticeship programs. By 2003 the government was announcing it had approved capital construction projects that would eventually create a total of 135,000 new student spaces in the system.

When the Ontario university and college application centers released their application statistics for September 2003 admissions, the figures became one of the top provincial news stories of the day. The number of students applying to university directly from high school increased 46.7 percent in 2003, compared with 2002 (an increase of almost 70 percent from the 2001 applicant pool). College applications from students applying directly from high school rose by 9.9 percent, and the number of applications from adult learners increased by 17.5 percent.

With only a few months to go before the arrival of the double cohort, public doubts about the government’s ability to deliver on its promise of a space for every qualified and willing student remained. ACAATO continued to voice concerns about the impact of the influx of additional students on the already underfunded system. Finally, in March, the 2003 budget offered some much-needed reassurance. Operating grants were again increased beyond the original commitments, bringing the total to $443 million more.
in 2003–2004 than in 2000–2001. Two Quality Assurance Funds were also created.

Maintaining Access
While the official number of first-year students registered at colleges and universities is not yet available, the COU expected universities to enroll the usual proportion of applicants from Ontario’s high schools—a remarkable achievement. In June 2003, close to 72,000 students had accepted positions in the province’s universities, and 42,600 confirmed they would attend first-year classes at one of the community colleges.

Ontario’s double cohort is a fascinating case study in the politics of higher education. While governments frequently come under pressure to maintain or increase access, few are forced to address these concerns in the context of a media flurry focusing on the countdown of a very public timeline to address the needs of a specific cohort.

Ross University: Cash Cow or Pig in a Poke?
Alan L. Contreras
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DeVry University, a reputable regionally accredited U.S. college that provides a variety of mainly technical programs, announced in spring 2003 that its corporate parent, DeVry Inc., was buying Ross University’s medical and veterinary schools in the Caribbean in order to improve and expand DeVry’s offerings. It is not unheard of for such international acquisitions to take place, but this one was special: the Ross veterinary school is on the Caribbean island of St. Kitts.

The St. Kitts Situation
Ross has no authorization to issue degrees anywhere in the United States; its office in New Jersey is expressly limited by that state’s laws to noninstructional administrative functions. Therefore, under U.S. law it is a foreign institution, and its degrees must be evaluated as foreign degrees.

Meaningful academic oversight on St. Kitts is doubtful at best. This is the country that once authorized a person in Texas to issue degrees as Eastern Caribbean University. It also hosts Berne University, which recently lost its Title IV approval because of findings by the General Accounting Office (the investigatory office of the U.S. Congress) and the U.S. Department of Education that its programs are not equivalent to a U.S. university, its award of credit is inappropriate and excessive, and its finances are questionable.

Multinational Suppliers
What exactly is the Ross veterinary school? It is not listed by UNESCO (not that this means much for good or ill anymore, since UNESCO has no screening). It does not appear on international lists of universities. The American Association of Collegiate Registrars and Admissions Officers international evaluation office (relied upon by many U.S. colleges for international evaluations) has never seen its degrees. The respected Florida evaluation firm Silny and Associates, which has seen its degrees, considers it only equivalent to an unaccredited U.S. college. It apparently has only a business license from the government of St. Kitts, the college oversight standards of which are, shall we say, opaque.

Has DeVry purchased an overstuffed pig in a foreign poke? Can this reputable U.S. chain school convert this expensive offshore porker that falls well below the normal accreditation radar horizon into a cash cow? Some observers speculate that DeVry assumed that its institutional accreditation from the U.S. North Central Association would automatically extend to cover Ross. Not so, according to the accreditor. Ross is not a unit of DeVry University but a freestanding unit of DeVry, Inc., a parent corporation. Fair enough. Ross must therefore undergo its own evaluation. But by whom and as what?

Nonexistent Oversight
DeVry has no apparent plans to make Ross a U.S. accredited school. According to the U.S. Department of Education, DeVry Inc. intends to keep Ross a foreign school for purposes of maintaining eligibility for U.S. financial aid, a much easier approval standard at the federal level in the United States since it requires no proof of academic oversight or quality, just fiscal management and a foreign business license. It appears that neither DeVry nor the Department of Education cares that the Ross vet-
ernary school has its “approval” from a nation whose approvals are widely considered substandard.

Ross will therefore become an academic version of Dr. Doolittle’s Pushmepullyou, a llama-like creature aimed in two directions at once, but worse: it will be of two species, lurching about to provide a chosen face depending on who is looking. No U.S. college or accreditor could possibly treat a school authorized by St. Kitts as having equivalent foreign approval to issue degrees—yet DeVry clearly considers this irrelevant.

The U.S. Department of Education piously cites its own rules, which say that foreign schools don’t need the equivalent of U.S. accreditation to be eligible for U.S. financial aid money. They just need whatever the local business license is, and if it is labeled “accreditation,” well, that is good enough for the U.S. government. So DeVry has bought a U.S.-certified foreign college that never requires external oversight by a legitimate national college oversight body in the United States or in its home country. Forever.

The fact that degrees issued on St. Kitts are illegal for use in places like Oregon is perhaps too minor a consideration to affect DeVry’s corporate strategy. We are sure that a large, lawyer-filled educational provider like DeVry has already figured out that buying a school located on an island with low oversight standards is a pretty good deal. Like everyone who observes the relationships between U.S. and foreign colleges, legitimate and bogus providers, we watch in anticipation, since the future of the Ross colleges is likely to be both entertaining and creative.

College Ownership

This picture—a reputable U.S. school purchasing a doubtful offshore degree supplier—may seem strange today but will be seen more often in the future. Unfortunately, the common pattern is not likely to be productive mergers between reputable providers in multiple countries, but the St. Kitts pattern: wealthy U.S. proprietary schools absorbing “approved” schools in small foreign countries, whether or not that approval means anything, and using them as one-way drainage tubes through which money can flow.

There will be no meaningful screening from the U.S. Department of Education, which lacks the structure, staff, funding, inclination, and political support to undertake such unpopular enforcement activity. Only a few states and evaluation firms, with limited ability to sail upwind in an expensive political and legal environment, are pointing out that certain colleges have no clothes. We hope that U.S. colleges and accreditors have the vertebrae to maintain standards in the face of such economic and political pressures.

---

News of the Center

On May 3, the Center hosted a conference of the main researchers on international higher education funded by the Ford Foundation, at Boston College. The discussions focused on how international and comparative higher education might be strengthened in the United States. Work on the Center’s research project on women’s colleges and universities worldwide has now been completed. A book entitled Women’s Universities and Colleges: An International Handbook, by Francesca Purcell, Robin Matross Helms, and Laura Rumbley will be published by the Center, with a commercial edition from Information Age Publishing, Inc. The Center’s collaboration with the Program for Research on Private Higher Education at the University at Albany has concluded with the publication of Private Higher Education: An International Bibliography, by Alma Maldonado-Maldonado, Yingxia Cao, Philip G. Altbach, Daniel C. Levy, and Hong Zhu. CIHE and PROPHE jointly published the book, and a commercial edition will be available from Information Age Publishers, Inc. PROPHE will also provide web-based access to the bibliography.

The Center’s website has achieved the distinction of being at the top of several of the major search engines subject directories. When a user looks for “international higher education” or a related topic, the CIHE site is shown at the top of the lists for Google, Yahoo, and MSN. This is a considerable distinction and indicates that our website is widely used and that those who visit the site spend a significant amount of time on it.

For the 2004–2005 academic year, there are several changes to note in CIHE staff. Hong Zhu will be working for the Boston College Institutional Review Board. Francesca Purcell has received her doctorate for a dissertation on women’s higher education in the Philippines and has joined the staff of the Massachusetts Board of Higher Education. Robin Matross Helms has taken a position with the Institute of International Higher Education in Washington, DC. Deirdre McMyler will join the Center as a graduate assistant. She is currently working as an administrator at Harvard University.
Philip G. Altbach participated in a UNESCO seminar on higher education in Tokyo in May. He will speak at a conference in Bergen, Norway in September and will give a series of lectures in India in the fall. His coedited (with Toru Umakoshi) book, *Asian Universities: Historical Perspectives and Contemporary Realities*, will be published by the Johns Hopkins University Press in late 2004. A Chinese translation will be published by the China Ocean University Press, and a Japanese language edition is also being planned. Dr. Damte Teferra, editor-in-chief of the *Journal of Higher Education in Africa* and research assistant professor at the Center was on a panel on “International Mobility Perspectives” at a conference in Lisbon, Portugal in February 2004 and spoke at the 10th Harvard International Development Conference at Harvard University on “Reinventing African Universities Toward a New Development Agenda in a Globalizing World” that took place in April 2004.

The Center has received a grant for work on a handbook for academic leaders in developing countries. Work proceeds as well on a research project on globalization and higher education. This work is coordinated by Laura Rumbley and Hong Zhu.

*Center related book series and publications*

RoutledgeFalmer Studies in Higher Education, a book series that mainly publishes excellent doctoral dissertations in the field of higher education, is edited by Philip G. Altbach. The series has published more than 20 books on a variety of topics including university-industry collaboration, women’s studies, governance in public universities, the use of information technology in Africa, the development of Catholic higher education in China, and others. More information can be obtained from Kimberly Guinta, RoutledgeFalmer Publishers, 29 W. 35th St., New York, NY 10001, USA.

The Center for International Higher Education’s book series now includes 13 titles, most of which remain in print:


Philip G. Altbach, ed. The Changing Academic Workplace: Comparative Perspectives, 2000. (Also published as a special theme issue of *Higher Education*, vol. 41, nos. 1–2, January–March, 2001)


Free copies of most of these books are available to institutions in developing countries on request.

New Publications


This volume, part of the quarterly “New Directions for Institutional Research” series, discusses the problems of generating financial resources for academic institutions. Writing from an economics perspective, the authors in this volume discuss such topics as generating revenues during a recession, problems with endowments, annual donations at private universities, determining the costs of transfer students, and others. The data and analysis relate to the United States.


This unique volume features thousands of quotations about all aspects of higher education from a vast array of sources, from author Oscar Wilde, Muhammed, and Greek philosophers, to 18th-century Harvard students, and an array of American university presidents. Among the topics for quotations are reform of higher education, the role of the president, students and their habits, and the academic profession and its foibles. While most of the topics relate directly to the United States, as do the quotations, the relevance is worldwide.


With a broad multidisciplinary focus on staff development in a British context, this volume discusses not only the needs of academic staff but also of research and support personnel. There is discussion of e-learning, departmental development, lines between teaching and research, and other topics.


The focus of this volume is on improving teaching through the use of technology. The volume consists of 70 case studies from many disciplines and on a variety of academic institutions in the United States relating to the classroom use of technology. All aspects of technology are considered, such as the use of the Internet for teaching, learning spaces, and many others. Issues relating to the failure of technology in teaching are considered as well.


This annual publication provides detailed information concerning international student and scholar enrollments in the United States. Statistics concerning countries sending students to the United States, fields of study, institutions hosting large numbers of international students, numbers of American students studying abroad, and related information are provided. *Open Doors* shows that for the first time in many years, international student enrollments in the United States have not increased.


This book presents a study of the attitudes of senior academic administrators toward a variety of governance issues, including the involvement of faculty in governance, information technology, and other issues—based on a number of surveys.


A republication of a classic history of the growth of the research university in the United States, this book analyzes the period of shaping the nature of this central American higher education institution. Special attention is paid to the...
privately funded research system and the emergence of research as a key factor.


Lee, Molly N. N. *Restructuring Higher Education in Malaysia.* Penang, Malaysia: Universiti Sains Malaysia, 2004. 130 pp. (pb). ISBN 983-40982-1-9. Address: School of Educational Studies, Universiti Sains Malaysia, Penang 11800, Malaysia. This volume contains a series of essays on the broad theme of Malaysian higher education. Among the topics considered are the development of private higher education, the changing academic profession, academic corporatization, and global trends as they affect Malaysia.


National Education Association. *The NEA 2004 Almanac of Higher Education.* Washington, DC: National Education Association, 2004. 136 pp. $35 (pb). ISBN 0743-670X. Address: National Education Association, 1201 16th St., NW, Washington DC 20036, USA. This valuable annual publication looks at the American academic profession and collective bargaining. The almanac is sponsored by the National Education Association, the largest union of teachers and educational professionals in the United States and is intended to provide data and analysis relating to NEA concerns. Among the topics discussed in the 2004 almanac are the evaluation of teaching and research, funding patterns for higher education in the 50 states, shared governance, and bargaining issues relating to workload. A CD-Rom containing data on faculty salaries, collective bargaining issues, and other information is provided.

Newfield, Christopher. *Ivy and Industry: Business and the Making of the American University,* 1880–1980. Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2004. 304 pp. $232.95 (hb). ISBN 0-8223-3201-9. Address: Duke University Press, 905 W. Main St., Durham, NC 27701, USA. This book traces the historical links between American universities and business and applied knowledge, on the one hand, and the humanities and critical analysis, on the other. These two trends have generally produced a productive tension. The author points out that U.S. universities have been “managed” for a long time and that there are often conflicts between academic values and the ethos of management—often gaining the upper hand in recent years.

Shatlock, Michael. *Managing Successful Universities.* Maidenhead, UK: Open University Press, 2003. 200 pp. (pb). ISBN 0-335-209610-0. Address: Open University Press, Shoppenhangers Rd., Maidenhead, Berks. SL6 2QL, UK. Written by one of the most successful university administrators in the United Kingdom, this volume distills Shatlock’s experience on such topics as the characteristics of successful management, financial issues, entrepreneurialism, organization, and collegiality and leadership. Although the analysis deals with the United Kingdom, this volume will be of interest internationally.

Shen, Hong, and Wenli Li. *A Review of the Student Loans Scheme in China.* Paris: International Institute for Educational Planning, 2003. 115 pp. (pb). ISBN 92-9223-001-8. Address: IIEP, 7-9 rue Eugene Delacroix, 75116 Paris, France. Loans, often provided or guaranteed by governments, are an increasingly important part of the funding of higher education worldwide. This book describes and analyzes China’s student loan system. The authors argue that the loans do not necessarily reach the targeted low-income groups and that repayment problems exist.


A summary of a major research project focusing on the internationalization of undergraduate education in American colleges and universities, this report concludes that while there have been significant efforts to internationalize in recent years, U.S. universities are not significantly internationalized, and most students have little exposure to international experiences as part of their education. The report recommends more emphasis on study abroad as well as the enhancing of on-campus international initiatives.


The Indian University Grants Commission is a somewhat unique agency. Its role is mainly to encourage reform and innovation in Indian higher education by providing central government funding to specific institutions and projects. The agency also supports several central government-sponsored universities. The book provides a critical analysis of the role of the UGC during its half century of operation and discusses such topics as the role of accreditation, professionalizing the professoriate, and others.

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: <arnoldk@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/avp/soe/hea/JEA/html>.

International Higher Education is available full-text on our website. Web-based subscriptions are also available.