

Editorial

For those SRHE members who are based in the United Kingdom, this is something of a time of introspection. Earlier in the year, a very significant policy document appeared from the UK Government, with potentially enormous effects on the HE system in England. Its impact on systems elsewhere in the UK is rather less direct, though there are certain to be some knock-on effects, particularly from the proposed increase in maximum levels of undergraduate student fees. The now-devolved Welsh and Scottish administrations appear likely to commit themselves to a different path; indeed, we could soon see differences between the various systems in the UK as great as differences between any of them and those prevailing in other countries. But policy changes in any one part of the UK – and to a slightly lesser extent those in any one part of the European Union – will impact upon other parts, in the increasingly globalised HE scene. At a time of change, comparative studies are needed as never before. It might be particularly interesting, in future editions of *International News*, to see some reflections on the English policy scene from observers in other countries.

It is interesting to note how often policy change is based on assumptions with dubious support in researched fact. Nowhere is this clearer than in parts of the UK government statement. Its most controversial aspect within the HE community has proved to be, not the proposals on funding and fees, nor even the way in which these are linked to the Government's drive for wider access, but what is said about the relationship between teaching and research and its implications for the structure of the system. In the eyes of many of its critics, the policy document significantly downgrades the relationship, in the interests of greater selectivity in research funding and the desire to shift at least some institutions towards a "teaching-only" role. In doing so, it draws analogies with the USA system (if indeed that country can be said to have a single system at all) to suggest that a strongly defined hierarchy of research-focused and teaching-focused institutions is best equipped both to maximise world-class research and knowledge transfer and to achieve the widest possible access to teaching. Critics have disputed this interpretation of the US scene. But there are precious few facts – either about how research does actually inform teaching (and vice versa), in what ways and at what levels, or about how other countries' systems, many of them still based on a binary divide or an even

more complex structure, actually work. SRHE's own Annual Conference in December this year will, serendipitously, be focusing on these very questions, and it is to be hoped that, perhaps even more than in the past, there will be a strong international presence and contribution.

Meanwhile it is also serendipitous that the main papers in this edition both come from the USA, though in one case the author originates from and focuses on Eastern Europe, and that their sources are not obviously identified with the most research-intensive elements in the US "system". Morey's global look at the professoriate is in a true sense agenda-setting, whilst Kweik's narrower focus on private universities in Central and Eastern Europe may have an equal resonance in many other countries. A brief report on the progress of the HE Reform Network, with its considerable interest in the same geographical area, appropriately compliments Kweik's paper.

Whilst we may hope that the many international conferences planned for later in the year – some of which are announced at the end of this issue – will provide material for future issues, unsolicited contributions are always most welcome.

Anthony Woollard, woollard@btinternet.com.

Contents

| | |
|---|---|
| Major Trends Impacting Faculty Roles and Rewards: An International Perspective..... | 2 |
| HERN and the Eastern European Network..... | 5 |
| The Missing Link: Public Policy for the Private Sector in Central and East European Higher Education..... | 6 |
| International conferences..... | 8 |

The views expressed by the contributors to International News are not necessarily those held by SRHE.

**SRHE, 76 Portland Place
London W1B 1NT
tel: 020 7637 2766
fax: 020 7637 2781
srheoffice@srhe.ac.uk
<http://www.srhe.ac.uk/>**

Major Trends Impacting Faculty Roles and Rewards: An International Perspective

Ann I Morey

*Professor and Director, Centre for Educational Research Innovation and Policy
San Diego State University, California.*

The academic profession is at the heart of the development and transmission of the intellectual heritage of the world. Over the centuries, the expectations, challenges and opportunities of many national and social settings have shaped its character. While symbolically held together by its traditions, the academic profession today is diverse and complex. Dramatic changes are occurring worldwide that are altering higher education as an institution and may bring about unprecedented changes in academic staff as its labour force. Most of these forces are external to HE. While they will impact specific disciplines, institutions and national systems differentially, the general direction can be discerned.

To meet the demands of the 21st century, higher education institutions around the world are undergoing reforms regarding their missions and better use of their intellectual resources. The convergence of such external factors as globalization, the increasing economic role of knowledge, information technology, and reduced public funding of HE place enormous pressure on institutions to change. Other forces include:

- changes in governmental structures
- increasing rate of knowledge creation
- demographic shifts in student populations
- changes in societal expectations for higher education
- the market model as applied to higher education
- the emergence of other providers of postsecondary education.

These factors and their interactions are driving the transformation of universities and impacting the nature and quality of academic work

One major force for change is the globalization of economic, cultural, political and intellectual institutions, along with the increasing interdependence of nations. The revolution in technological communications has accelerated this transformation by bringing about a real time, globally connected world. As markets become more global, economic development is linked to a nation's ability to acquire and utilize scientific, technical and socioeconomic knowledge, and medium to high levels of technology content now characterizes over half of international trade (Salmi 2000). Business and industry increasingly are entering into partnerships with academic researchers and HEIs for the development of new products and processes to bring about these applications (Salmi 2000).

However, concurrent with these changes, governments in many countries have reduced their support of HE. At the same time, many institutions are expected to increase enrolments in order to widen student access

and meet employer demands for a trained workforce. Governments have urged institutions to seek private forms of funding, including partnerships with corporations. Slaughter and Leslie (1997) documented this relationship between the growth of the global political economy and HE policies, which they termed "academic capitalism" in Australia, Canada, the United Kingdom and the United States.

Trends impacting teaching and learning

Before the last quarter of the 20th century, new knowledge was created and disseminated at a rate that assumed people accumulated knowledge before they contributed to it. This is no longer true. The accelerating rate of knowledge creation rattles universities to the very foundations (Clark, 2000). Disciplines have fractured and faculty members scramble to master a meaningful sphere of knowledge - leaving them feeling disempowered within their own disciplines. In addition, as institutions face the inevitable reality of making choices regarding what specializations and disciplines they will include, faculty may face decisions about the nature and place of their careers.

The challenge for faculty members and universities is to diversify and specialize, especially given the dispersal of knowledge, and its relatively easy access from almost anywhere (Williams 1998). Gibbons (1998) argues that universities must fundamentally restructure their approaches to teaching and research if they want a role as problem-solvers and purveyors of knowledge. To accomplish this they must adopt an approach which places emphasis on teams, networks, connectivity and other characteristics that are counter to the current dominant culture that emphasizes individual personal autonomy and discipline based research.

In addition, transdisciplinary patterns of new knowledge are emerging in teaching and research. The search for solutions to complex problems splits faculty identification between their "home" discipline and new configurations.

Technology and learning. In some respects, we are just beginning to perceive and understand the full impact of information technology on the nature and future of the university. They are emerging as new mediums, not just new ways to engage in old modes of communication and advanced conceptual abilities.

In an insightful article, Brown (2000) believes that in an interactive world, the boundaries between producing and consuming knowledge are fluid. University faculty, the traditional producers of knowledge, will continue to be a rich intellectual and educational resource, but they will increasingly also be consumers of knowledge

produced by their traditional consumers (students, alumni, business and industry, government agencies, etc.). Faculty culture will change from focusing on producing and transmitting knowledge to one that also will honor and facilitate fluid boundaries among knowledge producers from other organizations and settings.

Changing demographics. Another trend influencing faculty roles and rewards is changing demographics of students. Many countries have experienced dramatic changes in the cultural, ethnic and racial diversity, gender and age mix of their students. These changes present challenges to academic staff regarding curriculum, instructional strategies, and their personal attitudes and orientations. Moreover, in Europe and Australia, massification of higher education has stretched institutional capacity and challenged faculty to teach students who are less prepared for college work.

The types of students academics serve influence faculty identities. The changing student body is welcomed by some academics and unsettling to others, as it represents a less elite student clientele and a shift in society's vision of the mission of higher education.

This general context of the changing college student also makes a ready market for institutions that are "no frills" and offer programs with active instructional strategies and at times and locations convenient to students. Thus, a diversified market of knowledge providers and learners is emerging at the perimeters of traditional higher education. Rapidly expanding among them in the USA are for-profit, degree granting institutions.

The Emerging Professoriate

The convergence of these trends has placed enormous pressures on HE structures to change, even transform, in order to respond to the new realities. They are the major forces having the potential to redefine the professoriate. Their impact continues to vary across and among HE sectors and within national contexts. During this period of complexity and rapid change, we cannot predict with certainty what the outcomes/affects on faculty roles and rewards will be, but we can discern some general directions and turning points.

Core Tasks of Academic Work: Teaching and Research

While academic work involves a complexity of tasks, its core is teaching and research.

How academics *teach* has changed little over the decades. Nevertheless, while perhaps not leading to the widespread transformation of teaching, today's environment may significantly alter teaching in many institutions and disciplines. The knowledge explosion challenges academics to decide what content to include, how to organize it and for what purposes. Moreover, technology alone has introduced new learning modalities that challenge our assumptions about how students learn. New pedagogical approaches involving active and interactive learning, in synchronous and

asynchronous formats, are emerging from the concurrent use of multimedia and computers. Technologists and other specialists often work in collaboration with professors as they learn to use technology as part of the teaching/learning process.

In the USA and other countries, a movement to improve teaching has been underway for several decades that has sought to restructure the teaching role of faculty: to shift the focus from how faculty members teach to how students learn. This has led to an emphasis on student outcomes that has been furthered by calls for accountability and resulted in professors assuming broader roles as assessors of student learning.

The focus on student learning requires a fundamental shift away from the core focus on faculty members' disciplinary and research interests. A change of this magnitude is indeed difficult. Indeed, the American experience bears this out. Efforts to reward teaching and learning did result in innovations, but little has changed the research prominence in the reward system (Lazerson, Wagener and Shumanis 2000).

Perhaps the real revolution regarding teaching is yet to come. Salmi (2000) cites examples of such innovations in Brazil, Australia, Denmark, Scotland and elsewhere. Coaldrake (1999) projects a more professional approach to university teaching. For example, he reports that Australian academics are being asked to respond to the needs of diverse student groups, design curriculum across disciplines and around learning outcomes, employ new theories of learning, and gain expertise in technology.

Research remains preeminent in Western universities and is the major source of prestige and upward mobility for professors and institutions. Faculty rewards for research are tangible and are reflected in upward career mobility, increased prestige and salary. Changing the culture that rewards research, even at teaching institutions, is unlikely to occur (Clark 1987; Lazerson et al 2000). But changing the nature of research and the patterns of research work is possible, and evidence abounds that university research is itself changing in orientation, rewards structures and organizational relationships.

Governments are exerting influence by their funding patterns and research priorities. The research assessment exercise in the UK is used in determining the flow of research dollars from the government to the universities. In Australia, academics compete for commonwealth grants, while institutions seek to increase their share of the Research Quantum.

As noted earlier, faculty efforts are increasingly directed toward programs and research that intersects with the market. In their four-country study, Slaughter and Leslie (1997) found that in national policies promoted a shift from basic or curiosity-driven research to commercial or targeted or strategic research.

Other aspects of faculty life: faculty autonomy, authority, rewards and identity. Fundamental to university faculty is the personal autonomy faculty members enjoy in their teaching and research. It contributes to their sense of identity and is a primary source of work motivation and satisfaction. But this notion that faculty have control over all aspects of their teaching and research is being challenged by the new realities. For example, academic work in traditional and for-profit HE is being unbundled, with groups of specialists and other providers assuming specific tasks, such as curriculum design, teaching, instructional materials development, and assessment (Morey, 1999; Cunningham et al 2000; McInnis 2000).

The changes in academic authority go beyond the curriculum and relate to shared governance in general and the role of disciplines as central to organizational structure and functioning. The changing models of management are most often related to the reforms of devolution, massification and entrepreneurialism. This growth in management and non-faculty academic professionals has shifted power away from academics and made their work more interrelated and less a function of "isolated" professors (Rhoades & Sporn, 2002).

Along with differentiation and the unbundling of roles will come a diversification of employment arrangements. Complex functions will give rise to specialized staff who probably will not enjoy lifetime employment or the same traditional intrinsic rewards as traditional faculty members. For example, the capacity to respond quickly to labor market needs, the emergence of new disciplines and transdisciplines, new technologies, and other changing environmental conditions may require more flexible arrangements regarding traditional academics, including performance evaluation and the abandonment of tenure and civil service appointments. There is already evidence of such changes within traditional faculty ranks as HE seeks to become more flexible, responsive and cost-effective (Teichler 1998; Henkel 2000).

With regard to evaluation, post-tenure review is now required in 60% of USA campuses. National quality assurance mechanisms were implemented in the UK and Australia, and student evaluations of teaching is becoming the norm in several countries (Coaldrake 1999).

The new entrepreneurialism will bend some faculty members' perspectives toward the market. Faculty work with private companies in developing courses and instructional materials is making the working relationship between faculty and their universities more complex, and policies regarding intellectual property rights are being scrutinized, revised and challenged. Entrepreneurialism will generally continue to create tensions for academic work, especially between entrepreneurial centers and traditional departments

Even so, many rewards in academic life are of intrinsic value, and academics consistently report that they are more motivated by intrinsic interests than by material ones. Certainly, for most faculty members the central system of rewards is recognition from their disciplines for their research and scholarly accomplishments (Clark

1987). These rewards can be both social and intellectual, primarily centered in the invisible colleges of disciplines and subdisciplines that transcend regional and increasingly national boundaries. The prestige faculty accrue can have powerful affects on the recognition and opportunities they receive during their careers.

As Tierney (1999) observed, academics can no longer assume that they will be doing similar things in similar ways. Certainly, in this age of instant communication and globalization, faculty will become more global in their disciplinary perspectives and some faculty will even become citizens of time rather than place. Invisible colleges in those disciplines now mostly confined to national boundaries will likely expand, resulting in the measurement of prestige and status by one's colleagues worldwide.

Many of the potential changes in academic life may impact faculty identity. Norms of independence, integrity, commitment to discipline, and intellectual standards are powerful determinants of the core role and identity of faculty. Yet some of the changes bring into question whether HE can still maintain, and not undermine, the underlying values that support academic life. When control over the curriculum is curtailed, academics feel that their normative space has been invaded and their sense of self-esteem shaken (Henkel 2000).

Conclusions

The convergence of change forces presses against traditional higher education and the work of many academics and their institutions in unprecedented ways. The capacity to respond requires increasing flexibility and diversification of HE as well as the establishment of new resource streams. But the cultures, operational structures and missions of universities do not easily adapt to meet new external expectations and internal realities. Institutions will need to develop new organizational arrangements that can move individuals and institutions in desired directions. Among the arrangements are linkages with other entities, incentives, support systems, performance measures as well as new structures to accommodate the knowledge explosion, the applications of communications technologies and entrepreneurial activities. The need for flexibility especially impacts traditional patterns of academic appointments, rewards and careers. In many cases, needed changes will require renegotiating the balance between institutional objectives and individual academic work and autonomy. Increased differentiation and stratification of faculty roles and status within and across sectors of HE will occur.

Within this context, some academics will become more integrated with their local region and institutions, other academics will undoubtedly be pulled by global forces and the development of disciplines across national and continental boundaries. All will be influenced by the revolution in communication and information technologies and the ever-increasing pace of knowledge generation. Even so, the "transformation" of the academic profession surely will differ within disciplines and across institutions and national borders. While

these changes may seem dramatic, and well they might be, the academic profession at its core has been resilient and stable over the centuries. Traditional and symbolic values of the profession will endure and allow it to adapt to higher education in the 21st century.

References

Brown, J.S. (2000) *Growing up digital: how the web changes work, education, and the way people learn*, Change, March/April, 11-20.

Clark, B.R. (1987) *The Academic Life: Small Worlds, Different Worlds*. Princeton: The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching

Clark, B.R. (2000) *The entrepreneurial university: New foundations for collegiality, autonomy, and achievement*. Paper presented to the IMHE General Conference, Paris, France, 11-13 September.

Coaldrake, P. and Stedman, L. (1999) *Academic Work in the Twenty-First Century: Changing Roles and Policies, 99H*. Higher Education Division. Australia: Commonwealth of Australia.

Cunningham, S., Ryan, Y., Stedman, L. et al. (2000) *The Business of Borderless Education, AGPS Canberra*. <http://www.detya.gov.au/highered/eippubs.htm#00-3>

Gibbons, M. (1998) *Higher education relevance in the 21st century*. Paper presented to the UNESCO World Conference on Higher Education, Paris, France, 5-9 October.

Henkel, M. (2000) *Academic Identities and Policy Change in Higher Education*. London: Jessica Kingsley Publishers.

Lazerson, M., Wagener, U., and Shumanis, N. (2000) *What makes a revolution? Teaching and learning in higher education, 1980-2000*, Change, May/June, 12-19.

McInnis, C. (2000) *The impact of new technologies on academic work*. Paper presented to the Anniversary Symposium of the Center for the Study of Higher Education, State College, PA, 24-25 June.

Morey, A.I. (1999) *The Growth of For-profit Education in the United States*. Paper presented to the Japan/U.S. Teacher Education Consortium's Eleventh Annual Meeting, Honolulu, Hawaii, 2-4 August.

Rhoades, G. & Sporn, B. (2002). 'New models of management and shifting modes and costs of production: Europe and the United States.' *Tertiary Education and Management*, 8, 3-28.

Salmi, J. (2000) *Tertiary education in the twenty-first century: challenges and opportunities*. Paper presented to the IMHE General Conference, Paris, France, 11-13 September.

Slaughter, S. and Leslie, L.L. (1997) *Academic Capitalism: Politics, Policies and the Entrepreneurial University*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.

Teichler, U. (1998) 'Massification: a challenge for institutions of higher education,' *Tertiary Education and Management*, 4(1): 17-27.

Tierney, William G. (1999) *Building the Responsive Campus: Creating High Performance Colleges and Universities*. Thousand Oaks, California: Sage.

Williams, G. (1998) 'Advantages and disadvantages of diversified funding in universities,' *Tertiary Education and Management*, 4(2): 85-93
amorey@mail.sdsu.edu.

Higher Education Reform Network (HERN)

The Higher Education Reform Network (HERN) has reached the half-way point in its 3 year programme. Seminars have been held in Riga, Athens, Leiden, Sofia and Stockholm and we also held a symposium as part of the SRHE conference in Glasgow in December 2002. The next seminar is entitled "*Legitimacy, quality and accountability for lifelong learning and higher education*" and will be held in Krakow, Poland on 4 and 5 July 2003. This seminar (and the subsequent web-based eForum discussions) will be concerned with the analysis of issues of quality and accountability both within HEIs and in relation to the wider governance of HE in order to contribute to a policy briefing paper for the EC on future policies on HE and quality across Europe in the lead up to EU enlargement. There will be a welcome reception on Thursday followed by a full day's programme on Friday and a half-day concluding session on Saturday. There will be papers on accreditation from both national and institutional perspectives, a review of current German experience by Achim Hopbach and an analysis of quality issues in lifelong learning together with panel discussions and workshop sessions led by contributors from Poland, Czech Republic, Latvia, Sweden and the UK. For further information, please contact Professor Marek Frankowicz (frankowi@chemia.uj.edu.pl).

A significant element of the project is concerned with the implications and consequences of disability for students, teachers and institutions that includes two collaborative research projects on "*conditions which affect un/employment for disabled graduates*" and

"teaching and learning strategies for visually impaired students". These projects began in April 2002 and run until to March 2004 and represent a major collaborative effort for the Austrian, Greek, Latvian, Swedish and UK partners.

The last three seminars of the project will be held in 2004 and these are:

- "*Key features of teaching and learning in the university of tomorrow*", 22/23/24 January 2004, Glasgow, Scotland.
- "*Distance education and the use of technology for tomorrow's knowledge society*", 23/24 April 2004, Kaunas, Lithuania.
- "*Guidance for employment and inclusion: the development of new competencies*", 25/26 June 2004, Prague, Czech Republic.

At this half-way point we can say that the network has been established and that it is functioning effectively. On the other hand the policy outcomes are only at an early stage of development and the end of the project is now in sight. So, the project has just reached its apogee: we are confident that we will deliver but are already anticipating the rush.

Myszka Guzkowska, Co-ordinator, HERN Project University of Surrey Roehampton
m.guzkowska@roehampton.ac.uk
www.HEReform.Net

The HERN project is a Thematic Network supported by EC funds under contract HPSE-CT-2001-50011. The Commission's support is gratefully acknowledged.

The Missing Link: Public Policy for the Private Sector in Central and East European Higher Education

Marek Kweik

Professor of Philosophy and Director of the Center for Public Policy, Poznan University, Poland, and currently a Collaborating Scholar at SUNY-New York

The processes of social transition in Central and Eastern Europe (CEE) include also the transition of educational systems and the shift in educational policies: a move away from the state and towards the market. After more than a decade of mainly failed attempts, the challenges to educational reforms are still huge. Wholesale educational policies are rarely implemented, sometimes still non-existent; there are few examples of national visions of higher education systems compatible with the goals of the common “European higher education area”.

In the last half-century, despite immense growth in enrolments, European public HE remained relatively stable from a qualitative point of view and its fundamental structure remained unchanged. No major changes occurred that could be as revolutionary as the changes we are currently witnessing. The forces of change worldwide are similar and they push higher education systems towards more market-oriented and more competitive arenas (and certainly towards less state regulation). For centuries, “the market” had no major influence on European higher education. Most (modern) universities were created by the state and subsidized by the state; most students attended public institutions and most faculty worked in public institutions. Today market forces are invading higher education: while the form and pace of change is different in different parts of the world, that change is happening everywhere. The growth of the private sector in European post-communist countries is part of a much larger picture in which the restructuring of the whole public sector, the retrenchment of the welfare state, increasing privatization and marketization of public services generally and the influence of the forces of globalization are most visible.

Private HE is one of the fastest-growing and most dynamic sectors of education in CEE countries and yet it is still little understood and hardly ever analyzed in educational policy terms. Its fantastic expansion in recent decade is due to huge demand for access to higher education combined with the inability of the state to provide the necessary support. After about a decade of reforms of public institutions, there is a dramatic expansion of the private segment of higher education in several CEE countries (e.g. Estonia, Romania, Moldova, Poland). This expansion is not sufficiently reflected in scholarly debates or in national educational policies. Yet HE plays a crucial role in both generating and supporting current social transformations towards market economy and “knowledge-based” societies.

Poland, with a 30% share of enrolments (almost 500,000 students) in the private sector, and no solid policy for its functioning, is a good example. Private HE operates there in a largely unregulated space,

beyond reasonable quality control (and accreditation procedures), in the midst of still unreformed and underfunded public institutions. Reliable data about this social, economic and institutional phenomenon, as well as studies on its further implications for national educational policy, are scarce.

The private sector is becoming significant part of national education systems today in several CEE countries. But the question remains: how to build the common European research area and HE space if private higher education, still (on average) marginal in Western Europe but visibly present in several CEE countries, is mostly neglected in CEE educational policies, legal provisions, and scholarly debates?

A consistent public policy for the private sector in the region seems to be missing. But CEE’s private sector is also a “missing link” in current European research programmes and current publications, except for a handful of articles in international journals in recent years. Globally, the private sector is thoroughly studied. The conceptual and analytical literature is wide; but the CEE region is mostly absent from these debates, with main efforts focused on the USA, Latin America, and the Far East. The two single fundamental books are *Private Prometheus: Private Higher Education and Development in the 21st Century* edited by Philip G. Altbach and *Higher Education and the State in Latin America: Private Challenges to Public Dominance* authored by Daniel C. Levy. Levy’s classical book provides a unique conceptual framework for educational policy for the private sector (Levy is also a director of PROPHE, the Program for Research on Private Higher Education, at SUNY-New York, where the present author is a collaborating scholar).

In CEE countries, the interrelation between the “transition experience” and global transformations in mainstream educational policies is particularly strong. While the transition experience means that educational reforms should be deep and structural, politically-supported, fast (compared with EU countries) and implemented as part of much wider social and economic reform agendas, global transformations lead mainly to a long-term shift in state/market relationships; that means a changing social and economic status of public higher education and possibly steady growth of the private sector. The state/market relationships vary dramatically according to particular economic, political and cultural responses to felt pressures, but the change can have potentially complex and unpredictable effects on educational policies in several CEE transition countries.

While the balance of state and market forces in HE

remains relatively stable in EU countries, on a global scale market forces slowly gain predominance over state forces in very general terms. As opposed to EU countries, public HEIs in some CEE countries are already forced to operate in highly competitive, market-oriented surroundings, with the number of private providers sky-rocketing and the number of students enrolled in the private sector reaching (in some countries, like Poland and Romania) the level of 30 per cent, and in others (like Estonia or Moldova) almost 25 per cent, in the 2000/2001 (with the lower end of the Czech Republic with 1.0, Albania 0.0, Slovakia 0.7; and Russia with 10, Belarus with 13, Bulgaria with 11.5 and Hungary with 14 percent staying in the middle). Evidently market forces in operation are already much stronger in some EU accession countries than in EU countries. Also the reforms about to be introduced in several CEE countries are much more market-oriented than any reforms attempted so far in EU countries in general.

What is crucial is the current legal vacuum, the legal context in which higher education institutions operate today: laws on higher education combined with laws on entrepreneurial activities of for-profits, on non-profit organizations and professional associations etc. Prior to the EU Enlargement in 2004, national policies need to begin to be harmonized with European-level recommendations expressed in the ERA and Bologna initiatives. Market forces entering HE are powerful, forcing the system to become significantly more competitive. The awareness and understanding of the changes about to come on the part of policymakers, the academic community and the wider public are generally very limited. And not surprisingly, clear policies toward the expansion of the private sector are much more crucial in CEE countries than in Western Europe.

The majority of international literature in the field deals with reforming *public* HE; the phenomenon of the expansion of the *private* sector remains, by comparison, relatively undiscussed (in Western Europe on average 95 percent of students attend public institutions, albeit with big differences between particular countries). The role of the private sector in CEE countries – considering its ability to adapt to the new societal needs and new market conditions combined with the drastically underfunded and still unreformed public institutions – is bound to grow. Generally, the triumph of the market economy and the theory and practice of privatization have contributed to the emergence of the private sector and its huge social (and tacit political) acceptance. From the perspective of changing societal needs and relatively declining public support for higher education available, rapidly increasing demand for access combined with the institutional and financial paralysis of the public sector generally, there is a growing need for clear policies and thoughtful legislation.

Emerging market forces in HE combined with increasing competitiveness in the field and significant growth in size of the private sector definitely mean increased access, new learning options and improved

productivity; but the phenomenon also raises important questions about affordability, quality control, need for new regulations and accreditation bodies, social responsibilities of the private sector as well as about the very fundamental attributes of higher education so far – such as civic commitment, disinterested research, its double role of the vehicle of social mobility and a locus of critical thought.

The main concern of policymakers and policy scholars - i.e. reforming public HE – does not go in tandem with the concern for the new and increasingly significant private sector. Both short-term and long-term policy implications are at stake: in the short run, it is useful to engage in a debate about new opportunities (and new threats) provided by the dramatic growth of the private sector in parts of the region, to contribute to formulating a thoughtful public policy about the emerging new higher education map. In the long run, though, it is also useful to raise public awareness of more fundamental issues associated with the advent of the private sector, market forces and fierce competition to the arena of HE: should the expansion of private HE continue, how much responsibility does it have to the public good? How to balance the need for civic engagement, disinterested scholarship, social mobility and traditional values of higher education with the impact brought about to higher education by new private, often for-profit education providers? How to save the core of the ideals of modern higher education in the face of market forces serving private interests rather than the public good? How to regulate the competition between old state-run providers with new, often powerful and cost-efficient private providers? Or maybe leave it to the market and consumers i.e. students?

What is certainly needed is disinterested analysis of the current (in-transition) state of affairs, largely unexplored so far in policy research, and conclusions as to how to deal, in theory and in practice, with growing market forces in education; how to regulate privatization and corporatization of educational institutions and research activities within ongoing reform attempts, and finally how to accommodate principles of the “European Research Area” and requirements of the Bologna process to local conditions of those EU accession countries where the private sector has recently grown surprisingly strong.

References

- Altbach, Philip G (ed.). 1999. *Private Prometheus: Private Higher Education and Development in the 21st Century*. Boston College CIHE, Chestnut Hill, MA.
- Burbules, Nicholas C. and Carlos Alberto Torres. 2000. *Globalization and Education*. New York: Routledge
- European Commission. 2000. *Towards a European Research Area*. Brussels.
- Geiger, Roger L. 1986. *Private Sectors in Higher Education: Structure, Function, and Change in Eight Countries*. University of Michigan Press.
- Giesecke, Hans C. 1999. “The Rise of Private Higher Education in East Central Europe”. *Society and Economy*. 21, no. 1.

Johnstone, D. Bruce. 1999. "Higher Education Under Conditions of Transition to a Market Economy". Available from his SUNY-Buffalo website

Kwiek, Marek (ed.). 2003. *The University, Globalization, Central Europe*. Frankfurt/New York: Peter Lang. Lang.

Kwiek, Marek. 2002. "Academe in Transition: Transformations in the Polish Academic Profession". In: Philip G Altbach (ed) *The Decline of the Guru: The Academic profession in Developing and Middle-Income Countries*, Boston College CIHE, Chestnut Hill, MA.

Levy, Daniel C. 1986. *Higher Education and the State in Latin America. Private Challenges to Public Dominance*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Levy, Daniel C. and Claudio de Moura Castro. 2000. *Myth, Reality, and Reform. Higher Education Policy in Latin America*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins UP.

Levy, Daniel C. 2002. "Unanticipated Development: Perspectives on Private Higher Education's Emerging

Roles". Working Paper No. 1 Available from "PROPHE: Program of Research on Private Higher Education" website: www.albany.edu/~prophe/.

Newman, Frank. 2001. *The New Competitive Arena: Market Forces Invade the Academy*. www.futuresproject.org

Rado, Peter. 2001. *Transition in Education*. Budapest: Open Society Institute.

Tomusk, Voldemar. *The Open World and Closed Societies: Essays on Higher Education Policies 'in transition'* (forthcoming).

UNESCO-CEPES. 2000. *Ten Years After and Looking Ahead: A Review of the Transformations of Higher Education in Central and Eastern Europe*, Bucharest. *Higher Education in Central and Eastern Europe*. Bucharest.

World Bank. 1999. *Education Sector Strategy*. Washington DC.

kwiekm@amu.edu.pl

2003 EAIR (European Association for Institutional research) Conference

Building Bridges and Enhancing Experience

Limerick, Ireland, 24-27 August 2003

Speakers include:

- Dr Don Thornhill, Chair, Higher Education Authority of Ireland
- Dr Edward Walsh, President Emeritus, University of Limerick
- Dr Jan Sadlak, UNESCO-CEPES, Bucharest
- Prof Craig McInnis, University of Melbourne, Australia
- Ms Lesley Wilson, European University Association

Tracks include:

- HE in its context, local, national, international
- Governance and leadership
- Quality development and accreditation
- The student experience
- HE and the world of work
- Management of HE: improving performance
- Management of HE: optimising funding

Further information: <http://www.org.uva.nl/eaair>.

International Conferences

South East Asian AIR (SEAAIR)

Institutional research and quality development in Higher Education

15 – 17 October, 2003, Bangkok, Thailand

Themes:

- Institutional Research
- Quality Excellence, covering R & D in QA System, Q development and implementation, QA Policy on higher education.
- Recent Development in knowledge based society.

While proposals related to the issues above will be especially welcome, any proposal covering the broad areas of institutional research including policy analysis, strategic management, resource planning and analysis of tertiary education is encouraged.

For details contact: Prof. Somwung Pitiyanuwat, Vice President, SEAAIR/Chairperson SEAAIR, 2003 Conference Organizing Committee, c/o The Office of Education, Standard & Evaluation, ONEC Building #2, Sukothai Road, Dusit District, Bangkok, Thailand 10300. Tel: +662 243 7916 ext. 2310; fax: +662 570 8187; Somwung.P@chula.ac.th; www.seaaair.info.

2003 Association for the Study of Higher Education (ASHE) Conference

Portland, Oregon, 12-16 November 2003

Includes General Conference and conferences of the Council on International HE and the Council for Public Policy in HE

Further information: <http://www.ashe.missouri.edu>