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The previous meetings in Bratislava, Riga and Warsaw demonstrate a rich and varied range of challenges. They confirm what anyone associated with an university can appreciate – unprecedented pressure for greater access, better performance and relevant education producing graduates that can compete across the world. However one might respond to these widely held opinions - with despair or annoyance or pleasure – very little will alter this debate unless the higher education sector itself becomes more innovative and entrepreneurial.

Entrepreneurship in higher education is not solely concerned with resources. Rather, as will be explored at the end of this short paper, university entrepreneurship deals with the whole range of issues facing universities – policy, social needs, business demands, teaching innovation, technological applications, research and the quality of education. Obviously money helps but as an end to a means which is to provide relevant skill enhancing education for our young people and future generations.

Although this is a formidable list, it must not become overwhelming. There are colleagues, departments and centers all across the university world grappling with the same set of issues. The value of a conference of this kind is not to provide recipes or even a toolbox, but to find useful examples and case studies that can compare experiences and encourage change in the way that is consistent with the principles and practice of our very different institutions.

I. Organizational culture

All cultures evolve; so does an organizational culture. And this will be true for entrepreneurial cultures at universities and higher education institutions (HEI)s. This paper offers comments and suggestions about how that is happening without claiming any special insight into the seven countries involved in this meeting.

An organizational culture will come about if an institution provides opportunities and incentives for the exercise of entrepreneurship. On the other hand if there are no choices – that is everything is controlled or denied – it will be difficult to exercise entrepreneurship and develop an innovative organizational culture.
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There is a further condition. There must be overall agreement that the institution has the right and responsibility to undertake entrepreneurial activities. If not institutions will exercise their creativity by the back door – through influence, government connections and other means. Entrepreneurship must be a public value.

II. Educational Entrepreneurship and Change

Entrepreneurship, in this paper, is the positive response to change in the higher educational system. Developing a culture of entrepreneurship is one possible outcome of change; others might be an accommodation with the status quo or the sense that institutions are being driven by events and so overwhelmed with the demands placed on them; and which, in turn, could result in disillusion or a sense of despair. Thus entrepreneurship is defined as a set of institutional actions that enhances higher education.

Entrepreneurship depends on leadership, agreed institutional goals and procedures and accepted rules of the game for the HE system. Each of these conditions may be difficult to achieve as they involve all the various players or components of the system. In this sense, analogies to innovative companies and “captains of industry”, the typical image of the entrepreneur, are only partially helpful because higher education is not a typical competitive market. There may be market elements and there is certainly a move from state to public control that involves degrees of privatization, but the social role of education imposes constraints that most countries are not willing to abandon, although subject to intense discussion, which is as it should be.

The model of entrepreneurship that is most suitable to HEIs is that of social entrepreneurship which requires a balance between the goals of education – acting as a framework - and the ability of different institutions in their various ways to maximize their goals within this framework. The educational framework is itself a product of economic, social and political forces – so that it is not static but constantly changing. Fifty years ago, when education was seen as a pyramid, with relatively few people expected to go to universities, the framework (goals and structure) was easy to identify. That world has gone forever and a new framework has replaced it without, as yet, clear rules of the game. This emerging framework, pushed by the twin forces of massification and globalization, is in rapid transition. There are, however, some clear trends of which one of the most important is that HEIs will no longer decide system goals in terms of the older criteria of professional standards and research, even if nominally, but compete with other social actors, once upon a time regarded as extensions or peripheral to the university mission. In particular, business and economic activities will have a growing influence on the framework as their competitive demands grow within the knowledge economy.
The dynamic framework – however messy and partial – is the opportunity for social entrepreneurship and explains why it is important now to encourage these attitudes – to repeat attitudes to change – at HEIs. If the framework is in flux, then effective social entrepreneurship is a way of promoting educational goals and setting out ideas that can influence slowly changing structures. These may not always be optimum from the point of view of every institution, but it is far better to be a participant and actor in this universal and long term debate than passive recipients of change.

An implicit distinction must be made explicit at this stage. For the individual university or technical college, entrepreneurship is maximizing its benefits (however defined). They work within a set of opportunities set out by the framework, as discussed. Some issues are under their control others are not; and it is important to know which. Encouraging and building a culture of entrepreneurship within a higher education institution (HEI) is not just a question of institutional will or capacity alone but depends on the other components of the system. A commitment to change should embrace public and private universities, vocational school etc., as well as state authorities, government, politicians, teachers, researchers, parents and students. Social entrepreneurship requires a general commitment and this in turn requires building incentives and coordination mechanisms within the framework.

This paper will explore these issues in the following way. First, a short discussion of the meeting themes. Second a short discussion of the overall goals of education and higher education, with particular reference to the mechanisms of change, described here as principles, because they show some of the features to which a new framework has to adhere. Third, entrepreneurship takes place within a given structure, which conditions both the framework and the mission of individual units. How is the current system to be changed and what is the role of competition? Fourth, what are the policy choices facing educational systems and why does educational entrepreneurship offer an encouraging alternative to change? And finally how might an educational institution prepare for change – given the principles, structure and policy choices – and what can current examples of this phenomenon show the HEIs of the countries represented here.

III. Meeting themes

The main issues are, of course, resources, quality and the role and responsibilities of universities, government and business. In a sense these are reassuring topics for they are those debated in my own country, Chile, in Latin America, and in the countries that I know in Asia and Africa. Each area, in its own way and with different resource and institutional configurations, is attempting to resolve these issues. Underlying the listed proposals – all of which are important – are the restrictions on public funding, resource constraints and the growth of private arrangements and institutions.
The meeting issues are best summarized by distinguishing between the system and its components. Most of the recommendations fall into one or the other category. The HE system is national, run by Ministries or government authorities, and applies to all components. The components are universities, colleges of further education etc. that make up the UNESCO categories 5 and 6 in the international standard classification. The themes or issues, using this distinction, are set out below.

**Box 1:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Meeting issues</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>System Framework</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Legislative framework</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Funding framework</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Institutions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Institutions</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Autonomy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Quality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Access</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Accountability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Other funds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Bridge issues</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Stakeholders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Research needs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Quality and standards</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Summaries of Bratislava, Riga and Warsaw meeting

The system has to have a stable framework that consists of minimum rules about legislation and funding. Almost all other issues should be left to the discretion of universities or HEIs. This raises the issue of the meaning and degree of component autonomy in different systems and which is critical for the development of entrepreneurial universities and the evolution of an innovative organizational culture. From this perspective the main background paper has concentrated on a system issue, the funding of students and universities. Although there are good reasons to support loan schemes, it is as important that the issue is satisfactorily settled in order to provide stable rules of the game.

Behind this classification is that universities etc. should be autonomous to the point that they are responsible for their own quality, access, and accountability in the first instance. There is little reason and many disadvantages to drawing up complicated national plans for these issues. The higher education
system would do well to rely on the principal components which are often more flexible and able than central administrators.

However universities and higher education institutions are restrained from being rogue capitalists by three types of countervailing powers. First, there are joint or bridging issues that require consultation between the government, HEIs and stakeholders. The different components will approach them in different ways. For example, the government may have a notional figure for the number of young people it would like to have in tertiary education. Universities may not be willing to provide such open access on the basis of standards and therefore it is important to set up a bridging process for discussion of these issues. In principle, universities should be the decision point for these and the other issues listed. Second, no educational institution can work against the set of general principles which underpin policy and which are generally agreed to be in the public interest. Finally there is the enormous residual power of the state, which can alter the rules of the game if the outcomes are unsatisfactory in the long run. The long run must be emphasized because short run changes disturb public policy expectations, a condition for successful university entrepreneurship.

IV. Simple principles

The papers and case studies allow for considerable interpretation and so require a set of benchmarks, which can be called principles. Before examining some of the meeting issues, it is worth stating that higher education should reflect public values and these go beyond higher education. Values and policies about and for higher education are not separate from other values – indeed there is a case for saying that universities should strengthen overall values by example and practice. In addition, these principles, because they are widely shared by meeting participants, permit a general discussion about cultural change, which are inclusive of higher education but not particular to it. Taking the following principles and applying them to educational change allows for wide comparisons and sets out some of the tasks that challenge the university entrepreneur and culture. The principles are,

- Fairness
- Equal access to opportunities
- Public accountability
- Wealth and Knowledge Creation

Each of these concepts have long histories; scholars can provide philosophical and other tests which show their strengths and limitations. Although they have to be interpreted culturally – that is within the configuration of customs, habits, laws, tradition that make up the strengths of each country – they have the advantage of being rapidly understood and accepted by most citizens - this power makes them
formidable driving forces for university change. They are not limited to the higher education system. This is part of their power. They should be at the heart of the university mission.

*Fairness* refers to the way that individuals ought to be treated by universities and institutes of higher education. No one ethnic, gender or other social group, for example, should be excluded or, unless following an agreed compensatory principle, provided with greater advantages than other individuals or social groups.

*Access* to universities, just as to professions or the labor force in general, should be open providing that the individual reaches the agreed standards. There is an immediate objection to this principle as too often university cohorts are already favored as they have been to better schools, have more fortunate parents and other economic and social advantages. Fairness, our first principle, requires that there is as level a playing field as possible so that to ensure equal access, a well functioning secondary system is required. And a well functioning secondary system requires not only a well functioning primary system but also a call on resources that is often prior to that of tertiary education. Government authorities may be sympathetic to university requests for more funds but they have to take the complete education system into account.

The third principle is that of *public information*. First, students cannot make rational choices unless they know about the university and courses in some detail. Governments should not provide funds to any institution unless detailed public accounts are forthcoming. This is a simple principle of fairness, as these resources are collected from the taxpayer and presumably spent in his or her benefit. Universities or higher education might be a line item for the Ministry but each university should produce a relatively detailed record of income and expenditure. A written record provides university authorities and their members with an opportunity to see how well they are performing and provide a basis for future discussion. This is not an accounting revolution but an example of higher educational institutions catching up with a common practice in other spheres of enterprise. Many of these points were made at the Bratislava workshop that called attention to the needs of stakeholders and the need to change the focus from data to information. It follows that published reports by universities are important responses to the question of accountability to society – an issue which will become more pressing in years to come – and is a valuable output for stakeholders and public policy.

The fourth principle is that higher education and universities in particular should generate both *wealth and knowledge*. The most obvious indicator of wealth is the quality and capacity of students. Higher education brings a lifetime earnings premium, when the earnings of high school or secondary student are compared to university graduates. The latter *generally* can look forward to a higher income over his or her lifetime. While, perhaps in the past, this premium
reflected class or entry restrictions the rapid growth of undergraduate and graduates, which is occurring in all your countries, will alter the basis of that premium from scarcity to quality. The value of the premium may change but its existence will continue as modern economies continue to demand greater skills and economies change from manual to knowledge work. So creating wealth in these terms is ensuring that there are a sufficient number of graduates able to manage the modern economy; and for this to be successful there should be effective links with employers, the business community and government at all levels. University education does not guarantee a job, but it should provide training and education with the probability of being employed. Research knowledge is also subject to the needs of stakeholders, broadly conceived. Relations with stakeholders must be balanced and broadly conceived. Although partnerships between private companies and universities are, in my view, to be welcomed, universities have an equal responsibility to future generations to maintain values – such as libraries and archival research – but also to ensure that current knowledge, which may not a vociferous stakeholder – in fields such as theoretical physics and/or literature – continue to be taught and developed. Not all universities can teach every subject even though in principle the choice of subject areas, curriculum and research topics are the choice of the university and its members alone.

Effective university entrepreneurship must build its initiatives by using these four public policy values.

V. Structure and policy

All the meeting issues present challenges that require creative institutional responses. University or HEI responses are conditioned by the goals and principles of the education system that, in turn are conditioned by national laws, rules and regulations. Entrepreneurship has to work through the prism of structure.

Does building an entrepreneurial rather than institutionally opportunistic culture requires a degree of stability and reliability? As the various case studies show, most of the higher education systems are going through a period of considerable change and where in some cases, the rules of the game are unknown or subject to a lack of confidence or arbitrary interpretation. It is not change, as such that is the problem – that is the present and the future and cannot be wished away. Rather without key issues being settled as a public process, university entrepreneurship can become a kind of “cowboy capitalism” by which all the principles previously discussed are broken. Entrepreneurship has to be distinguished from opportunism.

One of the most important is how the system’s structure influences performance, across the dimensions of funding, teaching and research. The configuration of the structure – its size, legal basis, number of component
institutions, their competitiveness or contestability – will condition opportunities for university entrepreneurship. While a number of financial issues are clearer because of the background papers, other aspects are not quite so clear. In discussing policy issues it is important for system administrators in particular to understand the overall structure and how, when new legislation and funding rules are introduced, how different rival institutions might behave. Different structures generate different policy challenges.

There is no simple was to describe structure. The table below was drawn up to help understand relevant aspects.

Table 1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>HEI</th>
<th>Students</th>
<th>Percent Relevant Age group</th>
<th>Per student Expend. PPP</th>
<th>Public Funding %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>Total (000's)</td>
<td>Public Percent</td>
<td>1995</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sources</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Czech</td>
<td>2004/05</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>298.2</td>
<td>92.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hungary</td>
<td>1999/2000</td>
<td>89</td>
<td></td>
<td>171.2</td>
<td>89.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latvia</td>
<td>2000/03</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>118.9</td>
<td>75.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lithuania</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poland</td>
<td>2002/03</td>
<td>377</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>1,781.5</td>
<td>70.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slovakia</td>
<td></td>
<td>21</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>99.9</td>
<td>99.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slovenia</td>
<td>2001/02</td>
<td>22</td>
<td></td>
<td>77.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sources:
Columns 1-4, Eurodyce Country Profiles, Columns 5-7, UNICEF, TransMonee Database, 2004; columns 8 & 9, OECD.

First, almost all systems remain public systems although with greater variation than, for example, older European countries. Public attendance predominates and private funding plays less of a role than in other Asian and

---

1 The data is taken directly from official reporting agencies. No attempt was made to go beyond this data.
American countries\textsuperscript{2}. Second, cost per student is far less than older European countries, but appears to have been increasing in those systems making greater use of non-state sources. Third, all systems have expanded their intake as seen by the changing age relevant percentage participation, although this ratio may not take account of the large number of part time and distance students. Fourth, the tertiary sector is made up of an array of different institutions, dominated by large public universities. Finally, privatization within each system is a matter of degree and needs to be assessed in terms of these various dimensions: mission or purpose, ownership, source of revenue, control of government, and norms of management (See Appendix 2).

The overall organizational culture will be strongly influenced by their role within the system and relations between components. Further, the success or failure of resolving the issues set out at previous meetings will feed back into the different HEIs as inhibitors or stimulants for continued university change and entrepreneurship.

An examination of the following key issues should give a sense of potential for university entrepreneurship under each system. The key issues are,

- Autonomy
- Resources
- Competition and privatization
- Information
- Quality

If these issues are settled – even if as a wary truce – then entrepreneurship can flourish because in each case they involve incentives to do better. Approaches to these issues can shape the culture of entrepreneurship.

\textit{a) Autonomy}

The degree of autonomy clearly differs by country and tradition as Table 8 and 9 in the background paper shows (reproduced as Appendices 3 & 4). In comparison to some European systems, some of the E8 appear to have greater autonomy.

Greater private participation does not necessarily imply a greater autonomy as examples from Asia show (see Appendix 5).

\textsuperscript{2} The tertiary institutions of Canada, the United States, Argentina, Chile, Australia and Korea receive less than 60 per cent of income from government.
Autonomy

- How would you characterize relations between the government and autonomous institutions? Which aspects of autonomy and governance should be encouraged today?
- How important is autonomy to the running of the university?
- Do you see greater autonomy as providing greater opportunities?
- What are the advantages and disadvantages of autonomy?
- Can the university alter the price of services to students and others without reference to the government?

b) Resources

The most obvious driving force for change is the issue of resources. University education is becoming increasingly expensive – particularly when all direct and indirect costs are included – and it is quite unlikely that public resources will continue to expand to meet those costs and demand. And this is without mentioning competing costs – such as pension provisions – and the importance of maintaining an effective pre university educational system. Recall that the quality of the modern university depends on good secondary students. Repair courses may be socially necessary but they should not become a university staple and so it is in the university’s interest to ensure that students are well trained before they become undergraduates.

If resources are unlikely to keep up with student expansion, measured as a per student state contribution, then there are two possible outcomes. The first is to find an alternative way, within the public budget to finance costs; and the second is to pass these costs on to others. The most obvious example, discussed at length in the accompanying paper, is to convert student grants to loans of which income contingent loans would appear to be the most favored.

Income contingent loans are intended to promote access and as they are income contingent, assuming the scheme is administratively feasible, meet the test of fairness. However there are drawbacks because the scheme assumes a relatively high level of administrative skill and disclosure. For this reason, simple loans should not be disregarded providing there is a means test which takes account of student’s initial conditions. However a loan scheme is unlikely to improve higher education cash flow on its own until the first cohorts have begun to repay, unless the government or private investors are willing to guarantee these loans.

The second possibility, transferring costs to others is a feature of most university education. Families have usually paid something by providing lodging
and meals for students (their children), forgoing income and supporting them in other ways. This is one of the reasons that most students – calculations vary – attend universities close to home. The world in which students received support for most costs is long over and it should be recognized that it was a brief elitist golden age. The only way to return to this world is to restrict the number of students, which would break the principles of fairness and access and not help the goal of wealth and knowledge creation.

The most obvious way of transferring costs is to seek the support of private actors. The word “privatization” often excites emotions, because it is felt that private students have a particular advantage or that private institutions are making money hand over fist and in some way exploiting students by offering them expectations that cannot be realized. Public policy must do what it can to avoid “cowboy capitalism” without reducing sensible incentives and which can be applied to public and private universities. Providing that private universities meet the principles of public information and wealth and knowledge creation, then it is not immediately evident that private universities cannot make an effective contribution to overall public and national welfare.

The introduction of private funding and institutions is a partial solution to the increasing costs of universities and raise questions of public policy about fairness and access. For the university sector its influence goes beyond resources and to the way that institutions are managed and run. Moreover there are important gradations about the degree to which both full cost charging and privatization can be realized. However together with the increasing number of undergraduates, the degree of privatization is clearly one of the drivers for change.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Resources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Does the current funding formula help or hinder entrepreneurship?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• What do you see as the main non-governmental sources of income in the future. Does this require policy change?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• How secure are your institutions financial sources?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Should the government guarantee long term financial stability even if the total amount is less?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Does your HEI have a resource strategy?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

c) Competition

Higher education systems can be discussed in terms of the degree of competition. The dimensions found in the following box measure commercial competitive forces. Do they apply to higher education?
Box 2.

Competitive Forces

- Ease of exit and entry
- Bargaining power of customers
- Bargaining power of suppliers
- Threat of substitution of services or products
- Rivalry among competitors


It is sometimes assumed that privatization can only lead to extensive rivalry. However, as the discussion about Brazil, (Appendix 6) shows, this need not always be the case.

Competition

- Are there incentives for competition in your system?
- What would be the best incentives to encourage entrepreneurship by your institution?
- Should governments allow easy entrance and exit by HEIs?
- What are the best incentives for competition?
- Does competition involve more risks or more benefits for the system as a whole?

d) Information

HE systems and markets are particularly affected by information asymmetries. As Joseph Stiglitz has shown, "whenever information is imperfect and markets incomplete, which is to say always, and especially in developing countries, then the invisible hand works most imperfectly". Therefore it is necessary that the legal and policy framework provide clear guidelines for HEI’s reporting obligations. The three principal dimensions of the United Kingdom’s information requirements are set out below:\(^3\):

a. Information on the institutional context:
   i. The HEI’s mission statement.
   ii. Relevant sections of the HEI’s corporate plan.
   iii. Statement of the HEI’s quality assurance policies and processes.
   iv. The HEI’s learning and teaching strategy and periodic reviews of progress.

---

b. Information on student admission, progression and completion:
   i. Student qualifications on entry.
   ii. The range of student entrants classified by age, gender, ethnicity, socioeconomic background, disability and geographical origin as returned to the Higher Education Statistics Agency (HESA).
   iii. Student progression and retention data for each year of each course/program, differentiating between failure and withdrawal.
   iv. Data on student completion.
   v. Data on qualifications awarded to students.
   vi. Data on the employment/training outcomes for graduates from the First Destination Survey (FDS).

c. Information on the HEI’s internal procedures for assuring academic quality and standards:
   i. Information on program approval, monitoring and review:
      • program specifications
      • a statement of the respective roles, responsibilities and authority of different bodies within the HEI involved in program approval and review
      • key outcomes of program approval, and annual monitoring and review processes
      • periodic internal reports of major program reviews
      • reports of periodic internal reviews by the institution of departments or faculties
      • accreditation and monitoring reports by professional, statutory or regulatory bodies.
   ii. Information on assessment procedures and outcomes:
      • assessment strategies, processes and procedures
      • the range and nature of student work
      • external examiners’ reports, analysis of their findings, and the actions taken in response
      • reports of periodic reviews of the appropriateness of assessment methods used.
   iii. Information on student satisfaction with their HE experience, covering the views of students on:
      • arrangements for academic and tutorial guidance, support and supervision
      • library services and IT support
      • suitability of accommodation, equipment and facilities for teaching and learning
      • perceptions of the quality of teaching and the range of teaching and learning methods
      • assessment arrangements
      • quality of pastoral support.
iv. Information and evidence available to teams undertaking HEIs’ own internal reviews of quality and standards in relation to:
   • the effectiveness of teaching and learning, in relation to program aims and curriculum content as they evolve over time
   • the range of teaching methods used
   • the availability and use of specialist equipment and other resources and materials to support teaching and learning
   • staff access to professional development to improve teaching performance, including peer observation and mentoring programs
   • the use of external benchmarking and other comparators both at home and overseas
   • the involvement of external peers in the review method, their observations, and the action taken in response.

HEIs and governments should also provide public information to stakeholders about some of the major bridging issues, such as for example, labor market prospects for HE graduates.

If salaries are one consideration for choosing a particular career or course – the student as rational investor – then it is quite surprising that so little is known about the relationship between different educational and economic outcomes. How can students or parents choose sensibly if this information is not available? Chile has developed an interesting information device about the average annual salaries obtained by graduates 2 and 5 years after graduation, for more than one hundred professional and technical careers and jobs.. The Observatory on HE graduates’ employment is located within the Ministry of Education’s web site (http://www.futurolaboral.cl). The information is processed on a yearly basis by two independent academic centers with the support of HEIs and technical assistance from the Internal Revenue Service.

### Information

- Which agency should be responsible for information?
- Does the university or HEI provide satisfactory cost information to clients?
- Does the HEI know what happens to its graduates? Are the results published?
- Should self and independent assessments be published?
e) Quality assurance

The setting up of national quality assurance systems has now become an international trend. A recent study by Brunner et al\(^4\) identifies more than 100 countries around the world that have already adopted mechanisms and procedures for the evaluation and accreditation of HEIs and programs.

El-Khawas and colleagues believe that a solid consensus is emerging about the core elements of quality assurance for higher education. In part this consensus is because structures share common features and represents a modification to the traditional academic review processes; in part because there is wide-scale cultural "borrowing" among countries. However it is important that each system, while using best practices, develops its own approach consistent with its values or principles.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Core Elements of Quality Assurance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>* Semi-autonomous agencies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Explicit standards and expectations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Self-study by the academic institution or unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* External review by visiting experts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Written recommendations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Public reporting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Attention to both process (i.e., capacity) and results</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


The questions in the following box attempt to explore both common standards and differences.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quality</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• How is quality guaranteed in your university or HEI?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Is learning suffering because of the market?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Are HEIs continuing to attract the best staff? Is this a quality a factor in staff assessment?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Do central or departmental authorities deal with quality best?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^4\) JJ Brunner et al, *Guiar el Mercado. Informe sobre la Educación Superior en Chile*. Santiago de Chile: Universidad Adolfo Ibáñez, 2005
VI. The Entrepreneurial University

University or HEI initiatives are bounded by structure and policy of which competition is one of the most effective agents for change. As noted above competition is multidimensional and already pervades many of the most important university activities such as the search for students, faculty and funds.

The most helpful and influential current discussion of Entrepreneurial Universities is provided by Burton Clark\(^5\) who identifies five key factors for their growth, based on case studies in the USA, the U.K., Holland, Finland, Sweden, Uganda, Chile and Australia.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Box 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pathways to transformation – Reinforcing interaction</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Diversified university income</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Strengthened steering capacity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Extended development periphery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Stimulated academic heartland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Embracing entrepreneurial culture</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Burton R. Clark Valencia seminar

Whereas the stimulus for these universities was the realization that they would be unable to maintain their educational goals without further income, it was their reaction to this change that distinguished them from other universities that had made the same diagnosis and were in the same position. And to achieve (1) they recognized that they had to have not only an internal consensus about the problem but agreed actions to do something about it. Passive analysis would not do; an active process had to be initiated which encompassed - that is included - the whole university in setting goals and finding opportunities. As one reads the case studies one can see that the initial goals were quite modest; their importance was that a seed was planted.

The word process should be stressed. A university is often like a ship built by different hands at different times. It floats and slowly moves but to sail more rapidly it must have a common overall design. Universities are not like the navy where everyone follows orders; but without a rudder it is quite unlikely that the maps (diagnosis) alone will get one to port. Large departments often dominate faculties and faculties often distrust central administration. The purpose of a process is to move minimum agreements about shared values (relatively easy) and shared actions (relatively difficult). If Faculties see themselves as sovereign powers it will be quite difficult to generate an overall of process of change that

---

benefits the whole university and not just a part. One of Clark’s examples, the University of Warwick does not have deans as they believe that the flatter the structure the more efficacious because it is more inclusive. The university, like the ship, needs a general and agreed goal with a decision mechanism about how to read the map and set course. Hence the importance of the steering mechanism (2).

The third feature of an entrepreneurial university is to develop a much more comprehensive vision of what it does; it is the reverse of “marketing myopia”. It takes what are often regarded as “add-ons” and makes them part of comprehensive services provided by the university. The core activities – teaching, research – remain but joined as equals or near equals by extension services, short courses, adult education, evaluations, contracting with national and local governments and departments, business and national and international agencies. The list can go on and on. These activities often require specialized knowledge – adults and extension courses, local business needs – and so specialized staff which can become in his phrase “bureaucrats of change”. Not only should they understand their market but become advanced troops for the evolution of the steering function. In this way (3) reinforces (2).

A further suggestion for (3), the creation of interdisciplinary centers or special academic units, acts as a bridge to (4). Knowledge is expanding at such a pace that traditional courses and research do not easily fit within a static departmental structure. Units or agencies can provide a kind of test market for later incorporation into the mainstream structure as well as become a meeting place for those that our outside the university. Science departments often set up special laboratories for specific problems, techniques or clients; management schools link to their clients with special diplomas, intense short courses and consulting. These can act as bridges between the core and periphery. However their creation should be part of a process, limited in number and time so that they are reviewed after, for example, a five year mandate.

The final two dimensions, (4) and (5), depend in part on the success of the first three. The commitment to educational principles, teaching and research can be protected and renewed by the first three. Note that while (1) the diversification of university resources is one of the primary driving forces for university entrepreneurship it remains sadly incomplete unless joined by an ability to express overall educational goals and put them into operation (2) and developing a comprehensive view of university services (3). There is nothing less likely to build confidence than continual complaints about money, (justified or not), or a planning process which follows the planning philosophy of Mr. Micawber, a penurious although well tempered character in Charles Dickens’s David Copperfield, that “something will turn up”.

The successful examples studied by Clark and others shows that these activities become reinforcing. Smaller, less wealthy universities, can experience
the same process however modest. It is not difficult to point to successful stories and assume their success is because they are big or have money in the first place. But there are many large universities with funds that are not entrepreneurial and in the examples provided by Clark and others have suffered in the process. The overwhelming sense provided by these examples is that HEIs must prepare for and embrace change because knowledge is growing exponentially and interactions with society – as client and provider – changing with them. This may be a slow process but it is happening and probably, with the ICT revolution, increasing at greater speed.

The second benefit of reading these case studies is to understand that leadership is spread across the university. While it may require strong leadership, no university, to repeat, runs by orders alone. University staff members have very particular profile – they value independence, place a premium on intellectual integrity and believe in knowledge. That is why they are employed and that is what makes them valuable. But such attitudes do not normally make them irrational or adverse to change providing that the issues are properly explained and they are participants and not objects. Creating a team – where the majority “buys in” however skeptically at first – strengthens the capacity of the university to change. Such a process can be very slow, requires patience, good will and collegiality. Universities can abdicate the process but it will, given dynamic change, costly.

In summary university entrepreneurship is positive approach to change. How then to begin?

VII. Cumulative Steps

Health begins with self-diagnosis and university change begins in the same way. There is widespread concern about the future role and functions of universities and the concerns of people at this meeting are shared by most higher education systems. That is, after all, why this meeting is taking place. So the field has been ploughed. Will the seed grow? The richness and variety of your own systems only allows for (hopefully useful) generalizations from an outsider.

This paper has argued that the university or HEI should be the leading focus of change. The system, as discussed, must build a framework that set out clear funding rules and minimum standards while it encourages autonomy to the point that universities and HEIs can make meaningful choices. Not all will wish to become entrepreneurial universities in the sense discussed here, but all are likely to be faced with unaccommodating change.

Burton Clark in his discussion of creating a university culture writes as follows,
“...the deliberative transformation of a university requires two miracles. One is to get started, facing down the fear of failure before the beginning. Many universities will simply not try to start down the new road. It is risky – a hallowed institution may be laid low. The other miracle is sustaining a virtuous circle of successful accomplishments over a decade or more, facing down the multitude of conserving tendencies in organizations – especially universities – and among organized sponsors – especially ministries that bring change to a halt. At the heart of each miracle lies willful agency. It is not the demands of the day in themselves that drive a university to change, we now know, but rather the many specific responses to those demands, in the form of emergent acts of will, that are summoned from within. “  

[ Sustaining Change in Universities, p. 94-95] [For more information see Appendix 7]

There are two processes that most universities can undertake now, if they have not already done so. These cannot be done by ministries or other than those within the university, although, of course, well-intentioned and informed outsiders can help.

First, a necessary, although not sufficient, step is to establish an office of university analysis, charged with collecting data, estimating costs, identifying strengths and weaknesses and producing an annual report. This report should help university leadership and staff, the Ministries and funding agencies, and stakeholders. A sensible well-documented report can provide the basis for a university discussion about the challenges, strengths and weaknesses, faced by the university. From these discussions, a university should be able to mount a leadership group to promote identified activities.

Second, and equally important, establishing a series of consultative groups between the university and principal stakeholders such as large and small businesses, local welfare authorities, local government, ministries etc. to look at both present and future relations including access and quality issues.

Both steps can help universities have a much more realistic view of their future. They may not lead to miracles but they will bring revelation.
## Appendix 1

Table 1. Expenditure indicators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>2001</th>
<th>All 2001</th>
<th>1995=100</th>
<th>Change</th>
<th>2001</th>
<th>All 2001</th>
<th>1995=100</th>
<th>All</th>
<th>All</th>
<th>Public</th>
<th>Private</th>
<th>Household</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Annual expenditure/Student</strong></td>
<td><strong>(US PPP 2001)</strong></td>
<td><strong>Relative to GDP per capita</strong></td>
<td><strong>Sources for Tertiary Sector</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1</strong></td>
<td><strong>2</strong></td>
<td><strong>3</strong></td>
<td><strong>4</strong></td>
<td><strong>5</strong></td>
<td><strong>6</strong></td>
<td><strong>7</strong></td>
<td><strong>8</strong></td>
<td><strong>Secondary</strong></td>
<td><strong>Tertiary</strong></td>
<td><strong>Percent</strong></td>
<td><strong>Public</strong></td>
<td><strong>Private</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Europe</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Austria</td>
<td>8,562</td>
<td>11,274</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>94.6</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denmark</td>
<td>8,133</td>
<td>14,280</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>97.8</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finland</td>
<td>6,537</td>
<td>10,981</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>96.5</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ireland</td>
<td>5,245</td>
<td>10,003</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>84.7</td>
<td>15.3</td>
<td>12.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td>6,403</td>
<td>12,974</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>78.2</td>
<td>21.8</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>6,482</td>
<td>15,188</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>87.7</td>
<td>12.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UK</td>
<td>5,933</td>
<td>10,753</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>71.1</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>17.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canada</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mexico</td>
<td>1,915</td>
<td>4,341</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>70.4</td>
<td>29.6</td>
<td>28.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USA</td>
<td>8,779</td>
<td>22,234</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>34.0</td>
<td>66.0</td>
<td>33.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Czech R.</td>
<td>3,448</td>
<td>5,555</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>85.3</td>
<td>14.7</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hungary</td>
<td>2,633</td>
<td>7,122</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>77.6</td>
<td>22.4</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poland</td>
<td>2,134</td>
<td>3,357</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>35</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slovakia</td>
<td>1,874</td>
<td>5,285</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>93.3</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Argentina</td>
<td>2,306</td>
<td>3,775</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>68.5</td>
<td>31.5</td>
<td>27.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brazil</td>
<td>864</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chile</td>
<td>2,085</td>
<td>6,901</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>19.6</td>
<td>80.4</td>
<td>77.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peru</td>
<td>534</td>
<td>4,230</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>58.0</td>
<td>42.0</td>
<td>42.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>7,239</td>
<td>12,688</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>51.3</td>
<td>48.7</td>
<td>31.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Korea</td>
<td>5,159</td>
<td>6,618</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>15.9</td>
<td>84.1</td>
<td>58.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Appendix 2

### Privatization in Higher Education as Direction or Tendency on Multiple Dimensions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimensions</th>
<th>High &quot;Publicness&quot;</th>
<th>Continua of Privatization [Greater Privatization --&gt;]</th>
<th>High &quot;Privateness&quot;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Mission or Purpose</td>
<td>Serves a clear &quot;public&quot; mission as determined by the faculty or the state.</td>
<td>Mission is avowedly both public and private, but as defined by faculty.</td>
<td>Mission serves private interests of students, clients, and owners.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Ownership</td>
<td>Publicly owned: can be altered or even closed by state.</td>
<td>Public corporation or constitutional entity.</td>
<td>Private non-profit: clear public accountability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Source of Revenue</td>
<td>All taxpayer, or public, revenue.</td>
<td>Mainly public, but some tuition, or &quot;cost sharing.&quot;</td>
<td>Mainly private, but public assistance to needy students.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Control by Government</td>
<td>High state control, as in agency or ministry.</td>
<td>Subject to controls, but less than other state agencies.</td>
<td>High degree of autonomy; control limited to oversight.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Norms of Management</td>
<td>Academic norms; shared governance, antiauthoritarianism.</td>
<td>Academic norms, but acceptance of need for effective management.</td>
<td>Limited homage to academic norms; high management control.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Bruce Johnston

http://www.gse.buffalo.edu/FAS/Johnston/privatization.html
### Appendix 3

Table 8: Extent of autonomy enjoyed by universities, selected EU15 and EU8 countries compared

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institutions are free to:</th>
<th>Own their buildings &amp; equipment</th>
<th>Borrow funds</th>
<th>Spend budgets to achieve their objectives</th>
<th>Set academic structure/course content</th>
<th>Employ &amp; dismiss academic staff</th>
<th>Set salaries</th>
<th>Decide size of student enrollment</th>
<th>Decide level of tuition fees</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>EU15</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ireland</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UK</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denmark</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finland</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Austria</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>EU8</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Czech Rep</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estonia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latvia</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lithuania</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hungary</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poland</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slovenia</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slovakia</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Institutions have autonomy. ○ Institutions have some autonomy, but limited.

a "Employ and dismiss academic staff" (column 5) and "Set salaries" (column 6) include cases where any legal requirements for minimum qualifications and minimum salaries have to be met.

b "Decide size of student enrollment" (column 7) includes cases where some departments or study fields have limits on the number of students able to enroll.

Source: Interviews for EU8; OECD (2003/Table 3.1) for EU15.

* Public universities.
Appendix 4

Table 9: Appointment of leaders of universities, selected EU15 and EUS countries compared

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Process for election or appointment</th>
<th>Government has to approve?</th>
<th>Typically appointed for how many years?</th>
<th>Renewable position?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lithuania</td>
<td>Senate (academic staff)</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>4-5</td>
<td>Yes, for one more round</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finland</td>
<td>Academic staff &amp; heads of separate institutes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>Board or Council</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Czech Republic</td>
<td>Academic Senate (academic staff and students representatives)</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Yes, (for 2 consecutive periods, with possibility of later reelection)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hungary</td>
<td>Senate (academic staff and students)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Yes, for one more round</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latvia</td>
<td>Constitutional Meeting (academic staff 60%, other staff 20% &amp; students 20%)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Yes, for one more round</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poland</td>
<td>Academic Senate or Electoral College</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Yes, for a max of two consecutive periods</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slovakia</td>
<td>Academic Senate</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Yes, for one more round</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slovenia</td>
<td>All higher education faculty, faculty assistant, researchers employed by the university and students 20% of all votes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Process for election or appointment</th>
<th>Government has to approve?</th>
<th>Typically appointed for how many years?</th>
<th>Renewable position?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ireland</td>
<td>Governing Body (approximately 50% external)</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td>Supervisory Board: 5 external members appointed by Minister</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>Government, on recommendation of mainly external Governing Board, which first consults students &amp; employers</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Yes, for 2 periods of 3 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UK</td>
<td>Governing Body, of which majority are external members</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Countries where leaders are usually appointed by:**

**Countries where reforms have been implemented in 2003:**

Austria  
Formerly elected by University Assembly (75% staff, 25% students)  
From 2003 appointed by University Council, made up of external members, from a shortlist of 3 candidates nominated by Senate.

Denmark  
Formerly elected by academic staff (30%), other staff (25%), & students (25%)  
From July 2003, appointed by Board with majority of external members.

Source: for EUS, interviews; questionnaires; for EU15 countries, OECD (2003: Table 3.4).
Appendix 5

Asia – autonomy

Many Asian countries have had considerable experience in managing large private higher education sectors, while others are still seeking to establish appropriate structures. These countries face the challenge of allowing the private sector the autonomy and freedom to establish and manage institutions and compete in a differentiated educational marketplace while at the same time ensuring that the national interest is served. In India, where the large majority of undergraduate students attend private colleges, these schools are largely funded by the state governments and are closely controlled by the universities to which most are affiliated. University authorities, for example, design and administer examinations, award academic degrees, set the minimum qualifications for entry, and supervise the hiring of academic staff. The universities are all public institutions, and they have key administrative and academic control over the privately owned undergraduate colleges. India’s pattern of public-private management and control is unique and worth studying.

Japan and South Korea have a long tradition of rigidly controlling private institutions—going to the extent of stipulating the salaries of academic staff, the numbers of students who can be enrolled, approving the establishment of new departments or programs, and supervising the appointment of trustees. In the recent past, these two countries have moved toward allowing private institutions more autonomy and freedom. Other countries have imposed less strict supervision.

As in other parts of the world, private higher education is expanding throughout Asia, and countries that are moving toward a large private sector would be well advised to look at the experience in Asia for guidance. China has a dramatically growing private sector, with more than 500 private postsecondary institutions, most of which are neither accredited nor approved by the government. Vietnam and Cambodia also have rapidly growing private sectors, as do the central Asian nations that were formerly part of the Soviet Union. These countries face the considerable challenge of ensuring that the emerging private sector is effective, well managed, and serving national goals. Asia shows a variety of patterns of sponsorship, management, ownership, and state supervision.

http://www.bc.edu/bc_org/avp/soe/cihe/newsletter/News29/text006.htm
Appendix 6
Latin America – public private relations

The Latin American experience suggests that we should not look at public and private
education in polarized terms. They both perform useful and often complementary
functions and both have problems and drawbacks. Governments have the responsibility
to regulate and look for quality and relevance in both, but their ability to do so is more
limited than it is commonly thought.

[...]

It is common to think on the private world as governed by market competition and the
public as governed by normative principles and mandates. However, markets depend
also on common values and institutions, which define the “rules of the game”, and
assure the good faith of the players; while, in recent years, there has been a tendency
for governments to create “quasi markets” for the distribution of public resources. Thus,
science councils routinely establish competition among researchers for their grants;
students compete for places in universities, and, later, for jobs in public institutions; and
private companies dispute bids in procurement markets established by the public sector.
It is not true, therefore, that competition is inimical to the world of science, culture,
academic and public life; on the contrary, it is a very important part of it; and it is not true
that markets are inimical to values and institutions.

It is also not true that education and profit are always geared by opposite goals and
motivations. The current legislation in Brazil admits that private institutions can be for
profit or not, depending on whether they are truly philanthropic, like some religious and
community-based institutions. For-profit institutions have to pay taxes like any other
private concern, the assumption being that they should behave as any honest business
company, selling good, value-for-money education. In the public sector, an outdated
legislation still requires that all academics should earn the same salaries, according to
rules applied uniformly to all national institutions. This situation makes the universities
unable to compete for talent, and to lose their best people to the private sector or
institutions abroad. This extreme symmetry is compensated, in practice, by the ability of
academics to increase their income through participation in research projects. More
recently, in Brazil as well as in Mexico, the government created salary incentives to
stimulate dedication to teaching and research in public institutions. Thus, the notion that
people and institutions in public education and research should be financially rewarded
according to their work, dedication and entrepreneurship, is also gaining ground.

My main proposition is that public and private higher education institutions are
converging in many ways, and this is a positive trend. As higher education becomes
more expensive, and as the private sector becomes the provider of higher education for
large segments of the student population, the need to treat public education also as a
private good (and therefore subject to tuition), and private education as also a social
good (and therefore eligible for support), become stronger.

Public institutions are changing the ways they function, and becoming more
entrepreneurial in their daily activities. Universities have to dispute resources with each
other and with other social programs in the public sector. Besides, they have to look for
other sources of resources and support, in the private sector, from other government
agencies, from international donors. For this, they need to change the way they are
organized, with more power going to management positions, or through decentralization
into semi-independent business units, associated with academic departments and institutes. Private institutions, on the other hand, have to respond to public regulations and incentives, and, as they become more complex and bring in large staffs, they have to become more institutionalized, and cannot be ruled any longer as pure business concerns.

This convergence is far from being complete, and it is not likely that the differences between public and private institutions will disappear. On the contrary, we can expect that the range of institutional formats and motivations will continue to increase, together with the development of better policy instruments to make sure that they all work to the best interests of society.

Source: Simon Schwartzman, “Public and private higher education in comparative perspective”
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**Burton Clark’s dynamics of change**

How do universities move from a traditional posture wedded to the status quo to a new posture that is change oriented? That posture can be variously named -- the innovative university, the proactive university, the entrepreneurial university. Call it what you will, the key point is how it is accomplished.

I have been engaged in an effort that started in 1994 and has continued for a decade to find out how that transformation is negotiated. The research effort centers on institutional case studies reported in narrative form, in which I looked for what a set of universities have in common and at the same time tried to grasp their uniquenesses, their singularities. Narratives about each institution allow for this combination. My efforts over a decade had two main parts, the second building upon the first. The earlier one, a mid-1990s burst of field research that led to my 1998 book *Creating Entrepreneurial Universities*, subtitled Organizational Pathways of Transformation was followed by a 2000-2003 round of research, largely based on document analysis. This effort led to a second book, *Sustaining Change in Universities*, subtitled Continuities in Case Studies and Concepts, published in late 2004.

To summarize quickly, I saw five common elements as pathways of transformation: first, diversified university income; second, strengthened steering capacity; third, an extended developmental periphery consisting of non-departmental research centers and outreach programs; fourth, a stimulated academic heartland -- old departments newly activated; and, finally, an embracing entrepreneurial culture – the build-up of a system of beliefs that wrapped around the more material features identified in the first four pathways.

In the most successful cases of entrepreneurialism in universities, what is sustained is a capacity to go on changing. That capacity can be seen organizationally as a steady state of change. In an early dim sensing of this type of steady state -- in contrast to the ordinary steady state that exists when a university is married to the status quo – I concluded in the earlier book that "the five elements of transformation become just that by means of their interaction. Each by itself cannot make a significant difference. Those who see universities from the top-down might readily assume that the strengthened steering core is the leading element. But a newly constituted management group, for example, is soon without teeth if discretionary funds are not available, if new outreach units spanning the periphery cannot be constructed, if heartland departments fall into opposition, and if the group's idea of a transformed institution gains no cultural footing".
The five elements of transformation become just that by means of their interaction. Each by itself cannot make a significant difference. Those who see universities from the top-down might readily assume that the strengthened steering core is the leading element. But a newly constituted management group, for example, is soon without teeth if discretionary funds are not available, if new outreach units spanning the periphery cannot be constructed, if heartland departments fall into opposition, and if the group’s idea of a transformed institution gains no cultural footing.

In the 14 case studies written up cumulatively over a three year period, I gained one hint after another about the central importance of interaction among the structures of transformation. The continuous diversification of income -- think development officers -- freed up discretion in the steering capacity that stretched from basic departments to mid-level schools and colleges to the university's top offices, groups, and committees. The stronger steering capacity -- think entrepreneurial groups -- worked to spread and energize the search for income, to develop productive multidisciplinary outreach in research and teaching, and to make more creditable the claim of distinctive culture. The continuous reworking of the periphery fed back upon income diversification and the distribution of authority, including challenging the primary of traditional departments. Round and round it goes. You can enter the cycle of interaction at one point and you are soon in the company of the other basic features.

In an effort to clarify a very complicated flow of change, I set forth in the new book three "dynamics of change": the dynamic of reinforcing interaction, the dynamic of perpetual momentum; and, most powerful, the dynamic of ambitious collegial volition, the intensifying of collective willpower.

_The Dynamic of Reinforcing Interaction_
Sustained change in universities is rooted in changes on many fronts that lead to a combined infrastructure in which the substantial alterations are interlocked and mutually supportive. There is an emergent organizational foundation that we can appropriately understand as the steady state of change. Traditional universities have a steady state oriented toward inertia: the status quo has the upper hand. The universities that transform themselves on a number of fronts develop a steady state too -- one also full of vested interests, standard operating procedures, and sunk costs -- which is oriented toward change. The new status quo is development oriented. Out of interaction with one another and now linked together, the newly institutionalized elements resist a sliding back to the old status quo. The first new principle, then, is that elements of transformation become elements of sustainability as they become interlocked and reinforcing in a new basic organizational character.

_The Dynamic of Perpetual Momentum_
The steady state of change itself changes incrementally. As step-by-step adjustments are made to changing demands and newly appearing opportunities,
cumulative change rolls a university forward. The institution acquires a steady momentum that need not have a particular stopping point. Depending upon small incremental gains, fashioned essentially out of learning-by-experimenting, such forward movement does not depend on lucky throws of the dice in selecting one major investment. Rather, momentum is acquired from the cumulative thrust of small steps.

Our second new principle then is that elements of transformation become elements of sustainability as their cumulative incrementalism produces a perpetual momentum. The interlocking composite acquires a forward impetus. The university leans toward the future. Think Warwick on the European stage. Think University of Michigan in the U.S. system since the early 1980s.

The Dynamic of Ambitious Collegial Volition

Is there any doubt that some universities try much harder than others to improve their performance, especially when that improvement means much hard work to effect long-term change in character? The play of sheer will repeatedly comes to the surface. Behind the interlocking interaction and the perpetual momentum, something like institutional will plays a basic role.

In understanding what is at work, the concept of volition, borrowed from political economy, is helpful. In the framework developed by Charles E. Lindblom, democracy (or polyarchy -- rule by many) not only follows from the will of the people but also induces and shapes that will. "Polyarchy is a process that forms volitions as well as a process for making policy respond to them." A volition is "an emergent act of will," in the form of a decision to pursue a certain path of development.7 In organized settings, volitions are collective decisions producing collective commitment. In this fascinating explanatory framework for understanding political democracy, people create, rather than "find" their wants, needs, and interests. The decision decides what the want is to be, and what is needed. It creates the interest.

But how and why do certain volitions get made in universities, whatever their stressful situation? We have to turn back to ambition and to a stream of decisions that follow. A strong example is when Warwick was faced with a severe reduction in state support back in the early 1980s, along with nearly all other British universities. Decisions to go backward or to stand paralyzed were seen as simply not acceptable. The institution decided on a new approach, an earned income policy originally defined in the form of save-half/raise-half to get the money needed to cover the government cut. The raising of additional income proved surprisingly successful. The initial volition -- the decision to try out a certain new path of development -- then became a determined commitment that encouraged a variegated stream of ongoing decisions leading to much greater self-reliance.

In the beginning, and then onward, ambitious volition helped to propel the institution forward to a transformed character over a twenty-year period. Along the way, Warwick acquired much confidence in its capacity to face the future.
In all the institutions studied, there was the volition to take the risk of being highly proactive, even entrepreneurial, in contexts of much contrary even hostile academic questioning of the propriety of this choice. Other universities decided it was not worth the effort; or that it was best to wait for government to come to its senses and provide the needed funding (a little like Waiting for Godot); or that, as a matter of principle, we should hang together and share equally the pangs of poverty; or that old ways would prove best over the long term. Inertia in traditional universities has many rationales, all leading to avoidance of the needed hard choices that the Shapiro brothers had called for.

To restate: the increasingly self-reliance university is built and sustained out of blocks of will reflecting assertive ambition. At the beginning of change there is volition, along the way there are emergent acts of will, and in the end the ambition to deliberately fashion an even better university remains. If there is a single secret in significant university change, perhaps this is it.

To put the matter in striking terms: there are two miracles in the deliberate transformation of a university. One is having gotten started, having faced down the fear of failure before beginning. Many universities will simply not try to start down a new road. It seems risky; a revered institution may be laid low; it may lose its soul along the way. The other miracle is sustaining a virtuous circle of successful accomplishment over a decade and more, facing down the multitude of conserving tendencies in organizations -- especially in universities -- and among organized sponsors -- especially ministries -- that bring change to a halt. At the heart of each miracle lies willful agency.

ANNEX
Higher Education Policy and Management Related Websites

Boston College Center for International Higher Education
http://www.bc.edu/bc_org/avp/soe/cihe/
The Center for International Higher Education sees as its mission advancing knowledge about the complex realities of higher education in the contemporary world. It publishes *International Higher Education*, quarterly publication featuring analysis and reports about key issues in higher education worldwide. The Center is supported by core grants from the Ford Foundation and by the Lynch School of Education and the Monan Chair at Boston College. Additional funding has come from the Toyota Foundation, the MacArthur Foundation, the Rockefeller Foundation, the Carnegie Corporation of New York, the Council for the International Exchange of Scholars (Fulbright Program), and anonymous funders.

Center for Higher Education Managements and Policy (CHEMP), School of Professional Development & Leadership, University of New England
http://fehps.une.edu.au/PDaL/Research/chemp/about.htm
CHEMP pursues through a multi-disciplinary approach studies of national and international significance and generates leading-edge research on higher education and research policy around six main themes/focus areas: program evaluation and policy analysis; impact of national research policy on research in higher education; impact of market and non-market forces on higher education; management structures and management performance; comparative experiences in higher education systems; client groups, client service and sector relationships.

Center for Higher Education Policy Studies (CHEPS)
http://www.utwente.nl/cheps/index.html
CHEPS is an interdisciplinary research-institute located at the faculty of Public Administration and Public Policy of the Universiteit Twente, the Netherlands. Since 1984, CHEPS has undertaken and published a considerable amount of research on higher education especially at system and institutional levels. CHEPS seeks to increase our understanding of institutional, national and international issues that bear upon Higher Education

Centre for Higher Education Transformation (CHET), Cape Town, South Africa
http://www.chet.org.za/
The Centre for Higher Education Transformation (CHET) is a non-governmental organization that strives to develop transformation management capacity and skills throughout the higher education system, by integrating skill development training processes with new knowledge production, debates and information dissemination. CHET pursues its aims within a framework of co-operative governance, the promotion of institutional, regional, national and international co-operation and the flexible mobilization of expertise.
Center for Studies in Higher Education, University of California
Publications
http://repositories.cdlib.org/cshe/
The Center for Studies in Higher Education is a research and policy center on higher education oriented to California, the nation, and comparative international issues. It promotes discussion among university leaders, government officials, academics and all those interested in higher education policy. It assists policy making by providing a neutral forum for airing contentious issues and by keeping the higher education world informed of new initiatives and proposals. Likewise, the research conducted at the Center aims to inform current debate about higher education policy and practice. Founded in 1956 it was the first higher education center of this kind in the United States.

Center for the Study of Higher Education, Centre for the Study of Higher Education at the University of Melbourne
http://www.cshe.unimelb.edu.au/
The Centre for the Study of Higher Education at the University of Melbourne is one of the longest established centres of its kind in the world. With 35 years of operation it enjoys a pre-eminent reputation for the depth and relevance of its insights, innovation and applied policy research. CSHE is at the core of teaching and learning quality and development in the Australian higher education sector. The Centre provides many of the ‘tools’ and guiding principles used nationally and internationally for the improvement of higher education.

Center for the Study of Higher Education, College of Education, Penn State University
Publications
http://www.ed.psu.edu/cshe/publications.html
CSHE research informs a broad range of current challenges facing higher education: Governance, organization, and administration; Teaching, learning, and curriculum; Finance and economics; Student access and success; Legal, ethical, and historical implications of current issues; Education for professionals such as law, medicine, and engineering; Comparative and international education; Student affairs administration

Centre for the Study of Higher Education at the University of Melbourne
http://www.cshe.unimelb.edu.au/
The Centre for the Study of Higher Education at the University of Melbourne is one of the longest established centres of its kind in the world. With 35 years of operation it enjoys a pre-eminent reputation for the depth and relevance of its insights, innovation and applied policy research. CSHE is at the core of teaching and learning quality and development in the Australian higher education sector. The Centre provides many of the ‘tools’ and guiding principles used nationally and internationally for the improvement of higher education.
Commonwealth Higher Education Management Service (CHEMS), London
http://www.acu.ac.uk/cgi-bin/frameset.pl?ml=chems&amp;sl=chems&amp;select=chems
CHEMS was initiated in 1993 as part of the Commonwealth Higher Education Support Scheme (CHESS) through the Commonwealth Secretariat. Throughout that period of time, CHEMS has been supported by the Association of Commonwealth Universities (ACU) and has received pump-priming funds from the Commonwealth Fund for Technical Co-operation (CFTC), from UNESCO and the UK's Overseas Development Administration. Between 1994 and 2001, CHEMS undertook some 70 consultancies, advising and helping universities, governments and higher education agencies worldwide to tackle and solve their management problems. CHEMS ceased operating as a consultancy service in January 2001.

Through the financial support of the CFTC, an extensive series of publications on management issues in higher education have been developed during the years of CHEMS operation. These publications are produced in hard copy, with the majority also available electronically.

Conversando con directivos sobre gestión universitaria
http://columbus.universia.net/
Columbus y Universia desean acompañar a los directivos universitarios en sus funciones, en particular a los de reciente designación. Lo hace poniendo a su alcance una serie de entrevistas a rectores, directivos y expertos sobre aspectos relevantes de la gestión institucional con el fin de contribuir a su mejora. Todas las personas entrevistadas son o han sido recientemente protagonistas de la educación superior en sus países. Para dar la posibilidad de trasmitir una visión lo más concreta posible, cada entrevista se focaliza sobre una problemática más o menos circunscripta.

enic-naric.net website
European Network of Information Centres (ENIC) - National Academic Recognition Information Centres (NARIC)
http://www.enic-naric.net/index.asp?display=About#About
The enic-naric.net website is a joint initiative of the European Commission, the Council of Europe and UNESCO/CEPES, has been created primarily as a tool to assist the ENIC-NARIC Networks in carrying out the tasks they have been mandated to accomplish within their own jurisdiction, by directing them to up-to-date information supplied and maintained by the competent bodies in each member country and by each member organization.
ENIC is made up of the national information centers of the States party to the European Cultural Convention or the UNESCO Europe Region. It provides information on the recognition of foreign diplomas, degrees and other qualifications; education systems in both foreign countries and the ENIC's own country; opportunities for studying abroad, including information on loans and scholarships, as well as advice on practical questions related to mobility and equivalence. The NARIC network aims at improving academic recognition of diplomas and periods of study in the Member States of the EU, the EEA countries and the associated countries in Central and Eastern Europe and Cyprus.

European Network for Quality Assurance (ENQA)
ENQA, the European Association for Quality Assurance in Higher Education, disseminates information, experiences and good practices in the field of quality assurance (QA) in higher education to European QA agencies, public authorities and higher education institutions. The Website functions as an information forum for ENQA member agencies, stakeholders and those interested in the developments, actors and expertise in the European QA in higher education. It contains latest ENQA publications and news as well as information on the current transnational European projects and upcoming events.

**European Union: Education, Training, Youth**
[http://europa.eu.int/pol/educ/index_en.htm](http://europa.eu.int/pol/educ/index_en.htm)
Gateway to the European Union in matters related to education, training, and youth.

**European University Association**
The European University Association, as the representative organisation of both the European universities and the national rectors' conferences, is the main voice of the higher education community in Europe. EUA's mission is to promote the development of a coherent system of European higher education and research. EUA aims to achieve this through active support and guidance to its members as autonomous institutions in enhancing the quality of their teaching, learning and research as well as their contributions to society.

**Higher Education Funding Council for England (HECFE)**
Publications
[http://www.hefce.ac.uk/Pubs/](http://www.hefce.ac.uk/Pubs/)
Working in partnership, the Higher Education Funding Council for England (HEFCE) promotes and funds high-quality, cost-effective teaching and research, meeting the diverse needs of students, the economy and society. Through its work, HECFE also supports the further enhancement of leadership, governance and management (LGM) within the higher education sector.

**Higher Education at the Faculty for Interdisciplinary Studies of the University of Klagenfurt, Vienna**
[http://www.iff.ac.at/hofo/publications/publications.html](http://www.iff.ac.at/hofo/publications/publications.html)
The Department for Research in Higher Education at the IFF investigates the economic, social and political framework conditions for research and education at all kinds of higher education institutions. The main goal is to contribute to the modernization of the Austrian Higher Education System and to improve the competitiveness of higher education institutions in an international environment. The Department for Research in Higher Education at the IFF is one of the largest organizational entities for research in higher education in Austria.

**Higher Education Research Institute, University of California, Los Angeles**
[http://www.gseis.ucla.edu/heri/heri.html](http://www.gseis.ucla.edu/heri/heri.html)
The Higher Education Research Institute is based in the Graduate School of Education & Information Studies at the University of California, Los Angeles. The Institute serves as an interdisciplinary center for research, evaluation, information, policy studies, and research training in postsecondary education. HERI's research program covers a variety of topics including the outcomes of postsecondary education, leadership development, faculty performance, federal and state policy, and educational equity.

**International Public Management Network**

Research
http://www.inpuma.net/research.htm
The mission of the International Public Management Network (IPMN) is to provide a forum for sharing ideas, concepts and results of research and practice in the field of public management, and to stimulate critical thinking about alternative approaches to problem solving and decision making in the public sector.

**National Center for Public Policy and Higher Education**

http://www.highereducation.org/
The National Center for Public Policy and Higher Education promotes public policies that enhance Americans’ opportunities to pursue and achieve high-quality education and training beyond high school. As an independent, nonprofit, nonpartisan organization, the National Center prepares action-oriented analyses of pressing policy issues facing the states and the nation regarding opportunity and achievement in higher education— including two- and four-year, public and private, for-profit and nonprofit institutions.

**Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development**

Directorate for Education
http://www.oecd.org/department/0,2688,en_2649_33723_1_1_1_1_1,00.html
OECD's work on education is relevant, not only for government and local authorities, but also for civil society: researchers, professional practitioners and an informed lay audience, in many cases beyond the 30 Member countries. The extent of the audience is evident in the public discussion and debate that OECD's publications on education often generate.

**Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development**

Tertiary education
http://www.oecd.org/department/0,2688,en_2649_34859749_1_1_1_1_1,00.html
The OECD is studying the impact of changed funding systems on institutions, following work on policies for improving institutional financial sustainability. A comparative review of tertiary education will contribute, especially on approaches to governance of tertiary institutions and the impact on efficiency and quality of service. Current work also focuses on human resource development, research management and internationalization. The OECD also develops statistics and indicators for tertiary education on access and participation, finance and investment, and labor force attainment and rewards.
Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development
Public Governance and Management
http://www.oecd.org/topic/0,2686,en_2649_37405_1_1_1_1_37405,00.html
The OECD seeks to analyse and develop solutions to the common challenges and needs of governments, and to promote good practices that enhance the effectiveness of democratic institutions. Work on public governance includes activities on e-government, regulatory reform, public sector budgeting and management, sustainable development, citizen participation in policymaking, and fighting corruption. Through its extensive outreach program, OECD shares experience and knowledge on public governance with non-members throughout the world.

Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development
Emerging and Transition Economies
http://www.oecd.org/topic/0,2686,en_2649_37445_1_1_1_1_37445,00.html
The Centre for Co-operation with non-Members promotes and co-ordinates the OECD's dialogue with non-member economies. This dialogue is based on mutual interest and the sharing of policy experiences contributing to economic growth, social development and good governance. The CCNM's programmes - OECD Global Forums, Regional/Country programmes - cover the major policy areas of OECD expertise of mutual interest to Members and non-Members: economic policy, trade, fiscal policy, international investment, financial sector reform, structural adjustment through sectoral policies, environment, agriculture, labour, education, social, innovation and technological policy.

Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development
Emerging and Transition Economies: Information by Country
http://www.oecd.org/infobycountry/0,2646,en_2649_37445_1_1_1_1_37445,00.html

Program for Research on Private Higher Education (PROPHE)
Publications
http://www.albany.edu/dept/eaps/prophe/publication/publication.html
PROPHE is a global network dedicated to building knowledge about the development of private sectors in higher education around the world. PROPHE neither represents nor promotes private higher education. The core activity is scholarship, which, in turn, aims to inform public discussion and policymaking. PROPHE is headquartered at the University at Albany. PROPHE's funding comes principally from the Ford Foundation, assisted by the University at Albany.

Stanford Institute for Higher Education Research
Publications
http://siher.stanford.edu/publicationsalphabytitle.html
The Stanford Institute for Higher Education Research (SIHER) is home to sponsored research projects that examine contemporary higher education planning and policy issues from a wide range of analytical perspectives, including those of social scientists and policy audiences in the United States and abroad.

The Futures Project - Policy for Higher Education in a Changing World
http://www.futuresproject.org/
The Futures Project was founded in 1999: (i) to stimulate an informed debate about the role of higher education in our new global society, and the opportunities and dangers presented by a global market for higher education; (ii) to develop policies that ensure a skilled use of market forces to maximize the opportunities while minimizing the dangers. The Futures Project closed down on March 31, 2005. The site is no longer actively maintained. All the material on this site will be available until August 1, 2006.

Williams Project on the Economy of Higher Education
http://www.williams.edu/wpehe/publications.html
The Williams Project began in the summer of 1989 with a grant from the Andrew W. Mellon Foundation. The aim of the Project is to do studies of the economics of colleges and universities that meet high analytical standards while staying close to the institutional realities and policy concerns that motivate interest in this sector.

World Bank Tertiary Education Site
http://www1.worldbank.org/education/tertiary/
The World Bank is working to encourage not only better-quality outcomes from tertiary education worldwide, but also to promote more efficient tertiary education institutions that innovate and respond positively to meaningful performance-based allocation of resources and accountability systems. Such improvements can stimulate economic growth and help to stem the outward flow of highly skilled human capital by supporting cultures of quality and productivity.

Santiago, Chile, August 2005