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Venue for HER2017

Faculty Club, Hiroshima University

- Main venue/Parallel session
- 3F Smoking room/ Vending machine for drinks
- 4F Vending machine for drinks
- Registration
- Conference dinner on Day 2 (Optional)
PROGRAMME
Programme

Please check conference notice board next to registration desk for last minute notices

Day 1: Tuesday 26th September 2017
Venue: Higashi-Hiroshima Campus, Hiroshima University

From 12:00 Registration

12:30 – 13:30 Campus Tour (optional)

14:00 – 14:30 Welcome and Opening Session

• Introduction
  Jun Oba

• Welcome address
  Makoto Miyatani

• Background to Higher Education Reform Workshop series
  Maria Slowey

14:30 – 15:30 Keynote Presentation 1

• “Governing Quality: The Shifting Role of the Academic Profession in Decisions of Academic Quality and Standards”
  Glen A. Jones

• Discussion

15:30 – 16:00 Refreshment Break

16:00 – 17:15 Panel Session 1 (plenary)

• “Strategies and Activities of Internationalization of Higher Education in Asia and the Pacific in the Changing International Context”
  Futao Huang (chair), Mei Li, Qaing Zha, and Yangson Kim

17:15 – 17:30 Group photo

18:00 – 20:00 Welcome Reception (La Place)
Day 2: Wednesday 27th September 2017

From 08:30  
Registration continues

09:00 – 10:00  
**Keynote presentation 2**

- “The Academic Career Path and Career Development: Strategies for the Academic Journey”
  Jung Cheol Shin
- Discussion

10:00 – 11:15  
**Panel session 2 (plenary)**

- “Enhancing performance and increasing productivity? Policy reforms and institutional practice in three higher education systems”
  Maria Slowey(chair), Shinichi Yamamoto, and Pavel Zgaga

11:15 – 11:45  
**Refreshment Break**

11:45 – 12:45  
**Parallel Session 1** (see detailed schedule)

- **Paper Session 1A** (Conference Room 1)
- **Paper Session 1B** (Reception Hall 1)
- **Paper Session 1C** (Reception Hall 2)

12:45 – 14:15  
**Lunch Break**

14:15 – 15:45  
**Parallel Session 2** (see detailed schedule)

- **Paper Session 2A** (Conference Room 1)
- **Paper Session 2B** (Reception Hall 1)
- **Paper Session 2C** (Reception Hall 2)

15:45 – 16:15  
**Refreshment Break**

16:15 – 17:45  
**Parallel Session 3** (see detailed schedule)

- **Paper Session 3A** (Conference Room 1)
- **Paper Session 3B** (Reception Hall 1)
- **Paper Session 3C** (Reception Hall 2)

18:30 – 20:30  
**Workshop Dinner** (La Bohème, optional)
Day 3: Thursday 28th September 2017

09:00 - 10:30  Parallel Session 4
   Paper Session 4A (Conference Room 1)
   Paper Session 4B (Reception Hall 1)
   Paper Session 4C (Reception Hall 2)

10:30 – 11:00  Refreshment Break

11:00 – 12:00  Keynote presentation 3
   - “From Education to Learning Outcomes: How Can Academia Show the Evidence to Stakeholders?”
     Aya Yoshida
   - Discussion

12:00 – 12:40  Summary and Conclusions of the Workshop (plenary)
   - Workshop rapporteurs: Maria Slowey and Shinichi Yamamoto

12:40 – 12:55  15th HER Workshop: Preview and Invitation
   - Antigoni Papadimitriou, Johns Hopkins University, USA

12:55 – 13:00  Closure of the 14th HER Workshop

14:00 –  
   Tour in Saijo (optional)
Detailed Parallel Session Schedule

Day 2: Wednesday 27th September 2017
11:45 – 12:45 Parallel Session 1:

Paper Sessions 1B, (Reception Hall 1)
- “The Harmonization Process of Asian Higher Education: The Issues and Challenges of Regionally Aligned Student Mobility”, Taiji Hotta
- “Government internationalization initiatives and university admissions reform: The case of introducing the IB Diploma Programme to Japanese universities”, Justin Sanders; Yukiko Ishikura

Paper Sessions 1C, (Reception Hall 2)
- “University Fourth Mission, Spin-offs and Academic Entrepreneurship: Connecting Public Policies with New Missions and Management Issues of Universities”, Stefano Boffo; Augusto Cocorullo
- “Is the Research Performance Metrics Going to Change? A Push from the Open Science Movement”, Miho Funamori

14:15 – 15:45 Parallel Session 2:

Paper Sessions 2A, (Conference Room 1)
- “Evaluation Policies of Higher Education in Brazil: enhancing performance and cultural diversity?”, Ana Ivenicki
- “Performance-based university funding and local practices”, Jonas Krog Lind
- “Enhancing the Research Performance and Competitiveness of Higher Education Institutions – A comparative analysis of five European countries”, Torger Möller

Paper Sessions 2B, (Reception Hall 1)
- “To borrow or to mix? A cultural approach to observing Taiwanese higher education”, Warangkana Lin; Rui Yang
Paper Sessions 2C, (Reception Hall 2)
- “Competency-Based Education in Japan for a Globalized and Knowledge Based Society”, Kunihiko Takamatsu; Katsuhiko Muarakami; Takafumi Kirimura; Kenya Bannaka; Ikuhiro Noda; Kenichiro Mitsunari; Yasuo Nakata
- “What is an ideal “general education” in the 21st century? An exploration starts with Chinese universities and goes beyond China”, Qiang Zha

16:15 – 17:45 Parallel Session 3:
Paper Sessions 3A, (Conference Room 1)
- “A mixed-methods investigation of the language support of graduate international students on English-taught programs/courses in Japanese universities”, Mahboubeh Rakhshandehroo; Polina Ivanova
- “Harnessing the potential of Blended and Online Learning as a catalyst to support and advance Higher Education Reform in Canadian Universities.”, Kathleen Matheos; Alan Davis; Marti Cleveland-Innes; Heather Kanuka
- “How do universities adapt to their external environment? : An empirical study of the effects of university governance reform”, Kazuyuki Maeda; Masataka Murasawa; Jun Oba; Satoshi Watanabe

Paper Sessions 3B, (Reception Hall 1)
- “Professional remaking of returned Chinese scholars in the era of higher education transition in China”, Qiongqiong Chen
- “International Faculty in Japanese Universities: Who are they and what issues they are facing with?”, Futao Huang, Tsukasa Daizen, and Yangson Kim
- “A public policy for young researchers in Mexican higher education institutions”, Rosalba Genoveva Ramírez García

Paper Sessions 3C, (Reception Hall 2)
- “Applied Transformation of Local Undergraduate Colleges: Structural and Functional Adjustment of Chinese Higher Education”, Lida Chen; Sumin Li; Ziyue Wang
- “Importance of Collaboration between Academic Faculty and Administrative Staff in University Reform in Japan”, Yasuo Nakata; Takafumi Kirimura; Kenya Bannaka; Ikuhiro Noda; Kenichiro Mitsunari; Kunihiko Takamatsu
- “Back to the Past?: Weakened autonomy of national university corporations in Japan”, Fujio Ohmori
Day 3: Thursday 28th September 2017
09:00 – 10:30 Parallel Session 4:

Paper Sessions 4A, (Conference Room 1)
- “Chinese International Student’s Movement and their Learning Outcomes in Japanese University”, Qiujing Pan; Noboru Miyoshi
- “Governance in higher education and internationalization in Mexico”, Sylvie Didou Aupetit
- “Balancing higher education reform and ASEAN harmonization in Myanmar”, Takao Kamibeppu

Paper Sessions 4B, (Reception Hall 1)
- “Resource dependency and the unintended consequences of research output funding in South Africa”, Gerald Wangenge-Ouma
- “Application and Effects of Indicators of Internationalization: Case Study of Shanghai Jiaotong University”, Li Yi

Paper Sessions 4C, (Reception Hall 2)
- “The diversity of student pathways and performances”, Wietse de Vries; Olga Grijalva Martínez
- “Changing Role of Universities~ From a screening device to a school for a place of teaching ~”, Shinichi Yamamoto
- “From Post-doctoral Fellow to Full Professor: The Transnational Capital and the Construction of Professional Development Space of Thousand Youth Talents Scholars in China”, Mei Li; Rui Yang; Jun Wu
ABSTRACTS
Introduction

ENHANCING PERFORMANCE AND PRODUCTIVITY IN HIGHER EDUCATION

Universities are under pressure from different sides: Governments demand evidence for productivity and performance in exchange for the public funds universities receive. Employers demand that teaching be workplace relevant and for research to be useful and capable of commercial exploitation. Students want their degrees to enhance their employment prospects. At the same time, there are expectations for universities to expand their missions, for example by opening up to more underrepresented groups and engaging in service to their local communities.

While the higher education (HE) sector has been expanding in all developed countries, at the same time governments have imposed on universities an obligation “to do more with less.” They require universities to demonstrate accountability and transparency by providing detailed data about what they do and what “impact” their research has had, how many students have graduated and to what extent they are finding employment in their field of study or related fields. Governments want especially universities to demonstrate that they are competitive with other universities both in their own country and internationally. As universities are encouraged by governments to seek funding from other than public sources, private sponsors likewise ask for proof that resources are being used efficiently and for the purpose for which they have been provided. In addition, in some countries, institutional governance reforms and various types of collaboration among universities (including mergers) are actively sought for enhanced efficiency and productivity.

It is primarily through public policies that this evolution in the context of HE has been occurring. The focus of this workshop is, as in former workshops, on these public policies and the underlying reasons for their evolution, as well as with their implementation and evaluation.

International workshops on Higher Education Reform (HER) have taken place annually since 2003, when the first in this series was held in Vancouver, Canada, organised by the Centre for Policy Studies in Higher Education and Training. In following years workshops took place in Tokyo (Japan), Shanghai and Tianjin (China), St. Johns, Newfoundland and again Vancouver (Canada), Vienna (Austria), Berlin (Germany), Ljubljana (Slovenia) and, most recently in 2016, Dublin (Ireland).

This year’s HER workshop will be organised by the Research Institute for Higher Education (RIHE) of Hiroshima University. As in previous workshops, it will bring together HE researchers and policy analysts from different countries and HE systems who will present and discuss their research and analyses with respect to this year’s workshop theme.
Key Issues and Topics:

We invite contributions dealing with the above themes. Although the following list does not cover the entire breadth of themes, it provides examples of topics and issues to be addressed:

- Over the last two decades, how and why have public policies redefined or changed the missions of universities and other HE institutions? Does an increased differentiation within HE systems mean a redefinition of missions as well as types of governance?

- What purpose do data on performance serve? How do we understand and assess performance and productivity in relation to the different missions and different types of HE institutions? In the face of new and multiple missions, how can traditional values be maintained and possibly reinvigorated?

- Is an emphasis of performance and productivity just a mechanism of control by governments and non-public sponsors or is it important to the institutions themselves, as some of them are competing for reputation, funding and good faculty and students?

- What are the implications for pedagogy in higher education of these types of indicators?

- The growing pressure on universities and other HE institutions to demonstrate good performance and high productivity in spite of decreasing public funding (“doing more with less”) – is it compatible with the core missions of universities?

- Is accountability compatible with “academic freedom” – i.e., given that the freedom and responsibility of professors to determine what they research and what and how they teach are traditionally at the core of universities’ missions?

- Can the universities’ core missions (creation, analysis and transmission of knowledge) be accomplished without academic freedom, and is the contention by many analysts – that accountability vs. academic freedom creates one of the most basic conflicts of universities with society – supported by real evidence?

- Are there other forms of “accountability” besides performance indicators and productivity measurement? How can “performance” and “productivity” in teaching, learning and research be properly defined?

- Do formal governance reforms (or structural changes in the governance) really matter, since most important decisions made in the university occur outside the formal decision-making system?

- By gaining mass, how do universities find economies of scale and rationalise the use of resources in spite of the cost necessary for the merger process? How do collaborating institutions successfully change their culture so that they may profit from their collaboration and enhance their productivity?
Logistics and organisation of the Workshop

International Advisory Board to the HER Workshop series:

Germán Álvarez Mendiola, Centre for Advanced Research and Studies, (DIE-Cinvestav), Mexico
Walter Archer, Emeritus Professor, University of Alberta, Canada
Mei Li, East China Normal University (ECNU), China
Sumin Li, Tianjin Normal University, China
Hans G. Schuetze, Emeritus Professor, University of British Columbia, Canada
Maria Slowey, Dublin City University, Ireland
Andrä Wolter, Humboldt University, Germany
Shinichi Yamamoto, J. F. Oberlin University, Japan
Pavel Zgaga, University of Ljubljana, Slovenia

Local Organisational Team:

Research Institute for Higher Education (RIHE), Hiroshima University, JAPAN

Jun Oba; Tsukasa Daizen; Masashi Fujimura; Yumiko Hada; Futao Huang; Yangson Kim; Fumihiro Maruyama; Masataka Murasawa; Tomoe Nomura; Machi Sato; Satoshi Patten Watanabe

About RIHE:

Research Institute for Higher Education, Hiroshima University
Contributing to the promotion and international network development of higher education research

RIHE was established in 1972 as the first specialised research institute for higher education in Japan. It has evolved into a centre for current research and information exchange among domestic and foreign researchers and also fulfils national roles through its series of publications, research conferences, information services, and its extensive library facilities and holdings. It aspires to be a focal point for emerging networks of higher education research organisations and institutions worldwide.
Keynote Speakers by Order of Presentation

Glen A. Jones
Professor of Higher Education and Dean of the Ontario Institute for Studies in Education at University of Toronto

Glen A. Jones is Professor of Higher Education and Dean of the Ontario Institute for Studies in Education at the University of Toronto. His research interests include university governance, higher education systems and policy, and academic work. He received the Distinguished Research Award from the Canadian Society for the Study of Higher Education in 2001. He is the author of more than one hundred publications on higher education, and his most recent book (with Ian Austin) is Governance of Higher Education: Global Perspectives, Theories and Practices (Routledge, 2015). He has been a visiting professor at Fudan University, the University of Oslo, the University of the West Indies, and Beijing Normal University. His current projects include a national study of university governance in Canada (with Julia Eastman and Claude Trottier), a study of academic career pathways in the context of national systems (with Martin Finkelstein) that will be published by Johns Hopkins Press in 2018, and a study of academic work in Canada as part of the Academic Profession and the Knowledge Society international project.

Governing Quality: The Shifting Role of the Academic Profession in Decisions of Academic Quality and Standards

Given their key role in education and scholarship, universities are now regarded as essential institutions within national human development, research and innovation systems. The question of who determines the quality and standards of higher education has been the subject of considerable debate, and addressing this question has underscored many of the reforms to university governance that have taken place over the last three decades. This presentation reviews major trends in higher education governance and analyzes the shifting role of the professoriate in institutional decision-making. This shifting role can be understood as a response to external pressures related to neo-liberal reforms, rankings, accountability and a continuing quest for efficiency, but it can also be seen as a function of the changing academic profession, especially the increasing horizontal and vertical fragmentation of academic work in many jurisdictions, and the increasing valorization of research productivity. Are there ways of reasserting the role of academic self-governance over issues of quality and standards in higher education?
Jung Cheol Shin  
Professor at Seoul National University

Dr. Shin is a professor at Seoul National University. He served in the Korean Ministry of Education for about 20 years. His research interests are higher education policy, knowledge and social development, and the academic profession. He is Co-Editor-in-Chief of the International Encyclopedia of Higher Education and is an advisory board member of the Oxford Research Encyclopedia of Education. In addition, he is the co-editor of the Knowledge Studies in Higher Education series (Springer), and a board member of Studies in Higher Education, Higher Education, Tertiary Education and Management and the Peabody Journal of Education. His recent book publications include University Rankings (2011), Institutionalization of World-Class University in Global Competition (2012), Teaching and Research in Contemporary Higher Education (2013), The Future of the Post-Massified University at the Crossroads (2013), The Dynamics of Higher Education Development in East Asia (2013), and Mass Higher Education Development in East Asia (2015).

The Academic Career Path and Career Development: Strategies for the Academic Journey

This presentation will focus on career development of academics, from their doctoral training stage to senior academic positions. The presenter will briefly overview differences among higher education systems and academic systems across countries in order to establish common grounds for understanding academic career development in each country. Based on this understanding, the presenter will explain how career paths differ among disciplines (natural sciences, engineering, social sciences, and humanities) using career development models in each discipline. These discussions are the basis for understanding the differences between higher education systems and academic disciplines for academic career development. In addition, the presenter will describe changing academic work environments and discuss how the new environments bring changes in academics’ activities (teaching, research, service, and administration). These discussions are further developed through follow-up discourses on collaborations between colleagues as a strategy for survival in competitive academic environments. Finally, the speaker proposes a strategic approach for academic career development, from the doctoral degree stage to the senior academic stage, as a means for academics to survive in competitive academic environments and to accomplish their goals and dreams. The speaker expects that the audience, especially junior academics, will develop their ideas and strategies for their own successful academic journey through what is presented during this session.
Aya Yoshida
Associate Director, Center for Higher Education Studies and Professor of Sociology of Education in the Faculty of Education and Integrated Arts and Sciences at Waseda University

Aya YOSHIDA is Associate Director, Center for Higher Education Studies and Professor of Sociology of Education in the Faculty of Education and Integrated Arts and Sciences at Waseda University. Her current research interest is focused on Japanese higher education policy and the transformation of the higher education system since the 1990’s. Her recent publications are: ‘Global Human Resource Development’ and Japanese University Education: ‘Localism’ in Actor Discussions, Education Studies in Japan (2017); The Emptiness of ‘Global HR Development,’ Discuss Japan (2016); Daigaku to Kyoyokyoiku (Liberal Education in a University in a Postwar Japan) Iwanami Shoten: Tokyo, (2013), and others. She acquired her BA in History, Tokyo University, MA in Sociology of Education, Tokyo University, and Ph.D. in Sociology of Education, Tokyo University. She has served as a member of the General Committee of Universities, the Central Council for Education in Japan and also a member of the Science Council of Japan.

From Education to Learning Outcomes: How Can Academia Show the Evidence to Stakeholders?

The goal of this presentation is to trace Japanese higher education policy since 2000 and the transformation of Japanese universities in terms of human resource development. Japanese universities began to reform their undergraduate education after the deregulation in 1991. The Ministry of Education (MoE) has taken a leading role in university reform. It has used both carrots and sticks, as the situation demands. Universities have had to react to both, and in the process have gradually changed their system. Since around 2000, the MoE has shifted its reform focus from education to learning, and students’ learning outcomes. On the one hand, this is because the MoE has been affected by recent higher education policies regarding learning outcomes in the US and in Europe, and on the other hand it is because Japanese industry has raised its voice against universities. Japanese industry has demanded that universities nurture global human resources for developing their business overseas. In theory, there are many types of learning outcomes. However, in policy debates learning outcomes are regarded as competencies, generic skills, general performance, etc. Industry also expects global human resources who have communication skills in a foreign language (English), independence, a challenging spirit, problem solving skills, and so on. These stakeholders require universities to cultivate students who have those qualities and abilities, and then show the evidence that they are able to do it. It is hard to set the criteria or level for these qualities and abilities, and to show that the measured result is evidence of students’ learning outcomes while at university. This presentation explores the detailed policy of the MoE and the response of universities, and examines the transformation of the Japanese higher education system.
Panels by Order of Presentation

Panel 1: Strategies and Activities of Internationalization of Higher Education in Asia and the Pacific in the Changing International Context

Recent political developments have problematized the international activities that are increasingly central to the functioning of higher education systems and institutions. As well known, Donald Trump’s administration has produced a great deal of uncertainty within US colleges and universities, particularly in relation to internationalization. Similarly, it is anticipated that the UK’s withdrawal from the EU will have consequences for the international stature and activities of universities in both the UK and continental Europe. This panel discusses whether internationalization strategies and activities in Australia, China, Japan and Korea are similarly threatened by the changing international context.

This panel consists of four presentations. It is primarily concerned with higher education systems in Asia and the Pacific. Main points of the four presentations include the international strategies and status of each higher education system, important practices of internationalization, the benefits and risks of internationalization, relationship between internationalization and enhancement of academic productivity, and prospects of internationalization of higher education in the four countries in Asia and the Pacific. More details are as follows:

The first panel presentation is about Australia at the vertex: future contribution to international higher education. This presentation takes stock of this contribution and forecasts the future of Australia’s progress. The presentation begins by taking examining achievements to date with regards international higher education. The middle part of the presentation examines global and regional dynamics, with emphasis on geopolitical developments in Asia and in major higher education areas. The presentation closes by exploring prospects as well as challenges for Australia’s future growth. What values will advance Australia’s fortunes? What major obstacles need navigating? What kinds of partnership are required? The second presentation deals with strategies, challenges and opportunities of internationalizing Chinese higher education in the second decade of 21st century. This presentation begins with a brief introduction of new strategies of internationalization of Chinese higher education such as the Belt and the Road, implementation of double world-class universities project, and the cultivation of talents for innovation and entrepreneurship. Then it discusses the challenges facing the Chinese universities focusing on the tension between internationalization, nationalization, and localization. The third part argues opportunities for the internationalization of Chinese higher education, including the sustained social economic development in China, rising role of China at the international arena and space at various domains. The presentation concludes by presenting main changes occurred in the internationalization of Chinese higher education and its prospect. The purpose of the third presentation is to analyze institutional leaders’ perceptions of internationalization of Japanese universities. Based on major findings from national survey of vice presidents who are in charge of internationalization, this presentation addresses
reflections on the internationalization imperative, international and sectoral comparisons, sectoral stratification and internationalization. In conclusion, it argues Japanese universities have not considerably slowed their pace of internationalization. Internationalization is still highly valued despite new circumstances. The final presentation talks about achievements and challenges of internationalization of higher education in Korea amid deepening global uncertainties. Since the middle of 1990s, as one of strategies to secure the competitiveness, and enhance academic productivity, Korean government has attempted national level projects for internationalization of higher education such as Study Korea Project, World Class University Project, and Campus Asia Projects. This presentation aims to explore achievements and challenges of internationalization of higher education in Korea based on multiple dimensions and to suggest prospects and tasks of the internationalization of higher education in the context of increasing the global uncertainties.

Panelists:
Futao Huang (chair), Hiroshima University, Japan
Hamish Coates, University of Melbourne, Australia
Mei Li, East China Normal University, China
Yangson Kim, Hiroshima University, Japan
Panel 2: Enhancing performance and increasing productivity? Policy reforms and institutional practice in three higher education systems.

In many, probably most, countries there has been a marked shift towards demands from governments and funding bodies for greater accountability of public institutions, including universities and other higher education institutions (HEIs). This reform of higher education (HE) governance is most visible in countries like Japan and Germany where governments have recently granted universities a higher degree of autonomy over their programs, personnel and finances. At the same time new instruments have been introduced, for example “performance contracts” that give governments considerable control over budgets and programs. Even in Anglo-Saxon countries where a high degree of institutional autonomy has been a traditional feature of universities, a number of new measures are limiting that autonomy. Examples are new ‘degree authorization agencies’ that try to curb duplication of programs or conditions (sometimes called ‘expectations’ or ‘guide lines’) which are attached to the annual operating grants by the government.

To hold HEIs institutions accountable to the public (governments) a number of exercises are conducted aiming at assessing, evaluating, measuring and comparing ‘performance’ and ‘productivity’ of HEIs whereby ‘performance’ is primarily understood as outcomes of teaching and learning, for example labour market outcomes, measured by employment upon graduation, or student success, measured by program completion rates within the defined time span. ‘Productivity’ tends to focus on the ratio of input and output factors of research as well as the relevance of university research for industrial innovation and competitiveness.

HE has commonly been seen as having three principal missions: Teaching and learning, research, and service to the community (alternatively called ‘community engagement, or the ‘third mission’). Increasingly, HEIs have put a particular emphasis on certain objectives within these general missions, e.g. opening up to new types of (‘non-traditional’) students, research and skill development for particular industries and regions, or ‘industry liaison’ of ‘technology transfer’.

To be meaningful, attempts at defining and measuring performance and productivity must take into account such specific objectives as well as the particular contexts in which the HEIs operate. Moreover, the diversity of political and cultural contexts as well as the path-dependency of reforms will make any inter-country comparison challenging.

The panel will discuss the objectives and methods which a number of countries have introduced as they seek to improve ‘performance’ and ‘productivity’ of both individual HEIs and national HE systems as a whole, locating this discussion within the context of the various policy objectives HEI are expected to meet. Panelists will also
explore the ways in which these assessment exercises appear to be affecting missions, and the ways these missions are carried out.

The panelists represent three (four) different families of HE systems: The continental European, the Anglo-Saxon, and the Japanese system of HE (the latter partly a combination of the former two). Mexican, while different in some respect from both the Spanish and US models, has also some of the features and traditions of these two systems. The panel intends to demonstrate that, while all countries have their own idiosyncratic ways of organizing (and reforming) their HE systems, there are also a number of common features, processes and understandings, some of which influenced by the properties and traditions of the ‘families’ to which they belong, but increasingly also by norms and criteria that have been propagated by international bodies such as the OECD, the World Bank, and the Bologna group of countries.

Panelists will briefly present the gist of recent policies and practices in their countries or geopolitical regions with regard to defining, measuring and improving performance and productivity. After a first round of discussion among the panel members, the discussion will open up and invite contributions from the audience.

Panelists:

Hans G. Schuetze (chair), University of British Columbia (UBC), Canada: [Canada and Germany]
Germán Álvarez Mendiola, Centre for Advanced Research and Studies, (DIE-Cinvestav), Mexico: [Mexico]
Maria Slowey, Dublin City University, Ireland: [Ireland (and the UK)]
Pavel Zgaga, University of Ljubljana, Slovenia: [Slovenia (and Eastern Europe)]
Shinichi Yamamoto, J. F. Oberlin University, Japan: [Japan]
Antigoni Papadimitriou (discussant), Johns Hopkins University, USA
Papers in Alphabetical Order

Álvarez Mendiola, Germán¹, and Hans G. Schuetze²

¹ Centre for Advanced Research and Studies, (DIE-Cinvestav), Mexico
² University of British Columbia (UBC), Canada

HE Programs, Productivity, Profits and Public Policy – Private HE in North America (Canada, Mexico, the US)

Over the last three decades there have been fundamental changes regarding the relationship between state and market in higher education. They are embedded in, and result from a general trend which limits the role of the state, giving greater influence to “market forces”. Even where the state is still the main provider or funder of higher education, there has been a shift towards contractual relations between state and institutions, competition among providers for resources and external assessment of ‘outputs’ and results.

In this general framework, governments increasingly pressure public universities to reduce their costs and become more productive. Private universities, especially "for-profit” universities, have established programs that fit the real or perceived needs of their clientele, developing pricing policies to attract more students and widen profit margins. Only in a few cases, productivity linked to quality is a priority of institutions.

In spite of a similar environment of higher education, the private (non-public) sector in the North American countries has developed in different ways. In Mexico, it has grown at a dizzying pace while later leveling off. The traditional elite institutions connected to business and/or the Catholic Church have been surpassed by institutions of uncertain quality, many of them organized as systems or networks at national or regional level, aiming at responding to the demand that the public sector cannot meet. In the US, a private for-profit sector has strongly grown, now accounting for more than ten percent of PSE enrolment. Like in Mexico, there has been a concern about low quality and unethical business methods. In contrast, in Canada, although in most provinces legislation has been introduced that allow for the establishment of new, private, degree-granting institutions, there has been made relatively little use of that new possibility.

Like in most other countries, the HE systems in N/A, especially in the non-public sectors, have developed in a non-coordinated way. While the non-profit sector is mainly emulating the ways of the public sector, the for-profit sector is defined not by higher education laws but by ownership rules, corporate business laws, and tax codes. Its quality standards are not defined by academics but by investors and accountants, even if for-profit institutions must meet minimum standards in order to get accreditation for their programs without which these would be worthless and not marketable. However, in many cases accreditations are based on one-time decisions and there is no follow-up about minimum standards and quality assurance processes.

In the absence of mandatory rules in HE laws, public agencies only can try to regulate for-profit institutions through
business laws preventing unfair competition and criminal law against fraud. The only protection students have against shoddy standards, fraudulent programs and useless certificates are customer protection laws.

Evidence from Mexico and the US shows that ‘productivity’ in the for-profit sector, i.e. profits tend to be high for this sector. In contrast ‘performance’, i.e. measurable standards of quality and success, for example in regard to student graduation or success of the graduates in the labor market is generally low.

This paper analyzes the developments in the N/A countries but particularly in Mexico and Canada as the latter has a negligible for-profit sector that is almost entirely offering programs in non-academic fields. In the case of Mexico, the study will be based on primary data collected over the last years; in the case of the US and Canada, statistical data and evidence from various research studies will serve as a base.

**Boffo, Stefano, and Augusto Cocorullo**

Department of Social Sciences, University of Naples Federico II, Naples, Italy

**University Fourth Mission, Spin-offs and Academic Entrepreneurship: Connecting Public Policies with New Missions and Management Issues of Universities**

Purpose of this paper: Universities are presently considered vital players in the transfer of knowledge, innovation and technology to economy. This is one of the roots of the diffused reform processes investing most European tertiary sectors. In almost 25 year Italian universities have been the object of many changes which deeply reshaped academic institutions. Among other aspects, the need to contribute to give adequate answers to the demand of society led to an extension and deepening of the so-called university Fourth mission (Geiger 2006; Kretz e Sá 2013). A multifaceted set of activities were therefore addressed to strengthen the liaison between academia and society. If in the past this role was mainly covered by granting patents to outsiders, today universities are also dedicated to creation and promotion of spin-offs, as instruments for responding the social pressure to accountability and dialogue with economy through the sharing of scientific research results. In this framework, the main features of each academic institution are an important variable in the spin-offs' developing process. Though the use of case studies, the paper investigates university spin-offs in Italy from two different perspectives. First, the growing number of spin-offs as related to the current condition of Italian academic workers (increasingly affected by budget constraints), university policies and new management issues. Second, the academic actors involved in the spin-offs creation's process, in the light of their identity and self-perception.

Design/methodology/approach: In the first part of the paper we use a quantitative method based on the analysis of data from official statistical sources (Anvur, Netval, Cineca) (Netval 2005-2016; Anvur 2013; 2014; 2016; 2017); a second qualitative section uses interviews with key actors of spin-offs.

Findings: We show that the growing number of spin-offs can (also) be explained as a result of the decline of stable positions in Italian universities and we explore four possible identity-working configurations of academic actors
involved.

What is original/value of paper: We stress the role of university spin-offs as a tool for allow young scientific researchers to pursue research and applications otherwise not achievable by university staff. We propose a new qualitative analytical tool, called “matrix of trends”, addressed to locate spin-off actors following their first aims (academic or entrepreneurial).
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Applied Transformation of Local Undergraduate Colleges: Structural and Functional Adjustment of Chinese Higher Education

In October 2015, China’s Ministry of Education, National Development and Reform Commission and Ministry of Finance jointly issued Guiding Opinions on the Applied Transformation of Some Local Undergraduate Colleges, symbolizing that the practice of the applied transformation of some local undergraduate colleges and establishment of applied technology-based universities formally became a national education strategy. At present, there are about 200 colleges transforming to be applied technology-based universities, including some newly-built colleges, private general undergraduate colleges and independent colleges.

The research on the transformation and development of local undergraduate colleges will be of theoretical and practical significance for adjusting the talent structure to adapt to the social and economic development, improving the sustainable development of colleges and universities, and adjusting the structures and functions of Chinese higher education. This research consists of four parts. In part one, the background and causes of the applied transformation of local general undergraduate colleges are analyzed: to adapt to the transformation and development of the economic society is the primary external power, while to break through the homogenous development of colleges and universities is the internal power. In part two, the transformation of talent cultivation goal, curriculum setting and teaching staff construction after the transformation of local general undergraduate colleges to be applied technology-based colleges is introduced. In part three, government’s change of university administration method after the transformation and development is illustrated: give play to the macro-control by government and market mechanism properly, and deepen the integration of production and education and college-enterprise cooperation. In part four, the impact of applied transformation on Chinese higher education is analyzed, and this education strategy is actually the
reconstruction of structures and functions of the Chinese higher education system in the popular stage.
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Professional remaking of returned Chinese scholars in the era of higher education transition in China

1. Purpose and significance
The goal of this paper is to examine the globalization process and the changing academic profession in China, with a focus particularly on the academic lives of foreign trained academics. It aims to reveal the dynamics of how global and local forces work together in forming the academic lives of returned scholars, and how they reconstruct their professional identities and practices as they renegotiate the academic culture in the context of higher education internationalization in China. This study can be used as a window to understand the changing institutional environment and the academic lives of Chinese professors in general and returned scholars in particular.

2. Methodology
This study used qualitative methods to examine the everyday life of 52 US doctoral recipients from five research institutions in China. The US doctoral recipients in this study is defined as Chinese-born scholars who have completed at least college education in their home country and then obtained their doctorate degrees in the US, and subsequent return to Chinese universities. In-depth interviews, non-participatory observation, informal conversation, and documentary analysis were used to collect data. An inductive analysis approach was used to generate codes, categories, and themes from the raw data. This process was aided by a computer-assisted program called Nvivo 10.

3. Findings and discussions
This study finds that the convergence of globalization and the national push to build world-class universities have created new conditions for the returned scholars. Reconciling between international and local academic communities, the returnees harbored allegiance to both cultural frameworks. As part of a global intellectual community, they used international standards to guide their academic work and many tended to be more identified with their respective disciplinary globally. However, the returnees were not simply securing in the supremacy of one value system. As members of the Chinese academic community, they adjusted their scholarship to meet local needs through knowledge transferring and application. They also reconstructed what it means to be and become a “Chinese professor,” through the dual process of being-made and self-making (Ong 1999). In this sense, this study argues that the returned scholars do not passively accept ascribed roles and norms in China’s academy. Instead, they are understood as socially embedded individuals who actively negotiate new educational spaces, identities, and practices through the processes
of movement, displacement, and resettlement.
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The diversity of student pathways and performances

Since the 1970s there has been an important increase in the number of higher education institutions, as well as the number of programmes, students and academic staff. This increase has led many to the seemingly logical conclusion that higher education systems have become more diverse: newer institutions are different from older ones, new programmes are created as an alternative to existing ones, newly hired staff is different from the older professoriate, and previously excluded students are different from those who traditionally attended higher education. In conclusion, institutions and teachers need to understand a diversity of demands for teaching and learning.

However, growth does not translate automatically into diversity. Many new universities try to replicate the older, prestigious ones. New programmes are often variations on existing options. New faculty generally seek to become full-time tenured professors and behave as such. And students may come from different backgrounds and still behave like their peers.

This paper seeks to analyse in how far the increase in numbers has produced diversification in Mexican higher education. After briefly revising institutions, programmes, and academic staff, we will look particularly at different types of students, and ask what the implications of diversification have been for this actor. Our conjecture is that there is indeed a diversity of students with different demands and behaviours, which influences the internal workings of institutions, but that this diversity does not necessarily show within individual institutions. Research from different sources hint at students adhering to different youth cultures, with different socio-economical and educational backgrounds and interests, who choose (or are directed towards) different types of institutions, display different behaviours and academic outcomes inside institutions, and end up in particular activities in the labour market.

Diversification of higher education would thus entail dissimilar pathways through the system and in the labour market, which, for students, poses questions concerning freedom of choice, equity and equality, and the costs and benefits. On the national and institutional level, however, this diversification leads to questions about performance and its indicators, productivity, quality, and prestige. From this point of view, to comply with the current indicators would require admitting only a certain type of students. Would it not be better to change the indicators?
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**Governance in higher education and internationalization in Mexico.**

Since the Mexican government signed the North American Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA) with Canada and the United States of America in 1993, the Secretary of Public Education (SEP) and the National Council of Science and Technology (CONACYT) implemented policies to reduce the asymmetries between the national system of higher education and those of their counterparts. They sought to raise the quality of training, to ensure that academics get a postgraduate and to adapt student profiles to a changing economy. With these purposes, they designed programs of evaluation for teachers and researchers and funding schemes for HEIs. They built complex quality assurance mechanisms focused on individuals and institutions. They implemented a public policy to promote internationalization.

Our hypothesis is that the internationalization has a potential impact on the organizational models of HEIs, their relationships with their academic staff, their enrollment and their environment. Today, it is a key entry point to understand the breakdowns in governance that afflict higher education institutions in Mexico. It is, in metaphorical terms, a chemical revealer of the changes achieved and the progressive exhaustion of the "modernization" of higher education model, undertaken 25 years ago.

Contrary to what was done in the country, building a dynamic of internationalization involves not only implementing programs, in accordance with vertical decision-making schemes and administrative criteria of accountability, channeling resources of random amounts. It goes through ensuring continuity in the orientations of an internationalization project articulated with the systemic and institutional logics of development in higher education field. It involves specialized offices in the management of international agreements and assume the formal commitment to generate data for follow-up. It forces to get political and technical capacities to conclude alliances to give sustainability to the priority initiatives.

Retrospective balances on the state of internationalization indicate that the country already has the formal devices to boost it. But their impacts were limited, due to imbalances in the activities promoted, deficits of legitimacy, inadequate bureaucratic controls and lack of a geostrategic perspective. Considering this situation, we will present a critical assessment of the results. We will emphasize, particularly, the inadequacies in relation to the resolution of central problems for higher education, such equity, quality, professionalization, innovations and social responsibility.
Is the Research Performance Metrics Going to Change? A Push from the Open Science Movement

The Open Science movement is gaining traction since the G8 Science Ministers made a joint statement in 2013 on open scientific research data and increasing access to the peer-reviewed published results of scientific research. Open Science denotes the idea of conducting research in an open way throughout the whole research lifecycle. It encourages researchers to conduct research in collaboration with others, to share research outputs openly, to reuse and combine research data, and to review others’ work openly. Even though Open Science is an umbrella term for opening up aspects of the scientific research process, policy developments are mostly confined to sharing research outputs in an open format. Now, most funding agencies within the US, UK, and other major countries have made the open accessing of research publication of publicly-funded research mandate, and have adopted Data Sharing Policy which requires investigators submitting an application to include a plan for data sharing.

The mandates for making the research outputs of publicly-funded research openly accessible are facing challenges due to researcher’s idleness and reluctance to share research data. To cope this challenge, funding agencies and scholarly communication circles claim that there need to be incentives for researchers to make their research output openly available. For this purpose, they have been successful in establishing the so-called data journals where the acquired research data can be presented. The “Scientific Data” published by Springer Nature is an example. They also try to disrupt the scholarly communication by introducing “open peer-review” and “altmetrics.” These should promote the idea of Open Science.

Funding agencies are sponsoring research and have the power to direct researchers to certain directions. However, is it justifiable that funding agencies and the scholarly communication circle intend to change and shape the academic values and practices, which grew out of the academic society and has several centuries history? Even if the shift to Open Science is desired for the benefit of humankind, shouldn’t the academic society take the initiative to think what should be done in order to promote Open Science and, if needed, to change the academic value system?

This paper intends to shape the discussion on the academic value system in the digital era by giving an overview of the historical development of the alternate value system, scrutinizing views of various stakeholders, and making clear the discussion points of this issue.
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The Harmonization Process of Asian Higher Education: The Issues and Challenges of Regionally Aligned Student Mobility

The reform of European higher education, so called the “Bologna Process,” has been viewed as a “success” by many
Asian nations. Due to this perception, Asian nations have attempted to implement a regionally aligned “the Harmonization of Asian Higher Education” process. In this process, Asian universities jointly readjust their structures, functions and systems to create a single regionally aligned higher education area, so that students, staff and even educational programs can mobilize themselves without having any barrier inside of region.

One of actual attempts in this major reform plan of Asian higher education was to establish a regional student mobility scheme. During last two decades, Asian nations and their jointly created international organizations, such as the Southeast Asian Ministers of Education Organization-A Regional Centre for Higher Education and Development (hereafter SEAMEO-RIHED), the University Mobility in Asia and Pacific, and ASEAN University Network have separately developed a new scheme of regional student mobility program for their member nations and universities. Although those programs have already promoted regionally collaborative student exchanges in Asian region, there are still some nations who have difficulties to join in one of those mobility programs.

Therefore, the SEAMEO-RIHED has recently launched two development projects for regional academic collaboration and student mobility among the Great Mekong Sub-regional (GMS) nations, namely Cambodia, China, Laos, Myanmar, Thailand, and Vietnam. One is “GMS University Consortium” project to promote regional academic cooperation, and the other one is “Academic Credit Transfer Framework for Asia” (ACTFA) project to promote student mobility among 6 nations. One major mission of those projects, however, is to develop capacities of universities, especially the level of transparency and the quality of educational environment. Without any improvement of those factors, it is very difficult for participating institutions to promote regional student mobility programs with a spirit of mutual trust in the region.

The purpose of this presentation is to introduce outcomes of 5 workshops held in 2016, in which rectors, vice-rectors, deans, head of international offices, and registrars of 24 universities in GMS nations have thoroughly discussed (1) conditions for mutual trust and (2) most needed information from partner universities for future student mobility. Although the data are made for the promotion of student mobility, those representatives’ opinions regarding conditions for mutual trust and transparency can be vital information for other Asian institutions in order to promote the harmonization process of Asian higher education in the future.
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**International Faculty in Japanese Universities: Who are they and what issues they are facing with?**

International faculty is generally acknowledged to constitute an important part of internationalization of higher education. The presence of international faculty tends to create a more international atmosphere in campus. They usually incorporate more international perspective and content into university education. More importantly, many international faculty can play specific roles which cannot be assumed by domestic faculty in teaching, research,
In Japan, the national data of international faculty has been gathered and issued by the MEXT (the former Ministry of Education, now named as Ministry of Education, Culture, Sports, Science and Technology) since the late 1950 as part of all faculty members. However, except for changes to their numbers and percentages of the totals over time, by institutional type, gender, and academic rank, scant information on their personal and professional characteristics profiles is publically available. Although several studies have been conducted in international faculty being employed in Japanese universities since the late 1970s, still little is known of their demographic identities and challenges to them in recent years.

The purpose of this study is to describe the main characteristics of full-time international faculty working in Japanese universities and key issues facing them based on preliminary findings from a national survey on them in June 2017.

In the first section, the study presents a detailed portrait of the international faculty being hired in all the Japanese universities by gender, nationality, discipline, degree, age, academic rank, type of universities, and other variables.

In the second section, the study analyzes and discusses what key issues they are confronted with in their daily life, working condition, academic life and work, and so forth. The study concludes by summarizing major research findings and offering implications for research, policy, and institutional practice.

**Ivenicki, Ana**
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*Evaluation Policies of Higher Education in Brazil: enhancing performance and cultural diversity?*

Enhancing performance and productivity in higher education has been at the forefront of higher education policies in Brazil and elsewhere. However, assessment is a contentious theme, as it involves government choices and challenges concerning criteria, emphasis and focus of the evaluation process in order to judge the extent to which higher education has been contributing to the preparation of citizens for a globalized, highly technologized and yet culturally diverse world.

The present article will provide a contextual overview of public assessment policies of higher education in Brazil in the last decade, taken as a national case study. Methodology will be document analysis of the discourses of the assessment policies related to the evaluation of higher education at the undergraduate and the postgraduate levels; and the perspectives that underlie the vision for higher education performance and productivity, as explicated in the Brazilian National Plan for Education (Brazil, PNE, 2014-2024), which delineates goals for education in Brazil for the next ten years.

The theoretical framework that underlies the paper is based on a multicultural approach, which posits that performance and productivity of higher education should not be antithetical to the valuing of cultural diversity of institutions, faculties and students in culturally diverse societies such as Brazil. The argument is that even though the objectives of educational policies in Brazil are multicultural, a study of the extent to which these objectives are
achieved by the evaluation of performance and productivity should be made. The analysis of the narratives within the higher education policies focused on the paper will seek to understand how those multicultural aims have (or have not) been articulated to the assessment of performance and productivity in Brazilian higher education policies.

The article will particularly focus on the challenges involved in those aims, the main argument being that there is a need to balance accountability perspectives with a multicultural approach, so that assessment of higher education be based on multicultural and ecological dimensions that recognize cultural diversity and the complexity of educational factors that impinge on the diversity of higher education performance and productivity indicators, in Brazil and elsewhere.
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Balancing higher education reform and ASEAN harmonization in Myanmar

After 50 years of isolation, neglect and underinvestment, Myanmar higher education’s infrastructure, curriculum, research and teaching capacity requires substantial renovation, investment and capacity building. To address some of these issues, the National Education Law was enacted in October 2014 and amended in June 2015 by incorporating the demands of protestors (e.g., students and civil society organizations), which led to the slow progress in drafting its sub-sector (higher education and private education) laws.

Key higher education issues addressed in the National Education Law include the extent of university autonomy, the right to organize unions and the university’s right to formulate its own curriculum. Given the changing nature of higher education stakeholders and the country’s developmental needs, enacting and amending National Education Law has been an evolving process with inclusiveness, openness, and to a certain extent transparency which are key characteristics of a democratic government. Transparency and good governance through a set of legal frameworks help enhance the country’s higher education reputation especially with a clear higher education mandate which includes increased access, equity, quality and relevance.

With the new administration formed by the National League for Democracy (NLD) in April 2016, efforts have been made to enact Higher Education Law and Private Education Law, incorporate citizenship education, and increase engagement with ASEAN. When Higher Education Law is enacted, universities are granted a degree of institutional autonomy especially as each university has been tasked to draft their respective Charters.

At the same time, as an ASEAN member state, Myanmar needs to conform to ASEAN frameworks and utilize the advantages of its membership. The ASEAN University Network and SEAMEO RIHED have a significant number of higher education initiatives that support its member countries’ higher education systems to reach regional and international standards. Myanmar needs to establish quality standards through a Myanmar National Qualifications Framework and an independent National Quality Assurance Agency that are aligned with ASEAN and international practices.
Currently, Myanmar’s universities are facing difficulties in undertaking the above-mentioned responsibilities, especially within an unfamiliar environment and a fairly new and vague institutional autonomy framework. This presentation will, first, overview Myanmar higher education governance and reform, second, look into an array of gaps in higher education between Myanmar and ASEAN standards, and, third, consider how best the country can and should take advantage of its ASEAN membership for its own benefits.
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From Post-doctoral Fellow to Full Professor: The Transnational Capital and the Construction of Professional Development Space of Thousand Youth Talents Scholars in China

Recent years have witnessed China’s high level talent strategies and initiatives to lure back top-notch overseas talents urgently needed by the nation’s fast development in science, technology, and higher education. One of such major initiatives is the Thousand Talent Schemes (2008) and the Thousand Youth Talents Scholars (TYTS) launched in 2011 which are at the highest level and have led to a surging return of high quality young expatriate scientists. Usually recruited by Chinese research universities and institutes and enterprises, the returnees construct their professional spaces socially, culturally and vocationally by mobilizing domestic and international resources and networks and navigating their careers in the Chinese academic environment. They transfer knowledge, skills and experiences acquired globally to their home institutions. While they enjoy favorable policies and possess unique capital, they face challenges and difficulties in constructing their professional spaces to strengthen their academic performance. While China’s policies, at both governmental and institutional levels, have been well documented, the lived experiences of Thousand Youth Talent Scholars on (re)integrating into Chinese academic institutions are underexplored.

Reporting findings from an on-going project employing qualitative, semi-structure research interviews, this paper examines how “transitional capital” of TYTS transfer their knowledge, skills, social networks and resources obtained overseas to enhance career development at home. It finds that there are various patterns of the initial stage of their professional development determined by a variety of factors including their interplay with governmental and institutional policies, workplace and disciplinary environments, and available academic spaces. They follow different professional development patterns from the domestic-trained peers and most other returned academics, with comparative advantages on internationalized teaching and research. They are mobilizing the transnational capital with unique advantages of transnational experiences to acquire resources, opportunities and positions for frog-leap style of professional development. Finally, they face both opportunities and challenges when building their professional spaces for development (such as lab construction, research team building, and research lines formation) and outperforming their peers by combing local, national and international resources and academic culture.
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Application and Effects of Indicators of Internationalization: Case Study of Shanghai Jiao-tong University

Internationalization is an important approach towards building and developing core competencies at universities around the world. In recent years, an increasing amount of research has been put towards the development of relevant parameters or index systems. Such systems are normally used to measure the internationalization levels of universities, help to develop strategies towards improving these standards, and address the unbalanced development of internationalization. Previous studies indicated that the establishment of a scientific, systematic and logical assessment standard is vitally crucial to the understanding, measurement and assessment of the level of internationalization of universities.

The Shanghai Jiao-tong University International Observation Indicator (SJTUIOI) was established in 2015. This system consists of 37 secondary and tertiary indicators, and 5 primary indicators which include international development connotation, international cultural environment construction, academic reputation, talent cultivation and academic collaboration. Among them, some of the indicators use a traditional way to make statistics such as the international students number, co-published international papers or times of paper cited, research cooperation projects and the funds. The international cultural environment construction is a more innovative indicator, its focus on creating more international language and information environment so as to make efficient support to the development of international cooperation. This was designed to comprehensively reflect the essence of internationalization in education industry, including internationalization concept, student development and research collaboration. SJTUIOI system is based on the internationalization performance of each colleges or departments. Generality and characteristics of highly active international faculties were achieved by data analysis and comparative studies. This provides a scientific basis for future research to adjust internationalization strategy and further enhance the quality and level of internationalization.

The purpose of this report is to explore in depth the application and performance of this index system in recent two years, including the structure of the system, set-up and specific content of each index. Moreover, from the perspective of educational evaluation, this report progressively examines the validity and rationality of educational method. After two years of practical application within SJTU, it has been proved that this system is able to reveal the significant differences among different departments. This facilitates the development of less active departments and further promotes the adjustment of international strategies on university level. At the end of this report, current problems of the existing system will be discussed for future optimization purpose.
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To borrow or to mix? A cultural approach to observing Taiwanese higher education

This paper observes higher education development in Taiwan, a society with values and traditions from multiple origins. While most East Asian societies have achieved highly in socio-economic development, their historical roots and development approaches have led to some clear diversity in higher education development. The Taiwanese higher education system has intentionally been designed to follow the Western model, the values and traditions embraced in the society still play a significant role in its development. The society has undergone social, political, economic and cultural changes in over the past two centuries. In its higher education development, there are observable aspects of the policies and practices that echo the models from the West. Underneath the surface, however, various unseen facets reflect its deeply rooted values and heritages of the society.

While Western models have long been dominant in Taiwanese higher education, there has been a constant tension result fundamentally from the striking differences in value orientation between traditional understandings of higher education and the great influences from the West. Although such incompatibility of values seems to be widespread across East Asian higher education systems, there have been few studies from a cultural perspective to understand the phenomenon. This paper attempts to investigate the development of higher education system in Taiwan through a cultural lens. In particular, it examines the interplay of various forces in the existing system that has received much influence from the West, the cultural values derived from the Chinese origin, and the Japanese colonial and post-colonial regimes.

Adopting a case study research approach, in-depth semi-structured interviews with selected administrators and academics from two elite universities in Taiwan were conducted. The empirical data reflect the interstates of collision and assimilation between the East Asian and Western elements. This paper intends to explore emerging themes derived from data analysis concerning the fundamentals that play essential roles in the process of higher education development in Taiwan. It aims to illuminate further understanding of how Taiwanese higher education has well undertaken such changes through the exhausting process of borrowing and mixing. By so doing, it hopes to shed light on some key issues in the development of higher education across East Asian societies.
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Performance-based university funding and local practices

The proliferation of performance-based research funding systems (PRFS) has been an important development in higher education governance in recent decades. The indicators used vary across systems, but use of publication performance indicators is common (Hicks 2012). In Denmark the Bibliometric Research Indicator (BRI) was
introduced in 2010. The question of how PRFSs affect universities is of great importance, but has so far received limited scholarly attention (Aagaard 2015; Rijcke et al. 2015). There has been research on the construction and development of such systems (Schneider 2009) and on the effects they have on publication patterns/performance/behavior (see eg. Aagaard, Bloch & Schneider 2015; Ingwersen & Larsen 2014; ). However, research on how national PRFSs affect universities in terms of local implementation, management practices, etc. is scarce (Rijcke et al. 2015). Some recent studies has begun to bridge this research gap (Aagaard 2015; Hammarfelt et al. 2016).

What is unique about this study, compared to Aagaard (2015) and Hammarfelt et al. (2016), is that it follows the effects of the BRI all the way from the ministry, down through two different Danish universities and subsequent layers of management to the individual researcher. The strength of this research design is a very detailed analysis of the individual steps in the process all the way from system level implementation to individual level effects, which allows for a more precise identification of the mechanisms by which these systems work.

Empirically the study mainly draws on a total of 30 semi-structured interviews with managers on all levels and academics at both universities as well as ministry officials responsible for the BRI. Furthermore, document studies and a large Nordic survey will supplement these sources.

The article combines classical contributions to theory on de-coupling (Meyer & Rowan 1977; Weick 1976) as well as newer contributions emphasizing more nuanced expectations of both coupling and de-coupling (Coburn 2004; Røvik 2011; Bromley & Powell 2012) with theory on evaluation and quantification (Espeland & Sauder 2007; Dahler-Larsen 2014) arriving at the concept of ‘mediated reactivity’ to explain differences in effects of the BRI between universities as well as units/levels inside universities. Finally it is explored how these differences also lead to different constitutive effects (Dahler-Larsen 2014) on the researcher level in terms publication strategies.
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How do universities adapt to their external environment? : An empirical study of the effects of university governance reform

University reforms, accelerated by the development of “knowledge-based society”, have had great effects on Japanese universities as with those in many other countries. One of these reforms is governance reform, in particular centralisation of decision making around the president. It is often considered as an essential condition for successful university management, instead of collegiality based on faculty meetings. However, is centralisation of governance structure really to bring success to universities, just like division and specialisation of labour has promoted industrial modernisation? On the contrary, many researchers studying university governance have shown that formal structure reforms, such as centralisation of decision making, have not been directly effective for institutional outcomes. They also reiterate the importance of informal elements, such as organisational culture, leadership and relationship among members, as a key mechanism for organisational coordination process.

This paper aims to empirically study the effects of governance reform, focusing on adaptive practices of universities to cope with their external environment and their outcomes in terms of educational activities and financial management. Based on the data obtained through two national surveys among universities, the authors study in the first place the influence of formal organisation and in-formal organisation, focusing on the realisation of bachelor programme reforms. Secondly, using a productivity index concerning institutional financial efficiency and students learning outcomes, they analyse whether the above-mentioned programme reforms have effects on the institutional outcomes. For this study, the authors use diverse quantitative approaches, including regression analysis and data environment analysis (DEA).

Results of this study show that centralisation of governance is effective for programme reforms only in limited situations and that these reforms are not necessarily to enhance the outcomes measured by the above-mentioned indicator. This result implicates that institutional outcomes may not always be coupled with their practices, meaning that good practices recommended by the government and subsidies allotted by the government based on evaluation of practices may cause inappropriate behaviours in universities.
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**Harnessing the potential of Blended and Online Learning as a catalyst to support and advance Higher Education Reform in Canadian Universities.**

A fundamental component of the Higher Education Reform agenda has been a discourse around teaching and learning. This conversation spans a range of areas including, but not limited to accessibility, flexibility, performance, time to degree, cost/benefit, outcomes and assessment, accountability, technology, relevance, curriculum, and lifelong learning.

The must pay attention to the changing landscape of teaching and learning, reflected over the last decade by the growth of blended and online learning. Presently over 95% of Canadian institutions are involved in some form of blended and online learning. There are also numerous evidence based studies supporting the impact of blended and online learning on improved student engagement, retention, performance, flexibility and access. (Cleveland-Innes 2008, 2013, 2016; Owston 2011; Vaughan 2008, 2011). Yet despite the articulation of blended and online learning as a transformative practice, blended and online learning initiatives remain attenuated across most institutions (Cohere 2011; Owston 2013). There is a noted absence of a central agenda with the majority of initiatives located in individual courses, and to a much lesser extent programs or departments. A recent study (Wilcox, Sarma, and Lippell 2016) corroborates the potential of blended and online learning to impact teaching and learning and support Higher Education Reform but caution that it can only be realized with the development of a strategic agenda, and concomitant policies and practices to enable its implementation.

Drawing upon current literature, augmented by observations of organizational culture and strategies at a Canadian university, and a replicated study focusing on current faculty perceptions about teaching and learning/blended and online learning within two distinct Canadian institutions, the presentation seeks to address the following research questions:

- Is online and blended learning having any impact on teaching and learning in higher education?
- What are the barriers to its adoption and what strategies might be used to increase its use and effectiveness?
- How can blended and online learning serve as catalyst to advance HER in Canadian universities?
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In the light of increasing competition between national research systems and their institutions the question arises as to where the limited public research funding has the greatest benefit. Especially over the last 15 years an international shift toward public funding of higher education institutions is observable. In the 1980s the expenditures on research and development (R&D) of the OECD countries have been considerably larger in the government sector than in the higher education sector. Today, in almost every OECD country the public research funding focuses mainly on the higher education institutions.

This development raises several questions: What are the reasons for the shift in public research funding towards the higher education institutions? And what effects can be observed on an institutional level?

These questions will be addressed by a comparative analysis of five European countries (Germany, France, United Kingdom, Denmark and the Netherlands). Different data sources were explored from research funding and bibliometric performance to the different governance structures and science policy measures.

One dominant driver of the changing process is the growing pressure on the research achievement of the universities. For instance, the Shanghai Ranking (established 2003) and the QS/Times Higher Education-Ranking (established 2004) made – despite their methodological shortcomings – international differences visible, showing for instance in the cases of Germany and France the abstinence of their institutions in the group of the world’s leading universities (“Shanghai Shock”). The growing number of evaluations and rankings based on an increasing data availability (e.g. in bibliometrics) and their visible results called for science policy actions to enhance performance, productivity and effectiveness of higher education institutions. Some of those measures (e.g. Excellence Initiatives) aim to directly strengthen research and international competitiveness at the university level. Other efforts have been made to increase collaboration between strong non-university research organizations with higher education institutions to support the latter. For instance, in Denmark the government research institutions were merged into the universities.

From an overall perspective of public research funding, the government research institutions are the losers of this development in all investigated countries (except Germany), although this does not mean that the higher education
institutions are generally the winners of this process.
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Measuring higher education productivity trends: an analysis using Australian higher education key performance indicators

The purpose of this study is to investigate the implications of using alternative approaches to measure and to represent the productivity of the Australian higher education sector. The research takes the position that higher education productivity metrics should be able to inform high stakes decision-making and thus emphasizes the importance of full transparency in measurement. The results of the study expose strengths and limitations of two standard methods for measuring higher education productivity: Data Envelopment Analysis (DEA) and Tornqvist Chain Indexing (TCI). The results reveal highly significant differences in productivity representation when using the two different approaches on the same dataset. The differences explain practical implications of employing both approaches that extend beyond their known technical constraints, which are already discussed in the literature.

The Australian higher education context presents a significant opportunity for testing alternative measurement approaches. First, the accessibility of data on the Australian higher education sector is extensive. Second, these data are regularly used by state funding agencies to award competitive grants. Third, the Australian higher education system is expanding and evolving with increasing numbers of students and changing structures and regulations. Thus, both the ability to measure productivity, and the opportunities for the measurements to inform decision-making are high.

The research examines four prior studies that use DEA to analyse Australian higher education institutions. The research then performs a new productivity analysis that uses TCI and an adapted higher education productivity model that was initially developed by the United States National Academy of Sciences. Research findings show that the TCI method gives a more urgent and confronting portrayal of higher education productivity in Australia. It is recommended that the TCI results should be the baseline for interpreting productivity trends in the current Australian context for two key reasons. (1) Empirical results from the TCI analysis better align with the contextual and qualitative arguments used to justify the need for measuring higher education productivity in the first place. (2) TCI methods are more straightforward and more transparent. They make fewer assumptions and fewer data transformations during calculations.
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Importance of Collaboration between Academic Faculty and Administrative Staff in University Reform in Japan

OECD (2012) indicated that the rate of enrollment in university was 51% in 2010 in Japan. Japanese universities have changed from “mass type” to “universal access type,” necessitating reform and structural changes. However, university reform and its resulting complications are becoming increasingly diversified along with the sophistication and complexity of society, as well as factors related to globalization.

Over the past two years, we have discussed our university’s reform through voluntary gatherings with academic faculty and administrative staff, and in 2016 were able to identify strengths and weaknesses of our university using SWOT analysis as well as a complex network analysis (Takamatsu, 2016). We were then able to evaluate the school’s management as a whole and developed a system of exercises to improve and expand collaboration between academic faculty and administrative staff (Kirimura, 2016). Furthermore, in 2017, we created a proposal to innovate the management of teaching and learning at our own university through collaboration between academic faculty and administrative staff (Kirimura, 2017).

Mutual exchange of knowledge between academic and administrative faculty is hindered by the fixation on boundaries between specialists and non-specialists, ensuring that knowledge can flow only in one direction. We can nurture an environment that is conducive to multi-directional knowledge exchange where, for example, a facilitator works to bridge the boundary between specialist and non-specialist. Collaboration in such an environment allows unobstructed flow of knowledge and the creation of new ideas to facilitate successful reform.

From our experiences, we consider that collaboration between academic faculty and administrative staff is critical to achieving robust and effective university reform through collaboration and an open exchange of ideas and knowledge.
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Back to the Past?: Weakened autonomy of national university corporations in Japan

Major reforms in Japanese higher education took place in the early 2000’s under Prime Minister Junichiro Koizumi’s cabinet that had the strongest neo-liberal inclination in the contemporary Japanese politics. One of the reforms was the incorporation of all national universities, which the Ministry of Education, Culture, Sports, Science and Technology (MEXT) regarded as the largest reform in the contemporary Japanese higher education system since its creation in 1949 after the World War II.

In April 2004, all the Japanese national universities were incorporated. The then government explained that the reform would enhance the autonomous governance and management of the universities while creating an accountability system to evaluate their performances against the mid-term goals set individually for each of them. Many researchers regarded the Japanese national universities’ incorporation as an example of the global trend of neoliberal marketization.

However, the above popular view should be critically examined against the background of the peculiar policy design of incorporation as a part of the government agency reform that primarily aimed to decrease numbers of government employees without any substantial change in government controls over student numbers, degree programme creations, and annual budgets as strong policy instruments.

Furthermore, changing government policies since the incorporation indicate a return to more direct control by government who intervenes in internal resource allocations of each university. Since 2012, MEXT has been engaging in redefining the mission for each national university’s each discipline in order to identify the university’s departments and programs that deserve investment. Schools of teacher training, humanities and social sciences have been specifically targeted for abolishment or reorganization to respond to social needs. In short, the government has been micro-managing individual universities’ internal organizations.

This paper re-evaluates the incorporation of national universities, which occurred more than a generation ago, and subsequent policy changes in the historical context as well as from global perspectives, and discusses their implications for the future of Japanese higher education system.
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Chinese International Student’s Movement and their Learning Outcomes in Japanese University

Today, how to assure the quality of student’s learning outcomes through university education is one of the important issues in China. After entering Chinese universities, about 410,000 students are studying abroad. As a destination to
study abroad, there are many in the order of the United States, Britain, Australia, Canada, Hong Kong and Japan. Therefore, for Chinese students, it can be seen that Japan is low attraction as a destination to study abroad. However, in Japan as a receiving country, the number of Chinese international students is the largest (Japan Student Services Organization, 2015).

From these backgrounds, this research examined the Chinese international student’s learning outcomes in Japanese universities. This research conducted a questionnaire survey for Chinese international students in Japanese universities (government-sponsored and privately financed students only). As a result, 3,285 effective response was received from April to June 2016.

As a result of the analysis, it was revealed that Chinese international students who was learning before studying abroad, but stopped learning after studying abroad was negative effect to learning outcomes. On the other hand, Chinese international students who was not learning before studying abroad and begun learning after studying abroad was positive effect. Moreover, students who take a Japanese language class before studying abroad and continue to take the class after studying abroad was positive effect to gain Japanese language abilities. Furthermore, although Chinese international student was not taking the Japanese language class before studying abroad, they were taking the Japanese class after studying abroad was positive effect to gain Japanese language abilities.

Japan’s policy for accepting international students has been based on the “Plan for 300,000 International Students”. Thanks to this policy, the number of international students include Chinese in Japanese university are increasing and it reached 171,122 at 2016. However, one of the result of this research is shown that it has not enough to only increasing. Among these international students, some students did not wish studying abroad to Japan at the beginning. So that, these students does not to study Japanese at all in advance. The Japanese university needs to offer the substantial Japanese program and it becomes a key how to give a special assistant especially for these international students.
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Balancing Trust & Accountability: The Case of the Nordic Countries

Policy efforts aimed at modernizing the higher education sector have paid considerable attention to the way in which public universities operate. A privileged focus has been attributed to aspects such as efficiency, effectiveness and accountability. In addition to managing their internal operations in a more cost-efficient manner, public universities, in the Nordic countries and elsewhere, are increasingly expected to respond adequately to the needs of various
external stakeholder groups. One of the main issues in the higher education sector is the relation between these dramatic changes in terms of leadership, management and organisational structures on the one hand and trust on the other. The aim of this paper is to shed light on aspects of trust and accountability in higher education institutions, by analysing comprehensive volume of empirical data collected from four Nordic countries; Denmark, Finland, Norway and Sweden. In doing so, we particularly aim to address the lack of previous research focusing on the contents of recent management reforms and their impacts on accountability across the Nordic higher education systems.

More specifically, we focus on the following research questions: To who are academics accountable (both in theory and practice, formally and perceived)? How do collegiality, meritocracy and competition interplay with demands on accountability and trust? To what extent is academic behaviour is influenced by performance demands? Have there been any changes in practices, perceptions or the importance accredited to accountability over time (the last decade)? How and to what extent have recent management reforms influenced the use of accountability measures and perceptions of trust? We approach these issues with a combination of survey data and interviews. We implemented a large-scale survey for academics and managers at all public universities. In addition, we interviewed academics, managers and professional administrators at two universities in each country, including one “young” university and one “flagship” university. In total, some 80 interviews have been conducted. The paper reports from the ongoing FINNUT PERFECT research project (2013-2017), funded by the Norwegian Research Council, provides deeper knowledge on the relation between managerial reforms and the effects on teaching and research performance.
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Stakeholder salience, leadership and power relations in Nordic academe: Towards a new normal?

The rise of accountability and performance-based regimes in higher education have resulted in changes in the leadership structures of institutions in addition to the role played by external stakeholders. This paper addresses three research questions: How are university boards composed, and what power do they have? How are university leaders at different levels selected and what role do they play in academic recruitment? To what extent are external- forces and stakeholders influencing the internal dynamics of universities? We draw upon both quantitative and qualitative data sets from Denmark, Finland, Sweden and Norway, emanating from a large comparative study on the performance effects resulting from changes in leadership structures at Nordic public universities (FINNUT-PEFECT, 2013-2017). Privileged attention is given to the effects of recent reforms aimed at enhancing institutional autonomy, including...
changes in formal leadership structures. The role of external stakeholders insofar the governance of internal affairs is discussed and contextualized. The paper investigates the changing nature of academic organization in the Nordic countries, and thus contributes to shedding light on the changing notions of power and power relations within contemporary academe. These issues are of relevance for bettering our understanding on the relationships between formal university structures and arrangements and teaching and research performance.
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A mixed-methods investigation of the language support of graduate international students on English-taught programs/courses in Japanese universities

One of the Japanese government’s main initiatives for internationalization of higher education at home is increasing the number of international students. English-medium programs/courses are being increasingly offered to promote student recruitment. Nevertheless, the government has been criticized for focusing on the number of English programs/courses and the number of international students, without paying sufficient attention to building a ‘support network’ for students from diverse backgrounds, especially for those who come to Japan with little Japanese proficiency. They may also be L2 speakers of English.

The expansion of English-Medium Instruction (EMI) in Japan has resulted in a few studies looking at undergraduate students; however, little has been done at graduate level. This study is an exploratory investigation of the language support environment of graduate students studying on EMI programs/courses in Japan. It provides a case-study of two leading Japanese universities (national and private). The following research questions will be examined: Firstly, what are the positive and negative aspects of studying in EMI for graduate international students at national and private universities in Japan? Secondly, what kind of language support do these students receive and how can they be best supported?

The conceptual framework is based on Bradford’s (2013) typology of challenges in implementing EMI in Japan, which are linguistic, cultural and structural challenges; and Ishikawa’s (2011) university support model which compares a ‘traditional paternalism approach’ to the newer ‘global competitiveness approach’. Quantitative data from in-depth interviews of EMI program organizers, support office staff and professors, and qualitative and quantitative data from an online questionnaire with follow up in-depth interviews of graduate international students are being collected. This is a work-in-progress.

The preliminary findings reveal the coexistence of both of Ishikawa’s models in the same university. The humanities faculties tended towards the traditional paternalism approach with largely informal support and relying on student tutors and supervisors to look after international students. Whereas in engineering faculties the approach fitted the
global competitiveness model with greater systematization of support. This formal support was evaluated as more effective and highlights the need for more structural and formal support. The results of this study should lead to concrete recommendations to reduce challenges faced by all stakeholders and enhance the learning environment for graduate international students who are studying primarily in English language.
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A public policy for young researchers in Mexican higher education institutions

In 2014 the program “Conacyt Professorships for Young Researchers” (“Cátedras Conacyt” para Jóvenes Investigadores) is created in Mexico. This program is part of a public policy promoted by the National Council of Science and Technology (Conacyt), the ruling body of scientific policies in Mexico. With it, Conacyt seeks to attract highly qualified human resources in order to propel priority themes in the national agendas of scientific and technologic research. The program is targeted to Mexican researchers (or foreigners with legal residence within the country) with Ph.D. degrees and no more than 40 years of age, for men, or 43, for women. The insertion of these young researchers is done to strengthen the capabilities of public higher education institutions, research centers, and national health institutes. Also, the program strives to promote scientific and technological development in academically underdeveloped regions, in addition to facing “the imbalance between human resource formation and the absorption capability of it within institutions and research centers.”

Management of the program seeks to articulate both academic institutions’ interests and the young researchers’ interest and expertise. Institutions are called upon each year to present research projects which fall within national priorities, these may be individual or collective. Depending on the characteristics of each proposal, their implementation may demand the creation of one or multiple professorships. Once the projects are approved, the institutions select possible academics from an ample pool of candidates. The selected researchers are then hired as academic personnel from Conacyt, but act as if “commissioned” within the benefitted institutions.

For some scientists the “Cátedras Conacyt” program constitutes an historic event tending towards: the reduced number of researchers in academic institutions and the aging of the academic body. For others, it represents the possibility of working towards the problem of highly qualified emigration registered in Mexico: in 2013, the president of the Mexican Academy of Sciences (AMC) signaled that more than eleven thousand Mexicans with a doctoral degree were living in the United States; this number is equivalent to half the registered members within the National Researchers System (SNI) in the country.

In this sense, the “Cátedras Conacyt” program constitutes an inflection point within a policy that for decades focused
its efforts on highly specialized academic formation and on strengthening the national graduate programs, but less so on expanding national capabilities to attract its doctoral graduates towards work in their respective knowledge fields.

Our interest is analyzing the conditions in which the insertion of these young researchers is taking place. The analysis is based on documental and journalistic sources, Conacyt databases and on 25 interviews with young researchers within the "Cátedras Conacyt" program located in different institutions and states within the country. We hold as an hypothesis that the “Cátedras Conacyt” scheme entails the gradual introduction of new governability means of academic and scientific activity within the institutions.

1 Conacyt (2013). Reestructuración orgánica del CONACYT e implementación de las Cátedras CONACYT. 47ª Ordinary Session of Government Board, Mexico, December, 2013
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The function of universities in advanced industrial societies Building their autonomy in order to fulfil their responsibilities

The objective is first to clarify the context in which increasing demands and expectations are imposed on universities. A clarification and debate on these constraints help explaining how universities can respond. In all industrial societies, governments repeat the mantra that innovation is the only solution to escape from the present systemic crisis, to restore economic growth and social progress. In this conceptual and political context, universities, private and public, are supposed to adapt and reform in order to fulfil this goal. This increased control on universities is also a strategy of the various State apparatus to maintain a control on industrial development.

The objective is secondly to explain that this situation is paradoxical: the increasing constraints on universities reinforce their role in all industrial societies: 1. to produce and disseminate new knowledge or to import and transfer knowledge to local industries; 2. To train students, produce engineers and researchers. To fulfil their role, universities need to increase their autonomy and become more independent from the State apparatus and from industries. On the mid to long-term, only those industrial nations capable of managing this increased autonomy of universities will be able to respond to the innovation challenge.

This dual objective is explicitly addressed in only a few industrial nations: it requires deep institutional reforms toward a political agreement by civil society, business communities and government.

The goal is to explain how in this conceptual and political context, universities have an opportunity to reform themselves in order to build their autonomy and fulfil their function. First the responsibility of social sciences is to study the institutional, political and cultural contexts in which a given university operates. Secondly universities, both private and public, have to establish their own criteria of administrative and financial management. It is important to
negotiate with both government and businesses the budget required to fulfill their diverse activities. Thirdly, obviously, universities have to investigate the state of knowledge of the different disciplines they research and teach in order to train both students and future researchers. This includes collaborations taking into account the demand of industries and administrations. Fourth, universities have a social and cultural responsibilities.
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**Government internationalization initiatives and university admissions reform: The case of introducing the IB Diploma Programme to Japanese universities**

This paper examines the Japanese government’s plan to increase the presence of International Baccalaureate (IB) Diploma Programmes (DP) in state upper-secondary schools, the impact of this initiative on admissions policies and practices at Japanese universities, and the resulting reality of DP student matriculation trends. Internationalization has been a central element of the Japanese government’s education reform policies since the 1980s, and the 2011 initiative to increase the number of Japanese state high schools offering the DP is a cornerstone of current policy. The IB DP is a global upper-secondary education program created in 1968 and now in over 3,000 around the world. The program emphasizes an international mind-set and 21st century global competencies as well as traditional academics. However, this initiative has serious implications for a traditional university admissions system focused on national exam results. In order for this initiative to succeed, it is critical for Japanese universities to reform their admissions policies and practices in a relatively short time frame to ensure appropriate and equitable pathways for this new group of students. This paper analyses survey data collected from admissions offices at Japanese universities gathered as part of a 2014 nation-wide research project on the implementation of the IB DP in Japan. Admissions offices at 50 Japanese universities that applied for Super Global University funding were surveyed regarding their perceptions of the IB DP and current practices and future plans for recruiting and admitting IB students. Additionally we analyse IB student transcript (student records send to admissions offices) data IB students in Japan over the last ten years. By combining the survey data with the transcript data we can generate a more complete picture of the relationship between the government reforms, university implementation, and actual impact on student behaviour. Our findings indicate that while the IB situation in Japan is changing slowly, some universities have begun to open up their admissions and target IB students, and these institutions have seen a visible increases in the numbers of DP students sending transcripts. This research discusses how even government reforms at the secondary school level can have major implications for higher education and require significant shifts in policy and practice in university admissions and education.
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Competency-Based Education in Japan for a Globalized and Knowledge Based Society

Global competency as the knowledge and skills people need to understand today's flat world and to integrate across disciplines so that they can comprehend global events and create possibilities to address them. Global competencies are also the attitudinal and ethical dispositions that make it possible to interact peacefully, respectfully, and productively with fellow human beings from diverse geographies (Reimers, 2009). So, competency-based education, which is an approach to teaching and learning more often used in learning concrete skills than abstract learning, has become a hot topic in higher education circles these days. However, competency-based education Competency-based education has just begun in Japan.

At present, Kobe Tokiwa University is undergoing reforms, and one of the core is competency-based education. Our university developed a common evaluation indicator called “Tokiwa competencies” that students can acquire through regular, quasi-regular (or remedial), and extra-curricular (or club) activities.

In this article, we define a competency as a functionally linked complex of knowledge, skills, and attitudes that enables successful performance of tasks and problem solving (Spandy 1994). The Tokiwa competencies indicator evaluates 19 types of indicators: culture, common sense, professionalism/expertise, media literacy, logical thinking, critical thinking, intellectual curiosity, exploration, continuity, self-management, reflection, design thinking, presentation, judgment, implementation, responsibility, contribution, communication, and cooperation and collaboration. It is difficult to obtain all Tokiwa competencies by only engaging in regular curricula; for example, the responsibility competency is more easily obtained through club activities. Beginning with the 2017 syllabi, the university has established a relationship between the coursework design and the Tokiwa competencies.

In this presentation we will introduce our own efforts to effectively conduct competency-based education, especially this article details a similar curricula visualization method via a combination of cosine similarity and complex networks with thresholds. While most students select their courses based solely on content, these competencies will provide them with an expanded perspective and assist them in course selection.
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Resource dependency and the unintended consequences of research output funding in South Africa

South Africa, like many other countries, utilises a higher education funding framework that is partially based on the quantitative assessment of research outputs, viz. journal articles in accredited journals, books and book chapters, accredited conference proceedings, masters and doctoral graduates. Ex-post university research outputs are used to determine the distribution of research output component of the block grant. This funding allocation mechanism is linked to performance and competition, and is underpinned by rationales such as enhancing research productivity and efficiency, rewarding performers and incentivising less performing institutions to pull their socks up. Since the introduction of this funding allocation mechanism, the number of publications and other research outputs has increased dramatically. While this is a positive development, there are concerns that the competition and pursuit for funding engendered by the funding mechanism has resulted in practices that are counterproductive, some of which are outright unethical. There is arguably an increasing tension between maintaining high standards of quality and ethics and the demand for quality and growth in output. Departing from a resource dependence perspective, the paper reflects on some of the ways in which research output funding in South Africa has impacted on institutional behaviour (in pursuit of institutional survival and sustainability) and internal institutional dynamics regarding research.

The study’s research questions are:
(a) How is research output funding allocated in South Africa, what changes have been made to the allocation criteria and what are the rationales for these changes?
(b) How do South African Universities deploy research output funding and what impact has this had on research productivity and efficiency across institutions?
(c) How have South African researchers adapted to institutional mechanisms of allocating research output funding?

Methodologically, the study is underpinned by a conceptual component and an empirical component. The conceptual component is derived from elements of resource dependence theory and principal agent theory. The empirical component will derive mainly from interviews with officials from the Department of Higher Education and Training (DHET), senior researchers, research managers and Vice-Principals responsible for research. A review of policy documents and the relevant literature will also be carried out as well as an analysis of research output data.
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Changing Role of Universities ~ From a screening device to a school for a place of teaching ~

When the Imperial University of Tokyo was established in 1886 as the first modern university in Japan, its missions were to research on the most advanced Western sciences and to train elite people who would work for the government
and industry for modernization of the state. However, for the people, university education was regarded as the ladder to their future success. Thus by the beginning of the 20th century, the entrance examinations to higher education institutions had become very difficult. How to pass the entrance exam had been the main concern for the people until the end of the century. The Ministry of Education had frequently tried to reform examination system but the trials were unsuccessful because applicants were always exceed the capacity of acceptance by the higher education. Such situation continued even after the War II when the higher education system was completely reformed. Indeed, the 20th century was the “century of entrance examinations.” The difficulty of passing entrance exams has given students a kind of guarantee that they are able to work well after graduation. People in industry did not seriously ask the quality of teaching at the universities. In this way, university entrance exam played as a screening device for finding students’ potential ability to work well.

It was around 2000 however that the situation was changed due to the decline of 18-year-old population. Before then, most of the universities and colleges could choose students from many applicants but then some universities and colleges had a problem of application shortage. In 2016 about 45 % of institutions can recruit students less than their capacity. Thus the screening device does not work well. Instead, universities and colleges are now asked to teach well so that students can work well when they get jobs in industry. The Cost/Effectiveness and usefulness of university education become an important topic for the reform of universities. However it is very difficult for the universities and colleges, especially in humanities and social sciences, to fully respond to the needs of industry and it may even harmful to keep the status of academic institution. In my presentation, the role and the usefulness of university education will be mainly discussed.

**Zha, Qiang**  
Faculty of Education, York University, Canada;  
School of Education, Tianjin University, China

**What is an ideal “general education” in the 21st century? An exploration starts with Chinese universities and goes beyond China**

In the context of China and beyond, there is a variety of conceptions associating with such a curriculum in question, e.g., liberal arts education, liberal education, general education, humanistic education, classical education, and Tongshi education and perhaps Guoxue (Chinese classical studies) as well for the Chinese educators. Admittedly, there is a massive overlap among these conceptions, in terms of helping nurture students’ critical thinking ability and cultivate the whole person. Yet, they also carry different emphases. For example, liberal arts education typically stresses a humanistic appreciation of knowledge and renders students well versed in classic literary works, philosophy, foreign languages, rhetoric, logic and so on, while general education requires a broad survey of courses that foster students’ ability to think beyond their areas of specialization, and encourages students to make connections across disciplines, as well as between formal course instruction and informal learning experiences outside the classroom.
This paper focuses not on the “best practices” of liberal arts education in Chinese universities, but on the content and kind of general education the universities in China and elsewhere would need in the 21st century. Specifically, it addresses four questions: 1) Why do we need a general education curriculum? 2) How do we define an effective or ideal general education curriculum? Or, what is an effective/ideal general education curriculum supposed to bring along? 3) What is the major challenge now facing general education? Or, should an effective/ideal general education curriculum evolve with time/context? If yes, what needs to be taken into account in the 21st century? 4) How would a 21st century general education curriculum look like?

From there, this paper deliberately argues that, while rooted in cultivation of humanism, an effective/ideal general education curriculum in the 21st century must take into account those significant changes in contemporary and future society, and such changes arguably include globalization, higher education massification, and the knowledge-based economy. Consequently, the general education curriculum for the 21st century university in China and elsewhere should incorporate such essential units: humanistic education, global education, and cognitive education. Empowered by such a curriculum, university education is able to act as a leader in terms of forming values and visions, rather a follower of or an adaptor to the social status quo.

Zhang, Xinyi
Waseda University, Japan


In 1999, the Chinese government issued the policy that to increase the enrolment of undergraduate students in order to respond to the urgent need of the market. This reform comes with merging and restructuring of universities national wide. This research employs Mincer equation to estimate the rate of return of higher education before and after the reform.

In the original Mincer model, the independent variables is, schooling, experience and experience squared. In this research, in order to depict the experience’s effect of the current occupation, this research uses tenure for the current occupation instead of experience. The basic model for this research is:

$$\ln\text{wage} = \alpha + \beta_1 \text{educ} + \beta_2 \text{tenure} + \beta_3 \text{tenure}^2 + u$$

In this empirical research, the logarithm of average wage per hour (lnwage) is the dependent variable. In order to figure out the effect of schooling years (higher education) on samples’ wage rate, the following independent variables will be used: tenure, the square of tenure; dummy variable: female, rural, and ethnic group. Data used in this research are collected from the Chinese Household Income Project Survey (CHIP) in 1995, 1999, 2002, 2007 and 2009. The data covers 28 provinces, 9009 urban households and 10258 rural households. The empirical research aims to shed light on the consequent policy interventions of the expansion of enrolment in the higher education sector in China.
## International Workshops on Higher Education Reform (HER Workshops) 

### Venus, Themes and Publications

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Place</th>
<th>Main Theme(s)</th>
<th>Publication of (selected) Proceedings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2003</td>
<td>Vancouver (UBC) Canada</td>
<td>(Paired comparison of) Reforms of Higher Education in Six Countries, Various themes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>Vienna (U Klagenfurt) Austria</td>
<td>Various themes incl. Institutional diversity and system coordination, the changing state – HE, collaboration with the private sector</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>Tokyo (U Tsukuba) Japan</td>
<td>Higher Education reforms in Japan and various other countries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>Dublin (DCU) Ireland</td>
<td>Innovations in Teaching and Learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>Berlin (Humboldt U) Germany</td>
<td>Universities and Lifelong Learning</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
HER2017 Welcome Guide

Welcome to Hiroshima! In this guide, you will find helpful information about transport options after your arrival and getting around Saijo, Higashi-Hiroshima, where the campus is located. You will find the detailed Campus map in the brochure package distributed at the reception.

General Information

The HER 2017 Workshop is taking place in the Faculty Club (Gakushikaikan / 学士会館) at Higashi-Hiroshima Campus of Hiroshima University.

Address:
1-3-2 Kagamiyama, Higashi-Hiroshima City, Hiroshima, Japan 739-8511

Access to Higashi-Hiroshima Campus

From Saijo station (local train):
There are two bus companies that provide a bus service between Saijo Station and the Higashi-Hiroshima Campus. Please refer to the link below for a timetable (in Japanese). Buses depart approximately every 15 minutes from bus stop 3 in front of Saijo Station. It will take about 15 minutes, and the fare is 290 yen (one-way). The closest bus stop to the Faculty Club and RIHE is Hirodai Chuoguchi (広大中央口 / Hirodai Central Exit, 9th stop from the station).
http://www.geiyo.co.jp/Unyu/daigakuH29-3.htm

From Higashi-Hiroshima station (bullet train):
There is a very limited bus service to the Higashi Hiroshima Campus from Higashi Hiroshima Station (The time table for the morning is at 10:25 and 12:20). We recommend that you take a taxi to the Higashi-Hiroshima Campus or organise for someone to pick you up. If there is no taxi waiting at Higashi Hiroshima Station, please call Saijo Taxi on 082-423-2525 or Higashi-Hiroshima Taxi on 082-423-2121. By taxi, it will take approximately 15 minutes (about 2,000 yen).

From Hiroshima Airport:
Please take the bus to Shiraichi station and transfer to the train in the direction of Hiroshima/Iwakuni. Get off at Saijo Station (second stop, around 10 minutes) and take the bus (see above).
From Hiroshima station (local train):
Please take a train on the Sanyohonsen line in the direction of Saijo, Shiraichi and Okayama. The train usually departs from platform 5, but occasionally will depart from other platforms. It will take approximately 40 minutes. Please get off the train at Saijo Station and take the bus (see above).

From Hiroshima Bus Center:
There is a highway bus service approximately every hour between 6:30 a.m. and 8 p.m. from the Hiroshima Bus Centre and get off at Hirodai Chuoguchi (広大中央口 / Hirodai Central Exit). Buses depart from platform 1 and will take approximately 1 hour.

Taxi service information
From Saijo station to Higashi-Hiroshima Campus by taxi is approximately 15 minutes (about 2,000 yen). Taxi numbers in Higashi-Hiroshima are the following:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phone Numbers for Taxi in Saijo</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Saijo Taxis: 0120-21-2526</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daigaku Taxis: 080-422-1161</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Higashi-Hiroshima Taxis: 0120-33-1260</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Food places close to the venue

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Venue</th>
<th>Opening Hours</th>
<th>Type of shop</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Café (la place, Marmaid Café)</td>
<td>10:00-18:00</td>
<td>Bakery/ Cafe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Welfare Center No.1 3rd floor</td>
<td>11:00-15:00</td>
<td>Restaurant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd floor</td>
<td>8:00-19:30</td>
<td>Cafeteria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand floor</td>
<td>10:00-17:30</td>
<td>Small convenience store selling some lunch box, bread, drinks.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Welfare Center No.2</td>
<td>11:00-14:00</td>
<td>Cafeteria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saijo HAKUWA Hotel</td>
<td>7:00-10:00 (breakfast) 11:00-14:30 (lunch) 17:00-22:00 (dinner)</td>
<td>Buffet restaurant in hotel (10-minute walk from Faculty Club)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEVEN-ELEVEN</td>
<td>24 hours a day</td>
<td>Convenience store (15-minute walk)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>You Me Town</td>
<td>9:00-24:00</td>
<td>Shopping center and food court (20-minute walk)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McDonald's</td>
<td>9:30-23:00</td>
<td>Fast food restaurant (20-minute walk)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Optional Tours

Hiroshima University Campus Tour

Date: 26 September 2017
Time: 12:30 – 13:30
Place: Hiroshima University
Fee: Free of charge

◆ Meet the guide in front of the Faculty club entrance at 12:30

The Campus Guide is a walking tour designed to introduce the Hiroshima University campus and the valuable resources in its possession in order to deepen interest in and understanding of the university. The tour will take you to the museum, main library, and the rooftop to have the view of the whole campus which is one of the largest campus in Japan.

Saijo Brewery Guided Tour

Date: 28 September 2017
Time: 14:00 – 15:30
Place: Saijo, Sakagura-dori street
Fee: Free of charge

◆ Please note that there are limited places for the tour. If you are interested in participating, please sign up at the reception when you register on Day 1.

◆ Meet the guide in front of the Saijo train station at 14:00. There will be a bus 13:20 and 13:34 from “Yamanakaike” bus stop.

Saijo, the town where the campus is located is famous for great sake production. Some of the most prestigious and oldest sake breweries in Japan are located in the town. The tour will give you an opportunity to discover several breweries with a guide to get to know their history and taste some of their products.

Too see more about Saijo and its Sake production, visit http://saijosake.com/index.html