Preface

Introduction

Higher education serves society as creators, curators, and critics, and as a major force for economics, ethics, and equity in society (Scott 2008). In other words, higher education institutions (HEIs) serve society by acting as creators of new knowledge and also as creators of creative creators, as elaborated in Chap. 1 of this book. HEIs are also repositories of knowledge, preserving the intellectual, cultural, historical, and spiritual heritage of humankind in general and, in particular, that of the society in which they are located. In addition, HEIs serve society by playing the role of critics "characterized by critical thinking, analysis, moral reasoning and judgment" (Duderstadt 2002, p. 5). While there is a general consensus on the academy's role as an economic driver, there is a lack of consensus on whether it has ethical responsibility to hold up a mirror and serve as a beacon to the mercenary reality of the world.

The multiple roles of higher education have been made all the more complex in an era replete with drivers of change, such as globalization, an increasingly competitive environment, insufficient financial resources, the knowledge economy, the future of the nation, the quest for civic mission of higher education, to name a few. As a result, "where do we go from here" has become a question facing constituencies of higher education worldwide. This is also a question that we are attempting to answer in this book.

Definitely, globalization is a driver of change in higher education that merits full attention. As globalization of the world economy and financial crises continue to highlight the increasing economic interdependence of the world, higher education is becoming a global endeavor (Altbach 2011; Mok 2003; Rhoads and Torres 2006). For example, international students contributed over $21.81 billion to the U.S. economy during the 2011/12 academic year, through their expenditures on tuition and living expenses (Open Doors Data, 2011/12). On the one hand, China is the first leading place of origin of international students in the U.S. and the fifth leading destination country of U.S. study abroad students during the 2009/10–2010/11; on the other hand, there are dozens of U.S. colleges and universities

operating joint degree programs or international branch campuses in China. Understandably, globalization and economic interdependence of the world has significant implications for higher education in both China and the U.S.

Against this backdrop, an increasingly competitive market-based economic environment is another driver of change in higher education (Rhoades and Slaughter 2004; Slaughter and Rhoades 2004). In China and the U.S., the increasingly competitive environment is largely attributable to a variety of driving forces, such as competing for the market for student enrollments, for research funding, for public fiscal support, and for private-giving. In addition, insufficient financial resources, the current economic situation, the rising cost of higher education, the information age, access, affordability, and accountability in higher education are merely representative of some of the driving forces for the escalated competition. In large measure, this is also the case in China's higher education. To survive and thrive, HEIs must change and innovate in order to adapt to their competitive environment and to be responsive to the diverse needs of people and nations. In effect, this is also an assumption that undergirds the title of this book.

The shift of the industrial economy to the knowledge economy represents another driver of change in higher education. As nations are increasingly interdependent and their economies are more and more driven by knowledge and intellectual capabilities, HEIs are demanded to play a central and more critical role in reshaping the future of the nation, especially the economic future. As a result, growing intensity of university-industry ties has catalyzed academic entrepreneurship, manifesting itself "in such trends as research collaborations between industry and academia; institutional, departmental, and individual responses to scarce resources; innovative approaches to traditional and technology-based instructional practices; and more socially driven pursuits that encourage new methods for enhancing the academy's engagement with external communities" (Mars and Metcalfe 2009, p.1). To survive and thrive, the academy must live up to the expectations.

As academic entrepreneurship has emerged as a trend, there is growing concern that this economic or market serving value can erode the civic mission of higher education or even replace public serving value of higher education, altering the focus and content of research and teaching in the higher education setting eventually (Rhoads and Torres 2006). If that is the case, knowledge relating to the civic mission of higher education will be devalued, including the knowledge necessary to become good institutional citizens that serve their communities in multiple ways; to provide forums for free democratic dialogue; to conduct research on democracy, civil society, and civic development; and to educate their own students to be effective and responsible citizens (Carnegie Foundation 2005). To survive and thrive, HEIs must address the tension between their role expectations.

It is plain that, in China and the U.S., a university education is seen as key to economic development. In 2010, the Central Committee of the Communist Party of China and the State Council jointly issued *An Outline of China's National Plan for Medium and Long-term Education Reform and Development (2010–2020)*, with the central goal to "modernize education, bring a learning society into shape,

and turn China into a country rich in human resources". Halfway across the globe, President Barack Obama outlined similar policy goals for the U.S.: "If we're serious about making sure America…succeeds in the 21st century, the single most important step we can take…is to make sure that every one of our young people…has the best education that the world has to offer" (Obama 2010). Thus, while China and the U.S. have two very different political systems, they represent the two largest economies in the world and share beliefs that higher education will play an integral role to economic development.

Organization of the Book

The chapters in this book bring together scholars from both countries with multiple perspectives on the topic to create dialogue around similarities and differences and look to the challenges ahead for both countries. It has been written for scholars, higher educational administrators, and policymakers in both countries and other countries as well who are seeking to understand the shifting trends in Chinese and American higher education. The book has been structured into three interrelated Parts: Part I: Markets, Competition, and Strategic Change in Higher Education, Part II: Addressing Core Issues in Higher Education, and concludes with Part III: New Directions and Future Possibilities. Each of these parts taken together portrays a complex picture of higher education in both countries. Specific details on each part is elucidated below.

Part I: Markets, Competition, and Strategic Change in Higher Education

The first part focuses on the higher education system of China and the U.S. by highlighting some complex and interconnected issues the two systems are faced with, such as; how to foster creative creators across all sections and types of higher education (Chap. 1), how economic competitiveness is institutionalized in regulations and policy that shape HEIs in each country (Chap. 2), how China's massification expanded access to keep pace with economic development (Chap. 3), and how patenting and licensing in US higher education represents multiple conflicts of interests for HEIs (Chap. 4). Due to the fact that these are all complex and interconnected issues, individual efforts of HEIs are limited without financial resources and/or governmental support. As such, it seems to be rational that, in China's higher education, the traditional "state centric steering" mode has continued to be the governance mode in which the central government, as well as the Ministry of Education, initiates, plans, integrates, and evaluates almost all efforts in the system. In contrast, American higher education system is governed in a "social coordination" mode in which various actors' efforts are coordinated via

three types of social coordination: markets, hierarchies, and democracy (Beetham 1996, cited by Lee 2003), with the emerging trend that the market is playing an increasingly important role.

Part II: Addressing Core Issues in Higher Education

This section examines central issues associated with how HEIs have shifted to market-based approaches to reform, innovation, and change in the higher education system of the two countries. Specifically, Chap. 5 examines major initiatives to improve the quality of teaching and learning in China's higher education and anticipates their implications for future development. Based on this chapter, most quality improvement initiatives are designed and top-down imposed by the state, contrasting sharply with the way core issues are addressed in American higher education. Chapter 6 explores the dilemma of assessment at U.S. colleges and universities by focusing on the tension between the use of assessment for accountability and improvement purposes. Chapter 7 examines theoretical and empirical research to describe the changing nature of governance in American higher education from shared governance to faculty grassroots leadership. Chapter 8 discusses the evolving role of the university ombudsman in informal dispute resolution and problem-solving for issues and concerns arising within the university community in American higher education. Indeed, these three chapters merely embody several core issues in American higher education, but they do reflect some most distinctive features embedded in this changing landscape. According to Chap. 6, tension still exists between internally derived motivation for improvement in teaching and learning and external pressures for accountability in an increasingly market-driven and competitive higher education environment. Meanwhile, there is a shift from shared decision making to the managerial university. According to Chap. 7, the foregoing shift can be explained by the fact that neoliberal philosophies and market forces are permeating higher education, resulting in adversarial relationships between the state, the administration, and the faculty, as institutions change their goals and focus. As a consequence, in addition to existing formal structures and supervisory authority, universities recognize the heightened need for informal and effective conflict management and resolution that is arising as a result of the social, technological, and globalization changes, as discussed in Chap. 8.

Part III: New Directions and Future Possibilities

This part looks to the future of HEIs in both China and the US and examines possible future trends and the possibilities for collaboration, moving beyond an exclusive focus on market-based, economically driven approaches. Chapter 9

reports on the long-time collaboration between the Chinese Ministry of Education and the University of Michigan to provide training for the leaders of top-ranked Chinese institutions as they build world-class research universities. Chapter 10 reviews major policies and developments of transnational higher education in mainland China, critically examines student-learning experiences in transnational higher education programs, and the Chinese government's attempts to assert its soft power in the context of transforming the country from an economic power to a culturally strong power. Chapter 11 explores strategic planning as the lynchpin of all the internal and external forces that make up U.S. institutions of higher education as they change to adapt to the dynamic environment of the market today. Chapter 12 concludes the book by suggesting that the current policy emphasis on the role of HEIs in developing human capital (students and knowledge) in terms of economic and market outputs neglects much needed attention to the crucial role that HEIs can play in terms of supporting equity and the public good. Taken together each of the chapters in this section suggest that as we look to the future of HEIs we need to think more critically in terms of the promise of international HEI collaborations which are mutually beneficial and equitable, the limits of market-driven higher education decision-making that does not attend to equity issues, the potential of strategic planning that encompasses all stakeholders in decision-making, and the role that HEIs should play in developing human capital and supporting education as a public good.

The chapters in this book highlight the vast complexity of HEIs in each country while underscoring the need to think beyond a future driven exclusively by the economic market and instead consider extending the notion of human capital to include attention to equity, ethics, collaboration, and many other moral values in higher education.

We gratefully acknowledge support from the Fundamental Research Funds for the Central Universities (no.2009AC-3).

May 2013

Qi Li
Cynthia Gerstl-Pepin

References

Altbach PG (2011) The complex roles of universities in the period of globalization. http://upcommons.upc.edu/revistes/bitstream/2099/8111/1/altbach.pdf. Accessed 5 Dec 2013

Duderstadt JJ (2002) The future of higher education in the knowledge-driven, global economy of the 21st century. Toronto, Canada. http://milproj.dc.umich.edu/publications/toronto/download/toronto_103102.pdf. Accessed 5 Dec 2013

Lee M (2003) Conceptualizing the new governance: a new institution of social coordination. the institutional analysis and development mini-conference, May 3rd and 5th, 2003. In: Workshop in Political Theory and Policy Analysis, Indiana University, Bloomington, Indiana, USA. http://www.indiana.edu/~workshop/seminars/papers/y673_spring_2003_lee.pdf. Accessed 5 Dec 2013

Mars MM, Metcalfe AS (2009) Entrepreneurship in the contemporary academy. ASHE Higher Education Report, vol 34(5). http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1002/aehe.3405/pdf. Accessed 5 Dec 2013

Mok K (2003) Globalization and higher education restructuring in Hong Kong, Taiwan, and Mainland China. Higher Education Research and Development, 22(2): 117–129

Obama B (2010, August 9) Remarks by the president on higher education and the economy at the University of Texas at Austin University of Texas, Austin, Texas. http://www.whitehouse.gov/blog/2010/08/09/president-obama-higher-education-austin-we-are-not-playing-second-place Accessed 33 march 2011

Open Doors Data (2011/12). Special reports: Economic impact of international students. http://www.iie.org/Research-and-Publications/Open-Doors/Data/Special-Reports/Economic-Impact-of-International-Students. Accessed 5 Dec 2013

Rhoades G, Slaughter S (2004) Academic capitalism in the new economy: Challenges and choices. Am Acad 1(1): 37–60

Rhoades G (2005) Democracy and capitalism, academic style: Governance and accountability in contemporary higher education. Academe, 91(3): 38–42

Rhoads R, Torres CA (eds) (2006). The university, state, and market: The political economy of globalization in the Americas. Stanford University Press, Stanford

Scott RA (2008) The challenges facing higher education in America Today. Invited keynote address, Luncheon Roundtable, Naples Florida, February 28, 2008 Retrieved at http://administration.adelphi.edu/president/pdfs/022808.pdf on 5/12/13

Slaughter S, Rhoades G (2004) Academic capitalism in the new economy. The Johns Hopkins University Press, Baltimore

May, 2013

http://www.springer.com/978-3-642-39812-4

Survival of the Fittest
The Shifting Contours of Higher Education in China and the United States
Li, Q.; Gerstl-Pepin, C. (Eds.)
2014, XVII, 187 p. 2 illus., Hardcover
ISBN: 978-3-642-39812-4