

the same, then the implementation of a posttenure review system will only focus more attention on research, as opposed to teaching.

Moreover, to improve teaching, or address issues such as nonproductive faculty, we ought not reject out of hand the importance of ideas such as academic freedom. It seems wrong-headed to suggest that we must give up the cherished value of academic freedom to help make the academy more efficient. And I have seen no work that proposes alternative structures that will provide as rigorous a support of academic freedom as does tenure.⁴ At the same time, we also must recognize the fiscal and productivity-related issues that currently confront the academy. What should we do?

One step is to move the debate away from the pros and cons of tenure. If issues such as productivity are a concern, we should address them alone—just as we would in business and industry. Tenure is a structure that is governed and defined by faculty and administrators—it can change according to communal desire.

A second step is to consider ways to implement performance reviews that do not bring into question whether tenure should or should not stay. Instead, we might develop a system that enables a professor to talk about the kind of work he or she intends to do, and allows the faculty to assess these plans to ensure that all individuals are able to make a contribution to their academic communities while we still maintain an adherence to academic freedom and the tenure system. The best of both worlds—the maintenance of academic freedom and a more productive academy—are surely possible if we put our minds and hearts to it.

Notes

1. William G. Tierney and Estela M. Bensimon, *Promotion and Tenure, Community and Socialization in Academia* (Albany, NY: SUNY, 1996); William G. Tierney, ed., *The Responsive University: Restructuring for High Performance* (Baltimore, Md: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1998).
2. Howard Bowen and Jack Schuster, *American Professors: A National Resource Imperiled* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1986), 243.
3. Henry Rosovsky, *The University: An Owner's Manual* (New York: W. W. Norton, 1990), 211.
4. Erwin Chemerinsky, *American Behavioral Scientist* (February 1998): 640–53.

Internet Resource

For more information on international issues in higher education, visit the Center's web site, located at:

http://www.bc.edu/bc_org/avp/soe/cihe/

A Presidential Perspective from Japan

Yoshiaki Obara

Yoshiaki Obara is president of Tamagawa University. Address: 6-1-1 Tamagawa Gakuen, Machida, Tokyo 194, Japan.

A university president should perhaps keep quiet about problems his institution faces. But it would be a lie to say that no problems exist. Indeed, presidents of private-sector institutions of higher education in Japan face a range of challenging issues.

Some issues relate to the size of an institution. Private institutions in Japan range in size from 1,000 to 100,000 students. A president of a large university, having to preside over campus-wide faculty meetings, may long for a family atmosphere similar to faculty meetings at a small college. Some private colleges have but a single school or faculty. A president of such a college may feel at a disadvantage in the competition to attract students. A president of an engineering college has to work hard to keep up with ever-changing technologies, while one at a humanities college can sit back and relax.

Many institutions today are struggling with the dichotomy involving quality or quantity.

Some private institutions enjoy a long history and elite status much like that of the national universities. Some private schools have national reputations, while others are known only in their own region. And finally, there are the many so-called “train station box lunch” colleges that lack academic legitimacy. These last two types of institutions have a much harder job in reaching and recruiting students.

The Quality/Quantity Dichotomy

Many institutions today are struggling with the dichotomy involving quality or quantity. *Quality* refers to admitting students who have the scholastic aptitude, study habits, and clear academic and career goals that qualify them for higher education. For such students, college or university should be an opportunity for academic higher learning and a chance to open up one's career possibilities. But it certainly should not be a time for R & R, a reward for having studied hard from the 4th to the 12th grade and having passed the difficult entrance exam. It is a president's responsibility to provide a quality academic environment (faculty, building, and

equipment) for qualified students.

Quantity refers to enrolling sufficient numbers of tuition-paying students to finance the operation of an institution—a vital part of running a private school in Japan, where almost all private institutions depend largely, and often solely, on tuition. If quality is our ideal, quantity is the only means for us to attain that goal.

Boom and Bust

The economic boom of the late 1980s and early 1990s created a sense of omnipotence—that everything was possible with Japan's wealth. The Bubble Economy, an increase in the cohort of 18-year-olds, and the belief in equal access to educational attainment led to an increase in the number of college-bound young people. Rising demand aggravated the “hard-in and easy-out” style of Japanese universities. Children were now required to study even harder to get into the university than to graduate.

The economic boom of the late 1980s and early 1990s created a sense of omnipotence that everything was possible with Japan's wealth.

To alleviate this so-called “exam hell,” the Japanese government permitted institutions with sufficient resources to increase freshmen admissions until the year 2000. (In Japan, private—as well as public—institutions must follow government guidelines for freshmen admissions quotas.) Many private institutions increased admissions by 10 to 30 percent. This was also meant to fortify colleges financially.

The Bubble Economy has now burst, and the number of 18-year-olds has dropped from a peak of 2.03 million to 1.6 million. Further declines are anticipated. If institutions continue to admit more students, it is predicted that eventually all high school graduates who apply for college will be admitted. At present, there are 990,000 18-year-olds seeking admission to a college or university; of these 790,000 will be admitted. But by 2003, the number of student applicants will be down to 750,000. As the 18-year-old age cohort shrinks, so too does the number of qualified students. Theoretically, this could mean that students who would not have qualified for college admission in 1990 would be admitted as full-time students in 2003.

Many private institutions will have to welcome even those who are not qualified academically in order to fill their classrooms (or, put more bluntly, to raise enough income to keep the institution going). A failure on the part of the universities to address the decrease in the number of

students could lead to a lowering of academic requirements for high school graduation. A lessening of the competition for college entrance could generate an attitude of “Why study hard if everyone is assured of a college seat?”

As the 18-year-old age cohort shrinks, so too does the number of qualified students.

Ideally, a college president should maintain academic standards while securing the necessary revenues. At a time of declining population, income is proportional to an increase in student enrollment. But, to admit greater numbers of underqualified or less-well-prepared students necessitates offering remedial classes, which in turn may attract even greater numbers of less-qualified students. It is thus ironic that a policy intended to raise the revenues necessary to finance academic quality started a vicious cycle leading to an increase in the number of poorly prepared students.

It is a central issue today that changes introduced to strengthen private institutions are now undermining those very institutions. Presidents of private-sector institutions of higher education in Japan are now struggling to solve these and other problems.

Transnational Education: An Australian Example

Grant McBurnie and Anthony Pollock

Grant McBurnie is executive officer, Office of Deputy Vice Chancellor, International and Public Affairs at Monash University, Australia. Address: International and Public Affairs, Wellington Rd., Monash University, Clayton VIC 3168, Australia. Anthony Pollock is general manager of Monash International Pty Ltd., a wholly owned company of Monash University. E-mail: <grant.mcburnie@adm.monash.edu.au>.

Transnational education is an important aspect of international education. The Global Alliance for Transnational Education (GATE), an international certification body, defines it as follows:

“Transnational education . . . denotes any teaching or learning activity in which the students are in a different country (the host country) to that in which the institution providing the education is based (the home country). This situation requires that national bound-