

in terms of collaborations between universities and industry, the transfer of technology from universities, and creation of spin-off firms. Yet, the term also embraces ways through which external communities, such as government and local communities, engage with and contribute to the welfare of universities and the involvement of universities in policymaking and social and cultural life. Accordingly, any approach to the institutionalization of community engagement that focuses only on the commercialization of technology is likely to limit the ways through which African universities can engage with, and/or serve, external communities because African universities are not yet key players in cutting-edge innovation. In addition, although African universities should support and encourage the production of socially and economically relevant knowledge as well as the commercialization of inventions, their research agenda should emphasize not only application-oriented research, but also basic research because a number of science systems on the continent—Namibia, Botswana, Swaziland, Mali, Angola and Mozambique—rely on universities for the production of scientific knowledge and, therefore, have no viable alternative producers of knowledge.

Furthermore, much as the institutionalization of community engagement requires that the universities should, among other things, create specialized units—for example, the Food Technology and Business Incubation Center at Makerere University, the Center for Academic Engagement and Collaboration at Nelson Mandela Metropolitan University, the Center for Continuing Education at the University of Botswana, and the Management and Consultancy Bureau at Dar es Salaam University. To promote community engagement and coordinate engagement-related activities, African universities should avoid creating silo systems that restrict community engagement to specific units, disciplines, and individuals. Similarly, the institutionalization of community engagement at African universities requires each university to pay attention to its institutional context—for example, disciplinary focus, location, ownership, mission, culture, values and priorities, and national policy agendas. Because universities, even those in the same country, cannot have the same institutional environments, the focus, forms, and organization of community engagement cannot be the same for all universities. In this regard and considering the insufficiency of funding that characterizes many African universities, the funding allocation system for community engagement at each university should reflect, conform to, and support the vision, mission, objectives, and community engagement agenda of the specific university. ■

## Australian Universities Under Neoliberal Management: The Deepening Crisis

**RAEWYN CONNELL**

*Raewyn Connell is professor emerita, University of Sydney, Australia. E-mail: raewyn.connell@sydney.edu.au.*

Australian higher education dates from the second half of the 19th century, when a few small universities were set up in raw and violent settler colonies. The rationale was that universities transmitted stabilizing cultural traditions—such as the ability to quote Horace in Latin—and gave young lawyers, engineers, and doctors some technical skills with a portion of European humane education on top. Indigenous knowledge, like indigenous students, were utterly excluded.

In the mid-20th century, the universities were transformed under an agenda of national development. The country was industrializing. To be fully modern, Australia needed a bigger secondary and tertiary education system and wider recruitment of students. After World War II the Australian federal government, previously little interested in universities, put growing amounts of taxation revenue into expanding the small colonial-era universities, and building many more in the “greenfields” around Australian cities. A massive growth in student numbers followed.

A change in the character of universities accompanied this growth. The idea spread that the society needed technology, cutting-edge science, even social science. The research university is the great modern producer of knowledge. So, Australia needed expanding research capacity. A national research university was launched in the late 1940s, and the other universities soon began expanding higher degrees. As well as new lecture theaters, the plate glass windows of research institutes were seen in the land.

Four decades of expansion produced a public university workforce, which by the 1970s and 1980s was an important presence in Australian society. It was the main base for the country’s intellectual life, and probably did help economic growth. The university system created in this time was a remarkable social resource—not large compared with the United States or Europe, but of good quality, all public, and enjoying wide popular support.

### THE NEOLIBERAL TURN

In the 1980s, Australian universities’ conditions of existence changed. The country’s political and business elites turned toward neoliberalism, with its bracing agenda of privatization, deregulation, tax cuts, management power,

and short-term profit. Like other countries in the global periphery, Australia moved back toward a colonial economic structure. The country deindustrialized, and large-scale mining for export became the leading industry. There was little economic need for autonomous production of knowledge in Australia at the time.

University reforms were launched by the Labor Party government at the end of the 1980s—as in other parts of the South, neoliberalism in Australia was introduced by “left” parties. The policies were intended to expand the university further, for social reasons—but on the cheap. The first step was to fold the nonresearch Colleges of Advanced Education into the university sector. Not by rational planning, but by a frenzy of entrepreneurial takeovers—with vice-chancellors and their staffs cast as entrepreneurs.

The next step was to find someone else to pay, and a neoliberal solution was at hand: fees. The federal government share of university funding began an astonishing collapse, from around 90 percent of university budgets at the start of the 1990s to around 45 percent now. Student fees have risen, decade after decade, to compensate.

An advantage was getting foreigners to pay. Australian universities from the 1950s to the 1970s had offered free education to Asian students as development aid. Under the neoliberal governments of the 1990s and 2000s, the university sector was redefined as an export industry—the cultural equivalent of the mining sector. Overseas students, mainly from Asia, were the rich customers to be charged as much as the market would bear. Some attempts have been made to set up branch campuses in the overseas markets. This has not flourished: perhaps Australian universities do not have enough prestige; or the attraction of study in Australia is partly the prospect of immigration. Most of the income from overseas students comes from students who have come to Australia to study.

#### THE CHANGING INSTITUTIONS

Neoliberalism has done more than change funding arrangements. It has transformed universities as institutions. Vice-chancellors have operated more and more as corporate chief executive officers. They are now the elite managers in a managerial workforce that works on corporate lines and is paid on corporate scales—a million dollars a year, including bonuses, for the more fortunate vice-chancellors.

Crucially, the top managers and their immediate support staff at the business end have become increasingly separated, on a day-to-day basis, from the academic, maintenance, and technical staff. A cultural gap has been opening.

In business, a standard way to raise profits is to lower labor costs. In universities the first to feel the cutting edge were the nonacademic staff. More and more of their work

has been “outsourced”—contracted out to companies unconnected with the university. This possibly saved money, but it certainly severed everyday connections of the workers involved with the academic staff.

Labor costs also had to be lowered in teaching. One way was to thin out the commitment to teaching. Across the sector, the student/teacher ratio almost doubled between 1990 and 2010. Another way was to casualize the workforce. Managements do not reveal this information—it would be bad for marketing—but the National Tertiary Education Union calculates that about 50 percent of all undergraduate teaching is now done by casual staff.

---

**In the mid-20th century, the universities were transformed under an agenda of national development.**

---

With the social integration of the university in steep decline, management has proliferated *indirect* mechanisms of control. Computer-based control systems are impinging deeply on day-to-day university work. They embody distrust of the workforce, they often do not fit higher education or research processes very well, and they create cynicism.

The universities are now full of fake accountability. At the same time, they have turned to public-relations techniques to attract potential students and donors and burnish the organization’s image. The corporate university now projects to the world a glossy fantasy of broad lawns, relaxed students, happy staff, spacious buildings, and eternal Australian sunshine. The cultural rationale of universities as bearers of truth, of rigorous thought, is becoming deeply compromised.

#### A CRISIS OF PURPOSE AND REPRODUCTION

The key to much of this change is that the Australian ruling class does not need a first-rate university system, in the neoliberal era. The transnational corporations that dig up the ore and coal are happy to import their technology. The profitable local industries, from construction to gambling, do not need a broad professionalized workforce.

The rich, who can afford high fees, do need a few local universities with enough reputation to get their children into international business schools. A select group of older universities has arisen, calling themselves the Group of Eight and purporting to be a South Seas kind of Ivy League. The rest of the country’s universities, as far as the Group of

Eight is concerned, can eat the scraps.

Meanwhile, graduate students and recent graduates, who now do half of the undergraduate teaching, are under extraordinary pressure. They try to cobble together a living wage from fragments of teaching, often on different campuses, at odd hours, with zero security. Australia is producing a lot of graduates; but the academic workforce of the future is being eroded, not fostered.

Although the policy discourse of neoliberal management in Australia is optimistic—market strategy requires it—the reality beneath the glossy advertising is a growing crisis in viability of the workforce and in the production and reproduction of an intellectual culture. This will not be solved by neoliberal policymakers, who do not even recognize it. The new extractive and financial corporate elites have no particular interest in having it solved.

If the growing crisis is to be solved, it will be by a qualitative shift in the way decisions about higher education are made by popular demand for a first-rate university system for the whole society, and by university staff protecting the remarkable resource that earlier generations have created. ■

---

## Joint-Venture Universities in China: Shanghai and Shenzhen Comparisons

RUTH HAYHOE AND JULIA PAN

*Ruth Hayhoe is professor and Julia Pan is senior research associate in the Higher Education Program, Department of Leadership, Higher and Adult Education, Ontario Institute for Studies in Education, University of Toronto, Canada. Ruth Hayhoe E-mail: ruthhayhoe@sympatico.ca. Julia Pan E-mail: julia.pan@utoronto.ca.*

China's newly developing joint venture universities have two unique characteristics. Firstly, China's Ministry of Education requires a formal partnership between a Chinese and a foreign university for approval to be given. This policy reflects a Chinese concern over sovereignty that goes back to the indignities suffered at the hands of foreign powers in the late 19th century. Secondly, cities and towns in China's prosperous coastal regions are prepared to provide land and building costs for such institutions, as a means of raising their profile. Here we overview joint-venture institutions in the Shanghai region and then compare emerging initiatives

in the southern city of Shenzhen.

### EARLY SINO-BRITISH CASES

The earliest joint-venture universities in China are the University of Nottingham-Ningbo in a vibrant port south of Shanghai and Xi'an Jiaotong-Liverpool University in the nearby garden city of Suzhou. A recent article in *Higher Education* by Yi Feng (2013) provides a brief history, while drawing fascinating comparisons between these two institutions.

Nottingham partnered with a modest local university, which gained support from the town of Ningbo to build a beautiful campus. Liverpool University, by contrast, chose a top-level national university of engineering as its partner, and the Xi'an Jiaotong-Liverpool University is funded by a Suzhou-based foundation. Students at the University of Nottingham-Ningbo are exposed to a broad liberal arts curriculum offered in English, close to that of Nottingham itself, while students of Xi'an Jiaotong-Liverpool are enrolled in a range of engineering and management programs with a focus on innovative approaches to teaching and research. Both have around 4,000 students at present, with the aim of reaching about 8,000. They arose from relationships between leading scholars/administrators on both sides, the most celebrated being the Fudan University president, Yang Fujia. Yang's hometown of Ningbo supported the new venture, while Nottingham appointed him as their 6th chancellor, a position he held from 2001 to 2012.

---

**The earliest joint-venture universities in China are the University of Nottingham-Ningbo in a vibrant port south of Shanghai and Xi'an Jiaotong-Liverpool University in the nearby garden city of Suzhou.**

---

### RECENT SINO-AMERICAN CASES

Americans have been swift to follow the British lead. In May of 2014 we visited two new Sino-American joint ventures, also in the Shanghai area. New York University Shanghai and Duke Kunshan University recruited their first students in autumn of 2013 and 2014, respectively. While the former is a partnership between New York University and the East China Normal University (ECNU), with Shanghai's new Pudong district providing a Manhattan-style campus, the latter is a partnership between Duke University and Wu-