

autonomy and of leadership appointment are rarely discussed. When such discussions appear, some raise concern that boards may not realize their full potential if the Ministry retains the power to appoint and dismiss university rectors. Others note that society does not have a strong cultural foundation for lay governance. The legislative barrier poses another challenge that requires amendments in a set of laws, rules, and regulations.

The academic community seems in principle to embrace the idea of autonomy and corporate governance, but is cautious about the realities and timeline of implementation. In particular, some anticipate a power struggle between traditional and new governance structures; others, a pushback from rectors unwilling to give up their powers.

CONCLUSION

The Kazakhstan government has significantly modernized and internationalized universities through centralized policymaking and governance since the country's independence. However, there is an agreement, both nationally and worldwide, that to succeed in the twenty-first century, universities need to be given more autonomy. Lessons learned from Kazakhstan's decentralization efforts might be useful for other countries sharing the legacy of the soviet governance system.

Disclaimer: This article is part of the "Advancing Models of Best Practice in Academic Governance and Management in Higher Education Institutions in Kazakhstan" research project. It was supported in part by Nazarbayev University with funds from the Republic of Kazakhstan Ministry of Education and Science. The opinions expressed are those of the author and do not represent the views of the funder. ■

Private Higher Education: Even France, Even For-Profit

AURÉLIEN CASTA AND DANIEL C. LEVY

Aurélien Casta is assistant professor at Université de Lille in France and a PROPHE Affiliate. E-mail: aureliencasta@wanadoo.fr. Daniel C. Levy is SUNY Distinguished Professor, State University of New York at Albany, and PROPHE director. E-mail: Dlevy@uamail.albany.edu.

IHE devotes a column in each issue to a contribution from PROPHE, the Program for Research on Private Higher Education, headquartered at the University at Albany. See <http://www.albany.edu/~prophe>.

Many consider France as the "home" of a strong and centralized state, dominating society and imposing regulations on institutions, including the higher education sector. Seen from abroad, no country has been more associated with the historic "Continental Model" dominant in Europe, and partly transplanted in Latin America and elsewhere. Yet 200 years after the end of the Napoleonic era (1815), French higher education includes a significant non-state sector. Indeed, private higher education (PHE) enrolls 19 percent of all students. Furthermore, an increasing share of that PHE is legally for-profit, with a large international investor presence. At first sight, this contemporary reality may seem an abandonment of a glorious French state tradition. But in fact both the existence of PHE and even the recent for-profit surge within it have been consistent with accommodating state policy.

STUNNING NUMBERS AND CHARACTER

The 19 percent private share—representing some 436,000 of France's 2.3 million enrollments (2013)—is striking by its sheer size and also in comparative terms. Western Europe's PHE share is 12 percent (15 percent for Europe overall). In fact, the French private lead is larger than these figures alone suggest, for the great bulk of French PHE is "independent private"—an official European term indicating among other things that most funding is private, whereas PHE in several neighbor countries depends mostly on public funds. Moreover, French PHE is fast-growing, its present 19 percent significantly exceeding its 12 percent share in 2000; during the same time period, the PHE share has remained relatively stagnant in Western Europe overall.

There has been remarkable media attention on France's PHE growth generally, and in particular on the for-profit surge within it. True, in France as elsewhere outside the United States, anything private (and not religious) is often seen as for-profit, even if it is not officially for-profit. Yet, currently the dramatic emergence on the French higher education scene of private equity and multinational companies, and their quite visible acquisitions, make for "hot" news stories. Financial and educational media outlets stimulate public fascination. Of the five largest higher education "groups," only one is national (also family-owned); the four international groups include Laureate (easily the world's largest for-profit chain in higher education) and three French and British transnational private equity companies (Apax, Bregal, and Duke Street).

As is common in other countries, for-profits institutions are somewhat wary of the interest and coverage, lest they bring increased scrutiny and regulation. Nonetheless, for now at least, the French for-profit institutions have reason to welcome the attention, which helps "put them on the

map” for potential clients and employers.

How large is the for-profit component of French PHE? No close estimate can be responsibly made. Government has chosen not to gather comprehensive data sorted by for-profit/nonprofit. We will nonetheless hazard a very broad estimate: the for-profit share of PHE is probably substantially larger than 20 percent, and substantially smaller than 50 percent. Few of the roughly 235,000 PHE enrollments in 2000 were for-profit. The nonprofit share has grown

The 19 percent private share—representing some 436,000 of France’s 2.3 million enrollments (2013)—is striking by its sheer size and also in comparative terms.

over the past 15 years, so it is probably still today significantly larger than the for-profit share. On the other hand, the five largest groups mentioned above claim having some 80,000 students, thus accounting for roughly 18 percent of PHE. Whatever the exact current share of for-profit PHE, it is notably growing.

AN ACCOMMODATING STATE POLICY

Any outsider’s guess that such private, and especially for-profit, growth would happen despite restrictive state policy would be grossly mistaken. So would an assumption that the state has only recently become accommodating, with a more limited role and a broader acceptance of the market. On the contrary, state policy has been generally accommodating ever since the end of the Napoleonic era.

Specific state provisions have many times changed or been added, but no such provision has upset the general atmosphere of tolerance. To be sure, regulations have placed some restrictions, but they have also conveyed state recognition, thus buttressing PHE legitimacy, and now even for-profit legitimacy. In fact, several of the provisions introduced over time have *liberalized policy*. In the past half century, for example, PHE has gained rights to offer state diplomas, getting more latitude from various ministries for their vocational training, and even forming partnerships with public entities, including universities.

In the past two centuries, the French State has never banned or nationalized PHE—interventions seen in some European and other countries. On the contrary, it has generally allowed private institutions to go about their business. In the immediate post-Napoleonic era, tolerance of PHE mostly meant tolerance of Catholic institutions; today

it is mostly business that has latitude to go about its business in PHE.

Remarkably, all of the above holds for for-profit PHE as for nonprofit PHE. For-profit non-university higher education awards official degrees and diplomas. When allowing PHE, many countries in Europe and beyond proscribe for-profit education or regulate it more stringently than nonprofit PHE. French public policy is virtually neutral in this respect.

None of this means that the French State places no restrictions on PHE. Perhaps the most striking is that no PHE institution can be a university. Nor, for the most part, can any PHE institution offer university degrees or diplomas. But equally striking is how restricted the restrictions are. There are no extra restrictions on the for-profit PHE institutions and, since 1968, private institutions can in partnership with universities award university degrees and diplomas. Additionally, since 1999, if granted permission from a national commission and the ministry, business schools can by themselves award one of the three university degrees, the master. Though PHE graduates do not have the same access to the civil service as their counterparts from public education, the great majority of PHE graduates seek employment in the private sector and international business anyway.

Unions and public universities sometimes lobby for the state to be less accommodating of PHE, and their case may resonate with many citizens’ longstanding unease about private ownership and management in higher education. But actual French policy remains largely accommodating of PHE, now even of for-profit PHE. ■

Performance-Based Funding of Universities in Europe

THOMAS ESTERMANN AND ANNA-LENA CLAEYS-KULIK

Thomas Estermann is director for Governance, Funding and Public Policy Development at the European University Association in Brussels, Belgium. E-mail: thomas.estermann@eua.be. Anna-Lena Claeys-Kulik is policy analyst & project manager at the European University Association, in Brussels, Belgium. E-mail: anna.lena.kulik@eua.be Note: the full report on performance-based funding of universities in Europe is available on the EUA Web site at: http://www.eua.be/Libraries/publications-homepage-list/define-thematic-report_pbf_final-version.pdf?sfvrsn=26.

In a context of tight public budgets, performance-based funding of universities is often perceived as a useful tool