

centrally controlled are an infringement on academic freedom and an example of a “totalitarian society”?

ACADEMIC FREEDOM INSIDE AND OUTSIDE OF THE CLASSROOM

Generally, discussions of academic freedom divide in two. On the one hand, what the academic says in the classroom and pertains to his or her specific research helps us understand what one can say, because the individual speaks and writes from a particular knowledge base. On the other hand, extramural speech defines what a professor might say outside of the classroom, where he or she claims no disciplinary expertise. Both areas have become points of contention.

Communicating an idea in a classroom that others disagree with, may lead to the termination of one’s services and the elimination of a text. Rohinton Mistry’s Booker Prize shortlisted novel, *Such a Long Journey*, for example, was eliminated from a syllabus when a student objected to certain passages. The novel tells the story of a bank clerk who belongs to Mumbai’s Parsee community. A few pages in the novel negatively portray Indian politics and a specific political party. As an act of self-censorship, Mumbai University removed the book from its reading lists. Similarly, a professor at Banaras Hindu University was fired when he tried to screen in his Development Studies class the currently banned *India’s Daughter*, a movie about a rape that occurred in New Delhi.

Rightly framed, these sorts of discussions can be useful in helping academics to think through thorny issues that go to the heart of what a nation wants of its universities.

The kind of events that transpired at JNU is what has provoked heated discussions about academic freedom. The challenge of what should be taught in the classroom extends to the sorts of seminars, clubs, and activities that occur outside of the classroom. The JNU Centre for Sanskrit Studies invited, for example, a well-known Yoga Guru for a keynote address in an academic seminar. The individual is looked on as supportive of the conservative government. A group of students opposed the invitation, terming it as a “silent right-wing onslaught.” The speaker felt obliged to cancel his keynote.

CONCLUSION

Some will suggest that to critique academic freedom in In-

dia today requires an understanding of academic freedom in India a generation ago. In essence, they are asking if today’s concerns about academic freedom are simply a way to criticize the Modi government and portray its members as conservative ideologues. History, to be sure, always helps us understand complex issues such as academic freedom. One also needs to ask, however, if a 28 year old student should be put in prison for 21 days because he attended an event where controversial statements were made that some define as seditious. Rightly framed, these sorts of discussions can be useful in helping academics to think through thorny issues that go to the heart of what a nation wants of its universities. ■

The “New” Private Higher Education Sector in the United Kingdom

CLAIRE CALLENDER

Claire Callender is professor of higher education at Birkbeck, University of London and at University College London’s Institute of Education, where she is deputy director and coinvestigator at the Centre for Global Higher Education (CGHE). E-mail: c.callender@bbk.ac.uk.

Developing a private higher education sector in England—euphemistically called “alternative providers”—is central to the UK government’s policies. The government already allows students enrolled on approved courses at private providers to claim government-subsidized financial aid. Since 2010, it has made it easier for private colleges to enter the higher education undergraduate market through liberalization. It plans to do much more. The government’s 2015 higher education Green Paper, shortly to be turned into legislation, wants to remove barriers to entry and growth. In return for more regulation and potentially much more money, it proposes speeding up the processes whereby new entrants can gain degree awarding powers and access a university title, while simultaneously lowering the entry bar. Why is the government pushing this policy agenda? Does England need a private higher education sector?

To date, there is absolutely no evidence that UK private providers are really challenger institutions or disruptive innovators who will reshape the higher education undergraduate market, improve quality, widen participation, and drive down prices. Rather they are costly to the public purse, divert resources away from existing public provision, absorb an inordinate amount of public officials’ time, en-

ergy, and focus, are of questionable quality, and are likely to perpetuate, rather than eradicate, existing inequalities in higher education participation and outcomes. Ultimately, they are a reputational risk to the United Kingdom's higher education system.

THE DRIVERS OF PRIVATE HIGHER EDUCATION EXPANSION

Looking across the globe, the key drivers for the recent development and expansion of private higher education have been: to meet rising unmet demand, especially among young people; to help widen participation; and to fill niche provision. Do these apply to England? In 2015, the government lifted the cap on undergraduate student numbers in the public sector specifically to meet pent up demand. Applications and acceptances to English universities increased and reached the highest ever entry rates (which take account of demographic changes) recorded for 18 and 19 year olds. Now 42 percent of English young people enter full-time higher education by age 19, and are over a quarter more likely to do so than in 2006. So enrollments among young people are largely holding up, despite the threefold increase in full-time undergraduate tuition in 2012/2013 (unlike enrollments for mature and part-time undergraduates). But the growth has been unequal, with public higher education institutions at the bottom of England's hierarchical and stratified system seeing the smallest enrollment increases. Some institutions are struggling to fill their places, bringing into question the extent of unmet demand.

What about entry rates in England for students from poorer and disadvantaged backgrounds? Is the public sector widening participation? In 2015, entry rates for disadvantaged 18 year olds also were the highest ever recorded at 18.5 percent, but the rate of growth has slowed down recently. Even so, disadvantaged young people in England are 30 percent more likely to enter university in 2015 than five years ago, and 65 percent more likely than in 2006. Yet, there has been limited progress in these young people's access to the most prestigious universities, those demanding high entry grades. In 2015, only 3.3 percent of the most disadvantaged entered such universities compared with 20.7 percent of the most advantaged. Disadvantaged students and students of color remain concentrated in the least prestigious universities. Significantly, however, this expansion has been achieved without any apparent deleterious effects on drop-out. Noncompletion rates are falling in England. In 2013/2014, only 7 percent of all full-time degree students and 8 percent of similar disadvantaged young students dropped out of higher education after their first year of study.

Finally, niche and innovative provision is well serviced by government-funded further education colleges. These colleges have seen some increase in their undergraduate

student numbers following earlier reforms. They are particularly well attuned to the needs of local students and local employers, and their tuition fees are lower than universities. Yet colleges have been the target of government funding cuts.

Public sector higher education seems to be doing pretty well in terms of meeting demand, widening participation, and fulfilling niche provision. It could certainly do better. To understand the government's love affair with private higher education, we have to look elsewhere—to its ideology. Neo-liberalism with its idealized notion of the market is a hallmark of this, and the previous, governments' public service policies, including higher education. The government's vision is of a higher education sector whose purpose, role, and operation are driven and defined by the market. Provider competition and consumer choice supposedly leading to increases in efficiency and innovation are driving higher education reforms. To this end, in 2012/2013, the government withdrew most of the money it gave England's public universities for teaching, and raised the cap on tuition to £9,000 per annum (making it the most expensive higher education system among OECD countries), which

Applications and acceptances to English universities increased and reached the highest ever entry rates (which take account of demographic changes) recorded for 18 and 19 year olds.

students repay via subsidized loans. It sought to put students "at the heart of the system." Consequently, the culture of many public higher education institutions is changing. Many have become far more managerial and "customer" orientated. Increasingly, we are seeing privatization in education with the involvement of the private sector through a variety of arrangements that fall short of outright privatized provision, such as public-private partnerships, contracting services, and financing. Currently there are proposals to privatize quality assurance.

Now, the government wants the privatization of education to stimulate yet more competition and innovation, more choice for students, and better value for money, purely for ideological reasons.

But is this privatization really necessary, given the reach of marketization within the public sector and its record on meeting unmet demand, widening participation, and niche provision? From the limited data on the emerging private higher education sector in England, it is not. What we know

about private providers from research and official reports is not flattering, leaving civil servants and other government agencies preoccupied with unravelling the mess that characterizes this inadequately regulated evolving sector and the risks it poses, and taking a series of rearguard actions, often behind closed doors.

PRIVATE PROVIDERS IN THE UNITED KINGDOM

Of the estimated 670 private providers in the United Kingdom today, the majority operate as for-profits and are newly established. Just seven have degree awarding powers and four have university status. Compared with the public sector, most are cheaper, small, concentrated in London, highly specialized, offering a limited range of courses and a limited number of qualifications—mostly at sub-degree level, and have lower entry requirements. Government research estimates that there are now between 245,000 and 295,000 students in the private sector. Most study full-time and about half are international.

The number of private sector students claiming government-subsidized financial support has increased tenfold since 2010/2011, to around 60,000. The taxpayer costs of this aid has soared from £30 million in 2010 to £723.6 million in 2013–2014, before falling to £533.6 million in 2014/2015 after the government introduced a cap on student numbers at private colleges because of concerns about quality and rocketing public funding. A damning report on financial support for students attending private colleges by the National Audit Office, which scrutinizes public spending for Parliament and helps Parliament hold government to account, showed: students claiming support for which they were ineligible; providers recruiting students who do not have the capacity or motivation to complete their course; drop-out rates five times higher than the public sector; providers enrolling students accessing support onto unapproved courses; and providers supplying inaccurate information about student attendance.

All are clear examples of the waste and abuse of public money for the private gain of providers. They, together with the public costs, bring into question the supposed attractiveness of private providers as cheap alternatives to public universities, as well as what their students and taxpayers are getting in return. Why not invest and concentrate on public higher education instead of expanding private provision? ■

Changing Public-Private Dynamics in Polish Higher Education

MAREK KWIEK

Marek Kwiek is director of the Centre for Public Policy Studies and a chair holder of the UNESCO Chair in Institutional Research and Higher Education Policy, University of Poznan, Poland. E-mail: kwiekm@amu.edu.pl.

Poland provides an interesting example of the impact of rapidly declining demographics on the public-private dynamics in higher education. From an international perspective, the Polish case shows how fragile private higher education is, when its dominating, demand-absorbing subsector is confronted with changing demographics and massive public financing in the public sector; it also shows how interdependent the two sectors are. The Polish case provides a good policy lesson for all systems in which the public sector is funded by taxes and the private sector is fee-based, and in which demographic projections show that ever-growing pools of prospective students in the future are not guaranteed.

To describe the last decade in a nutshell: the number of public sector students has been increasing, compared with the number of private sector students, and the amount of public revenues to higher education, compared with private revenues, has also been increasing. In the public sector, the share of “tax-based” students has been increasing and that of fee-paying students has been decreasing. The number of private providers has also been shrinking. Consequently, Poland moved from a *fully public* system under the communist regime (1945–1989), to a *dual or mixed public-private* system in the expansion period of 1990–2005, to a *deprivatizing* system in which both the private sector and private funding are playing a decreasing role (2006–2016, and beyond); and, presumably, to a *deprivatized* system, with a marginal role of the private sector and a dominant role of both the public sector and public funding (from about 2025 and beyond).

EDUCATIONAL EXPANSION

The history of Polish higher education after 1989 can be divided into two contrasting periods: an expansion period during 1990–2005 and a contraction period since 2006. While the expansion period was characterized by privatization (private sector growth and increasing role of fees in financing public universities), the current contraction period is characterized by deprivatization. Deprivatization has both