



A RECORD OF
Universities Project 22nd Symposium

Academic Career Patterns

September 11-22, 2002

Salzburg Seminar

Table of Contents

Introduction

Panel 1: The Changing Academic Workplace

Moderator: John Davies

Robin Farquhar: *A General Conceptual Framework*

László Frenyó: *The Situation in Central and Eastern Europe*

Shirley Chater: *Current Trends and Issues for the Future*

Panel 2: Career Trajectories—The Academic Profession between the Civil Service and the Market

Moderator: Dan Matuszewski

Peter Magrath: *Career Paths in Universities*

Hans de Wit: *The Academic Profession in the Netherlands, Broader Issues, and Ten Items for Change*

Fireside Chat: Recruiting for Academic Leadership

Speaker: Shirley Chater

Moderator: Robin Farquhar

Panel 3: The Gender Gap

Moderator: Peter Rose

David Ward: *The Gender Gap*

Gail Stevenson: *A Personal View*

Laura Grünberg: *The View from Eastern Europe*

Barbara Weitgruber: *European Union (EU) Initiatives on Women and Science*

Panel 4: Institutional Responses to Changing Academic Career Patterns

Moderator: Jochen Fried

John Davies: *Challenges and Opportunities*

Pero Lucin: *Processes and Institutional Responses*

Plenary: Working Group Presentations

Presenters: Tony Claudino, Alexander Kovzik, Liviu Matei, Justine Shepard and Martina Vukasovic

Moderator: Robin Farquhar

Group 1. Recommendations on the Academic Workplace: New Demands, Heightened Tensions

Group 2. Nomadic Scholars and the Internationalization of the Academic Labor Market?

Group 3. Making Diversity Work

Group 4. European Trends in the Academic Professions

Summary Remarks: Robin Farquhar

List of Participants

Symposium Schedule

The Salzburg Seminar

Introduction

The 22nd Symposium of the Universities Project convened 50 Fellows and Faculty from 17 countries in Eastern and Western Europe and North America for a four-day symposium on changing academic career patterns. The academic program was supplemented by a variety of other activities including a guided tour of Schloss Leopoldskron, a walking tour of Salzburg, evening fireside discussion and relaxation, a classical concert followed by a candlelight reception in the Venetian Room, and a festive farewell banquet.

The symposium sought to prepare future leaders who had been selected or recommended by their institutions for leadership roles. Participants included student leaders, rising academics and administrators who may be engaged in changing academic career paths and, perhaps more importantly, who have great potential to take on the role of change agent in the future. The symposium looked at academic career paths from a variety of perspectives, and identified some best practices and ways in which academic careers can be made more attractive for promising young scholars.

Panel 1: The Changing Academic Workplace

Panelists: *Robin Farquhar, László Frenyó and Shirley Chater*

Moderator: *John Davies*

This first session provides the context for the week's discussions. It describes trends in academic career paths over time, some of the causes for the changes we have seen, some of issues produced by shifting career patterns, and the implications of changing career paths for the future of ourselves and our institutions.

Robin Farquhar: *A General Conceptual Framework*

I want to describe some changes in universities over the past three decades that have significantly altered working conditions. I chaired a department 30 years ago and then disappeared into senior administration for 25 years, to reappear as a professor five years ago.

The main changes have been infrastructural. We used to have secretaries to type our work. We also went to work every day and there were a lot of people around. Students used to be able to see professors all the time, but today there is no one for students to talk to because people work at home. Dress codes have changed radically and have become much more casual. On the plus side, universities used to reek of tobacco, which is now very different.

These are infrastructural changes, but what about more fundamental ones? The core issues perhaps do not stand in contrast to 30 years ago, but they are long-standing circumstances that must be grappled with to make academia an attractive environment.

Three aspects of the academic workplace are significant and challenging today:

1. Understanding the university's purposes. There is huge variation in the perception of what higher education institutions (HEIs)* are supposed to do today, which leads to confusion in the workplace. Universities serve three different and conflicting goals, and many try to meet all three at once:
 - a. Elitist institutions for creating leaders
 - b. Institutions for the massification of education. In this model, education is a public good that should be available to all who are able and willing to engage in it. This shift has profoundly changed the way HEIs act.

* As some issues are of general relevance to all HEIs and some specifically to universities, the two terms are often, but not always, used interchangeably in this discussion.

- c. Agents of social change and drivers of development as innovators, entrepreneurs, and sources of applied research and service to society.

Cultural values have been changing due in part to a shift in mission as outlined above, but also due to financial cutbacks. One movement is subsumed in the label of political correctness—gender-neutral language, no harassment, no tolerance for discrimination, etc. These trends describe a social engineering role that was not part of the original purpose of HEIs. Another cultural shift is the “corporatization” of universities through the introduction of management practices from the private sector and the need to act entrepreneurially and earn income.

The traditional three-part task of academics as involved in teaching, research and service has become vastly more complicated. The pressure to do research and get grants is largely defined by the university’s need for international ranking and prestige. On the other hand, the teaching function has become more important, in part because of the need to redress the lack of emphasis on teaching in the past. New professors must consequently embrace technology, multidisciplinary and teaching excellence as well as research. In addition, the need to engage in society has also led to a heightened emphasis on the service function. The increasing complexity of the three areas means that it is almost impossible to do all three equally well, yet opportunities to prioritize are rare.

2. Identification with the institution. The tendency for professors to identify with their discipline rather than the institution has been exacerbated by globalization and the internationalization of scholarship. The trend toward big research also encourages multi-institutional cooperation. More part-time and non-tenure contracts and the emergence of virtual universities have also encouraged academics to be nomads rather than engaged with one institution.

In the service domain, faculty members are often compelled to focus attention outward and away from the HEI. All of these pressures are, of course, a little different in Central and Eastern Europe (CEE) and the New Independent States (NIS), where inter-university mobility is limited and there are few international scholarly associations where faculty members can have access. On the other hand, many faculty members in these countries have two or three jobs, which discourages loyalty to the HEI. I would argue that the tendency to disaffiliation is worldwide, if slightly differentiated by country.

3. Motivation to engage vocationally in academic work. Today’s academic reward systems for faculty members to engage in academic work, including the lack of financial incentives for high performance, act as disincentives. Contracts also do not motivate engagement. The fact that it has become quite common in the USA for professors who are denied tenure to sue the university indicates a workplace that is insecure about employment and career paths.

All of these factors have decreased the willingness of people to make vocational, i.e., long-term, commitments to the academic workplace.

Teaching and Research

When a good musician—say Paul McCartney or Bono—performs good material with passion, people will come regardless of whether the venue is a small club or a huge stadium. A teacher must likewise be a passionate performer and have good material to deliver. However, the musician does not always write his own songs and the teacher does not necessarily have to develop his or her own material. Although few of us can be a Keynes or a Leontiev, we need to know what the great researchers have been doing. We need good teachers who are capable of delivering the latest scientific results to the students. Researchers are often not the best people to do that. Thus, our own research is the way to “understand what good music is” and what should be included in our “concert.” —Alexander Kovzik, Belarus/USA

Higher education is the sector that is perhaps best able to adjust to the changes that are now taking place in CEE. Let us look at history a bit, as we cannot strictly compare the development of the Western and Eastern systems since WWII.

The Hungarian example is fairly characteristic for CEE. In 1948, there were 42 HEIs, of which 26 were religiously affiliated. Although enrollment was very low, it doubled between 1948 and 1952 as other groups were encouraged to seek higher education. Students were channeled into engineering and science. Research was taken away from universities and transferred to the academies of science, which separated teaching from research. In 1949, a new law removed the primary purpose of universities by awarding the granting of doctoral degrees to the academies of science.

Institutions were split into small, single-profile institutions and totaled almost 100 in number by the late 1980s. Departments and Faculties were specialized and narrow. Programs were also specialized and rigid, with no interdisciplinary and no inter-university mobility. Higher education was planned, controlled and financed by the State. There was little institutional autonomy, as the Ministry made all decisions.

In the 1970s, the system gradually became a structure for bargaining among stakeholders and lobbying for access to public resources or the preservation of perquisites. The academic workplace lost coherence and had neither the authority nor the drive to change. Few people spoke foreign languages or had the opportunity to engage internationally. Average or below-average performers who “obeyed the system” coexisted with high-quality survivors in an isolated nest. Loyalty to the regime determined promotion and success.

What kept outstanding intellectual achievement going in this system? Universities were still places where intellectuals could both hide as well as be stimulated by contact with students. University teaching was prestigious and there was also the hope of international travel. Finally, there were no alternatives other than staying in academia. In spite of everything, the best people at the best institutions were high achievers of national and international recognition.

The lack of any development strategy or capacity for innovation made the system unable to embrace the changes of the late 1980s and early 1990s. Change and competition were forced by the dramatic political transitions, the sudden impact of globalization, a steep decline in resources, and the need to increase access and engage in the market, including multinationally.

In spite of the misery of the initial years of reform, many important changes have been introduced. The promotion system is much more competitive, although it is still subject to pressures and personal liabilities. International mobility has increased many times over. However, teaching loads have grown dramatically, and the need to publish (or perish) has increased, particularly for young faculty members. There is little performance-related remuneration and salaries are often shamefully low, leading young scholars to search for links outside the institution. Career paths are now highly unpredictable and have decreased weakened? loyalty to the HEI and to higher education as a whole. Private education and the private sector in general have become attractive alternatives to the State-supported HEIs.

Do State HEIs possess the willingness and capacity to do change their mentality, their governance and administration, and their internal systems in order to continue to attract academics in the future? The Bologna Process and the development of the Common European Space are forcing this change. The prime actor for change in the new system is the group of young Ph.D.s who are well traveled and who speak languages. This group can force change, but it is up to us, the senior academics, to push these changes through the system. I believe there is hope for change and renewal in the system.

On Specialization versus Comprehensiveness

There is a trend in the Netherlands to merge professional and academic educational institutions. The institutions hope in this way to direct students to relevant programs and careers on the one hand, and on the other hand, to create more opportunities for new programs demanded by industry and society. These mergers are opposed by academics who do not want to be identified with colleagues without research training.

—Hans de Wit, The Netherlands

Shirley Chater: *Current Trends and Issues for the Future*

I will share some experiences from my career at the University of California, contrasting the two cultures of UC Berkeley and UC San Francisco. I also recommend a book edited by Madeleine Green of the American Council on Education, “Transforming Higher Education: Views from Leaders Around the World,” which compares and contrasts systems. Finally, I will call upon my experience as a recruiter of college and university presidents, which has given me insight into higher education trends.

Although my comments are global in nature, everything has a cultural framework, not only internationally, but also institutionally. The University of California at Berkeley and San Francisco were ivory towers that maintained their culture and traditions behind walls. Change was effected by taking away one little brick at a time. I also was president of a very different institution, Texas Women’s University, the only public university for women in the USA, which has a radically different culture that allowed us to take out whole walls at a time. I will talk about three issues:

1. Drivers of change. People are now looking for education in many ways. The USA has a wonderful program called “Elder Hostel” for people over 55 years who want to learn more by attending courses at college campuses. Everyone today is looking for access to education. “Access” is a better word than “massification,” which sounds like it does not include accountability or attention to quality. Access includes admissibility as well as cost affordability.

Another driver is funding, which is down from both public and private sources. Many public institutions now receive only about 20-25 percent of their funding from the state. A third driver is the need for social and economic development. HEIs must act in very practical ways that address social problems because taxpayers and citizens demand engagement in society in exchange for tax support. A fourth driver is accountability, which is similar to taxpayers’ wanting to know what their money produces.

A fifth is autonomy and the tension between it and accountability. For example, as state funding is cut, teaching and other units are required to go autonomously into the community to build partnerships and attract funding. These links help build change. A sixth driver is technology, which now drives HEIs rather than their driving technology. The seventh driver is internationalization or globalization. I do not mean exchange programs, but rather the internationalization of knowledge as reflected in curricula and lesson plans. If we do not teach that knowledge is international, we are not teaching our students well. Particularly the USA “is remarkably isolated and parochial when it comes to international curriculum,” as Madeleine Green states in her book.

2. “Massification” or “access” and what it means as we look at the drivers

We need to ask who our students are if we want to increase access. What special things do we need to do to accommodate the new clients? At Texas Women’s University, for example, we found that many Hispanic women expect to get married. Their mothers had not gone to college, why should they? We developed a mother-daughter program that helped increase the enrollment of both mothers and daughters.

Distance learning also defines who our students are. Can they study from home? Is there a more convenient place than the campus for working or home-based students? Lifelong learning is also an aspect of massification.

Another important component of access is the emphasis on learning as opposed to teaching. When you can identify specific student groups as potential clients, you have to consider how they learn. It has long been known that women learn differently than men, for example. Knowing this forces us to change how we teach to reflect how different groups learn. The curriculum and what the faculty members teach should reflect the values of different ethnic groups if these are clients of the institution.

Partnership with community-based organizations and businesses is another critical component of access. HEIs can no longer educate alone, if only because of funding constraints. A final aspect of improved access is the globalization of higher education, which means that faculty members must develop a broader view of content.

3. The changing aspect of leadership. People hesitate to talk about leadership, which is considered a “soft” topic that is not sufficiently academic. However, there are more than 900 leadership programs in the USA today. There is a shift in administrative style from command and control to democracy and team-building, and a recognition that constituencies require more attention. Leadership is becoming more facilitative and consultative. We know that increased autonomy, the decentralization of departments and the rise of satellite organizations change the role of leadership, and that the new style of leadership lends itself better to these new HEIs.

Finally, we need always to keep in mind that emulating best practice does not allow us to explore new practices. I would suggest that we look at the drivers of change as not as obstacles, but rather as opportunities to move forward and embrace the new.

Panel 2: Career Trajectories—The Academic Profession between the Civil Service and the Market

Panelists: *Peter Magrath and Hans de Wit*

Moderator: *Dan Matuszewski*

We have seen that the walls of the university are increasingly porous, and the worlds of government and social concerns are interacting with higher education in unprecedented ways that represent both challenges and opportunities. This pattern of change has become a permanent aspect of life, driven by the revolution in information technology worldwide and by profound shifts in the political landscape of Europe and the NIS. Macro-changes trickle down to the micro-level slowly. One effect is on the redefinition of academic tasks, which has led to the impossible expectation that young academics be “super people” who excel in teaching, research, service, multidisciplinary, and interaction with the outside world in unfamiliar ways. This panel will explore some of these perspectives.

Peter Magrath: *Career Paths in Universities*

I am going to start with more references to what it was like 30 years ago. Allow me to be a little personal. A few years ago I was a graduate doctoral student in political science at Cornell University. I wanted to earn a Ph.D. and get an academic tenure track position at a research university, write many books, rise up the professorial ranks to be a distinguished professor, and hold a chair at a major research university. I did start on that path, wrote some books and articles and quickly got tenure at Brown University. However, it soon became clear to me that I wanted to become engaged in issues involving the entire university, not just my field. In some way I cannot explain, I gave off signals that led to committee and other assignments, and then I became a part-time graduate dean. Within four or five years, I began to get offers for full-time academic administrative positions.

My experience is in the context of the North American system, where there is considerable mobility among both professors and academic administrators. I would guess that US academics by an overwhelming margin stay in the professorial ranks. Perhaps only 10 percent move into fulltime academic administrative positions and into positions as dean and then provost, which is the usual stepping-stone to the role of president, chancellor or rector.

It is difficult once you commit yourself to fulltime administration to maintain your academic credentials and activity in your field. What is the “impure” academic path in today’s world, i.e., for those who move into administration? The major currency for advancement is still that one be a research scholar. Teaching is valued, as is service, but sometimes more rhetorically than in reality.

US and North American academics are fortunate in that they are well paid relative to those in many other countries. Tenure, although coming under serious review, remains important in the most prestigious institutions. It has been pointed out that a tenure-track appointment is a lifetime commitment to an expenditure of about \$1.5 million. Part-time adjunct and non-tenure faculty can be hired much more cheaply, often without health or other benefits.

Many of us here have been fortunate to become fulltime academic administrators and to seek to be a university president or rector. Most North American presidents have strong academic credentials and have established themselves as professors before “crossing the barrier” into administration. Academic administration is a worthy career path, but being a brilliant professor has little, if anything, to do with the skills of a president, which include human, political and financial skills, and administrative ability. People must also be motivated by a fundamental belief about the importance of education to society.

I do not think you can train people how to become a leader. You can teach people skills, but I do not believe that you can train people in the basic qualities of leadership. How does the system work in North America? You have to start by sitting in a lot of boring meetings. You need to be present and show interest and problem-solving ability. I also do not believe you can be an effective leader unless you are willing to speak out on issues and take a position—always tactfully and politely, but also clearly. One should always remember that the role of leadership is to serve the institution and its change agents, as well as society. A leader sees the big picture.

What does it take to be an effective academic leader?

- We need people who want the job, but not people who need it for ego or status.
- We need people who believe in the position and hold positions that benefit it.
- We need clear and strong leaders who are also flexible and able to change.
- We need leaders with a purpose—something they believe in.

What path should people like yourselves take? We need countless academics and professors who are involved in research, teaching and service. We equally need women and men who are willing to take on the difficult and often frustrating work of leadership.

Hans de Wit: *The Academic Profession in the Netherlands, Broader Issues, and Ten Items for Change*

Until the end of the 1960s, full professors, who had the power to elect deans and the rector, dominated universities in the Netherlands. Students and junior professors were not really important. In the late 60s, students and particularly assistant professors were able to institute a more democratic leadership system with involvement by inside and also outside stakeholders. By the end of the 1980s, it had become clear that the university was too inward looking and not responsive to societal demands.

Since then, the influence of students and professors on management has been reduced and the profession of academia has seen big changes. In-house stakeholders in a university council no longer run the institution and determine university policy, budgets and other aspects of life. There is now more autonomy and an outside board. A staff council and a student council each negotiate with the board on specific issues. This model is more entrepreneurial than democratic or collegial.

The data show that the number of professors of all categories has not really grown in the 1990s. The big change is that until 1987 the Crown appointed all professors (called “full professors” in the USA), but now they are competitively appointed by the institution.

Associate and assistant professors are appointed by the school or department, with a Ph.D. required for associate professor and a Ph.D. or ABD status (dissertation “all but done” and to be completed

soon) for assistant professor. There is more flexibility in determining the mix of teaching, research and administration, and the mix is negotiated by contract. The three ranks all maintain high prestige. Studies show that research is the most highly rewarded, but there is a lot of pressure to reward teaching on the one hand, and not to devalue research with regard to teaching on the other.

The career ladder between the three positions is based more on seniority than on merit. At lower levels there are research associates and also post-doctoral professors who come to a university for a specific period of time. There are also lecturers who are hired to teach in specific fields for a few years (teaching associates) and research trainees who can do research and sometimes teach while they finish their Ph.D.s. The government attempted to take away benefits from these teaching associates because it was too expensive, but students persuaded the government not to redefine these positions from teaching staff with benefits to students without benefits. The argument was that all the cost invested in them and the value to society would be wasted if the research trainees moved to industry to earn money and did not finish their degrees.

The broad picture in the Netherlands and across Europe:

1. Gender issues. In the Netherlands, women are largely absent in academic positions, comprising 5.4 percent of professors and 8.2 percent of associate professors. This participation rate is probably among the lowest in Europe and a reflection of Dutch women's relative inactivity in the labor force.
2. Aging of the faculty. In the Netherlands, 68 percent of full professors are older than 50, and the trend is the same down the ranks. With a mandatory retirement age of 65, a huge proportion will retire in 10 years. We are looking at ways to deal with this in the coming years.
3. The shift from a collegial to a managerial model. Deans and rectors in the Netherlands are no longer elected from among peers but are appointed based on academic and administrative credentials. They can come from outside the institution, and even from outside academia. We now have both a rector (usually to take care of academic interests) and a president, who is more the administrative head and often comes from outside the institution. Staffing is a significant problem because we need a huge pool of people who have both high-level academic and high-level administrative training.
4. A growing number of part-time and full professors have positions that are funded by corporations. There have always been endowed chairs in the Netherlands, but the growing trend of corporate funding has led to confrontations with people who say we should not accept chairs from industry because the chairs will have only a part-time allegiance to the university.
5. Change from civil service to contractual relationships. All university staff and faculty members used to be civil servants in the Netherlands, but now there are contractual relationships with the unions. The leadership of the university wants to abolish tenure, but the unions oppose shifting staff and academic positions away from lifetime tenure and toward contractual relationships.
6. Influence of internationalization and global competition. Competition among institutions means we increasingly need to hire people with international credentials. Recruitment and selection look favorably on English language fluency, teaching experience in English, publications in international journals and international experience. However, academic staff in the Netherlands are much less mobile nationally and internationally than in the UK or North America. Nonetheless, faculty members who can teach in the global market are increasingly in demand, as evidenced by the fact that more than half of our master's programs will be taught in English in the future.
7. We see continuous tension between autonomy and the demands of the market. Academics are asked to do more contract research for the private sector, but there is much debate about how

outside stakeholders influence the outcome of that work. Some studies show that the autonomy of the person and the university has been limited and the contractor has influenced the outcome.

8. Dichotomy between teaching and research. Academics are now increasingly selected and promoted by merit in either teaching or research, but there is a large contingent that argues that you cannot separate the two.
9. Senior administration of HEIs is very different in southern versus northern Europe. In southern Europe, administration is much more influenced by the academic side. Academics are contracted to take a senior administrative position for five to ten years, after which the person can continue or return to academia. In northern Europe there is a much clearer distinction between academic and administrative career paths. In the north we are trying to mix people a little to avoid an “us versus them” environment between academics and administrators.
10. Multidisciplinarity. Fields used to be highly specialized and narrow, which was reflected in teaching. Today, students constantly change what they want. Faculty members who are too specialized cannot meet student demands. HEIs are writing much broader contracts so they can force academics to teach outside of their narrow specialization, which creates a lot of unrest among faculty members.

Fireside Chat: Recruiting for Academic Leadership

Speaker: *Shirley Chater*

Moderator: *Robin Farquhar*

I know that in various countries people are recruited and selected for academic leadership positions in different ways. Nonetheless, I hope this information will be useful. There are always two parties involved in a leadership decision, the “me” and the “they.” What do I need to know about “me” to make a good impression? “They” can be the faculty senate (that elects the rector), the public, the dean’s council, or someone else. The purpose is to bring these two so close together that there is a good fit, whether the person is elected, selected or wins in a search process.

Introduction: There was a gentleman who applied to be vice chancellor for academic affairs at a place that he thought would be perfect for him. His résumé looked wonderful, as did he. He was invited to a long schedule of meetings, including a panel interview. A panelist asked him to share something that was not on his résumé. He said he loved dogs so much that he liked to bring his dog to the university and have him sit under the desk every day. After a few days he received a telephone call saying that someone else had been selected. I was involved in the search and I tried to find out why one person was selected and not someone else. In confidential conversation, people finally said that having someone come to work every day with his dog would just not fit such a prestigious institution.

The résumé or curriculum vitae (CV): You only have one time to make a first impression, and that first impression is usually a résumé. I have read thousands of résumés, and they are, as a rule, dreadful. First, there should be information on the first page about how to find you—where you work, your email, etc. The reader is almost looking for reasons to discard a résumé, and one reason to put you in the “maybe” or “reject” pile is if your basic information is not there. Another problem is the use of acronyms that mean nothing to the reader—don’t use them. Be mindful of writing down the names of organizations so that the reader knows what they mean.

Also, one résumé does not work any more. Higher education institutions require long academic CVs that contain everything. Résumés must often be re-tailored to each position. A research institution wants to know about your research, so put that up front; applying to a teaching institution means you put teaching up front. You need to fit your résumé to the institution to create a match.

I discourage listing people’s names as references on your CV because it does not give you a chance to contact the reference, explain what the job is and why you want it. I recommend stating that

references are available on request, which means the institution has to call you and gives you more control.

The interview: As a rule, people talk too much. Answer a question, end the sentence and smile, and do not chat on and on. People find this a hard subject to discuss, but the interview is your second opportunity to present yourself. How you look and act is extremely important. If you are going to be a dean or president, you need to look and act like one in subtle as well as overt ways. If it is a conservative place, dress conservatively. Your body language and all the secret clues about who you are shine through.

Homework: Do it. Find out about the institution, the search committee, its composition, the institution's wants and needs for the position, and anything else you can. The institution also needs to know clearly what kind of person it wishes to hire and why. More and more, institutions describe the kind of person they are seeking. Use descriptors that match what the institution wants. We all know what a department chair does, so listing it on your CV is not really informative. Describe what you did in the position—raise money, reform the curriculum, or whatever.

Negotiations: The only time to negotiate is before you take the position. Also, even though many of you work in civil services situations, there is always something to negotiate—if not salary, then benefits, time in grade, or starting a few weeks earlier or a few weeks later, for example.

Recruitment Stories from the Audience

We recently underwent a search for a dean. It was a national search that ended with three candidates. One withdrew, and the first person was interviewed. After the interview, the leadership announced that the search would be ended and renewed as an internal search only. An internal candidate who sat on the selection committee then submitted his/her credentials for the position and was immediately selected. Many of us thought it was highly unethical to know all the inside stories and be allowed to apply.

I once applied for a job as associate provost at a major university. I was pregnant, due at the end of August, and the institution had said it hoped to fill the position in November. I naturally did not indicate that I was pregnant, since it would not impact my ability to report to work as scheduled. I interviewed when I was 8½ months pregnant, and people were stunned. No one said anything, except that the campus was quite hilly and people kept asking me if I was OK, and I kept saying I was fine. Of course, I did not get the job.

I was finishing my dissertation and going on the job market in a few months. I attended a conference and was speaking with a woman whom I did not know well, but whom I knew was a faculty member in a field in which I would shortly be looking for a job. I wanted to make conversation and thought she was pregnant, so I asked her when she was due. She pretended to mishear my question and answered on another topic, so I compounded my mistake by repeating the question. She was, of course, not pregnant, and I had to spend the next three hours at dinner with her and her colleagues. Needless to say, I did not apply for the position in her department when it was advertised about a year later.

Panel 3: The Gender Gap

Panelist: *David Ward*

Commentators: *Laura Grünberg, Gail Stevenson and Barbara Weitgruber*

Moderator: *Peter Rose*

While women may not be a statistical minority, they fit the definition of a minority group as singled out for differential and often discriminatory treatment. This description is the essence of what is known as the gender gap. Gender in the academy is a topic that would not have been on the agenda a few decades ago. There was little concern about the plight of women in the academy nor attention to gender studies as an academic discipline. Women have begun to gain parity in many areas of the professoriate in the last few decades, and the glass ceiling has started to crack. Indeed, three of the eight “Ivy League” schools in the USA have women presidents today. These gains owe much to other minority struggles for affirmative action, anti-discrimination laws and “consciousness-raising” among

men. The panel will begin with an introduction on the broad issues, followed by perspectives from three commentators.

David Ward: *The Gender Gap*

The American Council on Education, of which I am now president, has among its functions the promotion of underrepresented groups, including women. One of our roles is to scale up good practice and create a national agenda for leadership development, to bring people together, to give women opportunities to connect and apprentice with leaders, and to be the primary source of data and information diffusion on federal programs, legislation and litigation.

My own experience as a departmental administrator was that debates about the under-representation of women on campus tended to veer into opaque and defensive discussions about political correctness. When I moved to the chancellor's office, I saw that this dialogue obscured the fact that the university was paying several million dollars a year in legal fees because it was breaking the law. Political correctness was masking the need for correctness before the law. The shift to legal correctness as a framework was the beginning of an institutional cultural shift. The Higher Education Reauthorization Act of 1972 gave women a framework for contesting unfair judgments and created a legal basis for dialogue. When departments began to be charged hundreds of thousands of dollars for their legal mistakes in hiring and promotion decisions, departmental cultures began to change.

We can look to the future of equity for men and women in the USA with cautious optimism. There has been considerable progress in the advancement of women in higher education since the passage of Title IX of the Higher Education Act. The majority of undergraduates are now women. Increased educational opportunity provides a larger pool of candidates for academic positions. Women now hold 33 percent of tenure-track positions, although they are still clustered in the junior ranks. Only 14 percent of full professors are women. Distribution is also uneven across fields—while education employs about 62 percent of women faculty, engineering employs only 8 percent. Breakthroughs are just beginning to occur in the sciences.

The situation among professional, administrative and executive staff demonstrates similar characteristics. Although women hold about half of these positions across all types of institutions—public and private, two- and four-year—most women are at the middle management level. There is often female dominance in administration, but no female leadership. About 20 percent of college and university presidents are women, although these are overwhelmingly clustered at community, women's and small liberal arts colleges. The sudden gains in female leadership of elite institutions over the last 18 months may reflect an abrupt change or may be a statistical blip.

Recruitment. The new developments are partly the result of two important changes in how boards of trustees and search committees view recruitment. The first is the need for a conscious and strategic plan to address the gender gap. The institution should not make a commitment to hire a woman for a specific position and treat each recruitment opportunity in isolation. Rather, the institution should commit to hiring x new women over the next y years and implement the plan sequentially and consistently. The second realization is that excellence is not ordinal, but discrete. Search committees have become more analytical in accepting that there is a band of excellence—a combination of skills or variables that each person would bring to the position—rather than a rank order. In a sense, recognizing the discrete nature of excellence and the seriality of decision-making is merely pointing out to recruiters that they should use the same scientific tools for recruitment that the institutions apply to their analyses of the outside world.

Retention. The second issue is what institutions can do to enhance the climate on campus once a person has been recruited. The first requirement of best practice for recruitment and retention is information. Nothing will happen without data in the hands of the leadership. The entire administrative team must also be aware of the need for progress and it must be an issue that is deliberate and visible. Another breakthrough is the need for mentors. There are two traditional ways of mentoring students as well as non-tenured faculty members in the USA—the Darwinian (“sink or

swim”) and the paternalistic. A middle path with accessible mentoring, preferably by someone outside the department—is probably the best.

Compensation parity is a big issue and includes not only salary, but the total research package. As chancellor, I found a small gender differential in salary and a huge differential in the total package. No one knew why, but it turned out that the men asked for better research packages than the women. When we looked deeper, we found that there were also differences among the men for the same reason. Obviously, people should be treated the same and the process rationalized. We used elaborate multiple regression analyses to track compensation gains and discover discrepancies over time. We were able to track inequities and make adjustments based on merit, and also to demonstrate that there were no inequities in other cases. The outcome and the solutions were complicated, but we defined gender policy through information and convinced faculty members the gender gap could be handled in a scientific way.

Another issue is the level and kind of infrastructure that is necessary for women’s advancement. One issue is child care, which the private sector is often better at providing than academia. Another is spousal hiring. As most people come with partners or spouses, it is necessary to address this issue frontally. Indeed, we were often able to provide grateful local employers with high-level people when we were not able to place qualified spouses in the university.

Progress over the past 15 years has been and will be defined by cascading sets of efforts to address the issues. Although the outcomes are incomplete, the change in gender distribution of students and faculty since 1970 has been almost, but not quite, transformational.

A New Gender Gap

In the United States, another gender gap is forming. Although we see a gap in favor of men in general in US society, at least one exists in favor of women. Women of color are outperforming men of color in the educational systems, both as students and as faculty and administrators. Moreover, this gap is widening each year. —Jerlando Jackson, USA

Gail Stevenson: *A Personal View*

I would like to start by stating that gender studies is not my field and I do not know the literature well. However, I do have some personal thoughts based upon a lot of cross-cultural experience in academia.

All of us are aware that gender issues in academic are rooted in the broader culture and hard to translate across cultures. They are probably equally hard to translate across generations. Indeed, many younger people in this room may already have experiences and perspectives different from mine.

Nonetheless and as had already been mentioned, data on the glass ceiling above which most women academics in the US do not rise are striking. Statistics from the late 1990s on the composition of the academic workforce by gender and ethnic group show that women constitute about 30-40 percent of the academic workforce, except for black women, who are about half of the black academic workforce. As one moves up the ranks from instructor to professor to full professor, the percentage of women across all ethnic groups drops steadily until only 20-25 percent of full professors are women, again except for black women, who do somewhat better relative to their male colleagues. The data surely hide many nuances, including differences by age, but the broad pattern is clear. Perhaps my own experience can shed some light on the obvious as well as subtle factors that impact women’s academic careers.

I am one of the people already discussed in this symposium—with academic credentials but who has not followed the traditional academic career path. I have been an administrator for the past ten years, partly as a matter of personal preference. I enjoy administration and have both been conscious of this in choosing places to work and fields of specialization, and also fortunate to be in environments where

I have been able to build on my skills. However, I am also a single mother of a child with a broad range of special needs that entail her having her own teacher at school and individual supervision constantly when not at school or at home. The traditional academic career triad of teaching, research and service is hard to balance with an administrative position, and almost impossible to balance with special parenting requirements. It is not strictly necessary in administration to keep up skills and build a résumé in each of these areas, but not doing so probably restricts institutional mobility and narrows one's career path for the future.

My situation is generalizable to many women, and also to some men with the responsibility for children. Also, women in the US increasingly have children very late—in their late 30s and even early 40s—at the time when tenure and promotion pressures often are greatest. Finally, many people of my generation have the double responsibility of children and the care of aging parents.

Care of the elderly is a huge issue also in CEE and the NIS, where the pension system is catastrophically under-funded and support for the elderly is often inadequate. Many people—particularly the very old—cannot survive without the help of their children. Most people in this room face or will face this issue some day and the primary burden often, but not always, falls on the woman.

Although the picture in academia is not all bleak, much remains to be done. What should the institutional response to the multiple pressures of work and outside responsibilities be? Academia and our own attitudes need to be humanized to include and legitimize priorities outside of work, but how? I consider myself fortunate to work in academia rather than the private sector because I have tremendous flexibility. However, this flexibility is a matter of institutional culture rather than a matter of right or law. The academy's ability and willingness to include people not only with excellent knowledge and skills, but also with a range of outside responsibilities and priorities, is a cherished value that must be maintained and enhanced.

It has been mentioned that affirmative action programs toward closing the gender gap at universities appear to have helped female minorities more than male minorities. We have experienced a similar phenomenon in Eastern Europe with the Roma population. Affirmative action may work in contradictory ways across the genders because of the strong male role models in minority groups. Roma men are taught from early childhood that they are the defenders of family and kinship and that the role of “fighter” for these values is highly rewarded by society. Unfortunately, the strong socialization may prevent males from adapting to new roles. Female minority group members are freer to embrace new models and, perhaps as a result, can be more adaptable to new challenges. —Janos Levendovszky, Hungary

Laura Grünberg: *The View from Eastern Europe*

In preparing this presentation, I thought about whether gender has influenced my career and I must say that it has, although in complex interaction with age, ideology and the politics of the times in Romania. Both my parents were philosophers, but I chose mathematics because I thought I could be uninvolved in the academic politics of the Ceaucescu years. The majority of mathematics students were women, but the professors and the best students were men. Most of these women are now high school teachers, and many of the men have emigrated to North America.

In spite of many gains, data from all over the world show stratification by gender and inequities and inequalities in rank, power, salary and prestige. A great deal of research points out subtle patterns and micro-inequities behind the data. For example, although women in CEE transition countries are entering universities in larger numbers, the trend is partly a reflection of the declining prestige and salaries of academia and the increased opportunities for men outside of academia.

My experience of the last several years has been contradictory. On the one hand, I am a part of the women's movement in Romania and internationally and have spent a lot of time discussing gender issues with other women. On the other hand, I represent UNESCO, an organization that deals with a broad range of international and higher education bodies and issues in fora where gender is never on

the agenda. The Salzburg Seminar deserves praise for making space for the topic in a symposium on higher education. Nonetheless, the gender gap in higher education cannot be analyzed in isolation. It evolved over many years in complicated ways and is only one piece of a pattern of overt and subtle interactions that begin in childhood.

The school system not only reflects, but also actively constructs, gender reality. A study of school textbooks from Romania showed a homogenous, monolithic treatment of gender with no room for real-life diversity. Men are over-represented in public life and the world of work, and women in private life. Gender segregation prevails over gender collaboration in the textbooks. Schools promote the internalizing of gender roles and do not prepare students well for the realities and subtleties of life.

The whole way gender is described and taught has to be rethought if gender patterns are not to be continually reinforced. I would like to comment on a UNESCO project I have been involved in. The institutionalization of gender studies in CEE is the best example of good practice in promoting gender equity in higher education found by the study. Although many new gender experts are now being trained, the study found a lack of variety in this good practice. In CEE, we need to pay more attention to how gender experts are trained, and to make better use of them. Is there really a market for all these gender experts in our region? At the moment there are few roles for this expertise that CEE is now rapidly creating so that these people can make a difference.

Even though male and female participation rates in Yugoslav higher education are balanced (albeit with strong concentrations in institutions and careers that are still typically male or female), the introduction of religious classes in primary and secondary schools may lead in the wrong direction. Classes focus not on religion as an academic subject, but rather on religious training, which will not only affect the gender gap in higher education and society at large, but also the attitude toward ethnic and religious minorities. School reforms will serve to reinforce gender and ethnic stereotypes rather than alleviate them. —Martina Vukasovic, Yugoslavia

Barbara Weitgruber: *European Union (EU) Initiatives on Women and Science*

A 1999 EU report describes the current situation of female scientists in universities, research institutes and academies. There has been a continuous drop in the numbers of women at each level of the academic ladder through the so-called “leaky pipeline.” Although half of graduates are women, they hold fewer than 10 percent of the top positions in the scientific system.

The so-called “Helsinki group of administrators” from EU member country ministries of education was set up to elaborate on these issues. The aim is 40 percent participation of women at all levels in implementing and managing research programs, e.g., in expert advisory groups and expert evaluation and monitoring panels. Key problems include:

- The pay gap between male and female scientists
- The design of fellowships, which are implicitly, if not explicitly, best suited to single, child-free individuals
- The difficulty of returning to science after a career break
- The operation of the peer review system, which can be detrimental to women, as well as to good science
- The spin off from male-dominated science, which is far-reaching and self-perpetuating, feeding back into the media, images, education and pedagogy.

Different awareness-raising measures are being taken, starting with making young schoolgirls aware of the possibilities of a career in science. The main tasks are to develop indicators on the situation of women in research so as to monitor and benchmark evolution and—hopefully—progress, to design gender-neutral concepts of excellence and merit, to produce evidence-based analysis, and to develop new perspectives in the research agenda across the EU. It is crucial to involve women in setting the agenda at both the European and national levels.

The situation in Austria. In Austria, while 57 percent of first year students and 50 percent of graduates are women, 31.4 percent of assistants and only 7 percent of professors are women. Gender mainstreaming was adopted in 2000. The new university law granting universities full autonomy does restrict this autonomy in requiring adherence to the Federal Government Equal Opportunities Act, which mandates that “all university bodies shall make efforts to achieve a balanced representation of men and women at work in all areas of university activities. Appropriate action shall be taken to attain this goal, particularly by means of the adoption and implementation of a female advancement plan.” The legal framework protects women, but the more sophisticated men find ways around these goals. Furthermore, the new laws have had the perverse effect that a woman may now have to battle the perception that she was hired because she was a woman, not because she was the best candidate.

Panel 4: Institutional Responses to Changing Academic Career Patterns

Panelists: *John Davies and Pero Lucin*

Moderator: *Jochen Fried*

This panel is a wrap-up of earlier discussions in plenary as well as in the working groups. We have reviewed individual, institutional and systemic-level problems, as well as the market forces that affect academic careers, and changes over time. This panel will take a more strategic approach to changing academic careers and focus on the institution as the most appropriate unit of analysis. On the one hand, we all have strategies for our own careers; on the other, we are not always in a position to influence change in the system as a whole, but we can perhaps effect more far-sighted change within our institutions.

John Davies: *Challenges and Opportunities*

Let us begin by reiterating the factors underlying the changes in academic career patterns. Personnel implications of massification derive from the renewed focus on teaching and learning as an enhanced institutional objective, multiple traditional and non-traditional student populations, the push for quality assurance and accountability, and alternative pedagogies that emphasize a culture led by learning rather than teaching. Entrepreneurial near-market activities have implications for the balance between community responsibility and academic integrity, the risks of income generation versus the need to fund professional development, the specialization of roles on- and off-campus, attendant risks and rewards, and academic credibility in applied domains. These are tied closely to professional development issues, attitudes and behaviors within the academy, and whether mechanisms exist to reward entrepreneurial behavior. The outcome is a mixed academic/professional workforce, negotiations with the enterprise about control of the curriculum and research agendas, and a market that values not only discipline specialization, but also multidisciplinary competence and transferable problem-solving skills.

These tendencies are intimately connected with redefining the knowledge-based industry concept. One mode might be traditional discipline-based research defined by academics. A second mode would be multidisciplinary problem-based research largely determined by the user. There are alternative sources of knowledge and research outside the university, which may attract academics. Of course, globalization, e-learning and the revolutionary growth in new providers all create opportunities for academics outside the traditional university's walls.

All these factors lead to the perception that previously clear distinctions between teaching and research, the academy and the workplace, among the disciplines, about the length of the academic year, and among staff categories and the possibility of mobility across them, have all become blurred. The question is whether the university is flexible enough to overcome the rigidities of culture, convention and regulation.

The strategic challenge. If the strategic challenge is to be met, what are its main orientations? A successful response is conditional upon staff adaptability. First, the institution must have the autonomy and self-determination to develop a strategy. It must have the legal power to enact change, whether in itself or through national steering bodies, and the political will and shared governance to

do so. Where is the locus of individual bargaining for career development—at the level of the department or Faculty, or with management? Is the locus of collective bargaining at the university or national levels? All of this implies an element of the corporatist approach, but in a collegial setting. We may have reservations about the corporate approach, but it does imply a certain style of policy formation, clear agenda setting, demonstrating the benefits of change to skeptical colleagues, creating incentives, and the necessity of providing help, advice and resources rather than rhetorical encouragement. The process must be iterative and evolving within a broad framework of directions. It also implies an inherent tension between employer-led change that must elicit the consent of the community and bottom-up reforms. Flexibility and the room to maneuver must be paramount. The institution must have a mission, a vision and an explicit commitment to them. There are many situational variables and possible approaches.

Key elements in an institutional strategy:

1. Recognition of the major challenges at various levels, of the peculiar cultures of academic “tribes” and conventions of career development, the need to sustain individual creativity for as long as possible and sustain high performance in different career phases, and equal opportunities.
2. Balance between retention and turnover, and the need to manage it.
3. Contracts and the need to have them accurately define expectations of people’s roles. We are becoming more sophisticated about the roles of academics in the knowledge industry. There is flexibility in terms of the expectations of scholarship. People may be good at different skills at different points in their career, and rewards should reflect this. It is even possible to deconstruct the academic role in the context of mass undergraduate education whereby some people will design courses, some produce, others deliver, counsel and assess, for example. In the future, contracts will include elements such as obligatory training at various stages. They will also be more flexible and include variations in duration, higher rewards for higher risks, conditions of employment like requirements to work overseas, and even definitions of the academic year.
4. Incentives and reward systems will need to be well articulated. They will presume that advancement will be based less on rank and years of service than on performance, which assumes that performance can be assessed. Criteria would need to differentiate among teaching, research and other functions, which would be of equal significance. If the university is to have multiple objectives, it must consider multiple career paths and multiple performance criteria. Of course, to do this the institution must have the means to reward staff and create incentives for different career paths. US universities often have 9-month contracts, for example, which imply that people are expected to generate outside income the remainder of the year. Contracts may include a share of intellectual property income or market supplements, or broad-band pay scales.

Reward systems are sensitive because many institutions do not appraise in any formal sense. Serious career development would imply a formal system that defines the nature of the appraiser and the rigor and admissibility of the evidence. For example, are peer or student evaluations adequate? How should individuals be rewarded in the context of group dynamics and solidarity? How should the poor performer’s career be managed? Today we usually avoid the problem by ignoring the poor performer or putting the person in an out-of-the-way corner.

5. The centrality of staff development. The University of Bath in the UK, for example, speaks of a “high caliber well-motivated faculty operating at the highest professional standards” in its mission statement. The identification of institutional priorities for staff development is related to the institution’s overall priorities and the identification of individual priorities through appraisal, counseling, and the mentoring role of the head of the department. Staff development requires the reconciliation of two foci—one system-led and the other institution-led—through sequencing, prioritization, and not least, budgetary resources to implement staff development programs.

Staff development will be defined by the individual units responsible for the function, the accreditation movement as the legitimization of certain steps, and the existence of mechanisms for peer support and to promote mobility and joint appointments. Of course, it will also be defined by the impact of career development programs. There is an interesting Canadian study demonstrating that staff development programs have greatly enhanced interdisciplinary endeavors, for example.

6. Part-time or fractional staff is a growing percentage of the academic labor force in many countries. Staff development for part-time staff will require clear policies that define working conditions, accreditation, quality assurance, mentoring, salaries, exit clauses, and all the other mutual obligations and entitlements of full-time staff.

Many recent studies predict that the university of the future may have a small core of full-time senior academics and managers surrounded by a large periphery of part-time staff, and will gather problem-solving teams for ad hoc purposes. To be effective, this new institution will require continuity in management and robust processes.

In sum, there are many issues and few concrete answers. Institutional responses to changing career patterns will need to be complex and multi-faceted, and conditional on what is systemically and legally possible. However, it should be noted that institutions in many countries have acted in spite of the ministry and other outside constraints. Responses will place demands on the collective bargaining process and the institution's culture and traditions. Additional income generation as a lubricant for career development strategies (travel funds, reward mechanisms, research resources, etc.) will become increasingly significant. These strategies will need managing at the university level through policies and resources, and at the Faculty or department level through the management of individual performance and interactions. Managers will need to be good at managing personnel, which many department leaders today regard as outside their purview. Finally, all strategies have limits and can only work with demonstrated need and ownership of them.

The University and Civil Society

It is dangerous for universities in CEE, where disrespect for the law has a long tradition, to signal the rest of society that respecting the law is not important. However, circumventing the law is on occasion the only way for universities to address important challenges. To cite one example of many, constitutional provisions in some CEE countries mandate free education at all levels, which is not possible in an environment of declining State funding if other State policies like increased access are also to be achieved. Universities find ways to charge fees and accept more students, which answers a real societal need but eludes the law.

What can be done? In the early 1990s, there were no laws in CEE to regulate the structured core of civil society. Nonetheless, foundations and associations were established in the legal void. They soon realized they could not operate in a void and "forced" the State to adopt laws regulating their own activities. Most of these have been good laws that have benefited society. Universities might well adopt a similar approach of responsible but critical respect for the law. If laws are not good, work to change them rather than ignoring them. It would be a shame if universities became the Enrons of CEE. —Liviu Matei, Hungary/Romania

Pero Lucin: *Processes and Institutional Responses*

In a small country like Croatia and in general in CEE, the university is expected to engage not only in teaching, research and social participation, but also in economic development. Human resource development and an orientation toward the knowledge-based economy compensate somewhat for a rigid economy and lack of financial power.

We are still a politically driven society that does not support the university in these new goals. Salaries are low and not attractive to young people, research facilities are inadequate, decision-making policies are inefficient and slow, and long-term negative selection among faculty members leads to a professoriate strongly resistant to change. Although universities try to keep their monopoly on

knowledge transfer, new institutions want to share the market, which has forced the adoption of some market-based principles in undergraduate education.

New institutions are able to provide education more cheaply than traditional universities, do not have the burden of research, and have a more managerial structure. Traditional universities are fragmented into Faculties or schools that are separate legal entities that negotiate independently with the government. There is little strategic planning culture, and the State is intimately involved in appointments and personnel. Most employees are public servants appointed by governments. Rectors, vice rectors and deans are elected for short-term appointments of two or three years, which hinders long-term development thinking. There is little hope that the present inadequate financial strategies will change.

What have we done in the University of Rijeka to move forward in such an environment?

1. Create a policy framework that will facilitate change. The first framework already exists, i.e., the Bologna process, which creates a clear program of change for our institution. Curricular reform is based on the principle of harmonization with European standards, which is extremely important because it prevents conflicts among different interest groups.
2. Government policy is a significant force for change in CEE, although government control will soon be combined with the market model. Universities should be more autonomous in all university functions, and the function of government should be to set broad control mechanisms based upon outcomes.
3. Address fragmentation of the university into number of units spread across the city and region, which leads to a lack of dialogue among these groups. We have made significant efforts to enhance this dialogue. We intend to build a campus-type strategy that unites all these units physically and institutionally.
4. Create a culture of strategic planning and a project culture. These mechanisms are not well developed, but we are trying to create a long-term strategy on the basis of dialogue with all members of the university, not only faculty members and staff.
5. Develop quality control and a culture of quality. The institution does not use most attempts at quality control, so we decided to establish a separate unit based on US and Australian models to survey and develop a strategy.
6. Governance and decision-making are major obstacles to change. We have discussed the differences between the collegial and managerial models, but what we have is a mixture of the two. The Senate is composed of deans of faculties, vice rectors and rectors. Faculty members are dispersed into groups that have different lifestyles and interests, i.e., the humanities and social sciences are always in conflict with the hard sciences. If we want to develop standards, we need dialogue.
7. We need to abolish the civil service model of appointments and hire our own staff.
8. Increase investment. All these tremendous changes require strong financial support for incentives, not only salaries. It should be government policy to improve teaching and research standards for all units by creating a system of incentives. We created a program of capital investment in teaching and research equipment that we presented to the government. In the first investment cycle we received a credit of 17 million euros from the government to improve working and research standards at the university. The second cycle will be used to build up the campus in Rijeka.
9. Public attitudes and public support are important for success. University work should be viewed as important to society. Our activities are open to public and to the media, which are strong. One

idea arising out of last year's Universities Project that has been implemented is a media and fundraising campaign. It has culminated in a university foundation that has collected money for computers and other improvements.

10. We need to attract young people and end brain drain. We have developed a credit system for teachers to buy flats at low interest rates, to build housing for employees and to attract talented young people from other regions. One major activity at the new campus will be the growth of spin-off companies that will lead to economic development.
11. Develop leadership and programs for faculty members. We are preparing a program for leadership development and are now looking at an extensive development program for faculty members and staff working in the university hospital. This program of several months of training every second year, preferably at institutions in neighboring countries, is being developed in conjunction with the hospital and will aid in reform of the health system overall.
12. Collaborate within the institution, with institutions in Croatia, and particularly with HEIs in neighboring countries. A fragmented institution like ours suffers from the lack of a scientific profile. Scientific activities are fragmented into narrow research priorities without enough leaders for research teams. We are trying to build collaborative and multidisciplinary research programs similar to the German SFB ("Sonderforschungsbereich") programs. The government has accepted the model and we believe it will start next year. We are also very interested in regional support programs with other European institutions.

The best young academics increasingly manage their own careers in spite of what institutions do or do not do. The challenge of the future may be to give young people policy space to do this, which will be a particular challenge for institutions with strong personnel policies. The key would be to start the institutional evaluation with a self-evaluation that includes career directions. Of course, this implies that the institution has professional development policies that embrace career diversity. —Robin Farquhar, Canada

Plenary: Working Group Presentations

Presenters: *Tony Claudino, Alexander Kovzik, Liviu Matei, Justine Shepard and Martina Vukasovic*

Moderator: *Robin Farquhar*

Four working groups gave Fellows a chance to delve deeper into issues of their choice, including the heightened tensions and new demands of the academic workplace, the internationalization of academia and the new nomadic scholar, making diversity work, and European trends in academia and the implications of the Bologna process.

Group 1. Recommendations on the Academic Workplace: New Demands, Heightened Tensions

- Gender balance. A selection committee should be tasked with analyzing and discussing the topic, cultivating awareness and taking appropriate action to increase the participation rates of women as students, across Faculties, and with the ranks of each Faculty or department.
- Inter-institutional cooperation. Foreign degrees should be recognized. Joint academic and research programs and joint degrees should be promoted.
- Quality. Implement a system of regular performance evaluation using inputs from students, peers, administrators, external sources and others, as well as an incentive system for meeting these criteria.
- Planning. A long-term planning program built on a senior leadership's strategy and vision and incorporating faculty members' inputs should be developed and a training program for managers instituted.

Brain Drain and Mentoring

Mentoring across institutions and countries is usually the result of personal relationships built up informally. Most universities have many international relationships, but they are *ad hoc* and seldom strategic. Neither the sending nor the hosting side values post-program mentoring enough to manage it. We may need a third-party broker organization to provide a soft management function. A broker agency could help returning scholars benefit from their experiences and contribute to their own societies rather than leave the country again because they can find no role that uses their international training and skills. —David Ward, USA

Group 2. Nomadic Scholars and the Internationalization of the Academic Labor Market?

Measures to hinder brain drain should include:

- Joint appointments such as the Central European University’s program to attract top quality academics from the region on a temporary basis
- Career advising and mentoring
- International education with opportunities for local employment
- Improved data collection on migration flows and on the networks of students, alumni and faculty members who have participated in mobility programs
- Strategic planning around international mobility at all levels
- Recruitment for academic teaching positions
- Local policies to support academic labor in returning to the home country and institution

Group 3. Making Diversity Work

Diversity is about recognizing and respecting human difference. This principle is a basic human right and core value for each institution. Every university has the obligation to be a social change agent and to act as a forum for the open discussion of issues. However, institutional priorities depend upon the context. Basic needs must be met first. Measures to address diversity are dependent upon having data on the absence of diversity and a set of means to address it.

Regardless of national and cultural specifics, we are all moving in the same direction. Each academic is responsible for fostering debate and engagement. We should take from this symposium the commitment to work within our institutions and societies to encourage the open acknowledgement of and debate on the importance of diversity in our societies.

Group 4. European Trends in the Academic Professions

New types of degrees and professorship are emerging, staff are increasingly mobile, the job market is fragmenting, and the attractiveness and prestige of the academic life are under threat in Eastern Europe relative to Western Europe and in Western Europe relative to North America. The group recommends:

- Providing sufficient financial and infrastructure support for academic careers
- Devoting more attention to “after master’s” programs in the Bologna process
- Differentiating promotion mechanisms for different “fragments” of the traditional academic job
- Requiring teacher training for promotion, particularly at the level of undergraduate education
- Rebalancing the relative importance of teaching and research and the incentive and reward systems for each on the institutional level

Group discussions culminated in a lively and interactive session in which teams of Fellows and Faculty were asked to build models of the university of the present, the university of the future, the academic of the present, and the academic of the future out of ordinary office materials. The constructions of cardboard boxes, paper, marker, glue and any other materials at hand—including the Schloss’ ubiquitous mineral water bottles and umbrellas—creatively illustrated a common vision of

the university of the future as a complicated and challenging, yet attractive and stimulating, workplace.

What policy issues derive from the transition of the academic of the present to the academic of the future, and of the university of the present to the university of the future?

The university:

- Values-based decisions are necessary, which mean loosening the strings of money.
- We must consider policies that move from a pyramidal structure with teaching and research on the top to a more balanced system that includes family and community.
- Governance must be truly shared and move away from an administration that builds on teaching and research toward an umbrella structure encompassing many forms of academic life.
- Some of the old traditions must be flushed away.

The academic:

- The tenure process must place more emphasis on balance between teaching and research.
- Mobility and international partnerships must be actively encouraged and even managed, not viewed solely as a negative and a source of brain drain.
- We must create a more accessible workplace for family and the community.

We have each been given a gift here. How the gifts are unwrapped, used and appreciated in the months and years ahead will vary from person to person and country to country, but to be honored with such an extraordinary gift is a rare thing. —Karen Adams, USA

Summary Remarks: *Robin Farquhar*

I do not know how to summarize a symposium that has delved as broadly and deeply into academic career patterns as this. Today's approach, with this morning's architectural formulation and this afternoon's results-oriented exercise that allowed us to highlight the strongest aspects of the experience, is perhaps the best summary.

We have all experienced the week in different ways and we should ask ourselves three questions:

1. Is there anything I know now that I did not know a week ago that is useful and important?
2. Is there anyone whom I now know and did not know a week ago, and with whom I intend to keep in contact, particularly on professional matters?
3. Is there anything I will now do that I would not have done a week ago, or something that I will do differently than I would have done a week ago?

One answer is to speak with our department heads to offer help and assistance. Academic careers are complicated and difficult, and leaders need help in mentoring and fostering the career development of colleagues. The best agent of career development and assistance to faculty members is the department head, who never has training and support in this area. So yes, I am going to do something different than I would have done a week ago. I am no longer a university president, but I am a professor and I do have a department chair, and I will speak to him and offer my assistance in developing career paths and career training opportunities.

Some of us are or will be in positions of influence beyond our institutions. We can network nationally with our respective ministries, transnationally within associations and scholarship bodies, and multinationally within the EU and Bologna structures, for example.

If the answer is yes to any one of these questions, I think the experience was valuable.

This report has been written by Gail Stevenson, Director of International Programs at Champlain College and Rapporteur for the Universities Project.

List of Participants

* denotes Faculty members

AUSTRIA

Federal Ministry of Education, Science and Culture

Barbara Weitgruber, Deputy Director General for Higher Education

University of Salzburg

Günther Kreuzbauer, Assistant Professor, Department of Basic Legal Sciences

BELARUS

Belarusian State University, Minsk

Vladimir Astapenka, Vice Rector for International Relations

Siarchei Khodzin, Dean of the History Faculty

CANADA

Carleton University, Ottawa, Ontario

***Robin Farquhar** (Symposium Chair), Professor and Former President

Eileen Saunders, Founding Director, Arthur Kroeger College of Public Affairs

CROATIA

University of Rijeka

***Pero Lucin**, Vice Rector for Organization

FINLAND

University of Kuopio

Heikke Helve, Development Manager (on leave); Development Manager, City of Kuopio

HUNGARY

Budapest University of Technology and Economics

János Levendovszky, Vice Dean for International Affairs, Faculty of Electrical Engineering and Informatics

Central European University, Budapest

Liviu Matei, Academic Secretary

Szent-István University, Budapest

***László Frenyó**, Professor of Immunophysiology; Dean of Faculty, Western Maryland College Budapest Program; Former President, Higher Education and Research Council

KOSOVO

University of Prishtina

Edmond Beqiri, Deputy Dean, University Business School

LATVIA

University of Latvia, Riga

Kaspars Balodis, Dean, Faculty of Law

Uldis Kondratovics, Dean, Faculty of Biology

MACEDONIA

Ss. Cyril and Methodius University, Skopje

Jasmina Stankova, Secretary General, Institute of Earthquake Engineering and Engineering Seismology

NETHERLANDS

University of Amsterdam

***Hans de Wit**, Senior Advisor International

Franciscus van Tatenhove, Manager, Data and Telecommunication Center

POLAND

Jagiellonian University, Krakow

Barbara Michalak-Pikulska, Head of the Arabic Department, The Institute of Oriental Philology

University of Warmia and Mazury, Olsztyn

Andrzej Krankowski, Senior Lecturer, Faculty of Geodesy and Regional Planning

ROMANIA

"Babes-Bolyai" University, Cluj-Napoca

Mircea Miclea, Head, Department of Psychology

RUSSIAN FEDERATION

Buryat State University, Ulan-Ude

Dmitry Buraev, Dean, Oriental Department

Herzen State Pedagogical University, St. Petersburg

Alexander Krouglov, Associate Professor, Department of Political Science

Novosibirsk State Technical University

Anna Madatova, Vice Dean, Business Faculty

Taganrog State University of Radio Engineering

Vladimir Bedouev, Chair, Students' Trade Union

Urals State Technical University, Ekaterinburg

Dmitry Shulgin, Head, Department of Intellectual Property

UKRAINE

National Technical University of Ukraine "KPI," Kiev

Andrij Babenko, Chair, Student Council

Daniel Benatov, Chair, Students and Postgraduate Science Association

UNITED KINGDOM

Anglia Polytechnic University, Chelmsford

***John Davies**, Dean of the Graduate School and Former Pro Vice Chancellor; Professor of Higher Education Policy and Management, University of Bath

The Open University, Milton Keynes

Justine Shepard, Senior Faculty Administrator, Faculty of Education and Language Studies

USA

Academic Search Consultation Service, Washington, DC

***Shirley Chater**, Senior Consultant

American Council on Education, Washington, DC

***David Ward**, President

Champlain College, Burlington, Vermont

***Gail Stevenson**, Director of International Programs

Indiana University, Bloomington

Karen Adams, Chief of Staff, Office of the Vice President for Information Technology

Institute of International Education, New York

Tony Claudino, Senior Program Officer, Ron Brown Fellowship Program

Mills College, Oakland, California

Ramon Torrecilha, Executive Vice President

National Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges, Washington DC

* **C. Peter Magrath**, President

New England Resource Center for Higher Education, Newton, Massachusetts

Deborah Hirsch, Director

The Pennsylvania State University, University Park

Donald Heller, Associate Professor and Senior Research Associate, Center for the Study of Higher Education

San Jose State University, California

Kenneth Peter, Associate Professor of Political Science

Smith College, Northampton, Massachusetts

***Peter Rose**, Sophia Smith Professor of Sociology and Anthropology; Director, American Studies Diploma Program for Foreign Graduate Students

University of Delaware, Newark

Lesa Griffiths, Director, Center for International Studies

University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign

Jennifer Bloom, Associate Director, Medical Scholars Program, College of Medicine

University of Maryland Eastern Shore, Princess Anne

Kelly Mack, Associate Professor, Department of Natural Sciences

University of Wisconsin-Madison

Jerlando Jackson, Assistant Professor, Department of Educational Administration

University of Wisconsin-Oshkosh

Alexander Kovzik, Assistant Professor, Department of Economics

YUGOSLAVIA

University of Novi Sad

Miroslav Veskovic, Head, Institute of Physics

INTERNATIONAL

ESIB, The National Unions of Students in Europe, Brussels, Belgium

Alexander Bols, Secretary General

Martina Vukasovic, Chairperson

International Research and Exchanges Board (IREX), Washington, DC, USA

***Daniel Matuszewski**, Former President

UNESCO-CEPES, Bucharest, Romania

Laura Grünberg, Program Assistant

Salzburg Seminar, Austria

Jochen Fried, Director, Universities Project

Marty Gecek, Coordinator, Visiting Advisors Program

Anna Glass, Program Associate, Universities Project

Helene Kamensky, Russian Program Coordinator, Universities Project

Ashley Maynor, Academic Program Intern

	Tuesday, September 17	Wednesday, September 18	Thursday, September 19	Friday, September 20	Saturday, September 21
09:00	Arrivals	Panel 1: <i>The Changing Academic Workplace</i> (PH) Plenary Discussion	Panel 2: <i>Career Trajectories: The Academic Profession between the Civil Service and the Market</i> (PH) Plenary Discussion 10:30 Group Photo (Schloss Terrace)	Working Groups 1,2,3,4 (Seminar rooms)	Panel 4: <i>Institutional Responses to Changing Academic Career Patterns: Challenges and Opportunities</i> (PH) Plenary Discussion
10:30		Coffee/Tea (GH)	Coffee/Tea (GH)	Coffee/Tea (GH)	Coffee/Tea (GH)
11:00		Discussion Groups A,B,C (Seminar rooms)	Discussion Groups A,B,C (Seminar rooms)	Working Groups 1,2,3,4 (Seminar rooms)	Discussion Groups A,B,C (Seminar rooms)
12:30	Lunch (MH)	Lunch (MH)	Lunch (MH)	Lunch (MH)	Lunch (MH)
14:00		Working Groups 1,2,3,4 (Seminar rooms)	Panel 3: <i>The Gender Gap</i> (PH) Plenary Discussion	13:30 Walking Tour of Salzburg Meet outside Meierhof	Plenary: Working Group Presentations Symposium Summary (PH)
15:30	Coffee/Tea (GH)	Coffee/Tea (MH)	Coffee/Tea (GH)		
16:00		Working Groups 1,2,3,4 (Seminar rooms)	Discussion Groups A,B,C (Seminar rooms)		
18:00	Reception (GH)				
18:30	Dinner (MH)	Barbeque (GH)	Dinner (MH)	Dinner (MH)	Reception (Vilar Cr)
19:30	Schloss Tour				19:00 Concert (GH)
20:00	Introductions and Greetings (PH)	Dylan Thomas reading		Fireside Discussion: <i>Recruiting for Academic Leadership</i> (GH)	Dinner (MH)
21:00	Reception (GH)				Reception (VR)

The Salzburg Seminar

Since its founding in 1947, the Salzburg Seminar has emerged as one of the world's foremost educational centers committed to the development of leaders with global perspective. With the principles of reconciliation and intellectual inquiry central to its activities, the Salzburg Seminar is dedicated to promoting the free exchange of ideas, opinions, and experience. Each year, approximately 1000 mid-career professionals from more than 100 countries gather at the Seminar's extraordinary facility at Schloss Leopoldskron to discuss issues of global concern in a multi-disciplinary, cross-cultural setting. The Salzburg Seminar remains committed to the idea that an exchange of information and expertise in a neutral venue will broaden perspectives, facilitate the establishment of world-wide professional networks, and bring about enlightened change in the future.

The Salzburg Seminar facilitates global dialogue through its multifaceted academic program:

Core sessions form the basis of the program, bringing together approximately sixty mid-career professionals from around the world. These participants, known as Fellows, work with a distinguished international faculty, all of whom donate their time and expertise. The weeklong sessions consist of lectures, discussions, and working groups, with time and opportunity for study, reflection, and informal conversation.

Special sessions convene senior-level professionals and are conducted in partnership with other organizations, foundations, and government agencies. Special sessions differ in length and structure from core sessions, but address similar global issues.

The Universities Project advances higher education reform, specifically in Central and Eastern Europe and Russia and the Newly Independent States. The most recent program initiative of the Seminar, the Project brings together senior administrators from the designated regions with their counterparts from North America and Western Europe. A multi-year series of conferences and symposia, the Project focuses on issues of university management, administration, finances, and governance.

The American Studies Center (ASC) conducts workshops exploring current themes in American studies teaching and research. Scholars, teachers, writers, and journalists from around the world attend the workshops, which are limited to twenty-five participants. With a sophisticated computer center offering access to the Internet, the ASC provides a resource for computer training to Seminar participants.

Schloss Leopoldskron Conference Center

Schloss Leopoldskron has been home to the Salzburg Seminar since its founding in 1947. Located within walking distance of the center of Salzburg, the rococo palace overlooks a picturesque lake and offers dramatic views of the Austrian Alps. Built between 1736 and 1744 for Prince Archbishop Leopold Firmian, the Schloss was restored in the twentieth century by Max Reinhardt, the renowned theater director and co-founder of the Salzburg Festival. Participants in the Seminar's programs live and work together in the Schloss and the adjacent Meierhof building, dating from the seventeenth century. This inspiring environment creates a special ambiance for quiet contemplation, as well as thoughtful and rigorous discussion.

Owned by the Salzburg Seminar and administered by Schloss Leopoldskron Conference Center, the Schloss and Meierhof are available to other organizations throughout the year as a venue for symposia and conferences consonant with the goals of the Seminar.

For further information about Salzburg Seminar programs or Schloss Leopoldskron Conference Center, please contact the Seminar at one of these addresses:

Salzburg Seminar, Schloss Leopoldskron
Box 129, A-5010 Salzburg, Austria
Tel: +43 662 839 830
Fax: +43 662 839 837
Email: up@salzburgseminar.org
<www.salzburgseminar.org>

Salzburg Seminar, Marble Works
PO Box 886, Middlebury Vermont, 05753 USA
Tel: +1 802 388 0007
Fax: +1 802 388 1030
Email: up@salzburgseminar.org
<www.salzburgseminar.org>