

INTERNATIONAL & DEVELOPMENT EDUCATION



# University Governance and Reform

Policy, Fads, and Experience in  
International Perspective

EDITED BY  
HANS G. SCHUETZE,  
WILLIAM BRUNEAU AND  
GARNET GROSJEAN



UNIVERSITY GOVERNANCE AND REFORM

---

POLICY, FADS, AND EXPERIENCE IN  
INTERNATIONAL PERSPECTIVE

*EDITED BY*

HANS G. SCHUETZE, WILLIAM BRUNEAU, AND  
GARNET GROSJEAN

palgrave  
macmillan

## International and Development Education

The *International and Development Education Series* focuses on the complementary areas of comparative, international, and development education. Books emphasize a number of topics ranging from key international education issues, trends, and reforms to examinations of national education systems, social theories, and development education initiatives. Local, national, regional, and global volumes (single authored and edited collections) constitute the breadth of the series and offer potential contributors a great deal of latitude based on interests and cutting edge research. The series is supported by a strong network of international scholars and development professionals who serve on the International and Development Education Advisory Board and participate in the selection and review process for manuscript development.

### SERIES EDITORS

John N. Hawkins

*Professor Emeritus, University of California, Los Angeles*  
*Senior Consultant, IFE 2020 East West Center*

W. James Jacob

*Assistant Professor, University of Pittsburgh*  
*Director, Institute for International Studies in Education*

### PRODUCTION EDITOR

Heejin Park

*Project Associate, Institute for International Studies in Education*

### INTERNATIONAL EDITORIAL ADVISORY BOARD

Clementina Acedo, *UNESCO's International Bureau of Education, Switzerland*

Philip G. Altbach, *Boston University, USA*

Carlos E. Blanco, *Universidad Central de Venezuela*

Sheng Yao Cheng, *National Chung Cheng University, Taiwan*

Ruth Hayhoe, *University of Toronto, Canada*

Wanhua Ma, *Peking University, China*

Ka-Ho Mok, *University of Hong Kong, China*

Christine Musselin, *Sciences Po, France*

Yusuf K. Nsubuga, *Ministry of Education and Sports, Uganda*

Namgi Park, *Gwangju National University of Education, Republic of Korea*

Val D. Rust, *University of California, Los Angeles, USA*

Suparno, *State University of Malang, Indonesia*

John C. Weidman, *University of Pittsburgh, USA*

Husam Zaman, *Taibah University, Saudi Arabia*

### Institute for International Studies in Education

School of Education, University of Pittsburgh  
5714 Wesley W. Posvar Hall, Pittsburgh, PA 15260 USA

### Center for International and Development Education

Graduate School of Education & Information Studies, University of California, Los Angeles  
Box 951521, Moore Hall, Los Angeles, CA 90095 USA



UNIVERSITY GOVERNANCE AND REFORM

Copyright © Hans G. Schuetze, William Bruneau, and Garnet Grosjean, 2012.

All rights reserved.

First published in 2012 by

PALGRAVE MACMILLAN®

in the United States—a division of St. Martin's Press LLC,

175 Fifth Avenue, New York, NY 10010.

Where this book is distributed in the UK, Europe and the rest of the world, this is by Palgrave Macmillan, a division of Macmillan Publishers Limited, registered in England, company number 785998, of Houndmills, Basingstoke, Hampshire RG21 6XS.

Palgrave Macmillan is the global academic imprint of the above companies and has companies and representatives throughout the world.

Palgrave® and Macmillan® are registered trademarks in the United States, the United Kingdom, Europe and other countries.

ISBN: 978-0-230-34012-1

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

University governance and reform : policy, fads, and experience in international perspective / Edited by Hans G. Schuetze, William Bruneau, and Garnet Grosjean.

pages cm.—(International and development education)

ISBN 978-0-230-34012-1 (hardback)

1. Universities and colleges—Administration. I. Schuetze, Hans Georg. II. Bruneau, William A., 1944– III. Grosjean, Garnet.

LB2341.U568 2012

378.1'01—dc23

2011051533

A catalogue record of the book is available from the British Library.

Design by Newgen Imaging Systems (P) Ltd., Chennai, India.

First edition: July 2012

10 9 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1

Printed in the United States of America.

# Contents

<i>Series Editors' Preface</i>	vii
<i>Foreword</i>	xi
Hans G. Schuetze, William Bruneau, and Garnet Grosjean	
<i>List of Abbreviations and Acronyms</i>	xiii

## **Part I: Premises and Problems**

1. University Governance Reform: The Drivers and the Driven <i>Hans G. Schuetze</i>	3
2. Reconsidering University Autonomy and Governance: From Academic Freedom to Institutional Autonomy <i>Pavel Zgaga</i>	11

## **Part II: North America**

3. The Provost Office as Key Decision-Maker in the Contemporary US University: Toward a Theory of Institutional Change <i>Nelly P. Stromquist</i>	25
4. Professors in Their Places: Governance in Canadian Higher Education <i>William Bruneau</i>	47
5. University Governance and Institutional Culture: A Canadian President's Perspective <i>Ross Paul</i>	63
6. The Politics of Policy Making in Postsecondary Education in Canada and in the Province of Ontario: Implications for Governance <i>Paul Axelrod, Theresa Shanahan, Richard Wellen, and Roopa Desai-Trilokekar</i>	77

7. Liberality and Collaborative Governance in a New Private University: The Experience of Quest University Canada <i>James Cohn</i>	95
<b>Part III: Latin America</b>	
8. International Forces Shaping Latin American Higher Education Governance <i>Alma Maldonado-Maldonado</i>	109
9. Reforms of University Governance in Mexico: Inducements for or Impediments to Change? <i>Wietse de Vries and Germán Álvarez-Mendiola</i>	125
10. Federal Policies and Governance of Universities in Mexico, 1990–2010 <i>Adrián Acosta Silva</i>	147
11. Higher Education Reform in Ecuador and Its Effect on University Governance <i>F. Mauricio Saavedra</i>	161
<b>Part IV: East Asia and Australia</b>	
12. Incorporation of National Universities in Japan: An Evaluation Six Years On <i>Motohisa Kaneko</i>	179
13. Current Challenges Facing Japanese Universities and Future Perspectives <i>Masao Homma</i>	197
14. Intellectuals, Academic Freedom, and University Autonomy in China <i>Qiang Zha</i>	209
15. Higher Education Reform in Indonesia: University Governance and Autonomy <i>W. James Jacob, Yuanyuan Wang, Tracy Lynn Pelkowski, Ravik Karsidi, and Agus D. Priyanto</i>	225
16. “Transforming Australia’s Higher Education System”: New Accountability Policies for a Global Era? <i>Lesley Vidovich</i>	241
<i>Contributors</i>	257
<i>Index</i>	261

## Chapter 8

---

# International Forces Shaping Latin American Higher Education Governance\*

*Alma Maldonado-Maldonado*

It is difficult to find a resolution for current global problems without the participation of an international organization. Three recent examples are the organized responses to the economic crisis by agencies such as the International Monetary Fund (IMF) in close alliance with the G-8 or G-20 in 2008; the international actions coordinated by the World Health Organization (WHO) to combat the influenza A (H1N1) virus pandemic crisis in 2009; and the 2010 United Nations Climate Change Conference—the COP16 Conference—organized in Cancun, Mexico. These three cases show the punctual intervention of international organizations in the discussion and resolution of global problems. These organizations “make authoritative decisions that reach every corner of the globe and affect areas as public as governmental spending and as private as reproductive rights” (Barnett and Finnemore 1999, 3).

Globalization has caused several transformations and set many challenges to current societies. In particular, it “has affected and changed the way power is realized in the nation state” (Rutkowski 2007, 243). There is an extensive literature on globalization and the influence of international organizations in education and higher education in terms of financial support or document production, since these are two very concrete ways to materialize their impact in national states and their policies. However, the study of the more sophisticated influence of international organizations in education has been a more difficult challenge. The aim of this chapter is to provide a conceptual

framework to understand the more indirect ways of affecting higher education institutions from the context of global governance.

### The Tool Box: Global Governance, Soft Laws, International Regimes, and . . .

Michel Foucault thought of his books as tool boxes from which people could use a phrase or idea to disqualify the power systems, just as if they were a screwdriver or an adjustable spanner interrupting the circuit (Eribon 1992, 291–292). This chapter aims to provide a tool box with the concepts that will be used in the understanding of the international pressures on higher education institutions in Latin America.

The first concept, “global governance,” is understood as an intellectual effort to describe changes that are produced at the technological, economic, social, and political levels identified with globalization. One of the first definitions of global governance was produced by an international commission in 1995. According to this commission global governance is

the sum of many ways individuals and institutions, public and private, manage their common affairs. It is a continuing process through which conflicting or diverse interests may be accommodated and cooperative action may be taken. It includes formal . . . as well as informal arrangements that people and institutions have agreed to or perceive to be in their interest. (Commission on Global Governance 1995, 2 cited in Karns and Mingst 2004, 4)

It is a challenge to discuss the idea of global governance regarding the field of educational public policies and reforms, considering that literature about global governance and education (and higher education) is basically nonexistent. For instance, an examination of the journal *Global Governance* contains little material on educational policies and reforms. A Review of Multilateralism and International Organizations shows that there are practically no articles that refer to education between 2001 and 2007. The main issues included are security, economy, environment, health, human rights, diplomacy, and other topics.

In this sense, global governance is a concept embedded in the field of international relations. Margaret Karns and Karen Mingst (2004, 4) state that “global governance is not global government,” but the key question is what are the implications of having one without the other. As Joseph Stiglitz (2002, 22) points out, the problem of having “a global governance without global government,” is that “many of those affected” by the decisions of international



organizations “are left almost voiceless.” Thomas Nagel cited by Sen (2009, 25) says that “if Hobbes is right, the idea of global justice without a world government is a chimera.”

There are four elements identified as integral parts of global governance: “international rules of laws; norms or soft law; structures, formal and informal; and international regimes” (Karns and Mingst 2004, 5). A characteristic of globalization is the participation of several actors—national governments, civil society, private entities or corporations, and/or groups or networks of experts—and the role of international organizations in the production of such soft laws and regimes is crucial.

International organizations are the “formal embodiment of institutions and regimes.” (Martin and Simmons 2011, 2). For Friedrich Kratochwil and John Ruggie (2001, 347), regimes are “broadly defined as governing arrangements constructed by states to coordinate their expectations and organize aspects of international behavior in various issue-areas.” These issues include the trade, monetary, and oceans regime or “nuclear weapons proliferation, whaling, European trans-boundary air pollution, food aid, trade, telecommunications, and transportation” (Karns and Mingst 2004, 12). The same authors mention that “where an international regime exists, participating states and other international actors recognize the existence of certain obligations and feel compelled to honor them” (Karns and Mingst 2004, 12). This is perhaps the most important difference when using the concept of “regime” in education. In this area, regimes exist in the sense of establishing “governing arrangements” and affecting the national and international (and in this case regional) behavior of their higher education institutions. The application of the concept of “international regimes” in education remains less strict than what the technical definition sets, perhaps with the unique exception of the educational regimes that the World Trade Organization (WTO) establishes; and even at the WTO there are no disputes until today related to education or higher education, the only related disputes have to do with intellectual propriety.

In the field of education, international regimes lack “settlement procedures to resolve conflicts” (Karns and Mingst 2004, 12). Nevertheless, the means to apply pressure and impact do exist. This is perhaps the most important paradox when attempting to use regimes as defined in international relations to discuss reforms and changes in higher education.

A more helpful definition of regimes to understand some current reforms in higher education is offered by Stephen Krasner (1983). He defines a regime as implicit or explicit principles, norms, rules, and decision-making procedures around which actors’ expectations converge in a given area of international relations.

Norms and soft laws should be considered as part of the international regimes. Soft laws are even less common in the field of education and higher education, because very few elements from the field of international law are

considered in the discussion of education. According to David J. Rutkowski (2007) and Hwa-Jin Kim (2001), “soft laws” are powerful tools of modern international law that have become a significant instrument in influencing global, national, and local agendas.

“Soft” law is a general term, and has been used to refer to a variety of processes. David M. Trubek and his colleagues, as cited by Rutkowski (2007, 233), suggest “that the only common thread among the vast definitions of ‘soft’ law is that they are not formally binding.” Rutkowski further argues: “Where ‘hard’ law encompasses strong obligation, precision, and delegation, ‘soft’ law allows for one or two of these three criteria to be relaxed or absent” (233).

An important part of the discussion is whether international law may or may not have the aim of “imposing constraints on domestic political behavior” (Raustiala 2006, 9). International law can be used as a tool “by which strong states couch their demands to weak states,” suggesting that the scope of these reforms may affect developing countries more directly than developed countries. Clear examples of this are some WTO norms or requirements to create “extensive judicial remedies and sweeping changes to local intellectual property laws” (Raustiala 2006, 11). In fact, some of the rules that are part of international law might be considered as “effective enforcement” (Kim 2001, 49).

In education, there is a debate on what constitutes international law. The most widely defined as laws or hard laws are the three treaties that make up the International Bill of Human Rights adopted by the UN General Assembly on December 16, 1966: the Universal Declaration of Human Rights; the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights (ICCPR); and the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (ICESCR). Nevertheless, there is no agreement on whether they can be considered hard or soft laws. For instance, the ICESCR that went into force in 1976 states: “Higher education shall be made equally accessible to all, on the basis of capacity, by every appropriate means, and in particular by the progressive introduction of free education” (United Nations, Office of Public Information 1978, cited in Rutkowski 2007, 234). This article was used in both senses in part given the reservations that each country established before signing.

However, the 26 article of the Human Rights Declaration says: “Technical and professional education shall be made generally available and higher education shall be equally accessible to all on the basis of merit.” In comparison with the ICESCR, the Human Rights Declaration has a more limited scope.

In 1998 and 2009 UNESCO organized the First and Second World Conferences on Higher Education and each of them produced a declaration signed by all the participants (members of the organization). These are a clearer example of soft law, yet one of the main problems in defining them as soft laws is understanding their limitations and importance.

Finally, formal and informal structures of international organizations will not be discussed in this chapter, but it does not mean that some additional concepts may be included in this tool box later.

## Two Concrete Ways International Organizations Influence Higher Education

As mentioned before, the two more widely studied and quoted examples of the concrete work and influence of international organizations are in terms of direct financing and the knowledge production and information that these agencies produce.

### Economic

According to Alma Maldonado-Maldonado and Brendan Cantwell (2009, 284), from 2002 to 2006 about US\$61.2 billion were assigned to education. This represents approximately 12 percent of the total spent on international aid. In 2002, the financial commitment was approximately the same between multilateral and bilateral organizations. However, this distribution changed in 2006 when an important growth on bilateral aid was reported, while the multilateral kept stable. The World Bank is the main international organization providing financial funds, so these data have to be considered carefully because the allocation of resources has to do with the size of the country and its particular needs.

The sheer number of publications that are produced by these organizations is immense (Robertson 2009). The World Bank for instance has at least 80,000 documents, books, reports, studies, and papers with free access. The OECD is in a similar situation, although a lot of its production is not free to access.

Another aspect of this knowledge and information production has to do with the role of experts and personnel. In most cases, there is a small network of experts that are working from one international organization to another and keep moving between organizations.

The study by Joel Samoff and Carrol Bidemi (2003) is interesting in terms of how the international organizations have been able to put together some of the top experts in every field. Among other things, in the case of Africa but perhaps as well in Latin America, a job in one international organization solves for these experts many financial problems and works inevitably as a mechanism to co-opt them. A discussion on experts, epistemic communities, and interest groups would be very difficult to do in this chapter.

## Four Cases from the Global Context That Impact Higher Education Institutions

### Millennium Development Goals

Eight Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) were coordinated by the UN and approved by 189 countries in 2000. Goal number two looks to achieve universal primary education: “Ensure that, by 2015, children everywhere, boys and girls alike, will be able to complete a full course of primary schooling” (UNDP 2011). Because this goal had been a long-term ambition; support for the MDGs was very clear on behalf of most international organizations and groups, such as UNESCO, the World Bank, IMF, and the EU. It has had important consequences in previous debates about the ongoing tension between primary versus higher education.

When the conference “Education For All” took place in Thailand in 1990, the emphasis that most international organizations put on supporting primary education became clear. This changed somewhat in 2000, when UNESCO and the World Bank published the report *Higher Education in Developing Countries: Peril and Promise*, written by the task Force on Higher Education and Society. Their two main conclusions discussed the importance of higher education for all developing countries, independent of their size and region; as well as a critique of the rate of return approach that favors the social impact of primary education over the tertiary sector.

The MDGs are a good example of what can be defined as a soft law in education, because they establish a frame of action about a very specific topic and one of the effects created is a change in international behavior regarding primary education and its support. One of the clear effects that these goals produced is that it became difficult for foundations, countries, or stakeholders to go against the prioritization of this educational level over any other.

The review of data, with its limitations, supports this idea. Available data on the public expenditure per pupil in primary and tertiary education as percentage of the Gross Domestic Product (GDP) in Latin America, from 1998 to 2007 and 2008, provide some interesting tendencies. In the cases of Argentina, Bolivia, Brazil, Chile, Colombia, and Mexico, there is a clear tendency where the public expenditure per pupil as percentage of GDP per capita in primary education has increased in a period of ten years. In some cases that increase was very limited; Bolivia went from 13 to 14 percent; Mexico from 12 to 13 percent. Other increases were more significant, such as the Brazilian case from 11 to 17 percent or Argentina from 11 to 15 percent. However, the increase was still very restrained.

These same countries share the tendency of decrease in the public expenditure per pupil in tertiary education as a percentage of GDP per capita in the

same period. In some cases, there is an important reduction. Brazil went from 80 to 30 percent, a 50 percent decrease; Bolivia went from 52 percent to 36 percent, with 16 percent less; Chile, decreased from 21 to 12 percent, a 9 percent reduction; Colombia first spent 34 percent and later 27 percent, decreasing by 7 percent; and Mexico went from 48 to 42 percent, a decrease of 6 percent. Among these countries, Argentina lost fewer points from 20 to 16 percent (World Bank 2011).

It is important to mention that there is no constant increase or decrease in the percentages because in every case the percentages vary considerably. Another issue to consider is the differences in percentages between primary and tertiary education. In most countries, the largest expenditure per pupil is in higher education because it is more expensive and there are fewer students enrolled.

There is not enough evidence to affirm that this tendency to prioritize primary education in the region is the result of the Education for All Conference and the MDGs. However, it may have affected the increase of tertiary enrollment in the region within the last ten years, perhaps a steady enrollment in primary education as an effect of the demographical changes in these countries. The sum of these factors reflects that states spent less money per students in tertiary education and more in the primary level than ten years ago.

The Education for All Conference and the MDGs have become a figure very close to a soft law that has caused several international organizations, groups of countries, networks, and coalitions to join together with the aim of achieving a specific goal: to make basic education universal and spend accordingly the first priority in developing countries.

## Accreditation and MERCOSUR

MERCOSUR (Customs union of four Southern-cone countries [Argentina, Brazil, Paraguay, and Uruguay] established under the 1991 Treaty of Asunción) is a trade regime like the North American Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA). MERCOSUR was created in 1991 as a response to several challenges, especially the economic integration of other regions and the need to construct something similar in Latin America. For Michael Mecham (2003, 377), "One early success was in driving an expansion of trade among members." Also, MERCOSUR "provided a basis for cooperation in foreign economic policy."

As with NAFTA, Mexico was forced to reform its accreditation system (Aboites 2010); Mexican higher education institutions were pressured into establishing evaluation mechanisms more similar to those existing in the United States.

Perhaps because of NAFTA or MERCOSUR, in the nineties the whole region of Latin America had to create several accreditation agencies (Fernández Lamarra 2003). The most prominent feature of the higher education convergence policies in MERCOSUR has been the development of a common accreditation system for degrees that, in turn, has given rise to related policies and spurred major projects in the higher education sector (Verger and Hermo 2010, 113).

Norberto Fernández Lamarra (2003, 266) presents advances made in 2003 regarding the constitution of the accreditation efforts: “first, the Ibero-American Network for Higher Education Accreditation (RIACES); and second, the work carried out by the ALFA-ACRO Project (Accreditation for Official Recognition) constitute important advances in this direction.” Despite the fact that the establishment of accreditation systems is still not similar everywhere, there have been some considerable advances since Lamarra’s article. This is reported by RIACES (2011), who by 2011 included 35 evaluation and accreditation agencies of higher education quality, as well as organizations involved in the development of instruments and policies related to its improvement.

Another related initiative is ALFA-Tuning, a project that attempts to establish “30 generic competencies in Europe and 27 in Latin America. Of those, 22 are ‘convergent’ or identical with the European ones” (Aboites 2010, 448). Indeed, Tuning is the methodology developed in Europe to create the higher education European space (Beneitone et al. 2007). The Bologna Process has become more “successful” than MERCOSUR-Educativo (Verger and Hermo 2010, 117). The explanations have to do with the existence of governance structures and resources along with stronger regional policy coordination than those in South America.

Finally, it is important to consider that the implementation of accreditation and evaluation systems has become a very powerful mechanism to reform higher education institutions and is shaping systems worldwide, as Guy Neave (1998) has previously discussed.

## World-Class Universities and Rankings

In 2003, the first worldwide ranking of universities was created by the Institute of Higher Education at the University of Shanghai Jiao Tong. The following year, the *Times Higher Education* produced another important ranking. More recently, the *U.S. News and World Report’s* ranking has greatly increased its influence (Maldonado 2010). The effects of rankings have to do with the role of prestige, the stratification effect, the methodological problems, the disadvantages for non-English speaking countries, and the ways in which they have been used by policy makers (i.e., some national agencies have started using them to provide scholarships to foreign students).

Another concept that has acquired a lot of relevance is that of world-class universities. According to Jamil Salmi (2009) the World Bank started the discussion and exploration of the issue of world-class universities after two ministers from two different countries asked for help to define a world-class university. In fact, the top ranked universities are those considered within a world-class rank. There are two complementary perspectives in examining how to establish new world-class universities.

The first dimension, of an external nature, concerns the role of government at the national, state, and provincial levels and the resources that can be made available to enhance the stature of institutions. The second dimension is internal. It has to do with the individual institutions themselves and the necessary evolution and steps that they need to take to transform themselves into world-class institutions (Salmi 2009, 7).

The final issue mentioned by Jamil Salmi refers to the internal challenges that many universities face—whether they have real possibilities or not—to aspire to become a world-class institution.

An examination of the 2010 Shanghai Jiao Tong ranking shows that nine Latin American universities are among the top two hundred. The top ranked is the University of Sao Paulo, located between spots 101–105; there are six other Brazilian ones, followed by an Argentinean, Chilean, and Mexican university respectively. However, in the *Times Higher Education* ranking the National Autonomous University of Mexico (UNAM) is the only Latin American university to rank in place 190. Finally in the third ranking, the *U.S. News and World Report*, there are three universities from Brazil, two from Mexico, and two from Argentina and Chile. The Latin American region only ranks better than Africa.

It is important to question the extent to which we should consider the ideas of rankings and world-class universities as a new type of regime that forces universities to reform themselves to become better established and to acquire the prestige that is implied by being better ranked. Some of these institutions already know what the ranking criteria are and are acting in consequence, for example, by increasing the number of international students or hiring more international faculty. It seems a new “nonformal” regime was born in 2003 for higher education institutions internationally.

## AHELO

The OECD has established several large-scale international assessments, such as the Program for International Student Assessment (PISA) focusing on 15-year-olds at compulsory school level, and the Program for the International Assessment of Adult Competencies (PIAAC). PISA began in 1997, and by 2006 it already had the participation of the 30 OECD members and another

57 nonmember countries (OECD 2010–2011). Interestingly, many of these nonmembers still participate despite the fact that their PISA results have not been very satisfactory (Rutkowski 2007, 241). This clearly is the case of Latin American countries.

In the context of these programs, the OECD is currently developing a new initiative: the Assessment of Higher Education Learning Outcomes (AHELO) that will test students in higher education. It will evaluate student performance across countries. The test will look at common generic skills (critical thinking, analytical reasoning, and problem-solving and written communication), discipline-specific skills (economics and engineering), and contextual information.

According to the official information, AHELO will be a tool for universities “to assess and improve their teaching,” for students “to make better choices in selecting institutions,” for policy makers “to make sure that the considerable amounts spent on higher education are spent well,” and for employers “to know if the skills of the graduates entering the job market match their needs” (OECD 2010–2011). The standing of the project reported in 2010 is as follows:

The OECD will be working with a consortium of world experts and teams in 15 participating countries to develop and administer the tests. By the end of the feasibility study in 2012, we will determine if such tests can indeed be developed and successfully administered to students. (OECD 2010–2011, 5)

It is interesting to notice the influence that the United States exerts in the project. They acknowledge that many of their questions “will be based on an international adaptation of the US Collegiate Learning Assessment (developed by the Council for Aid to Education)” (OECD 2010–2011). Further, two of the project’s sponsors are from the United States—the Lumina Foundation for Education and the Spencer Foundation—while the rest are from Portugal, Sweden, England, and Ireland (OECD 2010–2011, 8). Also there are 16 countries that are currently participating in the project.<sup>1</sup>

Tom Schuller and Stéphan Vincent-Lancrin (2009, 66) argue,

The OECD differs from many other international organizations in that it is not a regulatory, still less legislative, body (though with some “soft law” exceptions). It does not distribute financial support, either. Its legitimacy and influence depend to a high degree on the perceived quality of its information and analysis, not on its power as a rule-making body (as with the EU) or as a provider of funds (as with the World Bank).

In this sense, what would happen with AHELO if this initiative works? Neither AHELO nor PISA is any type of governance instrument or initiative that governments must follow, but there are some practices that affect



most educational systems in a nonnormative way, that is, “non-binding and intended to serve as a reference point” (Kim 2001, 34). Besides, these practices are “grounded in what is desirable and appropriate for liberal, market-friendly, economic policies” (Amaral and Neave 2009, 85).

To some extent the popularization of a standardized test like PISA has become a new type of “non formal” regime that countries need to follow. If AHELO works, it could be constituted as something similar in higher education. Colombia and Mexico are the only Latin American countries participating in AHELO testing their generic skills; Mexico is also participating in the Economics test. All of the participating countries take part in the analysis of their contextual dimension.

## Discussion

The four cases presented above provide important information about global governance, regimes, and reforms in Latin American higher education. They help in the understanding of how universities are changing and what strategies global actors have created to bring about these changes.

They are all international in scope. The MDGs could be considered a soft law, the accreditation mechanisms are an established regime, the rankings a regime in progress, and AHELO could eventually become a regime. However, as was mentioned before, this idea of “regime” must be considered carefully because it does not fully comply with the technical definition that has been used in other fields, especially international relations.

The MDGs are an example of an international initiative that was not directly addressed to higher education but has nevertheless affected it. Their influence has been more circuitous. The case of accreditation refers to a set of policies that have produced a regime. The policies have been implemented for some time and have resulted in the establishment of institutions, norms, standards, and networks. Their focus is specific and relates directly to higher education institutions. The expansion and acceptance of these policies throughout the region is evident.

The popularity of rankings and the concept of “world-class universities” seem to have increased in strength since the publication of the first worldwide ranking. It is still difficult to evaluate the extent that these worldwide rankings have impacted institutions, but looking at the way higher education institutions and educational systems are using and quoting their yearly results shows a growing relevance. Even though two of the worldwide rankings are produced by independent agencies—the *Times Higher Education* and *U.S. News and World Report*—it is not possible to affirm that the rankings’ initiative comes solely from university outsiders; the Chinese ranking was a university

initiative. Alternatively, the discourse around the idea of “world-class universities” does come from outsiders and represents a broader frame of action.

Finally, AHELO is a project that may end up establishing a focused frame: its target and objectives are very specifically directed to higher education. It is an initiative that comes from outside higher education institutions. It is an OECD initiative and its stakeholders are not higher education institutions.

After presenting the four cases, there is a concept that makes a lot of sense to compel their discussion: “*techne of government*.” This concept is used by Dean (1999) (cited in Sidhu 2007, 206), as one of the four dimensions to study government. They are as follows:

Forms of visibilities. The picturing and constituting of objects that are to be governed, ways of seeing and perceiving “the problem” at hand; *Techne of government*—The means, tactics technologies, and strategies through which authority is constituted and rule legitimized; *Episteme of government*. The forms of thought, knowledge, expertise, and calculation that arise from and inform the activity of governing; forms of identification—The actors, subjects, identities, and agents that presuppose the practices of government.

Discussing four specific constructs to analyze the influence of international organizations in national educational policy “in a movement towards global ‘soft’ convergence,” David Rutkowski (2007, 232) offers some ideas for the analysis of these *technes of government*:

- (1) construction of a multilateral space for “soft” laws to be formed;
- (2) construction of the means to directly implement policy through loans and grants;
- (3) construction of a multilateral space to create and exchange policy knowledge; and
- (4) construction of the concept of being experts in measuring and evaluation educational policy.

This classification helps to better understand how to place the cases presented in this chapter. According to these *technes of government*, the MDGs are an example of the soft laws; the case of credits and loans directly influenced by international organizations has purposely not been discussed in this chapter; and the other three—accreditation systems, worldwide rankings, and AHELO—correspond to the third and fourth slots of Rutkowski’s definition. In a broader sense, this chapter attempts to contribute to answering a question posed by Margaret Karns and Karen Mingst (2004, 24): “the question is not will globalization be governed, but rather, how will globalization be governed?” Here the question is not whether higher education will be governed in this globalization context; but rather, how will higher education be governed? This chapter provides some theoretical points to articulate an answer.

The reality is that higher education institutions have had to change because of these new forms of global governance. Either they receive less money and have to adjust; or they are established and actively participate in the international, regional, and national accreditation processes; or they must find ways to obtain better scores in the worldwide rankings; or they consider participating in a project like AHELO that may exert worldwide pressure in the future.

## Final Remarks

Given the novelty of this topic in the field of higher education, there are more pending issues to discuss than conclusions to make. Some of the issues have to do with the way the specific role of agendas are developed within the frame of global governance; the need for a deeper analysis of the role of power, agency, and hegemony; or to continue exploring the possibilities of the concepts of regime and soft law.

The concepts of “international forces” or “international technes of government,” “regimes,” or “soft laws” are hard to place theoretically in the traditional/classical governance models (New Public Management, Network governance, and Neo-Weberian narrative) or in their main aspects (decision-making processes, power, leadership, and institutional composition). This has posed a challenge in this chapter.

Perhaps global governance and the concepts of soft law and regime help as a scaffolding, or as a tool that belongs in the tool box previously mentioned, that set or hold different elements involved in the topic of development of a global agenda in terms of who participates, how this agenda is established, and the reasons why certain actors (organizations, networks, or group of countries) take part in this, and what the role of national states is. As Susan Robertson (2009, 114) argues:

The converging agenda of market multilateralism is amongst the powerful international agencies as a mechanism of global governance; together with the strategic use of governmental techniques, such as the construction of indexes and other methodologies, to produce the conditions and social relations for a new long wave of accumulation.

In sum, reforms in higher education public policies in Latin America are moving toward some form of global governance, including soft laws and regimes. But at the same time, the way this is happening, the strategies used, and the implementation processes still require more research and analysis. This is a pending task for people interested in these issues.

## NOTES

\*The author would like to thank Nicté-Ha Dzib Soto for her assistance in reviewing the journal *Global Governance: A Review of Multilateralism and International Organizations* and Scarlett Zamudio for their help in reviewing the data on public expenditure per pupil in primary and tertiary education in Latin America.

1. Australia, Belgium, Colombia, Egypt, Finland, Italy, Japan, Korea, Kuwait, Mexico, the Netherlands, Norway, the Russian Federation, the Slovak Republic, Sweden, and the United States (with particular state institutions)

## REFERENCES

- Aboites, Hugo. 2010. "Latin American Universities and the Bologna Process: From Commercialisation to the Tuning Competencies Project." *Globalisation, Societies and Education* 8 (3): 443–455.
- Amaral, Alberto, and Neave, Guy. 2009. "The OECD and Its Influence in Higher Education: A Critical Revision." In *International Organizations and Higher Education Policy. Thinking Globally Acting Locally?* ed. Roberta Malee Bassett and Alma Maldonado-Maldonado. New York: Routledge.
- Barnett, Michael, and Martha Finnemore. 1999. "The Politics, Power, and Pathologies of International Organizations." *International Organizations* 53 (4): 699–732.
- Beneitone, Pablo, Cesar Esquetini, Julia Gonzalez, Marty Malet Aida, Gabriela Siufi, and Robert Wagenaar. 2007. *Reflexiones y perspectivas de la Educación Superior en América Latina. Informe final -Proyecto Tuning- América Latina 2004–2007*. Bilbao, Spain: Universidad de Deusto, Universidad de Groningen.
- Eribon, Didier. 1992. *Michel Foucault*. Barcelona, Spain: Anagrama.
- Fernández Lamarra, Norberto. 2003. "Higher Education, Quality Evaluation and Accreditation in Latin America and MERCOSUR." *European Journal of Education* 38 (3): 253–269.
- Karns, Margaret, and Karen Mingst. 2004. *International Organizations: The Politics and Processes of Global Governance*. Boulder, CO: Lynne Rienner Publishers Inc.
- Kim, Hwa-Jin. 2001. "Taking International Soft Law Seriously: Its Implications for Global Convergence in Corporate Governance." *Journal of Korean Law* 1 (1): 1–50.
- Krasner, Stephen, ed. 1983. *International Regimes*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.
- Kratochwil, Friedrich, and John Gerard Ruggis. 2001. "International Organization: A State of the Art or an Art of the State." In *International Institutions: An International Organizational Organization Reader*, ed. Lisa L. Martin and Beth A. Simmons. Boston, MA: The MIT Press.

- Maldonado-Maldonado, Alma, and Brendan Cantwell. 2009. "International Organizations and Bilateral Aid. National Interests and Transnational Agencies." In *International Organizations and Higher Education Policy: Thinking Globally Acting Locally?* ed. Roberta Malee Bassett and Alma Maldonado-Maldonado. New York: Routledge.
- Martin, Lisa L., and Beth A. Simmons. 2001. *International Institutions: An International Organizational Organization Reader*. Boston, MA: The MIT Press.
- Mecham, Michael. 2003. "MERCOSUR: A Failing Development Project?" *International Affairs* 79 (2): 369–387.
- Neave, Guy. 1998. "The Evaluative State Reconsidered." *European Journal of Education* 33 (3): 265–284.
- OECD. 2010–2011. *Assessment of Higher Education Learning Outcomes (AHELO)*. Paris: OECD. <http://www.oecd.org>.
- Raustiala, Kal. 2006. "Refining the Limits of International Law." *ILSA Journal of International and Comparative Law* 34 (1): 1–21.
- RIACES. 2011. Official website. Buenos Aires: RIACES. <http://www.riaces.net>.
- Robertson, Susan. 2009. "Market Multilateralism, the World Bank Group, and the Asymmetries of Globalizing Higher Education: Toward a Critical Political Analysis." In *International Organizations and Higher Education Policy: Thinking Globally Acting Locally?* ed. Roberta Malee Bassett and Alma Maldonado-Maldonado. New York: Routledge.
- Rutkowski, David J. 2007. "Converging Us Softly: How Intergovernmental Organizations Promote Neoliberal Education Policy." *Critical Studies in Education* 48 (2): 229–247.
- Salmi, Jamil. 2009. *The Challenge of Establishing World-Class Universities*. Washington, DC: The World Bank.
- Samoff, Joel, and Carol Bidemi. 2003. "From Manpower Planning to the Knowledge Era: World Bank Policies on Higher Education in Africa." Paper presented at the UNESCO Forum on Higher Education, Research and Knowledge, Paris, October 2003. Paper commissioned by the UNESXO Forum Secretariat (ED-2004/WS/8).
- Schuller, Tom, and Stéphan Vincent-Lancrin. 2009. "OECD Work on the Internationalization of Higher Education: An Insider Perspective." In *International Organizations and Higher Education Policy: Thinking Globally Acting Locally?* ed. Roberta Malee Bassett and Alma Maldonado-Maldonado. New York: Routledge.
- Sen, Amartya. 2009. *The Idea of Justice*. London: Allen Lane.
- Sidhu, Ravinder. 2007. "GATS and the New Developmentalism: Governing Transnational Education." *Comparative Education Review* 51 (2): 203–227.
- Stiglitz, Joseph. 2002. *Globalization and Its Discontents*. New York and London: W.W. Norton & Company.
- Verger, Antoni, and Javier Pablo Hermo. 2010. "The Governance of Higher Education Regionalization: Comparative Analysis of the Bologna Process and MERCOSUR-Educativo." *Globalisation, Societies and Education* 8 (1): 105–120.