



**THE UNIVERSITIES PROJECT OF THE SALZBURG SEMINAR
VISITING ADVISORS' REPORT**

**BASHKIR STATE UNIVERSITY
REPUBLIC OF BASHKORTOSTAN, THE RUSSIAN FEDERATION**

June 18-23, 2001

Team Members

Dr. Olga Bain, Program Associate, International Comparative Higher Education Finance and Accessibility Project, State University of New York at Buffalo

Dr. Guy Haug, Principal Advisor, European Association of Universities (EUA)

Dr. Barbara Hill, Senior Fellow, American Council on Education

Dr. D. Bruce Johnstone (team leader), Professor of Higher and Comparative Education, State University of New York at Buffalo

Dr. Helene Kamensky, Russian Program Coordinator, Universities Project, Salzburg Seminar

**I.
*Introduction***

This report is based on a series of meetings, which took place at the Bashkir State University (BashGU), Republic of Bashkortostan, Russian Federation, from June 18 – 23, 2001. The team members met with the rector, vice rectors, deans, professors, and students of BashGU to discuss a variety of issues of concern to the University leadership. In addition to these discussions with the University community, the team members met with the Deputy Prime Minister of the Republic of Bashkortostan and gained from him an outside perspective with respect to how BashGU could partner with local government and businesses and serve as a catalyst for economic development.

B. Bashkir State University

Bashkir State University is the major scientific, educational and cultural center of the Republic of Bashkortostan. It traces its beginning to 1918 with the founding of the Ufa Teachers' Training College, the first higher education institution in the Republic of Bashkortostan. BashGU currently comprises thirteen faculties and enrolls 20,000 students. The academic staff numbers over 700 engaged in teaching and research. BashGU ranks among the top ten classical universities in the Russian Federation.

Our team members appreciate the privilege of visiting the Bashkir State University, and are grateful to the Rector, Academician Mukhamet Khadisovich Kharrasov and his colleagues for the candor in the discussions and their exceptional hospitality. BashGU administration and staff were gracious hosts and did their best to make our visit as pleasant and productive as possible. We were offered delicious meals, a very impressive cultural program, and computer facilities. We appreciate the engagement and vigor that characterized every phase of the discussions and commend the Rector and his colleagues for the comprehensive preparation for the visit.

C. Goals and Process of the Visit

This visit was at the invitation of the Rector of Bashkir State University, responding to the increasing awareness on the part of Russian universities of the Salzburg Seminar's Universities Project, and the twenty-nine successful visits carried out under the Salzburg Seminar's Visiting Advisors Program. The Salzburg Seminar's Universities Project is a multi-year series of symposia convening senior representatives of higher education from Central and East Europe and Russia, with their counterparts from North America and West Europe. The Visiting Advisors Program is an extension of the Universities Project. The Visiting Advisors, who are selected by the Salzburg Seminar, are credentialed and well-experienced members of the higher education profession, who volunteer their services to visit a host institution to share their knowledge and expertise with the university leadership.

The steps of the visit consist of:

- A *self study* in which the Russian university provides not only relevant descriptive data about its history, mission, and current academic programs, but also the perception of the Rector and other top administrators of its problems, and its plans. These plans generally address not only the identified problems (which, for all Russian universities, are overwhelmingly financial), but longer range priorities for growth, capital investment, new academic programs, and new ways of relating to the business and civic needs of the city, the surrounding region, and the Russian federal "subject" (in this case, the autonomous Republic of Bashkortostan).
- A site visit of several days during which the team meets with the Rector and other top administrators, generally some of the deans, students, and other offices within the University, and other higher educational entities in the region and the regional government.
- A preliminary report, drafted during the visit and delivered orally by the team leader to the Rector and his/her colleagues.
- A written report, drafted by the team leader and VAP staff member, with input from all of the team, shared first in draft form with the Rector before being issued in a final form.

The purpose of a visit is to assist the Russian university that requested the team visit. The process is in no way “evaluative.” It does not dwell on perceived shortcomings or attempt to impose a “Team” or “Salzburg Seminar Universities Project” agenda. The purpose, rather, is to bring an avowedly outside (primarily European and North American) perspective in order to call attention to those aspects of the visited university that seem strongest, as well as those aspects or practices or strategic directions that seem most different from those one might find in similar universities in Europe and North America. A visiting team needs to be aware of at least the broad contours of contemporary Russian higher education, as well as higher education in Europe and North America. Thus the composition of this visiting team was ideal: two members who had been Russian University faculty and administrators, but who were living in Austria and the US, with great familiarity with European and American universities; one specialist in European universities; and two members who had headed American institutions of higher education, one of whom is now associated with the principal American higher education association, and the other (the team leader) who is a scholar of higher and comparative education with a strong interest in higher education in the so-called “transitional” countries of the former Soviet Union and Eastern and Central Europe.

D. Overall Team Impressions of Bashkir State University

The team was very favorably impressed with the University, its leadership, and its plans. Specifically, we found:

1. A university of high quality—one that ranks highly among Russia’s so-called *classical* universities.
2. A university that seems to be coping creatively and effectively with the severe financial difficulties that are afflicting all Russian universities. (We were impressed especially with the largely successful efforts to supplement the dwindling revenues from Moscow with revenues from the Bashkortostan Republic, from regional businesses and industry, and from fee-paying students.)
3. A university that is well lead by a Rector (Academician Mukkamedt Kharrasov) who has a firm vision, and who seems to enjoy the great confidence and support of his administrative team and of the regional government and local business leadership.
4. A university that is becoming well integrated into the community, with effective ties to the Bashkortostan Government and to regional business and industry.
5. A student body that (at least from the perspective of the many students from the mathematics department with whom we met) is intelligent, studious, lively, and on the whole pleased with Bashkir State University and with their professors.

6. A plan, strategically focusing on e.g. new academic programs, information technology, and the need to rehabilitate existing facilities and acquire new ones.

II.

Observations and Recommendations

Our observations and recommendations must be given with considerable caution, even humility. Our visit was brief, and none of us had had previous experience in the Republic of Bashkortostan. And even though two of our team were products of Russian universities and former members of Russian university faculties and administrations, and even though the other members had considerable experience viewing universities in an international comparative context, we still recognize the difficulty of making useful observations without a much fuller knowledge not only of the host university but of the region and of the very most recent developments in Russian higher education. Nonetheless, while we recognize that what may seem to be similarities or elements of convergence may mask important differences in cultural and governmental systems, we were also impressed with how similar in most ways were the problems, the aspirations, and the general set of possible “solutions” on the agenda of Bashkir State University to those on the agendas of most universities in Europe and North America.

A. Mission and Strategic Direction

Observation:

In light of the three traditional missions of Western research universities—teaching, research, and service—Bashkir State University, as noted above, seems to be performing very well the teaching and the service elements of this tripartite mission. In comparison with North American or West European universities with comprehensive “research” or “classical” missions, Bashkir State University has a considerably less developed profile of advanced (aspirantura and doctorantura) education and fundamental research in the kinds of critical masses that can lead to collaborative advances in scholarship with national and international recognition and even funding. (The team recognizes that this is partly or even largely a function of the very considerable—arguably *excessive*—amounts of time that the faculty must spend both in purely income-generating activities and also in meeting the heavy classroom teaching expectations. While the first so-called “diversion” of faculty time and attention away from scholarship—the generation of non-governmental revenue—probably cannot be altogether “solved” in the foreseeable future, the second—the great number of hours that both the students and the faculty are expected to be in classroom teaching and learning—possibly can, and we will have some recommendations below.)

Recommendations for Mission and Strategic Direction:

1. Adopt as a long range goal (especially as financial conditions permit) an expectation that faculty, at least at the upper ranks, will spend more time on scholarship and on advanced (aspirantura) and doctorantura) training. Along these lines—and again, as financial and other conditions permit—consider a modest shift in the levels of the student body from undergraduate, or first degree, to the levels of masters, aspirantura and doctorantura training.
2. Consider very carefully the mission—and the special niche—that Bashkir State University can (indeed, must) play within the Russian Federation and the Autonomous Republic of Bashkortostan. On the one hand, Bashkir State University is fortunate to be ranked within the “high middle” of all of the “classical” universities so classified within the Russian Federation. On the other hand there is considerable overlap in the activities and programs of many of the institutions of higher education within the Republic of Bashkortostan—especially among Bashkir State University, the Bashkir State Pedagogical Institute, the Ufa State Aviation Technical University, the Ufa State Petroleum Technical University, and the Bashkir State Medical University. This overlap occurs both in some of the state-supported degree programs, as well as many of the commercial activities, including both fee-generating teaching and contract research. While Bashkir State University cannot at this time financially afford *not* to compete in many of these so-called commercial activities, neither can it afford in the long run to lose the position of academic leadership that comes to the more classical universities in the subject regions and autonomous republics.
3. In connection with this special regional niche, consider ways of cooperating even more fully, including such *real* cooperation as joint academic appointments and shared degree programs (in addition to the many other possible but less academic forms of cooperation such as e.g. shared facilities or student services).
4. Consider ways to provide *fewer but broader* academic degree programs. Even if academic content remains, for now, essentially the same, the objective should be to have academic program authorization broad enough to branch out in new directions, and to abandon outdated curricula without the constraint of waiting for ministerial approval. (This may require the kind of changes in Russian ministerial approvals that we refer to in the recommendation under part F, below.)
5. Further on the “breadth and depth” of academic programs, consider narrowing the number of academic programs in accord with the University’s overall academic mission and also in accord with the missions of the other institutions of higher education within the Bashkortostan Republic. The objective is not so much fewer programs, *per se*, but greater concentrations of faculty (and thus of important subspecialties) in the remaining fields, and also the greater ability to add new academic fields

and disciplines by reallocation of resources without having to await new resources from Moscow.

6. Although this may sound contrary to recommendations #4 and # 5 above, we nevertheless recommend attention to the long-range role that Bashkir State University might play in the training of physicians and other health professionals as well as in training and scholarship in the biomedical sciences. In North America and Western Europe, the most exciting—and currently the most well-funded—scientific fields, are mainly in the biomedical sciences, including such fields as molecular and cellular biology, biophysics, biochemistry, bioengineering, genetics, pharmacology and other medical basic science fields. In this connection—and in full recognition of the fact that the control of medical education in Russia lies mainly with the Ministry of Health—we recommend that Bashkir State University pursue much deeper ties and affiliations with the Bashkir State Medical University, desirably culminating, some time in the future, in a full merger of the two institutions. (We recognize that this recommendation is in a way radical. However, Russia is going to support medical education and research in the biomedical sciences in some way: our recommendation for possible merger of the premier research university in the region with the regional medical university is primarily one of *academic governance* and *ministerial authority* rather than a recommendation for the expenditure of additional public resources per se.)
7. Maintain the current very commendable orientation to the special needs of the region and to the government of Bashkortostan. At the same time, in recognition of the qualities and the specialties of the other institutions of the region, do not attempt to be “all academic things” to the region. More importantly, do not be so “regional” as to ignore some special roles that Bashkir State University can play in the neighboring subjects, the larger region of the Urals, in neighboring Turkic language speaking republics, and in the larger Russian Federation. Finally, begin to think and act more genuinely *international* and *European*, including participation in the various associations of European “classical” universities.
1. Consider the degree to which the mission of Bashkir State University extends to taking some responsibility (along with Moscow and the Bashkortorstan Republic) for redressing possible inequalities of access to this university—the most prestigious in the Republic, and thus a gateway to many of the most sought-after career opportunities. Such inequalities, assuming they exist, may be mainly manifested in inequalities in academic preparation at the secondary school level, which in turn may stem from such factors as low levels of family income or educational background of the parents, attendance at isolated rural schools or schools serving only linguistic minorities, and the like. Although some of the remedies are costly, and thus probably beyond the financial capacity of any university, other remedies have more to do with standards, admissions criteria, and programs of academic assistance.

2. Consider (with some apprehension) and begin to plan for the coming demographic changes in the likely university population: specifically, the anticipated sharp decrease in the traditional high school graduating population. It may be that the applicant pool for Bashkir State University is deeper than the pools of other institutions in the region. Yet, all this means in itself is that Bashkir State may be able to maintain enrollments by “dipping farther down” into this pool. However, in order to maintain the appropriate number of students with the desired academic profiles, the University will have to attract *new applicants* from some combination of: (a) neighboring subjects or regions; (b) neighboring countries; (c) new populations, such as adults and older university graduates who now need retraining; and (d) the above-recommended shift from mainly first degree to a more balanced emphasis on advanced degree students and programs.
3. Continue to work on the long range plan—although we prefer to think of a *strategic vision and directions* as opposed to the conventional (and too frequently constraining and narrowing) concept of a *plan*. Whatever it is called, there needs to be some concrete stipulations of directions and priorities that remains at one time flexible, permitting the institution to take advantage of new (and unforeseen) opportunities and to deal with the uniquely changing policies and circumstances of the Russian Federation, but at the same to do so without being totally opportunistic, or without a firm sense of direction that differentiates Bashkir State University from the other institutions of higher education in the Republic.

A. Service within the Region

Observation:

As universities in Russia and elsewhere have moved away from old models of centralized planning and control, they have taken on new missions of *relevance* and *responsiveness* to the needs of e.g.: students, local communities, businesses, civic organizations, and local and regional governments. Universities both *serve* and *lead*, meeting needs already articulated, as well as cultivating new ways of serving these regional stakeholders. And this service is motivated both by an institutional sense of obligation, or duty, as well as by self-interest, as they strengthen their financial base through commercial activities that met clear needs of students, business, and government.

There are important caveats to observe in meeting regional needs. The first is to avoid the parochialism that can come out of an *overorientation* to local as opposed to national and even international needs. The second is to avoid an *overorientation* to meeting externally-defined needs and to service—which a great many governmental and non-governmental service entities may be able to meet as well—to the detriment of an orientation to the kinds of academic values, to the pursuit of truth, and to the preservation of culture that arguably *only* the university (and especially the classical university) can perform.

Bashkir State University, as cited above, has a commendable record both of meeting needs and of generating new ways to serve the community and the region. The team was pleased to note, for example: (a) partnerships with thirty local schools to promote access of the brightest students to higher education; (b) outreach, including the off-campus sites in Sterlitamak, Sibai, and Neftekamsk; (c) a number of programs serving Republic and district governments, including such disparate services as a contract to train civil service staff at the Republic level and a joint project, centered at Bashkir State University, for the Internet wiring of all schools, hospitals and other governmental entities in the Republic. The assistance clearly goes both ways: The Republican government has assisted the University in the provision of housing for faculty, in repairing buildings, and in funding the Internet center and other projects.

Recommendations for Service within Region:

1. As mentioned under the “Mission” recommendations, consider, at least for the long run, a service and regional mission that is somewhat more oriented to the unique capabilities of Bashkir State University. This suggests a mission that would flow more from the special scholarly orientation and academic programs of Bashkir, as opposed to the more opportunistic commercialization that is much like the rest of the higher educational institutions in the Republic.
2. Devise a regional service plan, with specific service goals, timetables, rationales, and credible performance measures. These performance, or “output,” measures should demonstrate real value to the region, such as the level of regional employment or the monetary volume of exports that can be shown to depend directly or indirectly on the University. Such a plan with its performance measures could serve two purposes. First, it could show how Bashkir State University *already* serves the region, and could be used, then, to support requests to the regional government and to area business for support, as well as to help the regional government justify the resources that are already being devoted, directly and indirectly, to the University. Second, such a plan, with its measurable indicators of regional service, could be used internally to reward faculties, departments, and individual faculty and staff for activities furthering the goal of regional service.
3. Following *Mission and Strategic Direction* recommendation #3, above, take the lead in pursuing regional Bashkortostan “System” solutions to the need of all higher educational institutions in Ufa for expanded capital facilities (like the present Bashkir State University Internet Center) including for example, a journal library, computer service center, student dormitory, career advisement office, or *technopark/incubator* facility.
4. Form, and carefully staff, community liaison committees: some on going, and some to exist only for a defined period of time and/or until completion of a defined product. Consider having each committee co-chaired by a

University staff member and a person from the community. Have agendas, specific assignments (with timetables), and follow-up reports.

5. In lieu of having each regional university competing for the same governmental, business, and civic leaders, consider some committees that include representation from other appropriate universities, and be prepared to share the influence and ‘credit’ accordingly. (This could be an appropriate agenda for the regional association of rectors.)

B. Finances

Observation:

Bashkir State University. Like all Russian Universities (indeed like all of the Russian public sector) is severely constrained by the great budget cuts that have been handed down by the Finance Ministry of the Russian Federation. These cuts, in turn, may be seen as the consequence of three factors. The first is the considerable decline in Russian Gross Domestic Product at the start of the decade of the 1990s and the very slow growth (in the years that there has been growth at all) in the Russian economy since then, occasioned by the traumatic changeover from a strictly “command” economy to one embracing private means of production and driven largely by markets. The second factor, over and above the shrinkage in production, is the enormous and increasing difficulty that the government of the Russian Federation (as with governments in most of the rest of the world, especially in the newly privatizing economies) is finding simply to tax at all. The third factor underlying the budget cuts is the apparently diminished priority of higher education in comparison with all other claimants for these scarce public revenues—e.g. elementary and secondary education, public economic and civic infrastructure, health, the restoration and protection of the environment, and both internal and external security. In short, it is reasonable to believe that, as severe as is the present financial crisis in Russian higher education, and as much as the visiting team would hope that this situation would soon be ameliorated, we have little hope that any Russian universities are likely, at least in the immediately foreseeable future, to obtain substantial increases from Moscow. Therefore, the financial future of Bashkir State University will continue to depend, as it has for the past decade, on the university’s ability to get *other-than-central-governmental-revenue*—from e.g. the entrepreneurial activities of the faculty, fee-paying students, the commercialization of University assets and facilities, the Bashkortostan government, regional business and industry, and international sources of assistance such as the Soros Foundation, The World Bank, and other non-governmental sources.

Recommendations for Financial Strengthening

1. Continue the entrepreneurial pursuit of non-federal revenues from the region, from sponsors of grants and contracts, and from fee-paying students. (The promising beginning of a commercial enterprise in electronic texts is such an example.) Try, where possible, to maximize the core budget relief of such entrepreneurial activities by attempting to

incorporate as much of the teaching and other revenue producing activities within the base workload expectations of the faculty and staff.

2. Attempt to secure funding for additional enrollment, while holding (or even reducing) marginal costs. This means efforts to improve faculty and staff productivity by such methods as contracting out certain non-academic services, improving the student-faculty ratio by adding students without adding to the number of hours that the faculty are expected to teach, and shifting the faculty lines toward the high demand fields where there are potential fee-paying students.
3. Maximize the possibility of strategic faculty line reallocations by a policy of all faculty vacancies reverting to the institution to be redistributed by the Rector, upon advice from the Learned Council, to the academic areas of greatest need and institutional “pay off.”
4. Continue to solicit regional business and industrial leaders for financial contributions, in part through demonstrating their need for the kind of high quality workforce that Bashkir State can produce.

C. Teaching and Learning

Observation

The attention of Bashkir State University is properly focused on its students. Throughout our visit we heard many faculty and administrators express concern with the improvement of the educational process and more support for students, and our limited exposure to students—specifically, a session with 100 or so soon-to-graduate mathematics students—corroborated this. (In light of the concentration of programs and enrollments on the first degree student, the visiting team’s observations and recommendations are similarly focused on the teaching and learning of the undergraduate.)

The predominant teaching-learning mode seems to be the lecture. Although lectures are an important form of pedagogy in all universities, the dominance of the lecture at Bashkir State University (as in all Russian Universities), with many hours of “classroom seat time,” all but excludes other forms of teaching and learning such as group work and other forms of collaborative learning, discussions, independent field work, laboratory time, term papers or other “at home” assignments, or various forms of *self-paced* learning such as computer assisted instruction. While knowledge of the basic structure of the disciplines is important, and while some kinds of learning are effectively and efficiently conveyed in lectures, the kind of knowledge most useful in a fast changing world and in a competitive, market-driven economy suggest new approaches to teaching and learning.

For example, in the societies and economies of the 21st century, highly trained persons are less often asked simply to recall known “answers” to given problems. Instead, they may need to collaborate in teams to devise a solution to a complex problem that may not have an obvious “right” answer. They are

more likely to need to draw from a wide range of knowledge they have garnered from a variety of learning experiences in order to formulate a range of alternative solutions that they must then evaluate according to certain values or other criteria. Students who have been trained only to memorize “right” answers to questions, or simply to repeat back the content of lectures, may have difficulty moving to such “unscripted” problems because they have not had enough experience learning on their own or in groups. This has implications for possible improvements in the educational program, innovations in pedagogy, and the development of the faculty as teachers. Specifically, the most current thinking in the universities with which the visiting team members are familiar encourage more active learning on the part of students. To do this, an institution must move beyond the lecture as the overwhelmingly dominant teaching mode to include *problem-based*, *collaborative*, and various forms of *self-paced learning*.

Recommendations for Teaching and Learning

1. Develop a system of faculty incentives (travel grants, financial supplements, attendance at workshops, the use of consultants, etc.) for adding new pedagogy to encourage active learning in existing courses. (Knowledge of such pedagogy is widely available in the literature of higher education, and workshops are available to share this expertise. Bashkir State University has already provided some of its faculty the opportunity to study management in Moscow and to learn new materials for the establishment of the Academy of Complex Security of Enterprises. In a similar fashion, faculty could be given travel incentives or supplements to learn the techniques of problem-based teaching and evaluation to add this contemporary dimension to the educational program at Bashkir State University.)
2. While augmenting the lecture mode of instruction in this way is intrinsically valuable, it may also be helpful if required student attendance at lectures could be reduced—say, from 36 or 40 hours to, say, 18 hours per week (as has apparently been suggested at the Russian Higher Education Ministry level). Arguably the currently expected very high levels of student-faculty contact hours, predominantly in a lecture mode, are both inefficient and less than effective. A reduction of expected contact hours could help both the student and the faculty member experiment with different modes of teaching and learning that made more extensive use of the *out of classroom* hours.
1. In the same way, the number of expected classroom contact hours for most faculty could and should be reduced. At least for those faculty expected to produce research, the current number of classroom lecture hours is far out of line with faculty hourly teaching expectations at research universities in North America and the rest of Europe. The key assumption underlying this and the preceding recommendation is that the amount of student learning per faculty can be maintained—or even increased—through teaching and learning modes that place more responsibility for

learning on the student, and that rely much less on long hours of lecturing to relatively small classes.

2. Also in line with faculty hiring traditions at most research universities in North America and Europe, we recommend a policy that discourages excessive faculty “in-breeding”—that is, hiring one’s own advanced degree graduates for faculty positions. This is a reform that Bashkir State University cannot implement alone; but in concert with other classical universities, the practice of “hiring one’s own” should be recognized as more appropriately the *exception* rather than the *norm*.
3. The *electronic textbooks* that are being developed at the University are another method to enhance opportunities for self-paced learning and to free both students and faculty from the currently expected very high levels of classroom “seat time.”
4. Develop a clear strategy and incentives for encouraging faculty to include internet-based assignments in courses and programs. The team visited, and was impressed with, the Internet Center. Its popularity shows that students are eager to learn on their own, even though their Internet explorations may not be related to courses. This popularity suggests students are likely to welcome pedagogical changes that encourage independent learning. However, to gain the most effective academic use of the Internet Center, faculty must be actively encouraged to include internet-based assignments in their courses.

D. Students at Bashkir State University

Observations:

The Visiting Advisor Team had the opportunity to meet with a large group of first degree students. All the students, about evenly divided between young women and young men, were graduating in mathematics, and we visited with them just before they were to receive their degrees. (We assume that this group included few if any fee-paying students, as such students were not admitted in large numbers at the time these students began their studies—which may limit the extent to which one can generalize about all students from this sample.) These students were cheerful, polite, and articulate. They were quite pleased with the attitude of their professors, whom the students found accessible and concerned about their academic progress. Several mentioned that the faculty seemed to have little interest in their personal lives, though, in general, they found that to be quite acceptable.

The major concerns we heard dealt with included:

- the chronic inadequacy of student stipends;
- the inadequate material conditions of the dormitories; and

- concern about entering the job market in an effective, competitive manner. (The students were fascinated by the amount of career growth and change that is expected by graduates in Western Europe and North America), as well as by the attention to career preparation that US colleges and universities routinely pay.)
- The issue of faculty evaluations also arose, as some students had reportedly approached the dean about a faculty member whom they considered an unsatisfactory teacher, but were told that this was not a matter for the students. They were interested in the various kinds of student evaluation of faculty that are conducted in other countries. However, because they were about to graduate, they did not seem to feel passionately about having such a system at this University (nor were they aware that the University had such a system in the early 1990s).

Although we assume that the general satisfaction of the students with their experiences at Bashkir State University is mainly a reflection of things that the University is doing well, we were concerned with what appeared to be a somewhat passive acceptance of aspects of their life at the University with which they were also expressing clear concerns. The students felt that they were able to communicate with the administration through their union, which meets weekly with the Rector, and they knew that their dean could deal with academic problems through the departmental council. They seemed satisfied with these levels of access to authority even though they are not (or are no longer) represented on the University's premier deliberative and consultative body, the Learned Council.

We assume that a vibrant and democratic civil society depends on active involvement of citizens in areas of their concern. We therefore believe that this passiveness (if it indeed be indicative of the larger student body) could be a signal that the university needs to more actively encourage a role for students in the governance of the University. Furthermore (and quite aside from any ideological concern about the degree to which students are involved in "shared governance" of the University), the growing numbers of fee-paying students—who may be more inclined to take their fees elsewhere if they are dissatisfied—suggests a need to both *be*, and *be widely perceived to be*, especially responsive to the needs and views of the students.

Finally, although we noticed some impressive English language facility, the students—especially compared to their European counterparts—had almost no experience in other countries. Increasingly, the economic success of students will depend on their ability to function in international contexts, and the University should develop some strategies for broadening the students' outlook and experiences of other countries.

Recommendations for Students and Student Development

1. Engage the University community, perhaps beginning with the Learned Council, to explore ways in which the University might fulfill its social

obligation to prepare its graduates for full participation in the emerging civil society and in the world at large—in addition to training for careers and for academic success.

2. Consider an expanded student participation in University governance, perhaps within the Learned Council.
3. Encourage faculties and departments also to actively and formally seek expression of student concerns and their suggestions about how to address those concerns.
4. Consider the establishment of a Career Placement and Enhancement Center to allow graduates the best possible guidance about getting a first job and continuing learning for an effective career over a full lifetime.
5. Develop strategies for broadening the students' international outlook and experiences.

E. A National (All Russian Federation) University Agenda With Regard to Moscow and the Central Government of the Russian Federation

Observation:

Very many of the most obvious and even many of the most seemingly solvable, problems of Russian universities reside at the level of Moscow and the central government of the Russian Federation. At the same time, there does not appear to be a clear, unified, and forcefully-advocated agenda from the Russian universities of the changes they would like to see in federal policies and laws (other than more money and more autonomy). To this end, we suggest that the various rectors' conferences agree on such a list of demands or requests.

Recommendations for an Explicit, Focused All Russian Universities Agenda

8. Maximize the ability of universities to expend funds as they see fit, consistent with transparency and post audit controls, including the right to transfer funds between categories and to carry forward savings to subsequent fiscal periods.
9. Have a system of base budget allocations that is based on enrollments (as now), with accommodation to differences in costs according to the nature (e.g., laboratory science or lecture) and level (e.g., lower division undergraduate or postgraduate) of the programs and other major expense categories (such as energy needs), but that is fully transparent and as free as possible from political influence—and of course is as adequate as the Russian Federation budget can allow.
10. Alter the current system of academic program approval by narrow specialization to approve broader, more general programs, allowing

greater institutional flexibility in tailoring and adapting the actual curricular content.

11. Lower the current level of required student classroom contact hours in most programs (as the Deputy Minister has reportedly already proposed) to come more in congruence with universities in Western Europe and North America.
12. Recognize the very great need of universities to build and rehabilitate facilities by providing special equipment and facilities loans at affordable interest rates, and by encouraging universities to save and carry forward unspent funds from one budget year to the next.
13. Recognize the great hardship on all faculty of the currently grossly inadequate level of salaries and pensions, and the difficulty this presents to universities in the tendency of most faculty to defer retirement beyond the age that would be advantageous to the university by implementing a mandatory—but adequately pensioned—retirement age.
14. Recognize the need to participate, at the ministerial level as well as the level of the individual institutions, in the “Europeanization” and “internationalization” of higher education.

III.

Conclusion and Summary

Once again, we stress the tentative nature of both our observations and our recommendations. Both have been made with admittedly minimal time “on site,” and with only minimal input. In some instances, we may have missed current facts or critical background information that might have led to a different observations, conclusions, or recommendations. In other instances, the observation may have been valid, but the specific recommendation only one of several—and not necessarily the most efficacious—possible responses or “solutions.” Finally, we recognize that the challenges to Bashkir State University, as to all Russian universities (indeed to universities everywhere, including our own) are very many and occasionally quite daunting, and that the capacity of the administration and the faculty to respond, even to otherwise “good ideas” is inherently limited. And we certainly recognize that the current agenda is extremely full and probably entirely appropriate. Therefore, some of the recommendations may be reasonable, and may even already be on the list for future attention, but may simply need time for the current agenda of already-proposed *new initiatives* and *solutions* to be absorbed and institutionalized.

These caveats being said, we hope that we have made some useful observations and recommendations. We convey our warm thanks for the helpfulness of all with whom we met. We wish the leadership, faculty, staff, and students of Bashkir State University the very best in what we believe to be a promising future. And we convey again our most favorable impressions about the University and its present directions.

Visiting Advisors Team

Olga B. Bain USA

Olga B. Bain has recently received the Ph.D. degree from the State University of New York at Buffalo. Her fields of research include higher education finance, governance, and policy analysis. A member of the Comparative and International Education Society (CIES) and the Association for the Study of Higher Education (ASHE), she has written numerous publications in the areas of comparative higher education and linguistics. Dr. Bain formerly served as an Associate Dean and Assistant Professor in the Faculty of Romance and Germanic Philology at Kemerovo State University, Russia. Dr. Bain also holds the degree of Kandidat of Philology from St. Petersburg State University (1990).

Guy HAUG France

Guy Haug is Principal Advisor of the European Association of Universities (EUA) in Geneva/Brussels/Paris. He was instrumental in the preparation of the 1999 Bologna Declaration in which twenty-nine European countries pledged to reform their educational systems in a convergent way in order to make European higher education more compatible and more competitive worldwide. Dr. Haug was vice president and director general of the Council on International Educational Exchange for Europe until 1998. He worked for the European Union for the preparation and inception of the ERASMUS and TEMPUS programs. He cooperates regularly with the Council of Europe, the OECD, UNESCO and with NGOs involved in international education. Dr. Haug holds a master's degree in law from Strasbourg, France; an M.B.A. from Ottawa, Canada; and a Ph.D. in political science from the University of Tübingen, Germany.

Barbara A. Hill USA

Barbara Hill is a Senior Fellow in the Center for Leadership Development and International Initiatives of the American Council of Education (ACE). She previously served as President of Sweet Briar College, Virginia, Provost of Denison University, Ohio, and Associate Dean of the Faculty at Barnard College of Columbia University, New York. Dr. Hill has served the Association of American Colleges and Universities as editor of the quarterly *Liberal Education*, been on the Boards of Directors of the Association of American Colleges and Universities, the National Association of Independent Colleges and Universities and the Virginia Foundation of Independent Colleges. She has also served on the Commission on Leadership Development and the Commission on Governmental Relations of the ACE. Dr. Hill holds M.A. and Ph.D. degrees in English literature from the University of Washington in Seattle.

Bruce Johnstone USA

Bruce Johnstone is University Professor of Higher and Comparative Education at the State University of New York at Buffalo. From 1988 to 1994, Dr. Johnstone served as Chancellor of the State University of New York system, the 64 campuses of which enroll nearly 400,000 students with a consolidated budget of approximately \$5 billion. Prior to his appointment as the SUNY Chancellor, Dr. Johnstone served for nine years as President of the State University College at Buffalo. A leading authority on the economics, finance and governance of higher education, Dr. Johnstone is the author or editor of three books and many articles and monographs on the economics of higher education, student finance, state and federal higher education policy, and international comparative higher education finance. His B.A. is from Harvard College, his M.A.T. from the Harvard University Graduate School of Education, and his Ph.D. in higher education from the University of Minnesota. Dr. Johnstone is a member of the Universities Project Advisory Committee.

Helene Kamensky Austria

Helene Kamensky is Russian program coordinator for the Universities Project of the Salzburg Seminar. In addition to her work with the Universities Project, she is lecturer in philosophy and Russian studies at the Universities of Salzburg and Vienna. Previously, Dr. Kamensky was research fellow at the Institute of Scientific Theory, Salzburg International Research Center. From 1985 to 1989 she was dean of the Faculty of Foreign Languages, Novosibirsk State Pedagogical University, Russian Federation. Earlier, she served that same institution as associate professor and senior lecturer in the department of philosophy. She holds a Ph.D. from the department of logic and epistemology at the Russian Academy of Sciences.

The Visiting Advisors Program of the Salzburg Seminar's Universities Project, including the visit to Bashkir State University, has been made possible by a generous grant from the W.K.Kellogg Foundation.

THE UNIVERSITIES PROJECT OF THE SALZBURG SEMINAR

Universities throughout the world are undergoing systemic changes in their governance, academic design, structure, and mission. The Salzburg Seminar's Universities Project focuses on higher education reform in Central and East Europe, Russia, and the Newly Independent States as universities in these regions redefine their relationships with governments and try to become more integrated into the global intellectual community.

The Universities Project is a multi-year series of conferences and symposia convening senior representatives of higher education from the designated regions with their counterparts from North America and West Europe. Discussion in the Project's programs focuses on the following themes:

- University Administration and Finance
- Academic Structure and Governance within the University
- Meeting Students' Needs, and the Role of Students in Institutional Affairs
- Technology in Higher Education
- The University and Civil Society

OBJECTIVES

Universities and other institutions of higher learning are seeking to reshape themselves in ways that will prepare them more fully for the twenty-first century. Even as these institutions are considering extensive systemic changes in their academic design, structure, and mission, all desire autonomy in governance and in their intellectual life. Accordingly, the Universities Project aims to promote the higher education reform process by inviting senior administrators to participate in conferences and symposia concerning issues of university management, administration, finance, and governance.

THE VISITING ADVISORS PROGRAM (VAP)

The Salzburg Seminar launched this enhanced aspect of the Universities Project in the autumn of 1998. Under this program, teams of university presidents and higher education experts visit universities in Central and East Europe and Russia at the host institutions' request to assist in the process of institutional self-assessment and change. By mid 2001, twenty-eight VAP visits will have taken place to universities in East and Central Europe and Russia. A full schedule of visits is planned for 2001 and beyond. The addition of the Visiting Advisors Program brings to the Universities Project an applied aspect and serves to enhance institutional and personal relationships begun in Salzburg.

The Salzburg Seminar acknowledges with gratitude the William and Flora Hewlett Foundation and the W.K. Kellogg Foundation, which are funding the Universities Project and the Visiting Advisors Program respectively.

FOR MORE INFORMATION

For more information regarding the Salzburg Seminar's Visiting Advisors program, the Universities Project, and Salzburg Seminar programs, please contact one of the Seminar's offices below.

Salzburg Seminar
Schloss Leopoldskron
Box 129
A-5010 Salzburg, Austria

Telephone: +43 662 839830
Fax: +43 662 839837

Salzburg Seminar
The Marble Works
P.O. Box 886
Middlebury, VT 05753 USA

Telephone: +1 802 388 0007
Fax: +1 802 388 1030

Salzburg Seminar website: www.salzburgseminar.org