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

**NATIONAL TECHNICAL UNIVERSITY OF UKRAINE "KYIV POLYTECHNIC
INSTITUTE"**

September 17-22, 2001

Team members

Mr. William B. Baker, Vice President Emeritus, University of California System
Ms. Martha Gecek, Coordinator, Visiting Advisors Program, Salzburg Seminar
Dr. Daniel O'Hare, President Emeritus, Dublin City University
Dr. Piotr Ploszajski, Head, Department of Management Theory, Warsaw School of Economics; former Director General, Polish Academy of Sciences

Introduction

This report is based on a series of meetings that took place at the National Technical University of Ukraine "Kyiv Polytechnic Institute" (hereafter "KPI") from September 17-22, 2001. The visit took place at the invitation of the Rector of KPI, responding to the increasing awareness on the part of universities in Central, East Europe and Russia of the Salzburg Seminar's Universities Project, and the thirty successful visits carried out under its 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 Advisors, who are selected by the Salzburg Seminar, are distinguished educators who are invited to join a team because of their specific expertise in the areas identified by the Rector for discussion during the consultant visit.

The National Technical University of Ukraine "Kyiv Polytechnic Institute" is the largest and most prestigious technical university in Ukraine. Founded in 1898, KPI's proud history includes a close association with such renowned scientists as Dmitry Mendeleyev, Igor Sikorsky, and Stepan Timoshenko. The University currently comprises twenty-five faculties and several research institutes and scientific engineering centers. Currently more than 38,000 students are enrolled, including 800 international students. In recognition of the importance of providing a well-balanced curriculum for its students, KPI has introduced faculties devoted to the humanities in addition to faculties traditionally associated with a technical university. Recognizing the urgent need for international activity, KPI now has relationships with eighty-two partners in higher education institutions around the world.

The team members (hereafter "Advisors") met with the Rector, Mychailo Zgurovsky, vice rectors, deans, professors and students of KPI to discuss a variety of issues of concern to the University leadership. The Advisors were very pleased to also have the opportunity to meet with officials of the city administration concerned with educational affairs, as well as a very productive meeting with the Ukrainian Deputy Minister of Education, Professor Mikhail Stepko. These meetings provided the Advisors with an excellent opportunity to better understand the ways in which the KPI Rector and his colleagues are working with local and national government officials to further common goals with respect to educational reform.

The Visiting Advisors greatly appreciated the privilege of visiting the Kiev Polytechnic Institute, and are grateful to the Rector and his colleagues for the preparations before the visit, the excellent arrangements during our stay, and for the candor and engagement that characterized the discussions. The entire KPI staff were gracious hosts who did their very best to make our stay in Kiev as pleasant and productive as possible. It was indeed a memorable experience.

This report reflects the findings of the Advisors, and includes observations and recommendations of possible steps that could be undertaken by the University leadership in efforts to reform the University and to adjust to trends and developments in international higher education. The observations are given with caution. The recommendations are based on the materials provided us, and on the discussions with University personnel during the four days of discussion. Our visit was brief, and there is an inherent difficulty in making useful suggestions without in-depth knowledge of the University. It is clear, however, that in spite of some differences in cultural and governmental systems, the challenges and aspirations of KPI are remarkably similar to those faced by many universities in Europe and North America.

The Advisors find KPI in general, to be an excellent institution.

We recognize that many of our recommendations have already been discussed at KPI, and indeed, some may already be under implementation.

There are three general concerns that are not examined in detail in this report:

1. There is a need to seek further autonomy from the Government;

2. There is concern over what appears to be excessively high teaching loads;

3. There is a need to reconsider the overall organizational structure of KPI.

§§§

The recommendations of the Advisors follow, in no order of priority.

Financial Support

Nearly every public University in the United States has experienced a gradual reduction of financial support from its respective state government over the last

several decades. For example, the University of California has seen state funding decrease from 70% of total funding in 1970 to 23% in 2001.

The financial needs of a modern public university cannot be met in total by governmental funding.

U.S. universities have generated a wide number of alternative funding sources to replace the lost funding from state government.

The following are examples of alternative funding sources that US universities have developed to supplement the shortfall in state funding. Some of them may be applicable in some way at KPI, or there may be equivalent measures that would be appropriate for introduction at KPI.

1. Student Fees

In addition to tuition, which may range from a very small charge to as high as the full cost (which may be waived in whole or part because of a student's financial need or other special circumstances), students could be required to pay several additional fees for specific purposes such as:
   a. Books and school supplies;
   b. Use fees, including recreational facilities, attendance at sporting events, participation in special interest clubs;
   c. Fees for use of laboratories and charges for access to the Internet;
   d. Health care fees

2. Housing Fees

Those students and faculty who live in University provided housing could pay a rental charge, in addition to what they may already pay; those who live at home, or in other non-university housing would not pay a housing charge.

3. Parking Fees

Students, faculty and administrators who choose to bring a private automobile to the KPI campus could be required to pay a fee for parking. Because public transportation is readily available, automobile parking should be considered a privilege, not a right.

Parking fee levels could be set on a graduated scale depending on how close to the central campus area or particular building the parking area is located.

4. Establishment of private businesses of campus

Food shops (even a McDonalds!) stores, banks, school supply stores, clothing stores, coffee shops and vending machines could all be established on campus. The private businesses would pay rent for space, and share profits with the University.

Such businesses are common at U.S. universities and provide much needed services for students and faculty and produce considerable income for the university. In

addition, businesses could be required to hire students for all of their work force needs.

5. Funding from private foundations, business corporations, alumni associations and other private sources can be a major source of funding and is discussed separately below.

Alumni, Fund Raising and Public Relations

1. Alumni

As western universities seek to make up the shortage of funding provided by the government, alumni assume increasingly important roles. Most alumni are proud of their university, grateful for the education they received, and have a "warm spot in their heart" for their university and are eager to offer support.

Because alumni have become such an important element of support, great effort is expended in systematically organizing and interacting with alumni. Alumni can be called upon from government and the business community to support the university in ways to encourage funding from the government, and contributions from businesses and individuals.

The alumni organization becomes the principal support organization for raising both public and private funds for the University.

As a starting point, the Rector might appoint a group of 20 to 50 prominent KPI alumni to a special group which could be called something like "KPI Rector's Advisory Council" (RAC).

The RAC would be brought onto campus for periods (e.g. four times per year), be taken into the confidence of the Rector as his trusted advisors, and called upon to help in matters such as fund raising.

Over time, with the help and prestige of the RAC, a sophisticated, organized alumni association would be developed and which would include tens of thousands of KPI graduates.

The most important first step in <u>fund</u> raising is '<u>friend</u> raising". There is no better group of friends to start with than the alumni.

2. Fund Raising

The Rector's Advisory Council, which certainly over time and perhaps even at the outset, could have prominent citizens who are not alumni in its membership, should play a lead role in reaching out to government officials to secure the strongest possible funding support for the University. Who better to advocate on behalf of the University than important citizens who are not employees of KPI, but who have great influence over members of the Parliament who must vote for appropriations.

It is important to have a systematic, organized approach to advocacy or "lobbying" of the government.

Private fund raising requires a similar organized approach. Staff must be provided and given the full time responsibility for private fund raising.

A wide variety of private giving is possible. Below are only a few examples: (note: gifts can be "restricted" to a specific purpose determined by the donor, or "unrestricted", the use determined by the Rector.)

   a. Cash gifts;
   b. Gifts of equipment;
   c. Gifts of books or other supplies;
   d. Gifts of services;
   e. Gifts of building or building renovations;
   f. Gifts of real property

The key words in private fund raising are "organized" and "systematic". You have to be organized to do it and systematic in your approach. It involves identification of prospects, cultivation of their friendship and finding creative ways to help them give to the University.

Prospects include individuals from across the world, corporations, businesses large and small, and foundations. Many small gifts of only a few dollars can be as important as a single large gift. You will find that if approached systematically, people will want to give to KPI.

3. Public Relations

Underlying all efforts to advocate for the University and to be successful in private fund raising is a strong public relations effort.

The public should know about KPI. No day should go by without the great achievements of KPI, its students and faculty being in the news, both print and electronic. The more people hear about KPI, the more important it will become to the economic and social well being of the country. And the more important it becomes, the more generous will be the government and the business and private community.

Again, it is organization and a systematic approach that is essential. Adequate professional staff, dedicated full time to public relations is necessary.

The several external efforts that should be undertaken include governmental relations, alumni relations, public relations and private fund raising. These essential activities that are interdependent, require an organized and systematic approach.

It is recommended that KPI seek western experts, who for expenses only, would be willing to visit KPI and assist KPI in organizing these critical and essential activities.

Student Affairs

KPI has reason to be proud of its student body. The Advisors met with several student groups. Those we met with were extraordinarily poised and well informed on University matters. The student leadership appears to be far better represented and more involved in University affairs than in a typical western university.

In order to achieve a general sense of student life at KPI, we asked those we met with to suggest priorities for improving student life. The list is interesting, and is given here in no particular order.

1. Additional computers. By far the most often suggested need.
2. More instruction in use of computers.
3. Internet access.
4. Improved computer network.
5. Updated laboratory equipment.
6. Copy machines.
7. Fax machines.
8. Improved and updated library.
9. Improved housing.
10. Additional informal meeting space.
11. Improved ventilation in laboratories.
12. Adequate heat in classrooms and laboratories.
13. Increased book supplies with updated materials.
14. Translation of scientific literature.
15. Opportunities abroad
16. Employment opportunities after graduation.

These are the issues on the minds of students. The Advisors believe all of the issues should be addressed, with some clearly more important than others.

The most pressing issue and the Advisors believe to be clearly the top priority has to do with computers. Availability, Internet access and instruction should be addressed on an urgent basis.

English Language

The Advisors were impressed at the numbers of professors and other senior administrators who were able to communicate in English. A number who had a good facility in English were reluctant to use it because of a lack of confidence in their own ability. The situation was not as positive in this regard for students. The three student interpreters were outstanding; KPI should be very proud of them. A small number of student leaders had good fluency in English but were reluctant to use it because of a lack of confidence.

At the same time there was a clear commitment evident to the internationalization of the Ukraine in general and of KPI in particular. The ambitions in this regard were expressed as clearly by staff as by students. The Advisors were very impressed by the degree of unanimity on this matter.

The reasons for this interest are clear and universally acknowledged, namely, that English is fast becoming the internationally accepted language for technical and business endeavors in most countries; the software industry is, effectively, dominated by and reliant on English. The consequence is clear— whether for student/student or academic/academic interaction and for joint projects or for interaction with the European Union, for instance—proficiency in English is a sine qua non! It is the crossroads for much human interaction and encounter. Without ability in English many constraints on human-to-human interaction will be present.

KPI, in its forward looking and ambitious strategies for the future has yet another reason to focus on the English language. It wishes to send students and faculty abroad and to attract faculty and students to KPI. Without proficiency in the English language none of these objectives can be achieved. Indeed, there are additional pressures on faculty in this regard because of the desire of KPI to have many subjects taught by faculty in English.

It is very clear to the Advisors that a special effort must be made by KPI to ensure that students and faculty achieve a high degree of fluency in English. Two issues arise in this regard. Firstly, the teaching methods by which this can be achieved. Secondly, there is the motivation, existing or provoked, in students or in faculty to learn English.

At the very least, classes should be provided for all during normal working hours and at night—the latter for those whose daytime work load prevents them from attending class during the day. The excellent distance education facility at KPI could provide programs to KPI people and to the population at large; these programs could be transmitted to other universities and colleges throughout the Ukraine as well as being used on campus at KPI. The programs should prepare attendees for the TOEFL (Teaching of English as a Foreign Language) examinations that can be taken at various defined levels of mastery of English.

As for motivation, KPI could rely on the general or personal interest of students and faculty. However, the Advisors do not believe that this will be an adequate basis for success on a large scale since enthusiasm will vary widely. The Advisors offer the following suggestions for consideration by KPI. Indeed, a similar program and series of interventions could also be introduced into the secondary school system.
The following are suggested:

Faculty

1. A minimum level of proficiency—related to the relevant TOEFL certificate levels—should be agreed for docent, assistant and professor levels.
2. A stated time limit should be set for the achievement of that level. Of course, professors should be set a higher level to be achieved than docents, for example.
3. Should the stated level of certificate be achieved, a bonus payment equal to 10% of annual salary should be paid as salary and maintained annually thereafter. A language test should be passed each three years in order to retain the bonus.

4. A further bonus of 5% - 10% of salary would be paid to faculty who are willing to teach and conduct examinations in the English language.

Students

1. Each KPI student should be set target levels of achievement in TOEFL for each year of their program.
2. In order to pass from one year to the next of their Bachelors or Masters, the relevant level of proficiency must be achieved.
3. Should a student agree to be taught and examined in English their Marks/grades in those subjects should be increased by 5 – 10%.

These recommendations are very ambitious we acknowledge. However, we believe that Ukraine—or any other country—will not achieve its full potential in the information age of tomorrow if it does not achieve nationwide English language proficiency. Indeed, we believe that Ukraine will leap forward in all of its chosen industrial sectors—and could exceed the achievements of its international competitors—if it undertakes this initiative. At a minimum it will draw level with other nations if it makes a strong effort in this regard; however, should it fail to take progressive steps with regard to English language proficiency for its graduates and faculty it will fall behind the rest of the world as an economic force. This same logic has the same implications for all other universities and colleges in Ukraine as well as for KPI.

Since graduates from KPI and those from other institutions, along with faculty research, are vital to the future development of Ukraine, these recommendations will advance the achievements of Ukraine beyond measure.

International issues

Throughout the Advisors' many meetings with faculty and students, a strong recurring theme was that of internationalization or globalization. This concern was expressed in many ways. The concerns of the faculty included:
1. An anxiety to have KPI's degrees recognized abroad.
2. An anxiety to ensure that the quality of KPI's education, in being recognized abroad, would attract foreign students to study at KPI.
3. The wish of the faculty to have the quality of their research acknowledged abroad and, as a result, being able to participate in research projects with many new foreign partners. (There were concerns that there may be a prejudice against research proposals from Ukraine/KPI.)

Student ambitions were also many:

1. To interact with 'Student Unions' abroad in many countries and with international bodies that represent many 'Student Unions'.
2. To be able to travel abroad for study, leisure and for other pursuits and to identify sources of financial support for these purposes,
3. To ease the visa requirements and processes for obtaining visas to visit countries such as USA and the UK. A contrast was made between the ease

with which Finland issues student visas and the difficulties obtaining visas for other countries.

Recommendations

KPI expects that international recognition of its degree awards could be achieved both by means of intergovernmental agreements or accords, and also through bilateral or multilateral agreements between universities. The Advisors suggest that since universities are autonomous in relation to academic matters, only interuniversity agreements will be effective. These must be negotiated on a one-to-one basis; this will inevitably take a great deal of time and patience, but there is no other way.

As individual students gain admission to foreign universities, the process will involve the presentation of detailed descriptions of the program completed by the student. Having successfully achieved admission, further KPI students will have fewer barriers to overcome, and admission to other universities in the same country will be correspondingly easier.

The Advisors also suggest that KPI should make an approach to the British Council in order to seek its recognition of KPI awards. If that can be achieved, it will facilitate the more ready admission of KPI students to British universities and to universities in Commonwealth countries, such as Canada, New Zealand, Australia etc. It should be noted also that universities in yet other countries give special weight to British Council recognition of academic awards.

The active and visible participation by Ukrainian universities in the work and meetings of the European Association of Universities is also important. The membership of bodies such as OECD—and the participation of Ukrainian universities in the many program and activities of such bodies—is also an important component in gaining international recognition.

We also advocate the participation by Ukrainian 'student unions' in international student bodies.

Internet access for students in support of their education is referred to elsewhere. This ready and easy access to the Internet will give individual students and student unions full access to up to date information on matters such as admission requirements to foreign universities, to philanthropic foundations, to possible sources of financial support for travel which will facilitate them in participating in international student activities. But students must learn to rely much less on government and university support and much more on their own efforts!

Research Support

It was expressed to the Advisors, that faculty feared there might be prejudice in some international bodies who assess their bids for research support. The examples quoted did not convince the Advisors that these fears were well founded. Indeed, the Advisors were of the opinion that there were rational and fair reasons for the failures

described and that a number of measures could help KPI raise its success rate in obtaining research grants from international agencies.

To begin with, every university around the world must decide to promote a small number of research areas on a preferential basis. The Advisors were not made aware that this had been done at KPI. The Advisors believe that these choices must be made by the Rector and his senior colleagues if they are to have any credibility with research foundations and philanthropists and with the worldwide academic community.

We also believe that the techniques in writing research proposals are not always within the competence or knowledge of individual researchers. They frequently need a great deal of advice as to the specific requirements of any international grant-making agency. Equally, the identification of sources of research grant support is a special skill; it also requires constant and sustained attention over a period of time, something that busy researchers cannot afford without neglecting their research. It is for these and other reasons that the Advisors suggest strongly that KPI appoint a senior individual whose sole role would be to liaise with the relevant officers in the EU in Brussels and in other bodies with the purpose of identifying research funding opportunities. Such a person should have responsibility for raising the profile of KPI research capabilities with these bodies and with universities abroad. While the person appointed to this task should have a scientific or engineering research background, it is stressed most strongly that the other characteristics mentioned above are vital for success. These should be the sole duties of the person appointed to the task.

The Advisors also believe that the prospect of success in applying for research grants can be enhanced if a person with appropriate drafting skills is appointed to prepare or to assist in preparing applications for research support. This is a normal procedure in many foreign universities; it recognizes that to write clear and effective research proposals requires special skills and that many academics do not have these skills. In addition to having these skills, such people also develop an intimate knowledge of the requirements and expectations of individual research agencies, even to the extent of getting to know those who assess proposals and with whom they can develop a positive relationship.

The team's recommendations regarding fast and easy access to the Internet is also relevant in this regard also since the Internet contains information regarding sources of research support.

Modernization

A universal challenge for all universities, without exception, is that of keeping equipment and facilities up to date. It is a constant battle that all university leaders are aware of and must grapple with on a continuous basis in order to maintain quality. KPI feels these pressures more extensively than universities in richer countries, and understandably so. Notwithstanding these great challenges, KPI must strive to solve them—as universities elsewhere do—by a combination of government assistance and self-help and assistance from business. The leadership of KPI is not

lacking in determination and resolves to rise to these challenges. Indeed, it is well placed to succeed because of its dynamic and creative leadership.

We identified four such challenges and none of them will be easily solved:
1. The library
2. Computing facilities
3. Equipment
4. General facilities

Library

The library stock is not as up to date as it should be. Its book stock, the range of periodicals and reference material and handbooks is deficient and it will require a very special effort to rectify these shortcomings. Library users have limited access to the Internet.

In addition, a desire to have books and periodicals in the Ukrainian language is at once understandable and unrealistic. Our recommendations on proficiency in the English language for students and academics and the availability of much English language material on the Internet will go some way to providing a partial solution to the general problem.

Additional government support and fund-raising from private individuals, philanthropic organizations and businesses must also make a contribution to solving the library and other problems that we refer to. It is an obvious but a necessary comment to make that it is impossible to achieve quality in a university—both teaching and research—without a well-founded library. These same remarks and solutions are equally applicable to facilities, computing and equipment.

As an additional suggestion, the Advisors strongly suggest that KPI and its faculty should devise and execute a plan to approach business for financial and other types of support. This support can take many forms, such as money, equipment, building supplies, fittings and furniture; all should be regarded as appropriate. We acknowledge that KPI has attracted some support from business but our belief is that much more can be achieved in this regard with a more professional approach to fund-raising such as is advocated elsewhere in this report.

Allocation of Resources

The decline in funding received by universities from the State has caused budgetary challenges in universities throughout Central and Eastern Europe as well as in Western Europe and North America. University leaders need to find creative ways to increase revenue, as well as to reallocate present resources and set priorities in order to make the most efficient use of resources at hand. Allocation of resources entails making choices, all of which will require courage, persistence, patience and determination.

The fundamental choice to be made is between the "socialist" university model, and a "market and efficiency driven" university. There are advantages and disadvantages to each. The "socialist" university has little autonomy, too few resources, lacks strong

internal developmental forces, and must contend with mediocre performance of individuals and organizational units. At the same time, it offers comfortable, lifetime employment with relatively low stress, job security, friendly working environment, and the reassuring opportunity to blame "the system" for unfavorable results. The market driven university, on the other hand, enjoys more autonomy, increased resources and options, and more efficient operation. However expectations for productive work are higher, competition for both internal and external resources is intense, and job security is lower with employment often based on short or medium term contracts.

Each university must make the choice as to which direction it will choose. If KPI moves towards a market driven university, then difficult but necessary decisions must be made. The Advisors noted, for instance, that some organizational units at KPI are greatly overstaffed in comparison to comparable units at Western universities. Reduction of superfluous staff members may be difficult to implement for historical or "human" reasons, but such measures are necessary in the interest of efficiency.

KPI might also consider introducing a performance appraisal system at both the individual and the inter-departmental level. Such an evaluation procedure must lead to actions, instead of playing an ornamental role that gives staff the comforting feeling that quality assurance is being addressed.

Another choice that can be made by the University involves the broad range of functions it performs. The organizational diagram of KPI indicates that it continues to follow the traditional university structure, which was a model of any large organization in the socialist past. KPI should give priority to those areas in which it excels. For example KPI is teaching and conducting research, but it also operates university cafeterias and countryside rest centers. The Advisors suggest that KPI make a review of all KPI operations, and outsource some of them to external firms; for instance a cafeteria leased to a private operator may even provide a profit to the University.

The same observation regarding choice applies to KPI's scientific structure as well, though team members recognize that this will be even more difficult and painful a task. KPI has more than one hundred research/teaching departments, most of them more than 50 years old. The Advisors suggest that the University leadership review the individual departments to determine whether perhaps new departments are needed, whether others should be merged, and still others perhaps eliminated.

The traditional and somewhat obsolete structure in use at KPI greatly affects the curriculum. We were told that KPI produces a large number of graduates with specialties not needed in the current job market. While limited numbers of students go on to take a second diploma, often in management to make them marketable, this does not seem to be an efficient solution to the problem. The Advisors thus recommend that the University consider undertaking an extensive review of the existing curriculum, taking into consideration both the changes in today's technology as well as current market needs.

Finally, rational allocation of limited resources requires setting up research priorities based on KPI's own unique strengths in certain areas, in addition to external

demands. Clearly this will involve some painful choices, but they are unavoidable if KPI intends to become competitive on the international scientific scene.

It is always difficult to introduce change, and academic institutions are perhaps even more difficult to change than other institutions. The Advisors feel that it is extremely important for the University leadership to develop policies, practices and mechanisms that will reinforce the attitude that change is necessary and welcome. Staff members should be encouraged to react positively to new ideas and solutions to problems, rather than citing reasons why they cannot be implemented. This can be achieved by strongly and openly promoting and supporting individuals and departments that have demonstrated individual initiative, entrepreneurial skills, and independent thinking. The signal from the university management should be that initiative pays, including financially.

Business Plan

The Advisors recommend that the KPI leadership strongly promote business-type thinking among staff and faculty members and students. For example a proposal for a research contract should be accompanied by a business plan with careful calculation of benefits versus costs. The KPI management should set an example and include the issues of carefully calculated full costs in its strategic projects and other undertakings.

Entrepreneurship, taking initiative, and business-type thinking should be encouraged of faculty members and employees, and positively reinforced by the university management. Some departments have greater opportunities than others to generate income because of their specialty, and this should be supported. The Advisors would like to encourage the Department of Management to engage in the potentially very lucrative management and executive training for practitioners. Offering short courses to improve skills, post diploma studies, MBA and Executive MBA programs can provide sources of revenue for the Department and to the University, which can be shared to help other less viable departments and areas.

Thinking in business terms should be encouraged at many levels, including the student level. Students with business proposals for companies should be encouraged to create a business plan that includes a benefit for the company as well as for the student.

In short, each new idea generated at KPI should include a business plan component with the various expected benefits and costs carefully calculated.

Internet connectivity

As was mentioned repeatedly during the consultant visit at KPI, the Advisors feel strongly that unrestricted student and faculty access to wide band, fast Internet connection is a crucial component of a successful university. We would like to underscore our recommendation that the KPI leadership should make this its single most important goal that should be implemented in the shortest possible time, even at the expense of other urgent tasks. Many of the concerns expressed to us by faculty members centered on developing research partners abroad, obtaining foreign

grant and scholarship money, and purchasing expensive Western publications. Students expressed their need for travel money, internships, scholarships, and international contacts. Many of these may be found on the Internet in the form of scholarships, paid-for conference invitations in return for interesting contributions, free software and even equipment. Library costs may be lower because of free on-line publications. One Advisor noted during the consultant visit that a few years ago his university in Poland had installed hundreds of free standing Internet-connected computers in the school's corridors and seminar rooms. The result is that students are finding their own valuable contacts and sources for funding through the Internet. Advisors are aware that the introduction of free-access Internet will not solve every problem; but it will certainly change the University significantly at every level of its functioning.

The Advisors also believe that Ukraine needs a countrywide hyper-speed academic Internet network. Clearly universities cannot afford such a network, but it can be achieved with the help of the state government, and possibly also with support from business and from international sources. An example might be the Polish National Academic Computer Network (NASK.) We would encourage KPI to play a leading role in such a project. If desired, Poland would be willing to help Ukraine by demonstrating the system and explaining the steps needed for its creation. Advisor Piotr Ploszajski offered to arrange for a group of Ukrainian specialists to travel to Poland to study the system there, and to obtain the necessary funding for the visit. As mentioned during the consultant visit, another possibility for cooperation is the Japanese interest in starting a help program for Ukraine with Poland; the academic network may be one of the areas of support and cooperation. KPI will be contacted as soon as more details are available.

Conclusion

The Advisors stress that our observations are made after a minimal time "on site" and we may well have missed facts or critical information that might have led to different observations. We recognize that the challenges to KPI (as they are to universities everywhere) are many and often serious, and that the capacity of the administration to respond to recommendations is limited. That said, we hope that our observations and recommendations will be useful as KPI moves forward to join the intellectual global community. We were very impressed with the leadership of the Rector of the University, Mychailo Zgurovsky, and his determination to take the necessary steps to ensure that KPI continues its path towards educational reform. We wish the University leadership, faculty, staff and students of KPI the very best towards what we believe to be a promising future.

Salzburg seminar Universities Project

Visiting Advisors Program

National Technical University of Ukraine
"Kyiv Polytechnic Institute" team:

Myhailo Zgurovsky - Rector, professor (e-mail: zgur@zgurov.kiev.ua)

Yuri Yakimenko - First Vice-Rector, professor (YIY@ntu-kpi.kiev.ua)

Myhailo Ilchenko - Vice-Rector in charge of scientific work (olgilch@hotmail.com)

Sergey Sidorenko - Vice-Rector in charge of International Relations (e-mail: sidorenko@uap.ntu-kpi.kiev.ua)

Boris Tsyganok - Head of International Relations Department (e-mail: tsyganok@uap.ntu-kpi.kiev.ua)

Nikolaj Pechenik - Vice-Rector in charge of administrative and economic work (pechenik@uap.ntu-kpi.kiev.ua)

Ivan Korobko - Vice-Rector in charge of teaching educational work

Volodymyr Shechovtsov - Deputy first Vice-Rector

Volodymir Timofieiev - Deputy first Vice-Rector

Sergey Voronov - Deputy Vice-Rector in charge of scientific work

Danil Benatov - Deputy Head of Student Council of the University.

Team members – Visiting Advisors Program Consultant Visit to the National Technical University of Ukraine NTUU "KPI," Kiev, September 17-22, 2001

William Baker (team leader)   USA
Bill Baker was vice president of the University of California System for fourteen years, where his responsibilities included the negotiation and management of operating and capital budgets, governmental relations at state and federal levels, communications with the media and general public, and alumni and fundraising activities. He is a nationally recognized expert on alternative dispute resolution, and a frequent lecturer on arbitration and mediation. Mr. Baker has been a consultant to many higher education institutions throughout the USA on issues of governance, governmental relations, planning and budgeting, and management and executive leadership. He holds a B.Sc, in civil engineering from the University of California, Berkeley.

Martha Gecek   USA
Marty Gecek is administrative director of the Salzburg Seminar's American Studies Center, in addition to serving as coordinator of the Universities Project Visiting Advisors Program. A member of the Salzburg Seminar staff since 1966, she has held several positions including associate diretor for administration and personnel. Originally from Massachusetts, Ms. Gecek earned a B.A. in sociology from Hollins University, Virginia, and has lived in Salzburg since graduation from college.

Daniel O'Hare   Ireland
Daniel O'Hare is president emeritus of Dublin City University. He is chair of the Irish Government Organization, serves on the Committee of Expert Skills, Food Safety Authority of Ireland, and is a member of the Food Safety Promotion Board. Dr. O'Hare's interests center on higher education governance, management, and planning. He earned a B.Sc. and an M.Sc. from the National University of Ireland, Galway, and a Ph.D. from the University of St. Andrews, Scotland.

Piotr Ploszajski   Poland
Piotr Ploszajski is a former director general of the Polish Academy of Sciences, Warsaw. He is currently professor and head of the Department of Management Theory at the Warsaw School of Economics, and chairman of the Polish-Japanese Management Center. He is presently chairman of the Council for the Reform of Government Administration, and is a consultant for numerous industrial, non-profit, and government organizations. Dr. Ploszajski was educated at the Sloan School of Management at Massachusetts Institute of Technology, the Harvard Business School, and the Institute of Philosophy and Sociology at the Polish Academy of Sciences, where he received a Ph.D.

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 the end of 2001, more than thirty VAP visits will have taken place to universities in East and Central Europe and Russia. A full schedule of visits is planned for 2002 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 83983
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