

REPORT on
Altai State University
Barnaul, Russian Federation
May 22–26, 2005

SALZBURG SEMINAR

RUSSIAN HIGHER EDUCATION PROGRAM
VISITING ADVISORS PROGRAM



SALZBURG SEMINAR

The Russian Higher Education Program of the Salzburg Seminar Visiting Advisors Program

Summary Report of the Visit to the Altai State University, Barnaul, Russian Federation May 22-26, 2005

Team Members:

Alfred Ebenbauer (Team Leader), President, Austrian Academic Exchange Service; Professor and Rector Emeritus, University of Vienna, Austria

Dumitru Ciocoi-Pop, Professor and Rector Emeritus, Lucian Blaga University of Sibiu, Romania

Mark Power Robison, Academic Planning Officer, University of Southern California, United States

Helene Kamensky, Program Director, Salzburg Seminar, Austria

INTRODUCTION

Altai State University (hereafter referred to as “ASU” or “the University”) invited the Visiting Advisors Program Team from the Salzburg Seminar to review a set of issues selected by the University’s leadership because of their relevance to the future development of the institution. These issues included

- Academic structure and governance within the University
- Student needs and the role of students in institutional affairs
- Technology in higher education

In particular, ASU asked the VAP Team to offer assistance with strategies

- To simplify the scheme of the University management in order to solve issues faced by the University
- To find an optimal ratio of budget and non-budget financing of the University and its departments
- To increase student mobility (also by the means of academic credit system application)
- To apply computer-based system of documentation turnover
- To apply new technologies in the curriculum

In preparation of the visit, ASU provided helpful background materials, including a “statement of institutional concerns and goals,” a detailed list of “issues under discussion” that outlined the topics the Rector and Vice Rectors wished to address in the review, a “S.W.O.T.” analysis of the University, basic information about the

organization structure at ASU and its budget, a draft schedule, and a list of the teaching staff and administrators with whom we would meet.

During their four day visit to Barnaul, the Advisors met several times with Rector Yuriy Kirushin and Vice Rectors Gennadiy Lavrentiev, Nikolay Mikhailov, and Valeriy Nevinskiy. Their gracious hospitality and insightful comments made the visit a great success and a true pleasure for the VAP Team. In addition, the VAP Team met groups of teaching staff and administrators during a series of discussions with three working groups.

Working Group A: Academic Structure and Governance within the University

Chair: Nikolay Mikhailov, Associate Professor, First Vice Rector for Academic Affairs and Science

Co-Chair: Alfred Ebenbauer, Professor and Rector Emeritus, University of Vienna, Austria

- Boris Kagirov, Vice Rector for General Services
- Tatiana Bortnikova, Associate Professor, Branch Director, Altai State University in Slavgorod
- Tatiana Soboleva, Associate Professor; Academic Secretary of Academic Council
- Olga Zharnevich, Head of Personnel Department
- Tatiana Shekhtman, Head of the Registry
- Alexander Lukiyarov, Head of Legal Department
- Viktor Musyukin, Associate Professor; Dean of Law Faculty
- Viktor Revyakin, Professor; Dean of Geography Faculty
- Olga Sokolova, Associate Professor; Deputy Dean of Economics Faculty
- Olga Kolesnikova, Associate Professor; Deputy Dean of Sociology Faculty
- Viktor Polyakov, Professor, Head of Chair of Applied and Medical Physics and Measuring Electronics, Faculty of Physics and Technology
- Galina Strenadkina, Accountant General
- Tatiana Kirushina, Deputy Dean of Preliminary Training Faculty

Working Group B: Student Needs and the Role of Students in Institutional Affairs

Chair: Valeriy Nevinskiy, Professor, Vice Rector for International Affairs

Co-Chair: Dumitru Ciocoi-Pop, Professor and Rector Emeritus, Lucian Blaga University of Sibiu, Romania

- Vadim Chutchev, Rector's Assistant for Extracurricular Affairs
- Evgeniy Petrov, Associate Professor; Head of Academic and Methodology Department
- Galina Tailasheva, Head of Academic Affairs Department
- Alexander Chikildik, Head of League of Students
- Natalia Bazarnova, Professor; Dean of Chemistry Faculty
- Lyudmila Demina, Professor; Dean of Psychology and Philosophy Faculty
- Valentina Mansurova, Professor; Dean of Journalism Faculty
- Natalia Kuznetsova, Associate Professor; Dean of Philology Faculty
- Elena Pritchina, Associate Professor; Dean of Political Science Faculty

- Galina Spitskaya, Associate Professor; Dean of Pedagogical Education Faculty
- Tamara Stepanovskaya, Professor; Dean of Art Faculty

Working Group C: Technology in Higher Education

Chair: Gennadiy Lavrentiev, Professor; Vice Rector for Academic Affairs

Co-Chair: Mark Power Robison, Academic Planning Officer, University of Southern California, United States

- Alexander Maximov, Associate Professor; Vice Rector for Informatization
- Boris Shipunov, Associate Professor; Vice Rector for Innovations
- Sergey Semenov, Associate Professor; Director of Education Quality Ranking Center
- Vladimir Vladimirov, Associate Professor; Dean of History Faculty
- Sergey Kuzikov, Associate Professor; Dean of Mathematics Faculty
- Sergey Beznosyuk, Professor; Head of Physical and Colloid Chemistry Chair
- Viktor Belyaev, Professor; Head of Entrepreneurship, Economics, and Marketing Chair
- Irina Ignatovskaya, Associate Professor; Deputy Dean of Law Faculty
- Roman Raikin, Associate Professor; Deputy Dean of Physics and Technology Faculty
- Evgeniy Ivanov, Associate Professor; Head of Information Systems in Economics Laboratory

In addition, the Team met with a group of roughly thirty students.

The VAP Team wishes to thank all of the teaching staff, administrators and students with whom we met for their candor in the discussions and their hospitality throughout our stay. The Team owes special thanks to the two interpreters for their warm welcome and excellent work both as interpreters and guides.

GENERAL COMMENTS AND IMPRESSIONS

It is important to emphasize from the outset of this report that the purpose of the visit was not a formal evaluation of the ASU, since this would be impossible given the limitations of time and familiarity concerning the process of reform in Siberian higher education. Instead, the Visiting Advisors were asked as colleagues to share observations and offer recommendations with regard to the issues that were presented to them. The Team had to rely on the information and perspectives provided to them both before and during the visit. Having said this, the Team feels confident that they gained sufficient and accurate insights to set forth some discriminating views and propositions. The Visiting Advisors Team was away from home, and submits this document not in expert judgment but in the spirit of collegial, constructive observation.

OBSERVATIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Governance

Altai State University has accomplished an extraordinary amount in its thirty-two year history. The University has experienced rapid growth and has made changes during the past decade in response to the evolving needs of its students and the communities it serves. ASU is clearly an ambitious institution and is well positioned to build on those goals to continue its record of achievement. In particular, the University benefits from an impressive management team at the University, headed by the Rector and his Vice Rectors. We were impressed with the commitment and passion exhibited by the people with whom they met. Although our exposure was limited, the quality of faculty and administrative staff seems excellent.

Recommendations:

The most paramount need for the University is for a clear, effective strategic plan. At present there does not appear to be an on-going and systematic long-term planning process within the University. Current planning appears to be primarily reactive and defined by the resources available. Strategic planning has become an imperative if universities are to be successful in the twenty-first century. Such planning should be taken very seriously, be on-going in nature, and begin with a carefully crafted statement of mission for ASU, including the objectives related to teaching and learning, research activities, and broader service to the outside community. ASU has already identified some “priorities for strategic development,” but this list of goals needs to be expanded and clarified, and—most importantly—the University must articulate how it will seek to achieve these goals in the coming years. As this process is highly complex and requires input from the University’s many constituencies, we strongly recommend that ASU engage international and domestic experts to assist the University in developing such a plan. The University’s strategic plan should be aligned with its mission and should focus on the needs of its students and the region it serves. The first step in this strategic planning process should be to clearly articulate the University’s mission and values

On a separate matter, there appears to be a lack of long range budgetary planning. In order to efficiently and wisely manage the University, it is critically important to develop a long range budget plan for at least a five-year planning horizon. Such a plan will serve as a financial roadmap for the University. Annual revisions to the five-year budget plan to reflect actual results and changes in assumptions will permit intelligent financial decisions to be made.

With regard to the organizational structure of ASU, we recommend reorganizing the structure of the faculties to reduce redundancies and give clearer teaching and research focuses to each unit. The University is, of course, far more than a conglomeration of institutes—but the structures that bind these units together should be clear, coherent, and consistent with the overall mission of ASU. We departed Barnaul with the impression that (at least in many fields of study) there is too little cooperation between the institutes. The leadership of the University and

the teaching faculty need to discuss the optimal organizational structure for the University and then work toward creating and implementing a more effective structure. This will be most effective if it is facilitated by people from outside the University with experience in organizational management and strategic planning.

ASU appears to have no formal means of receiving advice from the external community. The University needs to consider the current and future nature of its relationship with the local and regional government, as well as the local and regional communities it serves. A key part of this effort should be a concerted effort to articulate the University's mission and plans so as to raise awareness of these amongst key constituencies including local and regional governments, businesses, civic groups, and the broader communities ASU serves. In particular, the University should create an advisory board of local business and civic leaders to forge closer connections with the University for the purpose of:

- Deepening connections to potential benefactors, such as businesses that might sponsor students in their studies
- Creating closer links between the education and research conducted at the University and the needs of the local community

Another suggestion that could be of benefit is the establishment of an alumni association. The graduates of any university are among an institution's strongest assets. Alumni can be a source of financial support through annual giving, one time donations, and bequests. They can also be of help in student recruiting and in job placement. It is important to be in regular communication with the alumni of the University and to keep them involved in the life of the institution.

Beyond the critical initiatives outlined above, ASU needs to reassess the complex governance structure of the University. The University appears to have too many overlapping authorities and responsibilities amongst its organizational units and leadership. The decision making process is unclear, and there appears to be more administrative positions than are normally required to manage an institution of this size. The number of vice rectors and deans seems excessive. For example, a typical American or Western European university of the size of ASU would not have more than three vice rectors and three deans, depending on the number of disparate academic units it included. Similarly, the responsibilities of the Rector, Vice Rectors, and Deans need to be clarified, giving the Rector clearer authority over the University while also empowering the deans to make the necessary academic and financial decisions to ensure the continued improvement and excellence of the teaching and research conducted by their staff. As with all matters of structure and governance, these activities must be aligned with the mission and strategic plan of the University.

The University needs to thoroughly consider and articulate the relationship between research and teaching at the University, and its goals for continued integration and improvement of these activities. Traditionally, the Soviet model of higher education separated these two functions when in fact they are actually interrelated. In other words, "I teach what I know, and I know the field in which I do my research;" a motto that guides scholarship and education at leading research universities throughout the world. In today's university these two major purposes

of this type of education cannot be separated. ASU would probably benefit from a serious discussion of this matter amongst its leadership and teaching staff.

The internationalization of the University should be a higher priority than it appears to be at present. The University has to increase its awareness of European and/or international activities by embedding them into institutional policies. ASU should be better prepared to respond to the effects of globalization and the need to compete in the wider educational market. As a result, the University needs a plan for internationalization that is integral to its wider strategic priorities. In particular the University should actively seek membership in key organizations of peer institutions, particularly the European University Association; and ASU should forge deeper relationships with universities in Europe and North America, as well as regional partners such as those in China.

The internet contains a wealth of information regarding these kinds of opportunities. We recommend that the University create an internet information center for this purpose and consider establishing an office devoted to facilitating student exchanges. With this in mind, we call the attention of ASU to a European program called TEMPUS, which is offered by the European Commission (in Brussels). This program is designed to assist non-European Union universities in improving their management practices, curriculum development and in acquiring basic administrative equipment, including computers, facsimile machines, photocopiers, etc.

It is clearly important to the leadership and staff of the University that it be considered an institution of very high quality. An impressive reputation can help bring to the University the highest quality of faculty and students. As is often the case, the public perception of ASU may lag behind the real quality it maintains. We believe that image and reputation in conjunction with private fundraising should be high personal priorities for the Rector. Outside expert advisers should be engaged to assist the Rector in development of an image campaign aimed at government and business leaders throughout the region, as well as the general population. At many European and American universities this very important role is played by an Office for Promotion or an Office of University Relations which also includes a Public Relation Unit (or a person responsible for public relations). The VAP Team strongly recommends creating such a unit, to operate under the direction of the Rector.

Similarly, sufficient funding for the University will be an ever increasing challenge. Funding from tuition, industry, and government sources may be adequate for the bare minimum operation of a university of average quality, but not for a university with the ambitions of ASU. The University needs to re-examine the role of the fundraising staff, including their training and the focus of their efforts. First and foremost, their work should be guided by the mission and strategic plan of the University. Managing scarce resources and identifying new resources is becoming a heavy burden for university administrators and managers; activities that are all time-consuming. At the same time, such activities require specific skills that are not typically part of the educational preparation of academics. Thus thought should be given to their professional administrative development and their roles in fundraising. Such initiatives have resulted in substantial gains for many universities in Europe and North America. Fundraising is a long-term process and

the first step in fundraising is “friend raising.” Private fund raising in a university setting requires the long-term cultivation of friends of the University. Friends are alumni, non-alumni, parents of students, businesses which seek ASU graduates for employment, organizations which have strong beliefs in the mission of ASU, organizations which benefit from the research carried on at the University, and other benefactors who believe in the good of education for societal and economic health and progress. Fundraising should focus on cultivating the support of these constituencies, as well as potential funders on the national and international levels. With this in mind, and to stimulate entrepreneurial efforts with the faculties, and particularly by the deans, the Rector should consider lowering the proportion of revenues from the faculties that are returned to the central administration from 50 percent to something closer to 25 percent.

ASU also needs to consider financial incentives and additional professional development opportunities directed toward excellent teaching and research staff. Consider establishing a committee of exemplary leaders from amongst the teaching staff to encourage and promote the cultivation of excellence in teaching and research. This committee must be given significant funds to be offered in support of professional development opportunities and for the funding of research activities, for which faculty can apply on a competitive basis. This group should work within a wider system of quality assurance that regularly monitors the efficacy of teaching and research activities in the faculties. The University needs to develop a system for training and professional development of deans and other managers, both for those currently in their positions and for emerging faculty leaders. This should include a strong internal system for professional development of current and future leaders, and for the University’s hosting of national or international gatherings focused on these issues.

Finally, with regard to the Bologna process, the University should conduct a thorough study of how universities in Russia and in the European Union have adapted in response the Bologna declaration and use this range of options as a menu from which ASU can draw models most suited to the University’s needs.

Information Technology

The University enjoys an impressive computing capability that offers students access to advanced computing systems. Students appear to have a high level of access to computing at home and at the University, as well as access to the internet. The University also has ambitious plans for implementing computerized administrative and academic systems that could greatly streamline efforts amongst the teaching staff and students.

Recommendations:

Like the need for a general strategic plan for the University, ASU needs to create a prioritized list of its information technology needs. This list should be used to guide decision-making in the acquisition and allocation of resources.

With regard to creating computerized administrative systems, the University should begin by assessing the many steps throughout the year when students

interact with the University to register for courses, advance to the next year, etc. This assessment should map the number of times students and staff interact with one-another to complete each step in the process, and what types of paper documents are created with each interaction. With this knowledge, the University can reduce the number of interactions and decide which of these can be computerized—thereby reducing the burden on staff and students alike. Other universities, particularly those in Europe and North America, have extensive experience in this field and should be consulted for their advice and guidance.

Although there appears to be wide-spread access to computing and the internet, the University needs to do a thorough poll of students to confirm that most students have sufficient access to information technology. With this knowledge, the University can then consider how best to use technology as a tool in teaching and in facilitating students' interactions with the University. Similarly, the University should perform a systematic assessment of the computing skills, equipment, and needs of existing students and of students in potential new markets. This information should be used as a basis for developing new training programs, new satellite campuses, and opening new markets for educational programs. Throughout these efforts, the University should consider the different needs of part-time versus full-time students so it can tailor educational program and information technology support to these different constituencies.

As with administrative computing and student access, ASU also needs a system for training faculty in the use of its computing technologies for teaching and research. It was evident that too few teaching staff are proficient in the use of technology in teaching, and the University's curricula would benefit from this expanded array of pedagogical tools. Many extremely useful resources available to enhance teaching and learning are available and free over the internet. Teaching staff should be made aware of these tools and have access to training needed to make use of these assets.

Students

In the materials that had reached the members of the VAP Team prior to their visit to ASU, and in the presentation of the University made by the Rector for the Team shortly after their arrival, the following information regarding students was set forth: on March 1, 2005 the total number of students at ASU was 18,361. Of these 9,517 were full time students (2,144 enrolled), 7,734 part-time students (1,229 enrolled), 1,238 students attending evening programs (371 enrolled), and 142 MA students. Apart from this main body there were also 450 postgraduate students; 19 doctoral students (Ph.D. candidates), over 1,000 pre-admission students, and 3,000 students attending refreshment courses.

Leaving aside the pre-admission students and the refreshment course students, who are not commonly found in all universities, we can see the main body of students is made up of state-financed students (enrolled students) and tuition-fee paying students.

The VAP Team members met with about thirty students, apparently representing various fields and specialties. Though not specified, the selection-criterion was, in all probability, their availability at the time appointed for the encounter with the VAP Team. The number of students was relevant (as a rule, VAP members meet with groups of ten to fifteen members). Nevertheless, there were two conditions which might have lead to even more rewarding result if they had been differently approached. First, the students' talk with the VAP Team members lasted about one hour, whereas 2-3 hour talk might have lead to a considerably better exchange of opinions. Second, the students (at least most of them) were apparently unaware of the items of discussion (or major concerns regarding student performance at ASU) that had been generously e-mailed to the VAP Team members prior to their visit, under the title: *"Student Needs and the Role of Students in Institutional Affairs."* These items are included again below for one reason: the conclusions regarding the students' major concerns, resulting from their interactive talk with the Team members, were drawn from the students' points of view regarding some of these issues.

Systems of academic credit and the credit transfer between universities

- *volume correlation of students' workload with their independent work;*
- *unification and standardization of academic subject names in a curriculum based on credits;*
- *organization of middle and final attestations of students in European universities (methods of testing and holding examinations);*
- *external expertise during the attestation of students (role and rights of an external expert);*
- *consideration of student quality progress when they enroll in the next year of study and/or when they are admitted to the next level of education (e.g., postgraduate study);*
- *opportunities of retraining for non-attested students, ways of implementation;*
- *organization of student independent work in European universities;*
- *features and differences of educational process in the universities of the Bologna Declaration member-states;*
- *issuing a Diploma Supplement (Diploma Supplement receipt, forms of Diploma Supplement approval);*
- *registration of Diploma Supplement;*
- *information regarding graduation educational documents issued by a foreign university. Their recognition at home and abroad;*
- *student evaluation of faculty members (subject contents and methods of teaching): open or anonymous, voluntary or compulsory participation in questioning, student suggestions on teaching quality improvement, role of the administration.*

In order to stimulate and promote student needs connected the above-mentioned issues the University has adopted the following measures:

- *computer-based testing of students' current and permanent knowledge of general and special disciplines;*
- *annual academic and methodical seminars on problems of integration in European Higher Education Area with the participation of the teaching staff, postgraduates, master students and senior courses students, including those attending programmes of academic credits applicable in the academic process and techniques of issuing a Diploma Supplement;*
- *in-service courses for the teaching staff in the frame of the distance learning programme "Tutor of Distance Learning;"*
- *annual meetings of graduates and employers;*
- *foreign languages courses (English, German) for teaching staff, postgraduates and students, in the frame of the Linguistic Centre programmes;*
- *monitoring educational, research and work places for postgraduates, MA students and undergraduate students in European and other countries;*
- *identifying scientific and academic fellowships and grants for postgraduates, MA students and undergraduate students abroad, primarily in the UK, Germany, Italy, France, Sweden, and the United States.*

The Team members all agreed that the students they met were very impressive, articulate and engaged in their educational and personal development. They were open-minded, anxious to learn, and improvement-oriented.

Of course, if one has a look at the previously quoted twenty issues, one can easily realize that the first thirteen represent major goals (or tasks) of the ASU leadership, regarding students' performance. Only the last seven issues represent actions focused on improving already existing realities, or challenges confronting a further implementation of unfolding plans.

Recommendations:

It would be advisable that students should be assisted in organizing themselves better (so far there is one student association focused mainly on professional issues). Student associations representing various schools or departments, united in a large association, might turn out to be more focused, more coherent, and more functional. This aspect is closely connected to another fundamental issue: students' co-option as full-time members on various leading boards of the University. This latter issue is fundamental if ASU wants to stay ahead of the change. The talk with the students revealed an essential problem which the ASU leadership will have to consider most seriously. It goes without saying that senior members of the University are impressed with some late changes (social, political, and cultural, as well as those regarding freedom of thought, freedom of speech, etc.) which would have been unthinkable twenty-five to thirty years ago. But, undoubtedly, young students (all over the world for that matter) have another (more daring) perception of academic changes and of students' roles. This reality

should be properly considered and dealt with; otherwise the “generation gap” may affect university development.

The Rector should insure that he has regular, unfiltered access to students to hear their opinions, concerns, and questions. The students should be encouraged by the Rector to take part in such interactive talks. It is not enough that the Rector should have a special day, each week or each month, to meet with students. He should “draw them out,” encouraging them to be pro-active. This can be more easily achieved with smaller associations than with one highly centralized student association.

The Rector ought to maintain direct links with the student leadership to seek and use their input. Beyond a shadow of a doubt, not all the wishes of students can be fulfilled in the near or distant future (and some can never be fulfilled at all), but it is essential to know accurately what students want, what galvanizes their interests, and the advantages that would accrue to them from adopting new attitudes.

ASU must provide students with the opportunity to evaluate efficacy of the teaching staff.

- It should be clear to all teaching staff and students alike how these evaluations will and will not be used.
- Results should be shown to the instructor and the dean, and should only be made more widely available with the agreement of the teaching staff.
- The evaluation should be anonymous.
- Although evaluations should be done for every course, they could begin immediately on a more limited, pilot basis.

Although, occasionally, evaluations can cause “bad blood,” ultimately they will turn out to be very useful. Of course, subjectivism may frequently be an evincible note in the evaluation. Teaching staff members should not be confronted with measures taken against them, without serious analysis, prior judgment, or proper evaluation of the truthfulness of the student’s evaluation. However, teaching staff can be easily and discreetly warned about the drawbacks in their performance, which, for reasons ranging from subjective to objective, they have failed to correct.

Students should be made aware of, and given input into, the purposes and structure of the education they receive. This is not to say that the students should impose “their will” and should decide what to study and what not to study; but they should definitely have their say in expressing their views and opinions about the extent to which what they study does or does not help them to be well trained in view of their future social and professional commitment and dedication. ASU should encourage students to have a more active role in advising the University on what academic program to expand, create, reduce, etc. The University should also use connections with alumni and the business community to enhance the student education experience and job placement. The alumni association of ASU must be at the heart of any action plan for the near future. The connection with the business community should be continuously strengthened, and it should never be looked upon complacently.

Student pro-activity should be increased, through augmented access to opportunities to conduct independent academic work, focused on their individual interest, pursued under the direct teaching of the faculty. This means precisely that they should not want to be told what to do or not to do. They should learn more and more and better and better, how to learn, how to find, and how to act under specific circumstances, how to become “creators” and cease being mere “recipients” of teachers’ wisdom and experience.

The University needs to increase awareness among students and faculty of the nature of changes in the student experience in recent years and of similar changes that should take place in the future. Both faculty and students should become incessantly aware of the need and importance to stay ahead of the change in a world that is changing more rapidly than ever before, in a world in which yesterday’s success may, occasionally, become tomorrow’s “bottleneck” if adequate adjustment measures are not taken.

Students would greatly benefit from opportunities to learn outside the normal structures of the University. The creation of an alumni association would be critical in this so that its network could link current student with alumni who can mentor them in career decisions. Similarly, internships and other short-term work assignments may be facilitated in a systematic way through an alumni association, the University, and/or the student association. It is important that this work should be of limited time commitment and duration so as not to create a fundamental conflict with students’ studies.

ASU’s preoccupation to meet students’ needs is clear and highly commendable, but this should not be equated solely to offering students the “best ways to follow.” It should mean, in more ways than one, a change of attitude. For example, it should hold the possibility that students should have a more prominent role in decision-making. Students may have much to contribute to the shaping of a “niche strategy” for ASU; that is, in identifying fields of great interest to the University viewed in terms of future relevance, and best use of ASU potential. The wider the geographical recruitment of students at ASU, the better and more convincing ASU training and education must be.

In the age of globalization, one cannot help realizing that the role of students (and by extension, the role of young people) will be of decisive importance. There is an amazing similarity between the aspirations, views, and wishes of the students at ASU and those of students in countries and universities far from Barnaul. Because of this, national and international academic interaction is an essential need of our time

Most assuredly, no one at ASU viewed the role of the VAP Team as that of a provider of ready-made solutions for the ASU students’ needs. What the Team was ready to offer was an invitation to sharing international experience, because, in so doing, academics may discover that “good” can be made “better” by learning how academics in other parts of the world have successfully dealt with similar problems of common interest regarding students’ needs.

We conclude by saying that in today's world the old motto "dare to learn," *sapere aude*, must of necessity be accompanied by its reverse form, "learn to dare," *audere sape*.

We thank the university leadership and students for making our visit to Altai State University and the wonderful city of Barnaul a most memorable and rewarding experience.

Visiting Advisors:

Alfred EBENBAUER, Austria (Team Leader)

Alfred Ebenbauer served for three terms as rector and one as pro rector at the University of Vienna, Austria. He is currently president of the Austrian Academic Exchange Service and the Viennese Eco-Social Forum, and a member of the board of the Sigmund Freud Society. He has been named honorary senator of the University of Vienna, and served as a visiting professor at Washington University in St. Louis, Missouri, USA. Dr. Ebenbauer holds an honorary doctorate from the University of Tirana, Albania and a Ph.D. in German and history from the University of Vienna. He is an alumnus of many of the Salzburg Seminar's Universities Project and Russian Higher Education Project symposia and has participated in several consultant visits by Visiting Advisors Program teams to the Russian Federation and Caucasus.



Dumitru Ciocoi-Pop, Romania

Dumitru Ciocoi-Pop is the former rector (1992-2004) and vice rector (1990-1992) of the "Lucian Blaga" University of Sibiu, Romania, and the former chair of the Department of American and British Studies. He serves as university counselor for International Academic Affairs, president of the "C. Peter Magrath" Center for Romanian-American Academic Interaction and Research, president of the Sibiu Division of the Romanian-Chinese Friendship Association, and honorary president of the Academic Anglophone Society of Romania. He holds a Doctor of Humane Letters, Honoris Causa, from the University of Missouri, Columbia, USA. The author of more than twenty books and a number of essays and articles focused on American and British Studies, Dr. Ciocoi-Pop holds a Ph.D. in philology of English and American literature from the "Babes-Bolyai" University of Cluj-Napoca. He is an alumnus of many of the Salzburg Seminar's University Project symposia and has participated in several consultant visits by Visiting Advisors Program teams to Central and East Europe.



Mark P. ROBISON, USA

Mark Power Robison is academic planning officer and adjunct assistant professor of history at the University of Southern California, Los Angeles, where he is responsible for coordinating a strategic planning process for the University and organizing academic reviews of schools and departments. He is the former executive assistant to the provost at Brandeis University, Massachusetts. Dr. Robison's teaching and research focus on British imperialism and colonial American history. He earned an M.A. from Claremont Graduate University and a Ph.D. from the University of Colorado. Dr. Robison is an alumnus of many Salzburg Seminar sessions, most recently Session 411, *The Cultural, Civic, and Economic Purposes of Higher Education*, 2003; and the second Russian Higher Education Project symposium, 2003.



Helene KAMENSKY, Austria

Helene Kamensky is program director for education and culture of the Salzburg Seminar, where she is responsible for the development and direction of academic programs on education, culture and related issues. Before joining the Salzburg Seminar, Dr. Kamensky served as an adjunct professor of philosophy at the Institutes of Philosophy at the University of Salzburg and the University of Vienna. Previously, she was research fellow at the Institute of Scientific Theory at the Salzburg International Research Center. From 1985 to 1989, she was dean of the Faculty of Foreign Languages at Novosibirsk State Pedagogical University in the Russian Federation, where she previously served as associate professor and senior lecturer in the department of philosophy. Dr. Kamensky's area of research interest is higher education policy and management. She holds a Ph.D. in philosophy from the Department of Logic and Epistemology at the Russian Academy of Sciences, which was authenticated by the University of Salzburg, Austria, in 1993.



Schedule:

Time	Topic	Participants
Sunday, May 22, 2005		
5:50	Team Arrives	
8:00	Arrival to the Hotel	
8:30	Breakfast	
9:30	Unscheduled Time	
13:00	Lunch	
15:00	Cultural Program (Sightseeing)	
19:00	Welcome Dinner	Rector Rector's staff
Monday, May 23, 2005		
9:00	Meeting with the Rector, Presentation of the Program.	Rector Rector's staff
10:30	Coffee Break	
11:00	Working Group A: <i>Academic Structure and Governance Within the University</i>	Working Group A
12:30	Lunch	
14:30	Working Group A: <i>Academic Structure and Governance Within the University</i>	Working Group A
15:30	Coffee break	
16:00	Working Group B: <i>Students Needs and the Role of Students in Institutional Affairs</i>	Working Group B
17:30	Team Debriefing Meeting	
19:00	Dinner or Cultural Program (optional)	
Tuesday, May 24, 2005		
9:00	Working Group B: <i>Students Needs and the Role of Students in Institutional Affairs</i>	Working Group B
10:30	Coffee Break	
11:00	Working Group C: <i>Technology in Higher Education</i>	Working Group C
12:30	Lunch	
14:00	Working Group C: <i>Technology in Higher Education</i>	Working Group C
15:30	Coffee Break	
16:00	Meeting with Students	Students
17:00	Team Debriefing Meeting	
19:00	Dinner or Cultural Program (optional)	
Wednesday, May 25, 2005		
9:00	Preliminary Report Preparation	
12:30	Lunch	
14:00	Presentation of the Oral Report to the Rector and the University Team	Rector Working Groups
15:30	Press Conference	
16:30	Spare Time	
19:00	Farewell Dinner	Rector Rector's staff
Thursday, May 26, 2005		
6:30	Team departs	

THE UNIVERSITIES PROJECT OF THE SALZBURG SEMINAR

Universities throughout the world are undergoing systemic changes in their governance, academic design, structure, and mission. From 1998 to 2003, the Salzburg Seminar's Universities Project focused on higher education reform in Central and East Europe, Russia, and the Newly Independent States as universities in these regions redefined their relationships with governments and try to become more integrated into the global intellectual community.

The Universities Project was 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 focused 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

THE VISITING ADVISORS PROGRAM (VAP)

The Salzburg Seminar launched this enhanced aspect of the Universities Project in the autumn of 1998. Under the VAP, 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. To date, seventy-five visits have been held at universities in Central and East Europe and in Russia. The addition of the Visiting Advisors Program brought to the Universities Project an applied aspect and served to enhance institutional and personal relationships begun in Salzburg.

THE RUSSIAN HIGHER EDUCATION PROGRAM (RHEP)

In 2003, in response to the need for continued engagement, the Salzburg Seminar and the Ministry of Education of the Russian Federation initiated a five-year partnership (2003-2008) designed to promote the exchange of knowledge and best practices between the higher education leadership of the Russian Federation and their counterparts from North America, Western Europe and Central-Eastern Europe, Commonwealth of Independent States countries and Eurasia. The Russian Higher Education Program consists of two symposia per year, which take place in Salzburg and in the Russian Federation. Each symposium convenes representatives of universities, higher education organizations, service organizations, governmental structures, and stakeholders. The Russian Higher Education Program centers around five main topics:

- Russian Program of Modernization in the Context of Global Education Reform
- Higher Education Governance Reform: Issues and Challenges
- Strengthening the Role of Russian Universities in Service to Society
- Quality Assurance in Higher Education: Sharing International Experience
- Higher Education and Research (Networks, Linkages, Best Practices)

The Salzburg Seminar acknowledges with gratitude the William and Flora Hewlett Foundation, the W.K. Kellogg Foundation, and the Carnegie Corporation of New York, which provided funding for the Universities Project, the Visiting Advisors Program, and the extension of the VAP in Russia, respectively.

FOR MORE INFORMATION

For more information regarding 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