



Asia Pacific Higher Education Research Partnership



Innovation, Policy, Governance and Quality

Senior Seminar

“The Changing Nature and Value of the Flagship University”

May 23-25, 2016
Zhejiang University
Hangzhou, China

Contents

CONCEPT PAPER	4
SCHEDULE.....	11
PARTICIPANT LIST	15
PARTICIPANT SHORT BIOGRAPHIES, ABSTRACTS, AND SEMINAR PAPERS	18
Professor Gregory Ching, Fu Jen Catholic University.....	18
Short Biography	18
Abstract.....	18
Professor Wei-Ta Chu, National Chung Cheng University	18
Brief Biography.....	18
Abstract.....	19
Professor John Douglass, University of California, Berkeley	19
Brief Biography.....	19
Abstract.....	19
Professor David P. Ericson, University of Hawai'i	20
Brief Biography.....	20
Abstract.....	20
Professor Amira Firdaus, University of Malaya.....	21
Brief Biography.....	21
Abstract.....	22
Professor Han Xiao, Hong Kong Institute of Education	22
Brief Biography.....	22
Abstract.....	22
Professor John Hawkins	23
Brief Biography.....	23
Abstract.....	23
Professor Quang Nhut Ho, Vietnam National University Ho Chi Minh City.....	24
Short Biography	24
Abstract.....	24
Professor James Jacob, University of Pittsburgh	25
Brief Biography.....	25

Abstract.....	25
Professor Shangbo Li, J.F. Oberlin University	26
Brief Biography.....	26
Abstract.....	26
Professor Joshua Ka Ho Mok, Lingnan University.....	27
Short Biography	27
Abstract.....	27
Professor Charles Morrison	28
Short Biography	28
Professor Deane Neubauer.....	28
Short Biography	28
Abstract.....	28
Professor Joanne Taira, University of Hawai'i System.....	29
Short Biography	29
Abstract.....	29
Professor Minho Yeom, Chonnam National University	29
Short Biography	29
Abstract.....	30
Professor Donald B. Young, University of Hawai'i	30
Short Biography	30
Abstract.....	30
Professor Jia Zhang, Zhejiang University.....	31
Brief Biography.....	31
Abstract.....	31

CONCEPT PAPER

Envisioning the Asian Flagship University: Past and Future

Zhejiang University Seminar Presenters Guide and Concept Paper

By John Aubrey Douglass (UC Berkeley) and John N. Hawkins (East-West Center/UCLA)

March 25, 2016

1. Presenters Guide

The following provides a brief essay on the *New Flagship University* model as an alternative narrative to global rankings and the notion of World Class Universities (WCU), as a preparatory Concept Paper for our APHERP seminar that will be held on May 23-25 2016 at Zhejiang University. Here we offer thoughts on the model's attributes and challenges regarding its relevance in Asia, and a set of queries for the presenters/chapter authors to consider in their contributions.

We ask that each contributor focus their presentation and working paper on one of the two thematic approaches:

Option A - Address one or more of the following three broad questions related to the national or regional case examples which you are most familiar and comfortable with:

- What has been the history of leading national universities in your nation or region that you are writing about (nation-states or regions), what we call *Traditional Flagship Universities*, including their sense of mission, programs, characteristics, and influence on the societies they are intended to serve?
- How is the notion of WCU's, and global rankings and similar benchmarking, influencing national higher education systems, and more specifically these Traditional Flagship Universities and, perhaps, any newer universities?
- How is the *New Flagship University* model applicable or useful for these leading national universities? Ancillary questions: Is the history, cultural and socioeconomic needs of these leading national universities significantly different that they are forging their own distinct, or perhaps, Asian model? What are the important contextual variables that constrain and influence institutions that might claim the *New Flagship* title?

Option B - Provide a comparative description analysis and discussion of reforms within a selected group of Asian nations that focuses on one of the following "Policy Realms" and practices profiled in the *New Flagship* model:

- Governance and Management Capacity

- Seeking Improvements in Undergraduate Education
 - Challenges and Reforms in Graduate and Professional Education
 - Economic Engagement – including such issues regional labor needs, and/or technology transfer and start-ups
-

2. Envisioning the Asian Flagship University - Concept Paper

Rankings and World Class Visions

Perhaps to a degree unmatched in other parts of the globe, the notion of a “World Class University” and the focus on its close relative, global rankings of universities, dominates the higher education policymaking of ministries and major universities in Asia. The emergence of global rankings, and its co-dependent WCU ideal, has captured the attention of higher educational officials, while at the same time, is being critically appraised by many academics and stakeholders in the field of higher education.

Just focusing on China for the moment, in the late 1990s, and in the midst of a dramatic investment in and re-organization of China’s higher education system, ministerial officials asked researchers at Shanghai Jiaotong University to help devise a way to understand the quality of its national universities. There existed national rankings of institutions in the U.S., with most focused on providing consumer guides. But there was no global ranking of universities. Focused on the concept of research productivity as the primary indicator of quality and the marker of the best universities in the world, the first Academic Ranking of World Universities (ARWU) was generated for the Chinese government and became a regular exercise and publication in 2003.

Why the attention almost exclusively on research productivity and a few key markers of prestige, like Nobel Laureates? One major reason was, and is, that globally retrievable citation indexes (also a relatively new phenomenon) and variables such as research income are now readily available and not subject to the labor intensive, and sometimes dubious, efforts to request and get data from individual institutions. But another reason is the sense that research productivity and influence remain the key identifiers of the best universities. The ancillary is that other primary missions of the most influential universities, such as undergraduate and graduate education, public service, the role of universities in socio-economic mobility, regional economic development, are less important and, ultimately, harder to measure.

Around the same time as the publication of the first ARWU, the mantra of what is and what is not a “World Class University” (WCU) also emerged in full force, in part influenced by the growing anxiety among many nations that they did not have one or more top-tier research

universities thought crucial to their economic competitiveness, and by NGO's like the World Bank who now argued that such universities needed replicating in most developing economies.

Because the character, behaviors and attributes of a WCU remain vague even to its promoters, the default was to simply refer to the ARWU, or one of a handful of other global rankings of universities that have since emerged. Most nations in Asia are pursuing higher education polices, and funding schemes, towards uplifting a selected group of national universities into the global ranking heavens. National goals of reaching the top 100, or more ambitiously the top 25, are ubiquitous.

Hence, the national role of universities as engines of socioeconomic mobility, knowledge production in STEM fields, for collaborating with local businesses and government agencies, of creating the next generation of leaders and the like are not relevant in a globally based bell-curve notion of what constitutes the ideal university.

The *New Flagship University* model briefly outlined in the following introductory section of our planned book, and articulated in more detail in the recent book of the same name, attempts to provide a more holistic and ecological vision of what constitute the best and most influential national universities. This includes a broad conception of the purpose and goals of these institutions that include the type of variables, like socioeconomic mobility and regional economic development, largely ignored or missing from the pronouncements, policy and funding initiatives related to the WCU desires of ministries and many universities. The model, as described, provides four "Policy Realms" to help shape our understanding of the operational side of being a *New Flagship University*: their role in national systems of higher education, their core missions of teaching and learning and research, public service and economic engagement, and their internal management and accountability practices. And it offers examples of key policies, activities, and outputs. To be sure, many leading research-intensive universities are already pursuing many of the aspects of the *Flagship* model within their own cultural and political realities, as presented in the many institutional examples offered in the original book.

In the face of the dominant WCU and ranking paradigm, most academic leaders and their academic communities have had difficulty conceptualizing, and articulating, their grander purpose and multiple engagements with society. The *Flagship* moniker harkens back to this larger vision found not only in the origins of the U.S. land grant universities, but also national universities in Latin America. The *New Flagship* qualification helps to stress that the most productive and engaged universities—those that seek societal relevancy—are much more diverse and complex in the range of their activities and goals than in any other time in their history. Take almost any current public research university, and some non-profit privates, and compare their sense of purpose, funding, programs, and expectations of stakeholders, with fifty or even twenty years ago, and they are very different.

At the same time, the *Flagship* model is not a rejection of global rankings. Ranking products are here to stay. They are a useful benchmark for ministries and universities, and citizens. The problem is that they represent a very narrow band of what it means to be a leading university within a region, within a nation. Further, while there are effective strategies to boost article production and citations, and rankings, the WCU advocates do not provide much guidance, or knowledge, on what organizational behaviors and methods can lead to greater productivity in research, teaching, and public service to best meet the needs of the societies they serve.

The *New Flagship* model is not intended as a set of required attributes and practices. This begs the question of what policies and practices, and even the larger understanding of the purpose of a university, are culturally determined and relevant to a particular nation-state. As Douglass notes in his book, “To state the obvious, different nations and their universities operate in different environments, reflecting their own national cultures, politics, expectations, and the realities of their socioeconomic world. The purpose [of the *New Flagship* model] is not to create a single template or checklist, but an expansive array of characteristics and practices that connects a selective group of universities—an aspiration model. However, many institutions and ministries may see only a subset as relevant, or only some aspirations as achievable in the near term” (Douglass pp. 39-40).

And finally, an important tenant of the *New Flagship* model is that there are limits to the effectiveness of government and ministerial interventions into the operation of their universities. Most universities within Asia, and within Europe and elsewhere, have had weak internal cultures of accountability and management. Government driven interventions and funding incentives have pushed much needed reform in much of the world. But ultimately, leading universities need to have greater control and build their own internal academic culture and efforts focused on institutional self-improvement. The *New Flagship* model attempts to decipher, and provide examples, of pathways for building this culture and for internal accountability practices that bolster academic management.

Asia’s Leading National Universities: The Context

Higher education in Asia has a long history of elite, leading national universities that have served the region well over the decades of their existence. Most are highly selective institutions, employing among the best scholars, and serving as the primary path for creating a nation’s civic elites in the absence of other postsecondary institutions (Hawkins 2013). These leading universities have, historically, been grounded in national service, but with a more limited vision of their role in socioeconomic mobility, economic development, and public service. There was little external pressure and internal desire to change. One thinks of Tokyo University, Zhejiang University, Peking University and Seoul National University in East Asia, and on a smaller scale their counterparts in Southeast Asia and South Asia, all largely fitting the mold of what we are

calling the *Traditional Flagship Universities*. Even as national governments pushed to expand access to higher education—the process of massification—these leading national universities sometimes seem stuck in time.

But in more recent decades, leading Asian national universities have undergone a metamorphosis, pushed by increasing expectations of a much more expanded role in society and the competitive needs of national economies. Because their mission was primarily “internal”, these universities were not initially concerned with competing with other universities outside of the national setting. With the rise of the complex interplay of neoliberalism, globalization and internationalization beginning in earnest in the 1990s, however, ministries and universities began to look “externally” for benchmarks of their quality and performance framed almost exclusively around the WCU/ranking paradigm—a worldwide phenomenon.

While the pursuit of improved rankings and a claim to WCU status continues as seemingly the primary goal for many universities in the Asian Pacific region, there has been a growing debate about the value and feasibility of this vision. Alternative ways are being discussed which challenge and critique this model and suggest other more creative ways to look at the role of teaching, community service, R&D and scholarship in higher education. In turn, this has created a “predicament” for these Asian *Flagship Universities*: in a rapidly changing ecology of higher education in the region, Asian universities are compelled to search for strategic ways to increase research income and journal publications, and citations, while also seeking a more holistic approach to their mission and engagement with the regions they serve.

Is it possible to strike a balance between teaching and research in the modern university or is the “research model” being blindly imitated globally? In the *New Flagship* model, these are compatible, indeed mutually reinforcing ideals; but this is not true for those focused myopically on the WCU and ranking paradigm.

It has been difficult for universities in the region to avoid the temptation to be imitative rather than innovative in the pursued of a WCU status. The strategy of imitation has been largely focused on research productivity and the practices found in the U.S. and the UK, while ignoring the ethos of creating and sustaining an academic community. It is an erroneous understanding of an “emerging global model” (EGM) (Hawkins and Mok 2015).

In the rush toward imitation, its important to keep in mind a criticism of the American research-intensive universities where many faculty are increasingly attracted to the prestige of research and away from teaching as a core responsibility, where increasing numbers of students are left without benefit of mentoring by the very faculty they came to encounter. As faculty sort themselves out along the research axis (those who are successful and those who are not),

particularly in STEM fields, another divide appears as those faculty less able as researchers pick up the teaching load or are simply let go through the tenure process. Again, this is a “research is the primary product” model that may not be the most productive for many universities and may in fact limit the possibilities of becoming an “innovative” university. Is this the current path being pursued by top Asian universities?

A Yi Liu Future?

This brings us back to the concept of the *New Flagship University* in the Asia region. There a place for both the *New Flagship* ideals and practices and the desire for the ranking focused WCU model to co-exist. As Douglass argues, the *Flagship* model can be a route to WCU status, but WCU status is less likely to guarantee status as a *New Flagship University*. In a message intended for both ministries and university leaders in Asia and elsewhere, Douglass notes that the current top ranked research-intensive universities on the ARWU, and particularly the public universities in the US, were not built around a narrow band of quantitative measures of research productivity or reputational surveys. “The path to national and international relevance rooted in their larger socio-economic purpose, and to internal organizational cultures and practices focused on self-improvement.”

In contrasting the WCU paradigm with the *New Flagship* model it is important to note that scholars of higher education, and practitioners and ministerial actors, may have their own concepts of what a *Flagship* is, or should be in different parts of the vast area we call Asia.

The *Flagship* model also has a number of major assumptions, including that national and regional higher education systems have significant levels of mission differentiation among institutions and a place for only a select number of truly leading or *yi liu* universities; that there is a significant level of policy and practice convergence, and best practices that can be adopted to different national cultures and traditions; and that universities can manage their evolution if given enough autonomy and sufficient levels of academic freedom.

The political, economic, and cultural peculiarities may make such assumptions a non-reality in many nations. Such was the conclusion for a number of the author’s who contributed to the initial book on the *New Flagship University*, with contributors from Latin America, Russia, and Asia noting that the biggest obstacles lay in the civil service mentality of faculty, severely inadequate university governance and management structures, and governmental controls and, often, political dynamics that made universities inordinately subject to political movements and encroachments. But all the authors also understood the *New Flagship* concept as aspirational—essentially a guide and reference point that was desirable and needed to help shape the discourse in their respective regions.

National higher education systems in Asia are rapidly changing. Many academic leaders and some ministries are beginning to understand that the bell-curve approach of rankings and the research dominant notion of WCU are no longer adequate to help guide policy, funding, and practice.

In addition to the three major questions related to the case example option and the thematic option (governance and management capacity, undergraduate/first degree education, graduate/professional education, or economic engagement), we are asking our contributing chapter authors to contemplate, we add these additional questions for your consideration:

- How are ministries approaching the issue of mission differentiation in their national systems (e.g., accreditation processes in Taiwan and Japan for example), and how are they identifying and positioning a subset of universities as leading national universities?
- What are the main policy and funding programs from national/regional governments that focused on the WCU and ranking paradigm and what its their influence within universities and what are their outcomes?
- Does the contemporary flagship university model offer some pathways forward to this resolution and if not, why not?"
- What features of the flagship university already exist in Asia's top HEIs, and which do not?
- Which forces and factors work toward the new flagship model and which create obstacles?
- Do the contemporary leading national universities offer something for the *New Flagship* model (as described by Douglass) that might be adapted in a positive manner?

There are obviously other important questions and issues regarding the discussion we are having here but it is hoped that your papers will seek to engage and discuss some of those that are presented here.

REFERENCES:

Douglass, John Aubrey (2016), *The New Flagship University: Changing the Paradigm from Global Ranking to National Relevancy*. New York: Palgrave MacMillan Press.

Hawkins, John N. (2015), "The Predicament of the Quest for WCU Status and Seeking an Asian Flagship University," , chapter in John Aubrey Douglass, *The New Flagship University*.

Hawkins, John N. and Ka Ho Mok, (2015), *Research, Development, and Innovation I n Asia Pacific Higher Education*. New York: Palgrave MacMillan Press.

SCHEDULE

May 23, 2016 – Day One:

- 9:00 – 9:40 Welcome Ceremony
Deputy Vice President of Zhejiang University, Prof. Yonghua Song
President East-West Center, Charles Morrison
Associate Vice President for International Relations, University of Hawai‘i,
Joanne Y. Taira
Dean, College of Education, Zhejiang University, Xu, Xiaozhou
Dean, College of Education, University of Hawai‘i, Donald B. Young
- 9:40 – 9:45 Ceremony Chair: Xiaozhou Xu
Opening ceremony of new Institute:
Zhejiang University Center for International Education Research
Yonghua Song, Charles Morrison, Joanne Y. Taira
- Morning Program Chair: Deane Neubauer, APHERP Co-Director
- 9:45 – 10:15 Session One
John Hawkins and John A. Douglas, Presentation of Concept Paper
“Envisioning the Asian Flagship University: Past and Future”
- 10:15 – 10:45 Discussion
- 10:45 – 11:00 Tea Break
- 11:00 – 11:30 Session Two: Yonghua Song, Zhejiang University
“The internationalization progress and strategy of Zhejiang University”
- 11:30-11:50 Discussion
- 11:50 – 12:20 Session Three
Minho Yeom, Chonnam National University
*“The Massification of Higher Education and the Changing Nature of the
Flagship Universities in South Korea”*
- 12:20 – 1:20 Lunch
- 1:20 – 1:40 Discussion
- Afternoon Program Chair: Yue Kan, College of Education, Zhejiang University
- 1:40 – 2:10 Session Four
Ka Ho Mok, Lingnan University

“The Quest for Flagship University and Global Ranking: Challenges and Prospects for Liberal Arts Education in Asia”

- 2:10 – 2:30 Discussion
- 2:30-3:00 Session Five
David Ericson, University of Hawai‘i
“Quality and Status Allure in Vietnamese Higher Education”
- 3:00 – 3:20 Discussion
- 3:20 – 3:40 Tea Break
- 3:40 – 4:10 Session Six
Deane Neubauer, East-West Center; Joanne Taira, University of Hawai‘i;
Don Young, University of Hawai‘i
“The University of Hawai‘i in its Flagship Role: Pursuing Excellence Through a Complex Diverse Mission”
- 4:10– 4:30 Discussion
- 4:30-6:00 Voluntary Discussion Session—Deane Neubauer

End of Day One

- 6:30-8:30 Seminar Dinner

May 24, 2016 – Day Two:

Morning Program Chair: Zhang Jia, College of Education, Zhejiang University

- 9:00 – 9:30 Session Seven
Wei-Ta Chu, National Chung Cheng University
“Life-Long Type Learning: The Learning Ecosystem Program at National Chung Cheng University”
- 9:30 – 9:50 Discussion
- 9:50 – 10:20 Session Eight
Amira Firdaus, University of Malaya

“The Role of the Flagship University in Fostering Inclusivity in the Higher Education Ecology: A Positive Organizational Scholarship (POS) Approach”

10:20 – 10:40	Discussion
10:40 – 11:00	Tea Break
11:00 – 11:30	Session Nine Shangbo Li, J.F. Oberlin University <i>“From Elite to Competitor: Changes in Japanese National Universities”</i>
11:30 – 11:50	Discussion
11:50 – 1:00	Lunch

Afternoon Program Chair: Shao Xingjiang, College of Education, Zhejiang University

1:00 – 1:30	Session Ten Han, Xiao. Hong Kong Institute of Education <i>“Chinese University’s Dilemma: Service for Whose Benefit?”</i>
1:30 – 1:50	Discussion
1:50 – 2:20	Session Eleven Gregory Ching, Fu Jen Catholic University <i>“Blending a new brand of institutions amidst the global and local pressures of higher education”</i>
2:20 – 2:40	Discussion
2:40-3:00	Tea Break
3:00 – 3:30	Session Twelve Ho Nhut Quang, Vietnam National University Ho Chi Minh City <i>“The Roles of a Flagship University in Recovering the Community Trust: The Case of Vietnam National University Ho Chi Minh City (VNU-HCMC) and the Manufacturing Sector in Vietnam”</i>
3:30 – 3:50	Discussion
3:50 – 4:20	Session Thirteen Zhang, Jia, Zhejiang University <i>“How Can Flagship Universities Promote Regional Social Development? The Case of Zhejiang University”</i>

4:20-4:40 Discussion

4:45-6:00 Voluntary Discussion Session

End of Day Two

Light Dinner 6:00

May 25, 2015 – Day Three:

9:00-9:30 James Jacob, University of Pittsburgh
*“Building World-Class Universities Through Professional Development
Optimal ICT Training Initiatives”*

9:30-9:50 Discussion

9:50 – 10:10 Tea Break

10:10-12:00 Wrap Up Session—Seminar Discussion: Charles Morrison, John Hawkins, John A.
Douglass, Deane Neubauer

End of Seminar and Goodbye Lunch

PARTICIPANT LIST



Asia Pacific Higher Education Research Partnership

Innovation, Policy, Governance and Quality

Senior Seminar in Hangzhou

“The Changing Nature and Value of the Flagship University”

Zhejiang University

Hangzhou, China

May 23-25, 2016

Dr. Gregory Ching

Assistant Professor

Fu Jen Catholic University

No. 510 Zhongzheng Rd.

Xinzhuang District

New Taipei City, 24205 Taiwan

094478@mail.fju.edu.tw

Professor Wei-Ta Chu

National Chung Cheng University

Department of Computer Science & Information
Engineering

Min-Hsiung,

Chia-yi 621 Taiwan (R.O.C.)

wtchu@ccuu.edu.tw

Dr. John A. Douglass

Senior Research Fellow

Center for Studies in Higher Education

University of California, Berkeley

881 Evans Hall, #4650

Berkeley, California 94720 USA

douglass@berkeley.edu

Dr. David P. Ericson

University of Hawai'i

Department of Educational Foundations

Wist Hall 112

1776 University Avenue

Honolulu, Hawai'i 96822 USA

ericson@hawaii.edu

Professor Amira Firdaus

University of Malaya

Department of Media Studies

Kuala Lumpur, 50603

Malaysia

Amira_firdaus@um.edu.my

Ms. Xiao Han

Ph.D. Candidate

Hong Kong Institute of Education

BP-03, The Center for Greater China Studies

Taipo, Hong Kong

hanxiao8439@hotmail.com, xiaohan@s.ied.edu.hk

Dr. Quang Nhut Ho

Vice Rector

Vietnam National University Ho Chi Minh City

International University

Thu Duc District, Ho Chi Minh City, Vietnam

hnquang@hcmiu.edu.vn

Dr. W. James Jacob

International Studies in Education

University of Pittsburgh

5714 Wesley W. Pover Hall

Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania 15260 USA

wjacob@pitt.edu

Dr. Shangbo Li

J.F. Oberlin University
Global Higher Education Research Institute
3758, Tokiwa-machi, Machida-shi
Tokyo, Japan 194-0294
Shangbo2001jp@yahoo.co.jp,
shang160101@hotmail.com

Dr. Charles Morrison

President
East-West Center
1601 East-West Road
Honolulu, Hawai'i 96822 USA
morrisoc@eastwestcenter.org

Dr. Minho Yeom

Chonnam National University
77, Yongbong-ro
Buk-gu
Gwangju, 61186
South Korea
minho@chonnam.ac.kr

Professor Jia Zhang

Instructor
Institute of Education Leadership & Policy
College of Education, Zhejiang University
Room 601, Tianjiabing Academy
Hangzhou, Zhejiang Province
China
5zhangjia@163.com

Professor Ka Ho Mok

Vice President
Lingnan University
AD208, Wong Administration Building
Tuen Mun
New Territories, Hong Kong
kahomok@ln.edu.hk

Dr. Joanne Taira

Sr. Executive, International & Strategic Initiatives
University of Hawai'i Systems
Bachman Hall 202
2444 Dole Street
Honolulu, Hawaii 96822 USA
tairaj@hawaii.edu

Dr. Donald B. Young

Dean, College of Education
University of Hawai'i
1776 University Avenue
Everly Hall, Room 128
Honolulu, Hawai'i 96822 USA
young@hawaii.edu

Dr. Song Yonghua

Professor and Deputy Vice President
of Zhejiang University
866 Yuhangtang Road
Hangzhou, Zhejiang Province
China

Program Staff

Dr. Deane Neubauer

Co-Director APHERP
East-West Center
1601 East-West Road
Honolulu, Hawaii 96848-1601 USA
deanen@hawaii.edu

Dr. John N. Hawkins

Co-Director APHERP
Professor Emeritus, UCLA
East-West Center
1601 East-West Road
Honolulu, Hawai'i 96848-1601 USA
hawkins@gseis.ucla.edu

Dr. Xiaozhou Xu

Professor and Dean
College of Education
Zhejiang University
148 Tianmushan Road
Hangzhou, Zhejiang Province 310028
P.R. China
xxiaozhou@163.com

Ms. Penny Higa

Program Officer
East-West Center
1601 East-West Road
Honolulu, Hawai'i 96848-1601 USA
higap@eastwestcenter.org

Ms. Audrey Minei

Program Assistant
East-West Center
1601 East-West Road
Honolulu, Hawai'i 96848-1601 USA
[mineia@eastwestcenter.org](mailto:minea@eastwestcenter.org)

Dr. Xingjiang Shao

Associate Professor
College of Education
Zhejiang University
148 Tianmushan Road
Hangzhou, Zhejiang Province 310028
P.R. China
cnsxj@163.com

Dr. Hui Wang

Associate Professor
College of Education
Zhejiang University
148 Tianmushan Road
Hangzhou, Zhejiang Province 310028
P.R. China
jjb0775@sina.com

Dr. Yue Kan

Associate Professor
College of Education
Zhejiang University
148 Tianmushan Road
Hangzhou, Zhejiang Province 310028
P.R. China
kanyue@zju.edu.cn

PARTICIPANT SHORT BIOGRAPHIES, ABSTRACTS, AND SEMINAR PAPERS

Professor Gregory Ching, Fu Jen Catholic University

Short Biography

Gregory Ching is an assistant professor of the graduate institute of educational leadership and development at Fu Jen Catholic University in Taiwan. His current research interests are focused but not limited to the effects of globalization and internationalization of higher education, acculturation processes in study abroad, and service quality and gaps within higher education.

Abstract

Blending a new brand of institutions amidst the global and local pressures of higher education

Taiwan higher education institutions are facing great challenges arising from both global and local sources. Global pressures brought forth by need to have a presence within the international university ranking systems, while confronting local pressures that stem from the declining number of incoming students. To remedy these dilemmas, the Taiwan ministry of education and higher education institutions are working hand in hand focusing on both policy and financial aspects of the academe. This presentation focuses on providing an overview of the current higher education institution situations, while also summarizing ongoing strategies such as institutional mergers, rebranding/transformation of degree programs, changing academic profession, further- expansion of international enrollments, and developing the quality of research through the establishment of institutional review boards (IRB) and institutional research (IR) centers. Ultimately Taiwan higher education institutions are seeking to expand their institutional competitiveness while struggling with the myriad challenges of the academe.

Professor Wei-Ta Chu, National Chung Cheng University

Brief Biography

Wei-Ta Chu received the B.S. and M.S. degrees in Computer Science from National Chi Nan University, Taiwan, in 2000 and 2002, and received the Ph.D. degree in Computer Science from National Taiwan University, Taiwan, in 2006. He is now an Associate Professor in the Department of Computer Science and Information Engineering, National Chung Cheng University (CCU), Taiwan. He also serves as the Director of Research Liaison Division of The Office of Research and Development, CCU. His research interests include digital content analysis, multimedia indexing, digital signal process, and pattern recognition.

Abstract

Life-Long -Type Learning: The Learning Ecosystem Program at National Chung Cheng University

To enable universities to keep pace with the future trend, the Ministry of Education of Taiwan encourages each university to build its learning ecosystem on top of its characteristic strengths and consensus of the staff. For this purpose, National Chung Cheng University (CCU) aims at developing an ecosystem that enables cultivating students with multiple specialties and the ability of life-long learning. We call it -type learning, named from that which is an irrational number and indivisible. Practically, CCU attempts to enable this new system from four perspectives: improving the efficiency of recruiting students, continuously tutoring students at different stages, enabling flexible credits, and enabling a flexible educational system. In this paper, I describe what and how to do from these four perspectives.

Professor John A. Douglass, University of California, Berkeley

Brief Biography

John Aubrey Douglass is a Senior Research Fellow at the Center for Studies in Higher Education (CSHE) at UC Berkeley whose research has focused on the interplay of globalization and higher education, the role of universities in economic development, and the history and development of California's pioneering higher education system. His latest book is *The New Flagship University: Changing the Paradigm from Global Ranking to National Relevancy* (Palgrave Macmillan, 2016). He is the editor of CSHE's ROPS publication series and the founding Principal Investigator for the Student Experience in the Research University (SERU) International Consortium – a group of some 35 leading research universities in the US and throughout that world that conduct survey research, and that share data and best practices. For more information see: <http://cshe.berkeley.edu/people/jdouglass.htm>

Abstract

Envisioning the Asian Flagship University

Perhaps to a degree unmatched in other parts of the globe, the notion of a “World Class University” and its focus on global rankings of universities dominates the higher education policymaking of ministries and major universities in Asia. Ranking products are here to stay. They are a useful benchmark for ministries and universities, and citizens. The problem is that they represent a very narrow band of what it means to be a leading university within a region, and./or a nation. The *New Flagship University* model attempts to provide an expansive and aspirational vision for leading national universities and an alternative narrative to global rankings and World Class Universities. The *New Flagship* model outlined in the 2016 book with

the same title, explores pathways for universities to re-shape their missions and academic cultures, and to pursue organizational features intended to expand their relevance in the societies that give them life and purpose. In this quest, international standards of excellence focused largely on research productivity are not ignored, but are framed as only one goal towards supporting a university's productivity and larger social purpose—not as an end unto itself. This concept, paper which in a revised form will constitute the first chapter of the seminar book, is meant to provide a frame of reference for analyzing the problematic of the notion of the “new Flagship university”.

Professor David P. Ericson, University of Hawai'i

Brief Biography

David P. Ericson is a Professor of Philosophy of Education and Educational Policy Studies in the Department of Educational Foundations, College of Education, University of Hawai'i at Manoa. Prior to joining the Faculty of the University of Hawai'i at Manoa in 1992, he was a professor at the University of California, Los Angeles (1979 – 1992) and a professor at Virginia Tech (1977 – 1979). In the College of Education at the University of Hawai'i at Manoa, he has served as chairperson in two departments (Department of Educational Foundations and the Department of Curriculum & Instruction), as Associate Dean for Research and Graduate Studies, and as director of the Office of International Education. He also served as Editor-in-Chief of *Studies in Philosophy and Education* for five years.

With research and scholarly interests in philosophy of education, educational policy analysis, and comparative and international education, he has published widely on education issues, the logic of social science research methodology, and educational policy and reform issues in the U.S. and Asia. He is particularly noted for his work on the structure and behavior of national educational systems in the U.S. and Asia. He has been a Fulbright Senior Specialist Award holder (2007 – 2012), an award that has enabled his research efforts on educational reform issues in lower and higher education in Denmark and China. Most recently, he has been researching policy issues concerning the expansion and quality of higher education in Vietnam.

Abstract

Quality and Status Allure in Vietnamese Higher Education

The expansion of higher education in Southeast Asia in the latter part of the 20th century and early part of the 21st century has been extraordinary. Vietnam has been no exception to this phenomenon. From an elite system of higher education numbering a few hundred thousand students in the early 1990's, Vietnam's institutions of higher education now contain over five million students today. And while this growth in numbers of institutions and numbers of

students has been breathtaking, questions concerning the quality of higher education in Vietnam have been a growing concern. Increasingly, Vietnam's Ministry of Education and Training have been developing new measures of quality control in an attempt ensure that such immense growth is accompanied by assurances of quality at the same time so that scarce national resources are efficiently and effectively deployed. In this regard, Vietnam joins similar attempts across the ASEAN countries in dealing with quality assurance issues in the region-wide tertiary education sector. Thus, Vietnam must consider issues of quality and quality control in higher education in a comparative context with the other ASEAN nations at the very least. Led by Vietnam National University-Hanoi and Vietnam National University-Ho Chi Minh City at the apex, Vietnam has singled out little more than a handful of universities for national university status.

Much of this ASEAN-comparative evaluation to date in Vietnam has been influenced heavily by the global ranking and World Class University syndromes that elevate the research mission of its top universities. Indeed, Vietnam's 2020 plan for higher education called for at least one of its universities to be named a top 200 university by that date. Here quality is understood in terms of research productivity and research reputation. In Vietnam's context, that could only be considered a policy maker's pipedream. While no university in Vietnam is likely to make the top 200 research universities any time soon, that does not mean that more traditional forms of academic quality are out of reach. It simply means that Vietnamese policy makers have to refocus on the meaning of higher education quality in the Vietnamese context that foregoes a race to catch up with top-ranked research universities, whether in the region or globally.

Thus, I will explore a variety of understandings of the meaning of higher education and single out one notion of quality that refuses to confuse quality with research expenditures. Most of the contemporary meanings of quality in higher education are, unfortunately, market-driven and embedded within the status system of higher education. What I shall argue for here is much more akin to the New Flagship model under exploration in this seminar. For it may help in reframing the policy discussion in Vietnam now and in the future.

Professor Amira Firdaus, University of Malaya

Brief Biography

Amira Firdaus is an early career academic at the University of Malaya (UM), Malaysia's "flagship" university ranked among the world's top 200. Amira is the inaugural Unit Head for the Emerging Scholars Leadership Advancement (EmeraLd) program at UM's Academic Development Centre (ADeC), responsible for the training and development of new faculty members. She has a deep interest in the career development of early career academics,

including postgraduate students. Amira is a member of an inter-university task force tasked by the Malaysian Ministry of Higher Education to develop a framework for talent excellence and differentiated career pathways. She is currently embarking on a self-study of positive psychology, wellbeing, and active aging, within the context of academia. Amira is a Senior Lecturer at UM's Department of Media Studies, and holds a PhD in Communication from the University of Melbourne.

Abstract

Shaping the New Flagship University: Foresighting Ministerial Policies and Revamping Institutional Practices in Malaysia's Premier University

Historically, Malaysian public universities' traditional flagship missions and WCU aspirations were established and driven by government policies. Malaysia's Higher Education system (quite literally) boasts five World Class Universities (WCU's), as ranked by major players of the global ranking industry. Among the five public universities, one higher learning institute, the University of Malaya (UM), has justification to claim the title of *the* flagship university under both the traditional and the new flagship models. It is the nation's oldest university, and the leading university in the country according to the several global ranking bodies. With a special focus on UM, this paper examines competition among Malaysia's leading universities for WCU status, driven by government aspirations for both global prominence as well as national development. Based on (an) interview(s) with UM's most transformational leader(s), this paper examines the dialectical relationship between top-down ministerial policies, and, internal institutional revamping efforts in shaping a top-ranked New Flagship University.

Han Xiao, Hong Kong Institute of Education

Brief Biography

Xiao Han, PhD candidate in the Department of Asian and Policy Studies, Hong Kong Institute of Education. Her research interests include transnational higher education, higher education policy and education inequality.

Abstract

A Chinese University's Dilemma: Service for Whose Benefit?

Even before its successful transformation from elite to mass education in 2003 (with a gross enrollment rate of 17%), China had concentrated its finite public funding on several selected universities (e.g. Project "985" and "211"), with the hope to cultivate competitive World-class educational institutions. Accompanied by the growing social inequality and aggravated by increasing stratification among Chinese universities, the world ranking goal has indeed been an

important trend. However, whether the growth and development of elite Chinese universities actually brings social benefits to the society as a whole is another matter. More specifically, the question of who benefits most from this rise has not been critically examined in the context of China's economic and social background. This study, will analyze one elite university in a relatively underdeveloped province, to explore the possible distorting impact of ARWU on three major pedagogical areas: administration, research and teaching activities, and international collaboration. It argues that in the current appropriation system, funding patterns from both the central and the local governments turn out to be the essential factor influencing the university's choices of internal funding allocations among these three areas.

Professor John Hawkins

Brief Biography

John N. Hawkins is Professor Emeritus, Social Sciences and Comparative Education at the University of California, Los Angeles (UCLA). He was dean of international studies at UCLA and has served as a director of the UCLA Foundation Board, director of the East West Center Foundation Board, and director of the Board of Governors of J.F. Oberlin University in Japan. He is also co-editor of the Comparative Education Series at Palgrave Macmillan, and serves as co-director of the Asia Pacific Higher Education Research Partnership (APHERP). His research focuses on comparative higher education, politics of education and higher education quality assurance. His current research addresses the challenges of innovation in higher education research, organization, theory and practice.

Abstract

Envisioning the Asian Flagship University

Perhaps to a degree unmatched in other parts of the globe, the notion of a “World Class University” and its focus on global rankings of universities dominates the higher education policymaking of ministries and major universities in Asia. Ranking products are here to stay. They are a useful benchmark for ministries and universities, and citizens. The problem is that they represent a very narrow band of what it means to be a leading university within a region, and./or a nation. The *New Flagship University* model attempts to provide an expansive and aspirational vision for leading national universities and an alternative narrative to global rankings and World Class Universities. The *New Flagship* model outlined in the 2016 book with the same title, explores pathways for universities to re-shape their missions and academic cultures, and to pursue organizational features intended to expand their relevance in the societies that give them life and purpose. In this quest, international standards of excellence focused largely on research productivity are not ignored, but are framed as only one goal towards supporting a university's productivity and larger social purpose—not as an end

unto itself. This concept, paper which in a revised form will constitute the first chapter of the seminar book, is meant to provide a frame of reference for analyzing the problematic of the notion of the “new Flagship university”.

Professor Ho Nhut Quang, Vietnam National University Ho Chi Minh City

Short Biography

Dr. Ho Nhut Quang is currently the Vice-Rector of International University, a member of Vietnam National University Ho Chi Minh city. He received a Bachelor Degree in Project Management from Moscow State University of Management in Russia, the Master of Science in Economic Development from the Institute of Social Studies (the Netherlands) and the PhD. degree in Economics from the University of Economics and Laws in Vietnam. His research areas include economics, business ethics and corporate social responsibilities and international business.

Abstract

Roles of a Flagship University in Recovering the Community Trust: the Case of Vietnam National University Ho Chi Minh City (VNU-HCMC) and the Manufacturing Sector in Vietnam

Pursuing a nation’s economic growth often goes together with some trade-offs. In contemporary Vietnam, one of the critical problems is the declining trust of the community in businesses due to their unethical and illegal actions. We are facing the problems of harmful products, deceptive advertising, financial fraudulence, oligopoly, etc., which may affect much our long-term sustainability development. Many Vietnamese highly ethical firms are put into the “same basket” with those who have had unethical and illegal behaviors. As a flagship university in the Southern part of Vietnam, VNU- HCMC needs to help businesses to recover the community trust that has been damaged by recent ethical and illegal scandals caused by some companies.

Our research paper’s objectives are of two: first, to identify the roles of VNU-HCMC in its contributing to solving of business problems and to increasing the community well-being, and secondly, to suggest practical measures for VNU-HCMC in recovering the community’s trust on Vietnamese businesses. The qualitative research design employs Delphi expert opinions method. As for the research results, the paper has clarified the roles of VNU-HCMC in recovering the community trust on businesses. To implement the roles, the paper suggests the establishment of a VNU-HCMC Green Center which uses a proposed 23 criteria to grant certificate to the qualified firm member

Professor W. James Jacob, University of Pittsburgh

Brief Biography

Dr. W. James Jacob is an Associate Professor of International Higher Education in the School of Education at the University of Pittsburgh. Since 2007, Dr. Jacob has served as the Director of the Institute for International Studies in Education at the University of Pittsburgh. His research interests include higher education management; HIV/AIDS multisectoral prevention, capacity building, and principles of good governance; indigenous education issues of culture, language, and identity as they relate to post-secondary education; quality assurance; organizational development; higher education strategic planning; and organizational effectiveness. He is the co-editor of two book series related to the development of comparative, international, and development education scholarship: *International and Development Education* (Palgrave Macmillan) and *Pittsburgh Studies in Comparative and International Education* (Sense Publishers). His most recent books include *Community Engagement in Higher Education: Policy Reforms and Practice* (with Stewart E. Sutin, John C. Weidman, and John L. Yeager, Sense Publishers, 2015); *Indigenous Education: Language, Culture, and Identity* (with Sheng Yao Cheng and Maureen Porter, Springer, 2015); *Economics and Finance in Higher Education* (with John C. Weidman, and colleagues, 2014); and *Policy Debates in Comparative, International, and Development Education* (with John Hawkins, Palgrave Macmillan, 2011). Dr. Jacob has worked with a number of private, public, bi-lateral, and multi-lateral organizations in his research endeavors, including the Asian Development Bank, the East-West Center, the European Union, UNAIDS, UNDP, UNESCO, UNICEF, The World Bank, USAID, ProLiteracy Worldwide, the South Pacific Forum, UNITUS, and many government ministries of education and health. His teaching interests and experience are in the areas of higher education management, strategic planning, human resource management, policy analysis, program evaluation, international development, research ethics, and organizational leadership and strategy. He has written extensively on comparative, international, and development education topics with an emphasis on higher education. Dr. Jacob holds master's degrees in Organizational Behavior (Marriott School of Management) and International Development (Kennedy Center for International Studies) from Brigham Young University and a PhD in Education from the University of California, Los Angeles.

Abstract

Building World-Class Universities through Professional Development: Optimal ICT Training Initiatives

James Jacob, Weiyan Xiong, Huiyuan Ye, Fang Lu, Xi Wang, and Shangmou Xu, University of Pittsburgh, USA

This paper explores best practices and roles of information and communication technology (ICT) in faculty professional development centers at 20 world-class universities. As part of the research and teaching programs at world-class universities, leaders of professional development centers shared through in-depth oral interviews about the current ICT practices as well as strengths and limitations of their own centers. The common successes that facilitate the ICT practices of these centers are discussed including modes, services, ideas, and goals. The analysis includes a critical look at ICT practices among flagship universities from a human resource theory lens. The paper concludes with suggestions on how professional development center leaders, senior administrations, and educational policy makers can help improve the function of the professional development with the assistance of optimal ICT initiatives.

Keywords: Information and Communication Technology (ICT), teacher professional development, human resources management, leadership.

Professor Shangbo Li, J.F. Oberlin University

Brief Biography

Shangbo Li (Ph.D., Tokyo University of Foreign Studies, 2004) is Specially Approved Research Fellow at J. F. Oberlin University in Tokyo, and is professor at the Open University of China in Beijing. She specializes in Higher Education and Japanese Studies. She is currently writing a book-length survey of comparative higher education.

Abstract

From Elite to Competitor: Changes in Japanese National Universities

2004 is a major turning point for Japanese National Universities. Before that, the national university had been at the top of the ivory tower. It can be said that the national university means the elite in Japanese higher education. The Japanese government allocated them all their required budget. As faculty had shut themselves up in an ivory tower, they knew very little about world affairs. This situation was changed in 2004. In this year, national universities were turned into independent administrative corporations. Japanese national university also has many great changes as a result of this transformation.

This paper, therefore, will (1) focus on the general question of “what has been changed? ”, and (2) set out to explore the implication of the changes, in order to clarify what emerges within today’s institutional context, and the particular way in which the national university has been affected by events within the more macro contextual levels that the guideline of APHERP Senior Seminar has described. Sources used include Japanese government documents, the data of Japanese national universities and the results of previous research.

Professor Joshua Ka Ho Mok, Lingnan University

Short Biography

Professor Joshua Mok Ka-ho is the Vice-President and concurrently Chair Professor of Comparative Policy of Lingnan University. Before joining Lingnan, he was the Vice President (Research and Development) and Chair Professor of Comparative Policy of The Hong Kong Institute of Education, and the Associate Dean and Professor of Social Policy, Faculty of Social Sciences of The University of Hong Kong. Prior to this, Professor Mok was appointed as the Founding Chair Professor in East Asian Studies and established the Centre for East Asian Studies at the University of Bristol, United Kingdom. Professor Mok is no narrow disciplinary specialist but has worked creatively across the academic worlds of sociology, political science, and public and social policy while building up his wide knowledge of China and the region. He has published extensively in the fields of comparative education policy, comparative development and policy studies, and social development in contemporary China and East Asia. His recent published works have focused on comparative social development and social policy responses in the Greater China region and East Asia. He is also the founding Editor-in-Chief of the Journal of Asian Public Policy (London: Routledge) and Asian Education and Development Studies (Emerald) as well as a Book Series Editor for Routledge and Springer.

Abstract

The Quest for the Flagship University and Global Ranking: Challenges and Prospects for Liberal Arts Education in Asia

With a strong intension to rank higher in the global university leagues, governments in Asia have made various attempts to create for flagship universities by concentrating resources to make a selected few universities to compete for world-class university status. In addition, the massification of higher education in Asia has also created the growing concern of graduates confronting under and unemployment. This paper sets out against the wider policy context outlined above to examine what major challenges face higher education in Asia, with particular reference to examine the purpose of higher education. With a focus on addressing a growing diversity of learning needs, this paper critically examines the role of liberal arts education in the context of vocationalization of higher education and the quest for flagship universities in preparing graduates for uncertain futures.

Professor Charles Morrison

Short Biography

Charles E. Morrison has been president of the East-West Center since 1998. He has been associated with the Center since 1980 in various capacities, including heading its former Institute of Economics and Politics. A U.S. Senate aide early in his career, he has also been a research associate at the Japan Center for International Exchange. Morrison served as the international chair of the Pacific Economic Cooperation Council from 2005 to 2012, and is a member of other national and international bodies that promote trans-Pacific security and economic cooperation. His Ph.D. is from the Johns Hopkins School of Advanced International Studies, where he also once taught on Southeast Asia. He speaks and publishes widely on U.S. Asia policy issues and the countries of the region, and gives special emphasis to regional cooperation, particularly the APEC process.

Professor Deane Neubauer

Short Biography

Deane Neubauer is Emeritus Professor of Political Science at the University of Hawaii, Manoa and currently also serving as the co-director of the Asia Pacific Higher Education Research Partnership (APHERP). His work has touched on comparative democratic theory, health care politics, and various aspects of globalization including those focused on finance, governance, food and education. His current interests at the EWC focus on higher education in the Asia Pacific Region

Abstract

The University of Hawai'i in its Flagship Role: Pursuing Excellence Through A Complex Diverse Mission

Deane Neubauer, Joanne Y. Taira and Donald B. Young

The University of Hawai'i is in many respects a conventional U.S. flagship university to the extent that this usage applies to the primary research campus of the 10-unit Hawai'i higher education system. As a unique system in U.S. higher education in which all units exist in one system governed by a single board of Regents and a system President, the Manoa campus, the research intensive campus is both a "conventional" state flagship entity but also functions as a coordinated entity within the larger system. This paper explores some of the many ways in which the flagship concept is operationalized in a variety of state-wide and regional contexts at all levels of public higher education in Hawai'i.

Professor Joanne Y. Taira, University of Hawai'i System

Short Biography

Dr. Joanne Y. Taira is Senior Executive for International and Strategic Initiatives at the University of Hawai'i (UH), a system of eleven colleges, universities, and research, service, and education centers throughout Hawai'i. Taira convenes the systemwide international education committee; coordinates the President's Emerging Leaders Program; and is Hawai'i's liaison for an alliance of states focused on increasing higher education completion and decreasing gaps for underrepresented populations. In 2011 she oversaw the APEC project, *Quality in Higher Education*, and serves on the steering committee for APHERP. She earned a BA from Carleton College and a Masters in Asian Studies and PhD in Education from the University of Hawai'i at Mānoa.

Abstract

The University of Hawai'i in its Flagship Role: Pursuing Excellence Through A Complex Diverse Mission

Deane Neubauer, Joanne Y. Taira and Donald B. Young

The University of Hawai'i is in many respects a conventional U.S. flagship university to the extent that this usage applies to the primary research campus of the 10-unit Hawai'i higher education system. As a unique system in U.S. higher education in which all units exist in one system governed by a single board of Regents and a system President, the Manoa campus, the research intensive campus is both a "conventional" state flagship entity but also functions as a coordinated entity within the larger system. This paper explores some of the many ways in which the flagship concept is operationalized in a variety of state-wide and regional contexts at all levels of public higher education in Hawai'i.

Professor Min-ho Yeom, Chonnam National University

Short Biography

Min-ho Yeom is associate professor of the Department of Education in the College of Education, Chonnam National University, Gwangju, South Korea. He has written widely on issues of higher education reform at the micro- and macro levels, particularly curriculum changes, learning communities, writing center operation, and faculty professional development programs as well as government policies. His major research interests include educational policy development and evaluation, higher education reform, comparative international education, teacher education, and writing across the curriculum.

Abstract

The massification of higher education and the changing nature of the flagship universities in South Korea

Korean higher education over the last thirty years has been rapidly massified and this massification has changed the nature of old and new universities. Particularly, considering the nature of traditional flagship universities, it can be said that universities have changed their characteristics from focusing largely on education to being research driven universities and developing industry-university partnerships. This paper aims at comprehensively reviewing the changing characteristics of leading universities revealed over the process of expansion and critically discussing the implications of the changing nature of universities. By analyzing statistical data and reviewing articles, books, and government documents, this paper explores a few results of the massification, major forces and factors affecting the nature of traditional flagship universities, and implications of the changing nature of the universities. The paper will be instrumental to understand the complex dynamics of major forces and factors affecting Korean higher education institutions and to review critically the results of the massification driven by government.

Professor Donald B. Young, University of Hawai'i

Short Biography

Donald B. Young is Dean of the College of Education and Professor of Science Education at the University of Hawai'i at Manoa. Previously, Dr. Young served as Director of the Curriculum Research & Development Group (CRDG) in the College of Education. He has been a classroom science teacher, curriculum developer as well teaching undergraduate, graduate, and in-service teacher education programs. His research interests are in learning and teaching science, program dissemination and implementation, and in multi-dimensional assessment. Dr. Young holds degrees from the State University of New York–Albany and the University of Hawai'i.

Abstract

The University of Hawai'i in its Flagship Role: Pursuing Excellence Through A Complex Diverse Mission

Deane Neubauer, Joanne Y. Taira and Donald B. Young

The University of Hawai'i is in many respects a conventional U.S. flagship university to the extent that this usage applies to the primary research campus of the 10-unit Hawai'i higher education system. As a unique system in U.S. higher education in which all units exist in one system governed by a single board of Regents and a system President, the Manoa campus, the research intensive campus is both a "conventional" state flagship entity but also functions as a

coordinated entity within the larger system. This paper explores some of the many ways in which the flagship concept is operationalized in a variety of state-wide and regional contexts at all levels of public higher education in Hawai'i.

Professor Jia Zhang, Zhejiang University

Brief Biography

Dr. Jia Zhang is an assistant professor at the Institute of Educational Leadership and Policy, College of Education, Zhejiang University, China. She obtained her PhD degree in Education at the Chinese University of Hong Kong. Her research interests include school effectiveness and school improvement, educational leadership, teacher professional development, and higher education. Her publications have appeared in *Asia-Pacific Education Researcher*, *Educational Management, Administration & Leadership*, and *Asia Pacific Journal of Education*.

Abstract

How can flagship universities promote regional social development? The case of Zhejiang University

Flagship universities are playing an increasingly important role in socioeconomic development and public service. Zhejiang University, known as a leading flagship university in China, has contributed a lot to the economic growth and social progress of the country, especially in Zhejiang province. Specifically, Zhejiang University has significantly promoted the regional socioeconomic development in the following ways: first, its direction for improvement is coordinated with the strategic goal of the local district. Second, the university cultivates high quality talents (including establishing independent colleges through collaboration with local governments and supporting the development of local universities) to serve the development of its regional district. Third, the university provides research and technology support for the strategic emerging industries in local districts, which promotes the upgrading of local traditional industries. Fourth, as both a think tank and a resource center, the university plays a key role in the regional community building process in terms of medical and health services and legal system construction. Fifth, the university facilitates the regional cultural development by promoting cultural heritage protection, cultural innovation and cultural services. Last, the university helps to improve the regional environment through scientific research on prevention of water, air and soil pollution.