

United States Aid and the Development of Higher Education in Ukraine and South Africa: Tale of Two Countries¹

Joseph Stetar
Seton Hall University

Ukraine and South Africa are two countries that underwent significant transformations in the 1990's. Ukraine gained its independence from Russia in 1999 and South Africa abolished the repressive Apartheid system and installed a new democratically elected government in 1994. Both countries then embarked on significant efforts at transformation, nation building and educational development.

American aid for higher education in South Africa and Ukraine has two basic and distinct sources: government and private foundations. United States government assistance for education development in South Africa, Ukraine and worldwide is administered primarily through the United States Agency for International Development (USAID) and United States Information Agency (USIA) both of which are independent foreign affairs agencies with the executive branch of the United States (U.S.) government. USAID provides economic and humanitarian assistance to advance U.S. economic and political interests overseas while USIA has the somewhat narrower mission of explaining and supporting U.S. foreign policy and national security interests to overseas audiences. USIA also has the broad mission of promoting mutual understanding between the U.S. and other countries through a wide range of cultural educational and information programs.

USAID has approximately 80 missions that manage individual country programs. USIA has over 200 offices in more than 125 countries. These offices, known as United State Information Services (USIS) posts represent an extensive international network for promoting international educational and cultural exchanges and to disseminating information about the United States overseas. When referring to U.S. government support to Ukrainian or South African higher education it will generally mean programs administered by USAID or USIA and USIS (USAID (<http://www.info.usaid.gov>)).

Private or philanthropic foundations constitute the second leg of U.S. overseas assistance for educational development. Familiar to many academics both in the U.S and internationally foundations such as The Andrew W. Mellon Foundation with a broad mission "to aid and promote such religious, charitable, scientific, literary, and educational purposes as may in the furtherance of the public welfare or tend to promote the-well-doing or well-being of mankind" (Andrew W. Mellon Foundation, 1998,5.). Other foundations such as the Soros Foundation Network / Open Society Institute have established and funded an informal, decentralized network of autonomous foundations that share a common mission "to foster the development of an open society" (Soros Foundation, 1996, 9). Foundations such as Mellon and Soros as well as Ford,

Mott and W.K. Kellogg among others have assumed a high profile role in South Africa and/or Ukraine.

After providing background on the educational systems and changes underway in Ukraine and South Africa this article will examine how support from the United States -- both government and private foundations -- is being channeled into these two countries and for what purposes. In looking at U.S. assistance to Ukraine and South Africa it is important to realize that government and foundations can and often pursue different aims for different purposes. To what extent are the foci of U.S. government and private assistance congruent? To what extent do they differ? Questions such as these help us to better understand the complexity of U.S. aid to both nations.

Ukrainian Higher Education

Ukrainian higher education as in many of the newly independent States of the former Soviet Union is undergoing its second revolution of the twentieth century. The first began in 1917 and expanded in the years following World War II especially under Josef Stalin, who sought to impose a socialist and to varying degrees a Russified system of higher education upon the countries comprising the Soviet Union. Ideological orientation with strong central state planning, control and academic orthodoxy, it lacked the intellectual pluralism -- particularly in the social sciences and humanities -- essential to institutional vitality. This initial revolution limited academic freedom and imposed a strong governmental imprimatur upon the growth, direction and development of higher education in Ukraine as well as the other Soviet Union and Eastern Bloc countries.

However, a second revolution is now underway in Ukraine and much of Eastern Europe. Volatile, unpredictable and centrifugal in orientation this revolution seeks to radically and profoundly restructure higher education. It seeks to substantially alter, if not eradicate, the official state dogmas through healthy doses of pluralistic thought and academic freedom. This second revolution also seeks to recapture national history and identity, expand the barriers of institutional autonomy while rethinking and redefining the role of government vis- -vis the university. It seeks to foster educational pluralism (e.g. private educational institutions), reinstate indigenous language and cultural studies and infuse higher education with an increased, although often undefined emphasis, upon individualism (Swing and Orivel, 1992 and Stetar, 1999).²

While conservative ideologues are still strong throughout much of the former Soviet Union, they are especially evident in Ukraine where tensions between ethnic / linguistic Russians are strong. In addition Ukrainian nationalistic sentiments must be balanced against the interest of the substantial Russian-speaking minority which comprises approximately 22 percent of Ukraine's more than 52 million people.

Nevertheless, higher education planning is being infused with new perspectives Rejecting simplistic approaches which tend to characterize higher education as the passive product of society or the active engine of change (Jarusch, 1983). Ukrainian reformers -- clustered disproportionately in the private sector -- are looking at ways to reform and restructure

higher education within a broader systematic perspective which accommodate varying views of mission, values, structure, function, rationalization and bureaucratization. As Bjorn Wittrock and Sheldon Rothblatt suggest in their comparative look at European and American universities:

The disenchantment with State planning, 'command economies', and large-scale bureaucracy...the balkanizing of former Soviet regimes have predictably led to a search for new and different ways of structuring and financing higher education to achieve the three goals of economic development, social mobility and 'quality' (Rothblatt and Wittrock, 1993)

In Ukraine as well as several other nations of the former Soviet Union small but vocal bands of higher education al reformers are attempting to integrate the dynamics of reform and restructuring with sensitivity to national idiosyncrasies.

South African Higher Education

Higher education in apartheid-era South Africa was divided into three basic categories. The privileged English-language "open universities" of which Cape Town and the University of Witswatersrand were the flagships. The equally privileged but conservative and obsequious Afrikaans-medium universities such as Pretona, Stellenbosch and the Orange Free State comprised a second category and the impoverished, historically black universities such as Vista and the University of the North a third (Stetar 1999b).

With the inauguration of President Nelson Mandela in May 1994 South Africa began the task of trying to integrate a society divided by more than a hundred years of white domination and 45 years of oppressive apartheid ideology. But the building of a new nation was only part of a very complex equation. Through an ambitious reconstruction and redevelopment Mr. Mandela and his African National Congress (ANC) party articulated a vision for the fundamental transformation of South Africa.

In addition to having to meet basic citizen needs for housing, water, sanitation facilities and nutrition there was a broad goal of developing human resources through an expanded system of education and training. To provide the financial resources to support such an effort South Africa would have to transform itself from the isolationist siege economy of the apartheid and sanctions years into a player in the new global market -- a task as recent history suggests -- that can be destabilizing to a whole range of emerging economies (Sparks, 1999).³ With the infrastructure of a developed country within a developing one South Africa was in a unique position on the African continent. Its economy, immense in comparison to others on the continent forces South Africa to have to address issues of if an how it would maintain its education and research strength while expanding educational access and extending basic services. South Africa is a very minor player in the world of research and development(R&D). Its total expenditure or R&D in 1992 was about 0.223% of the total world spending on research and development and it has about 0.282% of the world's R&D scientists and engineers. However, on the African continent

South Africa is the major player accounting for about 60% of all R&D expenditures and about 28% of all R&D scientists and engineers in Africa (Directorate for Science and Technology Policy, 1996: 103-123).⁴

Higher education has an important role to play in South Africa's economic and social development. As it does in R&D spending, South African universities dominate research on the continent. For example, South African university faculty publishes approximately 44% more articles in the sciences than Egypt which is the second most prolific country in Africa (Directorate for Science and Technology Policy, 1996: 125).

However, as to be expected the research capacity of South African universities is not evenly distributed. The research capacity tends to be concentrated in six comprehensive universities: Cape Town, Witwatersrand, Natal, Pretoria Stellenbosch and the Orange Free State. As table I indicates in 1991 these six universities accounted for more than 70% of the research undertaken in higher education (Directorate for Science and Technology Policy, 1996: 354).

It is evident these six universities dominate research and development in South African higher education. Moreover, it can be argued that by most commonly accepted benchmarks (e.g., comprehensive faculties, extensive graduate and professional programs, research and development expenditures, faculty publications etc.) these six institutions are the only international standard, research-oriented universities in South Africa and on the entire African continent⁵.

Table 1 University R&D Funding / Expenditure 1991⁶

University	Total R&D Funding in Rand	Percentage RSA Higher Education Funding
Cape Town	R95,775	14%
Natal	R71,363	10.4%
Orange Free State	R66,391	9.7%
Pretoria	R94,039	13.7%
Stellenbosch	R73,624	10.7%
Witwatersrand	R86,766	12.7%
All other RSA universities	R194,668	28.5%
Total RSA university R&D funding	R682,626	Due to rounding does not equal 100%

Clearly these six universities and perhaps one or two others have the capacity, skills and experience to provide clear support for policy development and implementation. These universities also have the infrastructure to supply an important portion of the basic and applied research needed to help the nation meet the basic needs of its citizens and build the economy.

Because these six universities have the potential to be powerful economic and job creation engines and some of South Africa's greatest magnets for attracting international capital maintenance and enhancement of their role would appear to warrant special consideration by both the South African government and the international donor communities. Unfortunately, this may not be occurring.

American Assistance to Ukrainian Higher Education

United States government assistance to Ukraine has since the beginning of this decade refocused its programs away from Cold War priorities of containment towards longer-term U.S. objectives for development. Ukraine provides a complex but illustrative example of U.S. government support of education to advance perceived long-term U.S. interests.

The United States perceives a long-term strategic interest in maintaining Ukrainian independence from Russia and U.S. aid policy to Ukraine appears to seek to foster Ukrainian nationalist and independence. As the often heard refrain suggests "Russia without Ukraine is not an empire; Russia with Ukraine is an empire."

United States efforts to influence development of Ukrainian higher education appear to follow a clearly trodden path. On one hand USIA and USIS provide state universities such as Taras Shevchenko National University (Kyiv State University), Donetsk State University as well as the quasi State university Kyiv-Mohyla Academy with direct financial and technical support in a transparent effort to lessen State control and encourage emerging efforts at institutional autonomy.

For example, USIA established the NIS College and University Partnership Program (NISCUPP) to foster institutional partnerships between U.S. universities and institutions in the new independent states (NIS) of the former Soviet Union. Short and intermediate term goals of NISCUPP are to strengthen curriculum at the NIS institutions by providing support⁷ for exchanges with U.S. faculty and staff for a combination of lecturing, teaching, curriculum development, faculty and administrative staff development, collaborative research and outreach efforts.

Longer-term goals of NISCUPP include:

- Support the ability of academic institutions in the New Independent States to contribute through the curricula and applied research capacities, to the creation of democratic institutions rule of law and an environment hospitable to foreign investment.
- Advance mutual understanding between the U.S.A. and the NIS by supporting linkages, which provide true reciprocity and significant mutual benefit
- Diversify and expand international exchanges by supporting linkages with U.S. academic institutions
- Expand U.S. government and private sector cooperation by leveraging significant cost sharing from U.S. and foreign partners, foundations, foreign government and non-governmental organizations and businesses

In keeping with its intent to further democratic and capitalistic development while lessening state control over education in the countries comprising the former Soviet Union, NISCUPP limits program activities to the fields of:

- law

- business, economics, accounting, trade,
- education, continuing education, civic education, educational reform,
- government, public policy, public administration, urban and regional economic development and
- Journalism and communications

A parallel program, Sustaining Partnerships into the Next Century (SPAN) is supported directly by USAID and is administered by the International Research and Exchange Board (IREX) and shares similar goals and objectives with NISCUPP.

While such programs as NISCUPP are directed at all of the countries comprising the former Soviet Union the principal recipient countries are, as Table 2 indicates Russia and Ukraine. In 1998 those linkages with those two countries comprised 12 of the 19 funded projects (NIS College and University Partnerships, USIA).

Table 2: 1998 Summary of NISCUPP Proposals and Funded Projects⁸

Country	Proposal Received	Proposal Funded
Armenia	2	1
Azerbaijan	3	1
Belarus	2	1
Georgia	3	1
Moldova	2	0
Kazakhstan	3	1
Kyrgyzstan	3	0
Russia	39	8
Tajikistan	1	1
Turkmenistan	0	0
Ukraine	17	4
Uzbekistan	3	1
Totals	78	19

Recognizing the need to insure that public policy issues are debated within an institutional framework that is informed by the theoretical and empirical findings of the social science USIA has launched -- in cooperation with the European Union -- a Summer Institute in Social Science Research and Public Policy for Ukrainian Social Scientists. Drawing upon the disciplines of economics, political science and public administration this program seeks to insure that Ukrainian social scientists have the skills and knowledge base to impact the daily work of officials in the public policy arena be they elected officials, government managers or public policy professionals by helping provide a context for the framing, addressing, debating and resolution of public policy issues (Summer Institute, USIA).

USIA has also supported Ministry level exchanges, encouraged the development of private universities and schools and fostered their autonomy from State. It has encouraged

linkages between U.S. and NIS secondary schools to develop strong institutional ties between U.S. and NIS schools and communities and to promote broad partnerships that will support educational development among all participants (NIS Secondary School Partnership, USIA). In addition, USIA has supported the Ukrainian and English languages as medium of instruction in universities.

Working in parallel with similar goals but independent of United States government assistance to Ukraine are a number of private foundations led by the Soros Foundation / Open Society Institute with its mission of trying to transform closed societies into open ones and to protect the values of open societies. Faced with political apathy, declining living standards and growing unemployment in Ukraine the Soros Foundation established the International Renaissance Foundation⁹ (IRF) as an autonomous organization to support programs that empower Ukrainians to take the steps necessary to build an open society and to nurture and sustain their recently acquired freedoms.

Economic problems have severely undermined Ukrainian education and to stimulate interest in reform the IRF initiated in 1996 a series of roundtable discussions involving educators, administrators, government officials, students and academic experts. Topics included higher education reform, financing of education, roles of private and state education, introduction of new textbooks and curricula and the critical area of increasing civil involvement in the formation of Ukrainian educational policy (Soros Foundation, 1996, 99-102, Soros Foundation Network, 1998 Annual Report).

The Soros Foundation has also been instrumental in facilitating economic change in Ukraine through the Soros Training for Economic Transformation Network (STETN). Through its training programs and seminars, STETN facilitates non-political discussions regarding economic change among reform-oriented policymakers. It assists government agencies with regulatory efforts and seeks to instill a sense of professional standards among clerks, managers and consultants preparing and implementing economic reforms.

IRF sponsored activities complimentary to those of STETN by entering into a joint agreement with foundations such as the U.S. based Charles Stewart Mott Foundation to support repatriation efforts for minority deportees in Ukraine as well as joining with the Soros sponsored International Science Foundation to assist with efforts to enhance the funding and managing of scientific research in Ukraine. This latter effort was of particular interest to Ukrainian universities (Soros Foundation, 1996, 194-196, Soros Foundation Network, 1998 Annual Report).

Complementing the substantial efforts by IRF to encourage the development of a strong civil society in Ukraine by providing hundreds of opportunities for professional development of professors of humanities and social sciences were efforts by The Christian A. Johnson Endeavors Foundation of New York. Through its support of Artes Liberales, an indigenous Eastern European group committed to encouraging the development of programs to foster liberal education and democratic leadership among scholars in the post-communist countries, the Johnson Foundation is fostering goals and objectives similar to those of USIA, USAID and the Soros Foundation Network (Artes Liberales 1997).

In summary the U.S. educational / aid policy toward Ukrainian education appears remarkably focused. U.S. government and private foundation assistance programs are concentrating their efforts on building democratic institutions and supporting complementary efforts. There appears to be a strong consensus among the U.S. aid community as to the policy directions that should be pursued with respect to assisting the development of Ukrainian education. The situation in South Africa is, as we shall see, quite different.

American Aid to South African Higher Education

In developing its strategy for assistance to South Africa there were, as expected clear and obvious differences between those factors that drove policy in Ukraine. While apartheid was a brutal and dehumanizing system it did not shape American foreign and defense policies with anything near the intensity of communism and the Cold War South Africa never occupied a position of strategic importance to the U.S. equivalent to that of Ukraine. The latter with its substantial nuclear arsenal and its ability to quickly undermine stability in Europe, was strategically although not necessarily politically more important to U.S. interests. In any event U.S. assistance to South Africa has been substantial averaging approximately \$110 million per year over the last three years.

While the strategic importance of South Africa to the U.S. may not be equivalent to that of Ukraine, the U.S. government is clear in its position that strengthening education in South Africa is of critical concern. In its strategic plan for South Africa USAID outlined a goal of supporting South African efforts to achieve a "transformed education system based upon equity of access and quality". To meet its educational objectives USAID assistance has focused on five distinct sub-sectors of South African education.

- Primary education. Here the objective is to improve the quality of primary education in South Africa's neediest provinces. Focus has been upon three areas: (1) the improving of national and provincial finance and education management information systems, (2) introducing a new outcomes based curriculum and (3) training teachers in new methods and continuous assessment.
- Further education and training (FET). Goal in this area is to assist the more than 3 million young adults who were unable to complete schooling due to their involvement in the anti-apartheid movement. This effort assists with teacher training, helps vocational and agricultural colleges to restructure and consolidate programs to better serve their communities and includes the establishment of pilot community colleges in each of the nine provinces.
- Adult basic education and training (ABET). USAID objectives in this area are to build a more coherent and effective ABET system and to expand adult education programs in selected provinces. Efforts in this area include financing for the development and testing of new curricula for adult learners, training of practitioners and delivery of new courses in public adult training centers.

- Workforce development. With this initiative USAID seeks to facilitate the rapid integration of blacks into leadership and executive positions. Improving the skills of newly appointed government officials and creating opportunities for South Africans to compete in a global economy is the underlying objective of USAID's program for workforce development. In order to achieve this objective USAID finances U.S. and South African based degree-training programs and as of mid-1999 more than 5,000 black students have utilized USAID funds to further their studies
- Higher Education. Support for higher education aims to improve the quality of education at 15 historically disadvantaged institutions (HDI's)¹⁰. These institutions were specifically targeted because of the disparities created by the apartheid system. To support this objective five areas are the focus of HDI institutional development: (1) curriculum, (2) staff development (3) student academic development, (4) research and (5) administration and management (USAID <http://www.info.usaid.gov>).

The USAID assistance to HDI's is in accordance with the commitment of the South African government's Higher Education Act which seeks to fulfill "the constitutional imperative to facilitate equality and development in historically deprived institutions..." (The Times Higher, 1999b). However, because USAID has excluded the six research oriented universities: Cape Town, Natal, Orange Free State, Pretoria Stellenbosch and Witwatersrand from support there is a real question as to whether this approach provides a basis for a sustainable reform and enhancement of higher education.

Enrollment in South Africa's twenty-one universities is dropping dramatically at a time it was expected to be expanding. In the two years preceding 1998 enrollment dropped by approximately 100/0 to 352,000 and is expected to drop even more in the next couple of years (The Times Higher, 1999a). The HDI's have borne the brunt of these declines as fewer black students are qualifying for university admission. Moreover, the black students who do qualify are deserting the HDI's and enrolling at the historically white institutions¹¹ -- especially the six research universities whose degrees are perceived -- and by almost any measure correctly -- to be of higher quality than those offered by the HDI's (The Chronicle of Higher Education, 1999).

Increasingly South Africa's six research universities are being called upon to educate the nation's black elite while providing the technical and research required for economic growth. Unless South Africa can find a way to provide these universities with the support necessary to maintain their critical missions the future of higher education in South Africa would appear quite bleak.

In many ways USAID policies toward higher education development in South Africa appear to be outmoded and based upon historical and political conditions in U.S. rather than being tuned to the rapidly changing educational realities of South Africa in 1999. It is within this context that U.S. government and U.S. foundation assistance appears to be taking divergent paths.

For example, The Andrew W. Mellon Foundation has taken a major role in South Africa with appropriations in 1998 alone totaling nearly \$13 million. The Mellon Foundation appears to

have three basic priorities for South Africa:

- Graduate training and faculty development
- Library automation and collaboration
- Development of new teaching tools.

An overarching objective uniting each of the priorities appears to be a goal of increasing access while enhancing quality and a clear recognition that South Africa's research oriented universities have an especially critical role to play in the nation's development.

With respect to graduate training and faculty development the Mellon Foundation recognizes that the legacy of apartheid has left many of South Africa's leading universities with a common dilemma. Although they have made impressive progress in transforming their student bodies from majority white to majority black the more difficult and equally pressing task is the transformation of their faculties. While black faculty are continually recruited from other African countries South Africa recognizes the need to "grow their own." And it is within that context that the Mellon Foundation has provided substantial grants to several of these research-oriented universities (Mellon Foundation 1999).

Library automation and collaboration have been another focus of the Mellon Foundation over the past three years. And again, the Foundation recognizes the library resources in place at the research oriented universities and has sought to encourage automation of their library systems and thereby permitting the sharing of resources with other institutions such as the HDI's. The library automation and collaboration project appears to be rooted in the realization that the vast bulk of South Africa's academic library resources are housed with the collections of the six research oriented universities and that while it is impossible to recreate those collections at each of the nation's 21 universities technology provides the wherewithal to share the collections. Table 3 illustrates the vast disparities in institutional library collections in the Free State but the situation is similar in other provinces (FRELICO, 1997).

Table 3: University Library Collections in the Free State

Collection	Volumes	Periodical Subscription
University of Orange Free State	500,000	4,000
Technikon Free State	46,000	200
Vista University at Bloemfontein (an HDI)	29,000	296
Vista University at Welkom (an HDI)	20,000	200
University of the North at Qwa Qwa (an HDI)	NA but very basic	NA but very basic

The need to find new ways to teach basic skills to entering college students who come from widely disparate backgrounds is critical to any effort to strengthen South African higher education. Given the budgetary constraints in South Africa a more cost-effective method for teaching has to be developed. To search for these solutions the Mellon Foundation again turned

to several of the six research oriented universities for possible solutions. For example, in 1963 the Multi-media Education Group at the University of Cape Town was provided at grant of nearly \$600,000 to develop a set of cost effective instructional materials that can be utilized to prepare students for university level work recognizes (Mellon Foundation, 1969).

Mellon has not been alone in its efforts to draw upon the strengths of the six research oriented universities to address broad educational and social problems. The Ford Foundation is providing critical support to the University of the Orange Free State (UOFS) to develop a consortium (i.e., Free State Trust for Higher and Further Education) of higher educational institutions in the region to enhance the delivery of educational services. Still other foundations such as the W.K. Kellogg Foundation headquartered in Michigan have provided several million U.S. dollars to the University of the Orange Free State for the promotion of broadly based community health programs and the training of appropriate personnel. Kellogg has also provided the UOFS with over \$600,000 for bursaries that will help talented black students to pursue careers in such fields as education, health sciences, and agriculture.

U.S. Government and Private Foundation Aid: Partners or Competitors?

As evidenced from the examples drawn from Ukraine and South Africa U.S. government and foundation aid are not necessarily congruent with respect to goals and objectives. In Ukraine -- due perhaps to the clear and strong foci of encouraging the development of democracy and market economies -- both U.S. government and foundation assistance appear to have developed similar goals and strong mutually supportive programs. In South Africa where America brings along its own legacy of racial tensions and divisions the congruence between government and foundation assistance appears less evident. While South Africa under apartheid was not a democratic country it had the infrastructure of a market economy and the basic institutions of a democratic society in place. However, perhaps even more importantly. South Africa lacked the strategic importance of Ukraine. South Africa's importance to U.S. was more political than strategic and American support to South Africa may reflect America's domestic political agenda more than it does South Africa's long term developmental needs.

Finally, any examination of U.S. aid to South Africa and Ukraine raises the question of the degree to which U.S. aid is really a subterfuge for U.S. educational imperialism. Is, for example, U.S. aid an effort to convert education in Ukraine from a Soviet model to a U.S. model with organized teaching, evaluation and research with little concern for cultural roots or the important links between education and national goals? Is U.S. government aid to South Africa more a reflection of racial interactions and patterns in U.S. than a response to indigenous South African goals, needs and cultural values?

To what extent is looking at foreign assistance from the national perspective of the U.S., Ukraine or South Africa an oxymoron? Are models with deep European and American roots dominating the discussion regarding the development of higher education internationally and ultimately leading universities in developing countries toward a single, rather narrow American definition of higher education?

In a series of discussions in recent years with faculty at several universities in Minsk, Moscow and Kyiv regarding approaches to higher education reform was struck by the intensity of their characterization of the USA as the "capital of educational arrogance". Is their assertion that far too many U.S. academics tend to view universities in most parts of the world from a perspective most akin to that of zealous missionaries from imperial Spain or Britain at the height of their respective empires? That is, there is no limit to the good that can be accomplished if only the heathens can be converted to the U.S. models of higher education.

Are the assertions surfacing in Kyiv and elsewhere that too many American academics comfortable in their privileged sinecures, view universities in other parts of the world as instruments for the extension of American cultural or, more precisely, educational dominance? Is there truth to the accusation that American shouting "In the U.S. we do it this way" too quickly characterize efforts to develop an indigenous path for higher education that deviates too sharply from the American model as residing in the backwater rather than the mainstream of higher education?

Finally, in fairness should point out that accusations of efforts to dominate the discussion surrounding higher education reform are not solely directed at U.S academics. In a recent discussion with the a group of Kenyan academics regarding higher education development several pointed to efforts of South African universities to dominate discussions in Africa. Without any prompting one member of the Kenyan group characterized Johannesburg as the African capital of educational arrogance.

Notes:

- 1 Earlier versions of this article were presented for discussion at the Unit for Research into Higher Education of the University of the Orange Free State in Bloemfontein South Africa in February 1999 and the Hiroshima University Center for the Study of International Cooperation in Education and the International House of Japan in Tokyo in March 1999.

Wish to thank my colleagues in both Japan and South Africa for their comments and reactions, which stimulated my thinking. Also wish to thank Professors Anatoly Pohribny at Taras Shevchenko (Kyiv) National University and Oleksiy Panich at Donetsk State University in Ukraine for their valuable assistance.

Finally wish to thank Prof. Alida Dippenaar and her colleagues at the University of the Orange Free State SASOL library for their assistance in collecting important reference materials. Of course, any errors in this study are completely my responsibility.

- 2 For some historical perspectives on the development of Ukrainian higher education see Stetar (1995) and Savchuk, Gal, Oparin & Luzik (1997).
- 3 Note: the destabilizing effect of the new global market has been felt in countries such as Malaysia, Russia, Mexico and Brazil. South Africa is subject to similar if not greater pressures as it seeks to move from an economy based upon agriculture and mining to one

based on the exporting of value added products. Unemployment is high with the Free State Department of Economic Affairs and Tourism reporting that 45% ± of its citizens are unemployed. The situation is not dramatically different in other provinces.

- 4 Note: The Directorate for Science and Technology Policy in Pretoria is currently updating its study of South Africa's science and technology indicators. Preliminary indications suggest South Africa's domination of R&D on the African continent has increased substantially since their 1996 report. The 1998 South African Science and Technology Indicators are expected to be published, in late 1999 or early 2000.
- 5 For a further discussion of the importance of these six universities see J. Stetar, *Can South African higher education institutions learn anything from quality assurance trends in USA and Ukraine?* (1996a).
- 6 These figures will be updated with publication of *1998 South African Science and Technology Indicators*. Preliminary indications suggest these six universities will maintain -- if not further expand - their research and development dominance of South African higher education.
- 7 Grants are generally for a maximum of \$100,000 per year for up to three years. Some additional funds for educational materials and project administration are also available.
- 8 In 1999 preference for NISCUPP grants in Ukraine will be given to proposals for partnerships with institutions located in Kharkiv region which has had limited funding in past.
- 9 Soros Foundation Network 1996 Annual Report indicates that in 1996 the International Renaissance Foundation (Ukraine) reported expenditures of \$15,322,710 on various programs.
- 10 In a 30 July 1999 announcement on the USAID CBO listserve (E-mail: lisproc@info.usaid.gov) it was announced that the funds to support the HDI's would be increased by approximately \$1.2 million and the number of eligible HDIS would be expanded from 15 to 17. The six South African research oriented universities: Cape Town, Natal, Orange Free State, Pretoria, Stellenbosch and Witwatersrand were again excluded from any possible USAID funding.
- 11 The University of the North and South Africa's oldest black and perhaps most distinguished black university Fort Hare are illustrative of the enrollment problems facing the HDI's. Enrollment at the University of the North has declined from 15,000 in 1995 to 10,000 in 1998 to 5,500 in 1999. At Fort Hare enrollment in 1999 was 2,500, down 50% from 1998.

Bibliography:

- Andrew W. Mellon Foundation. (1999). *Report from January 1, 1998 through December 31, 1998*. New York: The Andrew W. Mellon Foundation.
- Artes Liberales. *Statement of Intention* (1997). Paper presented at a meeting of the Educational Leadership Program of The Christian A. Johnson Endeavor Foundation Yale Club, New York, NY.

- FRELICO. *Final Report* (1997). Free State Libraries and Information Consortium.
 Bloemfontein, South Africa: University of the Orange Free State.
- Directorate for Science and Technology Policy. (1996). *South African science and technology indicators 1996*. Pretoria: Foundation for Research Development.
- Hare, P. (1997). Conceptual issues in the analysis of higher education: application to Russia and Ukraine. In P. Hare (Ed.) *Structure and finance of higher education in Russia, Ukraine and the EU*. London: Jessica Kingsley.
- Jarausch, K.H. (1983). Higher education and social change: some comparative perspectives. In K.H. Jarausch (Ed.) *The transformation of higher learning 1860-1930*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Lategan and A. Muller (Eds.), *Quality assurance in South African higher education national and international perspectives*. (pp. 200-317). Bloemfontein, South Africa University of the Free State.
- MacGregor, Karen. (1999, April 2). Pretoria crackdown on university financial bungling. *The Times Higher Education Review*, p.11.
- NIS College and University Partnerships Programs. USIA: ([http:// www.usia.gov/education /rfps](http://www.usia.gov/education/rfps))
- NIS Secondary School Partnership Program. USIA: ([http:// www.usia.gov/education/ rfps](http://www.usia.gov/education/rfps)).
- Rothblatt, S. & Wittrock B. (1993) *The European and American university since 1800*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Savchuk, V., Gal, I., Oparin, V., Luzik, P. (1997) Higher education in Ukraine: structure and financing. In P. Hare (Ed.) *Structure and finance of higher education in Russia, Ukraine and the EU*. London: Jessica Kingsley.
- Soros Foundations Network, *1996 Annual Report*. New York: Open Society Institute.
- Soros Foundations Network, *1997 Annual Report* (<http://www.soros.org>)
- Sparks, A (1999 Spring) The status of the dream. *The Wilson Quarterly*. 66-92
- Stetar, J. (1996a), Can South African higher education institutions learn anything from quality assurance trends in the United States and Ukraine? In A. H. Strydom, L. Stetar, J. (1996b), *Higher education innovation and reform: Ukrainian private higher education 1991-1996*. Vienna: United States Information Services.
- _____. (1996c). Private higher education and external control. In John D.Turner (Ed.), *The state and the school: an international perspective*. (pp.77-91). London: Falmer Press.
- _____. (1996d, October). *Ukrainian private higher education and state policy*. Paper presented at the Conference on Private Higher Education in Ukraine in the Context of International Experience, Kyiv.
- _____. (1996e, October). *Private higher education and the state: International perspectives*. Paper presented at Dominican Republic and New Jersey Universities Rectors Summit, Jersey City State College, Jersey City, NJ.
- Stetar, J. & Stocker, J. (1997, March) Reform and innovation: Ukraine's new private universities. *International Higher Education*, 17, 14-15.
- Stetar, J. and Pohribny, A., (1999a) Towards a new definition of quality: Taras Shevchenko

- Nation University (Kyiv University), Ukraine. In P. Sabloff (Ed.) *Higher education in the post-communist world: case studies of eight universities*. New York: Garland Publishing.
- Stetar, J. (1999b) [Review of the book, WITS: a university in the apartheid era]. *History of Education Quarterly*, 39, 226-228.
- Summer Institute in Social Science Research and Public Policy for Ukrainian Social Scientists.
USIA: ([http:// www.usia.gov/education/rfps](http://www.usia.gov/education/rfps)).
- Swing, E.S. & Orivel F. (1992) Education in a new Europe. *Comparative Education Review*, 36(1), 1-9.
- United States Agency for International Development [USAID] ([http:// www.info.usaid.gov](http://www.info.usaid.gov))
- Vergnani, Linda. (1999, March 12). South Africa's black universities struggle to survive in a new era. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, p.A45-46.