

*REPORT ON*  
*TBILISI STATE UNIVERSITY*  
*TBILISI, GEORGIA*  
*September 28 – October 3, 2002*

# **SALZBURG SEMINAR**

**UNIVERSITIES PROJECT**  
**VISITING ADVISORS PROGRAM**



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

**TBILISI STATE UNIVERSITY**

**TBILISI, GEORGIA**

**September 27 – October 3, 2002**

***Team Members:***

**Dr. Andris Barblan**, Senior Advisor, European University Association,  
Geneva, Switzerland

**Dr. Madeleine Green**, Vice President, American Council on Education,  
Washington, DC, USA, *team leader*

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

**Prof. Dr. Helmut Schramke**, Project Manager, University of Vienna, Austria

**Introduction**

Although our visit to Tbilisi State University (TSU) was brief, the difficult circumstances in which the University operates were very visible, and form the backdrop for any discussion of quality improvement and reform. The scarcity of government funding for the University and the overall lack of the necessary financial resources were abundantly clear to the team, as well as the difficult national economic situation of the Republic of Georgia. The toll of the recent civil war and the devastation of the national economy were frequently mentioned by the people with whom we met, reminding us that in the near future, a strategic reform agenda must be accomplished without the infusion of significant new resources. While some strategies we suggest will have little or no cost, we recognize that there are often hidden costs, in time as well as in money, and that some approaches will require investments. We are not familiar enough with the internal workings of the University to know the possibilities for reallocation of existing resources. If the experiences of other universities around the world are any guide, we can speculate that new investments will inevitably come from a combination of reallocation and new funds. In the concluding section we return to this theme, urging the University to press for a global (lump-sum) budget, rather than the existing line-item budget, which makes it impossible for the University to make such reallocations.

We also recognize the work accomplished to date by TSU in modernization in the Post-Soviet era. The newly developed bachelor's and master's structure is an important first step in creating a more flexible curricular structure, as is the creation of a credit system. Similarly, we applaud the initiative to design and implement a system to evaluate the teaching process. We heard about other innovations around TSU, such as the Tempus-sponsored internship program in economics, the consortium for business studies with U.S. partners and the new medical curriculum, which indicate a spirit of innovation and experimentation. Indeed, there seems to be a solid foundation for the important work that lies ahead.

### **The Context for Reform**

We began our visit by noting that in order to address the three issues designated as the focus of our visit—academic governance, student affairs, and information technology—, we felt a need to learn far more about the overall institutional context for these areas of concern. Much of our discussions with TSU administrators, teaching staff, and students focussed on broader questions that would enable us to understand why these were such important issues and how they fit with other pressing matters faced by the institution. Since universities are complex, interrelated systems, it is often difficult to approach particular issues without considering the larger strategic questions that they raise. Thus, we would like to draw attention to what we believe should frame a larger strategic approach to academic reform.

As the leading institution of higher education in Georgia, TSU has a special opportunity and responsibility to contribute to national well-being and development. Like other universities around the world, TSU can contribute in many ways to the public good—in educating students for citizenship, in performing the basic research that creates an essential knowledge base and the applied research that addresses actual scientific and human needs, and in serving as a forum for open debate and inquiry. However, like many classical universities in other countries, TSU has historically looked more inward (to the conditions of scientific progress) rather than outward (to the service of the society at large) in shaping its development path. Given the rapid rate of change in the external environment and society's expectation that higher education serve as a partner in social and economic development, there is a need for TSU to engage more systematically with its stakeholders. We have identified two specific areas that warrant attention immediately.

The first is the engagement of TSU in the educational reform process of primary and secondary education. We understand that a reform strategy for these sectors is under development. As an integral part of the larger system, and as a recognised reference institution in standard matters, TSU is in a unique position to help shape that reform process so that the students TSU receives are optimally prepared for a university education and thus enable the University to add the greatest value possible to the education of students. We also heard of the gap between the end point of secondary school and the entrance requirement for TSU. Working to align these will ensure that all students gain the necessary preparation in secondary school and thus

promote a fairer system for university admission. While there will inevitably be costs to such a reform, it will ultimately serve to improve the overall quality, transparency, and fairness of the educational system.

The second area concerns an overall shift in the conception of bachelor's level education. A first degree should provide broad preparation for work, citizenship, and lifelong learning. Georgia will require an active and informed citizenry to sustain democracy; it will need a well-trained workforce continually able to learn new skills. These demands require an educational process that teaches critical thinking, teamwork, and an understanding of Georgian culture as well as an appreciation of other cultures. To accomplish this educational goal will require a broader approach to the bachelor's degree— one that shifts from a concept of an education aimed at the best and the brightest students to one that provides an excellent education for all. In our meetings with professors, we often heard about the top students, but little was said about the rest of them. It is for these “average” students that the University makes the biggest difference; the “best” students are likely to do well no matter what the quality of the education they receive. A focus on success for all students would be a significant change mentality and approach that would have a profound effect on the educational process at Tbilisi State University.

Another shift that would facilitate a move to a broader conception of bachelor's education is to move from a focus on producing specialists to producing broadly educated students who also have acquired specialized knowledge. The explosion of knowledge and rapid change in all areas will make the body of knowledge acquired in university less important for students than the ability to continue learning in one's field, or to be able to learn a completely new set of skills or body of knowledge. A major goal of bachelor's education should be to produce graduates with the capacity for lifelong learning rather than aiming to produce specialists in a field.

A final philosophical and practical shift concerns the role of the student. Traditionally, professors have “dispensed” knowledge to students, who are the passive recipients of lectures and who demonstrate their learning through tests that assess what they have absorbed from their teachers. A move to more active, engaged learning would engage students in independent reading and research, problem solving exercises, group work, and fieldwork. Such active learning helps students integrate and absorb concepts more than learn facts that they will soon forget. But this means a reform in pedagogy based on new roles for students and professors, with both groups collaborating in developing so-called transversal skills, such as the capacity to learn, the ability to work with others or the capacity to take initiative. As a result, the special link between individual teachers and students – symbolized at present by the requirement of buying the notes prepared by the professor in charge of a course – will be broken. Similarly, cramming practices and rote learning based on special textbooks would become obsolete.

## **The Academic Reform Agenda: From a Professor-Centered to a Student Centered University**

As we noted, TSU has launched a process of academic reform. As in most classical universities around the world, the professors decide what to teach and how, and students are the recipients of the education provided. Moving to a student-centered university would rebalance the equation, taking into greater consideration what students need in order to be optimally prepared for citizenship and work life. In this conception of the university, students are partners in the learning process, with a voice in curriculum design, engaged in active and independent learning, and benefiting from opportunities to relate theory to practice. Administrative systems are designed to be user-friendly and transparent policies and procedures help students proceed through the institution as easily as possible. A student-centered university recognizes that students learn in different ways and at different speeds, thus, many forms of pedagogy are required to meet different needs (e.g. lecture, discussion, group work, independent work, oral and written presentations.) Becoming a student-centered university is no small task; most universities in North America and Western Europe have found that their traditions and values make this a difficult challenge.

In order to move in this direction, TSU will need to intensify its reform efforts in the following areas:

**1. Curriculum Reform.** TSU has made a good start in creating four-year bachelor's and two-year master's degree programs, introducing the credit system, and providing some choice for students in their studies. The continuation of the reform agenda should address three major issues:

**1.1 Flexibility of the Curriculum:** Having heard from students and professors that there are still too many requirements, that the curriculum is overloaded, and that changing faculties is still difficult, we suggest that the University continue to increase the flexibility of the curriculum. The number of required courses should be reviewed and the obstacles that students encounter in changing their courses of studies identified and addressed. One solution that has been widely discussed is permitting students to delay taking regularly scheduled final exams. In our final meeting, the Rector indicated that a policy had already been implemented to allow such delays. If our understanding is correct, we support this decision, and hope that it has been implemented in the context of a University-wide decision and written policy that is consistent across TSU, while recognizing the needs of different disciplines and faculties. We also believe that students should not be permitted indefinite delays in taking their exams, and that the policy should provide a time limit (such as 30 or 60 days) for students to take the examination in question.

**1.2 Greater student independence.** As we indicated earlier, continued curriculum reform should foster greater personal and intellectual independence of students. More curricular choice can help students learn to make responsible decisions. Ironically, in Georgia, students make the most important decision of their university careers—their chosen course of study—at a very early age, prior to entering the university. Once they enter, however, their courses of study are as highly structured and well defined as those of their secondary schools. Their ability to make educational choices seems highly restricted, considering their capacity for self-development and responsibility. Indeed, greater intellectual autonomy in the form of independent study and research will help students to learn how to learn—the essential skill to be gained from a bachelor's degree education.

**1.3 Stronger links to society.** The concept of the “ivory tower” has become outmoded in universities around the world. As curricular reform proceeds, we suggest that special attention be paid to ensuring that the curriculum and the University as a whole deepen its ties with Georgian society. Applied research to local problems, internships (such as the TEMPUS program of the economics faculty), the use of advisory boards composed of individuals from outside of the University, and the development of University-sponsored consultancies are examples of ways to accomplish this goal.

**2. Strengthen the process of improving and evaluating teaching.** It was not clear to us until our final meeting with the Rector that the University is already engaged in the evaluation of teaching as well as research. We recommend that the annual evaluation of professors by the department heads be supportive, not punitive and have as its clear goal the continued improvement of the teacher's effectiveness. Teaching staff should have the opportunity to define their goals for the year and to use the evaluation process to measure their progress towards meeting those goals and to reflect on their professional growth. i.e., to help shape their academic careers. Written policies, some standardization of the evaluation process across faculties, and training for department heads on how to conduct evaluations are typical components of a good evaluation system. The dean of the faculty should review all evaluations to strive for consistency across academic departments.

Student evaluations of professors—a topic that elicited a lot of animated discussion in our meetings—should be only one component of the evaluation system. In most U.S. and Western European universities, these evaluations are not made public, but rather used by the professor and department chair to support the teaching improvement. Used in this way, such evaluations are less threatening and more useful to professors.

3. **Learn more *about* your students and *from* them.** Although we understood from our meetings that TSU has a database on students, it was not clear what information is being collected or how it is being used it. We also learned that the deans and department heads do not yet have access to the central database, and we surmise therefore that they are not using information about students to regularly inform their decision-making. For example, information on success rates in particular faculties or courses will help professors be aware of problem areas for students. Similarly, surveys of graduates about job placements will help the University to analyze its contributions to the labor market and demand for graduates. Or, TSU might consider studying the perceptions of graduates as to how useful or relevant they judge their education to be to their current work –valuable information even at a time of depressed economic conditions. In fact, the role of the university is all the greater at times of recession as graduating informed and responsible citizens must be organized to face the unexpected – an important challenge for innovation, in terms of course content and teaching practice

In addition to gathering information *about* TSU's students, there is a lot to be learned *from* the current students. The inclusion of students on the faculty council is a useful step, but we suggest that TSU consider going even further by conducting special meetings of students to learn more about their needs and views and develop a collaborative framework for engaging them more deeply in faculty and University matters. Promoting a sense of shared responsibility for reform moves the discussion beyond student complaints and puts some of the responsibility on them to work towards solving their problems.

4. **Consider further simplification of the organizational structure.** Twenty faculties are hard to unite under a single university strategy. TSU has taken an important step in putting together four economic faculties under one Vice Rector. Doing the same with other faculties, or simply merging them would simplify decision-making and diminish the number of academic “towers” that usually fragment universities. Also, the current size of the Council of Deans could be reduced; with its twenty deans and the Vice Rectors, it can only function as a legislative or information-sharing group rather than as an executive body able to support the Rector in steering the University. We return to that theme in the next section.

### **Leading Change**

We turn now from the substance of academic reform to the leadership, management, and governance tasks associated with the change process. We believe that this set of issues is extremely important, and they often receive too little attention from most universities. Today's universities require leadership and management at many levels and throughout the institution. It is not enough to have excellent professors who shine in their academic fields.

The greatest challenge that we see for TSU is to strengthen its identity as a coherent University and to ensure that a coherent strategy promotes the development of the whole University rather than simply of its component

parts. This is a challenge that faces most universities around the world, where the autonomy of professors and the independence of the faculties work against such cohesion and unity. The ability to steer the University as a whole and to have clearly articulated institutional priorities are essential to obtaining funding and resources as well as to spending and allocating them wisely. Donor agencies, international partner institutions, and the public will want to know that the University has a clear sense of direction and that it has charted a course to achieve its goals. A widely-understood strategy – discussed and shared within the institution - provides a yardstick for decision making about what the University will and will not do, what new initiatives it plans to undertake, and where it will invest its scarce resources.

Institutional cohesion depends on a strong sense of trust within and among all groups on campus, including students. Given the legacy of the Soviet regime and the difficult times that Georgia is facing, creating trust is a challenge. Common projects, opportunities to test collaboration, and spaces for open and honest dialogue contribute to building trust on any campus.

Clearly, the strong Rectorate at TSU and the record of accomplishment and respect of Rector Metreveli in his eleven years as Rector are real strengths in building greater cohesion and a shared institutional strategy. In our opinion, moving ahead in building a unified institutional strategy would be advanced by the following approaches:

- 1. Ensure that the institutional strategy is widely discussed and understood.** While the Rector indicated that the Rectorate does indeed function as a strategy group, our impression is that the strategy needs to be clearly articulated to the broader public and more widely understood by the University community, especially by the deans and department heads. If they have already been developed, a limited number of short and long-term goals should be discussed by the various governance groups (the Council, the Deans; Councils, the Faculty Councils) and the progress made towards achieving set targets should be consistently measured across the University. A continuous and cyclical process of formulating, refining, and assessing progress towards shared goals (for instance on a yearly basis) will enable the different stakeholders to focus on common themes across the University. This should foster collaboration to achieve the goals, which means moving from strategic considerations to operational implementation.
- 2. Encourage greater collaboration among faculties and departments to achieve shared goals.** Competitive behavior among faculties is very common at all universities. The needs at TSU are very great, and it is not surprising that faculties will do whatever they deem useful to enhance their programs and to obtain resources. Yet, it would benefit all if there were more collaboration and more pooling of knowledge and ideas. This is certainly the case in obtaining external funding and support. The interests of donor agencies must often be matched to a particular program or faculty. This could be stimulated (when activities



fit University strategy) by the use of a central *stimulation fund* from which the TSU leaders could draw to support projects of particular importance for the growth of the whole institution. The use of such a fund should be transparent, with clear rules and specific targets, so that staff members are encouraged to innovate without relying on power games. Pooled knowledge and contacts could indeed help direct new resources to the appropriate place in the University.

- 3. Enhance the management roles and capacities of deans and department heads.** The execution of an institutional strategy requires that the leadership of the Rector and the Rectorate be reinforced by leadership from the department heads and deans. They will be crucial actors in ongoing curriculum reform, in the continued strengthening of teaching, and in generally promoting innovation in the University. As we noted earlier, a strong Council of Deans will require a smaller number of members. That Council could function as an executive team to shape institutional policy and strategy that transcends the differences among faculties while recognizing their different needs. Simultaneously, the role of the larger Council as a *forum for discussion* where new ideas and projects can be shared – from chairs and departments – should be reinforced, for instance by offering greater consultative functions to students, alumni and potential employers of graduates. Such a body – although large - is needed to test, validate and shape innovation and change; By facilitating institutional approaches rather than departmental competition, such a forum can help the University become an organization to which all members feel they can belong. In order to translate intentions into actions of use to the whole institution rather than to their own department, department heads and deans will need to think differently about their roles, and accept the legitimacy of being managers and leaders as well as scholars and researchers. As they move into these new roles, they would certainly benefit from specific training.

#### **Endnote:**

As TSU moves ahead with reform and innovation, it will want to consider how it moves towards greater compatibility with European higher education and its connection to the Bologna process. A well articulated institutional strategy to align its curriculum with the “three plus two” or “four plus one” model of the bachelor’s and master’s degrees and to join the European Credit Transfer System (ECTS) will be required if TSU is to move in this direction – not to mention shared quality procedures and mobility activities. That decision will require the development of institution-wide policies to move TSU towards greater alignment with the elements of the Bologna declaration. This should be supported by the Ministry with the help of the other institutions of higher education in Georgia. Considering the lack of hard currency in the country, a coordinated policy vis-à-vis international inter-University collaboration could be of great importance – an area where TSU could use its prestige around the world to foster informed cooperative action.

To conclude, we affirm the considerable accomplishments made to date in extraordinarily difficult circumstances. While the future of TSU is closely tied to the improvement in the Georgian economy and social situation, we believe that as an autonomous institution, there is much that the University can do on its own to both improve its own situation and to contribute to the national recovery. TSU has certainly the capacity to change as it has proved in the past. It has now to prepare for the unexpected in a shifting environment. In a way, the “White Temple,” rather than attracting the best to its inner sanctuary – keeping the quality and strength of Georgian identity - could serve to open the gates of the house and bring knowledge to the community of the Georgian citizens at large, and address their needs and difficulties. To do so, the University needs a strong identity, the capacity to act autonomously, and a clear definition of its responsibilities to society.

As a consequence, we urge the Rector and the Rectors’ Council to work with the Ministry and Parliament to ensure that the new law of higher education provides the University with a global (lump-sum) rather than a line-item budget. The University must have the freedom to allocate its funds in the most flexible and strategic way possible. With this freedom to manage its future, TSU can have the maximum opportunity to work towards becoming a university that puts students at the center and that serves society to its fullest ability.

**Salzburg Seminar Universities Project  
Visiting Advisors Program  
Tbilisi State University (TSU)  
Tbilisi, Georgia  
September 28 – October 3, 2002  
Schedule**

Date	SalSem	Flight	LOCATION
Thursday, September 26 • 17:20 pm	• Helmut Schramke	• A9 682K / from Vienna	
Saturday, September 28, 2002			
• 5:05 am • 03:05 am • 12:15 am	• Helene Kamensky • Andris Barblan • Madeleine Green	• OS 653 / from Vienna • TK1386 / from Istanbul • BA 6721 / from London	
13:00-14:00	All the Team	Lunch	Restaurant
14:00 – 15:00	All the Team	Orientation meeting	Hotel “Prima Vera”
15:00-18:00	All the Team	Round Tour Tbilisi	
18:00-19:00	All the Team	Free time	
19:00	All the Team	welcome dinner	Restaurant

Sunday, September 29, 2002  
Excursion to the Old Capital of Georgia and Free time  
Evening: Cultural program

Monday, September 30, 2002	TSU	EVENT	TOPIC
8:00-9:00 Breakfast			
9:30 – 10:45		Meeting with Prof. Dr. Roin Metreveli, Rector	Concerns and Goals; Problems and How the University tries to solve them; Review of the schedule Main issues to be discussed
10:45 – 11:00 Coffee break			
11:00-12:30		Meeting with the representatives of	

		Faculties	
12:30 – 13:30 Lunch			
14:00-15:30	Working group A Chair: Teimuraz Khurodze, Vice Rector Co-chair:	Working group A “Academic Structure and Governance within the University”	Development of Government and advisory boards, general management issues faced by University administrators, university autonomy and academic freedom, role of the market place in teaching and research priorities
15:30-16:00 Coffee break			
16:00-17:30	Working group A Chair: Teimuraz Khurodze, Vice Rector Co-chair:	Working group A “Academic Structure and Governance within the University”	Continuation
17:30-18:00		Debriefing meeting	
18:00-19:00		Dinner	
19 <sup>00</sup> Cultural Program			

Tuesday, October 1, 2002	TSU team	Event	Topic
8:00-9:00 Breakfast			
9:30-10:45	Working Group B Chair: Armen Margvelashvili, Vice Rector Co-chair:	Working Group B “Student Needs and the Role of Students in Institutional Affairs”	Introduction of interdisciplinary courses, systems of Academic credit and the transfer of credit between universities, student evaluation of faculty members
10:45-11:00 Coffee break			
11:00-12:30	Working Group B Chair: Armen Margvelashvili, Vice Rector	Working Group B	Continuation

	Co-chair:		
12:30-13:30 Lunch			
15 <sup>00</sup> -16 <sup>00</sup>		Meeting with the officials from the Ministry of Education, City Municipality or the Parliament of Georgia	
16 <sup>30</sup> -17 <sup>30</sup>		Debriefing Meeting	
18:00-19:00 Dinner			
19 <sup>00</sup>			
Cultural Program			

Wednesday, October 2, 2002	TSU team	Event	Topic
8:00-9:00 Breakfast		Breakfast	
9:30-10:45	Working Group C Chair: Anzor Khelashvili, Vice Rector Co-chair:	Working Group C “Technology in Higher Education”	Use of Technology to improve administration and general services, impact of education technology on the curriculum
10:45-11:00 Coffee break			
11:00-12:30	Working Group C Chair: Anzor Khelashvili, Vice Rector Co-chair:	Working Group C	Continuation
13:00-14:00 Lunch			
14:00-17:00		Team meets to prepare the preliminary report	
17:00-18:30		Presentation of the preliminary report to the Rector and his team	
20 <sup>00</sup>	Rector and his team	Farewell dinner	

**Salzburg Seminar Universities Project  
Visiting Advisors Program  
Tbilisi State University (TSU)  
Tbilisi, Georgia  
September 28 – October 3, 2002  
Team Members**

**Andris Barblan**

**Switzerland**

Dr. Barblan has been secretary general of the European University Association (EUA) – the successor of the Association of European Universities (CRE) – since 1976. The EUA, located in Geneva and Brussels, is the coordinating body of some 600 universities and thirty National Rectors' Conferences from forty-five European countries. The Association organizes international conferences for university leaders on the management and development of university institutions in Europe and acts as a representative of the higher education community in Brussels (European Commission), Paris (UNESCO) and is a key partner of the so-called "Bologna Process." Dr. Barblan is a member of the administrative board of the European Centre for the Strategic Management of Universities in Brussels. He received a Ph.D. in political science from the University of Geneva. Dr. Barblan is an alumnus of several Universities Project symposia and serves as a member of the Universities Project Advisory Committee. He has participated in trips by the Visiting Advisors Program to Brno, Czech Republic in 1999 and 2001 and to Moscow, Russian Federation in 2000, and was team leader on the trip to Vladivostok, Russian Federation in 2001.

**Madeline Green – team leader**

**USA**

Dr. Madeline Green is vice president for International Initiatives and Director, Center for Leadership Development, American Council on Education (ACE). Her responsibilities at ACE include its international programs and leadership development activities. From 1978 to 1991, she directed the ACE Fellows Program, which prepares future leaders for positions in higher education administration. Dr. Green has written widely on topics related to leadership and management. Her recent publications include *Investing in Higher Education: A Handbook of Leadership Development* (1992); *The American College President: A 1993 Edition* (1993); *Minorities on Campus: A Handbook for Education* (1989); and *Leaders for a New Era: Strategies for Higher Education* (1988). Her most recent volume, *Transforming Higher Education: A World-Wide View*, was published in 1996. Dr. Green earned a B.A. degree magna cum laude from Harvard University and a Ph.D. from Columbia University, both in French literature.

**Helene Kamensky**

**Austria**

Dr. Helene Kamensky is the Russian program coordinator for the Universities Project of the Salzburg Seminar. In addition to her work with the Universities Project, she is a lecturer in philosophy and Russian studies at the Universities of Salzburg and Vienna. Previously, Dr. Kamensky was a research fellow at the Institute of Scientific Theory, Salzburg International Research Center. From 1985 to 1989, she was dean of the Faculty of Foreign Languages, Novosibirsk State Pedagogical University, Russian Federation. Earlier, she served that same institution as the associate professor and senior lecturer in the department of philosophy. She holds a Ph.D. in philosophy from the department of logic and epistemology at the Russian Academy of Sciences. In 1993, her Ph.D. in philosophy was authenticated by the University of Salzburg, Austria.

**Helmut Schramke**

**Austria**

Dr. Schramke is the project manager for the University of Vienna, responsible for project management and fund-raising for international projects. He worked previously as an independent consultant in the fields of office automation, management training, and multimedia applications, among others, for companies, corporations, and universities both in Austria and abroad. Dr. Schramke holds a Ph.D. in biology and physics from the University of Graz. He was a member of the Visiting Advisors Program team to Minsk, Belarus, in 1998, and is an alumnus of several Universities Project symposia.

## **THE UNIVERSITIES PROJECT OF THE SALZBURG SEMINAR**

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

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

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

## **OBJECTIVES**

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

## **THE VISITING ADVISORS PROGRAM (VAP)**

The Salzburg Seminar launched this enhanced aspect of the Universities Project in the autumn of 1998. Under this program, teams of university presidents and higher education experts visit universities in Central and East Europe and Russia at the host institutions' request to assist in the process of institutional self-assessment and change. By the end of 2002, more than fifty VAP visits will have taken place to universities in East and Central Europe and Russia. A full schedule of visits is planned for 2003. The addition of the Visiting Advisors Program brings to the Universities Project an applied aspect and serves to enhance institutional and personal relationships begun in Salzburg.

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



## **FOR MORE INFORMATION**

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

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

Telephone: +43 662 83983  
Fax: +43 662 839837

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

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

Salzburg Seminar Website: [www.salzburgseminar.org](http://www.salzburgseminar.org)