

科目：教育文獻及時事

編號：212

考生注意：

1. 依次序作答，只要標明題號，不必抄題。
2. 答案必須寫在答案卷上，否則不予計分。
3. 限用藍、黑色筆作答；試題須隨卷繳回。

本 試 題
共 7 頁
第 1 頁

【本試題共有三大題，皆為申論題（共7頁），滿分100分；中英文答題皆可，考試時間100分鐘】

一、我國已啟動「承認大陸學歷」與「招收陸生」之相關政策，請闡釋前述政策之內容與相關爭議（12分）。再者，我國雖已開放陸生來臺，但目前招收陸生情況不如預期，試分析其原因（7分），並提出改進之建議（6分）。

二、各國在推行教育政策時，經常會面臨「卓越與均等」何者為重之爭辯；請先闡述「十二年國民基本教育」與「國中教育會考」之相關內容（12分）；再從前述觀點加以評析（13分）。

三、以下為有關建構「世界一流大學」短文。請寫出約五百字摘要（20分），並針對臺灣「五年五百億計畫」造成的問題，分就「大學與社會」、「大學與大學之間」、「大學內部」三個方向說明本身的看法（30分）。

Initiatives to Build World-class University

Governments and universities benchmark top ranking universities to establish strategic plans to accomplish their goal of becoming a world-class university. These efforts lead many universities in developing countries to seek to become top-ranking universities in the global rankings. As a result, universities in developing countries copy the university model of developed countries, especially US universities. This isomorphism has happened even in European countries with the emergence of the Bologna Process of 1999 and the Lisbon strategy of 2000. The Bologna Process Americanizes the education systems and the Lisbon strategy does the same for the research systems. This isomorphism has been happening at the institution level as well as at the basic academic unit and individual faculty level. The institutionalization process can be addressed from different perspectives—government policy, institution level, and basic academic unit and individual professor level.

科目：教育文獻及時事

編號：212

考生注意：

1. 依次序作答，只要標明題號，不必抄題。
2. 答案必須寫在答案卷上，否則不予計分。
3. 限用藍、黑色筆作答；試題須隨卷繳回。

本 試 題

共 7 頁

第 2 頁

Government Policy Level

In many developing countries national policy is focused on the development of a world-class university. Even governments in advanced countries such as Germany, France, the UK, the Netherlands and others are also actively involved in building a world-class university through policy initiatives. These government initiatives differ according to their cultural traditions and their governance systems. Governmental initiatives are also quite strong in Asian countries in the Confucian tradition (Marginson, 2011) while less so in the Anglo-American tradition.

The government initiatives may start with mission differentiation between universities because current top-ranking universities are all research focused. The government may then allow greater autonomy to a research focused university by deregulation in order to enhance their productivity through flexible management. A flexible government and deregulation is a core component in Salmi's (2009) three components of world-class university. The third policy initiative may establish or reshape research funding systems to support these universities and their researchers. Finally, the government may adopt a merit-based personnel and incentive system to enhance academic research productivity.

1. Mission Differentiation

Countries without a world-class university begin by selecting universities that have world-class university potential. To that end, governments begin to differentiate universities one from the other (for details, see Altbach and Balan, 2007) in terms of mission difference and focus. The well known mission classification is the Carnegie Classification in the US. The Carnegie Foundation developed classification criteria and classified US higher education institutions beginning in 1971. The US mission classification can be traced back to California's Master Plan of 1960 when the state of California reclassified its higher education institutions as the University of California (UC), California State University, and California Community College systems.

科目：教育文獻及時事

編號：212

考生注意：

1. 依次序作答，只要標明題號，不必抄題。
2. 答案必須寫在答案卷上，否則不予計分。
3. 限用藍、黑色筆作答；試題須隨卷繳回。

本 試 題

共 7 頁

第 3 頁

This systematic classification is not found only in the USA. Most of the other countries have legal classification systems. For example, the UK and Australia used to have a legal classification although they eliminated the typology in 1988 in Australia and in 1992 in the UK. Legal typology was eliminated in many countries during the neo-liberal period, especially during the 1990s. Under neo-liberal policies which force higher education institutions to compete against each other, the high performer survives regardless of its former legal status.

In this context, policymakers began to pay attention to mission classification between higher education institutions. The policy concern is how to select a potential world-class university from the pool of universities which had increased under neo-liberal policy. The initiatives were successful in China where the government is strong and higher education is relatively less developed. The Chinese government selected 100 universities in its 211 project, and 38 universities in its 985 project (Ma, 2007). However, a similar approach failed in South Korea and Germany where higher education systems were already in place. Both South Korea and Germany tried to select a limited number of universities as research universities, but they revised their original plan when confronted with political objections from universities and expanded the number selected.

An alternative strategy was the program-based approach in some countries, e.g., Brain Korea 21 in Korea, Center of Excellence in Japan, and the Excellence Initiatives in Germany. Presumably, developed countries have difficulty in adopting an institution-wide approach in mission differentiation. Some disciplines are research competitive whereas others are not even though they are in the same university. Because of the controversy around selecting a limited number of universities for a world-class university, these countries developed a *voluntary* and *proposal-based* approach to the selection process. Currently, *program-based* (vs. institution-based) and *proposal-based* (vs. government-designation based) approaches are favored. On the other hand, institution-based and government designation-based approaches may be more efficient in emerging higher education systems.

科目：教育文獻及時事

編號：212

考生注意：

1. 依次序作答，只要標明題號，不必抄題。
2. 答案必須寫在答案卷上，否則不予計分。
3. 限用藍、黑色筆作答；試題須隨卷繳回。

本 試 題

共 7 頁

第 4 頁

2. *Deregulation of Governance*

As Salmi (2009) argued, a world-class university needs flexible and autonomous governance to compete with other global universities. For that, governments need to give special consideration to selected research focused universities. Most governments that have begun a world-class university project deregulate the selected universities and tend to adopt indirect intervention mechanisms such as quality assurance and evaluation-based budget allocation. These changes in the relationship between the state and the university are critical for a world-class university. Without autonomous institutional management, the university may not be able to compete with its peers worldwide.

In considering a world-class university, the quality of teaching and research is a fundamental component. In many countries, the quality assurance systems were developed in the 1990s when neo-liberalism was widely adopted. In addition, governments attempted to link quality assurance with budget allocation by adopting performance-based budgeting to enhance institutional performance (Harman, 2011). As well as these quality assurance and performance evaluation mechanisms, governments provide performance data of individual universities to the public, enabling parents and students to take into account the institutional performance in their college choices. These policy initiatives have dual purposes: one dimension allows autonomy and the other dimension assures the quality of higher education.

The quality assurance and performance-based accountability have been developed in the US and the UK and the approach was adopted by many countries in the 1990s (Shin, 2010a). Although deregulation and performance-based accountability are not directly related to a world-class university, these policy efforts in the 1990s became the basis of a world-class university in the early 2000s. A world-class university can't be developed without allowing institutional autonomy through governance changes. The governance reforms are noticeable in European countries and the changes are impressive in Chinese research universities where the government and communist party used to be deeply involved in higher education governance.

科目：教育文獻及時事

編號：212

考生注意：

1. 依次序作答，只要標明題號，不必抄題。
2. 答案必須寫在答案卷上，否則不予計分。
3. 限用藍、黑色筆作答；試題須隨卷繳回。

本 試 題

共 7 頁

第 5 頁

As well as these general national governance changes, governments also make fundamental changes in their relationships with their universities. A representative case is the shift in legal status of the university. The university used to be a national entity and thus its legal status was part of government in many Europe and Asian countries. In both regions, many governments are transforming their universities' legal status into a corporate entity. For example, Japan transformed their national university's legal status to a corporate entity in 2004. The Korean government decided to incorporate Seoul National University, the representative national university in Korea, in 2010. The same thing happened in China in 1998, Taiwan in 2008, Malaysia in 1996, and Singapore in 2006. These changes gave their universities more autonomy in their budgeting, faculty and staff matters, and in their administration. Although there are disagreements on the issue of a national university as a corporate entity, these governance reforms may provide more autonomy.

3. Research Supporting Systems

As well as reforms in governance systems, research supporting systems are fundamental to building a world-class university. One unique feature of a world-class university compared with other universities is its research productivity. In the knowledge society, knowledge is considered as a core element of the economy along with land, labor, and capital. The world-class university is a collection of research productive professors and talented students. From the government perspective, one issue is how to attract research-productive professors and how to support them to be highly productive.

The government may establish a research funding agency or reshuffle current research funding systems to be more efficient. For example, in 2009 the Korean government merged two national research funding agencies into one entity, the National Research Foundation of Korea. The main goal was the integration of funding supports between the funding agency for soft disciplines (Korean Research Foundation) and that for hard disciplines (Korean Science Foundation). As well as organizational changes, the government may develop various sources of research funding. Governments in many Asian countries and even in European countries, establish special funding projects to support research and to build world-class research universities. The special

科目：教育文獻及時事

編號：212

考生注意：

1. 依次序作答，只要標明題號，不必抄題。
2. 答案必須寫在答案卷上，否則不予計分。
3. 限用藍、黑色筆作答；試題須隨卷繳回。

本 試 題

共 7 頁

第 6 頁

funding approach has been adopted in China, Korea, Japan, Taiwan, Malaysia, Singapore, and even in Germany and other European countries (e.g., Spain, Italy etc). These special funding efforts have contributed significantly to research productivity.

As well as funding policy, the government has been trying to integrate research with economic development in the knowledge society. The Government does not simply set out to build a world-class university for only top ranking universities; instead, the government desires their universities to provide knowledge and a technology base to enhance their national competitiveness. As a result, these funding efforts are related to national innovation systems. The special funding projects have a research focus that is highly related to their industrial development (Shin, Lee, & Kim, 2011).

Finally, governments may develop research evaluation systems to measure how much their universities are close to their benchmarked world-class university and to promote competition between their universities. As a policy effort, Taiwan developed a global ranking system that focuses only on research performance (Hou, 2011). Further, governments began to develop domestic journal indexing systems to support and classify journals by their academic quality to evaluate and classify the research productivity of their academics. These policy efforts have led to competition between universities and between researchers to obtain more resources and enhance their reputations through their research competitiveness.

4. Faculty Personnel and Incentive Systems

Attracting research productive faculty is a critical factor for the success of a world-class university because it is based mostly on research productive professors. As Altbach (2009) mentions, faculty hiring and promotion systems should be based on meritocracy. However, the academic culture in many countries, especially those with less developed higher education systems is not based on their performance. More recently, many Asian governments have adopted merit-based faculty hiring and promotion systems. Faculty evaluation of teaching and research is an initial step for a merit-based personnel system.

科目：教育文獻及時事

編號：212

考生注意：

1. 依次序作答，只要標明題號，不必抄題。
2. 答案必須寫在答案卷上，否則不予計分。
3. 限用藍、黑色筆作答；試題須隨卷繳回。

本 試 題

共 7 頁

第 7 頁

Evaluation of teaching was not common in many Asian and European universities until recently, but it has become the norm for most higher education institutions. Research performance is regularly evaluated in most universities. In many Asian countries where the hierarchy within universities is rigid, universities began to hire their academics on the basis of their research performance. These universities used to hire their graduates and thus “inbreeding” can become an issue because most of the top-ranking universities tend to hire their own graduates (Horta et al., 2010). Although there is disagreement on whether inbred faculty are less productive than non-inbred faculty, inbreeding is not advisable in a university that is seeking to be a world-class university. In Japan and Korea government initiatives aim to lessen the rate of inbreeding in order to enhance institutional performance (Horta et al., 2010; Shin, 2010b).

As well as these policy initiatives, governments pay special attention to faculty incentive systems to enhance their academic productivity. Faculty salary used to be decided on the basis of years of teaching in European and Asian countries. In this environment, there is little incentive to work hard and the current incentive systems may not attract talented faculty. Governments began to adopt merit-based salary and incentive systems to attract more productive faculty. In addition, faculty contract systems have been established in some countries where previously faculty would teach until they reached retirement age. For example, China adopted a tenure system and Taiwan created a new faculty rank to motivate their faculty to be more productive (Tien, 2007).

The countries with an active world-class university policy encourage their universities to hire international professors, especially highly productive professors. To attract star faculty, salary and incentive systems have been changing in these countries. An aggressive policy effort to employ international professors has been applied by the Korean government since 2008 (Shin, 2011a). A similar strategy has been adopted in China, Singapore and many Middle-Eastern countries. A high ratio of international to national professors is related to enhanced research productivity. International faculty may also bring a new approach to classroom teaching, and impact the academic culture of their host university.

資料來源：摘錄自 J.C. Shin & B. M. Kehm(2013). Institutionalization of World Class Universities in Global Competition. Springer.