

Chapter 5

POLICY MAKING AND POLICY IMPLEMENTATION IN VIETNAMESE HIGHER EDUCATION

Introduction

This chapter presents, firstly, the major policy-making bodies of the Socialist Republic of Vietnam (SRV) and secondly, it analyses the results of interviewing policy makers and people involved in the policy process in Vietnamese higher education in order to find out how the policy on higher education is made and implemented. The policy process analysed in this study, as identified by Harman (1980, 1986), includes the following stages: issue emergence, policy formulation and authorisation, policy implementation, evaluation and review, and policy redirection. The policy process is considered in the context of formulation and implementation of policy on non-public higher education in Vietnam.

Principal Policy Making Bodies in Vietnam.

The direct participation and leading role of the CPV in policy making is one of the distinctive characteristics of the policy process in Vietnam. The CPV, as the vanguard of the Vietnamese working class and representative of the rights and interests of the working class, is the force leading the state and society (Tran Hong Quan et al, 1995). The role of the CPV and its organisations is determined in the 1992 constitution and all organisations of the CPV operate within the framework of the law. The CPV, as the only leading political party in the country, plays a decisive role in policy making and deals with the most important issues of the country's development and defence.

The National Assembly (NA) is the highest law making body of the Socialist Republic of Vietnam (SRV). The NA is the only organ with constitutional and

legislative powers. The NA decides fundamental domestic and foreign policies, socio-economic, national defence and security issues. The NA exercises a supreme control over all activities of the state.

The Government is the executive organ of the NA and is the highest organ of the state and administration of the SRV. The Government is accountable to the NA and makes its reports to the NA, its standing committees and the country's President.

Three important bodies mentioned above: the CPV - the leading party; the NA - representative and law making institution; and the Vietnamese Government - the highest executive organ; have bodies responsible for education and training. In the Central Committee of the CPV, there is a Committee of Science and Education; in the NA - a Commission of Culture and Education, and in the Government - a Ministry of Education and Training (MOET).

MOET is responsible for all levels of education. The MOET Department of Higher Education is dealing with important issues of higher education. Policies concerning higher education are usually raised and drafted by the Department of Higher Education within MOET. Other MOET departments such as Department of Personnel and Organisation, Department of Planning and Finance, Department of Student Affairs and Department of International Relations are also involved in making policy on higher education.

The overlap of functions between the three bodies - the Committee of Science and Education in the CPV Central Committee, the Commission of Culture and Education in the NA and MOET in the Government has created difficulties in making policy on higher education. In making a policy, MOET, the main body dealing with policy on higher education, needs to receive agreement from the two other bodies within the Central Committee of the CPV and the NA to decide how the policy is to be made and implemented. Therefore, it takes a long time to approve policy and creates difficulty in controlling policy implementation. MOET usually raises and

drafts policy on education, but it needs to consult with the CPV Committee of Science and Education before submitting policies to the Prime Minister for approval.

Actors making policy in Vietnamese higher education might be divided into three major groups. The first group comprises the highest ranking leaders and officials of the CPV, the NA and the Government who make the final decisions on policy in higher education. The second group comprises the Minister of Education and Training and education agencies who approve any policy concerning higher education before its submission to the Government for approval. The third group includes ministers and other officials from ministries and agencies other than those from the educational portfolio which affect higher education policy with their power over finance and personnel.

Non-official groups influencing policy making in Vietnamese higher education consist of social organisations, such as trade unions, youth organisations and women's associations; the media; the public and "clients" of universities, such as students, their parents and employers. In the past, non-official groups had a modest influence on policy making in higher education. In transition to the market economy, these groups have an increasing role and significantly influence policy decisions in higher education.

In the next sections, the issues of how policies on non-public higher education are made and implemented are discussed to answer the question of how the policy on privatization in Vietnamese higher education is made and implemented.

Data Sources

The major information for analysing the policy process in Vietnamese higher education in this chapter was obtained from interviewing nine senior officers from MOET including the adviser to the Minister, directors, deputies directors and senior officers from MOET departments and an officer from the Government office in charge of education. All these people were involved in the process of policy making and

policy implementation at any stage as key actors or representatives of policy making bodies. Information is also given by 12 senior officers from four non-public HEIs (Thang Long, Phuong Dong, Dong Do and Ho Chi Minh City Open Universities). They were presidents, vice-presidents or chairmen of boards of trustees who were involved mostly in the process of policy implementation. Clarification of any information given by interviewees was undertaken during subsequent interviews. Additional information was taken from reports of special groups, MOET documents, and university reports. The collected information is presented and analysed in the five stages of the policy process: issue emergence, policy formulation and authorisation, policy implementation, policy evaluation, and policy redirection.

Issue Emergence

Policy on non-public higher education in Vietnam is rooted in the change of the CPV policy on socio-economic development and is made to meet the need for the development of higher education in the new context. The *doimoi* policy introduced at the sixth Congress of the CPV in 1986 is a result of change in the philosophy of the CPV and creates an historical turning point in the CPV policy on the country's development. The need for the development of non-public education might have emerged in the past, but the economy based on the state and collective forms of ownership could not satisfy the emerging need of society. Moreover, in the central demand economy, the Government and its leading party took control over all spheres: economy, culture, education and science; non-public forms of ownership were not allowed to exist and the need for non-public education could not emerge and be satisfied. The *doimoi* policy creates a legitimate environment for the development of a multi-sectoral economy, and, in its turn, the multi-sectoral economy speeds up the development of the non-public sector in education. The discussion in this section is focused on the issues emerging after the *doimoi* policy was implemented and on how these issues were raised and solved.

The need for more higher education in fact emerged in the past, particularly in the South, but the existing higher education system based on the state plan with

limited public funding was not allowed to expand and enrol more students. School leavers who wanted to be enrolled at universities took coaching one year before taking the entry examination. Employment in public organisations was guaranteed for those who graduated from universities. Becoming a student was still only a dream for a lot of young people. The need for learning by the population was not met. This need was recognised by scholars and intellectuals who had worked for a long time in the higher education system and research institutions. Some intellectuals recognising the ineffective and cumbersome machinery and low quality in public universities cherished the hope of opening a non-public HEI. However, there was no legitimate environment for the establishment of non-public HEIs to satisfy the excess demand for higher education and improve the quality of training. When the *doimoi* policy was successfully implemented in several branches of the economy, the need for more higher education became urgent. Educational institutions were urged to become more effective and appropriate to the functions of providing human resources for social and economic development. The need for the establishment of private and semi-public schools and HEIs had emerged. This was caused by the following factors.

Firstly, the social structure has changed. There are co-existing public, collective and private institutions in manufacturing, agriculture and service industries. Educational institutions are encouraged to be more entrepreneurial and more ambitious in seeking interactions with industry and employers. The need for diversification of human resources development has emerged. This has strongly influenced the emergence and the development of non-public institutions in higher education.

The second influential factor which has emerged is that higher education needs more resources to extend enrolment, improve the quality of training and strengthen the infrastructure of HEIs. One of the possible solutions to the problem is to mobilise financial potential in the general population, from private enterprise, student families and other organisations.

The next factor influencing the establishment of non-public higher education is that public institutions of higher education for a long time had existed under a central control and were not able to meet the needs of society for highly qualified graduates. *“The academic standard of the country's universities appears to be lagging too far behind that of many other comparable countries. At the national level, a new policy based on openness and innovation was needed”* (Hoang Xuan Sinh, 1995:200).

Fourthly, the rigid management mechanism which limited flexibility, institutional autonomy and academic freedom was the greatest obstacle for HEIs in adapting to the changing external environment. There was a need for development of a flexible managerial mechanism, flexible rules and regulations, and an entrepreneurial climate within HEIs to facilitate higher education development.

Finally, since Vietnam opened to the outside world, its system of higher education has been strongly influenced by the models of the democratic countries. This influence becomes stronger when Vietnam joined the Southeast Asian Ministers of Education Organisation. The assistance of the international organisations, such as UNESCO, UNDP, World Bank also facilitates the development of Vietnamese higher education. All these factors together made administrators in higher education and intellectuals recognise the need for the establishment of a non-public sector in higher education.

Many intellectuals who were knowledgeable and wanted to contribute to the training of the young generation, sent letters to the General Secretary of the CPV and the Prime Minister asking for opening non-public HEIs. They also met and discussed the matter with the Minister of Education and Training and other officials in the CPV Central Committee, the NA and the Government. Later, issues were put on the agenda of the Government and the CPV Politburo.

Although permission for the establishment of private industrial or commercial enterprises was given by several levels of authority, there was no tradition for the establishment of non-public institutions in education. In 1988, the CPV Central

Committee and the Government decided to satisfy the need for more higher education by, firstly, allowing public universities to enrol extra-plan students for fee-paying courses, according to their available equipment, classrooms and staff; and secondly, allowing the opening of private pilot courses of higher education in the Thang Long University Centre in Hanoi and in the Open University in Ho Chi Minh City. At the same time, many schools also were allowed to enrol pupils for non-public pilot classes.

Policy Formulation and Authorisation.

The issues on the establishment and development of non-public higher education were raised and met different reactions from officials and the general population. Public reactions were different in the North and the South. People in the South easily accepted the tuition fees system, because they were accustomed to the market economy before 1975. In the North, the general situation was quite the opposite. People were not used to the notion of private students and private education, because since 1954, all universities in the North had been public. Formerly, when students passed the national entry examination to the university, they all received scholarships both for tuition fees and for living expenses. Their parents had to contribute nothing apart from waiting some years until their son or daughter got their degree and then employment. Many students who failed to gain entry to university took coaching as preparation for the next year's examination. General public opinion diverged in its ideas of privatization in higher education.

There was also disagreement among policy makers, officials and the CPV, NA and Government departments on establishing a private sector in higher education. Some policy makers stated that the private sector should have a significant role in manufacturing, agriculture and service industries, but not in education. They argued that public education institutions are funded by the Government, so that the Government is able to take control over their admission, curricula, academic standards, and outputs; and influence their management. Private HEIs depend on private resources from students, entrepreneurs or social organisations; they would be

less influenced by the Government, and, according to some policy makers, this could lead to anarchy. Other officials who supported self-management and institutional autonomy in public educational institutions had a bias towards the establishment of a non-public sector in higher education.

Trade unions and women's associations opposed privatization in higher education arguing that privatization in higher education leads to inequality in opportunity and access to professional education. The poor have no money to pay. This creates greater divergence between the rich and the poor in society.

In the media, there appeared an opinion that higher education was considered as an instrument to put communist ideology into practice. The establishment of private HEIs was rejected as a potential social inequity in higher education and as a manifestation of capitalism.

Based on the experience of countries in the region, many scholars suggested that the establishment of a non-public sector in higher education is a solution to the problem of resource shortage. Moreover, it is claimed that non-public HEIs naturally have flexible managerial mechanisms and use scarce resources more efficiently than public universities.

This variation in points of view on non-public higher education forced policy making bodies to consider the issues more carefully before making any decision. MOET in cooperation with the CPV Committee of Science and Education was given responsibility to establish a special committee to advise the CPV Central Committee and the Government. The Committee consisted of highly ranked officers from MOET, the Government Office, the Ministry of Planning and Investment, the Ministry of Finance and representatives from the CPV Committee of Science and Education. The Committee analysed the situation in the country, the benefits the country could receive and the challenges in the establishment of a non-public sector in education. The Committee recommended that the CPV Central Committee and the Government take several steps in the process of privatization in education, from experimentation to

extensive implementation. While experts spent time on research, the highest officials of the CPV and the Government asked MOET to carry out a pilot program of privatization. At the end of 1988, MOET was allowed to establish a private University Centre in Hanoi and a semi-public Open University in Ho Chi Minh City as experiments in privatization in higher education.

The Thang Long University Centre in Hanoi was supported by Vietnamese-French intellectuals and other non-government organisations in France with an amount of money that was enough for training a small number of students. The Ho Chi Minh City Open University received a small campus as an initial contribution by the State.

After four years of experimentation, the first results were evident. The quality of teaching and learning in the Open University, according to officers in the Ho Chi Minh City Open University, is even better than in some public universities. The training process is flexible. Students and academic staff are more motivated. Many students studying at the third year in the university could sign work contracts with companies for employment after graduation. The administrators of the university are committed to high quality training and are responsible to the Minister for curricula, admission and staff recruitment. The university has signed contracts with highly qualified teaching staff members of public universities in Ho Chi Minh City. Despite the advantages of a new model of higher education being proved, the University was given official status as a semi-public university only in 1994.

The Thang Long University Centre faced some difficulties with shortage of resources and infrastructure. Its enrolment was limited. Only students who failed to enter public universities applied for enrolment at the centre. The economic and social position of people in the North and their attitude towards the new model were less appropriate for privatization in higher education. Therefore, the status of the centre had to be changed from a private university centre to a people-founded university which could receive some support from social organisations and MOET.

Nearly four years were spent on experimentation with a new kind of higher education institution. During that time the debate involved thousands of people from government departments, academic staff, parents, trade unions, women's associations, youth unions, the media, and other social and political forces. Decisions were made based on the results of experimentation, research activities and experience from overseas. The Resolution of the fourth Plenum of the CPV Central Committee, held in January 1993, on "Continuation of Education and Training", a general guideline for development of education and training in the period of renovation, consisting of policy directions for non-public higher education, appeared in public as an official policy document. The Provisional Regulation on semi-public universities and the Provisional Regulation on people-founded universities issued by MOET in 1994 constitute the regulatory framework for non-public higher education. However, the policy and the regulatory framework for non-public higher education are still in the process of improvement and consolidation.

The formulation of policy on non-public higher education and the experimentation of a new kind of HEIs were conducted at the same time. The initial thoughts of policy makers were tested and revised over a long period of time. In 1988, the first test of the idea of non-public education was conducted. Five years later, in January 1993, the first official documentation of policy on non-public education - the Resolution of the fourth Plenum of CPV Central Committee (CPV, 1993) - appeared in public.

Policy Implementation.

The implementation of policy on non-public higher education in Vietnam has gone through two steps: the testing of the idea of non-public education and the implementation of the formulated policy. The first step was discussed in the previous section. This section presents the implementation of formulated policy on non-public higher education.

The policy on non-public higher education was officially put into practice in 1993, although the testing step was conducted beforehand. MOET was asked to formulate regulations on non-public HEIs, to examine and approve proposals for the establishment of non-public HEIs before submitting them to the Prime Minister for final decisions, to supervise and assist established non-public HEIs in the process of the policy implementation and to deal with complaints from the public on the matters concerning non-public higher education. MOET regularly consults with officials from the CPV Committee of Science and Education and the NA Commission of Culture and Education.

In 1992, MOET established a group of officers responsible for the formulation of regulations for non-public higher education. The group consists of people from several MOET departments such as the Department of Higher Education, the Department of Organisation and Personnel, the Department of Planning and Finance, the Department of Continuing Education and the National Institute for Education Development. Officers from the CPV Committee of Science and Education and the NA Commission of Culture and Education were asked to participate in the process of preparation of the regulatory framework for non-public HEIs.

The regulations on semi-public, people-founded and private universities were drafted in 1993. Hundreds of educational officers, academic staff, educational researchers and managers were consulted to improve the draft regulations. In 1993, all three draft regulations were submitted to the Prime Minister for approval. The regulation on private universities was signed by the Prime Minister in May 1993, but it was not put into practice. The explanation for the suspension of the regulation was that the conditions in the country were not mature enough for the establishment of private HEIs. It is obvious that big private investors are not willing to put money into education as an area with low profit rate, while small private investors are not able to secure places for students during the time they study in a private university. There is also another reason, in the understanding of the writer, that makes the regulation unworkable. This is the caution of many politicians towards the process of privatization in higher education. Therefore, only two draft regulations, one for semi-

public universities and the other for people-founded universities were approved by MOET as provisional regulations, which need some time to be improved and submitted to the Prime Minister for approval as legal regulations.

MOET was given the task of approving proposals for the establishment of non-public HEIs before submitting them to the Prime Minister. From 1992 to 1994, MOET received about 30 proposals for establishing non-public universities. Half of those were asking for the status of private HEIs, despite the suspension of the regulation on private universities. Later, some of these proposals were converted to proposals for the status of people-founded universities.

MOET established a group of officers and experts from MOET departments and research institutes to consider proposals submitted by councils of founders and to conduct surveys on the conditions necessary for the establishment of non-public universities to be approved, if it is necessary. At first, this group was chaired by the Director of the Department of Higher Education, and then by the Director of the Department of Organisation and Personnel. During three years, from 1992 to 1995, two semi-public universities and eight people-founded universities were established. At present, other proposals are being considered and in the near future some new non-public universities are expected to be established.

MOET also supervises and assists the established non-public universities in design of curricula, appointment of staff and other matters. In the proposal on the establishment of a non-public university, courses to be taught at the university are suggested. The Department of Higher Education is responsible for approving proposed programs. Any program taught at non-public universities must be accredited. When the non-public university intends to open a new course or program, a proposed program must be submitted to the Department of Higher Education for approval. The Department for Higher Education establishes a group of experts to consider the proposed program and approve it if it meets the requirements set up by MOET.

Since the policy on non-public higher education was implemented in Vietnam, there have been matters which cannot be solved only by the available regulatory framework. The Department of Higher Education consults with other MOET departments and officials from the CPV Committee of Science and Education and the NA Commission of Culture and Education to help non-public HEIs overcome difficulties. There are no articles in the regulations that define the concrete criteria for finance, staff, infrastructure, curricula, quality assurance, enrolments, etc. that can be seen as necessary conditions for the establishment of a non-public university. The MOET departments responsible for implementation of policy on non-public higher education consider each proposal case by case by comparing the conditions proposed with those in a public university. Therefore, it takes a long time to make a decision and conditions for making a decision may vary from one case to another.

Some people-founded universities enrol an overwhelming number of students that they are not able to afford. The Department of Higher Education discussed the matter with agencies concerned and allowed people-founded universities to enrol no more than 4,000 students.

As far as staffing of non-public higher education is concerned, there are no articles in the regulations specifying the ratio of full-time to part-time staff. In order to keep stability within non-public universities, MOET requests semi-public universities to employ at least 50 percent full-time staff and people-founded universities at least 30 percent. There is also no legal base for teaching staff who work for public universities to enter into a contract with non-public HEIs. The employment of teaching staff working for public universities by non-public institutions creates some difficulties for public universities. The administrators of public universities claim that their best academic staff spend most of their time teaching at non-public universities. They have required MOET to issue regulations on conditions of contracts in order to maintain stability in staffing of public universities.

Another matter of contradiction is finance. The level of tuition fees, as determined in the regulations, is set by the non-public HEI based on FTE cost for a

student that the Government provides for public universities and the result of consultation by the non-public HEI with students and parents representatives. Therefore, the limitation imposed by the Government on the level of tuition fees sometimes creates difficulties for non-public HEIs. Where there is disagreement, MOET sends officers to the institution to solve the differences. All these practical experiences are to be considered in the formulation of new regulations and the improvement of the provisional regulations for government approval.

Another department that shares responsibility with the Department of Higher Education in dealing with the matter of non-public HEIs is the MOET Department of Continuing Education. Before amalgamation of the Ministry of Higher Education and the Ministry of Education to become MOET, the Department of Continuing Education belonged to the former Ministry of Education which lacked experts and experiences in higher education. As a result, the Department of Higher Education is still one of the main bodies responsible for the non-public sector in higher education.

Local authorities in Hanoi, Ho Chi Minh City and Da Nang where non-public HEIs were located significantly influence the implementation of policy on non-public higher education. The Ho Chi Minh City People's Council, as a local authority demonstrating open and dynamic thinking, greatly assists newly established non-public universities. It provided two non-public HEIs - the Hung Vuong University and the Ho Chi Minh City Foreign Language and Computing College - with buildings and land for campuses. The City Council also assists the founders of non-public HEIs to complete the legal procedures involved in their establishment and operation. As distinct from Ho Chi Minh City, Hanoi and Da Nang, located in the relatively less dynamic areas, have no conditions to support non-public HEIs. The non-public HEIs established in Hanoi and Da Nang have more difficulties compared with those located in Ho Chi Minh City. The advantages of non-public HEIs in the South are rooted in the political, economic and social environment which is ripe for the development of non-public higher education. Parents recognise the necessity to pay for their children's education. Tuition fees charged at the non-public universities in the South are higher than those charged at the non-public universities in the North.

Public opinion affects non-public HEIs differently in different locations. The media is an active means of communication between people who support non-public higher education and those who do not accept the idea of privatization in higher education. The non-public universities in Ho Chi Minh City use the media to struggle for more openness and autonomy. Matters such as advantages and disadvantages of non-public higher education, the level of tuition fees charged at non-public HEIs, the employment of teaching staff from public universities by non-public HEIs, and policy decisions are discussed in the media. For example, the article “*Where to study and how to study?*”, written by Ha Thach Han and published in Youth Sunday 12 October 1995, criticised MOET decision on transferring 6,000 students from the Ho Chi Minh City Open University to three public universities. The reason for this decision is that the Ho Chi Minh City Open University is given the mission to provide degree and non-degree programs for students who are not able to attend internal courses by open learning delivery mode, while the University enrolls students mostly for *face to face* training. In Youth Sunday, 3 December 1995, the results of a survey on training programs of the Ho Chi Minh City Open University were published. Included are also comments on strengths and weaknesses of these programs.

Non-public universities by their own efforts also manage to gain support from the Government, MOET, local authorities and “clients”. In the early years, only courses that are the most “fashionable” and that require relatively cheap equipment are taught at non-public universities. Programs taught at non-public universities meet the requirements for future employment. The administrative machinery of non-public universities is usually small and practise the principles of efficiency and effectiveness. Taking advantage of a flexible and dynamic organisation, non-public universities try to meet the learning needs of students and the administrative requirements set up by MOET, although they have disadvantages in infrastructure and facilities. More discussion on the achievements and shortcomings of non-public universities is given in chapter 6. The following are two case studies: at the Thang Long University and the Phuong Dong University.

The Thang Long University. The Thang Long University was first established as a private University Centre in Hanoi. The Party Chief, Nguyen Van Linh, directly gave concrete guidance to its establishment. There was no precedent for this. There was no regulatory framework governing operations of private HEIs and no building, equipment and facilities for the Centre's operations. Only some money contributed by Vietnamese-French intellectuals was available. The establishment of the Thang Long University Centre was considered as an experiment with a new higher education model in Vietnam. As the first non-public tertiary education institution in modern-day Vietnam, it received close scrutiny. The pilot stage lasted longer than it took the first of Thang Long's students to graduate. Only in August 1994 did Thang Long itself graduate to full legal status, since which time it has been called a "University".

The process of establishing the University began in December 1988 when a meeting of the founder, Professor Hoang Xuan Sinh, with the Minister of Education and Training was held to discuss a plan for opening a pilot private course of higher education. In February 1989, a course in mathematics and computing was opened. A management department was added in 1992, and two more departments (law and foreign languages) in 1996. The university's stated mission is to provide students with a high standard of academic training so as to impart skills geared to the labour market in Vietnam's transitional economy.

In the first two years, the Centre had many difficulties. Its student intake was not sufficiently qualified. Only students who failed to enter the public university system were enrolled at the Centre, therefore, the general academic level of first year students was low. Students were not used to working hard. 40 percent of the students dropped out or were sacked by the Centre after two years. However, a strong "selective mechanism" used at the Centre helped to increase the quality of training and, consequently, the reputation of the university. When Thang Long first opened, there were just 100 students enrolled. In SY 1995/96, the number was 600, although MOET had actually approved an enrolment of 700. Approximately 90 percent of the students come from Hanoi itself, and 80 percent are children of civil servants. Access from neighbouring provinces is difficult owing to the high cost of living in the city.

The university intends to conduct external classes outside Hanoi in SY 1996/97 in order to increase the number of students from other provinces. The graduates of Thang Long (more than 100 by 1996) are reported to be employed in a wide range of jobs, including private sector work, in Vietnam's large urban centres.

A student at Thang Long completes four years to obtain a Bachelor of Science or Bachelor of Management degree awarded by MOET. Instruction during the first two years is general, with courses offered in fields such as philosophy, languages and computer science. Students who leave after two years receive a Diploma in General University Studies awarded by the University itself. In the third and fourth years, students specialise in one of the four departments of study. Although the medium of instruction is Vietnamese, two foreign languages, one of them English, are compulsory requirements for all students.

In terms of finance, when Thang Long opened, it could charge students only small fees that covered only one quarter of its expenditures. The other three quarters were contributed by overseas Vietnamese. Since 1992 when the assistance from overseas decreased, the University has increased tuition fees. In 1996, the annual fee was set at two million VND, about US\$180, which yields enough to meet the institution's recurrent expenditures. About 5 percent of students receive merit-based awards that cover up to 50 percent of their fees.

Phuong Dong University. Another non-public university established in 1994, the Phuong Dong University, took an easier path to its foundation. After the Council of Founders was established, it took only 12 months to receive official approval by the Prime Minister. Unlike public universities, Phuong Dong has considerable autonomy to decide what is taught and how it is taught. The University's stated mission is to train highly qualified personnel for both private and public business enterprises which operate under market mechanisms. The subjects taught at the basic phase are based on the curricula designed by MOET. The subjects taught at the professional phase are designed by the University itself with assistance from overseas specialists. The

modular approach is used to make programs flexible and suitable for students to transfer from one course to another.

The university's four departments have taught languages, information and computing science, business administration, and economic law. An enrolment of 700 students for the first SY 1994/95 was approved by MOET. The enrolment for SY 1995/96 was doubled. In addition, about 500 students currently employed by both public and private enterprises were enrolled for in-service training courses.

The tenured administrative and academic staff are selected from among experienced educational managers and highly qualified teaching staff in public universities who are ambitious for the development of non-public higher education. There are only 13 administrative and 20 teaching staff working as full-time employees. To meet the staffing needs, the University also hires part-time employees.

In 1996, the annual tuition fee was set at 2.2 million VND, about US\$200, which covers all the university's recurrent expenditures with a small surplus set aside for building a future campus. Around 5 percent of students are awarded scholarships covering up to 50 percent of their tuition fees. The University hires classrooms and facilities from the Hanoi Technical School and other public universities nearby. Contributions from the trustees and sponsor organisations were spent on the acquisition of land for a future campus. The administrative building and lecture rooms are being designed. Some investors are expected to be interested in funding for the campus construction. However, as a recently established people-founded university, Phuong Dong is facing serious difficulties in capital building and finance.

In brief, the policy on non-public higher education in Vietnam was put into practice when the regulatory framework for the policy implementation was not well prepared. In obtaining legal status for a non-public university, the council of founders had to deal with bureaucratic machinery and uncooperative attitude of government officials towards the non-public sector. The legal regulations on financial, staffing, organisation and academic matters of non-public universities are still insufficient and

need to be improved. A body with authorised power within MOET needs to be established to assist non-public HEIs in policy implementation.

Evaluation and Review of Policy on Non-Public Higher Education

Although the policy on non-public higher education was recently implemented, first reactions of the public in the media have already appeared. The official evaluation of the policy is being conducted. The achievements and challenges of the policy on non-public higher education are presented in reports of non-public HEIs sent to MOET, papers (Working Group no 4/WB, 1996a, 1996b, 1996c) written by expert groups established by MOET to evaluate the policy and reports presented at meetings of presidents of universities and colleges (MOET, 1992, 1993, 1994c).

A group of officers, established by MOET and responsible for the implementation of policy on non-public higher education, regularly visits non-public HEIs and reports to the Minister and his deputies during the policy implementation stage. The group also deals with difficulties and contradictions between non-public HEIs, local authorities and the public.

Non-public HEIs periodically report their teaching and service activities, enrolments, finance and other matters to MOET departments. According to the officials from MOET, two issues are still challenging MOET supervision over non-public HEIs. They are: 1) how to control the quality of training at non-public HEIs and 2) how to make clear income and financial distribution in the non-public sector. The reports sent to MOET by non-public universities usually are not detailed enough to include statistical data like income of the institution, different kinds of expenses, staff salaries and other financial items. Therefore, reports of non-public universities are not always reliable sources of information for evaluating the current situation in non-public HEIs.

The results of the evaluation of the policy on non-public higher education are presented at the meetings of university presidents conducted each year. The evaluation

is also based on reports of expert groups, MOET departments and non-public HEIs. The conclusions made by the Minister at the meetings of university presidents are usually brief and include only general items on the current situation of the sector. At the meetings, changes in the policy objectives, plans for the policy implementation and measures to be used in the process of implementation are announced by MOET.

Public opinion is discussed in the media. There are two points of view. The first supports the idea of privatization in education and looks for new ways to increase effectiveness of the policy. The other view considers the establishment of the non-public sector in education as a manifestation of capitalism. Criticisms and suggestions by the public are taken into consideration in the process of policy redirection and correction. The evaluation of the policy on non-public higher education is not conducted as a separate stage but undertaken during the process of policy implementation. Reactions from the public mostly reflect the attitude of people towards the achievements and shortcomings of the non-public sector which are taken into consideration in the process of official evaluation.

Policy Redirection

The establishment of the non-public sector in higher education is a reflection of the CPV policy on diversification of the education system and multi-sectoral development in education. Since 1993 when the policy on non-public higher education was first officially put into practice, some policy changes have been made. As confirmed in the statement of the Minister of Education and Training (MOET, 1994c), the non-public sector in higher education is not established to play the same role that the public sector plays in training a highly qualified labour force, as understood before, but the task of the sector is to complete only the peripheral function of higher education. Together with extra-plan enrolments in public HEIs, the non-public sector contributes to meeting the excess demand for higher education. This point of view is formulated based on the fact that private individuals and non-public organisations have very limited capacity and ambition to invest in education. This also reflects the attitude of students and their parents towards the newly established sector in higher

education. Students usually prefer to undertake courses at public universities rather than attend courses at non-public universities where the infrastructure and equipment are still very poor and teaching staff are mostly part-time and already retired from the public sector (evidence is presented in Chapter 6).

As the market economy has developed only recently in Vietnam, the private sector is still weak, the contribution of private investors is still limited and there are no strong guarantees for students who are enrolled at private universities to complete courses in the case of bankruptcy. Therefore, the Government is not willing to establish private colleges and universities in the near future. Although permission for the establishment of private HEIs is stated in the Resolution of the fourth Plenum of the CPV Central Committee (CPV, 1993), there is still no regulatory framework for the operation of private HEIs in Vietnam.

Concluding Observations

- Overlap in functions between the NA Commission of Culture and Education, the CPV Committee of Education and Science and MOET makes the policy process in Vietnamese higher education more complicated. It takes a long time to go through all these agencies to obtain a policy decision.

- The CPV and the Vietnamese Government took an incremental approach in making and implementing the policy on non-public higher education. The policy was made based on the result of experimentation which took a long time to complete. This approach was chosen based on the general principle of the CPV, according to which economic and social reform is to be carried out while keeping the country in politically stable.

- The issues related to the policy on non-public higher education were first raised by intellectuals who recognised the excess demand for higher education and then were put on the agenda of the Politburo and the CPV Central Committee for consideration. Once policy decisions were made, MOET and its departments, as the

major bodies dealing with matter of higher education, became responsible for the policy implementation.

- Although various political groups were allowed to take part in policy discussion and interest groups, the public and the media today play an increasing role in policy making and policy implementation in Vietnamese higher education; the dominant role in policy decision belongs to senior officials and elite groups. This trend is clearly manifest in developing the policy on “privatization” in higher education and could be understood as an evidence of the centralised approach to policy making in Vietnam.

- Cultural and economic conditions in different regions of the country affect policy making and policy implementation differently. The attitudes and the economic conditions of the people in the South facilitate the development of the non-public sector in higher education, while attitudes of the people and conditions in the North are still inappropriate to the private sector development.

- There were two major amendments to the policy on non-public higher education. One confirms the dominant role of the public sector and the peripheral function of the non-public sector in training a highly qualified labour force. The other states that no private university will be established in Vietnam in the near future due to the limited capacity of private investment in higher education.

Chapter 6

POLICY OUTCOME AND MEASURES FOR FURTHER DEVELOPMENT OF NON-PUBLIC HIGHER EDUCATION IN VIETNAM

Introduction

Although the policy on privatization in higher education was put into practice only recently, it has significantly contributed to the development of higher education. In the SY 1995/96, whereas there were 354,103 students enrolled in HEIs, regular full-timers sponsored by the State were only 138,843, or 39 percent of the total. About 79,169 students were pursuing in-service training in HEIs. The rest, 136,091 students, were enrolled both at non-public HEIs or at public HEIs as fee-paying students (World Bank, 1996:23). Two semi-public and eight people-founded universities have been established in the three biggest cities, Hanoi, Ho Chi Minh and Da Nang, in Vietnam. 18.6 percent of resources used in 1994 were contributed by consumers (World Bank, 1996:63). The new managerial mechanisms used at non-public educational institutions, based on effectiveness and efficiency, create the competitiveness of the non-public sector. However, non-public HEIs face serious challenges such as: an inappropriate political, social and economic environment; poor infrastructure, equipment and learning materials; shortage of finance; and poor performance of students enrolled, that hold back the development of the sector in the long run. This chapter presents the achievements of the policy on the non-public sector in Vietnamese higher education, resulting in changes in educational policy and analyses advantages of and challenges for the non-public sector which could facilitate or brake further development of the sector in the future. Some recommendations suggested by researchers and educational managers for policy improvement are also discussed in this chapter.

Data Sources

Data and information presented in this chapter were collected by interviewing 12 senior officers of the four non-public HEIs (Thang Long, Phuong Dong, Dong Do and Ho Chi Minh City Open Universities). Among the interviewees, there were three presidents, four vice-presidents and three chairmen of boards of trustees and two registrars. Three blank data sheets (see appendix 3) were designed to collect statistical data on finance, resource allocations, physical facilities, equipment, and staff profiles. Additional information was also taken from available published articles or research reports on non-public HEIs. As recently established institutions, non-public universities are short of technical facilities, staff and experience in information management. Statistical data are not regularly recorded and updated. Some important information was not available at the time of collection. With regards to finance, all investigated non-public institutions were not willing to reveal their income and resource allocations in numbers. The data collected, therefore, could only be presented in percentages.

The Current Situation of Non-Public Higher Education in Vietnam

All non-public HEIs in Vietnam are newly established institutions. Two institutions, the Ho Chi Minh City Open University and the Thang Long University, were allowed to run pilot courses in 1989. The following points indicate the general characters of each institution.

The semi-public Ho Chi Minh City Open University was officially established in 1993 by the Prime Ministerial Decision 389/TTg dated 26 July 1993. The University offers a range of undergraduate courses: computing, business administration, biological technology and English. In the SY 1995/96, about 21.260 students were studying at the University.

The other semi-public higher education institution is the Marketing College in Ho Chi Minh City. The College was established in 1994 by the Prime Ministerial

Decision 641/TTg dated 4 November 1994. The College offers a small number of courses, like business administration, computing and English. About 700 students were enrolled for the SY 1995/96.

There are three people-founded universities located in Hanoi: Thang Long, Dong Do and Phuong Dong. The Thang Long University was officially established in 1994 by the Prime Ministerial Decision 411/TTg dated 9 August 1994. The University offers the following courses: mathematics and computer science, business administration, law, and English. For the SY 1995/96, 600 students were enrolled at the University.

The Dong Do University was established in 1994 by the Prime Ministerial Decision 534/TTg dated 8 October 1994. The university offers a range of courses: computer science and information technology, technology and environment, economics and business administration, journalism and international relations, law, and foreign languages. About 800 were enrolled for the SY 1995/96.

The Phuong Dong University was established in 1994 by the Prime Ministerial Decision 350/TTg dated 8 July 1994. The University offers the following courses: computer science, foreign languages, business administration, and economic law. In the SY 1995/96, 1,500 students were studying at the University. There were also 500 in-service training students enrolled in the SY 1995/96.

Only one non-public university, the Duy Tan University, was established in the central part of the country, in Da Nang City, by the Prime Ministerial Decision 666/TTg dated 11 November 1994. The University offers the following courses: computer science, foreign languages, business administration, economics, and tourism. About 550 students were enrolled at the University for its first SY 1995/96.

There are four people-founded universities established in Ho Chi Minh City: the Ho Chi Minh City Foreign Language and Computing College, the Van Lang

University, the Ho Chi Minh City University of Technology and the Hung Vuong University.

The Ho Chi Minh City Foreign Language-Computing College was established in 1994 by the Prime Ministerial Decision 616/TTg dated 21 October 1994. The University offers courses on foreign languages, computer science and Eastern studies. The enrolment for its first SY 1995/96 was 1,350 students.

The Van Lang University was established in 1995 by the Prime Ministerial Decision 71/TTg dated 27 January 1995. The University offers a range of courses, such as: computer science and computer technology, biology and biological technology, foreign languages, law, business administration, electronic technology, architecture, construction, and environment management. The enrolment for the first SY 1995/96 was 4,700 students.

The people-founded Ho Chi Minh City University of Technology was established by the Prime Ministerial Decision 235/TTg dated 26 April 1995. The University offers the following courses: electronics, computer science and computer technology, and foreign languages. The enrolments for the SY 1995/96 was 1,200 students.

The Hung Vuong University was established in 1995 by the Prime Ministerial Decision 470/TTg dated 14 August 1995. The University offers the following courses: business administration, foreign languages, mathematics, and computer technology. The enrolment for the SY 1995/96 was 1,200 students.

As presented above, all non-public universities were established in 1994 and 1995. In general, their infrastructure and equipment are very poor. Two semi-public universities initially had their buildings as the contribution by the State, but the average space per student is very small. A study on learning facilities in selected HEIs (Nguyen Thi Tri et al, 1995) shows that the facilities in the semi-public Ho Chi Minh City Open University are very poor, compared to those in other selected public HEIs

(see table 6.1), although this University is considered as the best equipped institution among the non-public HEIs. Of eight people-founded universities, only two institutions: the Hung Vuong University and the Ho Chi Minh City Foreign Language and Computing College have their own buildings, the six other institutions hire space for their lecture rooms and offices. The average space per student rented by each investigated non-public university could not be recorded, but according to the interviewees, this indicator is much lower than the average space per student owned by public universities.

In terms of learning facilities, the Ho Chi Minh City Open University has relatively good computer rooms and other facilities. People-founded universities mostly hire computers and equipment from public universities for teaching, learning and practical work. The libraries of non-public universities are very poor (see table 6.2). These libraries mostly contain textbooks and study guides, but lack reference materials. Only the library of the Ho Chi Minh City Open University has a relatively good collection of printed materials and textbooks, in spite of a limited number of book titles. Non-public universities are given the rights to use facilities and libraries at

Table 6.1
Facilities Data in Selected Institutions

Name of Institutions	Floor Area by Type of Construction (sq. metres)				Average Area/Student
	Total	Permanent	Semi-permanent	Temporary	
Hanoi University of Technology	59,150	47,900	11,290	0	13.14
Hanoi Agricultural University	70,115	40,200	29,000	1,515	23.23
Hue University	19,000	10,000	9,000	0	19.65
Dalat University	19,288	4,599	13,837	439	12.77
HCMC Open University	1,264	696	568	0	0.47

Source: Nguyen Thi Tri et al, (1995:185)

public universities with a negotiable payment rate. All of the four investigated non-public universities are equipped with computers, but the number of computers is still very limited. Only two of the investigated non-public universities have special rooms for language teaching. Non-public universities lack other expensive facilities or special laboratories (see tables 6.1 & 6.2).

Table 6.2
Facilities of the investigated non-public universities

Name of institutions	Number of laboratories	Number of computers	Books titles	Specially equipped language training rooms
Thang Long University	1	24	2300	1
Phuong Dong University	0	18	2150	0
Dong Do University	0	16	1960	0
HCMC Open University	2	76	12000	2

Most expenditures of non-public universities are covered by tuition fees. Universities charge students around US\$200 per year. This income covers recurrent expenditure, such as teachers salaries, rental payment, equipment, water, power, communication and other expenses. Some universities can save a little money for reinvestment (see table 6.3).

The Phuong Dong University, for example, charges students 2.2 million VND (equivalent US\$200) per year. The annual income of the university is about US\$400,000. 63 per cent is spent on staff salaries and rent payment for building and equipment. About 8 percent is spent on acquisition of new facilities and learning items. Around 4 percent is used for student scholarships and student assistance. The rest, 25 percent of the income, is used to invest in acquisition of a future campus. The university is negotiating with the local authority about the construction of the university campus and the payment for land rent.

Table 6.3
Financial Expenditure of Nor-Public Universities
 (Percent of income)

Name of Institutions	Salaries and Administration	Student Scholarships	Teaching-learning Items	Investment in equipment and building
Thang Long University	78 %	5 %	8 %	9 %
Phuong Dong University	63 %	4 %	8 %	25 %
Dong Do University	74 %	2 %	9 %	15 %
HCMC Open University	58 %	3 %	11 %	30 %

The Ho Chi Minh City Open University is the biggest non-public HEI in Vietnam with more than 20,000 students. Tuition fees vary from course to course, from 2.5 million VND (US\$221) to 3.5 million VND (US\$319). Although the University owns a reasonable campus given by the State as its initial contribution, the University has also acquired a large land area in the suburb of Ho Chi Minh City for a second campus.

For some non-public universities, tuition fees collected are not enough to cover all recurrent expenditures. Additional resources are collected from Vietnamese communities living overseas or from research and service contracts. These resources are usually small. In the case of the Thang Long University, tuition fees contribute about 90 percent of the University's income. In 1992, the University charged a student about 1 million VND (equivalent to US\$91), lower than the average rate. The best students were also awarded a small scholarship to encourage them to achieve a good result. Currently, the assistance from overseas is decreasing and the University has to think about increasing tuition fees and making money through undertaking contract work. In 1996, tuition fees per year increased to about 2 million VND, equivalent to US\$180.

According to the officers from the MOET Department for Planning and Finance, with about 40,000 students in the SY 1995/96, the non-public sector in higher education contributed about 9.2 percent of total income of the higher education system, which is equivalent to 14.3 percent of the resources that the Government provides for the system of higher education. Although the financial contribution of the non-public sector is still small, it has an increasing significance, when the demand for higher education cannot be met with only public funding.

The training objectives of non-public universities are tailored to meet the needs for future employment. Providing students with knowledge and skills aiming at employment in free labour markets is the first priority of non-public HEIs. As in many public universities, courses taught in non-public HEIs are divided into two phases: the first phase for basic or general education and the second phase for professional education. The two year program of the basic stage is designed at universities, based on the core program approved by MOET. The program for the professional stage, that lasts from 2 to 3 years, is designed by the non-public university itself. In the four investigated non-public universities, about 40 percent of contents taught at the second phase is taken from Western universities through bilateral or multi-lateral cooperation.

At present, all non-public universities use a modular approach in designing courses. This creates the possibility for students to transfer from one course to another. In public universities, although the approach is being used, its application is still a challenge for many universities due to shortage of staff who know the approach.

Non-public universities offer courses which, upon competition, enable students to easily find a job. Computer science, business administration and English are typical of these. All of the ten non-public universities offer courses on computer science and English; and eight of them offer courses on business administration. Other courses, like biological technology, law, environment management, international relations, engineering, architecture, and construction are taught in one or two non-public universities only. The second reason why computer science, business administration and English are chosen for teaching in most non-public universities is

that expenditure for the courses like English and business administration is cheap. Although computer science is relatively expensive, the non-public HEIs can acquire or hire necessary equipment in public universities or other institutions to meet the needs of students. In this case, students attending courses are required to pay extra expenses.

In terms of courses taught, the non-public sector in Vietnamese higher education fulfils a peripheral function, compared to the public sector. No non-public universities have resources to teach courses like engineering and medicine that require expensive facilities, well equipped laboratories and space for practical work. In time, as enrolments are extended and savings of non-public institutions increase, new courses including engineering and medicine could be taught in non-public HEIs.

Traditionally, the only criterion for enrolment at university in Vietnam is the result of the entry examination. The non-public sector has accepted the admission procedure that is used at public universities. In recent years, the number of candidates taking the entry examination to non-public universities was usually bigger than the non-public universities could afford. Admission rate is less than 50 percent. At the Phuong Dong University, for example, in the SY 1994/95, there were 1700 students who took the entry examination; only 700 were enrolled. In the SY 1995/96, 2000 students took the entry examination; only 800 were enrolled. The Ho Chi Minh City Open University has the largest enrolment, compared with other non-public HEIs. About 6,000 students were enrolled in the SY 1995/96. At the Van Lang University 4,700 students were studying in the SY 1995/96.

Enrolments at the non-public universities in the South are much bigger than those at the non-public universities in the North. The total number of students currently enrolled at non-public universities throughout the country is about 40,000. Only about 5,000 students are enrolled at the non-public universities in the North. Around 500 students are enrolled at the Duy Tan University in Da Nang - the central region of the country. The rest, about 35,000 students, are studying at the non-public universities in the South.

The academic performance of students who are enrolled at non-public universities is usually not high. Most students enrolled at non-public universities failed to enter public universities. Paying tuition fees, students prefer to undertake courses at public universities where infrastructure and equipment are relatively good rather than to attend courses at non-public HEIs. In the three investigated universities (Thang Long, Phuong Dong and Dong Do) in the North, only about 2 percent of students enrolled at those universities have chosen a non-public university as their first priority. Although they were eligible for enrolment at a public university, the other 98 percent failed to be enrolled at a public university. In the South, the situation is more optimistic. In the Ho Chi Minh City Open University, 20 percent students enrolled have chosen the university as their first priority, even though they passed the entry examination to a public university. About 40 percent of those students are pursuing two programs, one of which is at a public university.

According to the results of investigation (see table 6.4) at the 4 investigated non-public universities (Thang Long, Phuong Dong, Dong Do and the Ho Chi Minh City Open University), the number of managerial and service staff working for these non-public institutions is very small. The staff working as presidents, vice-presidents and other service members varies from 10 to 15 persons in each university. Most of them are full-time staff. Non-public universities also employ part-time staff if it is necessary. Managerial mechanisms used at non-public universities in recruiting and dismissing staff are based on effectiveness and efficiency. Non-public universities are not suffering the consequences of the centrally controlled demand mechanisms that public universities are currently facing. For example, the public university cannot dismiss unqualified staff members, nor pay for those who are highly qualified with higher salary rates. These mechanisms significantly discourage the contribution of staff to teaching, research and community service.

Most teaching staff working for non-public universities are part-time employees. The Ho Chi Minh City Open University has only 14.25 percent of staff working as full-time employees and only about 12 percent of full-time teaching staff. People-founded universities have a very low rate of full-time teaching staff. At

Phuong Dong University, for example, among 198 lecturers working for the University, only 19 are full-time staff members; the ratio of full-time to part-time staff is only 9.5 percent. The Thang Long and the Dong Do universities have no full-time teaching staff at all. Obviously, the ratio of full-time teaching staff to total teaching staff in the non-public universities is much less than the ratio that MOET requests non-public HEIs to attain. Legally, the full-time teaching staff of a semi-public university must be at least 50 percent of the total teaching staff. This is reduced to 30 percent at a people-founded university. A problem of critical importance to which non-public universities must find a solution is somehow to recruit their own teaching staff, at least at the rate required by MOET.

Table 6.4
Staffing Profile of non-public universities

Name of Institutions	Total staff number	Teaching staff number	Full-time teaching staff number	Managerial staff number
Thang Long University	87	77	0	10
Phuong Dong University	211	198	19	13
Dong Do University	114	102	0	12
HCMC Open University	554	539	64	15

Paying double the salaries of public universities, the non-public universities can select and sign contracts with highly qualified staff from public universities. According to the results of the present study, all academic staff (full-time or part-time) working for non-public universities, teaching subjects other than languages, hold some postgraduate (masters, candidates or doctors) degree. In the public sector, the percentage of teaching staff who hold a postgraduate degree was only about 11.8 percent in the SY 1991/92, 12.2 percent in the SY 1992/93, 12.6 percent in the SY 1993/94, 14.1 percent in the SY 1994/95, and 18.0 percent in the SY 1995/96 (MOET, 1993:100; World Bank, 1996:30). Around 90 percent of full-time teaching staff working for the Phuong Dong and Ho Chi Minh City Open University are those who

have retired from public universities and research institutes and who are over 60 years of age. Most teaching staff working as part-time lecturers at non-public universities are young and also currently employed as full-time staff at public universities or research institutes.

The employment of academic staff who are currently working for public HEIs creates some problems for the public sector, such as grey drain or shortage of highly qualified teaching staff. In dealing with these emerging issues, some public universities allow their teaching staff to sign work contracts with other institutions only if they are able to complete the working load or hours.

The fact that non-public universities have more autonomy in recruiting and dismissing staff while public universities have no right to do so, plus a high salary level that is a significant incentive for employment at non-public universities, has created a temporary advantage for non-public institutions in recruitment and promotion of the part-time staff. However, not all non-public universities can recruit their full-time staff. There are two reasons for this. Firstly, increasing the number of full-time staff soon becomes a financial burden for non-public universities that they cannot afford. At the same time non-public universities can hire part-time staff from highly qualified personnel of public universities. Secondly, the experienced teaching staff of public universities who are considered as civil servants and who can receive benefits from the Government when they retire, psychologically, are not ready to move from the public sector to the private sector. According to interviewees, when management mechanisms at public universities are renovated, highly qualified staff are well paid and the number of private students enrolled at public universities is large enough to keep staff busy, non-public universities will face significant difficulties in staffing.

To conclude, as all non-public HEIs are recently established institutions, it is too early to draw any strong conclusion on the development of non-public higher education in Vietnam. However, the results of the investigation based on the

interviews of officers of non-public universities and the collected data allow one to make some preliminary observations.

- Generally, non-public universities offer courses such as computer science, foreign languages, economics and business administration that require cheap equipment and that can meet the extensive needs of students for employment in the labour market.

- Non-public universities have more autonomous rights compared to public universities in identifying training objectives and designing programs. Programs and courses taught at non-public universities have been designed based largely on those taught at public universities with some new contents added and practical work taken from overseas universities.

- Teaching staff of non-public universities are mainly working part-time and one selected from among the highly qualified academic staff of public universities. As distinct from public universities, in which staff recruitment and promotion strongly depends on the MOET plan and regulations on the recruitment and promotion of civil servants, non-public universities recruit and promote new staff depending only on their own needs.

- The infrastructure, equipment and learning facilities at non-public universities are very poor and mainly rented from public institutions. Learning facilities for courses like computer science and languages meet only the minimum need. There are only two semi-public universities that have their own campuses, three people-founded universities (Hung Vuong University, Foreign Languages and Computing College in Ho Chi Minh City, and Phuong Dong University in Hanoi) are waiting for their campuses to be build. but the others still have no prospects of their own campuses.

- Tuition fees are the major financial source for non-public universities and for some, it is the only source of income. The additional finance from overseas assistance

and contract activities is still small and cannot be a significant part of the income in the near future.

Although the non-public sector in higher education was only recently established, its contribution is obvious. The sector's income consists of about one tenth of the total income of the higher education system. In terms of private financing for both public and non-public sectors, about 18.6 percent of the income of the higher education system is taken from students and their families (World Bank, 1996:63). The enrolment of more than 40,000 students at non-public universities significantly increases the tertiary education enrolment rate and partly satisfies the excess demand for higher education. In higher education management, there is competition for effectiveness and efficiency. The two sectors (public and non-public) are competing to attract more students.

Challenges for Non-Public Higher Education in Vietnam

The non-public sector in Vietnamese higher education, recently established, is in a seriously disadvantaged position, compared with the public sector. The three major disadvantages of non-public higher education are: (1) Political disadvantaged position, (2) poor infrastructure, and (3) shortage of finance.

Non-public higher education is in a politically disadvantaged position. Although the restriction on non-public higher education has been lifted, the regulatory framework governing operations of non-public institutions in higher education is still not clearly identified. The bureaucratic procedures and obstruction by officials in charge of non-public education are the obstacles to the implementation of the policy on non-public higher education. In the case of the Thang Long University, it took two years to complete the legal procedure for the transformation of pilot classes to the status of a pilot university and it took nearly five years to complete the experimental stage. In 1994, the provisional regulation on people-founded universities was approved by MOET and the Thang Long University was reorganised accordingly. The board of trustees was founded. Professor Hoang Xuan Sinh, the founder of the

University, was elected as the Chair of the Board. The Board nominated Dr Huynh Mui to the post of President. It took nearly one year for the Hanoi People's Council and MOET to approve the nomination. In order to establish a non-public university, the council of founders needs to go through many agencies from the local authority to the government office. In some cases, the decision could be made only at the meeting with the Prime Minister and his Deputy in charge of culture, education and social affairs.

The social psychology of the people and public opinion are still not amenable to the development of non-public higher education. In the centrally controlled demand economy, people were used to receiving free education. In the transitional economy, although the high level of education significantly helps to increase the possibility of being employed and the income level of employees, still few families invest in their children's education. Moreover, public opinion still doubts that the non-public sector is able to succeed. Public HEIs that used to have a monopoly and now are not willing to compete with non-public HEIs try to slow the development of the non-public sector.

In economic terms, the market mechanisms are still in the process of establishing and strengthening. The labor market is not fully developed. The financial markets, especially the stock market, still have no effect in the country. Moreover, the Government still controls many important branches of industry and commerce. Therefore, the weak non-public sector is in unequal competition with the public sector. In addition, GNP per capita is very low (around US\$220 in 1994) and poverty and the unemployment rate is still very high (World Bank, 1996). All of these discourage development of non-public higher education in Vietnam.

The second challenge for the non-public sector is the shortage of infrastructure, equipment and learning facilities. Only two of the ten non-public universities have their own campus, building and space for lecture rooms and laboratories and the average floor area per student is very low, compared to that in public universities (see table 6.1). All other non-public universities use limited rental

space. Most equipment and learning facilities used at non-public universities are hired from public universities and other public institutions. Non-public universities own very poor learning facilities, such as computers, laboratories, books and special language training equipment (see table 6.2).

The shortage of finance is the third challenge for non-public HEIs. Finance from private sources is usually invested in industrial and service sectors because of the high profit rate. At the same time, making a profit in non-public higher education is not allowed. According to regulations, semi-public and people-founded universities are given the status of a not-for profit institution. Therefore, a great amount of money from private investors cannot be mobilised for the non-public sector in higher education. Public sources of finance for non-public higher education are still in doubt. Non-public universities have not been given any assistance, although a significant amount of credit with low interest rates has been promised.

In brief, non-public higher education is facing three major difficulties including an inappropriate social and economic environment, poor infrastructure and learning facilities, and shortage of finance. Non-public HEIs also face other challenges such as a shortage of full-time teaching staff and poor academic performance of students enrolled. But in the short term, having a sufficient number of full-time teaching staff soon becomes a burden for non-public institutions. In the long-term, when the financial situation is improved and the market environment is strengthened, highly qualified academics will come to work as full-time members and better performing students will attend courses at non-public universities.

Advantages of Non-Public Higher Education in Vietnam

Besides challenges non-public HEIs, as institutions established in the period of transition, also have many advantages, compared with public HEIs. According to the results of this investigation, three major advantages of the non-public sector have been found. They are: (1) non-public HEIs have more autonomy, compared with public HEIs; (2) non-public HEIs are less affected by the centrally controlled demand

mechanisms, the consequences of which are still serious for many public institutions; and finally (3) non-public HEIs, as recently established institutions, also have advantages benefiting from over 40 years experience by public HEIs.

Firstly, non-public HEIs in Vietnam have more autonomous rights than public HEIs. In the financial aspect, for example, market mechanisms affect financing and resource allocations in the non-public sector, while the bureaucratic mechanism is still in effect at public universities in the distribution of the part of their resources which come from the government budget. In management, the leadership of a non-public university makes decisions based only on the interests of the institution. In academic respects, non-public universities can focus on improving the knowledge and skills of students in the key areas which are critically important for students when they seek work. For example, the accountancy program taught at the Thang Long University was designed by French specialists and focussed on knowledge and skills required by enterprises which operate in the market mechanisms. The programs on business administration taught at the Ho Chi Minh City Open University are “imported” from the USA. In staffing, non-public HEIs can sign contracts depending only on their own needs. All of these enable non-public HEIs to use scarce resources more efficiently, increase competence of students effectively and stimulate staff to work successfully.

Secondly, as recently established institutions, non-public HEIs are less affected by the central demand mechanism, the influence of which is still serious in the public sector. This advantage manifests itself in effective organisational structures, machinery, and a dynamic style of personnel and financial management. A public university employs staff on the principle of long-life tenure. It cannot easily dismiss unqualified staff and recruit new staff to strengthen its capacity. As a result, the university machinery becomes cumbersome and ineffective. In contrast, as the non-public university employs staff and pays them according to their work done, financial resources are used in the most effective way.

Finally, non-public universities may inherit the experience and avoid the mistakes of public universities. All key managerial staff of non-public universities

used to work for public HEIs for some time, thus they know from experience what mistakes to avoid. The experience of overseas private universities also helps non-public universities to adapt to new requirements of a society in transition.

In brief, autonomy, academic freedom, experience from public and overseas universities and advantages of newly established institutions are the favourable factors for the development of non-public higher education in Vietnam. In order to overcome difficulties and to take advantage of the newly established sector, policy and regulations on non-public higher education need to be improved to facilitate non-public higher education. In the next section, shortcomings of the policy and the regulatory framework for non-public higher education are discussed.

Shortcomings of the Policy and Regulatory Framework for Operations of Non-Public HEIs.

The policy on the non-public sector in education analysed in Chapter 5 is mainly stated in the CPV and government documentation. The regulatory framework governing the operations of semi-public and people-founded HEIs is found in the two provisional regulations issued by MOET in 1994. There is no regulation for private universities. The education law in which the legal status of non-public education might be determined has not been ratified by the NA. Non-public HEIs operate within an insufficiently regulatory framework. The following observations concerning the policy and regulations on non-public higher education need to be improved.

Identifying and Protecting Ownership of Non-Public HEIs. The absence of articles in legal documentation determining and protecting ownership of investors and their right to enjoy the fruits of their labor discourages investment in non-public higher education. Although the protection of ownership might be determined in other legal documentation, it should be confirmed in the regulations on non-public education institutions. This becomes critically important when the law on ownership is still not authorised in Vietnam. In the regulations on non-public higher education, the minimum amount of legitimate capital for the establishment of a non-public HEI is

not determined. As a result, non-public HEIs already established do not meet the minimum requirements for infrastructure and equipment. Because of the absence of recognition of private ownership of HEIs and the absence of a regulatory framework for private HEIs, many so called “people-founded” universities which are in fact owned by private individuals, have the legal status of existence.

Procedure for the Registration of a Non-Public HEI. Although several steps for the establishment of a non-public HEI are clearly determined in regulations, criteria for registration and the period of time necessary to obtain approval for a proposal are not determined in regulations. Because of the absence of the criteria clearly identified in regulations, MOET has to deal with a lot of proposals in which the conditions for establishment are obviously insufficient and the approval of a proposal is mainly based on temporarily established criteria that may vary from time to time. The inadequate legal base also leads the process of approval slowing down and creates the possibility for increasing bureaucratic malaises which are very common in Vietnam today.

Supervision and Management of a Non-Public HEI. As determined in the regulations, the structure and organisation of a non-public HEI are similar to those of public universities. Although more autonomy is allowed and self-management principles are used to increase effectiveness and efficiency, non-public universities are under the tight control of MOET. The state control model should be transferred to the state supervision model to increase autonomy of non-public HEIs, as Neave & van Vught argue (1994). The mechanisms of supervision and criteria for accreditation of a non-public HEI are not determined in regulations. MOET usually establishes a mission to supervise non-public HEIs. The conclusions of the mission usually depend on the personal relations or the mission’s sympathy for the supervised institution. It is necessary to establish a legal procedure for supervision and criteria for accreditation of a non-public HEI.

Financial Issues. For many people-founded universities already established, there was no capital available at the time of foundation. In the regulations on people-founded

universities, there are no articles determining the amount of initial capital contributed by individual founders and sponsor organisations for construction of the university's campus and acquisition of necessary equipment. For semi-public universities, the minimum amount of capital contributed by the state at the time of establishing a semi-public HEI is not determined in the regulation. This creates a difficulty in definition of the rights and the responsibility of the state and private individuals in the university management. Moreover, revenues of non-public HEIs in Vietnam mostly rely on tuition fees, but the maximum level of tuition fees is limited by the Government. This discourages non-public HEIs from increasing quality and meeting the needs of students for high quality higher education.

Among other things, there are no articles that specify the responsibility of a non-public HEI in the case of closing down. It is not clear what actions will be taken by the State to secure the right of students to continue their study. Of further concern with production and service activities, there are no articles defining the tax exemption status of non-public universities, that public universities currently enjoy.

In brief, the weaknesses of the policy on non-public higher education and its regulatory framework are found in shortage of recognition of and protection for the ownership by individuals and organisations of non-public HEIs, insufficient identification of concrete criteria for registration, overwhelming control of the State over non-public HEIs, and inappropriate solutions to the financial problems in non-public HEIs. In order to improve the regulatory framework for non-public HEIs, some measures are recommended by MOET officials and education managers at non-public HEIs.

Recommendations for Further Development.

As the policy objectives identified, non-public higher education was established to mobilise finance for meeting the excess demand for higher education, to increase academic freedom and institutional autonomy, and choices for students to learn according to their aspirations and income situation. Since its implementation, the

policy has achieved great success. To different extent, all policy objectives have been achieved. The private finance contribution to the sector is significant. The enrolments at HEIs have dramatically increased. The freedom of academic staff and the autonomy of HEIs are recognised. Students have a great chance in choosing courses and institutions for their study. However, the policy still has limitations that prevent further development of the sector. Some reasons were presented in the previous section. The following suggestions are made, based on the results of discussions with MOET officials and senior officers from the investigated non-public HEIs.

Improvement of Regulatory Framework for Non-Public Education: The government and other state agencies responsible for education should formulate the education law and pass it to the NA for ratification. Some articles on non-public education should be included. The policy itself needs to be institutionalised and conceptualised in concrete measures and actions to be taken in the later stage - the stage of implementation. The legitimate environment for policy implementation should be improved and the rights of ownership of non-public HEIs need to be guaranteed to encourage the investment in education. An agency within MOET responsible for non-public higher education should be established to supervise and advise HEIs. The policy making and the policy implementation should be indivisible to increase confidence of the providers and the consumers of non-public higher education.

Encouraging Investment in Non-Public Higher Education and Providing Assistance for Non-Public HEIs. The state should encourage individuals and enterprises including individual foreigners and international organisations to participate in providing higher education. The state could provide non-public HEIs with necessary assistance such as exemption of taxes, permission for staff from public HEIs to work for non-public HEIs on work contracts and through MOET assistance programs like the program of quality improvement and the program of textbook renovation. In order to increase the quality of non-public higher education, it is necessary to provide non-public HEIs with technical assistance and restrict the

expansion of enrolments at public HEIs for programs and courses that non-public HEIs are able to provide to relieve the public financial burden.

Providing Financial Assistance for Students Enrolled at Non-Public Universities and Increasing Cost Recovery in the Public Sector in Higher Education. To ensure equity in higher education, students in both the non-public and public sectors need to be treated equally. Students of non-public universities should be allowed to borrow money from the state loans system which started in November 1995. Tuition fees charged at public universities need to gradually increase to reduce public expenditure for higher education and decrease the big gap between tuition fees charged in the two sectors. These measures will help to change the attitude of the people towards non-public higher education and decrease the burden on the State.

Quality Assurance and Accreditation. Naturally, non-public HEIs are responsible for their quality. Nevertheless, some non-public HEIs are more interested in pursuing quantitative enrolments and tuition fees than quality. MOET should be responsible for supervising non-public HEIs through supervising their mission, objectives, infrastructure, equipment, staff qualifications, programs of courses provided, training processes, and mechanisms of quality assurance. All HEIs, both public and non-public, should be accredited, but at the first stage only non-public HEIs are the subject of accreditation. The accreditation procedure should be open to the public and based on the legally standardised criteria approved by a competent group of experts and officers.

Increasing Responsibility of Non-Public HEIs. Non-public HEIs are responsible for achieving their stated mission and training objectives according to the license granted by the Government. Non-public HEIs are also responsible to MOET for providing necessary information and statistical data when required. The training quality standards of each non-public university should be published and information on any HEI should be accessible to any candidate who wishes to undertake courses of high learning.

Concluding Observations

- Although the non-public sector in Vietnamese higher education was established only recently, the achievement of the sector is evident. Its foundation has increased financial income for the higher education system, expanded enrolments and significantly changed the way in which the higher education system is managed.

- Compared with the public sector, non-public higher education has the advantage in management style, which is generated by the nature of private ownership. Non-public HEIs are less influenced by centrally controlled demand mechanisms. They also inherit the experience and avoid the mistakes of public universities.

- The non-public sector in higher education also faces some challenges that discourage the development of the sector. Poor infrastructure and equipment, shortage of finance and the politically disadvantaged position of the sector are among the major disadvantages.

- Fulfilling the peripheral function of the higher education system, non-public HEIs usually offer the courses most in demand in the free labour markets, that require cheap equipment and that can meet the extensive demands of society.

- The policy on non-public higher education has relieved the restriction on the private sector and allowed the realisation of potential implicit in the population and private enterprise. The implementation of the policy on privatization in Vietnamese higher education in both provision and financing has led to a boom in higher education and significantly increased of the enrolment rate of the student cohort.

- However, the policy still has many of shortcomings that brake the development of non-public higher education. The lack of a legal base for identification and protection of ownership for investors, the lack of concretely identified criteria for the registration of non-public HEIs, the restrictions on autonomy

for non-public HEIs and the tight financial control over non-public HEIs are among these weaknesses.

- To improve the situation of the non-public sector in higher education, the Government needs to improve the regulatory framework governing operations of non-public HEIs to encourage investment in the sector, to treat equally students of both sectors, non-public and public, to increase quality assurance in non-public universities, and to increase the accountability of non-public HEIs.

Chapter 7

CONCLUSION

This chapter brings to a conclusion the research undertaken in this thesis. It includes presentation of a summary of the approach adopted to the research problem, an overview of the principal findings and implications for further research. Clearly, much more research about the policy on privatization in Vietnamese higher education is required.

Summary of Approach

The research presented in this thesis was undertaken in response to the three questions which formed the problem statement in Chapter 1:

1. What are the existing policies that are of critical importance to the development of the non-public sector in Vietnamese higher education?
2. How are the existing policies on privatization in Vietnamese higher education made and implemented?
3. To what extent have the objectives of the policies on privatization in Vietnamese higher education been achieved?

In developing an appropriate response to these questions the research was designed to take account of a number of factors likely to influence the study, particularly: the context of enquiry, sources of information and methodology.

The analysis of the policy on privatization in Vietnamese higher education, the discussion on how the policy was made and implemented, and the analysis of the policy outcome are considered in the context of profound economic and social transformation in Vietnamese society.

Information was collected from several sources. Its reliability depends on where the information comes from. Official documents and opinion of policy makers and policy implementers are considered as official sources of information. Interest groups, parents and students may express their points of views. Any information collected by indirect ways was clarified during the interviews of policy makers and policy implementers.

The data were collected through a triangulation of data collection methods: documentary analysis, use of interview as an instrument, and statistical data collection. Any information obtained from one of these methods could be verified and clarified through personal contacts or telephone interviews. The critical issue in the modes of enquiry that were pursued was to achieve a balance between collecting enough information and making assessment and judgement. The collection of data used for analysis in various chapters was primarily guided by the three questions at the centre of the research problem. Treatment of the data as presented in Chapters 4 to 6 involved both qualitative and quantitative methods.

This research is directly related to policy science and politics as fields of study. Culture is an important factor influencing policy process. The norms, the values and the symbols of human groups significantly influence policy direction. Social and economic factors were also taken into consideration in this study.

Policy is considered in this study as a process that goes through several phases and stages. The significant events of the process, the role played by the different actors, the influence of internal and external factors on the policy process, the impact of how policy was made on its implementation, and substantive outcomes of the policy were analysed.

Overview of Principal Findings

Based on the research reported in Chapter 4 to 6, this section presents the principal findings in response to the three research questions: objectives and contents

of the policy on privatization in Vietnamese higher education, the process of its formulation and implementation, and the major policy outcome.

The Main Policy Changes since the *Doimoi* Policy was Implemented. A review of policy changes in education was undertaken to make clear the impact of the *doimoi* policy on education. Three elements of a new model of education: a system of new ideas on education development, a structure for the education system and mechanisms for operation and management of the education system were introduced in the Resolution of the CPV Central Committee (CPV, 1993) and The Circular 90/CP (Vietnamese Government, 1993a). The system of new ideas on renovation in education and training is based on the changing role and function of education and training as “primary national policy”. The structure of the national education system is to be restructured to be unified, diverse, flexible, based on the modularisation of knowledge and create the opportunity for people to learn all their life in the way that is the most appropriate to their conditions, ability and expectations. The mechanisms for operation and management of the education system are to be reformed based on the principle of decentralisation and deregulation. All these changes are aimed at making the education system relevant to the needs of socio-economic development.

The Main Objectives of the Policy on Privatization in Higher Education. According to the results of the documentary analysis, three major objectives of the policy on privatization in education were found in the Party (CPV, 1986: 1993), Government (Vietnamese Government, 1993a) and MOET (MOET, 1992; 1993; 1994c) documents. Firstly, privatization in education and training is to mobilise private resources to meet the excess demands for education. Secondly, it aims at promoting institutional autonomy and institutional responsibility. And finally, it creates the opportunity for students to learn according to their aspirations, ability and income situation.

Regulatory Framework for Operation of Non-Public HEIs. An overview of the regulatory framework for non-public HEIs was undertaken based on the two provisional regulations issued by MOET: the regulation for semi-public universities

and the regulation for people-founded universities. These regulations specify the responsibilities of councils of founders, councils of trustees, presidents, teaching staff and students; conditions for setting up the level of tuition fees, requirements for infrastructure and facilities, organisation of non-public universities, quality assurance; and conditions for dissolution and temporary suspension of non-public university activities. The shortage of concrete criteria specified in the regulations creates some difficulty in the process of implementation.

Policy Making. The major information for analysing the policy process in Vietnamese higher education was obtained from interviewing policy makers at the ministerial level and senior officers from non-public universities. Additional information was taken from reports of special groups, MOET documents and university reports. The policy on non-public higher education in Vietnam is rooted in the change of the CPV policy on socio-economic development and it was made to meet the needs for the development of higher education in the new context. In conditions that educational institutions were urged to be more effective and appropriate to the function of providing human resources for social and economic development, the needs for more higher education and effective way of management were recognised by scholars and intellectuals. Issues were put on the agenda of the Government and the CPV Politburo as the results of personal meetings and correspondent contacts between scholars and high ranking officials. The variation in points of view on non-public higher education forced policy making bodies to consider the issues carefully before making any decision. A special committee to advise the CPV Central Committee and the Government was established. Several steps, from experimentation to extensive implementation, in the foundation of a non-public sector in education were recommended. A pilot program of privatization in higher education was conducted. A private University Centre in Hanoi and a semi-public Open University in Ho Chi Minh City were established as experiments in privatization in higher education. Nearly four years were spent on experimentation with a new kind of higher education institution. During that time the discussion involved thousands of people from government departments, academic staff, parents, trade unions, women's associations, youth unions, the media and other political

forces. Finally, in January 1993, the first official document of the policy on non-public education, the Resolution of the fourth Plenum of the CPV Central Committee (CPV, 1993), appeared in public.

Policy Implementation. MOET was given responsibility to formulate regulations for non-public HEIs, to examine and approve proposals for the establishment of non-public HEIs before submitting to the Prime Minister for final decision, to supervise and assist established non-public HEIs in the process of the policy implementation, and to deal with complaints from the public on the matters concerning non-public higher education. In 1993, all three regulations for semi-public, people-founded and private universities were drafted and submitted to the Prime Minister for approval. Only regulation for private universities was approved by the Prime Minister; the two others, one for semi-public universities and the other for people-founded universities, were approved by MOET as provisional regulations. However, the regulation for private universities was not put into practice. The explanation for the suspension was that the conditions in the country were not mature enough for the establishment of private HEIs. Private investors are not able to secure places for students during the time they study in a private university. Politically, privatization in higher education is a sensitive issue. The question of when the private form of ownership in higher education will be permitted is still debatable.

MOET was given the task of approving proposals for the establishment of non-public HEIs. A group of officers and experts was established. During three years, from 1992 to 1995, two semi-public universities and eight people-founded universities were founded. There have been issues which cannot be solved based only on the available regulations. To solve any emerging problem MOET usually consults with officers from the CPV Committee of Science and Education and the NA Commission of Culture and Education.

Several departments from MOET, the CPV Committee of Science and Education, and the NA Commission of Culture and Education were actively involved in the process of policy implementation. Local authorities in the three cities: Hanoi,

Ho Chi Minh City and Da Nang, where non-public HEIs are located, have different impacts on non-public HEIs. At the same time, non-public HEIs manage to gain support from the Government, MOET, local authorities and “clients”.

Policy Review and Policy Redirection. There hasn't been any conference on non-public higher education organised to evaluate policy and policy implementation. The achievements of and challenges for the non-public higher education were discussed in reports of non-public HEIs, papers of working groups and at meetings of presidents of universities and colleges. Public opinion was taken into consideration in policy redirection.

There were two major amendments to the policy on non-public higher education. One confirms the dominant role of the public sector in higher education and the peripheral function of non-public HEIs in the system of higher education. The other stated that no private university will be established in the near future due to financial and political reasons.

Policy outcome. To date, two semi-public and eight people-founded universities have been established in Vietnam. The sector enrolls above 40,000 students for a range of courses and programs. This quite large enrolment significantly contributed to the satisfaction of the needs for more higher education and to the increase of the total income of the higher education system. Non-public HEIs and fee-paying courses taught in public universities contributed about 18.3 percent of the total income of the higher education system. The training objectives identified by non-public universities are directly aimed at future employment of students. The use of a modular approach in designing courses helps create the possibility for students to transfer from one course to another. Management mechanisms used at non-public universities are based on the principle of effectiveness and efficiency. All of these are significant achievements of the policy on privatization in renovation of the whole system of higher education.

As a recently established institutions, non-public universities have three major advantages compared with public universities. Gaining more institutional autonomy is

the first advantage. Secondly, non-public universities are less affected by the centrally controlled demand mechanisms. And the last one is an advantage benefiting from over 40 years experience by public HEIs.

However, non-public higher education in Vietnam is in a seriously disadvantaged position, compared with the public sector. Politically disadvantaged position, poor infrastructure and shortage of finance are considered as the three major challenges for non-public higher education. In the long-term, more explicit regulations and policy actions are needed to improve the position of non-public HEIs.

Shortcomings of the Policy and Regulatory Framework for Non-Public HEIs. As analysed in Chapter 6, there are many shortcomings found in the two provisional regulations issued by MOET in 1994. The absence of recognition and protection of ownership of investors in non-public higher education discourages investment in the non-public sector. Too complicated procedures for registration of a non-public HEI and the absence of concretely identified criteria for the establishment of a HEI slow down the process of approval of proposals and the increase of bureaucratic malaises. In financial terms, a limited by the Government level of tuition fees discourages non-public HEIs from increasing the quality of training. The rights and obligations of the Government and private investors are not clearly identified in the regulation for semi-public universities. This creates difficulty in management of semi-public HEIs.

Recommendations for Further Development. The achievements of the policy on privatization in higher education have been widely recognised. However, the policy and the regulatory framework for non-public higher education need to be improved in order to strengthen the position of the non-public sector. The major suggestions on the measures for further development of non-public sector were presented in Chapter 6. They include the improvement of regulatory framework for non-public higher education, encouragement of investment in non-public higher education, provision of technical assistance for non-public HEIs and financial assistance for students studying in non-public universities, increase of cost-recovery in the non-public sector, provision of service for quality assurance and accreditation in non-public HEIs, and

increase of accountability of non-public HEIs for the quality of training and achieving the training objectives.

In brief, the policy on non-public higher education was put into practice only recently, therefore, making any strong conclusion on its achievements and its impacts on the development of higher education would be inappropriate. The results of this study allow some synoptic conclusions.

- The implementation of the policy on privatization in education has resulted in policy changes since the *doimoi* policy was implemented. The nature of the changes in education is in the transformation of an education system mostly relying on the government budget and central planning to a system that could respond to the needs of the market.

- The incremental approach was used in the making and the implementing of the policy on non-public higher education. The policy was made based on the results of experimentation which lasted quite a long time. Various political groups were allowed to take part in policy discussions, but the dominant role belonged to senior officials and elite groups. This manifests itself as implementation of a centralised approach in policy process in Vietnam.

- The public sector in higher education will continue to dominate but private activities are also encouraged. The non-public sector is given only a peripheral function - to compensate for the weaknesses of the public sector. This policy decision was made based on the limited capacity of the non-public sector in the transitional period. The reliance on euphemisms such as “non-public” in most context instead of clear reference to private forms of higher education reflects also the caution of policy makers and political sensitivity of the issue.

- “Privatization” in higher education can take two forms - private provision and private financing. In terms of provision, earlier restrictions against private (or non-public) institutions have been lifted or relaxed during the early 1990s, and the

number of such institutions is growing very fast. In terms of private funding, most of the costs of running non-public HEIs are met from student fees. Students also pay tuition fees for attending courses at public universities.

- The achievements of the policy introduced over a relatively short period of time are quite significant. The establishment of the non-public sector in higher education has increased income for the higher education system, expanded enrolments and considerably changed the way in which the higher education system is managed.

- The non-public sector in Vietnamese higher education has both advantages and challenges presented in Chapter 3. In order to facilitate the further development of the sector, the government needs to improve the regulatory framework for operation of non-public HEIs, to encourage investment in the sector, to treat equally students of both sectors, public and non-public, and to increase the accountability of non-public HEIs for the quality of training.

Implications for Further Research.

This study has gathered evidence on the policy on privatization in higher education. This is one of the first studies focusing on policy studies in Vietnam and the only study on the policy on privatization in Vietnamese higher education. It is to be expected that a number of matters worthy of further investigation have been implied or identified. These are classified into two set of topics.

First, there are those issues which were relatively clearly identified as separate topics on the non-public sector or policy on privatization in higher education. Included among this set of research topics are the following:

- The role of scholars and intellectuals in making and implementing the policy on non-public higher education.
- Role of officials as policy makers and interest groups in making policy on non-public higher education.

- Process of making the policy on non-public higher education.
- Evaluation of the outcome of the policy on non-public higher education.
- Non-public higher education in Vietnam and its development prospects.

The second set of topics considers broader research themes and issues. Many of these are concerned with social and political factors, the change in the philosophy of the CPV, inter-relationship between the public and non-public sectors in higher education, and impacts of the non-public sector on development of higher education in Vietnam. Included into the second set are the following:

- *Doimoi* policy and implementation of policy on non-public higher education in Vietnam.
- Social and economic factors and policy on non-public higher education.
- Relationship between public and non-public higher education in Vietnam.
- Impacts of the non-public sector on development of higher education in Vietnam.
- Impacts of globalisation in higher education on the development of non-public higher education in Vietnam

Conclusion

This study was conducted in a short period of time and it was not able to cover a large range of issues. Many issues were touched upon but were not analysed in detail. The field for further research is extensive. The satisfaction of the writer as a researcher will be increased if the present work be thought useful when further research is undertaken.

APPENDIX 1

Semi-Structured Questions for Interviewing Officials at the Ministerial Level

1. According to you, what are the objectives of the policy on privatization in Vietnamese higher education?
2. What problems or issues is the policy supposed to resolve ?
3. How do this policy fit with other important policies accepted and being implemented in Vietnam?
4. Who brought up the issues related to the policy on privatization?
5. Why were these issues raised?
6. When were these issues raised?
7. How and in what forms were these issues raised?
8. Who were involved in the process of policy formulation?
9. Who were consulted in the process of policy making?
10. Who played a decisive role in policy decision?
11. Who were responsible for the formulation of resolutions, directives and regulations related to policies on privatization?
12. What was the role of the Ministry of Education and Training and its departments in making and implementation of the policy on privatization in higher education?
13. What was the role of the State Planning Committee, the Ministry of Finance, the Government Office and other ministries and government agencies?
14. What role did the National Assembly play ?
15. What role did the Communist Party officials and its organisations play?
16. What was the role of presidents, vice-presidents and other officers of universities and colleges ?
17. What was the role of intellectuals?
18. How were parents, local people and other interest group members involved in the process of policy making and policy implementation?
19. What changes in the policy on privatization have been made?
20. Why were these changes made?
21. What was the nature of the changes?

22. Is there any principal official or agency responsible for non-public HEIs? If yes, what is the role of this body?
23. Is there any recognised procedure for establishing a non-public HEI?
24. What are the criteria for this approval?
25. How does MOET assure the quality of non-public HEIs?
26. Was there any intervention of the government in the business of non-public HEIs?
27. Who are affected by the policy on privatization in higher education?
28. What are the main impacts of the policy on the development of higher education in Vietnam?
29. How effective is the policy implementation?
30. What are negative consequences of the policy and its implementation?
31. What changes in the content of the policy would you like to suggest?
32. What changes in the process of policy making would you like to recommend?
33. What changes in the policy implementation would you like to suggest?

APPENDIX 2

Semi-Structured Interview Questions for Interviewing Senior Officers of Non-Public Universities

1. What is your evaluation of the relevance of the policy on privatization in higher education to Vietnam's situations?
2. Have you participated in formulation of the policy on privatization in higher education?
3. Have you and your organisation suggested any change in the policy on privatization in higher education?
4. How was your university established?
5. How is your university organised?
6. What are the criteria for student enrolment to your university?
7. Has your university been accredited? If yes, how has it been accredited?
8. What autonomous rights does your university have?
9. How did MOET and other government agencies assist the establishment and operation of your institution?
10. What is the role of the local authority?
11. What was the attitude of parents and students towards the establishment and the operation of your university?
12. Where did the major financial resources for your institution come from?
13. What kind of curricula (school year's or modular) is used in your institutions? and how was it designed?
14. What differences between your university and public universities in the way they are managed?
15. Do your teaching staff have enough academic freedom?
16. What is the ratio of full-time teaching staff to total teaching staff?
17. Why don't you employ enough full-time teaching staff?
18. Where do teaching staff come from?
19. How are the staff salaries determined?
20. What are the most important factors for the success of your organisation?
21. How many students have graduated from your institution ?

22. How many of them have jobs?
23. How does your university contribute to the development of higher education in Vietnam?
24. What is the plan for further development of your university?
25. What is your evaluation of the policy on privatization in Vietnamese higher education?
26. Do you have any suggestion for change in the policy on privatization in Vietnamese higher education?
27. Do you have any suggestion for change in the way the policy on privatization was made and implemented?

APPENDIX 3

Blank Data Sheets

FINANCIAL RESOURCES

Institution:.....

	92/93	93/94	94/95	95/96
Tuition Fees				
- Total				
- Per student				
Contracts				
Government Funds				
Gifts				
Endowment				

RESOURCES ALLOCATION

Institution:

	92/93	93/94	94/95	95/96
Staff salaries				
Student scholarships				
Learning materials				
Equipment and building				

LEARNING RESOURCES AND FACILITIES

Institution:.....

	92/93	93/94	94/95	95/96
<i>Floor area:</i> - Owned; - Rental - Average Area/Student. <i>Categories of floor area</i> - Permanent, - Semi-Permanent, - Temporary,				
Number of Laboratories				
Books (amount):				
Computers: Other equipment				

STAFF-STUDENT STATISTICS

Institution:

	92/93	93/94	94/95	95/96
<i>Teaching Staff:</i> - Total number, - Full-time, - Part-time,				
<i>Managerial and Service Staff:</i> - Total number, - Full-time, - Part-time,				
<i>Undergraduate St.</i> - Total number, - New enrollees, - Graduates,				
<i>Short course students</i>				

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Adam R. 1973. Interest Groups in the Formation of Education Policies, Paper read at ANZAAS Conference in Perth, 17th August.
- Albrecht D. & Ziderman A. 1992. "Student Loans and their Alternatives: Improving the Performance of Deferred Payment Programs", *Higher Education*, vol. 23(4), 357-374.
- Amsterdamski S. & Rhodes A. 1993. "Perceptions of Dilemmas of Reform: Remarks and Interpretations Concerning a Study by the Vienna Institute for Human Sciences", *European Journal of Education*, vol. 28(4), 379-402.
- Australian Higher Education Council. 1992. *Achieving Quality*, Australian Government Publishing Service, Canberra.
- Baldrige J.V. 1971. *Power and Conflict in the University: Research in the Sociology of Complex Organizations*, Wiley, New York.
- Baldwin P. 1991. *Higher Education: Quality and Diversity in the 1990's*, Australian Government Publishing Service, Canberra.
- Beare H. 1987. "Change Structure in Education", in Simpkins W.S., Thomas A.R. & Thomas E.B. (eds.), *Principal and Change: Australian Experience*, UNE, Armidale, 95-124.
- Beloff M. 1979. "Starting a Private College: A British Experiment in Higher Education", *American Scholar*, Summer 1979, 395-403.
- Berlie J. 1995. "Higher Education in Vietnam: Historical Background, Policy, and Prospect", in Yee A.H. (ed.), *East Asian Higher education: Tradition and Transformations*. Pergamon, Oxford, 155-164.
- Birnbaum R. 1983. *Maintaining Diversity in Higher Education*, Jossey-Bass, San Francisco.
- Birnbaum R. 1989. "The Cybernetic Institution: Toward an Integration of Governance Theories", *Higher Education*, vol. 18, 239-253.
- Blaug M. & Woodhall M. 1978. "Patterns of Subsidies to Higher Education in Europe", *Higher Education*, vol. 7, 331-361.
- Boys C.J., Brennan J., Henkel M., Kirkland J., Kogan M. & Youll P.J. 1988. *Higher Education and the Preparation for Work*, Jessica Kingsley, London.
- Braybrooke D. & Lindblom C. 1963. *A Strategy of Decision*, Free Press, New York.

- Clark B.R. 1977. "Problems of Access in the Context of Academic Structures", in Burn B.B. (ed.), *Access, Systems, Youth and Employment*, International Council for Educational Development, New York, 39-52.
- Committee on Higher Education Funding. 1988. *Report of the Committee on Higher Education Funding*, Australian Government Publishing Service, Canberra.
- CPV. 1986. *The Resolution of the Sixth CPV Congress*, CPV Central Committee, Hanoi.
- CPV. 1993. *Materials of the Fourth Plenum of the CPV Central Committee, Seventh Tenure*, CPV Central Committee, Hanoi.
- CPV. 1996. *The Resolution of the Eighth CPV Congress*, CPV Central Committee, Hanoi.
- Crane J.A. 1982. *The Evaluation of Social Policies*. Kluwer-Nijhoff, Boston.
- Dang Ba Lam., Nghiem X. N. & Sloper D. 1995. "Research Activities and Higher Education", in Sloper D. & Le Thac Can, (eds.), *Higher Education in Vietnam: Change and Response*, St. Martin's Press, New York, 134-160.
- David M.E. 1977. *Reform, Reaction and Resources, the Three R of Educational Planning*, NFER, Publishing Company, Windso.
- Davies S. 1992. "Binary System of Higher Education", in Clark B.R. & Neave G. (eds.), *Encyclopedia of Higher Education*, Pergamon, Oxford, vol. 2, 1066-1071.
- Davis G., Wanna J., Warhurst J. & Weller P. 1988. *Public Policy in Australia*. Allen & Unwin, Sydney.
- Davis G., Wanna J., Warhurst J., & Weller P. 1993. *Public Policy in Australia*, Allen & Unwin, Sydney.
- Do Ba Khe. 1974. "Problems of University Growth in Vietnam", in Tapingkae A.(ed.), *The Growth of Southeast Asian Universities: Expansion versus Consolidation*, Regional Institute of Higher Education and Development, Singapore, 23-36.
- Do Ba Khe. 1995. "The Difficult Path Toward an Integrated University and Community College System in Vietnam", in Yee A.H. (ed.), *East Asian Higher Education: Tradition and Transformations*. Pergamon, Oxford, 135-154.
- Dror Z. 1968. *Public Policy-Making Re-examined*, Chandler Publishing Company, New York.

- Dror Y. 1984. "On Becoming More of a Policy Scientist", *Policy Studies Review*, August, Vol. 4(1), 13-21.
- Dye T.R. 1978. *Understanding Public Policy*, Prentice Hall, Englewood Cliffs.
- Eisemon T.O. 1992. "Private Initiatives in Higher Education in Kenya", *Higher education*, Vol. 24, 157-175.
- El-Khawas E. 1993. "Demographic Factors in the staffing of Higher Education: An International Perspective", *Higher Education Management*, vol. 5(2), 127-139.
- Fenwick P. 1993. "Marketing Tertiary Education: the New Zealand University Experience with Tuition fees", *Journal of Tertiary Education Administration*, vol. 15(1), 77-97.
- Fiebiger N. 1983. "Staff Policies", *International Journal of Institutional Management in Higher Education*, vol. 7(1), 43-52.
- Frackmann E. 1991. "The German Experience", in Craft, A. (ed.), *Quality Assurance in Higher Education: Proceedings of an International Conference, HongKong*, The Falmer Press, London, 47-64.
- Fulton O. 1993. "Paradox or Professional Closure? Criteria and Procedures for Recruitment to the Academic Profession", *Higher education Management*, vol. 5(2), 161-171.
- Furth D. 1973. "Short-Cycle Higher Education: Some Basic Considerations", in OECD, *Short-Cycle Higher Education*, OECD, Paris, 13-42.
- Geiger R. 1985. "The Private Alternative in Higher Education", *European Journal of Education*, vol. 20(4), 385-399.
- Geiger R. 1986. *Private Sectors in Higher Education: Structure, Functions, and Change in Eight Countries*, The University of Michigan, Michigan.
- Geiger R. 1987. "Private Initiatives in Higher Education: The Australian Predicament in Comparative Perspective", in Jones D.R. & Anwyl J. (eds.), *Privatizing Higher Education: A New Australian Issue*, The University of Melbourne, Melbourne, 103-117.
- Geiger R. 1988. "Public and Private Sectors in Higher Education: A comparison of International Patterns", *Higher Education*, vol. 17, 699-711.
- Girod de L'ain. 1994. "Modular or General Certification: Which System Should Be Used for Students in Europe?", *European Journal of Education*, vol. 29(4), 339-413.
- Gobbels-Dreyling B. 1993. "Overcoming Staff shortages and Blockages Selected experiences", *Higher Education Management*, vol. 5(3), 345-349.

- Goedegebuure L.C.J., Lysons A. & Meek V.L. 1993. "Diversity in Australian Higher Education?", *Higher Education*, vol. 25, 359-410.
- Goldschmid B. & Goldschmid M.L. 1973. "Modular Instruction in Higher Education: A Review", *Higher Education*, vol. 2, 15-32.
- Grant B. 1991. From the HUB to the RIM. System Renewal in New South Wales, Australia, Paper Presented at the 35th Annual Conference of the Department of Educational Administration, University of Alberta, September 30
- Grzelak J. 1993. "Higher Education in Poland: Four Years after", *European Journal of Education*, vol. 28(4), 413-420.
- Harman G.S. 1973. Pressure Groups and Education Policy and Administration in Australia. Paper read at ANZAAS Conference in Perth, 17th August.
- Harman G. 1980. "Policy-making and Policy-making Process in Education", in , Farquher R.H. & Houseso I.E. (eds.), *Canadian and Comparative Educational Administration*, University of British Columbia, Vancouver, 54-75.
- Harman G. 1985. "Handling Education Policy at the State Level in Australia and America". *Comparative Education Review*, vol. 29(1), 22-45.
- Harman G. 1986. *Social Science Research and Education Policy*, UNE, Armidale.
- Harman G. 1988. "Studying Merger in Higher Education", in Harman G.S. & Meek V.L. (eds.), *Institutional Amalgamation in Higher Education: Process and outcome in Five Countries*, Armidale, 1-7.
- Harman G. 1993. *Policy Science and the Study of Educational Administration*, Materials for Education AS 469-14, University of New England, Armidale.
- Harman G. 1994. "Australian Higher Education Administration and the Quality Assurance Movement", *Journal of Tertiary Education Administration*, vol. 16(1), 25-43.
- Harrold R. 1992. "Resource Allocation", in Clark B.R. & Neave G. (eds.), *Encyclopedia of Higher Education*, Pergamon, Oxford, 1464-1476.
- Hecló H. 1974. *Modern Social Politics in Britain and Sweden*, the Yale University, New Haven.
- Hoang Xuan Sinh & Sloper D. 1995. "An Entrepreneurial Development: Thang Long University", in Sloper D. & Le Thac Can, (eds.), *Higher Education in Vietnam: Change and Response*, St. Martin's Press, New York, 200-210.

- Hocking H. & Caldwell B. 1990. "Conceptual Frameworks", in Macpherson R.J.S. & Weeks J. (eds.), *Pathways to Knowledge in Educational Administration. Methodologies and Research in Progress in Australia*, ACEA, Armidale, 5-15.
- Hogwood B.W. & Gunn L.A. 1984. *Policy Analysis for the Real World*. Oxford University Press, New York.
- Howell D.A. & Brown R. 1983. *Educational Policy Making*, Heinemann Educational Books Ltd., London.
- Ivic I. 1992. "Recent Development in Higher Education in the Former Federal Republic Yugoslavia", *European Journal of Education*, vol. 27 (1/2), 111-120.
- Jennings R.E. 1977. *Education and Politics: Policy-Making in Local Education Authorities*, Batsford, London.
- Karmel P. 1987. "Private Initiative in Higher Education", in Jones D.R. & Anwyl J. (eds.), *Privatizing Higher Education: A New Australian Issue*, The University of Melbourne, Melbourne, 1-11.
- Keller G. 1983. *Academic Strategy: the Management Revolution in American Higher Education*, Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore.
- Kluckhohn C. 1962. in Kluckhohn C (ed.), *Culture and Behaviour*, New York, Free Press of Glencoe, cited in Savage W. 1968. *Interpersonal and Group Relations in Educational Administration*, Glenview, Scott, Foresman and Company, 58.
- Lajor T. 1993. "Perspectives, Hopes and Disappointments: Higher Education Reform in Hungary", *European Journal of Education*, vol. 28(4), 403-411.
- Lam Quang Thiep. 1993. Current Status of and Options for Strengthening and Reconstructing the Vietnamese Higher Education System. Paper read at Workshop on Policy Options for Higher Education Reform in August 1993, co-organised by the World Bank and MOET of SRV.
- Lane J.E. 1983. "Higher Education - Public Policy-Making and Implementation", *Higher Education*, vol. 12, 519-565.
- Le Thac Can. 1991. "Higher Education Reform in Vietnam, Lao, and Cambodia", *Comparative Education Review*, vol. 35(1), 170-176.
- Lenn M.P. 1992. "The US accreditation system", in *Quality Assurance in Higher Education: Proceedings of an International Conference, HongKong, 1991*, The Falmer Press, London, 161-168.
- Levy D.C. 1986a. *Higher Education and the State in Latin America: Private Challenges to Public Dominance*, The University of Chicago Press, Chicago.

- Levy D.C. 1986b. "Private" and "Public": Analysis Amid Ambiguity in Higher Education. In *Private Education: Studies in Choice and Public Policy*, Levy, D. (ed.), Oxford University Press, New York, 170-192.
- Lieberman M. 1986. "Privatization and public Education", *Phi Delta Kappan*, vol. 67(10), 731-34.
- Lindblom C.E. 1968. *The Policy-making Process*, Prentice-Hall, New Jersey.
- Lonsdale A. 1993. "Changes in Incentives, Rewards and Sanctions", *Higher Education Management*, vol. 5(2), 223-236.
- Marginson S. 1987. "Free Market Education", *Australian Universities' Review*, vol. 30(1), 12-16.
- Marginson S. 1989. "Academic Salaries in Australia", *Australian Universities' Review*, vol. 32, 14-23.
- Marginson S. 1993. "From Cloister to Market: the New Era in Higher Education", *Journal of Tertiary Education Administration*, vol. 15(1), 43-63.
- Marshall N. 1992. "Higher education Policy-Making: A Role for the States?", *Journal of Tertiary Education Administration*, vol. 14(1), 47-59.
- Martin L.M. 1993. "Implications of a Move to a User-Pays System of Higher Education", *Journal of Tertiary Education Administration*, vol. 15(1), 65-75.
- Martorana S.V. 1973. "Community Junior Colleges in the United States", in OECD, *Short-Cycle Higher Education - A Research for Identity*, OECD, Paris, 83-148.
- Meek L.V. 1989. "Institutional Amalgamation in Higher Education", *Journal of Education Policy*, vol. 4(1), 23-37.
- Meek L.V. 1990. "The Rise and Fall of the Binary Policy of Higher Education in Australia", *Journal of Education Policy*, vol. 5(3), 282-292.
- Meek L.V. 1991. "The Transformation of Australian Higher Education from Binary to United System", *Higher Education*, vol. 21(4), 461-496.
- Meek L.V. & Jones D.R. 1988. "Introduction", in Jones, D.R; Meek, L.V. & Anwyl, J. (eds.), *Alternative Funding Strategies for Australia's Universities and Colleges*, The University of Melbourne. 1-21.
- Meek L.V., Goedegebuuree O., Kivinen R. & Rinne R. 1991. "Policy Change in Higher education: Intended and Unintended Outcomes", *Higher Education*, vol. 21(4), 451-459.

- Middlehurst R. 1992. "Leadership and Management in Higher Education", *Studies in Higher Education*, vol. 17(3), 251-264.
- MOET. 1987. *Materials of the Meeting of Presidents of Universities and Colleges, Nhatrang, August 1987*. MOET, Hanoi.
- MOET. 1992. *Continuing Renovation of Higher Education - Materials of Meeting of Presidents of Universities and Colleges, August 1992*, MOET, Hanoi.
- MOET. 1993. *Continuing the Renovation of Higher Education - Materials of the Meeting of Presidents of Universities and Colleges, October 1993*, MOET, Hanoi.
- MOET. 1994a. *Provisional Regulations Governing Operations of Semi-public Universities*, MOET, Hanoi.
- MOET. 1994b. *Provisional Regulations Governing Operations of People Founded Universities*, MOET, Hanoi.
- MOET. 1994c. *Increasing Training Quality in Higher Education to Meet the Needs for Industrialisation and Modernisation of the Country - Materials of the Meeting of Presidents of Universities and Colleges, November 1994*, MOET, Hanoi.
- Moses I. 1993. "The development of Knowledge and Skills of academic Staff", *Higher Education Management*, vol. 5(2), 173-190.
- Neave G. 1984. "On the Road to Silicon Valley? The changing Relationship between Higher Education and Government in Western Europe", *European Journal of Education*, vol. 19(2), 111- 129.
- Neave G. & van Vught F. 1994. "Government and Higher Education in Developing Nations", in Neave G. & van Vught F., *Government and Higher Education Relationships Across Three Continents: The Winds of Change*, Pergamon, Oxford, 1-21.
- Nguyen Danh Binh. 1995. "Historical Background", in Tran Hong Quan, (ed.) *50 Years Development of Education and Training (1945-1995)*, Education Publishing House, Hanoi, 9-29.
- Nguyen Thi Tri, Pham Quang Sang & Sloper D. 1995. "Physical Facilities and Learning Resources", in Sloper D. & Le Thac Can. (eds.), *Higher Education in Vietnam: Change and Response*, St. Martin's Press, New York, 182-199.
- OECD. 1990a. *Financing Higher Education: Current Patterns*, OECD, Paris.
- OECD. 1990b. *Higher Education in California: Review of National Policies for Education*. OECD, Paris.

- OECD. 1994. *Staffing Higher Education: Meeting New Challenges*, Jessica Kinsley, OECD, Paris.
- Patrinos H.A. 1990. "The Privatization of Higher Education in Colombia: Effects on Quality and Equity", *Higher Education*, vol. 20, 161-173.
- Pham Minh Hac. 1995. "The Educational System of Vietnam", in Sloper D. and Le Thac Can, (eds.) *Higher Education in Vietnam - Change and Response*, St. Martins' Press, New York, 41-61.
- Pham Quang Sang & Sloper D. 1995. "Funding and Financial Issues", in Sloper D. & Le Thac Can, (eds.), *Higher Education in Vietnam - Change and Response*, St. Martin's Press, New York, 161-181.
- Pham Quang Sang & Pham Thanh Nghi. 1995. Theoretical and Practical Base for the Development of Policy on the Non-Public Sector in Higher Education and Vocational Training - A Research Report. The National Research Institute for Education Development, Hanoi.
- Pham Thanh Nghi & Sloper D. 1995. "Staffing of Higher Education", in Sloper D. & Le Thac Can, (eds.), *Higher Education in Vietnam - Change and Response*, St. Martin's Press, New York, 95-116.
- Phan Tat Gia. 1995. "Higher Education", in Trần Hồng Quan, (ed.) *50 Years' Development of Education and Training (1945-1995)*, Education Publishing House, Hanoi, 189-255.
- Pisut J. 1993. "Higher Education Reforms in the Slovak Republic", *European Journal of Education*, vol. 28 (4), 421-428.
- Psacharopoulos G. & Woodhall M. 1985. *Education for Development: An Analysis of Investment Choices*, Oxford University Press, New York.
- Psacharopoulos G. 1991. "Higher Education in Developing Countries: The Scenario of the Future", *Higher Education*, vol. 21, 3-9.
- Pritchard R.M.O. 1992. "Principles and Pragmatism in Private Higher Education: Examples from Britain and Germany", *Higher Education*, Vol. 24, 247-273.
- Rajagopal I. & Farr W. 1992. "Hidden Academics: The Part-time Faculty in Canada", *Higher education*, vol. 24, 317-331.
- Relika E. 1994. "Target-Oriented Management Decentralised Decision-Making, Cut-Backs, What's Happening in Finish Higher education", *Higher Education Management*, vol. 6(3), 377-390.
- Richardson J.J. 1969. *The Policy-Making Process*, Routledge & Kegan Paul, London.

- Roper T. 1973. "The Role and Responsibility of Students in Policy Determination and Government", in McCaig R. (ed.), *Policy and Planning in Higher Education.*, University of Queensland, Brisbane, 117-132.
- Rupnik J. 1992. "Higher Education and the Reform Process in Central and Eastern Europe", *European Journal of Education*, vol. 27 (1/2), 145-151.
- Saitis C.A. 1988. "The Relationship between the State and the University", *European Journal of Education*, vol. 23(3), 249-259.
- Saran R. 1973. *Policy Making in Secondary Education*, Oxford University Press, Oxford.
- Scott R. 1985. "Politicians, Flat Earthers and Astronauts: Contemporary Conflicts in the Administration of Education", *Unicorn*, 11 (2), May, 120-126.
- Scott R. 1987. "Politics, Markets and Tertiary Education", *Journal of Tertiary Educational Administration*, vol. 9(1), 51-63.
- Silva L. 1990. "A Case Study in Historical Perspective: Policy Research into Financing School Education in Srilanka", in Macpherson R.J.S. & Weeks J. (eds.), *Pathways to Knowledge in Educational Administration. Methodologies and Research in Progress in Australia*, ACEA, Armidale, 75-85.
- Simpkins W.S. 1988. The Politics of Education and its Administration: Discussion Points and Study Areas. Paper read at Australian Association for Research in Education National Conference in Armidale, 30th November - 4th December.
- Sloper D. 1988. Academic Staff Development: Policies and Issues from an Australian Perspective, Working Paper presented at the Research Institute for Higher education, Hiroshima University.
- Smart D. 1991. "Higher Education Policy in Australia: Corporate or Coercive Federalism", *Journal of Education Policy*, vol. 6(1), 97-100.
- Taylor M. 1989. "Recent Changes in National Higher Education Policies", *Higher Education Management*, vol. 1(3), 314-321.
- Taylor M. 1991. "New Financial Models", *Higher Education Management*, vol. 3(3), 203-213.
- Teichler U. 1988. *Changing Patterns of the Higher Education System. The experience of three Decades*, Jessica Kingsley, London.
- Tran Chi Dao, Lam Quang Thiep & Sloper D. 1995. "Organisation and Management of Higher Education in Vietnam: An Overview", in Sloper D. & Le Thac Can, (eds.), *Higher Education in Vietnam - Change and Response*, St. Martin's Press, New York, 74-94.

- Tran Hong Quan. 1992. "Continuing Renovation of Higher Education to Create a Movement Appropriate to the Socio-economic Development and the Trend of Higher Education in the World". in MOET, *Continuing Renovation of Vietnamese Higher Education*, MOET, Hanoi, 1-26.
- Tran Hong Quan. 1993. "Continuing Renovation in Higher Education in the Light of the Resolution of the Fourth Plenum of CPV Central Committee", in MOET, *Continuing Renovation of Higher Education - Materials of Meeting of Presidents of Universities and Colleges, October 1993*, MOET, Hanoi, 1-35.
- Tran Hong Quan. 1994. "Improving Training Quality in Higher Education to Meet the Needs for Industrialisation and Modernisation", in MOET. *Increasing Training Quality in Higher Education to Meet the Needs for Industrialisation and Modernisation of the Country- Materials of Meeting of Presidents of Universities and Colleges, November 1994*, MOET, Hanoi, 1-20
- Tran Hong Quan, Vu Van Tao & Sloper D. 1995. "The Policy - Making Context and Policies of Education and Training in Vietnam", in Sloper D. & Le Thac Can, (eds.), *Higher Education in Vietnam - Change and Response*, St. Martin's Press, New York, 62-73.
- Trow M. 1974. "Problems in the Transition from Elite to Mass Higher Education", in OECD, *Policies for Higher Education*, Paris, 51-101.
- Trow M. 1984. "The Analysis of Status", in Clark B.R. (ed.), *Perspectives on Higher Education*, University of California, Berkeley, 132-164.
- Trow M. 1988. "Comparative Perspectives on Higher Education Policy in UK and US", *Oxford Review of Education*, vol. 14 (1)
- UNESCO. 1985a. *Academic Staff Development in Higher Education - A Report of the Regional Workshop at University of New England, Armidale, Australia, 15-26 November 1984*. UNESCO, Bangkok.
- UNESCO. 1985b. *Higher Education and Development in South-East Asia: Summary Report and Conclusion*. UNESCO & the International Association of Universities, Paris.
- UNESCO/UNDP/MOET. 1992a. *Education Sector Review and Human Resources Analysis*. UNESCO/UNDP/MOET. Hanoi.
- UNESCO/UNDP/MOET. 1992b. *Education Sector Review and Human Resources Analysis*, Synthesis Report. UNESCO/UNDP/MOET. Hanoi.
- UNESCO/UNDP/MOET. 1992c. *Education Sector Review and Human Resources Analysis*, Final Report. UNESCO/UNDP/MOET. Hanoi.
- Van de Bunt-Kokhuis S.G.M. 1993. "Reforming Higher Education in Eastern Europe", *Higher Education Management*, vol 5(3), 317-331.

- Van Eijl. 1986. "Modular Programming of Curricula", *Higher Education*, vol. 15, 449-457.
- Vietnamese Government. 1993a. *Circular 90 CP on the Structure of the National Education System and Degree System of the SRI*, The Government Office, Hanoi.
- Vietnamese Government. 1993b. *Regulations Governing Operations of Private Higher Education Institutions*, the Government Office, Hanoi.
- Vietnamese Government. 1996. *Regulations Governing Post-Graduate Training*, The Government Office, Hanoi.
- Vu Van Tao. 1996. 10 years' Renovation in Higher Education. Paper read at Conference on Evaluation of Quality in Higher Education and Vocational Training, 20-21 August, Hanoi.
- Wandel C.F. 1983. "The Challenge of Collective Aging of University Staff", *International Journal of Institutional Management in Higher Education*, vol. 7(1), 53-61.
- Whitwell G. 1986. *The Treasury Line*. Allen & Unwin, Sydney.
- Williams G. 1987. "Changing Patterns of Educational Finance and their Anticipated Effects on Institutional Behaviour and Educational Outcomes", in Thomas H. & Simkins T. (eds.), *Economics and the Management of Education: Emerging Themes*, Falmer, London, 33-47.
- Williams G. 1991. "Markets and Higher Education", *Higher Education Management*, vol. 3(3), 214-225
- Williams P. 1992. "The UK Academic Audit Unit", in *Quality Assurance in Higher Education: Proceedings of an International Conference, HongKong, 1991*, The Falmer Press, London., 141-159.
- Wirt F.M. & Mitchell D.E. 1982. "Social Science and Educational Reform: The Political Uses of Social Research", *Educational Administration Quarterly*, vol. 18(4), 1-16.
- Woodhall M. 1989. *Financial Support for Students: Grants, Loans or Graduate Tax?* Kogan Page, London.
- Woodhall M. 1992. "Student Loans in Developing Countries: Feasibility, Experience and Prospects for Reform", *Higher Education*, vol. 23(4), 347-356.
- Woodhall M. 1993. "Turning-points in Development of Higher Education in Asia: Comparative Study on Optional Models for Education Provision, Finance and

- Management (1960-1990)", in World Bank & MOET, *Workshop on Policy Option for Higher Education Reform*, World Bank & MOET, Hanoi, 95-191.
- Worgan P. 1995. "The Changing Relationship Between the State and Higher Education in Czech Republic", *Higher Education Management*, vol. 7(2), 241-252.
- Working Group No 4/WB. 1996a. The System of Non-Public (semi-public, people founded and private) Education in Vietnam - A Report for World Bank.
- Working Group No 4 /WB. 1996b. Major Points in State Policies on the establishment, Operations and Development of Non-Public (semi-public, people founded and private) Education - A Report for World Bank.
- Working Group No 4/WB. 1996c. Some Observations about Quality of Non-public (semi-public, people founded and private) Schools in Vietnam - A Report for World Bank.
- World Bank. 1986. *Financing Education in Developing Countries: An Exploration of Policy Options*, The World Bank, Washington D.C.
- World Bank. 1993a. *The East Asian Miracle - Economic Growth and Public Policy*, Oxford University Press, New York.
- World Bank. 1993b. "Study on Higher Education- Policy Options for Higher Education Reforms", in World Bank & MOET, *Workshop on Policy Options for Higher Education Reform*, World Bank & MOET, Hanoi, 1-95.
- World Bank. 1994. *Higher Education. The Lessons of Experience*, World Bank, Washington D.C.
- World Bank. 1996. *Vietnam Education Financing Sector Study - A Sector Report*, World Bank, Washington D.C.
- Zigerel J.J. 1970. "The Community Colleges in Search of an Identity", *Journal of Higher Education*, 12(9), 701-712.