the so-called "sunset" laws (e.g., all Colorado state agencies must pass scrutiny and be recreated every ten years by a body more specifically higher education approaches.

At the level of the governing board, Gail Patridge of the Berkeley Center is now working with the Association of Governing Boards to develop board self-evaluation kits for trustees at public four-year, private four-year, and public two-year colleges. So it may soon be possible for board members to use carefully designed instruments to see if they are living up to their challenges. Of course, we would press strongly to include several self-evaluation questions concerning board relations with the statewide co-ordinating board. Here I don't want to be misunderstood: there is nothing in my training as a political scientist that tells me it will be possible — or even desirable — to set up structures and seek personalities wherein all differences and conflicts between governing boards and a central board can be made to disappear. There will always be areas where differences in constituencies, in perspectives and in perceived interests will — and should — lead to vigorous disagreement over given issues in postsecondary education. A co-ordinating board is no more infallible than other social institutions, and it needs strong and articulate institutions as healthy countervailing forces. But, given some goodwill of the Commissioners, did send out a letter on January 6, 1976, on the possibility of trying to apply sanctions to guilty states.)

The ACE, as a body structured to serve as an arm of the academic community, has moved to implement this recommendation (the AAUP Committee which investigates abuses of academic freedom.


ACCOUNTABILITY AND AUTONOMY: A CROSS-NATIONAL ANALYSIS OF RECENT TRENDS

If misery loves company, then Australian academics disturbed over State encroachments on university autonomy might take some solace from cross-national comparisons. State power over higher education has been growing throughout much of the world, increased dependence on government funds, increased accountability, increased mandated inter-institutional co-ordination — these and other new common Australian themes are being widely played out in other nations also. The balance between State control and university autonomy varied greatly. In the most salient question, cross-nationally, in the politics of higher education.

This essay focuses on the changing relationship between the State and the university. It obviously provides no more than a brief overview. It first analyses the trend toward greater direct accountability to the State; then it turns to a comparison from the perspective of the state of institutional autonomy.

Direct Accountability

Universities today, being held accountable more than previously to the idea that they should serve the public interest directly. The notion that the university best serves the public interest, by surmounting its own goals directly, has fallen upon relatively light times. So has the related notion that sufficient accountability is insured through free market mechanisms. The rationale of the first is that students, professors, and university administrators are the best able to make policy dealing with teaching and research. Good teaching and research then benefit society at-large. The rationale of the second is that market competition satisfies student and professor choice, and thereby fosters institutional responsiveness, administrative and curriculum innovation, and program flexibility. Thus, if efficiency and excellence are ensured, demands met. But both rationales are less than suitable to the task of institutional autonomy.
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Committee in England (1965) or Martin Committee in Australia (1964-5) argued. The first direct State accountability. Government expenditures generally have risen, not just in absolute but even in proportional terms so that many universities have come to rely increasingly on public revenues. Higher education claims a significantly greater share of the public dollar, even of the enlarged public education dollar, than previously. Such trends are familiar to Australians, who have seen university income evolve from a government-endowment-tuition mix to a near government monopoly, while higher education's share of the GNP more than doubled from the early 1960s to the mid-1970s. A heightened university dependence on government funds is generalisable to many nations (Canada, Great Britain, the U.S.) where mixed public-private funding had been characteristic. And skyrocketing government expenditure have occurred, not just in these nations but in the traditionally State-oriented ones in which public funding had already been the rule for some time. Moreover, if bigger enrolments and expenditure have been accompanied by greater accountability to the State, so has retribution! The argument is that scarcity makes direct protection of the public interest all the more imperative.

Universities are now held directly accountable to contribute to a wide variety of social, economic and political goals — some of which their governments themselves did not pursue earlier. Roger Heyns, President of the ACE, did send out a letter on January 6, 1976, announcing that his organisation would establish panels of qualified persons who would then be available to visit a state where relations between the central board and institutions had become badly strained. The invited observer(s) would then do their best to restore the necessary working relationships.

In the light of the severe challenges which face postsecondary education over the next decade, let us hope that most of these co-ordinating/governing board relationships will stay healthy — or that when they deteriorate dangerously, they can be quickly restored. Anything other than that and we shall have all up as civil servants of the state, and no one that knows thinks higher education can prosper in that context.
U.S. courts have also become increasingly active in holding the states accountable for the individual rights of members of the university community. Among these rights are tenures, academic freedom, and student participation. Indicative of the courts' guiding role is their involvement in cases of academic freedom whereas there had been no such involve-
manship prior to the Second World War, despite fervent disputes over the issue. 6

Another issue which is increasingly used to justify direct accountability is the control and influence that universities can exert over the curriculum. This is referred to as the "influence thesis." The case for influence is based on the argument that universities have a unique role to play in society as educators, researchers, and contributors to knowledge. The courts have been called upon to make decisions regarding the extent of this influence, and the ability of universities to control the content of their curricula. As a result, the debate over the influence thesis has become a central issue in higher education.

Institutions of higher education have long been seen as places of academic freedom and independence. However, in recent years, there has been a growing concern about the decline of academic freedom and the increasing influence of government and other external forces on university decision-making. The courts have played a significant role in this debate, particularly in cases involving freedom of speech and the right to academic freedom.

In conclusion, the courts have demonstrated a willingness to intervene in cases of academic freedom and influence in higher education. This has led to a greater degree of accountability and control by government and other external forces. The future of academic freedom and the role of the courts in this area remain uncertain, but the debate is likely to continue for some time to come.
Perhaps the most basic cleavage among detaanocratic regimes lies between relatively centralised and relatively decentralised higher education systems. Most of Europe has long been characterised by relatively centralised models that treat the university as a very public institution, an arm of the State. This has led to extremely strict rules for the higher education systems. It creates, certifies, supports and governs its higher education institutions, and in general, it is good for everyone. The Napoleonic model was transferred to other regions and one still sees its predominance, though hardly challenged, in most Latin American countries.

More decentralised systems have derived basically from a more pluralist, Anglo-American tradition, and elsewhere, mostly in the United States. Such countries have more autonomous, more decentralized systems that allow for greater diversity and autonomy. It has been argued that these systems have a better fit with the needs of modern society and with the diversity of the people that make up these societies.

In the late 20th century, there has been a trend towards greater centralisation, particularly in response to the growing demand for accountability and efficiency in higher education systems. This has led to a shift towards more centralised models, where the State plays a more significant role in the governance and funding of higher education institutions. However, this trend has been challenged by the growing importance of private funding and the desire for greater autonomy among universities.

In general, the shift towards greater centralisation is partly driven by the need to ensure the quality of higher education and to ensure that it is aligned with the economic and social needs of the country. However, this has also led to concerns about the loss of autonomy and independence of universities, particularly in terms of academic freedom and decision-making.

The debate about the appropriate model for higher education continues to be a significant issue, with advocates for both centralised and decentralised systems making strong cases for their approach. The challenge for policymakers is to find a balance that acknowledges the importance of both accountability and autonomy in the provision of quality higher education.
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THE SOCIAL POSITION OF ACADEMICS IN AUSTRALIAN SOCIETY: SOME OBJECTIVE AND SUBJECTIVE PERSPECTIVES

Whether he be king or clergyman, lawyer, soldier, physician, professor, merchant, dealer or artisan, he is worthy of his wage, and if he need not blush to claim it, only this is not the highest reward. 1

In 1860, this statement by the Rev. Dr John Woolley, the first Professor of Classics at the University of Sydney, paid service to the egalitarian ethos of Australian society. It was an academic who argued for an equality of status for all occupational groups. However, throughout the years, the egalitarian ethos has been declared a myth. Then, as well as now, academics in Australia have held positions of high status, along with other members of the professional community. This prestige has been called “disproportionate”, “desperately courted”, and “distasteful to many thinking Australians”. 2 Yet, apart from the fleeting comments of journalists and social commentators, the social position of academics has rarely been, if ever, studied directly or systematically.

It can no longer be doubted that occupations in Australia, as indeed elsewhere, are differentially valued and receive unequal status and prestige by the general population. The cumulative evidence from empirical research suggests considerable consensus about the social ranking of occupations, even with the precise measurement instruments and conceptual refinements of contemporary social science research. 3 However, little research has been done about the consequences of differences in prestige on recruitment and career patterns by individuals in those occupations.

The Importance of Social Position
One important theory in sociology argues that recruitment to and the performance of occupational roles is directly related to the rewards accruing to those occupying those roles. The argument contends that career patterns are more or less a matter of choice, and that the relationship of a particular career is the result of a rational assessment of the costs and benefits a particular career might be expected to provide. Furthermore, the rewards which accrue to career occupants are held to be the result of societal consensus, which implicitly allocates those rewards on the basis of the “need” that certain occupations be chosen and performed at a high standard. Thus the benefits of a career in medical practice are seen as

*This is a revised version of the paper presented to the 60th ANZAAS Conferences, Section 22, Symposium on The Academic Profession. Adelaide, May 1980.
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