

(as we have defined it) and how it will cope with the most severe disadvantages meanwhile. That will involve each in a serious examination of the kinds of issues we have considered in this paper. It will certainly be necessary, we believe, for each small university to formulate publicly supportable reasons which it would advance for its continued support by government and the public.

Finally, we do not think that any of us should shrink from examining even those actions which could lead to the disappearance of the university as a separate institution (that is, either federation or integration). There are circumstances when such transformations could readily be accepted as best for staff, students and the development of higher education itself; if, for example, competitive pressures decrease the numbers of suitably qualified students so greatly that neither adequate resources nor achievement of the critical mass for the student body could be assured; or if a university and a college, competing for the same students, found that their educational development was hampered by inadequate funding and that the deficiency could be overcome if they pooled their separate resources: then it would be eminently sensible for the institutions themselves to generate proposals for integration or federation. We claim after all, to be expert in preparing our students for imaginative and effective activity in greatly changing economic, social, industrial and political circumstances. It would be strange indeed if, as a system, or as units in that system, we were found lacking in the ability to adapt our institutions to changes occurring here and now!

NOTES AND REFERENCES.

1. The definition of a "discipline" is itself a matter of some dispute. In our view, at any one time it is possible to define a set of related pieces of information and concepts, which have been accumulated by using particular kinds of intellectual and practical techniques; and

in which students can be trained so that they can in turn understand and build on existing knowledge. That corpus of information and the skills which are necessary to understand, sustain, and expand it, constitute the basis of a discipline. The basis will change, sometimes slowly, sometimes rapidly. Nevertheless, at any given moment it is possible to approach a particular aspect of man's knowledge about himself and his world from within the boundaries of a particular discipline. The organisation of knowledge in disciplines is useful because our minds cannot encompass the complete range of man's understanding; we need to fix, around particular areas of knowledge, boundaries within which we can conduct research, teaching and learning.

There is, of course, a danger that these boundaries are assumed to be more permanent, part of "the nature of things", than they really are, and that they therefore impose restrictions on desirable intellectual development. But it does not seem to us that these dangers have prevented the growth of the new disciplines from older ones (for example, bio-chemistry) or of multi-disciplinary activities (for example, in "schools of inquiry", as in Griffith University). Indeed, an adequate and continuing grasp of the content of "disciplines" is essential for strong and effective multi-disciplinary and inter-disciplinary work!

2. Australian Universities Commission. *Report on the Proposal of the Government of Victoria for a Fourth University in Geelong, Ballarat and Bendigo*. Canberra A.G.P.S. 1973.
3. Education, Training and Employment: *Report of the Committee of Inquiry into Education and Training* (Professor B. R. Williams, Chairman). Canberra, A.G.P.S. 1979.
4. Tertiary Education in Australia. *Report of the Committee on the Future of Tertiary Education in Australia to the Australian Universities Commission*. (Sir Leslie Martin, Chairman). Melbourne, Government Printer, 1964.
5. Sale, Kirkpatrick *Human Scale* Coward, McCann and Geoghegan, New York, 1980.

THE RATIONALISATION OF HIGHER EDUCATION IN TASMANIA

In February 1980 the State Government accepted an offer from the University of Tasmania to assume responsibility for courses given by the College of Advanced Education in Southern Tasmania. The University stated that if it were given such an opportunity, it would become a broadly-based dual-purpose institution. The University recognised the need for flexibility in a small state and stated:

The University indeed welcomes the opportunity to evolve into a comprehensive regional University new to Australia which could well be a model for small universities in other parts of the Commonwealth. Under this scheme the University would maintain its traditional scholarly activities but also offer a broad range of courses and services more usually offered by colleges of advanced education in other states.

To understand the problems behind the rationalisation of higher education it is necessary to realise that Tasmania is not at all like other states. The population and interests of the community can be clearly identified with three major regions: the South, the North and the North West. The Tasmanian system of parliamentary representation, based on five seven-member electorates, contributes to this regional pattern of interest as does the division and ownership of the media. The total population is only a little over 400,000. Of these about 160,000 live in greater Hobart, 100,000 in Launceston and the rest in towns of less than 20,000 people or in the country.

Like their mainland counterparts, vocal sectional groups in Tasmania seek a wide range of educational opportunities and would like them to be at their doorsteps. However, there are limited resources available and it is not possible for every tertiary sector to be represented in each region in Tasmania. Thus some tension and conflict is almost inevitable but is compounded by an extraordinary jealousy between the North and the South, specifically between Launceston and Hobart. An equally important factor is a sense of deprivation, freely expressed by representatives of the three major towns in the North West.

The sense of deprivation is well founded in fact. Tasmania's participation rates of 7.1% for the University and 6.3% for the College sector do not compare well with the national averages of 9.5% and 10.0% respectively. They are consistent with the low retention rate to the final year of schooling — 25.4% compared with a national average of 35.3%. Decentralisation of the population and low retention rates to

Peter C Byers,
Assistant to the Vice-Chancellor; and
David E Caro,
Vice-Chancellor;
University of Tasmania

year 12 schooling are linked factors, the lowest participation rates being found in the areas outside Hobart.

In the metropolitan centres of the larger states, universities and colleges can each limit their offerings but collectively provide a very wide range of opportunities in the one city. Many universities have chosen a limited role, emphasising research and scholarship, without being seen by the community as failing in their duty. Over the last three decades there has been a substantial change in the distribution of students between courses at various levels. Postgraduate teaching and research have expanded dramatically and at the same time there has been a decline in sub-graduate teaching. Sub-graduate courses accounted for 27% of all students in 1954 and only 10.4% in 1963. Subsequently many of these courses were phased out or up-graded to full degree courses in the late 1960s following the Martin Committee Report.

It is perhaps ironic that the large institutions which can relatively easily be "comprehensive" now have no need to be, while the smaller ones in more remote communities, are urged to be "comprehensive" but have to wrestle with problems of scale which inhibit such diversity. In the Tasmanian experiment the University will be required to broaden its base and to provide some courses which in other areas may be found in CAEs.

History

To understand the latest moves to rationalise higher education it is necessary to review the history of the Tasmanian College of Advanced Education (TCAE). Perhaps because the University was not providing the breadth of service needed by the community, a decision was taken in the late sixties to set up a CAE in Tasmania. The potential student population was quite small so that the arguments for a college depended on breadth of opportunity rather than on numbers or the associated costs of the institutions involved. It might have been expected that, since more than half Tasmania's population lives outside Hobart, the College would have been established in Launceston, the second city. However, the argument that no capital city could be without a CAE prevailed and in 1968 the TCAE opened its doors on a site at Mt Nelson which is almost contiguous with the University grounds. Subsequently the College took steps to develop a second campus at Newnham in Launceston. The new College incorporated a previously existing School of Art, a Conservatorium of Music, and a

Teachers College. It proceeded with new developments in Librarianship, Medical Technology and Applied Sciences, Pharmacy, Social Work, and Environmental Design. In addition, it developed a number of other courses, notably in Engineering, Accounting, Administration, Commercial Law and some Arts and Science subjects, which overlapped those offered by the University. This resulted in some tension between the two institutions.

In 1975 a Committee on Post-Secondary Education, with Professor P. H. Karmel as Chairman, was appointed jointly by the Australian and Tasmanian Ministers for Education to report on the promotion, development and co-ordination of post-secondary education in the State, having regard to its future needs. Following an extensive investigation, its recommendations proposed a major restructuring of tertiary education in Tasmania.

The Karmel Committee's recommendations were made in the context of demand forecasts which predicted that both the University and the TCAE would continue to grow slowly and would have difficulty in attracting substantially increased enrolments. The Committee said:

... The projected total tertiary enrolment of 6,950 by 1991 could, by general Australian standards, be accommodated in a medium-sized university (the average size of established Australian universities in 1975, excluding the new Griffith University and Murdoch University, was over 9,000) or by a smaller university and a single college of advanced education.

The Committee foresaw that:

... the estimates of future tertiary growth thus raise the question whether the State should continue to support three main centres of tertiary education, two of which are located in Hobart side by side.

Subsequent events show that the basic recommendations of the Committee were made in the context of forecasts of student numbers which were optimistic. Projected total student numbers for 1981 were 6,800 students but it is now known that participation rates are not growing as fast as expected and a more realistic estimate would be 6,200 students.

The Karmel recommendation was for a total rationalisation:

- 1(a) (i) *A basic restructuring of university and advanced education in Tasmania should be undertaken in order to rationalise the programs of the University of Tasmania and the Mt Nelson campus of the Tasmanian College of Advanced Education (TCAE) and to provide a better balance of effort in tertiary education between the North and South of the State.*

- (ii) *To achieve these objectives, the existing programs of the Mt Nelson campus of the TCAE should be transferred to the University or to a fully autonomous college of advanced education at Newnham (or as necessary, to the Hobart Technical College), and the site and buildings of the TCAE at Mt Nelson transferred to the University.*
- (iii) *The existing legislation relating to the Tasmanian Council of Advanced Education and the TCAE should be replaced by new legislation establishing a fully autonomous college of advanced education at Newnham.*

The recommendations of the Karmel Committee were not all implemented. Although in general they were similar to one of the options contained in a submission made to the Committee by the University, sections of the staff objected so strongly that there was insufficient community and University support to carry out most of the recommendations. College staff also resisted the recommendations vigorously. In the event, the College headquarters moved to Launceston where courses in Teacher Education, Arts, Engineering, Commerce and Art were expanded and developed. The TCAE still maintained the campus at Mt Nelson in Hobart where it continued to teach the majority of its students in courses in Teacher Education, Art, Music, Librarianship, Social Work, Environmental Design and Legal Practice. Only a limited rationalisation had been achieved.

In 1978, further committees (Kearney and TEND¹) recommended a more complete rationalisation but nothing happened until the State Minister for Education brought the two institutions together for further discussions. At about the same time it was becoming apparent that there was a significant over-production of teachers both in Tasmania and in the other states. Discussions were delayed pending the arrival of the new Principal of the College. When they were held late in 1978 they were a disaster. Relationships between the two institutions were badly damaged and, in 1979, the few existing co-operative arrangements in the South were repudiated.

In September 1979, the Tertiary Education Commission of Tasmania (TECT) advised the Minister for Education that teacher training numbers should be reduced by 26% for the State as a whole and by 40% in Hobart. It was evident that either the College Division of Teacher Education in the South or the University Faculty of Education should close. Discussions took place and by November 1979 the Tertiary Education Commission of Tasmania was known to be drafting a report on the future of teacher education. Despite the previous recommendations of the Karmel, TEND and Kearney Committee Reports that the rationalisation should maintain or expand the University, there was in Tasmania in November 1979, a firm belief that the University had lost the last round of the rationalisation and teacher education would be maintained in a restructured College facility

in the South of the State. Not only was it expected that the University would lose teacher education but there were also fears that this loss would quickly impinge on enrolments in the Arts and Science faculties.

In the event the decision was delayed. In December the Minister for Education requested the University and the TCAE to make submissions outlining their proposals for teacher education programmes in Hobart and gave the two institutions six weeks to complete these submissions.

A remarkable consensus of opinion developed in the University. Various concepts of the role to be played by a regional university had been discussed in University circles over the previous four years. These were developed for the University's submission which was written in four weeks over Christmas. It was approved, with three votes against it, at a general meeting of all staff in mid-January. The Professorial Board and the University Council approved it *nem con* in time for it to be handed to the Minister on 30 January 1980. The main thrust of the University's offer was:

- (i) It would take over all teacher education in Hobart;
- (ii) It would take over the College Schools of Art, Music and Librarianship;
- (iii) If required it would take over Environmental Design and Legal Practice;
- (iv) The University would, in the future, operate as a much broader based institution, providing facilities for all higher education in Hobart either on its own initiative or under contract from the College;
- (v) The College should develop in the North with the University assisting as necessary.

The merger decision

On 20 February 1980 the Minister for Education announced that the Government had accepted the University's offer and that the College in the South would be closed. There can be little doubt that the University's proposal to become a more comprehensive institution was the significant factor in deciding the outcome. The TECT, commenting upon the University's plan said:

The Commission has been impressed by the proposal by the University that it should become a more broadly-based institution. The reappraisal by the University offers exciting possibilities for the future...

The University was now to acquire by transfer the Division of Teacher Education and the Schools of Art, Music and Librarianship. After further discussion it was agreed that Environmental Design should be transferred to Launceston with a branch in Hobart, and that Legal Practice would continue to be provided in Hobart by the College. The date for these changes was set for 1 January 1981.

New courses and academic structure

The courses which the University has agreed to take over include Associate Diploma (UG3), Diploma (UG2), Bachelor Degree and Post-graduate Diploma courses in Art and Music, a Post-graduate Diploma in Librarianship, and a B.Ed. and course-work M.Ed. in Education. The University will also offer new masters degrees in Fine Arts and Music. As part of the rationalisation proposal the University agreed to take over and maintain the integrated B.Ed. previously taught by the College and to continue the vital extension role of the Centre for the Continuing Education of Teachers.

It has been necessary to develop new academic administrative arrangements to deal with the transferring sections. Librarianship becomes a department in the Faculty of Arts. The University's Faculty of Education is replaced by a Centre for Education with three departments: Teacher Education, Educational Studies and Special Education. The first is headed by a new professor, the second by the present Professor of Education and the third by a Reader in Special Education. The Centre for Education has all the powers and functions of a faculty.

The Schools of Art and Music have the formal title of The Tasmanian School of Art and The Tasmanian Conservatorium of Music. Each operates as a faculty. The two schools will be associated in a new educational structure to be known as The Centre for the Arts. This aims to bring together the specific requirements of the arts and the community. The Centre will provide courses in Art and Music at all levels from the post-compulsory education stage to the post-graduate education stage. It will encourage practising artists, designers, craftspeople and teachers of the arts to provide and participate in continuing education. It will facilitate links between the educational establishment and the community and it will help develop increased vocational opportunities in the arts and crafts.

Staff transfers

The question of staff transfer is an essential issue in all rationalisation exercises. The experience at Deakin University had not been particularly happy and the University was concerned that an effective way to make transfers and provide security for staff should be found. In this it was aided by a submission made by the University of Tasmania Staff Association to TECT. While rejecting absolutely proposals that all College staff members be taken into the University, the submission did accept that there should be some variation in normal appointment procedures. The Staff Association requested that a criterion of "sympathetic consideration" be used and applied on the basis that, if an applicant was regarded by an interviewing committee as being of a quality that would normally find him or her a place in a "short list" for final consideration, then the applicant would be judged to

have satisfied the requirements for appointment. A similar procedure had been used when Pharmacy and Surveying were transferred to the University following the Karmel Report.

Following discussions within its staff, the Professorial Board and Council, the University offered to bring the courses in Music, Art and Librarianship into the University structure and to appoint all members of the present staff of those units wishing to transfer. It was not possible to employ all the teaching staff from the Division of Teacher Education since the number of students was decreasing. However, the University offered to advertise seventeen staff posts, initially by closed advertisement within the Division of Teacher Education at the Mt Nelson campus of the CAE. Additionally, the University agreed that, during the transition period whenever it was possible, it would fill any temporary additional posts in the Faculty of Education by appointment or secondment of College staff. The University provided positions for library and administrative staff and part of a group dealing with audio-visual materials. In addition, the University undertook, whenever possible, to fill vacant general staff positions by appointment from the Mt Nelson staff. The maintenance and grounds staff were given employment with the State Education Department.

In those cases where selection was necessary, some difficulties arose. Pressure was brought to bear on the University through the press and Cabinet Ministers to make more appointments than were possible and there was some bitterness. The Minister for Education set up a committee under Sir George Cartland to advise him on accommodation needs and the progress of rationalisation with particular emphasis on redundancy. In the event most staff rendered surplus by the rationalisation were offered positions with the TCAE in Launceston, two or three year contract teaching positions with the University, or positions with the State Department of Education. In all, the University is employing about 120 new staff from the College out of a total of 160 in all staff categories.

The university adopted the following principles in offering appointments:

- (i) *The salary of everyone transferring should be the same in real terms in 1981 as it would have been in the College;*
- (ii) *In as many cases as possible appointment should be made at a University grade equivalent to the relevant College grade;*
- (iii) *In the few cases where a lower University grade was offered (e.g. senior lectureship following a principal lectureship in the College), the salary from 1982 should be held constant in money terms until national wage variations bring the appropriate University salary into line with the old College salary. Thus no one should lose money as a result of the transfer;*

(iv) All entitlements to long service leave, annual leave, and where appropriate sick leave, should be honoured by the University. In considering applications for external studies leave, note should be taken of service in the College.

These principles were in accordance with those discussed between the parties at the Cartland Committee.

Superannuation caused some problems. Some of the TCAE staff belonged to one or other of two State superannuation schemes; some belonged to a scheme operated by the College. The latter is not compatible with the University's present superannuation scheme which is in any event in financial difficulty. The State Government agreed to pass legislation permitting those in the State schemes to remain members after transferring to the University. The legislation gives the State liability for the cost of past service prior to 1 January 1981, while the University has the responsibility thereafter.

The University set up a new superannuation scheme for those transferring from the college's scheme. This provides benefits similar to those of the proposed Superannuation Scheme for Australian Universities. Past service in the College is recognised for those bringing transfer benefits from the College scheme. The service recognition is such as to give a basic pension right within the University equal to that in the College at the date of entry to the University scheme. Since the University scheme provides a fully indexed pension while the TCAE scheme does not, the new staff receive a significant increase in benefits. Some staff have moved to be declared redundant on leaving the College so that they can obtain cash from the College scheme. In this case, no past service recognition can be given.

Transfer of equipment and money

Agreement was reached on the transfer of equipment, books and other library materials without too much difficulty. Agreement on the transfer of funds for 1981 was less easily achieved. Since the University has taken over most of the activities at Mt Nelson, it argued in March 1980 that it would be easiest if the entire Mt Nelson budget, less the costs of staff transferring to Launceston, were passed to the University. Despite the College's original offer to relinquish control of Mt Nelson campus and courses on a "walk in — walk out" basis from 1 January 1981, this was not acceptable to the College. Very detailed and protracted negotiations went on until the end of November 1980 when the same result was finally achieved. The transfers of recurrent funds, equipment grants and minor works grants were approved by the Tertiary Education Commission and will be effected by an amendment to the States Grants Act.

Accommodation arrangements

As part of the arrangements, the University has closed a Hall of Residence and the State Government has

provided a grant to convert the building for use as The Centre for Teacher Education. All the Education staff, old and new, will be located in this building on the main University campus from the end of first term 1981.

The School of Librarianship will move at about the same time to the University campus leaving only the Tasmanian School of Art and the Tasmanian Conservatorium of Music at Mt Nelson. This arrangement will continue for several years. Eventually both Schools and associated library and student facilities will move to The Centre for the Arts on the Hobart waterfront. The University will then vacate the Mt Nelson campus which is to be used by the State Department of Education as a Community College (matriculation plus some elements of Further Education).

The Government has accepted the University's offer to plan the redevelopment of sections of an old and interesting jam factory located on the waterfront in Hobart at Sullivans Cove. The intention is for the University to take over the site and, as part of an urban renewal programme, to develop it partly as an academic home for its own Schools and partly as a place available to other educational institutions and to the public. It is envisaged that The Centre for the Arts will also be the home for the TCAE Hobart branch of the School of Environmental Design, and some TAFE activities in Art. It may house an FM radio station at present situated at Mt Nelson. It is planned to include some artists' studios for craftspeople in residence. There will also be a restaurant which will be available both for students and the public. The design team has been appointed and it is expected that this exciting project will be completed with State funds within three to four years.

Government policy for post-secondary education

The move towards a more comprehensive University in Southern Tasmania should be viewed in the context of government policy and the structural changes proposed in post-secondary education.

Government policy aims for a balanced development of educational provision throughout the State and it assumes a delineation of major responsibilities within each region. The University of Tasmania has the major responsibility for tertiary education in the South, the College of Advanced Education is to assume that responsibility in the North and Further Education has the major responsibility in the North West. In each region the main institution is to be supported by the other bodies.

The 1977 review of Australian education policy by the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) commented that:

There is a good case in Australia for the creation of a network of community colleges catering for the further education needs of the whole community from remedial work in literacy and numeracy up to degree level work. At present further education opportunities at the lower

levels hardly exist and at the middle and higher levels they are shared between TAFE institutions, colleges of advanced education and universities. (Paragraph 159).

A new pattern of education from Year 10 schooling onwards is being introduced in Tasmania. It combines matriculation, technical and adult education in community colleges. These form part of the Further Education system and their courses are defined to be at tertiary level. Further Education arrangements in the tertiary sector will be slightly different in each of the three main regions of the State. The development of the community colleges will require extensive cross crediting arrangements with other tertiary institutions both for entry standards and for actual course performance.

The future university

The idea of a comprehensive institution is not new. The Williams Committee Report explores the possibility of creating dual-purpose institutions in various regions. The OECD Conference on Higher Education (Paris 1973) identified the "comprehensive institution" as one of the four broad models for the development of structural relationships in post-secondary education. Developments in this direction are well established in North America and have received increasing attention in Britain and Western Europe. New institutions have been built where the special characteristics of the traditional university — such as the maintenance of standards of excellence and the initiation of research — are combined with a wider range of activities and more open access.

In constructing its brief for a comprehensive institution the University said:

A university has a fundamental responsibility for the preservation and extension of knowledge, for education and training, and for the critical evaluation of the society in which it is set... A university must maintain its place within the international community of scholarly institutions, but it also has responsibilities to the community which creates and sustains it. A university fails if it lives to itself; it must forge links with local business, industry and labour, interpret knowledge to the benefit of the local community and bring its resources to bear on the problems of the region and the nation. A measure of a university's stature is the contribution it makes to public progress in the community it serves...

These beliefs remain the basis for the developments which are now taking place.

The rationalisation decisions have resulted in immediate changes within the University. It will be much larger, nearly 4,000 wsu in 1981 instead of about 3,000 in 1980. It has increased breadth because of the addition of the Schools of Art, Librarianship and Music. Starting in 1981 it will offer CAE-type diploma courses in Art and Music as well as degrees. These have been approved by the TEC and will be funded in the usual way through the Universities Council.

It is inherent in the rationalisation decisions that the University may need to offer other CAE-type courses from time to time and this raises questions of accreditation and funding. Normally universities approve their own courses and this in principle can happen with diplomas as well as with degrees. It has been argued (see, for example, Professor Sir Bruce Williams²) that the basic binary approach to higher education would be weakened if funding were determined in accordance with the usual Universities Council procedures.

At the opposite extreme, the "comprehensive" university could have diploma courses accredited and funded as if it were a college of advanced education. This too has disadvantages. First, there would be multiple paymasters. Second, it is difficult, and perhaps undesirable, to separate diploma and degree students in programmes which may well have the first few years in common. Third, there may be an implication that the university would have two different categories of academic staff. This idea is unacceptable to the staff of the University of Tasmania.

A possible compromise is for UG3 level diploma courses to be provided by University staff under contract either from the CAE or from Further Education as appropriate. The award would then be given by the contracting body and funds would come through the appropriate tertiary sector. Degree and UG2 or postgraduate diplomas would be provided by the University in the normal way. The ideal arrangement has yet to be decided.

In Tasmania, to compound the problem, there is no separate Advanced Education Accrediting body. The Council of the TCAE accredits its own courses and has not shown any great inclination to extend its role.

Unless there is an independent accrediting authority, it will be very difficult to establish tertiary courses at the appropriate level and at the same time facilitate their conduct on contract by the appropriate institution in each region. Separate accrediting bodies exist in all other States and with the movement of both the University and Further Education sector into diploma courses there is a need in Tasmania to implement similar policies. This would leave the Tasmanian Council of Advanced Education with only those powers appropriate to a council of a college of advanced education.

Before the rationalisation decision there was a growing awareness within the University that it had to be more concerned with the perceived needs of the community. In 1980, despite the obvious difficulty of providing evening classes as well as day classes in a small university, an increased number of units was offered at times suited to part-time students. The demand for part-time studies will never be very large in any one discipline, and it is likely that courses may have to be provided for part-time students in rotation, the range being limited in any one year.

The educational needs of the people of the North West are particularly important. They are being considered by a new Council for Community Education on which one of us (Peter Byers) serves. The University has indicated its willingness to co-operate as well as it can short of contemplating branch campuses. It seems likely that visiting staff from the TCAE and the University may provide a limited number of courses in the North West using Further Education facilities and study centres located in community colleges.

It may well be desirable for visiting staff from the University to give some courses at the TCAE in Launceston. For rationalisation to be a success, it is vital that the College and the University should facilitate the transfer of students in both directions between the two institutions.

Professor Sir Bruce Williams (*loc. cit.*) has criticised the use of the term "comprehensive" by the University of Tasmania, stating that it will not be any more comprehensive than some larger universities have been in the past. This is certainly true. The point is that most small universities have been much more restricted in their offerings than the larger universities were before colleges of advanced education came into existence in large numbers in the sixties. The Tasmanian experiment requires both the University and the TCAE to become broader and more flexible. This is a necessity for a small State and it should not be seen as being destructive of the binary system of universities and colleges which has worked well elsewhere.

The changes in the University are only just beginning but it is already clear that there is a renewed interest within the University in providing a broader and better service to the community. Reviewing the progress during 1980, it seems that innovation within the University is more probable now than even a year ago. As an example, the older part of the University is introducing four new masters degrees (Humanities, Social Sciences, Financial Studies, Legal Studies in Welfare Law), and two new postgraduate diplomas (Welfare Law, Operations Research) in 1981.

At the same time, there is an insistence that, whatever is done, the standards must be those proper to a university. The University will not dilute its standards in becoming more comprehensive. Rather it intends to apply standards of excellence to wider areas of higher education. Perhaps as a result of this insistence on standards and because of the awakening in the University, there has been a dramatic increase in the number of Commonwealth Postgraduate Research and Course Work awards received by the University for 1981. It reflects the high activity in research and postgraduate studies which differentiates a university, "comprehensive" or otherwise, from other institutions.

The Tasmanian experiment will take some years to work out and premature judgment is unwise. Whatever the judgment may finally be, the University

will certainly emerge as a different institution. While there may be lessons to be learned from the Tasmanian experience which can be applied in other small centres, it should be remembered that Tasmania is unique, and the solution to a purely Tasmanian problem may not necessarily be as useful in the major metropolitan areas.

UNIVERSITY AUTONOMY: A NEW ANALYSIS¹

Introduction

Among scholars doing research on university organisation the concept of autonomy is used as the theoretical tool by means of which the relationship between the university system or any system of higher education and the central authorities is understood. To these scholars the transition from elitism to mass education has been accompanied by a reduction in traditional university autonomy or at least they assert that the trend has presented threats to university autonomy.² However, general statements about the evolution of university autonomy in the western democracies may fail to do justice to the variety of systems within higher education. The development of the Swedish university system does not confirm the notion of decreasing autonomy. On the contrary, the reform of 1977 will increase the autonomy of the Swedish universities. Among most scholars doing research on university autonomy there is a general value commitment to the ideal of the autonomous university, although some of these scholars are pessimistic as to the realism of making a stubborn stand against all encroachments on autonomy. However, none of these scholars have made it clear why autonomy is to be considered of value in relation to the university system. Is university autonomy to be considered an end in itself or is it to be regarded as a means to some valuable end? An answer presupposes some kind of deeper understanding of the functions of autonomy within university systems; it would, in effect, require a theory of university autonomy.

REFERENCES

1. Ministerial Working Party on Tertiary Education in Tasmania, D. A. Kearney, Chairman. *Tasmanian Education Next Decade (TEND)*.
2. *Vestes*, Volume 23, No. 2, 1980.

J. E. Lane,

Center for Administrative Studies,
University of Umea,
Umea, Sweden

Though the concept of university autonomy occurs in most studies on the external relationships of systems of higher education it still remains to be seen what "university autonomy" really means and what measurement procedures would allow systematic comparative studies of university organisation in various countries. There is something vague about statements to the effect that the autonomy of the university system in country C₁ has decreased or that the system in country C₂ has more autonomy than the one in C₁. Moreover, since there are practically no theories of university autonomy available there is as yet little understanding of the great differences in autonomy between various systems. While university autonomy has been a prominent feature of Anglo-Saxon systems, continental university systems like the German and the Swedish ones have witnessed virtually no autonomy. How come? If autonomy is so valuable, what substitutes are there for systems with little autonomy?

I intend to put forward a tentative analysis of the concept of university autonomy and I will outline some steps towards a theory of university autonomy. My approach is comparative and my analysis is aimed at an understanding of the fundamental difference between the Anglo-Saxon and the German-Swedish type, between an independent system and a dependent system or in the terminology of the analysis, the autonomy-oriented system and the heteronomy-oriented system.