



Carnegie Results

SPRING 2009

Carnegie Results is a quarterly newsletter published by Carnegie Corporation of New York. It highlights Corporation-supported organizations and projects that have produced reports, results or information of special note.

Research, Scholarship and Collaboration:

Legacies of Carnegie Corporation of New York's Higher Education in the Former Soviet Union (HEFSU) Initiative, 1998–2008

Carnegie Corporation of New York has for many decades been one of the most prominent supporters of U.S. scholars and university research centers engaged in the study of the former U.S.S.R. The Corporation also sponsored major international programs focused on improving U.S.-Soviet relations and promoting cooperation in areas such as arms control and nuclear non-proliferation. Building on these earlier efforts, the Corporation then began, in the late 1990s, to add an ambitious new dimension to its involvement in the countries of the former Soviet Union, as it sought to engage more directly in the transformation of post-Soviet higher education. When Vartan Gregorian became president of the Corporation in 1997, his interest in supporting the continued intellectual vitality and civic engagement of the beleaguered intelligentsia in Russia and Eurasia then became even more urgent as a result of the Russian financial crisis of 1998. The Corporation grant programs that emerged,

known collectively as the Higher Education in the Former Soviet Union (HEFSU) initiative, began in 1998-1999 and are projected to scale down by 2010, with total grant funding over the course of the initiative at nearly \$50 million. Taken as a whole, and especially when considered together with coordinated and often co-funded efforts by major partners such as the John D. and Catherine T. MacArthur Foundation and the Russian Ministry of Education and Science, Carnegie Corporation's HEFSU initiative represents one of the largest and potentially most influential international higher education partnership programs of our time.

The various components of the HEFSU initiative sought to integrate research and education, foster international collaboration, sponsor high-quality scholarly publications, improve university management, and spread innovative research methodologies. From a larger perspective, HEFSU was inspired and shaped by an overarching vision of helping to strengthen academic communities and professional networks.¹ HEFSU also sought to build on those scholarly networks to contribute to the transformation of Soviet-era higher education institutions into modern and more comprehensive research universities, and to improve those institutions' ability to contribute to the tasks of economic development, political and legal reform, and the formation of post-Soviet civil society.

In fact, the Soviet era left behind complex and ambiguous legacies, both of remarkable achievements in science and research, and of institutional obsolescence and intellectual isolation. Higher education institutions and universities in the U.S.S.R. (until the Soviet Union's collapse in 1991) were tightly connected to the planned economy, tended to be narrowly specialized, and were

often only loosely connected to the research institutes of the Soviet Academy of Sciences. In other words, the Soviet system was built for rapid growth and the "production" of large numbers of narrowly trained specialists, but it was built in ways that ultimately constrained institutional adaptability, educational quality, and intellectual creativity. The entire system of post-Soviet higher education and research then went into profound crisis during the economic and budgetary upheavals of the 1990s. These wrenching systemic crises posed two very stark threats. First, that the post-Soviet higher education systems (now struggling to reorganize themselves as newly national systems in each of the fifteen Soviet successor states) might effectively collapse, undermining the prospects for economic liberalization and political democratization; and second, that the research systems would disintegrate, with Soviet weapons scientists and military technologies flowing uncontrollably around the world.

To summarize the findings of this issue of *Carnegie Results*, there is persuasive evidence that almost all the major components of HEFSU have been effective, and, in some cases, quite influential in the transformation of higher education in the region, perhaps especially in Russia, though often, necessarily, in coordination with other partners. In some instances, HEFSU-sponsored innovations have been taken up and incorporated into official educational policy and into institutional practice. Along with the recovery of state funding in the more prosperous nations in the region such as Russia, these programs have clearly contributed to the increasingly successful transformation and accelerating internationalization of post-Soviet higher education, a remarkable turn of events in light of the crises and institutional degradation that gripped many of those same universities throughout the 1990s.

¹For a summary of HEFSU, see also "Strengthening Scholarship and Research in the Former Soviet Union," Carnegie Review (New York: Carnegie Corporation of New York, 2008).

The Evolving Policy Environment in Russian and Eurasian Higher Education

Beyond the specific principles and practices of HEFSU, a key larger issue is the tension between the intertwined processes of globalization and internationalization in higher education. The globalization of higher education encompasses all of the complex and often contradictory transnational forces that are influencing higher education systems from the outside, such as increased academic mobility and the emergence of a global “market” for faculty and research talent, growing student exchange programs, the rise of cross-border and for-profit providers, the emergence of global university ranking systems, and the impact of new information technologies. The internationalization of higher education encompasses efforts to foster the professional capacities and institutional strategies inside universities to respond to those global opportunities and challenges.

In a very real sense, HEFSU and other similar international assistance programs have essentially sought to build capacity within leading Russian and Eurasian universities to better adjust to the new demands of globalization, while strengthening the capacity of scholarly communities and regional universities to embrace institutional and intellectual internationalization in sustainable and, ideally, mutually beneficial ways.

The policy environment in Russian and Eurasian higher education in the 1990s was chaotic, with ad-hoc attempts to respond to the region’s sudden exposure to the full force of globalization, and often equally ad-hoc attempts to internationalize both older state universities and new private (and sometimes rapaciously for-profit) institutions. The new national higher education systems that emerged after 1991 were beset by an abrupt decline in financial support from state and region-

al authorities, by policy incoherence and lack of administrative capacity, and were also undermined by widespread brain drain out of academia and out of the region. In other words, HEFSU and its companion programs emerged at a critical time, when the policy “experiments” of the 1990s with unfunded decentralization and unregulated privatization were exhausting themselves, and national governments were moving to reinvigorate leading state universities and to create (or to recreate) national innovation systems. While embracing different approaches regarding issues such as governance and university autonomy, leading nations in the region such as Russia, Kazakhstan, Georgia, and Ukraine began to explore more systematic policies to foster the successful internationalization of their higher education systems.

HEFSU’s Origins and Operating Principles

Guided by Carnegie Corporation President Vartan Gregorian and shaped especially by Deana Arsenian (now Vice President, International Program and Program Director, Higher Education in Eurasia at the Corporation), as well as by a wide array of scholarly experts and partners with experience in international education, HEFSU began with a series of planning seminars in 1998 and 1999, and then took on an increased sense of urgency in the aftermath of the financial crisis of 1998 that threatened to further destabilize Russia and the wider region. Initial steps were informed by a landmark needs assessment that was conducted in 1998-1999 by Blair Ruble, Nancy Popson and Susan Bronson of the Kennan Institute in Washington, DC.² The Kennan report focused

²Blair Ruble, Nancy Popson and Susan Bronson, *The Humanities and Social Sciences in the Former Soviet Union: An Assessment of Need* (Washington, DC: Kennan Institute of the Woodrow Wilson International Center for

especially on the weak “middle ground” of scholarly networks and academic communities (in other words, the neglected terrain in-between individual grants and exchange programs, and higher-level and more ambitious programs aimed at whole institutions and system-wide reform). The Kennan report also highlighted the acute needs in neglected areas of the humanities and social sciences, in light of the fact that the vast majority of international assistance funds were flowing to new academic programs and professional training in fields such as economics, business, management, and law.

A guiding principle for HEFSU was that scholarly research and education in the arts, humanities and social sciences were not luxuries in difficult times, but were vitally necessary for the emerging nations as they articulated new civic and cultural identities, and as they sought to navigate exceptionally difficult economic and political transitions. Subsequent adjustments to the proposals laid out in the Kennan report were then made by Carnegie Corporation leaders and staff during the implementation of HEFSU in order to emphasize creating innovative “centers of excellence,” strengthening scholarly communities and professional networks in Russia, Belarus, Ukraine, Moldova, Armenia, Azerbaijan, and Georgia; and with a special emphasis on building capacity at leading regional universities in Russia.

Reinventing Social Science Research and Education in the Russian Federation

The CASE (Centers for Advanced Study and Education) program in Russia has been the flagship effort of HEFSU since 2000, and has grown to encompass nine leading state universities in

Scholars, 1999), which was commissioned by Carnegie Corporation together with the MacArthur Foundation.

all major regions of Russia (<http://www.iriss.ru> and <http://www.ino-center.ru>).³ A comprehensive evaluation of the CASE program was conducted by the author in 2006-2007, and concluded that the program has been quite successful, even if, inevitably, some CASE “centers for excellence” have been more productive and dynamic than others.⁴ Since 2000 the scholarly networks clustered around the CASE centers have sponsored hundreds of academic publications under the editorial supervision of INO Center, have worked to encourage interdisciplinary research methods and a greater awareness of international theories and academic standards, and have worked to revitalize regional studies and rebuild faculty capacity in the nine CASE host universities.

The accomplishments of the CASE centers and CASE-supported scholars have arguably been most significant in several domains: publishing high-quality academic research in diverse disciplines; linking innovation in the social sciences more directly to university-wide strategies for

³The CASE program is operated in Russia by the Information-Scholarship-Education Center or INO Center in cooperation with the Kennan Institute in Washington, DC, and has received grant funding of nearly \$16,000,000 through 2010. Carnegie Corporation has been the primary donor for the CASE program, with additional support from the MacArthur Foundation and the Russian Ministry of Education and Science. The network includes the Baltic CASE at Immanuel Kant Russian National University in Kaliningrad, Novgorod State University, Voronezh State University, Southern Federal University in Rostov-on-Don, Saratov State University, the Urals CASE at Urals State University in Yekaterinburg, Tomsk State University, Irkutsk State University, and the Far Eastern CASE at Vladivostok State University. The Russian Ministry of Education and Science later created four more CASE centers that are entirely funded by the Ministry. In Russian, the CASE centers are known as Interregional Institutes for the Social Sciences (*Mezhhregional'nye instituty dlia obshchestvennykh nauk*, or MIONy), although some of those names and programmatic foci may change as the program shifts over to entirely Russian funding.

⁴Mark S. Johnson, *Building Capacity for Innovative Social Science Research and Education in Russian Regional Universities* (New York: evaluation commissioned by Carnegie Corporation of New York, 2007).

internationalization; helping to foster external partnerships with private businesses, government agencies and civil society organizations; and working to apply new research to innovative teaching, or, in Russian parlance, to “integrate” high-quality research and university-based education.

In the first domain, world-class scholarship on tolerance, human rights and political philosophy have been sponsored by the Urals CASE in Yekaterinburg under the leadership of Maxim Khomiakov and Valery Gudov, together with a wide array of colleagues from departments and research centers across Urals State University. Other projects from the Urals CASE have analyzed the integration of Russian universities into the European higher education area and quality assurance in Russian higher education, and have supported team-taught summer schools in comparative political science with U.S. and European colleagues. Young scholars and broad circles of students associated with the Saratov CASE have conducted in-depth studies of the “phenomenology of power” in modern Russian and Soviet history, have analyzed issues such as the culture of the Cold War period and trends in modern historiography, and have developed an array of innovative projects in applied sociology involving community-based learning.⁵ Almost all of the CASE centers sought to balance their embrace of international research standards with detailed analyses of their surrounding regions, as for example in the Baltic CASE, led by scholars including Andrei Klemeshev, Valentin Korneveets, and Gennadii

⁵Unfortunately, the Saratov CASE became entangled after 2006 in a vituperative power struggle between new university leaders and a cadre of younger scholars and students associated with CASE Director Velikhan Mirzekhanov, which could be said to illustrate that such sweeping changes in the generational balance of power do not always come easily to inherently conservative institutions such as universities.

Feodorov. Major projects included research on the regional economy of the Kaliningrad exclave, migration patterns and labor market issues, and on the history and philosophy of the region (back to the time of Immanuel Kant and the Prussian Albertina University). In fact, the accomplishments of the Baltic CASE helped Klemeshev to become the Rector of Kaliningrad State University, and contributed directly to an increasingly rich network of collaborative research projects and exchanges with neighboring European universities.

In the second domain of accomplishments, many of the strongest CASE centers have come to play an important role in the articulation of university-wide strategies for institutional internationalization. Young scholars affiliated with the Rostov CASE have developed international collaborations in fields such as history, political science and philosophy, focused on the theme of the modernization of Russian society; and the CASE center itself has become central to strategic planning as Rostov State University has been transformed into the core of a larger consolidated institution, Southern Federal University. In Voronezh, CASE Director Vladimir Titov became the Rector of Voronezh State University, CASE coordinator Yelena Ishchenko became Vice Rector, and the CASE became a hub for university-wide methodological training, instructional reform, and the development of regional partnerships. Finally, the Far Eastern CASE in Vladivostok has played a central role in articulating university-wide strategies for internationalization through its sponsorship of research projects on the Asia-Pacific region in areas such as comparative legal studies, economic relations, and security studies. The Far Eastern CASE also helped to incubate an exceptionally innovative project, led by the young historian Vladimir Sokolov, to create a “Humanities

Technology Park” that seeks to foster new media technologies in areas necessary for a “creative economy” such as school reform, tourism, museum studies, and arts management.

Several of the leading CASE centers have also distinguished themselves in the domain of building external or strategic partnerships for their host universities, or perhaps more accurately, in leading efforts to reinvent such partnerships amid the transformations of post-communist Russian society. The Urals CASE has collaborated with partners such as the Center for Modern Art in Yekaterinburg, migrants’ rights groups, and local schools; as well as fostered innovative research together with corporate partners on economic and infrastructural innovation in “old” or post-industrial regions such as the Urals. The Baltic CASE has collaborated with regional officials, Russian business leaders, and community organizations in its analyses of social and economic trends in Kaliningrad. Finally, the Rostov CASE has reached out to a wide array of government and university partners throughout southern Russia and the northern Caucasus in support of applied research and faculty development and is now poised to play a potentially leading role in the reform of university management throughout the Russian Federation.

Many of the CASE centers have also played a sustained role in the fourth domain, applying research to university education and instructional reform. For example, led by the CASE directors Sergei Devyatkin and Valentina Grokhotova, and supported by Rector Anatoly Gavrikov, the Novgorod CASE has fostered a rich array of new courses and instructional materials at Novgorod State University in areas including medieval and modern Russian history, philology and linguistics, foreign languages, comparative legal stud-

ies, archaeology, and historical preservation. The CASE at Irkutsk State University, now under the leadership of the young historians Dmitrii Kozlov and Liudmilla Igumnova, has sponsored research and innovative education on Siberian economic and social trends, the ethnography of indigenous societies, and the ethnic and religious dimensions of cultures in the Lake Baikal region. Finally, scholars affiliated with the CASE at Tomsk State University, led by Vasily Zinoviev and others, have worked to apply innovative research on Siberia and the “Eurasian frontier” to university courses in history, archaeology, ethnography, sociology, and international relations.

For all of these successes for the program as a whole, some of the CASE centers have undeniably struggled to achieve consistent quality standards in their research, or to sustain international partnerships. In a valuable lesson for university leaders and reform-minded faculty members around the world, the single most important issue in the relative intellectual vitality and institutional adaptability of each CASE seems to be the quality of leadership and the style of governance within and around each interdisciplinary center. Those CASE “centers for excellence” that have been the most dynamic, and that have established the faculty capacity and institutional presence for long-term sustainability, are those that have reached out to a wide array of departments, programs, and disciplines within their host universities; that have included broad circles of graduate students and young researchers in CASE-sponsored activities; that have worked to reach out to new external partners in business, government and civil society; and that have worked to coordinate CASE activities with university-wide strategies for internationalization.

The Belarus CASE and Innovation in Exile

The CASE in Belarus, which was designed to become a regional “center for excellence” that would also reach out to reform-minded scholars in Ukraine and Moldova, was founded in 2003 in partnership with the private European Humanities University (EHU, <http://en.ehu.lt/>), an innovative private institution that offered greater academic freedom than its counterparts in the state sector.⁶ Despite the difficulties that have afflicted the post-Soviet intelligentsia in Belarus, scholars supported by the Belarus CASE have worked to explore the “social transformations in the border regions” of western Eurasia. An informal network of scholars from across the region have worked together to publish academic monographs and innovative serials such as *Perekrestki* (Crossroads), with special attention to long-neglected (or proscribed) themes and new methodologies in religious studies, folklore, philosophy, history, and cultural studies. The Belarus CASE has offered research and travel support to more than a hundred scholars, including Tatsiana Paulova, to study comparative national identities; Elena Matusevich, to develop university curricula in border studies; and Ala Svet of the Free International University of Moldova, to analyze the role of the Russian minority in Moldova. While often rigorous in their methodologies and linked to the reform of research and education in numerous regional higher educational institutions, many of the inno-

⁶The Belarus CASE has received funding of approximately \$1,600,000 from Carnegie Corporation, and has been operated with the American Councils for International Education (ACIE) in Washington, DC. The main EHU campus in Minsk was closed by the Lukashenko regime in 2004 for political reasons (and perhaps also because EHU threatened to compete with the state monopoly in higher education), and was compelled to move to neighboring Lithuania and operate as a “Belarusian university in exile.” Ultimately, the Belarus CASE was also forced to move to Vilnius in 2007 in the face of continued political pressure.

variations sponsored by the Belarus CASE necessarily remain tenuous, operating across the border in neighboring Lithuania, and yet could prove to be vitally important if able to return home to Belarus and flourish in a post-Lukashenko⁷ era.

Building Capacity for Policy-Relevant Research in the Southern Caucasus

The third dimension of the network of “centers of excellence” was developed as three CASE-like centers in the southern Caucasus, coordinated as the Caucasus Research Resource Center (CRRC) program, with its central office in Tbilisi.⁸ Under the leadership of regional director Hans Gutbrod, Armenian country director Heghine Manasyan; Georgian country directors Levan Tarkhnishvili and now Koba Turmanidze; and Azerbaijani country directors Latif Kengerlinski, Anar Ahmadov, Leyla Karimli, and now Bayaz Zeynalova, the network of CRRC centers has sponsored workshops, conferences and seminars in social science research methods as well as on policy-relevant topics in fields such as sociology, legal studies, economics, demography, political science, public policy, and environmental studies. The CRRC centers also offer trainings in quantitative research methods and statistical analysis, and supervise a large-scale Data Initiative survey project to collect household and other data on issues such as poverty, employment, education, migration, and crime across the Caucasus region. CRRC has also offered research support to nearly a hundred promising young scholars through its fellows program.

⁷Alexander Lukashenko became president of Belarus in 1994.

⁸Planning for the CRRC program began in 2001, and has been supported since 2003 by Carnegie Corporation with grants of more than \$7,350,000, and has been operated by the Eurasia Foundation in Washington, DC (now through the Eurasia Partnership Foundation in Tbilisi, <http://www.crrccenters.org/>).

The primary differences between the Russian and Belarusian CASE programs and CRRC are that the latter centers tend to operate more independently, and to focus more on methodologically rigorous yet applied or policy-relevant research. Thus the CRRC center in Armenia is located at Yerevan State University but operates with a wide array of partners in higher education, government and the business community; the center in Georgia is now housed at the International School of Economics (ISET) of Tbilisi State University, but similarly collaborates with a very wide array of non-academic partners, foreign governments, and international organizations; and the CRRC center in Azerbaijan still operates independently but is exploring possible long-term affiliation with the private Khazar University. If the accomplishments of CRRC can be successfully institutionalized, the program will have helped to cultivate the “market” for policy-relevant social science research in the public and private sector across the region, and will have helped to train a new generation of researchers in international methodologies and publication standards.

Revitalizing Scholarly Communities and Cross-Cultural Dialogue in the Humanities

While the operators of the CASE program in Russia labored over the years to forge enduring partnerships with regional state universities and ministerial officials, and the operators of the CRRC program in the Caucasus worked to establish more flexible and autonomous research centers loosely affiliated with leading regional universities, the operators of the Carnegie Corporation-funded Humanities Program in Belarus, Russia and Ukraine worked directly in the scholarly “middle ground” to create a dynamic and delib-

erately informal network of scholars and students in the arts and humanities.⁹ The humanities program has been guided since 1999 by leading scholars from the United States and Canada, as well as by experts from throughout the region such as Alexander Kamenskii (Russian State Humanities University), Boris Norman (Belarusian State University), Elena Gapova and Tatiana Schytsova (European Humanities University), Ljubov Kisseljova (Tartu University), Volodymyr Kravchenko (Kharkiv National University), Nikolai Vakhtin (European University at St. Petersburg), and many others.

The Carnegie Corporation-funded humanities program has clearly succeeded in building rich scholarly networks between leading state and private institutions, as well as in sponsoring high-quality research and academic publications in fields such as history, art history, religious studies, philology, cultural studies, literature, philosophy, archaeology, and anthropology. For example, Borys Gudziak, Oleh Turii and other faculty leaders at the Ukrainian Catholic University in L'viv have conducted cutting-edge research in oral history and religious studies, as they have sought to adapt elements of American-style liberal education. Leonid Finberg has received Corporation grants to revive Jewish studies in Ukraine through the Institute of Judaica and the University of Kyiv-Mohyla Academy (UKMA); pioneering work in Belarusian language and history has been conducted by Ales Ancipienka, Ihar Babkou, Henadz Sahanovich, and others; and efforts have been made across the network to translate this new scholarship into innovative approaches to teaching

⁹*The Humanities Program, operated by the American Council of Learned Societies (ACLS) in New York (<http://www.acls.org/grants/Default.aspx?id=544>), and led especially by Andrzej Tymowski and Olga Bukhina at ACLS, has received \$5,065,000 in Carnegie Corporation grant support.*

and graduate training in the humanities. There is some danger that the more informal or network approach of the Corporation-funded humanities program might prove fragile or unsustainable, although Carnegie Corporation and ACLS are now sponsoring ambitious efforts to institutionalize the program through an innovative new professional association, the International Association of Humanities Scholars (MAG, Mezhdunarodnaia assotsiatsiia gumanitarev), based at Kharkiv National University in eastern Ukraine.

Integrating Research and Education in the Natural and Physical Sciences

In a precursor to the CASE “centers for excellence” in the humanities and social sciences, the Basic Research and Higher Education (BRHE) program began in 1998 as an initiative of leading Russian and American scholars brought together by the John D. and Catherine T. MacArthur Foundation and the Russian Ministry of Education and Science, an effort that was later joined by Carnegie Corporation as part of HEFSU.¹⁰ BRHE and CASE both operated on the vitally important principle of co-funding and coordinated management with the Russian Ministry of Education, and both CASE and BRHE have arguably proven to be influential in policymaking. The core of the BRHE program has been a network of twenty interdisciplinary Research and Education (REC) centers in Russian state universities.¹¹ The REC

¹⁰BRHE has received approximately \$5,000,000 from Carnegie Corporation, and has been operated since 1998 by the Civilian Research and Development Foundation in Arlington, Virginia and Moscow (<http://www.crdf.org> and <http://www.crdf.ru>). The MacArthur Foundation and the Russian government were primary funders.

¹¹For a detailed summary and analysis of BRHE, see Peter Idenburg, Manfred Spiesberger, Ivan Bortnik, Anne Harrington, Mark Johnson, and Klaus Schuch, *Inte-*

centers have worked to improve the integration of research and university education in fields such as physics, chemistry, marine biology, nanotechnology, ecological studies, mathematics, materials science, molecular biology and biophysics, and geology and earth science.

The REC centers have made a special effort to support and retain young scientists in university research careers, and thereby to help rebuild Russia's capacity for scientific and technological innovation. For example, at Kazan State University in the Volga region, renowned chemists Vladimir Skirda and Igor Antipin are exploring new pharmaceutical technologies together with teams of undergraduates and graduate students; Alexander Fishman and Andrei Skvortsov have used BRHE support to develop innovative media for secondary and university-level science education; and the Kazan REC has led university efforts to commercialize research and to partner with innovative venture capitalists in Tatarstan. At Novosibirsk State University, intensive efforts are underway to integrate university research with the advanced institutes of the Russian Academy of Sciences; scholars such as Vladimir Boldyrev, together with younger faculty and students, are leading efforts to reconfigure molecular biology and chemistry for the production of ecologically safe industrial materials; and young scholars such as Andrey Arzhannikov are adapting new media technologies for the reform of science education. In fact, BRHE has been so successful that the Russian government has now created fifteen new REC centers that are entirely funded by Russian state agencies and their host universities.

gration of Teaching and Scientific Research in Russia: An Independent Evaluation of the Basic Research and Higher Education Program, 1998-2007 (Arlington, VA: evaluation commissioned by the Civilian Research and Development Foundation, 2008).

Building Sustainable Capacity for Faculty Development and University Reform

HEFSU has also encompassed a wide array of other Carnegie Corporation grant programs, all of which were designed to support individual scholars, research teams, and universities as they worked to improve faculty development and university management. Perhaps most notably, the Carnegie Research Fellows Program (CRFP) has operated since 2001 as an international exchange program, and has become a sophisticated and sustained effort to build linkages between the various component programs of HEFSU.¹² Another major component of HEFSU, the University Administration Support Program (UASP), tended to operate more autonomously and was only loosely linked to the CASE network or other Corporation-funded programs.¹³ UASP began in Russia and expanded in 2008 to encompass Armenia, Georgia, Ukraine, Kyrgyzstan, and Kazakhstan. UASP has supported efforts to build alumni networks, to improve strategic planning, to improve assessment and quality assurance techniques, to improve research management capacity, and to improve the management of international programs. Significantly, many leading Russian scholars associated with UASP now argue that they no longer

¹²Operated by the National Council for Eurasian and East European Research (NCEEER), CRFP has received \$2,380,000 in Carnegie Corporation grants to provide semester-long research fellowships for study at leading U.S. universities, with a special focus on assisting young scholars affiliated with CASE and CRRC centers and their host universities (<http://www.nceer.org/Programs/Carnegie/carnegie.php>). In its current phase, CRFP is working to build linkages between the CASE centers, CRRC centers, and the Humanities Program.

¹³UASP has been operated since 2001 by the International Research and Exchanges Board (IREX), and has received \$2,803,000 from Carnegie Corporation (<http://www.irex.org/programs/uasp/index.asp>).

need direct grant support, but still desperately need access to U.S. and international expertise in university reform.

Finally, the HEFSU initiative also encompassed an array of complementary grant programs that have supported scholarly research and faculty development.¹⁴ For example, faculty members from CASE universities in Russia were offered grants-in-residence at the Smolny Collegium, an interdisciplinary institute for advanced studies affiliated with the Smolny Institute for the Liberal Arts and Sciences at St. Petersburg State University (http://www.smolny.nw.ru/smolny_collegium), in cooperation with Bard College. CASE scholars have also received grants to study in residence at the University of California Berkeley, to work with leading U.S. academic experts on themes such as human rights, border studies, national identities and nationalism, and globalization.

While the HEFSU initiative focused overwhelmingly on collaboration with state universities, there were also some peripheral grant programs that sought to foster linkages between scholars in state institutions and researchers in new universities. For example, faculty members from an innovative private institution, the European University of St. Petersburg (EUSP), were supported in joint research and publication projects in political science and sociology with colleagues from Georgetown University on themes such as regional identities, electoral processes, and public health. Innovative summer schools in history, sociology and international relations that brought together junior faculty from the U.S. and Russia were funded through a partnership between Temple University and the State University of

¹⁴These programs, which have received Corporation grant support of approximately \$9,000,000, have been operated by an array of leading U.S. institutions such as Stanford University, the New School, and others.

the Humanities (GUGN) in Moscow. Finally, in one of the most ambitious and innovative of these peripheral components, graduate students and junior faculty who were trained at EUSP in history and political science, and exposed to cutting-edge international methodologies, were then subsidized in entry-level teaching positions at state universities in northwestern Russia (especially in Cherepovets and Petrozavodsk), under the auspices and active mentoring of University of Michigan faculty members.

Conclusions: An Historic Gamble and Some Enduring Legacies

In a very real sense, the overall design of the HEFSU initiative was an historic gamble, guided by the conviction that long-term partnerships with state universities in the region would be viable and could help to push those institutions toward systemic reform; and that co-funding agreements and sustained cooperation with ministerial policymakers would be sustainable, and could help to foster practices such as open competition for subgrants and peer review. From another perspective, HEFSU and its partner programs were never intended to be more than bridges (if ideally influential ones) until the restoration of state funding, or the emergence of private philanthropy in the region. There were, entirely predictably, setbacks and some components of HEFSU that were clearly less successful than others for internal reasons (in the design or implementation of the program) as well as for external or unpredictable reasons (as in the Belarus CASE).

It should of course be acknowledged that the successes of HEFSU and major international programs such as BRHE unfolded at the same time that increasingly powerful domestic inter-

est groups such as university leaders and major employers in Russia and other parts of Eurasia were advocating for increased state funding and more innovative reforms in higher education. It should also be acknowledged that HEFSU unfolded alongside, and at times in close partnership with, other major international grant programs by organizations such as the MacArthur Foundation, the Ford Foundation, and the Open Society Institute. Finally, the increasingly receptive policy environment in the region after 2000 was also conditioned by large-scale bilateral assistance programs in the 1990s (most notably from the United States, the European Union, Japan, and Turkey) and by major investments from multilateral agencies such as the World Bank. Thus, while the systemic reform of Russian and Eurasian higher education and research capacity is still very much a work in progress, one can offer a preliminary summary and analysis as the various components of HEFSU begin to wind down.

A central goal of the HEFSU initiative was to support research and scholarship across the region as individual scholars struggled to sustain and develop their careers as academics and engaged members of the intelligentsia. Quite literally thousands of both established and younger scholars have benefited from HEFSU grant programs, a wide array of innovative scholarship and educational materials have appeared, and up-and-coming young scholars (and potential future leaders in their disciplines and universities) have been encouraged to stay in academic careers. However, it must also be admitted that there remain persistent difficulties in assessing the relative or enduring quality of much of this research, and in analyzing academic career patterns in depth and detail across the region. Perhaps most ominously, it is difficult to say how sustainable

these revitalized scholarly communities might be in the face of renewed economic turmoil or intensified political repression in the region (or, perhaps more realistically, amid the self-censorship that often accompanies such economic and political crises).

A second major goal of HEFSU was to build enduring relationships with federal policymakers and ministerial officials, and/or with leaders of influential higher education institutions throughout the region. As noted, this was intended to foster joint governance, co-funding, and local legitimacy for the international programs, all with an eye to long-term sustainability and encouraging powerful local patrons to sustain at least some of the programs after the end of grant support from Carnegie Corporation and other Western donors. The most vivid evidence for the success of this approach can be seen in the adoption by the Russian Ministry of Education and Science of the REC and CASE model (as *Nauchno-obrazovatel'nye tsenry*, or NOTsy) in a growing number of leading Russian state universities as the new paradigm for interdisciplinary research and education centers. Further evidence of this success can be seen in the fact that many of the CASE and BRHE host universities were successful in the recent Russian federal competition for major (\$20-30 million each) “innovative university” grants, which were awarded in two rounds to 56 leading institutions, with their applications in many cases built directly upon innovations in research and education that were sponsored by BRHE and/or CASE.

A third major goal of HEFSU was to help foster new professional and disciplinary networks, to strengthen the “middle ground” of scholarly communities. Yet again, there is clear evidence of

success in this regard, most notably in the recent establishment of the International Association of Humanities Scholars or MAG, and its network of consultants and grant recipients in various humanities disciplines. Some inter-regional scholarly networks have also been built through the CASE “network projects,” as well as through the annual BRHE Pan-REC conferences and summer language camps for junior faculty. However, it must also be admitted that the development of robust scholarly networks and associational ties has been hindered by the undeniable tendency of some institutions to hoard resources and international contacts, and an undeniable tendency for exclusive and sometimes opaque patron-client networks to form around international grant funding.

A fourth major goal of the HEFSU initiative was to contribute to the “integration” of research and teaching, and to help overcome the long-standing barriers between the teaching mission of Soviet-era universities and the research mission of the institutes of the Soviet Academy of Sciences. Efforts had been made to overcome this structural gap as early as the 1950s, and attempts were made again throughout the 1980s and 1990s. Unfortunately, efforts to foster the integration of research and education have often been hindered by powerful institutional interests and by the residual power of the Russian Academy and its scholarly elites, who were able to defend their relative institutional autonomy even as funding plunged.¹⁵ Overcoming this barrier has now become a major goal of Russian higher education policy, and the CASE and BRHE programs have clearly contributed to these developments, as demonstrated by the adoption of new degree programs based on

¹⁵For a vivid and thorough account of many of these issues, see also Loren Graham and Irina Dezhina, *Science in the New Russia: Crisis, Aid, Reform* (Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press, 2008).

innovations fostered at the centers, and by the many collaborative research and teaching projects involving Academy of Sciences research institutes and departments at leading state universities, which were designed in part specifically to draw talented young researchers into careers as faculty members. However, it must also be admitted that both the depth of this integration and the quality of research and education throughout the region remain uneven and in many ways unconsolidated, and that even the best Russian and Eurasian universities have been very slow to embrace emerging global reform movements such as the “scholarship of teaching and learning,” or innovative new approaches to the assessment of faculty teaching and student learning.

A fifth major goal of the HEFSU initiative was, once the centers for excellence were established, to then leverage those hubs to help reform larger systems of university management and to influence larger processes of institutional development, especially in areas such as faculty development, research management, and international programs. Reforming university management remains an acute problem in almost all Russian and Eurasian universities, and has now emerged as a top priority for state policy as well. There is some evidence that these efforts have been successful around the best CASE and REC centers, as some CASE leaders ascended to lead their universities, as in Kaliningrad and Voronezh, and as CASE centers in Rostov, Yekaterinburg, and Vladivostok have become increasingly central to university-wide strategies for internationalization. Innovations in university management and projects in areas such as student services, assessment, and leadership development have emerged out of UASP and its incipient executive networks, although that program by design was only loosely connected to

the core components of HEFSU. Finally, it must also be acknowledged that the impact of some other HEFSU programs, such as the humanities program, CRFP, or CRRC on larger patterns of university reform remain unclear, perhaps precisely because of those programs’ focus on more informal scholarly networks and individual research exchanges, or because of enduring divisions (and rivalries) between state and private universities.

It was recognized that a sixth major goal of the HEFSU initiative would only become possible once the centers for excellence were established, had functioned more-or-less successfully for a number of years, and in turn had begun to influence the larger dynamics of university management. This was the longer-term goal of making at least some of the centers sustainable, and equipping them to reach out to powerful patrons within the university as well as in the surrounding business and political communities.

In fact, there is clear evidence that this has begun to happen in some regions, as the Urals, Baltic, Rostov, and other CASE centers conduct contract research for local governments and industries; or as various CASE centers offer trainings for faculty from other higher education institutions in their regions; or as various REC centers establish contacts and contracts with Russian and international businesses for research and technology transfer. Another landmark was recently passed when the Russian Ministry of Education and Science committed nearly \$1 billion to sustain and expand the network of REC centers that emerged out of the BRHE program; the Ministry has also expanded its support for the CASE network and added four new CASE-like centers that are fully funded by the Russian government. In fact, in late 2008 a grant competition was launched by the Russian

Ministry of Education and Science to potentially increase CASE funding, and possibly to select the strongest CASE centers to become enduring regional hubs for interdisciplinary research and faculty development.

However, it must be also be admitted that sustainability remains a challenge not only for the REC and CASE centers, but for almost all Russian and Eurasian universities, to shift from having strategic planning and external partnerships dictated to them by the state (in the context of the Soviet planned economy), to having to learn since 1991 how to dynamically and creatively develop and sustain such external partnerships. It also seems quite clear that some HEFSU components will simply end when Carnegie Corporation grant funding ends, and the long-term financial sustainability of the ACLS-sponsored MAG professional association also remains unclear. Finally, the ultimate sustainability of the CRRC centers also remains highly provisional, although they have worked in recent years to find new potential partners and donors for their policy-relevant research projects in both the private and non-profit sector.

Finally, there was yet another goal of the HEFSU initiative, and this may be the most urgently needed issue, and yet one that also remains perhaps the most problematic. A central goal was to leverage key HEFSU components to foster regional cooperation, to assist the nations of Russia and Eurasia as they struggled to work beyond the common legacies they inherited from Soviet higher education, as each nation worked to navigate the challenges of globalization and to embrace the opportunities of internationalization. This goal of regional cooperation was embedded within the larger goal of fostering robust international cooperation, although ironically that larger and

more ambitious dimension may well have been more successful than the more modest agenda of regional dialogue. In fact, these region-wide efforts may have been most successful when they took the form of low-level or informal scholarly networks (as with the ACLS-operated humanities program) or now increasingly in the inter-regional activities of the CRRC centers; and least successful when they tried to foster higher-level cooperation between the nations of the southern Caucasus and Russia, or between Ukraine and Russia, especially when such efforts became entangled with narrow institutional self-interests or a reluctance to share resources and international opportunities across borders.

In other words, if the overall goal of HEFSU was to act as a lifeline for individual scholars and a bridge for struggling universities until state funding recovered, then it has clearly been successful when taken as a whole, and when analyzed in conjunction with similar international programs. Admittedly, these successes may prove more enduring in more prosperous regions of Russia than in some of the other more disadvantaged states in the region, which continue to struggle to provide adequate funding for higher education or to implement coherent educational policies for sustainable internationalization. If another key goal of HEFSU was to help keep the “doors open” for intellectual exchange between scholars in the former Soviet Union and the wider world that has also clearly been successful, even if border conflicts and bilateral tensions now cloud those prospects. While Carnegie Corporation may be winding down its engagement in the region, it will leave behind some potentially transformative legacies and institutional structures, which local interest groups, other donors, and international partners

could—and perhaps should—continue to build upon into the future.

Potential Lessons of HEFSU for the Internationalization of Higher Education

Beyond its influence in the region, what might the lessons of HEFSU be for higher education leaders in the U.S. and Europe? Several potential lessons emerge. First, that it is vitally important to invest substantial resources in faculty members' skills and international experiences, as well as to build coherent institution-wide strategies for internationalization together with faculty and student partners. Second, HEFSU and its partner programs have helped to illuminate the fact that remarkable progress has been made in many universities in Russia and Eurasia since the 1990s, and that some of the leading regional universities are ready to enter into serious, sustained and mutually beneficial partnerships in research and education. These leading universities need no longer be the passive recipients of "technical assistance," or of major international philanthropy, or of often ill-adapted Western policy models. In fact, many of the leading universities in Russia and Eurasia now have substantial financial resources and real momentum behind their own reform initiatives. However, there is still enormous scope for the sharing of professional expertise in university leadership, as well as for mutually beneficial intellectual and institutional cooperation. Finally, a third lesson of HEFSU might be that leading policymakers across the region are now embracing and helping to propagate international standards and practices in faculty development, scholarly research, joint publications, joint or dual degree programs, and university management. In other words, the HEFSU initiative leaves behind vital legacies not

only in Russia and Eurasia, but potentially globally, in how faculty development programs and individual scholars' and students' international experiences can be "leveraged up" into larger processes of university reform and the systematic internationalization of higher education policy.

However, in light of the current tensions between Russia and other states in the region such as Georgia, as well as between the U.S. and Russia, leadership in this sphere arguably must now come from the profession itself, and it is the author's conviction that American, European and Russian university leaders especially must step up to explore potential cooperation with their colleagues across the deepening divide. One can hope that some U.S. and European university leaders and researchers will pursue such potential cooperation with the same energy that has been invested in cooperation with the Persian Gulf and East Asia, especially in light of Russia's reemerging scientific and technological potential, and of the enduring geo-strategic importance of Russia, the Caucasus, and Central Asia. Additionally, one can hope that U.S., European and Russian philanthropic and corporate leaders might similarly explore new collaborative strategies to sustain and consolidate the internationalization of Russian and Eurasian higher education, in order to keep the intellectual and professional doors open between the region and the world, as well as to contribute, as much as possible, to improved educational cooperation between Russia and its neighbors in Eastern Europe and Eurasia. In fact, just as during the Cold War, robust cooperation in higher education and research can offset and help to mitigate tensions and disagreements in other areas such as energy, trade, migration, and security. Thus, the ultimate legacies of Carnegie Corporation's HEFSU initiative may well unfold

Carnegie Results

Spring 2009

CARNEGIE CORPORATION OF NEW YORK
437 Madison Avenue
New York, New York 10022

Phone: (212) 371-3200
Fax: (212) 754-4073
Web site: www.carnegie.org

**Vice President, External Affairs
Director, Journalism Initiative, Special
Initiatives and Strategy:** Susan Robinson King
**Editor, Director, Publications
and Public Affairs:** Eleanor Lerman
Manager, Strategic Communications: George
Soule
Editor/Writer: Karen Theroux
Program Associate: Ambika Kapur
Communications Coordinator: Adrienne Faraci
Public Affairs Assistant: Patricia Pagnotta
Researcher: Ronald Sexton

Carnegie Corporation of New York is a philanthropic foundation created by Andrew Carnegie in 1911 to promote the advancement and diffusion of knowledge and understanding among the people of the United States. Subsequently, its charter was amended to permit the use of funds for the same purposes in certain countries that are or have been members of the British overseas Commonwealth.

Board of Trustees

Thomas H. Kean, Chairman
Richard W. Riley, Vice Chairman
Vartan Gregorian, *Ex officio*
Kofi Annan
Pedro Aspe
Richard H. Brodhead
Amy Gutmann
Susan Hockfield
Ana Palacio
Norman Pearlstine
Thomas R. Pickering
Janet L. Robinson
Kurt Schmoke

Helene L. Kaplan, *Honorary Trustee*
Warren Christopher, *Honorary Trustee*
Newton N. Minow, *Honorary Trustee*

not only within the leading universities of the region, but ideally in long-term improvements in inter-regional and international relations as well.

Written by: Mark S. Johnson. Johnson is visiting associate professor of history and education at Colorado College in Colorado Springs; his research interests focus on the history of education and post-Soviet education policy, as well as global trends in higher education development; and has been a member of the CASE International Program Board since 2003.



© 2008 Carnegie Corporation of New York. All rights in photographs, illustrations, artworks and other graphic materials are reserved to Carnegie Corporation of New York and/or the copyright holders (licensors).

CARNEGIE CORPORATION OF NEW YORK
437 Madison Avenue
New York, New York 10022



Non-profit Org.
US Postage
PAID
St. Louis, MO
Permit No. 1018