GENG Yiqun, John L. YEAGER

Professionalization and the Training of University Administrators in China: A Comparative Perspective

Abstract Compared to the training of higher education management professionals in the US, the training of their counterparts in China is relatively modest, with few programs offered at the graduate level. Further, few concrete solutions have been proposed for tackling the challenge of preparing managerial professionals for the sound development of higher educational institutions in China. Based on existing theories and practices associated with professionalization and findings from the literature and data collected from universities both in China and the US, this paper examines the training of higher education professionals from a comparative perspective in the two countries. With the intention of identifying the characteristics of “best practices” for the training and education of institutional executives, in an effort to provide possible suggestions for the future development of higher management training in China, the paper will discuss the topic from two perspectives: short-term in-service training programs and formal PhD and EdD programs.

Keywords professionalization, higher education management, training, administrators

Introduction

During recent decades, higher education worldwide has experienced phenomenal growth and change including new institutions, service populations, administrative organizations and delivery systems. Increasingly, nations and regions are recognizing that their very economic development and national survival is linked to strong educational systems. To that end, many countries have been actively increasing their investment in education. These investments

GENG Yiqun (✉)

Institute of Communication Studies, Communication University of China, Beijing 100024, China

E-mail: gengyiqun@126.com

John L. YEAGER

School of Education, University of Pittsburgh, Pittsburgh, PA 15260, USA

have not only focused on the construction of new facilities, delivery systems, and academic programming, but also on the professionalization of staff at all levels. These changes are evident not only in emerging and developing countries but also in developed countries.

Two examples of this growth, development and renewal of education systems, particularly higher education, are found in China and the US. In both countries, governmental leaders have recognized the national imperative of providing their societies with world class education so as to assure their countries' future economic and political status in the world community. While recognizing that both countries are at different stages in the development of their educational systems, it is nevertheless instructive to examine the educational issues each are contending with and their responses to these issues.

China is facing daunting challenges in terms of meeting the increased demands of a rapidly growing population at the higher education level. In response to these changes it has undertaken several initiatives, such as the creation of a number of high profile world class institutions categorized as "211" and "985" institutions. Although these institutions possess a very high level of excellence, because of the limited number of such institutions they can only accommodate a very low percentage of eligible students. While it is possible to invest in the brick and mortar aspect of university plant expansion, it is much more difficult to identify and prepare the essential human resources needed to operate these top institutions.

Quality educational programming requires a well-trained instructional staff that is cognizant of learning theory and its application, as well as subject matter competence supported by appropriate staff led by knowledgeable leaders. While considerable recognition has been given to the former through the offering of workshops and continuous training provided to institutional faculty, only modest attention has been given to pre-service and in-service needs when preparing Chinese institutional administrators. It could be helpful to undertake a comparative examination of the training of administrative professionals in China and the US from the point of view of professionalization with an intention to determine an appropriate future direction for the training of higher education administrators in China.

The Status of Professionalization of Executives in Higher Education Management in China and the US

Professionalization in other organizations and in higher education institutions has been examined by many scholars. According to Forsyth and Danisiewicz (1985), a profession is a fundamental social process embedded in the relationship between society and those who practice certain expert occupations. In this sense,

the concept of professionalization has been used to refer to the dynamic process whereby certain crucial characteristics of an occupation can be observed to change in the direction of a profession. The basic elements of professionalization have been described in terms of the following three categories: (1) acquisition of a specialized technique supported by a body of theory; (2) development of a career supported by an association of colleagues; and (3) establishment of community recognition of professional status (Farmer, 1970).

With the development of professionalization of executives in higher education management in colleges and universities, the training of professionalized personnel in higher education management becomes imperative. Yet, few concrete solutions have been proposed for tackling the challenge of preparing higher education management professionals for the development of higher education. According to Pausits and Pellert (2009), the endeavor towards professionalization must be considered from two perspectives: specialists arriving from outside must be provided with appropriate know-how about the functional logic and specific characteristics of the organization that makes up the “university” so that this change agent function can be perceived. Meanwhile, members of the traditional administration who are moving towards a stronger management orientation must be provided with the specific management know-how they need in order to bring their specialized knowledge to the organization. In this sense, both pre-service and in-service training are very important in training professionals in higher education management.

Universities in China are being granted increased autonomy, and at the same time, they are required to respond to social changes. Higher education institutions are beginning to adopt the idea of “managerialism,” and professional management personnel are in high demand in these institutions. The latent demand for professionalization exceeds supply by the government and the higher institutions themselves. According to a survey, 80% of the presidents hold doctoral degrees in American universities, and most of them hold EdD degrees, amounting to 43%. While, in China, according to a study made by Lan (2005), since the 1950s, among the 14 presidents of Peking University and Tsinghua University, there have been only six presidents with doctoral degrees (five of them with doctoral degrees in Science and Technology, and one in Economics). The present situation of Chinese administrators’ education reported in a survey of a university in Beijing shows that 4.2% of the staff hold doctoral degrees, 10.7% hold master degrees, 60.3% bachelor degree, and other levels of education account for 24.8%. This is in contrast to faculty members who hold: 15.5%, 53.4%, 30.6%, and 0.4% of these levels of education respectively (Zheng, 2005).

Typically, public university presidents and vice presidents are appointed by the government. These appointments in the past have usually been based upon political affiliation, previous contributions and experience, and educational

preparation. It is now imperative that these individuals possess a doctorate since this is a major advantage for individuals wishing to lead institutions of national importance. Similarly many of the senior staff of these institutions are expected to have a terminal degree in higher education management. In general, appointed higher education executives are expected to acquire new skills via OJT (on the job training). While it is recognized that administrators all over the world are often placed in positions that require them to learn how to succeed at a job through trial and error, this is not viewed as either effective or efficient, and it can be counter-productive.

Li, Liu and Zhao (2009) have pointed out that with the maturation of the professionalization of college or university administrators in countries such as the US and Japan, a complete professional system involving personnel recruitment, employment, and training has been developed in these countries. In view of the successful experiences of these countries, the author concludes that higher education institutions in China should follow a rational professional management model regarding college and university administrators in line with China's national conditions and the actual situation at Chinese colleges or universities, to promote the overall development of China's higher education. Farmer (1970) once conducted a survey of 93 higher adult education chief administrators in 1967, and attempted to identify the status of professionalization in higher adult education administration in the US with an intention to indicate that there should be further professionalization. He found that the administrators studied had a wide variety of training and professional experience before entering the occupation. Most were trained primarily in other fields and came into the occupation later in their careers. While this was the situation in the US nearly 50 years ago, it remains the case in China to this day. According to Farmer's three basic elements of professionalization, the professionalization of executives in higher education management in China is still progressing. There are professional education programs which grant masters and doctoral degrees in higher education management in China. Professional associations such as the Educational Administrative Branch of the Chinese Association of Education, the Chinese Association of Higher Education, and the Higher Education Administration Branch of the Chinese Association of Higher Education have been established in China to foster the professionalization of higher education management. Also there are a large number of publications and peer reviewed journals on higher education management. The profession has attracted recent public recognition, but the training capacity of the profession cannot yet fully meet the needs of the development of higher education institutions. Both degree and non-degree training are imperative to the professionalization of administrators.

China has a relatively long history with regard to the in-service training of

presidents and key administrators. This kind of training generally is short-term. The history of degree pre-service training is very limited, especially at the doctoral level. Based on a review of relevant literature, there are approximately 16 graduate programs in higher education at the doctoral level offered by Chinese institutions for developing leaders of Chinese institutions of higher education. Most advanced doctoral programs, including 15 Doctorate of Education Programs, would indicate recognition that there is a need to provide a more practical training for these leaders rather than simply PhD degrees designed for the preparation of academic scholars and researchers. Little information is available as to where graduates of these programs are employed upon graduation.

In contrast to the present situation in China, there are more than 80 American universities offering 500 higher education management courses, and among them, 50 institutions granting doctoral degrees in higher education management (Zhang, 2002). Furthermore, there are thousands of seminars and workshops to provide administrators with short term in-service training each year. While many of these programs offer management training in the general area of higher education institutional management, many restrict their specializations to student affairs or community college management. Both are areas of rapid institutional growth. By investigating the top 17 ranked graduate schools for programs in higher education administration by the U.S. News & World Report in 2012, and by using the websites of these universities, we can find that degree programs cover Masters of Arts in Higher Education Management, Masters of Education in Higher Education Management, Doctor of Philosophy in Higher Education Management, and Doctor of Education in Higher Education Management. In the top 17 universities, 14 universities have PhD programs in higher education administration and nine universities offered EdD programs (the 17 universities include University of Michigan, Michigan State University, University of California at Los Angeles, Pennsylvania State University, University of Georgia, Vanderbilt University, University of Southern California, Indiana University at Bloomington, University of Pennsylvania, Harvard University, University of Maryland, Stanford University, Columbia University, New York University, Ohio State University, University of Iowa, University of Arizona). In addition to these graduate programs, a number of institutions offer non-degree programs in these areas; other institutions offer non-degree programs in conjunction with professional masters degree programs such as management of non-profit institutions and public and international affairs. Major factors contributing to the growth of these program offerings are the increasing demand by employers that their institutional leaders possess the highest level of professional credentials. Almost 100% of the boards of major institutions require terminal degrees for advanced leadership positions.

The Present Status of Higher Education Professional Management Training in China

Degree Training of Higher Education Management Professionals in Universities

To meet the educational needs of its large population, the Chinese government has long been devoted to forming educators. There is currently a large education system in place to train future educators and provide in-service training to the educators. At the doctoral level, 919 graduate students received doctoral degrees in education in 2009, and 3,991 candidates were studying for a doctoral degree in education. PhD programs in Educational Economics and Management and PhD programs in Higher Education have been established to train researchers as well as practitioners in higher education. PhD programs in Educational Economics and Management were attributed to the discipline of Management in 1998 according to “Disciplines and Majors Directory of Granting Doctoral and Master Degrees and The Training of Graduate Students” issued in 1997 by the Academic Degree Committee of the State Council (1997). PhD programs in educational economics and management focus on the training of graduates in the disciplines of economics and management, paying little attention to training higher education professional managers. The first PhD programs in higher education were established in 1986, focusing on the training of professional researchers rather than professionals in higher education management. In 2006, there were 16 PhD degree granting units and 93 masters degree granting units in higher education in China. It was estimated that in 2006 there were more than 20,000 students studying for a masters or doctoral degree in higher education (Gao, 2007). In 2008, there were 16 universities that could grant PhD degrees in higher education. They were Peking University, Beijing Normal University, East China Normal University, Huazhong University of Science and Technology, Tsinghua University, East China Normal University, Nanjing University, Northwest Normal University, South China Normal University, Nanjing Normal University, Northeast China Normal University, Xiamen University, Hunan Normal University, Central China Normal University, Suzhou University, and Zhejiang University. These programs focus on the development of the academic quality and the skills of the doctoral candidates. Some of the graduates will go into offices of higher education administration but they have little knowledge of the operations of higher education institutions.

In China there is a tradition of emphasizing the training of researchers in doctoral programs in higher education as opposed to the training of practitioners. In 2002, at a symposium of higher education doctoral and masters degree granting units held in Hubei Province, scholars from the 34 higher institutions in China participating in the symposium emphasized the importance of research in

higher education degree programs. However an introduction to the practical orientation of the similar programs in the U.S. higher education institutions attracted the attention of the scholars at the conference. It started scholars thinking about the kind of graduates these programs should prepare to meet the needs of the development of higher education (Zhang, 2002). In September 2003, an “Advanced Education Management Doctoral Program” was established jointly by Peking University, the National Academy of Education Administration, and the University of Pennsylvania as a pilot program of the EdD. But few EdD candidates were successfully recruited to the program. In Peking University, only four candidates were recruited (Wen & Yan, 2004). Because there was no EdD degree in China at that time, the graduates of this program were granted PhD degrees. With the establishment of the EdD degree in China in 2008, the training of higher education management personnel in China began a new phase, which initiated fundamental structural changes in degree granting in higher education management at the doctoral level. In 2010, 15 universities began to recruit EdD candidates in China. The number of candidates recruited in each university was limited to 20 each year, and the actual number of candidates admitted to these

Table 1 Admission of EdD Candidates in the First 15 Pilot Universities in China in 2010

University	Duration of Study (in Years)	Number of Candidates Recruited
Peking University	4	25
Tsinghua University	4	20
Beijing Normal University	3–4	10–15
South China Normal University	4–8	6–8
Northeast Normal University	*	*
East China Normal University	3–4	*
Nanjing University	4	*
Nanjing Normal University	4	10
Zhejiang University	4	*
Xiamen University	4	8
Huazhong University of Science and Technology	*	15
Central China Normal University	*	10
Southeast University	*	20
Shanxi Normal University	At least 4 years	5
Northwest Normal University	4	*

Note. * Data is unavailable. Adapted from Zhou, X. F. (2010). 我国教育博士专业学位研究生招生工作的思考 [Discussion and analysis on EdD admission]. 清华大学教育研究 [Tsinghua Journal of Education], 31(2), p. 110.

universities was fewer than this quota. Comparing to more than 10,000 qualified possible candidates in different levels of the national education system, this total quota of 300 is very small (Zhou, 2010; see Table 1).

The first professional training programs in education at the masters level were established in 1996, and this type of program focused on the training of administrators and teachers in primary and secondary schools. Professional masters degrees in education were granted to graduates. By 2008, 30,000 graduates received their masters degrees in professional training in education. As to professional doctoral programs, it is really something new in China. It was from the year 2000 that several prestigious universities such as Peking University, Beijing Normal University, and Huazhong University of Science and Technology began to train advanced administrators in education management within traditional PhD doctoral programs. These carried out the first pilot work in formal doctoral training which granted doctoral degrees. In 2008, the Office of the State Council Academic Degrees Committee issued an official document entitled the “Notification Regarding the Development of the Doctor of Education Degree in Education Pilot Work.” The document emphasizes that 15 universities were allowed to admit candidates and grant doctoral degrees by establishing EdD programs. These programs focus on an applied management curriculum as opposed to a PhD which focuses on teaching and research, aiming at training research professionals.

By examining the universities that grant different degrees, it can be determined that 13 universities grant both PhD and EdD degrees in higher education (see Table 2). The differences between PhD and EdD degrees have been examined by several scholars. While it can be seen that the curricula in the 13 universities are similar for both degree programs, there is a difference in focus. There are some practically orientated curricula in EdD degree programs, yet the distinction is not very clear compared to the distinction between the two kinds of programs in the US (see Table 3 and Table 4). This provokes a discussion of the issue of quality in EdD programs.

Table 2 Universities Granting PhD and EdD Degrees in China in 2008

Universities that Grant PhD degrees	Universities that Grant EdD degrees
Peking University	Peking University
Tsinghua University	Tsinghua University
Beijing Normal University	Beijing Normal University
South China Normal University	South China Normal University
Northeast Normal University	Northeast Normal University

(To be continued)

(Continued)

Universities that Grant PhD degrees	Universities that Grant EdD degrees
East China Normal University	East China Normal University
Nanjing University	Nanjing University
Nanjing Normal University	Nanjing Normal University
Zhejiang University	Zhejiang University
Xiamen University	Xiamen University
Northwest Normal University	Northwest Normal University
Central China Normal University	Central China Normal University
Southeast University	Southeast University
Suzhou University	Shanxi Normal University
Hunan Normal University	Huazhong University of Science and Technology
Southwest University	

Note. Adaped from Zhou, X. F. (2010). 我国教育博士专业学位研究生招生工作的思考 [Discussion and analysis on EdD admission]. 清华大学教育研究 [Tsinghua Journal of Education], 31(2), p.110. Huang, G. R. (2011). 中国高等教育学位点发展的研究 [China's higher education degree development research]. (Unpublished masters thesis). 广西师范大学, 桂林, 中国 [Guangxi Normal University, Guilin, China], p. 52.

In order to illustrate the difference between the PhD and the EdD curriculum in China and the US, two university programs were examined: Peking University and the University of Pittsburgh. While there are many institutional comparisons that could be made in both countries, this illustration provides reasonable examples of the differences in the degrees (see Table 3 and Table 4).

Table 3 Comparison of PhD and EdD Programs at Peking University

	PhD Courses	EdD Courses
Training goal	Skills and competencies in academic research	Skills and competencies in both theory and practical experience
Duration of study	Full-time, 3–4 years	Full-time or part-time, at least 4 years
Credit requirement	Students with bachelors degree-at least 59 credits; Students with masters degrees-at least 34 credits	Masters degree is required-at least 30 credits
Course content	Public elective courses; Basic academic courses; Core courses; Elective courses; Research work, including dissertation	Required courses; Elective courses; Research work, including dissertation

Note. Adapted from Graduate School of Education, Peking University. (n.d.). Training scheme. Retrieved November 21, 2011, from <http://web5.pku.edu.cn/jyxy>

Table 4 Comparison of PhD and EdD at the University of Pittsburgh

	PhD Courses	EdD Courses
Training goal	Prepare creative and innovative professionals to assume leadership in inquiry about critical problems and questions in education	Provides both a theoretical and a practical orientation to the management of post-secondary educational organizations
Duration of study	Full-time, 3–4 years	Full-time or part-time study
Credit requirement	Masters degree required with a GPA of at least 3.5—at least 90 credits	Masters degree required with original score from GRE—90 credits
Course content	Department core; Program core; Research methodology; Supervised research; Supporting field; Dissertation	Department core; Program core; Specialization; Research Methodology; Supervised research; Dissertation

Note. Adapted from School of Education, University of Pittsburgh. (n.d.). Programs in the Department of Administrative and Policy Studies. Retrieved November 21, 2011, from <http://www.education.pitt.edu/>

Non-Degree In-Service Training of Administrators in Special Institutions and Selected Universities

For the preparation of senior administrators in higher education institutions, the Chinese government offers a number of specialized non-degree programs ranging from one-year training programs and short-term management seminars to programs lasting several weeks addressing management topics and an introduction of new policies and procedures. This kind of training is generally offered by special institutions or top level normal universities in China, as well as some comprehensive universities.

Special institutions, such as the National Academy of Education Administration, offer in-service training to administrators in higher institutions. Often, this kind of training is short term and offers no degrees. The National Academy of Education Administration was established in 1955 and began to offer training programs for administrators in education system. In 1960, the academy was closed down but it re-opened in 1980, and began to recruit trainees again in 1982. Up to 2007, the academy trained 14,690 administrators in higher educational institutions and offered nearly 500 courses (National Academy of Education Administration, 2007). The training courses focus on educational management, leadership, and other emerging educational topics. Sometimes the top level normal universities such as Beijing Normal University will also offer this kind of training, but generally such offerings are offered within schools of economics of education and management and no degrees are given. In addition, some comprehensive universities such as Peking University also offer short-term training in higher education management.

The Comparative Analysis of the Higher Education Management Professional Training in China and the US

Degree-Level Training in Higher Education Management in the Two Countries

The first PhD program of higher education was established at Xiamen University in 1986. It focused on higher education research, and the training centered on academic research skills and theory with little attention given to the practice of higher education management. The aim of this kind of program was to train professional researchers. While, in the US, PhD programs in higher education were begun before the year 1861 when Yale College granted three doctorate degrees. With the inception of the EdD degree in 1921, there has always been confusion between the EdD degrees and the PhD degrees in education in the US. Generally, the PhD is to focus on the training of researchers and academicians. There are comparatively fewer formal EdD programs in China to train higher education administrators.

China and the US followed similar pattern with the awarding of the PhD, reflecting the outgrowth of many institutions supported by various religious faiths in the U.S. The priority of these programs was to cultivate graduate students with proficiency in the practical work of higher education. Since then the EdD has grown in popularity and is currently recognized as a terminal degree for educational professionals. This degree is indicative of advanced training for professionals working in all educational sectors. After the first EdD program was established in Harvard, many universities followed. In May 1917, the first student to enroll in the new doctoral program named as Graduate in Education met all the requirements, becoming the first recipient of the degree in the University of California. And in 1921, the Doctor of Education title replaced the Graduate in Education title. The Annual Report of the President of the University of California contained a brief announcement regarding the change: "A professional doctor's degree has been established, a degree planned to serve as an intrinsically worthwhile objective for school men and women who are on the way to expert educational leadership" (Kyte, 1958). A study made by Hollis (1946) shows that the EdD degree is clearly preferred by the public-school administrators and supervisors who attended the University of Pittsburgh. The University found its satisfaction primarily in giving practitioners a professional degree suited to their occupational needs. In the past decades, professional staff members have increased tremendously in American higher education. Grassmuck (1990) indicates that nationwide between 1975 and 1985 alone, there was a 61% increase in the number of non-teaching, non-research college employees who have jobs that required college degrees. Between 1985 and 1990, the percentage of what are termed "middle-level professionals" in academe increased another 28% (Grassmuck, 1991). The creation of the EdD degree was considered

necessary to meet the need for trained practitioners who have the necessary skills and knowledge to manage and operate these emerging complex organizations. The PhD is a teaching and research degree which did not provide the necessary background to manage these large complex organizations. Over the last several decades a variety of higher education management programs have been developed for different educational settings. In 1967, there were 67 EdD programs in the United State, while, in 1970, 97 programs, 1979, 133 programs, and 1989, 163 programs. Until now the EdD programs are flourishing in different types of higher institutions to meet the needs of thousands of professional in higher institutions.

While in China, the EdD degree was first initiated in the year 2008. As to the admission, educational duration and graduation requirements, there are some differences and similarities between the EdD programs in China and the US.

Non-Degree Training in Higher Education Management in the Two Countries

Comparing the degree training programs of professionals in higher education management, there is a relatively long history of in-service training programs in China. Short-term in-service training of higher management professionals offered by institutions such as the National Academy of Education Administration seems to be well developed in China. They have established certain kinds of principles and ways of providing short-term training to administrators in higher education institutions. In the US there are equivalents to this kind of training presented by workshops on higher education management and various professional development programs. In the US, professional staff development in higher institutions has had a long history. While originally such professional development activities were primarily focused on the instructional staff, over the last several decades this instruction has been expanded to include almost all aspects of institutional administration ranging from physical plant operations, to financial management, to institutional management programs for senior executives. In addition to degree programs offered by higher education institutions, many professional associations offered specialized programs such as the Society of College and University Planning, and the American Council of Education (ACE). These programs are typically four to six week summer programs. Sometimes these training programs last over one year. For example, ACE as the major coordinating body for all the nation's higher education institutions, offers "Department Leadership Programs" which include an online resource and a series of national workshops for division and department chairs and deans focused on departmental leadership, as well as a special advanced workshop on topics such as conflict management and leading change. The most famous training program by ACE for administrators in colleges and universities is the Fellows Program which has cultivated a large cohort of administrators in

higher education and has contributed greatly to the professionalization of the administrators in colleges and universities. Other associations such as the Council of Independent Colleges, the American Association of Community Colleges, the American Association of State Colleges and Universities run sector-specific training programs for new presidents and senior administrators. The ACE launched the Institute for New Presidents in 2012 for training new university presidents. Compared with the programs offered by the Harvard Graduate School of Education (HGSE), which has a long history of preparing for leadership in the field of education, the training programs by these associations are more specific and focused and of a longer time duration (see Table 5). To some degree, the training programs such as Fellows Program have the same function as the training programs offered by the National Academy of Education of Administration in China.

Table 5 Comparison of the Training Programs of ACE and the HGSE

	ACE Programs		HGSE Programs
Training program	Fellows Program	New Institute for New Presidents	Harvard Seminar for New Presidents
Training goal	Develop the leadership ability of individuals who have the capacity to rise to senior-level leadership in colleges and universities	Enable higher education leaders in their first two years of service as president	Provide new presidents with a practical and conceptual orientation to the presidency; address the specific needs and challenges they may face
Admission of the trainees	Candidates from all areas of institutional life, a record of leadership in institutions of higher education, nominated by the institution’s president or other senior officer who agrees to pay the candidate’s salary and benefits for the duration of the Fellowship (50 administrators each year)	Presidents in their first two years (25 presidents each year)	First-time presidents from all sectors of American higher education ranging from those who have been appointed but not yet assumed office to those within the first 12 months of their presidency. Admission decision is made by the Admissions Committee (40–45 presidents each year)
Training duration	One year on another campus under the mentorship of the president and his/her senior leadership team, participate in three week-long national retreats, visit other campuses, attend national meetings	Eight months	Five and a half days (July 13–18, 2012)

(To be continued)

(Continued)

	ACE Programs		HGSE Programs
Training content	Focusing on six overlapping areas: Leadership, Strategy, The World of Higher Education, Higher Education and the World Beyond, Personal and Interpersonal Dimensions of Leadership Executive Skills	How to work effectively with key constituencies, assemble strong administrative teams, assess campus culture, lead change and work effectively with boards	Focuses on the critical issues of the first months and years of the presidency, ranging from fundraising to building the administrative team
Training method	Placement at a host institution, mentoring, visits to campuses and higher education organizations, interactions with higher education leaders, participation in conferences and meetings, stimulations and evaluations, personal feedback, and networking	Face-to-face and online meetings, the ACE Annual Meeting in Washington, DC	Courses, events, interaction with peer groups of colleagues from around the country
Characteristics of training	One year on another campus under the mentorship of the president and his/her senior leadership team, bridging the individualized learning components with three week-long retreats as well as the ACE Annual Meeting	In-person sessions supplemented by online activities, and the program will likely conclude with a session during the council's annual meeting in March	Intensive, interactive sessions
Training evaluation	Self-evaluation and feedback	Self-evaluation and feedback, survey	Feedback from the new presidents

Note. Adapted from ACE. (2011). Programs & Service. The ACE Fellows Program: The Proven Path to Leadership. Retrieved December 18, 2011, from <http://www.acenet.edu/Content/NavigationMenu/ProgramsServices/FellowsProgram/AbouttheProgram/index.htm>. 12-18-2011; ACE (2011). ACE launches Institute for New Presidents. Retrieved April 1, 2012, from http://www.acenet.edu/AM/Template.cfm?Section=News_Room&TEMPLATE=/CM/ContentDisplay.cfm&CONTENTID=43465; HGSE. (2012). Harvard Seminar for New Presidents. Retrieved April, 2, 2012, from <http://www.gse.harvard.edu/ppe/programs/higher-education/portfolio/new-presidents.html>.

Future Trends of Training of Professionals in Higher Education Management

According to Vollmer and Mills many professionals apparently learn to live in complex organizations in less than ideal circumstances. Some resist the system. Others adapt to the system by becoming less professional and more bureaucratic (Farmer, 1970). It is a very common phenomenon in China that professionals in higher education administration become increasingly bureaucratic. However, with the mergers of higher education institutions in China, more and more universities are becoming more comprehensive. One person's will cannot steer the university's progress in an appropriate manner. With the growing complexity of higher institutions, the managerial professionals are becoming more and more bureaucratic, and this kind of phenomenon will make the operation of the higher institutions less efficient. In this sense, training of administrators will be of great importance for the well-being of the universities.

Growing Distinctions between the PhD and the EdD

Many universities grant the two kinds of doctoral degrees, and faculty members will teach the students in the two programs. The question of how to draw a clear distinction between the two kinds of programs will be a major focus for the future development of EdD programs in China. More and more universities are beginning to realize this problem and design different courses for the two programs. Peking University is trying to integrate theories with practical work of the candidates in the courses. One difficulty is that in some EdD programs the candidates are conferred PhD degrees. To avoid this confusion there should be a distinction between the degrees at the very beginning of the development of the EdD programs. There is even some confusion between the PhD program and the EdD program in higher education management in the US. The Carnegie Project on the Educational Doctorate (CPED) was designed as an inter-institutional project to examine new approaches to the professional practice doctorate in education with the goal of reshaping the educational doctorate to make it distinct from the PhD. Currently Phase II of the Project is being initiated (Perry, 2011).

More Attention on Curriculum Design for the Training Programs

In China there is a lack of clarity regarding the status of administrators in higher education institutions, and there is little knowledge of the kinds of skills and knowledge administrators need to possess in order to be effective senior administrators. Still, because most non-degree training programs are generally

supported by the government, the training content cannot wholly meet the needs of the administrators. The government issues training requirements periodically, and while universities train administrators according to government requirements, these cannot meet the practical needs of the administrators. In most training programs, the training content does not include related administrative knowledge. It is imperative to design curriculum for the newly established EdD programs and the various non-degree training programs to meet the needs of the administrators.

Popularization of International Training Programs

With the internationalization of higher education, training programs for executive professionals in higher education will be more and more internationalized in order to meet the needs of the university and satisfy the needs of the administrators. In fact, in recent years, many universities in China have been cooperating with prestigious universities such as Columbia University and the University of Pennsylvania to gain the necessary knowledge about EdD programs in these universities. In addition, senior institutional staff are often supported in short-term international study programs that do not lead to graduate degrees but to provide some opportunities to acquire new knowledge and skills. For example, Wuhan University sends their administrators periodically to the US to be trained in the area of higher education administration for several weeks. At the governmental level, the Ministry of Education (MOE) has programs for sending university presidents, vice presidents, and administrators overseas to be trained. The MOE will trust the training programs to the National Academy of Education Administration to implement the training programs, and it cooperates with prestigious foreign universities. The China Scholarship Council also funds training programs such as “The Overseas Training Program of University Administrators” for administrators in higher education institutions to be trained overseas. While these opportunities can be valuable to administrators, the instructional content often focuses on the international practices of the host country and may not have direct applicability to the particular situation or needs of the administrators being trained.

Online Training Programs as New Opportunities and Challenges

It should be noted that in the US many degrees, especially professional degrees, are offered via the Internet. As to online programs in training higher education management professionals in China, it seems to be still an undeveloped field. In contrast to the flourishing of the online EdD programs in higher education management in the US, there are no formal online training programs at the

doctoral level in China. Online training for higher education professionals in China is extremely limited, while there exist some programs at the Bachelor's degree level. This may be the future delivery process for higher education management programs in China.

In China, most of the training programs of higher education administrators are sponsored by the government. The sources of financial support are relatively limited. The marketing of training programs is probably a reasonable choice for the future development of non-degree training programs of administrators in colleges and universities. The future development of all management training programs for higher education will be dependent on their perceived effectiveness and their impact on colleges and universities.

References

- Academic Degree Committee of the State Council. (1997). 授予博士、硕士学位和培养研究生的学科专业目录 [Disciplines and majors directory of granting doctoral and master degrees and the training of graduate students]. Retrieved October 1, 2011, from <http://www.cdgc.edu.cn/xwyyjsjyxx/sy/glmd/267001.shtml>
- Farmer, J. A. (1970). Professionalization in higher adult education administration. *Adult Education Quarterly*, 21(1), 29–39. doi: 10.1177/074171367002100104
- Forsyth, P. B., & Danisiewicz, T. J. (1985). Toward a theory of professionalization. *Work and Occupations*, 12(1), 59–76. doi:10.1177/0730888485012001004
- Gao, Y. M. (2007). 高等教育学专业研究生培养的问题与对策 [Problems and solutions to the training of graduates in higher education]. *大学研究与评价 [Higher Education Research and Evaluation]*, (4), 97–100.
- Grassmuck, K. (1990). Big increases in academic-support staffs prompt growing concerns on campuses. Retrieved September 9, 2011, from <http://chronicle.com/chronicle/archive.htm>
- Grassmuck, K. (1991). Colleges hired more non-teaching staff than other employees throughout the '80. Retrieved September 28, 2011, from <http://chronicle.com/chronicle/archive.htm>
- Hollis, E. V. (1946). A comparison of the EdD and PhD in education. *The School Review*, 54(2), 77–82.
- Huang, G. R. (2011). 中国高等教育学学位点发展的研究 [China's higher education degree development research]. (Unpublished masters thesis). 广西师范大学, 桂林, 中国 [Guangxi Normal University, Guilin, China]
- Kyte, G. C. (1958). Origin of the Doctor of Education degree at the University of California. *History of Education Journal*, 9(4), 98–103.
- Lan, J. S. (2005). 大学校长之学术背景: 对中美研究型大学校长教育背景与工作背景之综合考察 [The academic background of presidents: A comprehensive survey of presidents in research universities in China and the U.S.]. *科学中国人 [Scientific Chinese]*, (4), 10–19.
- Li, X. H., Liu, J. S., & Zhao, J. H. (2009). The international comparison of professionalization of university administrators and the related apocalypse. *Second International Conference on*

Education Technology and Training, 154–158.

- National Academy of Education Administration. (2007). 国家教育行政学院培训课程概览 [Overview of training courses in National Academy of Education Administration]. Retrieved October 2, 2011, from <http://www.naea.edu.cn/news/detail.asp?newsid=430&classid=174/>
- Pausits, A., & Pellert, A. (2009). The winds of change: Higher education management programmes in Europe. *Higher Education in Europe*, 34(1), 39–49. doi: 10.1080/03797720902747009
- Perry, J. A. (2011). The Carnegie Project on the education doctorate: Phase II, a quest for change. *University Council for Educational Administration Review*, 52(3), 1–4.
- Wen, D. M., & Yan, F. Q. (2004). 美国“教育博士”(EdD)的培养及其启示 [The training of EdD in the United States and its implications]. 国家教育行政学院学报 [*Journal of National Academy of Educational Administration*], (3), 97–100.
- Zhang, D. M. (2002). 全国高等教育学科硕士, 博士学位授予点研讨会纪要 [A summary of the symposium of the national higher education master's and doctoral degree granting units. 中国高教研究 [*Higher Education Research*], (7), 15–16.
- Zheng, X. L. (2005). 高校管理队伍专业化建设研究 [Study on the construction of the professionalization on the administrators in colleges and universities]. (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). 福州大学, 福州, 中国 [Fuzhou University, Fuzhou, China].
- Zhou, X. F. (2010). 我国教育博士专业学位研究生招生工作的思考 [Discussion and analysis on EdD admission]. 清华大学教育研究 [*Tsinghua Journal of Education*], 31(2), 109–112.