cation are, accordingly, diverted toward political gains. Political manipulation, including public jobs to supporters (Empreguismo), scholarship distribution, federal resource transfer to state and municipalities, and student assistance programs, imposes costly trade-offs on the country’s development. By the same token, financial subsidies to private schools and “free” public universities cause both inefficiencies and inequities. The well-documented section on inequalities gives the reader a better perspective on the major hurdles facing the Brazilian people. Political survival cannot continue to take precedence over the national agenda of human development.

Although the book does not address where the country will be headed over the next century, it leaves the reader convinced that, under the circumstances, Brazil will never be able to join the ranks of the developed world. The education system cannot foster independence and accountability unless it portrays those characteristics itself. Financing reform is crucial to both the internal and external efficiency of the education system. The author, however, advocates a pure political solution: more democratic governance as opposed to education reform. Yet, it often takes an educated citizenry to nurture democracy!

Djehane Hosni
University of Central Florida
Orlando, FL 32816-1400, USA
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This multi-author piece addresses, through a series of eight essays, many of the problems faced by the academic community worldwide in the 1990s and into the next century. However, it is not likely to be particularly useful as a resource for those strictly conducting theoretical and empirical research in the field of education economics. It is, though, likely to appeal to the academic interests of researchers in the areas of educational management and to administrators in higher education. For the rest of us, the volume does at least provide a few insights into the new directions that many business administration colleges are now taking in the United States. Presently, the College of Business at my university is attempting to revise the way it recognizes and rewards teaching, research, and service. Additionally, we have recently undergone a revamping of our organiza-

...
The fifth essay, by Berrell, is titled “The Place of Research, Scholarship and Teaching in Newly Established Universities.” It begins by pointing out that there were many new universities created in Australia after implementation of higher education policy reforms in the early 1990s. As they point out, “academics interpret the nature of research, scholarship and teaching differently, feeling despondent about their ‘teaching load’ yet enthusiastic about ‘research opportunities’ (page 78).” Academicians at these new universities, after 1992, had to appraise their role in the new environment. This essay details a case study of a faculty of education in a newly established university, using information “gleaned from a faculty informant.” Most of the difficulty faced by these faculty members, according to the informant, involved the methods used to evaluate research and scholarship. Arguments over numerical counts, journal quality, and the source and size of external grants ensued, as one might expect. The main focus of the essay is to categorize the types of academic work that would define the “culture” of this new university. Research encompassed everything from journal articles to “high profile” consulting, and the most significant finding was that 28 percent of the faculty reported “no participation” in any of the research/scholarship categories (the authors state that this is consistent with studies on academic pursuits at American universities). As the authors state, “In this study, exogenous circumstances such as ‘work in progress’ or ‘articles under review’ were offered to explain low productivity … However, such a defence failed to adequately explain non-productivity over consecutive years (p. 85).” It is interesting to examine the data they present, which suggests that as the reward system was reallocated to competitive scholarship (i.e., refereed journal articles, etc.), the pursuit of non-competitive scholarship (i.e., conferences, seminars, etc.) waned. At the same time, “more staff had begun to openly express their desire to become actively involved in the research process (p. 85).” In general, how faculty members viewed teaching and research influenced the debate about the appropriate mix of these tasks within the workload. About 40 percent of the faculty saw teaching as the sole academic activity. These faculty chastised others whom they felt were “dodging teaching.” About one-third of the faculty recognized a pressing need to emphasize research. One of this type suggested his “colossal teaching load” was an impediment to quality research. A third group, about 15 percent, saw research as the university’s primary focus and surreptitiously criticized those who failed to take on this responsibility. Finally, a fourth group held the view that research should be recognized as the pinnacle of academic activity, like the third group above. They would, however, overtly criticize the failure of other groups to recognize the cardinal importance of scholarship. As the authors point out, “At least one point of intersection [among the groups] is the fundamental role of teaching in achieving a university’s mission. Thus, none in the faculty believed that establishing a discrete research school was a sensible proposition in a fledgling institution (p. 89).” In summary, these authors support a separation of teaching and research as a step in resolving workload anomalies among the faculty. Other essays included in this volume detail (1) the problems associated with faculty reward systems that focus on undergraduate education only, (2) the problems associated with quality of performance measures for non-academic divisions of the university, (3) a continuum of initiatives for supporting university freshmen, (4) reform in financial management of universities, (5) new funding arrangements for research, and (6) university-state relations. Again, with the exception of the last essay most of this work is not likely to be particularly appealing to economists engaged in theoretical or empirical research on the economics of higher education. The last essay, “University-State Relations: A Comparative Perspective,” by Kogan details the form of educational support provided in England, France, Germany, and other countries in Europe. This piece is potentially useful as historical background for cross-country analyses in education economies.

Of particular interest to American readers will be the article titled “Negotiation Over Teaching Award” by Ben-Zadok and Carter. These authors detail the Teaching Incentive Program (TIP) developed by the State University System of Florida in 1993. The TIP was set up to reward educators in Florida’s system for outstanding teaching. Specifically, the award was an additional $5,000 to each winner’s base salary for the remainder of his/her employment in the Florida system. It was a direct result of the demand for accountability of faculty teaching by the legislature on behalf of parents, taxpayers, and the private sector, all of whom had complained of inefficiency in higher education. A fixed number of awards were allotted to each university every year, based on enrollment. The criteria were (1) student credit hours taught, (2) instructional contact hours, and (3) the number of preparations taught each academic year. The quantity-based criteria disadvantaged faculty who teach in professional and graduate schools, and the authors detail the near futile efforts of those faculty to influence the political process within which TIP rules are determined. As the authors point out, faculty in professional schools “learned that political power and budget in American universities in the 1990s will continue to be determined by numbers of students and credits (p. 37).”

The fiscal constraints highlighted by Ben-Zadok and Carter represent a common element or theme in each of the essays. Readers will find the political elements involved in state-university relations and with faculty-faculty and faculty-administration relations at the university level to be another common thread as well. In all, however, I find that Higher Education Management pro-
vides little that particularly lends itself to education economics research. It could, however, provide a useful resource for educational management educators and university administrators.

Franklin G. Mixon, Jr.
The University of Southern Mississippi, Department of Economics, Hattiesburg MS 39406, USA
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Beginning in 1991, states began adopting legislation to allow public schools to operate with some independence, calling them charter schools. By 1999, more than 1,000 charter schools were in operation in 29 states serving over 100,000 students. Hassel reviews the political forces in four states (Michigan, Massachusetts, Colorado, and Georgia) that adopted such laws. He then describes problems in implementation and early results in the same states. The study uses interviews with officials, newspaper accounts, and official records.

The definition of a charter school differs across the states. Although categories are not simple, Hassel distinguishes strong charters with more independence from local school districts from weak charters that are closely aligned with local school districts. He traces the differences to the political forces that shaped the laws and implementation. The book concludes that charter schools will have a better chance of thriving and being of positive influence on traditionally organized schools when they have greater independence and more funds. The book will have appeal to proponents of charter schools because it takes as given that more independence for charter schools is likely to improve performance.

The book hints at deeper problems for education reform. Problems relevant to the charter school initiative are also problems for other educational reforms.

A key issue is how to evaluate the performance of a school so as to decide whether to continue its charter. A central point of chartering is to create a market place, to invite entrepreneurs to devise new ways to operate public schools and then winnow out those that under perform. A brief concluding chapter points to the monitoring problem without resolving it. If we could convincingly measure all the results we care about, chartering, contracting, and other incentive regimes would have more chance of success. Because we are unlikely to find such measures, bureaucratic rules are unlikely to replace informed judgement about what makes a good school.

A second issue is finance. Many charter laws provide that charters will get an amount per student, often somewhat less than the local school district spends per student. Hassel compares per pupil spending at some charters with average per pupil spending at local schools. Unfortunately, the financial information is limited. Some charters raise philanthropic dollars, indeed some are operated by philanthropies. If a school raises philanthropic dollars, then its total spending will be more than its tax finance. We should not conclude that the presence of philanthropic dollars means that the charter would otherwise have run a deficit. Cost comparisons should be made with care.

A third problem is in comparing traditionally organized schools to charters. Traditional public schools show considerable diversity in program and performance. Hassel observes that the instructional programs at charters are within the range of programs offered at conventionally organized schools. The case for charters is one of performance incentives rather than instructional innovation.

A fourth issue is the role of state regulations. When charter schools waive normal state regulations, one might wonder why the local schools remain subject to them? If local public schools must hire certified teachers, follow complex reporting systems, and monitor attendance, but charters are exempt, what happens? If regulations can be modified for charters, why not for the others? To what extent might performance gains at charters be due to modifying regulations?

A fifth issue is replicability. Education reforms often attract highly effective leaders, people whose dedication and extra effort is more likely to be effective. That pioneers often enjoy more than average success means that comparison of an innovation with traditional operation must be done with extra care. Will today’s innovation come at age ten to look just like today’s convention? The charter schools are too new to consider how performance changes with time. Might charters best be compared to newly organized conventional schools?

A study might provide information about the extent to which charters locate in urban, suburban, and rural areas. Schooling problems differ substantially by location. It would be helpful to know the skill mix of staff, for example, the ratio of certified to non-certified staff in charters not required to hire certified teachers. The study