A Brief Overview of Chinese Higher Education System

1. Historical overview

Chinese higher education dates back to Han Dynasty, but modern higher education in China is generally considered to emerge in the late 1890s. In its early history, western higher education, especially Christian higher education, played an important role in shaping Chinese higher education. By the mid 1920s, there had emerged a diverse higher education landscape consisting of national universities, church-affiliated universities, corporate universities and other types of private universities.

Chinese higher education entered a period of enormous development after the People's Republic of China was founded in 1949. By then there was only 205 higher education institutions in total, consisting of 123 state and provincial universities, 61 private universities, and 21 church-affiliated universities. A total of 120 thousand students enrolled, and the gross enrollment rate was extremely low, with barely one out of 10 thousand Chinese people enrolled in higher education.

In the early 1950s, Soviet Union exerted a profound influence in the restructuring of Chinese higher education. Following the Soviet model, the Chinese government took a series of measures to reform its higher education institutions, with the goal of "developing specialized institutes and strengthening comprehensive universities, focusing on the development of industry-oriented talents and teachers". In consequence, Chinese higher education was experienced a dramatic restructuring and developed into a total of 229 higher education institutions, consisting of 17 comprehensive universities, 58 normal universities, 44 poly-tech institutes, 37 medical schools, 31 agricultural and fishery institutes, 17 art schools, 8 language-training institutes, 6 athletics institutes, 5 finance and economy institutes, 5 politics and law institutes, and a few others. Under the Soviet influence, the Chinese government also introduced a central plan for a nationally unified instruction system, i.e. texts, syllabi, etc. The impact of this shift can still be seen today, in the form of excessive departmentalization, segmentation, and over-specialization in particular.

With the further development of higher education institutions, the higher education institutions increased to 434 and enrolled 680 thousand students by 1965, rightly before the Cultural Revolution broke out. From 1967 to 1976, China's Cultural Revolution took a toll on higher education, which was devastated more than any other sector of the country and had a major impact on education in the 21st century. The enrollment of postsecondary students dropped enormously from 674,400 to 47,800, and the decline in educational quality was profound.

In 1977, Deng Xiaoping made the decision of resuming the National Higher Education Entrance Examination (Gao Kao), which had a profound impact on Chinese higher education in history. From the 1980s on, Chinese higher education has undergone a series of reforms that have slowly brought improvement. Structural reform consists of five parts, including reforms of higher education provision, higher education governance, higher education finance, recruitment and job-placement and inner-institution administration, which turned out to be the most difficult. These reforms aimed to provide higher education institutions more autonomy and the ability to better meet the needs of students, with the state focusing exclusively on macro planning.

Since the late 1990s, Chinese higher education has experienced rapid development. In 1999, China started a decade-long higher education expansion, with an annual increase rate of 2%, resulting in a gross higher education enrolment rate of 30% in 2012. According to the official statistics, Chinese higher education system consisted of over 2,442 regular (academically oriented) colleges and universities, 348 adult higher education institutions, and 823 non academically-oriented private agencies. Among the regular higher education institutions, a majority (1,623) were affiliated with provincial or local governments, 113 were affiliated with national ministries and enjoyed more funding and prestige, and 706 were privately funded and run.

Table 1: Higher Education Institutions in 2012

	No. of HEIs
Regular Higher Education	2,442
By degrees offered	
--4-yr HEIs	1,145
--2- to 3-yr HEIs	1,297
By affiliation	
--Central ministries	113
Ministry of Education	73
Others central ministries	40
--Provincial	1,623
--Private	706
Adult Higher Education	348
Private Agencies	823

Data Source: National Bureau of Statistics of China (2012), http://data.stats.gov.cn/workspace/index;jsessionid=C781D208E25C79B326BDB5A26F52CE16?m=hgnd

In 2012, China had a total postsecondary education enrollments of over 31 million, including 25.6 million in regular higher education sector and nearly six million in the adult higher education sector. 1.7 million (5.5%) were enrolled at the graduate level, 16.7 million (53.2 %) were pursuing bachelor degrees, and the rest 13 million (41.3%) was enrolled in two- or three-year programs. China has surpassed the United States in higher education enrollments and boasts the largest higher education system in the world.

Table 2: Higher Education Enrollments in 2012

	No. of HEIs
Regular HEIs	25,632,973
--graduate programs	1,719,818
doctoral level	283,810
master's level	1,436,008
--Undergraduate programs	23,913,155
4-year HEIs	14,270,888
2- to 3-yr HEIs	9,642,267
Adult HEIs	5,831,123
--4-year	2,475,495
--2- to 3-yr HEIs	3,355,628
Total	31,464,096

Data Source: National Bureau of Statistics of China (2012), http://data.stats.gov.cn/workspace/index;jsessionid=C781D208E25C79B326BDB5A26F52CE16?m=hgnd

In recent years, China has also become a major destination for international students. In 2012, 157,845 international students were enrolled in Chinese colleges and universities, and 18,259 international students received academic degrees. As of 2013, China was the most popular country in Asia for international students, and ranked third overall among all countries.

2. Key Policy or Change Points over the Last 30 Years

a) Key Education Policies regarding Higher Education

- In 1985, the Chinese Communist Party (CCP) Central Committee issued *the Decision on the Reform of Education System*.

  This policy document asked for reform the education system in order to expand the autonomy of higher education institutions.

- In 1986, the State Council issued *the Preliminary Regulations on the Responsibilities of Higher Education Governance*.
  This policy document defined the authorities and responsibilities regarding higher education governance among national ministries and between central and provincial governments.
- In 1993, the CCP Central Committee and the State Council jointly issued *China's Outline for Education Reform and Development*.
  This policy document pointed out to reform higher education system, dealt with the relationship between government and higher education institutions, central government and provincial government, and theNational Council for Education (now Ministry of Education) and other national ministries, with the goal of gradually establishing an education system characterized with governmental macro-management and institutional autonomy.
- In 1999, China started to implement *PRC Higher Education Law*.
  The law included specific statements on the nature, tasks, principles, basic institutions, and investment of higher education, as well as the organizational structure and students of higher education institutions.
- In 2010, the CCP Central Committee and the State Council jointly promulgated *the National Outline for Medium- and Long-term Educational Reform and Development (2010-2020)*.
  The *Outline* is a programmatic document for guiding the future reform and development of China's educational system for the next decade. It produces an across-the-board scheme and forward-looking disposition for the reform and development of China's education during a key period marked by the emergence of a moderately well-off society and its accelerated drive toward socialist modernization, and during a key phase of its overall implementation of programs to invigorate the country through science and education, strengthen it by training talent, and carry on a sustained strategy of development. In terms of higher education, this policy document focuses on enhancing the overall higher education quality, increasing the quality of talents and professionals, elevating research capacity, better serving the society, and optimizing the overall higher education structure and developing institutional uniqueness.

b) Change Points
Higher Education Expansion Starting in 1999

In 1999, the government issued *the 21st Century Education Revitalization Plan*, which raised the goal of increasing the gross enrollment rate to 15 by 2010 and entering the phase of higher education massification. Following this policy, Chinese universities doubled their enrollment in 1999-2001 alone. Between 1999 and 2004, new students experienced an annual growth rate of 26.1% at undergraduate level and 28.6% at graduate level. By fall 2002, higher education gross enrollment rate increased from 9.8% in 1998 to 15%, making China the new addition to countries with mass higher education.

Table 3: Expansion of Higher Education in 1990-2010

	1990	1998	2005	2010	Increase b/w 1998-2010
New Entrants (Million)	0.609	1.084	5.045	6.618	510%
Enrollments (Million)	3	8	23	31.05	290%
Gross Enrollment Rate	3.4%	9.8%	21.0%	26.5%	170%

Data Source: National Bureau of Statistics of China, http://data.stats.gov.cn/workspace/index;jsessionid=C781D208E25C79B326BDB5A26F52CE16?m=hgnd

Pursuit of World-class Universities in the 1990s

Accompanying China's move to higher education massification, Chinese government pursued the transformation from a large system of higher education to a strong system of higher education. Within this context, China started to focus on enhancing international competitiveness of its higher education, primarily in the form of Project 211 and Project 985.

Project 211

Project 211 was first suggested in 1993 in the policy document *China's Outline for Education Reform and Development*. It aimed to strengthen 100 specific institutions of higher education and key disciplinary areas. Approved by the State Council, the Overall Construction Plan for Project 211 marked its official launch in 1995. As of 2013, three phases of the project have been implemented, covering 112 higher education institutions. The government made handsome investment on this initiative. During 1995-2005 alone, CNY36.8 billion was allocated as special funds to support Project 211 institutions.

Project 985

Project 985 was started by the Chinese government for the purpose of establishing world-class universities in the 21st century. It was approved and officially launched in 1999. Peking University and Tsinghua University were the pioneers for the implementation of Phase I of Project 985. As of today, a total number of 39 universities are included in Project 985, all of which are taken from those included in Project 211. The goal is to make a number of universities join the ranks of world-class universities by the middle of this century, some of which are expected to be in the forefront of global academia, laying a solid foundation for realizing the goal of building China into a moderately developed country. The financial support to Project 985 largely surpassed that to Project 211. For example, CNY25.5 billion and CNY42.6 billion were allocated in Phase I (1998-2003) and Phase II (2004-2006), respectively, compared with only CNY36.8 billion for Project 211 during its first ten years. The third phase was launched in 2010, with even more funding invested in this initiative.

Higher Education Quality Assurance

Along with its pursuit of mass higher education, China has paid unprecedented attention to its higher education quality assurance system. In 2003, the Ministry of Education explicitly proposed in *the 2003-2007 Education Revitalization Action Plan* that a higher education institution teaching quality evaluation system be implemented every five years. In 2004, The Higher Education Teaching Evaluation Center of the Ministry of Education was set up to organize the implementation of higher education evaluation, which marked the move of China's higher education teaching evaluation work to a standardized, scientific, systematic and professional direction.

The National Outline for Medium- and Long-term Educational Reform and Development (2010-2020) further proposed to encourage specialized agencies and social intermediary institutions to assess the level and quality of disciplines, profession and courses in higher education institutions, and to explore cooperation with the international high-level education evaluation agencies to form an education evaluation model with Chinese characteristics. To promote the construction of higher education quality guarantee system, higher education undergraduate teaching evaluation is at present exploring to establish a teaching evaluation system within which institutional self-evaluation serves as the basis, colleges and universities evaluation, professional certification and evaluation, international evaluation and data normal monitoring of the basic state of teaching constitute the main contents, and the government, schools, specialized agencies and social multi-evaluation are combined with each other, and the teaching evaluation system adapts to the modern higher education system with Chinese characteristics.

3. Current Characteristics and Existing National Strategic Priorities

Chinese higher education is currently at a critical point of transformation. Following the rapid expansion, Chinese higher education is now in the phase of stable development, with a focus on quality, equity and rebalance between the provision of graduates and the demand from the labor

market. *The National Outline for Medium- and Long-term Educational Reform and Development (2010-2020)* identified four strategic goals, including enhancing higher education quality, promoting innovation, and encouraging optimal structure and institutional uniqueness, and enhancing internationalization.

Quality

The National Outline for Medium- and Long-term Educational Reform and Development (2010-2020) stated that "raising quality is at the heart of higher education development, and it is a basic requirement of building a strong nation of higher education". In April 2011, in the centennial anniversary ceremony of Qsinghua University, President Hu Jintao re-emphasized that "keeping enhancing quality is the bloodline of higher education", and that "higher education institutions should put quality enhancement at the very heart of education reform and development and as the most pressing task". This indicates the pathway to follow from a big to a strong nation of higher education. Specifically, it includes deepening higher education reform, transforming the development modes, and takes the route of connotative development with quality enhancement at the heart.

The Chinese higher education community is familiar with the statement that quality is the lifeblood of higher education. However, it does not happen overnight and it takes long-term unwavering effort. It is important to reform the curriculum and teaching in the higher education system in order to ensure that college graduates acquire knowledge and skills needed by the changing society. Many Chinese universities have realized that it is important to foster skills and competencies such as knowledge acquisition, innovation, problem-solving, communication, and team-building. They have recognized the importance of transforming teaching styles from passive knowledge-cramming to proactive competency-fostering. Still, much work is needed to translate theories to specific educational activities in order to enhance the added-value of higher education in knowledge, qualities, and skills. In order to urge higher education institutions of all types and at all levels to take substantive actions, Chinese Ministry of Education is developing a higher education quality assurance system, which includes minimum input, quality control, and teaching evaluation, to name a few.

Innovation

Chinese government attaches much importance to the strategic role that science and innovation play in improving the society's productivity and comprehensive national power. China has invested heavily on strengthening scientific capacity and infrastructure in universities, research institutes, large-scale enterprises, and science parks, and it has selected a batch of research universities to conduct fundamental research. Improving science and innovation will be critical to achieve the well-being society in China in the future. Further development of the innovation system depends on enhancing the capacity of basic research in universities, expanding the participation of science and research, and accelerating the process of knowledge transfer. Research universities and technological higher education institutions have formed partnership with enterprises in a more open and smooth way. Together they are making progress in improving technology transfer and contributing to the society.

Structure and Uniqueness

When exploring the direction of higher education reform, one of the tasks is to identify the mission for higher education institutions of all types and at all levels, and to ensure that diverse education needs are met. Of particular note is to balance the demand from two sectors. On one hand, the government concentrates resources on major subjects and carries out Project 985 and Project 221, in order to keep a number of research universities globally competitive; on the other hand, the government needs to increase the capacity and standard of other types of higher education institutions. For example, the government recently released *the Action Plan for Rejuvenating Higher Education in Middle and Western Regions*, in order to ensure that higher education in these regions meets the national and regional demand, contributes to the implementation of major regional strategies launched by the central government—such as *the Development Strategy in the West, the Strategy of Rejuvenating Traditional Industrial Bases in the Northeastern Region*—and meets the need of the regional economic and societal development. In addition, the sustained development of regional economy calls for more highly skilled talents, which leads to a rapid growth of the higher vocational education with a local orientation. China currently has nearly 1,300 higher vocational colleges. The Ministry of Education is exploring an initiative to transform some newly established local undergraduate institutions into poly-tech, which expands the reach of vocational education to undergraduate institutions.

Internationalization

Chinese higher education has become increasingly open in terms of international exchange and cooperation. Every year over 300 thousand Chinese students go overseas for undergraduate and graduate education. China also welcomes international students to pursue higher education in China, and it accepts high-quality foreign institutions of higher education to partner with Chinese universities in cooperatively running schools.

The international cooperation of higher education includes academic exchanges, cooperation in sciences, and international infrastructure-sharing. There is still much room for improvement in these areas. For example, some of China's first-rate universities are emerging as world's top institutions in the creation and dissemination of new knowledge, in exchanges with scholars from other countries, in large-scale international research cooperation, and in promoting cultural exchanges. A vital, research-oriented international cooperation will continue to be on the top of the government's agenda in the years to come.

Implications of Higher Education Massification

The decade-long higher education expansion starting in 1999 had a profound impact on China. Specifically, its major implications are as follows.

1. **Quality**
   Like other countries that experienced the rapid expansion, China encountered the conflict between quantity and quality. Many scholars have shown concern about the declining quality as a result of the rapid and continuous expansion. The growth of funding, teaching resources, and infrastructure failed to catch up with that of higher education enrollment, thereby putting higher education quality in jeopardy. Higher education quality was particularly a concern among the rising middle-class parents who have increasingly high expectation of education opportunities for their only child and who are willing to invest heavily on their child's education. Fortunately, this issue caught the attention of the central government; as a consequence, as early as in 2002, the Ministry issued a series of documents, all of which strengthen higher education quality as the priority.

2. **Equity**
   For a country as large as China, education inequity has always been an issue, and it was only worsened by the increase of enrollment. Specifically, the inequity has two dimensions, regional and

individual. During the expanding process, local higher education institutions that made up 80 percent of the total number of HEIs played a core role in expanding enrollments. However, in qualitative terms, due to the increasing aggravated imbalance in the allocation of higher educational resources, the development of HEIs in some regions faced serious challenges. Specifically, the economically developed provinces in east China were able to invest a lot more resources to their higher education than their less affluent counterparts in middle and west China. Likewise, urban areas afforded more resources than their rural counterpart; as a result, the proportion of rural students reportedly declined in top universities. For example, the average national expenditure per student was CNY14, 929 in 2004, with Beijing the highest CNY30, 634 and Guizhou Province the lowest (CNY8,103). In terms of the higher education enrollment per 10 thousand population, the national average was 1,613 in 2005, with Beijing the most (6,580) and again Guizhou Province the least (838). This unevenness not only threatens the overall harmony and sustained development of the higher education system, but also places restraints on the realization of the concept of equity in Chinese higher education.

3. Structure

Although China has made the historic transformation from elite higher education to mass higher education, the academic programs and curriculum have yet to change accordingly. The current programs and curriculum are basically a replication of those in the era of elite higher education, and therefore fail to meet the demand of the students and the society. A comparison of the academic distribution of the enrollments in 1998 and 2004 indicates that there is no obvious difference. A comparison of the academic programs in different types of higher education institutions and a comparison of the academic programs in different higher education institutions in different provinces indicates that there exists a high level of homogenization regardless institutional missions and geographic locations.

4. Finance

The entry into the era of mass higher education calls for a different higher education financing system. In the era of elite higher education, public funding was predominantly the source of the budget for higher education institutions. This mechanism is clearly not feasible in the mass higher education period when over 30 percent of the 18-24 population enters the higher education sector. For example, in 2004, the national input to higher education was CNY100.98 billion, which was 2.6 times more than that in 1998. However, due to the faster growth of enrollment, the expenditure per student decreased by 23%. It is within this context that cost-sharing scheme was introduced into Chinese higher education. For example, in 1997 when the expansion of higher education was not taking place, 78.3% of the higher education expenditure came from the public source, yet it decreased to 45.5% in 2004. In comparison, the percentage of tuition and fees increased dramatically from 14.8% to 30.4% in this period.

While a cost-sharing scheme is justifiable, we need to be cautious of the affordability issue. For example, the tuition and fees for higher education increased by 3.1 times between 1997 and 2004, yet the net income of rural residents and urban residents only increased by 1.4 and 1.8, respectively. Therefore, while it is reasonable to continue the cost-sharing scheme, more efforts need to be made to set a reasonable limit on tuition and fees for the sake of affordability and to develop a sophisticated financial aid system for the sake of access and opportunity for students from economically disadvantaged background.

5. Graduate Employment

Another major issue is the structural unemployment as a result of changes in human resources market. Statistics indicate that the overall higher education graduates reached nearly 7 million in 2012, yet the employment prospect is anything but optimistic. Nevertheless, a long-term prediction of the workforce demand shows a need for a large number of high-caliber professionals and skilled technical talents, and a shortage of technical talents in specific areas. This suggests that Chinese higher education needs to transform from the traditional mode in response to the new demand of the labor market. The

traditional mode is fit for the acquisition of knowledge, but not for the development of skills required by the highly competitive global economy. Likewise, the traditional mode does not respond well to the need of the diverse student body. The challenges faced by Chinese education originate from the social and economic development; therefore, they are beyond the education system. This requires that policy-making in higher education not only considers the internal system of higher education, but the background and framework of the overall social and economic policies, as well as the coordination between different governmental branches.

6. Academic profession

The sustained increase of enrolments calls for an expansion of the college profession to maintain the basic quality of higher education. However, this has failed to happen in many higher education institutions. Many institutions, while enrolling an unprecedentedly large student body, lack the funding to hire more faculty members to accommodate the additional students, to attract high-quality professionals for teaching and research, or to find faculty members who can create programs to better respond to the demand of their students and the society. For example, as a result of the expansion, the overall higher educational enrolments have expanded by over four times, yet the full-time faculty has increased barely by 1.7 times. The overall student-faculty ratio averages 1：18 in higher education, while this figure reach as high as 1：30 in many higher education institutions.

Higher Education Governance

1. A brief history of the higher education governance reform

In the first years since the People's Republic China was founded in 1949, higher education governance was highly centralized, with the central government having total control of higher education in terms of institutional establishment, recruitment, enrollment, and graduate employment. In 1961, the CPC Central Committee issued *Higher Education 60 Articles*, which asked for expanding higher education autonomy, yet it failed to substantively change the relationship between higher education institutions and government. However, as China made its historic transformation from the planned economy to market-oriented economy, a completely new governance system was required in every field, education included.

Since the mid 1980s, higher education has entered the era of higher education governance reform, featured by four documents:

(1) The CCP Central Committee's *Decision on the Reform of Education System* in 1985 included specific regulations on higher education institutions' rights in terms of admission, academic programs, instruction, internal organizational structure, nomination of vice president and appointment of mid-level management and international exchanges.

(2) *China's Outline for Education Reform and Development* in 1993 further granted more autonomy to higher education institutions by giving them more leeway relating to admission, fund raising, and internal fund distribution.

(3) *The Higher Education Law* in 1998 made it clear that a higher education institution shall enjoy the status of a legal person upon its establishment, its president shall be the legal representative, and higher education institutions shall operate in respond to the society demand and realize democratic governance. The document also made specific regulations regarding institutional autonomy in terms of admission, program and majors, and instructional plan.

(4) The *National Outline for Medium- and Long-term Educational reform and Development (2010-2020)* issued in 2010 advocated to speed up the process of education legislation and to govern education by law. This document further straightened out the relationship between higher education institutions and government and clearly defined the responsibilities for both. Specifically, the Outline contributed a whole chapter to the "construction of modern school system", which was the first time in any documents issued by CCP Central Committee and the State Council. It advocated "building a modern school system that is characterised with running school by law, self-governance, democratic supervision, and engagement by the society; and constructing a new relationship among government,

schools, and society". The policy connotations apply to higher education as well in guiding higher education governance. The modern university system aims to further separate the functions of the government from those of public school and to detach school governance from school operation. In this framework, schools are run according to law, under autonomous governance and democratic supervision, and with public participation, and to foster a new relationship between government, schools and society.

If the above policies and regulations were completely and properly implemented, the relationship between higher education institutions and government could be on the right track. Unfortunately, abuse of governmental power still exists in the governance of education. As a result, institutional autonomy is still restrained, as admission, graduation certificates issuance, program and major setting-up, personnel transfer, faculty promotion need the approval of relevant governmental agencies. Higher education institutions are still considered by some as the government's auxiliary institutions and fail to exist independently as legal corporations that run themselves in respond to society demand.

2. An Overview of the Two-level Higher Education Governance System in China

Chinese higher education is administered by the central and provincial governments, with the latter taking the major responsibility. *The Interim Regulation on the Management Responsibilities of Higher Education* (1986) classified the division of responsibilities for managing higher education between the central and local governments, providing a preliminary responsibility framework for governments at different levels to manage higher education. *The Higher Education Law* promulgated in 1998 further specified that the national higher education shall be under the unified leadership and the management of the State Council. Governments of provinces, autonomous regions and municipalities coordinate higher education cause within their administrative domain, managing colleges and universities mainly cultivating local talents or professionals and those institutions authorized by the State Council.

Under the guidance of the major policies and the macro planning of the central government, decision-making and coordination power of provincial government on higher education has been gradually expanded. In 2000, the State Council made the decision to transfer the approval power of higher vocational education to provincial governments, except that of teachers' colleges, and medicine schools. *The National Outline for Medium- and Long-term Educational Reform and Development (2010-2020)*stipulated that "the central government shall unify its leadership and management of national education, formulate the development planning, policy and basic standards, and optimize professional discipline types, level structure and regional distribution. It shall make an overall deployment of education reform experiment, and promote the regional coordinated development".

Specifically, the management responsibilities of the Central Government for higher education are mainly as follows: (1) Formulating and issuing administrative regulations, decisions and orders in multiple ways, at multiple levels, and from multiple perspectives. They include *the Constitution*, *Higher Education Law*, *the Teachers Law*, *the Private Education Promotion Law*, *the Interim Provisions on the Establishment of Higher Education Institutions, the Interim Provisions on Higher Education Admission*, etc. (2) Formulating national higher education development plan and annual enrolment plan. These plans not only include development goals, development priorities, development speed for higher education in a certain period—covering such elements as the number, scale, distribution and programs for higher education institutions at various levels and of various types—but also assurance measures, basic requirements, sources of funding, specific plan of implementation, and steps and procedures. (3) Providing policy guidance. China is a large and populous country with sharply uneven development. To formulate effective and feasible policies requires an in-depth analysis of information, coming up with various solutions and choosing the best policy plan through comparison and evaluation. (4) Fiscal appropriations. The vast higher education expenses are primarily reliant on governmental appropriations, which make appropriations an important tool for governing the types, levels and programs of higher education institutions; for regulating higher education quality, infrastructure and resource allocation; and for achieving the diversification of funding sources. (5) Education supervisions. Higher education supervision agencies have been in

place at both central and provincial levels, equipped with a team consisting of full-time and part-time staff. The current priority is on supervising government's insufficient input to higher education and urging government to carry out its education responsibilities. (6) Education evaluation. China has established the legal framework for higher education evaluation, has in place a higher education evaluation scheme that is dominated by the state and participated in by the academy and the society, and has formed a higher education system that consists of undergraduate teaching evaluation every five year, academic program evaluation every three year, and national star course evaluation every year.

Regarding the management responsibly of provincial and local governments, *the National Outline for Medium- and Long-term Educational Reform and Development (2010-2020)* stipulated that "more efforts shall be made to further intensify, within a province, the coordination of education of all levels by the provincial government". "The local government is responsible for the implementation of national policies, the development of education reform experiments, and for local education reform, development and stability according to the division of responsibilities". The local government coordinates the overall development of higher education within their respective administrative areas, works out the regional higher education development plan, exercises the management of provincial higher education institutions, independent colleges and private universities in accordance with the laws, provides the examination and approval of some higher vocational schools, and carries out the laws, administrative regulations, rules, related decisions and orders by the Central Government.

3. An Overview of the Autonomy of Higher Education Institutions

The Higher Education Law in 1998 regulated that a higher education institution shall enjoy the status of legal person upon its establishment, and its president shall be the legal representative. It further defined higher education institutions' autonomy in eight forms.

The Status of Civil Subject and Civil Rights

Once established, a higher education institution shall enjoy its civil rights and take civil responsibilities according to law.

Right to admissions

Higher education institutions shall set and adjust on their own the ratio of their enrollments among different disciplines and majors in response to society demand, school infrastructure, and scale of enrollment approved by the state.

Right to setting up majors

Higher education institutions shall independently establish their disciplines and academic programs according to law.

Right to instruction

Higher education institutions, in accordance to the need of infrastructure, independently formulate instruction plans, choose textbooks, and organize and carry out instruction-related activities.

Right to conducting research and development and providing social service

Higher education institutions shall independently conducted research, development, and public service that correspond to their conditions.

Right to conducting international exchanges and cooperation

Higher education institutions are entitled to independently conducting exchanges and cooperation with overseas higher education institutions in the field of science and culture, as long as it is in accordance with law.

Right regarding organizational establishment and personnel

Higher education institutions are entitled to setting up and staffing internal units on instruction, research and administration, and to hiring and appointing faculty members, administrators, and staff.

Right to the use and management of property

Higher education institutions shall independently manage and use the operator-contributed property, public funding, and donations by individuals and society.

In addition, The Education Law and The Regulations on Degrees also grant higher education institutions the right to offer degrees.

Higher Education Finance

One of the greatest changes in Chinese higher education reform has been the transformation of the higher education finance system from a single funding channel primarily depending on governmental appropriations to a variety of funding channels underpinned by the government, private support and other resources. China's higher education system thus gradually shifted from a free education system into a cost-sharing system; in other words, from a system in which higher education was funded by the government into one in which students or their families have to shoulder at least some of the cost.

1. A Brief History of the Higher Education Finance System

In consistence with the planned economy system, higher education was still considered a product of state planning until the 1980s. Higher education institutions largely depended upon governmental appropriations and their internally generated revenue constituted only a small percentage of their operating costs. Until the mid 1980s, higher education institutions charged no tuition or fees from students; instead, they provided grants to all students to cover students' living expenses.

Table 4: Revenue Sources of Higher Education Institutions

Year	Governmental appropriations	school-generated
1978	95.7%	4.3%
1985	91.5%	8.5%
1987	91.6%	8.4%

Data source: China Education Statistics Annual Report (1978, 1985, 1987)

In 1984, China decided to admit a number of commissioned and self-financed students to higher education, therefore starting the double-track period featuring both state-financed and self-financed students. In 1985, *the CCP Central Committee's Decision on the Reform of Education System* stated that student grants program be reformed in higher education and measures be taken on tuition and fees. As a result, most of the higher education institutions started charging tuition ranging from CNY 100 to CNY300. Even though it constituted a very small percentage of the budget, it was the turning point from a state-covers-all system to a cost-sharing system.

Another major document, *China Outline for Education Reform and Development*, announced in 1993 to "charge tuition and fees in non-compulsory education stage" as an investment scheme of raising education funds through multiple channels. Consequently, China started to experiment with merging the two tracks in 1994 and started to charge all freshmen tuition and fees in all higher education institutions in 1997.

In 1994, the State Council issued a follow-up document *the Opinion on the Implementation of the 1993 Outline*, and asked higher education to be governed by both central and provincial government, with provincial government taking a leading role, thereby gradually expanding its authority relating to education decision-making and coordinating and eventually making it motivated to invest in higher education.

The Higher Education Law promulgated in 1998 officially pointed out a higher education financing system with governmental appropriations as the major source and supplemented by other channels, thereby legitimizing the cost-sharing scheme. At the same time, higher education institutions were given the leeway to generate revenue to supplement their operating expenses.

Since then, national fiscal input for higher education has started to be supplemented with funds raised from diverse channels. Enterprise, social forces, and individuals are encouraged to make investments in higher education. *The National Outline for medium and long-term Education Reform and Development (2010-2020)* further defined a system wherein the school organizers shoulder the main portion of the higher education costs and the students share a reasonable portion as well. The school can also raise funds by setting up a foundation to seek public donations.

Table 5: Sources of Higher Education Revenue (1978-1995)

Sources	1978	1985	1990	1991	1992
Governmental appropriations	95.9%	91.5%	87.7%	86.9%	81.8%
Institution-generated	4.1%	8.5%	12.3%	13.1%	18.2%
2.1 Overall	--	--	10.3%	10.7%	12.8%
2.2 Donations	--	--	0.2%	0.7%	0.8%
2.1 and 2.2	4.1%	--	10.5%	11.4%	13.6%
2.3 Tuition & fees	--	--	1.8%	2.9%	4.6%

Data source: China Education Statistics Annual Report

Specifically, higher education revenue comes from the following channels, including governmental appropriations, tuition and fees, institution-generated revenue, donations, investment by social organizations and school-operating individuals, and others.

As can be seen from Table 5, in 1997, national governmental appropriations covered nearly 96% of the overall expenses; this percentage was still high in 1997 reaching 78%. As higher education institutions started charging all students tuition and fees, this percentage started to drop accordingly. By 2003, this percentage went down dramatically to 44.1%, and went back to over 50% in 2010.

In comparison to the declining percentage of governmental appropriations is the rapid increase of student tuition and fees. Prior to 1993, barely 5% of the higher education expenses came from student tuitions and fees. Even in 1993 when the government announced the multiple-channel fund raising, this percentage was only 6.1%. In 1999 when higher education expansion started, student enrolment grew dramatically, and the percentage of student tuition and fees grew to 17.2%. As the scale of higher education continued growing, the percentage of tuition and fees grew each year with an annual growth rate of 3%. It soon became the second largest source of revenue, reached a record high of 33.7% in 2007 and went down to below 30% in 2011. Revenue generated by higher education institutions by research and service accounted for a stable share between 8% and 13%. Other sources including donations and investment by social forces and individuals made up for the remaining 8% of the overall higher education revenue.

Table 6: Sources of Higher Education Revenue (1997-2005)
(Unit: 10 thousand)

Year	Governmental Appropriations	Tuition & Fees	Institution-generated revenue	fund by social organizations & individuals	Donations	Others	Total Revenue for Higher Ed	Total Education Revenue	Percentage of Higher Ed Revenue
1997	3,057,455 (78.43%)	578,857 (14.85%)	--	--	58,471 (1.50%)	203,377 (5.22%)	3,898,160	25,317,326	15.40%
1998	3,567,538 (65.13%)	731,134 (13.35%)	--	--	114,640 (2.09%)	1,064,505 (19.43%)	5,477,817	29,490,592	18.57%
1999	4,431,601 (62.82%)	1,207,836 (17.12%)	--	--	161,677 (2.29%)	1,253,602 (17.77%)	7,054,716	33,490,416	21.06%
2000	4,431,601 (62.82%)	1,207,836	--	--	161,677 (2.29%)	1,253,602	7,054,716	38,490,806	18.33%

		(17.12%)				(17.77%)			
2001	6,328,004 (55.10%)	2,824,417 (24.59%)	--	--	172,775 (1.50%)	2,158,574 (18.80%)	11,483,770	46,376,626	24.76%
2002	7,521,463 (51.70%)	3,906,526 (26.85%)	--	--	278,253 (1.91%)	2,840,985 (19.53%)	14,547,227	54,800,278	26.55%
2003	8,405,779 (49.62%)	5,057,307 (29.85%)	--	--	256,375 (1.51%)	3,220,992 (19.01%)	16,940,453	62,082,653	27.29%
2004	9,697,909 (48.07%)	6,476,921 (32.10%)	--	--	215,440 (1.07%)	3,785,362 (18.76%)	20,175,632	72,425,989	27.86%
2005	10,908,369 (46.02%)	7,919,249 (33.41%)	--	--	210,796 (0.89%)	4,662,641 (19.67%)	23,701,055	84,188,391	28.15%
2006	11,285,356 (44.49%)	8,379,126 (33.03%)	3,206,846 (12.64%)	181,489 (0.72%)	211,960 (0.84%)	2,104,017 (8.29%)	25,368,794	98,153,087	25.85%
2007	15,983,187 (44.08%)	12,231,914 (33.74%)	4,755,113 (13.11%)	234,326 (0.65%)	271,809 (0.75%)	2,781,040 (7.67%)	36,257,389	121,480,663	29.85%
2008	20,035,116 (47.59%)	14,181,277 (33.68%)	4,462,865 (10.60%)	301,687 (0.72%)	286,343 (0.68%)	2,835,082 (6.73%)	42,102,370	145,007,374	29.03%
2009	22,645,083 (48.82%)	15,403,469 (33.21%)	4,785,446 (10.32%)	261,761 (0.56%)	261,761 (0.56%)	3,023,369 (6.52%)	46,380,889	165,027,065	28.11%
2010	29,018,026 (52.78%)	16,760,756 (30.49%)	5,404,796 (9.83%)	269,647 (0.49%)	296,357 (0.54%)	3,229,068 (5.87%)	54,978,650	195,618,471	28.11%
2011	40,234,989 (58.48%)	18,121,026 (26.34%)	5,886,150 (8.56%)	332,915 (0.48%)	431,870 (0.63%)	3,795,366 (5.52%)	68,802,316	238,692,936	28.82%
2012	40,963,277 (58.34%)	18,623,612 (26.53%)	5,996,407 (8.54%)	332,915 (0.47%)	434,534 (0.62%)	3,857,995 (5.50%)	70,208,740	238,692,936	29.41%

Note: Compiled based on data from the National Bureau of Statistics of China, http://data.stats.gov.cn/workspace/index;jsessionid=C781D208E25C79B326BDB5A26F52CE16?m=hgnd

2. The Student Financial Aid System

Table 6 indicates that higher education institutions are increasingly reliant upon student tuition and fees, which constituted 30% of the overall higher education revenue in 2003. This figure was 20% for ministry-affiliated universities and as high as 40% for provincial colleges and universities. In this context, higher education opportunities for students from financially challenged families became the concern of the whole society. To prevent poor students from losing higher education opportunity due to inability to pay tuition or fees, the student financial aid system started to come to place. In adapting to a cost-sharing mechanism, the Chinese financial aid policy for higher education is constantly being improved, especially for poor students. China has established national scholarships, national grants, national student loans, work-study programs, and "Green Pathway" and other types of financial aid, which serves as an important supplement for higher education.

State Scholarships

This program is financed by the central government and for excellent sophomore, junior and senior who are enrolled full-time in two- and four-year institutions. It covers 50,000 winners, with CNY8, 000 per person per year.

State Motivation Scholarships

This program is jointly finance by both central and provincial government, and it targets at sophomore, junior and senior who are excellent academically and disadvantaged financially, are enrolled full-time in higher education institutions. It covers 3% of the whole enrolments, with CNY5, 000 per person per year.

State Grants

Funded by both central and province government, this program is meant to partially cover the living expenses of financially challenged students who are enrolled full-time in two- and four-year institutions. It covers 20% of the whole enrolments, with an average of CNY3, 000 per person per year.

State student loans

This program targets at financially challenged students who are enrolled full-time in two- and four-year undergraduate programs and graduate programs in higher education institutions. In principle, it is CNY6, 000 in maximum per person per academic year. The interest is entirely subsidized by the government during the length of study, and is paid by the student after students' graduation.

Tuition Make-up

This program has been in place since 2009 to make up tuition and state student loans for students who agree to serve three years or longer in the middle and western regions. It provides CNY6, 000 per person per year, up to three years. It also applies to students who serve military service after graduation.

Free Education for Students in Normal Colleges and Universities

This program has been in place since 2007 to provide free education to eligible students in six normal universities affiliated with the Ministry of Education who are willing to teach in rural schools in middle and western regions after their graduation. In return to their future service, the program waives tuition and lodging and provides subsidies to cover food and other living expenses.

Work-study

This program compensates students for their on-campus service in their spare time, so that they can improve their learning and living conditions.

Tuition waiver

This program provides tuition waiver for full-time students in public higher education institutions who are financially challenged and cannot afford tuition, especially those who are orphans, disabled, or belonging to an ethnic minority.

"Green channel"

Once admitted, students who are financially challenged and unable to afford tuition and fees can get enrolled first and receive different subsidies depending on the situation.

Others

Higher education institutions are entitled to reserve 4-6% of its institution-generated revenue for the purpose of subsidies. In addition, higher education institutions are allowed to use internally generated income and donations to set up institutional scholarships and grants and grant subsidies to students who temporarily suffer from financial difficulty.

Academic Profession

China has the largest higher education system in the world, in terms of both higher education enrollment and faculty. In 2010, Chinese academic profession numbered 1.4 million, which accounted for one fourth of the world's total.

1. An Overview of the Chinese Academic Profession

The academic profession in Chinese universities has experienced ups and downs since the late 1970s. Firstly, after the Cultural Revolution ended in late 1970s, new policies were adopted concerning intellectuals including university faculty, and their political status as part of the ruling class was identified. Secondly, in line with the implementation of the reform and opening up policy, academic community began to have more chances of international exchanges. Statistics show that 78% of the university presidents attached to Ministry of Education and 62% of doctorate supervisors have either study or research experience overseas. Thirdly, there was once significant outflow of faculty to business sector due to salary gap. Fourthly, since late 1990s, academic profession has become attractive, as faculty working conditions were improving and their income going up. These changes can be attributed to the national strategy of "rejuvenating the country through science and education" in general, Project 211 and Project 985 in particular. The favorable changes can be exampled by two cases. One case is that per capita income of faculty in a provincial university grew from CNY977 in 1982 to CNY 5,879 in 1996, 5 times increase within 14 years. The other case is that per capita income in a national university grew from CNY 22,612 in 2000 to CNY 75,738 in 2008, 2.3 times increase within 5 years. In 2005, the State Taxation Administration listed university faculty as a high-income group.

When discussing the academic profession in China, it is important to keep in mind the complex system of higher education landscape, which consists of regular higher education, adult higher education, and non-degree-granting, career-oriented private agencies. The regular higher education sector generally consists of degree-granting public and private higher education institutions; in this sphere, public higher education institutions are divided into central ministries-affiliated universities and provincial higher education institutions. It is noteworthy that vast difference exists between public and private higher education sector, and between the regular and adult higher education sector. In consequence, faculty members in these sectors have different treatments.

Statistics shows that in 2010, a majority of the faculty members (95.5%) were in the regular higher education sector, among which 82% were in the public sector and 18% in the private sector. Only 3.3% and 1.3% were found in the adult higher education sector and other private agencies, respectively. Due to the small percentage of the adult sector and the private agencies, most of the following description focuses on the regular higher education sector only.

In 2010, full-time faculty members in Chinese higher education reached more than 1.3 million. In terms of gender, male faculty members outnumbered their female counterpart by 8% (54% versus 46%).

In terms of institutions by level, nearly one million (70%) of the faculty members taught in 4-year institutions and the remaining 40 thousand (30%) in 2- or 3-year short-cycle institutions.

In terms of institutions by affiliation, only 13% of the faculty members worked in selective central ministries-affiliated universities; among them, barely 14 thousand (80%) in universities affiliated with the Ministry of Education and the others (20%) in universities affiliated with other central ministries. Less than a quarter of a million (18%) of the faculty members worked in the least selective private higher education sector, while the majority, nearly one million (69%) were in provincial higher education institutions affiliated with provincial or local government.

Table 7: Distribution of Full-time Faculty Members in Higher Education Institutions in 2010

Institutions	No. of HEIs	Percentage of HEIs
1.Regular HEIs	1,343,127	95.5%
--Public	--1,106,753	--78.7%
--Private	--236,374	--16.8%
2.Adult HEIs	45,883	3.3%
3.Other Private Agencies	17,794	1.3%
Total	1,406,808	100%

Data Source: China Education Statistics Yearbook (2010)

In terms of the academic qualifications of Chinese academic profession, there is much room for improvement. For example, in 2010, across all types of higher education institutions, only 14.3% of the faculty members had doctoral degrees, 33.8% had master's degrees, half of the faculty had bachelor's degrees, and nearly 2% of them only had diplomas. Among the three types of institutions, the regular higher education sector, which consists of central ministries-affiliated universities, provincial HEIs, and private colleges, had faculty with the highest level of academic qualifications, as slightly half of their faculty received graduate education. It is noteworthy that even within this sector, vast differences exist. A majority of the faculty members in central ministries-affiliated universities tend to have doctoral degrees, tailed by provincial institutions and then by private colleges. In comparison, the adult higher education sector and the diploma-granting private agencies lagged far behind. In adult higher education institutions such as the television and broadcasting university system, barely one out of five faculty members had graduate degrees, and three quarters had only bachelor's degrees. In private agencies, nearly one quarter had graduate degrees, one third had bachelor's degrees, and nearly one tenth only had education in short-cycle courses and held no degrees.

Table 8: Academic Qualifications of Full-time Faculty Members in ALL Higher Education Institutions

	Doctor's Degree	Master's Degree	Bachelor's Degree	Short-cycle Courses	Total
Regular, Public (95.5%)	200337 (14.9%)	463401 (34.5%)	656991 (48.9%)	22398 (1.7%)	1343127
Adult, Public (3.3%)	770 (1.7%)	8324 (18.1%)	34167 (74.5%)	2624 (5.7%)	45885
Other Private Agencies (1.3%)	708 (4.0%)	3642 (20.5%)	11784 (66.2%)	1660 (9.3%)	17794

Overall	201815 (14.3%)	475367 (33.8%)	702944 (50.0%)	26682 (1.9%)	1406808

Data Source: China Education Statistics Yearbook (2010)

In terms of compensation and job security, huge disparities exist. The faculty in public universities belongs to the public unit staffing system, whose staff is paid by central or provincial governmental budget. Their basic salary and welfare, including medical care, housing, pension and unemployment insurances, etc, are favorably secured. In comparison, faculty in private sector is employee of a particular university, whose compensation come solely from the university without any public subsidy. Moreover, their welfare is less favorably secured. Consequently, less apparent variation is observed in public sector and more apparent variation in private sector in compensation and benefit. The differences in compensation and job security lead to the fact that job opportunities in public universities are more attractive for talents than those in private ones. Due to different staffing systems, there are little movements of faculty between two kinds of universities. Within the public sector, as mentioned above, there are two types of universities: universities attached to central ministries including Ministry of Education and universities attached to local governments. The former, funded by central budget, boasts of abundant educational resources and higher quality while the latter, funded by local governments, provide less educational resources and relatively lower quality. Generally speaking, faculties in the former category enjoy higher income than their counterpart in the locally funded institutions.

In terms of academic rank, faculty in Chinese higher education institutions fall into four categories, including senior (equivalent to "full professor"), sub-senior (equivalent to "associate professor"), middle ((equivalent to "assistant professor"), junior (equivalent to "lecturer") and no rank. A look at the distribution shows that overall, in 2010, only 11% of the full-time faculty members enjoyed the title "senior", slightly over one fifth was "sub-senior", over one third "middle", and 17% and 5% in the "junior" or "no rank" category, respectively. When compared by gender, roughly the same percentage of male and female faculty members had senior or sub-senior title; yet female members were more likely to be in the lower rank of "junior" or "no rank" than their male counterpart. When broken down by level of institutions, faculty members in four-year institutions were more likely to have a higher rank and less likely to have junior or no rank at all than their counterparts in two- or three-year institutions. When broken down by institutional affiliation, a majority (57%) of the faculty members in universities affiliated with central ministries had senior or sub-senior rank, compared with 37% in provincial HEIs and 32% in private agencies. Likewise, only 7% of the faculty members in the universities affiliated with central ministries had junior or no rank at all, while the percentage reached 23% in provincial HEIs and 34% in private agencies. This pattern speaks well with the difference in faculty's academic qualifications of the three types of higher education institutions.

Table 8: Full-time Faculty Members in Regular Higher Education Institutions in 2010

	Senior	Sub-senior	Middle	Junior	No rank	Total
Overall	148,552 (11%)	377,225 (28%)	516,938 (38%)	231,099 (17%)	69,313 (5%)	1,343,127 (100%)
By Gender						
--Male (54%)	108,914 (15%)	215,893 (30%)	257,355 (36%)	104,298 (15%)	32,326 (4%)	718,786 (100%)
--Female (46%)	39638 (14%)	161332 (29%)	259583 (42%)	126801 (20%)	36987 (6%)	624341 (100%)
By Degree						
--4-year (70%)	133731 (14%)	275262 (29%)	368043 (39%)	124632 (13%)	33825 (4%)	935493 (100%)
--2- to3-year (3%)	14655 (4%)	101133 (25%)	147332 (36%)	105691 (26%)	35287 (9%)	404098 (100%)
By Affiliation						
--Central Ministries (13%)	41152 (23%)	59106 (34%)	62772 (36%)	8720 (5%)	3456 (2%)	175206 (100%)
----MOE (80%)	33928 (24%)	47676 (34%)	49656 (36%)	5976 (4%)	2616 (2%)	139852 (100%)
----Other agencies (80%)	7224 (20%)	11430 (32%)	13116 (37%)	2744 (8%)	840 (2%)	35354 (100%)
--Local Authorities (69%)	85061 (9%)	262785 (28%)	374820 (40%)	166691 (18%)	42190 (5%)	931547 (100%)
--Private (18%)	22339 (9%)	55334 (23%)	79346 (34%)	55688 (24%)	23667 (10%)	236374 (100%)
Total	635194 (11%)	1567176 (28%)	2128961 (38%)	932340 (17%)	280507 (5%)	5544178 (100%)

Data source: Educational Statistics Yearbook of China (2010), by People's Education Press.

2. Cultivation and Evaluation of the Academic Profession

Faculty members in Chinese higher education largely received academic training in domestic universities, ranging from four years' undergraduate education, two or three years' master's education, to three or four years' doctoral education. The training generally focuses on discipline-based knowledge and research skills, yet with little preparation for classroom teaching in their discipline after graduation. In consequence, many faculty members, especially junior ones, are better researchers than teachers.

Another issue that has concerned many in the Chinese academy is inbreeding of faculty. Chinese higher education institutions have the tradition of recruiting faculty members from its own fresh graduates. The disadvantage of this phenomenon has been obvious, and some institutions, especially prestigious universities, have taken measures to hire less of their own graduates and bring more from other universities, domestic and overseas. In recent years, some universities have experimented with recruiting 1/3 new faculty members from its own graduates, 1/3 from domestic universities, and 1/3 from overseas universities. There is no statistics regarding this, but it is no secret that faculty openings in most of the 4-year universities require a doctoral degree, and those in prestigious universities like Project 985 institutions prefer people with doctoral training in top overseas universities.

To develop a high quality faculty, the central government issued in 2007 *the Program for Cultivating High-Caliber Creative Talents in Higher Education Institutions.* The initiative aims to develop a

faculty development and support system at three levels: (1) On the top of the system is *the Project for Yangtze River Scholars and Innovative Team Development*, which is focused on attracting and selecting a batch of internationally competitive academic leaders and forming a number of distinguished innovation-oriented team. (2) In the middle of the system is *the New Century Distinguished Talent Support Project*, which aims to train and support a large number of academic leaders who are academically sound, innovative, and with great potentials. (3) At the bottom of the system is *the Young Faculty Cultivation Project*, which is charged with providing training to thousands of talented junior faculty members and improving the quality of the whole faculty. This project provides various faculty development opportunities for junior faculty members, including in-service degree escalation, dissertation grants, start-up funds for overseas returnees, study abroad grants, domestic research grants, advanced seminars on teaching, etc.

As far as faculty evaluation is concerned, reform is underway. In the planned economy system, faculty positions were considered stable and even permanent. There was evaluation in terms of teaching, research and service in some cases, but it focused on more formality than substance. Since China entered the market-oriented economy system, there has been more call for efficiency in every line of work, higher education included. As a result, the academic community has been taking measures in evaluating its faculty and their work so as to motivate them to be more responsible and efficient. As faculty evaluation falls into institutional jurisdiction, it varies differently from campus to campus, which makes it difficult, if possible at all, to generalize. It is reasonable to say, though, that top universities like Project 985 universities are under more pressure to and are taking more profound measures in conducting faculty evaluation. Some prestigious universities such as Peking University and Tsinghua University have taken an up-or-out approach. Teaching is emphasized in faculty evaluation, and research publication is even given more weight. How to maintain the delicate balance between teaching and research in faculty evaluation has been heatedly debated within the academic community and beyond.

Selected References

1. ____. *China Educational Finance Statistical Year Book* (中国教育经费统计年鉴). China Statistics Press. 2006-2012.
2. ____. *China Education Statistics Year Book* (中国教育统计年鉴). China Statistics Press. 2006-2012.
3. ____.*National Data on Education*. Official website of the National Bureau of Statistics of China.
4. ____. *The Rising of a Country through Education* (教育大国的崛起（1978-2008）). Educational Science Publishing House. 2008.
5. ____. *Survey of the Employment for Higher Education Graduates* (全国高校毕业生就业状况(2009-2010)). Peking University Press. 2011.
6. ____. *Review on the Development and Reform of Higher Education in China for the Last Thirty Years* (改革开放30年中国高等教育发展经验专题研究：1978-2008). Educational Science Publishing House. 2008.
7. Li Fengliang. Financing Higher Education: Lessons from China. *Irish Educational Studies*, 31(2), 191-206, June 2012.
8. Yan Fengqiao. China's Academic Profession in the Context of Social Transition: Institutional Perspective. *Economics of Education Research (Beida)*. 7(2). 2009.
9. Yuan Liansheng. Financial Policies for Education in the national Medium- and Long-term Educational Reform and Development Guideline (2010-2020). *Chinese Education and Society*. 45(3), 37-49, May-June 2012.
10. Yuan Guiren. *Education in China* (中国教育). Beijing Normal University Publishing Group. 2013.
11. Zhang Li, Ma Luting. *Theory and Practice on Modern University System with Chinese Characteristics* (中国特色现代大学制度建设理论与实践). East China Normal University Press. 2013.