

International Higher Education is the quarterly publication of the Center for International Higher Education.

The journal is a reflection of the Center's mission to encourage an international perspective that will contribute to enlightened policy and practice. Through *International Higher Education*, a network of distinguished international scholars offers commentary and current information on key issues that shape higher education worldwide. *IHE* is published in English, Chinese, Russian, and Spanish. Links to all editions can be found at www.bc.edu/cihe.

Brain Drain or Brain Exchange?

- 2 Brain Drain or Brain Exchange: Developing Country Implications
Philip G. Altbach
- 4 Research Collaboration and Global Migration
Gali Halevi and Henk F. Moed

Internationalization: Trends and Critiques

- 5 The False Halo of Internationalization
Jenny J. Lee
- 7 The Dragon's Deal: Sino-African Cooperation in Higher Education
Milton O. Obamba
- 9 Deceptive Foreign Credential Evaluation Services
George D. Gollin
- 10 Financial Aspects of Offshore Activities
John Fielden

Rankings and Their Implications

- 12 Are Global Rankings Unfair to Latin American Universities?
Andrés Bernasconi
- 13 Implications of Excellence in Research and Teaching
Johannes Wespel, Dominic Orr, and Michael Jaeger

India Issues

- 15 Getting Value for Money in Higher Education
Philip G. Altbach and Pawan Agarwal
- 17 Does India Have an International Strategy?
P. J. Lavakare

England's Present and Future

- 18 English Education in Distress?
Heather Eggins
- 20 What Will English Higher Education Look Like in 2025?
Jeroen Huisman, Harry de Boer, and Paulo Charles Pimental Bótas

Regions and Countries

- 21 The Challenge of Sustaining Student Loan System: Colombia and Chile
Jamil Salmi
- 23 American Engineering Doctoral Enrollments
Richard A. Skinner

Departments

- 25 New Publications
- 27 News of the Center

Does Anyone Care About Developing Countries: Brain Drain or Brain Exchange?

PHILIP G. ALTBACH

Philip G. Altbach is Monan University professor and director of the Center for International Higher Education at Boston College. E-mail: altbach@bc.edu.

The rich world is worrying about skills shortages, especially at the upper levels of their economies. The causes are many—such as a “demographic cliff” in Japan and in some European countries, significantly reducing the numbers of university-age young people, especially too few students enrolling in science, technology, engineering, and mathematics (STEM) fields, a leveling off of access, and low-degree completion rates. What is a solution of these problems? Increasingly, it is to boost the “stay rates” of international students—in other words, to convince international students, mainly from developing and middle-income countries, to remain after they complete their degrees. To oversimplify, the rich are robbing the brains of the developing countries—or for that matter any qualified brains who can be lured. Although the brain drain has been part of academia for a century or more, the situation is increasingly acute for all sides. For developing and emerging countries, the danger is that they will be left behind in the global knowledge economy, thus permanently damaging their futures.

CURRENT REALITIES

In the era of globalization, it may be a bit of an exaggeration to call this a deliberate policy to encourage brain drain, but only slightly. Stay rates are already quite high. For example, 80 percent or more of Chinese and Indians who have obtained their advanced degrees in the United States over almost a half century have remained in the country. It is hardly an exaggeration to point out that a significant part of Silicon Valley has been built with Indian brainpower. A recent analysis of data from the National Science Foundation’s Survey of Earned Doctorates shows that the large majority of doctoral recipients from developing countries plan to remain in the United States, contributing to the academic labor force, particularly in the STEM fields. While data are seldom available, other European countries and Australia no doubt show similar trends. However, return rates are modestly increasing globally as developing country economies improve, and some of the rich world remains mired in recession.

SUBSIDIES FROM THE POOR TO THE RICH

Emerging and developing economies are actually contributing significantly to the academic systems of wealthier countries. International students contribute significantly to the economies of Europe, North America, and Australia while they are studying as well as if they remain. Data from 2011 indicate that the 764,000 international students studying in the United States contribute more than US\$22 billion to the American economy annually. Similar statistics can be cited for the other major host countries. Indeed, Australia, earns US\$17 billion from international scholars, and the United Kingdom, where higher education is a US\$21 billion earner, both have clearly stated national policies to increase income from overseas students.

Perhaps of greater concern are the subsidies provided by emerging and developing economies—through their doctoral graduates—who remain and join the academic profession in the rich countries. Here are examples from India and China—the two largest “brain exporters” in the world. It should be noted that these statistics are suggestive since details are unavailable and data points vary. In 2012, 100,000 Indian students were studying in the United States, mostly at the postbaccalaureate level. The large majority of these students remain after earning their degrees, and many join the local professoriate. Using UNESCO statistics, a rough estimate is that it costs the Indian taxpayer around US\$7,600 in purchasing power parity (PPP) to educate a student from primary schooling through a bachelor’s degree. It can be estimated that an Indian family may invest a similar amount in the education of a child—particularly since many of the young people who qualify for admission to overseas universities have been educated in private English-medium schools in India—for a total estimate of US\$15,000. Thus, the approximate Indian investment in America, by paying for the education of 100,000 young people through the bachelor’s degree is approximately US\$1.5 billion annually. The China figures are likely even higher. Although public expenditures on education are not available, research shows the average Chinese family invests US\$39,000 PPP dollars to educate a student from primary through the completion of a bachelor’s degree. There were 194,000 students from China studying in the United States in 2012. One can estimate that Chinese families were investing US\$7.6 billion in brainpower in the United States. Significant additional funding from Chinese state sources were also being invested, although figures are unavailable.

It seems possible to approximate the educational contributions of the various, mostly developing, countries—whose young people are studying abroad—to the economies of the host countries. While not all of these students will remain after completing their studies, the sums are significant.

In addition to direct costs, the host countries benefit from an immense amount of intellectual capital from some of the brightest young people from the developing world. At the same time, the losses for developing countries are huge—for academe in particular, in research and teaching talent, new and innovative ideas that might have been cultivated from overseas experience, practices in university management, and many others.

RICH COUNTRY STRATEGIES

Hans de Wit and Nannette Ripmeester provide an excellent summary of some of the policies aimed at increasing “stay rates” through changes in immigration policy, the provision of scholarships, closer links between universities and employers, and others (*University World News*, February 17, 2013). There is wide agreement in Europe and North America that new initiatives to entice the “best and brightest” of professionals from other countries, whom they educate, to stay and join the local labor force are a good idea. Efforts to liberalize visa regulations; open employment opportunities; permit postgraduate work, easier degree recognition; improvement of cooperation between the universities, governments, and industry; and many other initiatives are being implemented.

Countries, such as the United Kingdom and Australia, that recently implemented more stringent immigration limits, are rethinking their policies. The US National Academy of Sciences as well as universities advocate liberalizing visa regimes, in order to make it easier for foreign graduates to remain and work in the United States. There is absolutely no recognition of any contradiction between, for example, Millennium Development Goals, which stress the necessity for educational development in the emerging nations and policies aimed at attracting the best brains from developing countries.

African countries as South Africa and Botswana, which have relatively advanced higher education systems and pay more attractive salaries, also lure talent from elsewhere in Africa. Further, the academic brain drain operates between the major “academic powers,” as well. Germany tries hard to attract back its postdocs and doctoral graduates, working in the United States, back to Germany, with only limited success. The attraction of a more stable academic career structure and somewhat higher salaries in the United States are attractive, and American universities try to keep the brightest international graduates, whatever their nationality.

THE COMPLEXITIES OF A GLOBALIZED WORLD

While location still matters and the world is by no means flat when it comes to academic excellence and power, globalization has certainly impacted universities and academic

systems worldwide. The Internet has made communication and collaboration much easier. The proportion of research and publication conducted jointly by academics in more than one country has grown dramatically at the top of the system. Distance education, joint-degree programs, and branch campuses exhibit another aspect of a globalized academic world. None of this, however, makes up for losses in personnel.

China, as a country with large numbers of its academics working overseas, has instituted a number of programs to lure top Chinese researchers back to China. Joint appointments have also been offered for academics in key fields, so that Chinese universities can benefit from top scholars who wish to remain abroad. Other developing and middle-income countries also seek to leverage the academic diaspora through encouraging joint research projects, attracting investment, sponsoring academic organizations, and others. Successful programs have at least ensured that top local talent can benefit from expertise by compatriots who live abroad. Countries such as South Korea, Turkey, Scotland, and others have implemented programs.

To oversimplify, the rich are robbing the brains of the developing countries—or for that matter any qualified brains who can be lured.

In all of these cases, however, the advantage remains with the major global academic centers for obvious reasons. Also, location matters a great deal; being part of an academic community is a much more powerful draw, even than Internet-based communication or sabbaticals or summers abroad. Stable academic careers, attractive salaries, academic freedom, unfettered access to the latest scientific and intellectual ideas, among other things, are a tremendous attraction. Few programs to bring back researchers and academics or efforts to limit academic mobility have been very successful. The fact is that until universities in developing countries offer the academic culture and facilities that top academics expect—including academic freedom, unrestricted information access, and laboratories—they will be unable to attract and retain top academic talent, but the policies of the rich countries certain do not help.

ACADEMIC JUSTICE?

Do the “academic powers” have any responsibility to developing academic systems? A sense of responsibility for encouraging doctoral graduates from the developing world to

return home, to build universities, and to improve the quality of emerging academic systems is entirely absent from the current discussion. The only concern is to improve “stay rates” and liberalize immigration rules to ensure that the maximum number of the best and brightest from the developing world remains. Should the rich world at the least, in the context of Millennium Development Goals, remit to the developing world the costs incurred, by developing countries, in educating their nonreturning young people? There are many ways to at least ameliorate the situation—for example, joint doctoral degrees that provide young developing country scholars an opportunity to study abroad for part of their PhD work, while retaining a link to their home university and at the same time building research capacity. Then, at least, the developing countries would not be directly subsidizing the academic systems of the rich. ■

Research Collaboration and Global Migration

GALI HALEVI AND HENK F. MOED

Gali Halevi is at the Informetric Research Group, Elsevier, New York. E-mail: g.halevi@elsevier.com. Henk F. Moed is at the Informetric Research Group, Elsevier, Amsterdam, Netherlands. E-mail: h.moed@elsevier.com. The full text of the article can be found at: <http://arxiv.org/ftp/arxiv/papers/1212/1212.5194.pdf>.

This study compares trends in coauthorship and physical migration of scientists from country to country. Coauthorship analysis has long been used as a way to track the formation of scientific networks both domestically and internationally. Recently, however, an increased interest forms tracking and analyzing authors’ affiliations, to follow the physical movement of researchers from one country to another. By analyzing authors’ geographical location of a particular paper or studying large sets of articles, international coauthorship and collaboration networks can be identified. Migration, as opposed to coauthorship has an impact, not only on the formation of scientific collaborations but also on the social and economical fabric of a country. Migration trends can, potentially, serve policymakers and programs directors—as to the strengths and weaknesses of their scientific community and whether a country suffers from brain drain or benefits from developments, due to migration.

DRIVERS OF MIGRATION AND COAUTHORSHIP

Our recent study conducted a multidisciplinary database containing over 20,000 sources of peer reviewed publications, analyzing coauthorship patterns and scientific migration of 17 selected countries—Egypt, Iran, Malaysia, Pakistan, Romania, Portugal, Germany, Italy, Netherlands, the United Kingdom, Brazil, China, India, the United States, Australia, Japan, and Thailand. Analyzing the 2011 corpus of publications and including authors who started their careers from 2001 to 2010, it was able to trace the strengths of immigration between various countries.

The research found a difference between coauthorship and migration patterns. It is apparent that common language and geographical proximity drive international migration more strongly than coauthorships. In addition, the effect of political tensions seems smaller on migration than it is on coauthorship. This can be seen in the relatively low ratio of coauthorship and high migration between Iran and the United States, India, and Pakistan—and China and Taiwan, as examples.

The United States and China are both unique cases of interesting patterns in migration. US authors tend to migrate less frequently than researchers do from large European study countries—United Kingdom, Italy, and Netherlands. This could be due to the sheer size of the United States and the abundance of excellent US research institutions that allows researchers to move from one institute to another without having to leave the United States. In addition, our analysis showed that compared to the level of coauthorship, relatively many young researchers currently active in the United States have been previously active in India and Iran.

PERMANENT VS. TEMPORARY MIGRATION

Another focus of the analysis was based on the percentages of authors who stay within their country; those who migrate permanently, and those who migrate yet return to the origin country. The largest percentage of authors who stay in their country are American authors, followed by Chinese authors. A much smaller percentage of authors move permanently; and those are from predominantly German and Dutch authors, followed by American and Italian authors. The ones least likely to move permanently are Chinese authors. This could be due to the wealth of resources available to Chinese scientists, as opposed to the lack of expertise. In this respect, Chinese scientists might migrate to other countries, to gain expertise in a certain area, but return to their homeland, to practice and develop their careers. It was also found that the number of authors who migrate and return comprises the smallest percentage of authors. A comparison of the percentages of authors who move permanently to those who move and return to their origin country, a clear picture

of countries where brain drain occurs vs. countries which are in the process of developing their infrastructure. Countries such as Iran, Thailand, Malaysia, and Pakistan seem to have a large number of researchers who move abroad and return. This type of migration supports the development of the country's professional-skills levels and infrastructure and shows rising numbers of such exchange. On the other side of the spectrum are countries such as the United States, Japan, India and Germany where larger number of researchers seem to be moving to different countries permanently. In the middle, are countries such as China, Brazil, and Australia, where the numbers are balanced between those, who leave their country to work abroad and come back, to those who leave permanently.

It is apparent that common language and geographical proximity drive international migration more strongly than coauthorships.

IMPLICATIONS ON SCIENCE POLICY

This analysis, despite tracking existing trends, could potentially serve as a way to examine the effects of migration and collaboration patterns on research performance—especially the extent that researchers who move from one country to another increase their research performance. A case study conducted some years ago on the performance of researchers, at Leiden University in the Netherlands, revealed that those after attaining of their PhD in the Netherlands conducted their postdoc training at prestigious foreign universities and performed better than those who remained in the Netherlands.

The use of affiliation indicators allows one to track co-authorship patterns and identify the formation of domestic and international scientific networks. Similar use of affiliation indicators have shown that they can be used to track actual physical migration of scientists from country to country, whether on a permanent or temporary basis. This method of analysis enables policymakers at the national level to track researchers who started their career in a country but moved abroad and continued their careers in foreign institutions. This information can play an important role for programs aimed to invite researchers who went abroad to return to their home country. In this manner, one can track migration based also on the scientific focus. If, for example, a country sees scientists in neuroscience migrating out, it can decide to invest more in that area, in order to keep its

talent and avoid brain drain. This type of analysis can also indicate the formation of centers of excellence around the world. ■

The False Halo of Internationalization

JENNY J. LEE

Jenny J. Lee is associate professor at the Center for the Study of Higher Education, University of Arizona, Tucson. E-mail: jennylee@email.arizona.edu.

I nternationalization has come to the forefront as countries and their institutions strategize to participate in today's global society. Internationalization can be likened to an arms race of international students, scholars, programs, and linking an institution to individuals and activities outside its national borders. While massive efforts are now being made to internationalize, less attention is paid to determining the quality and educational return in investments once the activities are set up. This effect of internationalization too easily overlooks the human aspect of migration and exchange, which is well documented as being quite uneven globally. In short, a danger occurs in blindly promoting internationalization, without careful consideration of its intended purposes and unintended consequences.

Being cautious and paying attention to the qualitative experiences of international students and scholars can yield major insights leading to improved benefits and coordinating the intended diplomatic goals of internationalization. Two cases will be presented on the experiences of understudied international scholars and students, which offer implications on how internationalization should be critically assessed and practiced.

SCIENTIFIC POSTDOCTORAL LABOR

International postdocs are a fundamental but often overlooked population in understanding scientific-research production. In the United States and in the United Kingdom, postdocs are heavily concentrated in the science, technology, engineering, and mathematics fields. These contingent researchers serve the countries' scientific-knowledge creation, given current domestic-skill shortages. Meanwhile, providing postdocs from abroad is plentiful, as international scholars tend to seek out positions in the United States and western Europe at the most highly ranked global universities.

While all postdocs had at least some aspirations toward becoming faculty, international postdocs were far less inclined. This international population holds two tiers of academic labor—one theoretical (United States and Europeans) and the other technical (Asians), as determined by faculty supervisors' stereotypes. These views then translated to different levels of work responsibilities and, ultimately, career paths—lab supervisors on temporary contracts and tenure-track science faculty. Based on this research, particular groups (i.e., Asians) are especially vulnerable as they tend to be assigned tasks that may not lead toward faculty positions. Faculty supervisors' decisions may be based on unchecked perceptions about cultures and countries of origin.

This effect of internationalization too easily overlooks the human aspect of migration and exchange, which is well documented as being quite uneven globally.

In today's global knowledge society, the principles of efficiency suggest that several part-time or short-term researchers are a better financial investment on scientific knowledge production, compared to a single, tenured full professor. Consequently, the term "postdocs for life" is becoming increasingly common, because opportunities for advancement and permanent job security are limited. Questions arise, however, when considering whether such activities constitute "internationalization." Based on a superficial observation, the hiring of international scholars appears certainly to qualify. When observed more critically, however, the potential exploitation of scholars from developing countries runs directly counter to the good-spirited message of internationalization.

STUDENT ATHLETES FROM ABROAD

As a second example, international student athletes are heavily recruited in the United States as a way to bring athletic prestige to an institution. As in the case of international postdocs, international student athletes are sought later to promote an institution's reputation above and beyond their domestic supply. African athletes have been researched strongly represented in track and field. Instances of social isolation, verbal insults, and harassment were identified, in many ways similar to previous findings on other international student populations. Among the most

pervasive misperceptions about African student athletes, in particular, are that these student athletes prioritize a future professional career in sports over academics. Consequently, many are funneled to majors that might be less academically demanding, to accommodate for their training and competitions, but left with degrees that have little relevance when they return home.

In the United States, a highly regarded athletic program can generate hundreds of millions of US dollars from corporate sponsorships, private donations, ticket sales, and more. In order to maintain or increase a team's competitiveness, recruiting student athletes from abroad is commonplace. As an added benefit, these international students can be showcased to demonstrate an institution's internationalization efforts. These students also gain from receiving scholarships and the opportunity to study at a university with more resources than what might be available at home. Such a win-win situation appears appealing to both parties but, when examined more carefully, concerns arise. The quality of these student athletes' experiences tend to be ignored, despite the considerable efforts that are made to recruit them. The career trajectories of these individuals are also left unexamined, especially considering that top-ranked athletes can pursue a professional athletic career, without a college education.

A SOCIAL AND EDUCATIONAL RESPONSIBILITY

In sum, it is naïve and irresponsible to perceive internationalization as being inherently good. Internationalization is not merely a set of observable activities but also involves social and education responsibility. As demonstrated in the previous examples, internationalization efforts do not automatically result in improved education opportunities and experiences, let alone greater diplomacy between participating countries.

Internationalization potentially reflects the dominant interests of the host recipients, than in the intended spirit of mutual collaboration and cultural exchange. In the higher education context, faculty and administrators must not limit planning to fiscal considerations, as is often the case. The burden of internationalization beyond the initial setup should be on the international hosts, not the invitees. When international scholars and students report unmet expectations, discrimination and unfair treatment, and harassment from the host community, the problem should be addressed by those who recruited them, not left to the sufferers.

The research has found that the source of discrimination is often our own domestic students and even faculty, who ironically are occurring in education sites—including classrooms. As such, the reported incidents in many ways

reflect a failure of the education system to educate its own members on the value of internationalization and the educational benefits that international students and scholars need to offer.

Many domestic students cannot afford to study abroad but can have an international experience in their own institutions. Among international students' most cited disappointments is the lack of social relationships with domestic students. While university activities to facilitate social exchange are plentiful, these events tend to be poorly attended with limited interest from local students. Higher education institutions can internationalize by educating their own domestic students on the value of internationalization and acquiring basic global competencies, such as being able to effectively communicate with individuals in foreign accents, possess knowledge about diverse cultures outside its borders, and network with those from overseas, as vital to success in this globalizing society.

Receiving countries and institutions need to avoid exploiting international students or scholars in the interest of global prestige or economic revenue. While internationalization is part of today's academic landscape, how we practice it is yet to be determined. ■

The Dragon's Deal: Sino-African Cooperation in Education

MILTON O. OBAMBA

Milton O. Obamba is research associate, African Network for the Internationalization of Education, Eldoret, Kenya. E-mail: M.O.Obamba@Leedsmet.ac.uk.

China and Africa have a long tradition of bilateral cooperation. The establishment of the Forum on China-Africa Cooperation (FOCAC) in 2000 has dramatically revolutionized Sino-African cooperation. It is an intergovernmental agency established jointly by China and African countries to provide a plan for strengthening bilateral cooperations between China and 50 African member countries. The emergence of FOCAC can be more accurately interpreted as part of the increasing institutionalization and intensification of Sino-African relations, at a time of deepening multilateral interactions, although critiques have intensified simultaneously. Since the establishment of FOCAC, trade volumes

have significantly increased from US\$10 billion in 2000 to US\$160 billion in 2012. Similarly, the levels of China's official development assistance to Africa have also increased significantly, rapidly rising from US\$5 billion in 2006 to US\$20 billion in 2012. In short, China's cooperation with Africa runs deep and straddles a vast spectrum of strategic, economic, and sociopolitical spheres. To focus on the development, character, and scope of Sino-African cooperation in the field of education, the article is based on an analysis of policy documents produced by the Chinese government and FOCAC. The aim is to contribute to a more systematic characterization of China's bilateral education cooperation with Africa.

HUMAN CAPACITY AND ACADEMIC MOBILITY

The earliest form of educational cooperation between China and Africa consisted of relatively small-scale and diffuse patterns of exchanges involving the outbound mobility of African students and inbound movement of Chinese teachers during the 1950s and 1960s. This pattern provided small numbers of Chinese government scholarships to African students. In the 1970s, short-term training programs in China were established for African professionals in various fields. The First FOCAC Action Plan (2000) reaffirmed China's commitment to increase the number of government scholarships and inbound Chinese teachers to Africa. Significantly, the Action Plan also established the African Human Resource Development Fund, to provide a more coordinated mechanism for training African professionals. Over the last decade, the volumes of Chinese scholarships and professional capacity opportunities have continued to increase. Scholarships, for instance, have grown from 2,000 in 2003 to 6,000 per year in 2012. This recent upsurge in Chinese initiatives in Africa has raised concerns regarding the transparency of criteria applied to training opportunities across all the 50 countries in Africa. Considering the vastness and diversity of the African continent, China's approach of an undirected continent-wide cooperation has triggered criticism around China's priorities and effective development cooperation of that scale.

CAPACITY BUILDING

Both within and outside the FOCAC framework, infrastructure development support has remained a significant agenda within China's engagement with Africa, for many decades. The third FOCAC summit contained Beijing's pledge to build 100 rural schools in Africa, while the fourth summit provided the construction of 50 China-Africa friendship schools and providing research equipment to African researchers returning from China. Some of the flagship Chinese educational infrastructure projects in Af-

rica include the Ethio-China Polytechnic in Addis Ababa and the University of Science and Technology in Malawi. China's spectacular infrastructure projects have been criticized as a way for permitting corruption and political patronage by the ruling African elite rather than as initiatives to deliver sustainable development for the populations. However, China's role in infrastructure funding is vital for Africa, since traditional Western donors no longer support such initiatives and African governments also face severe financial constraints.

China and Africa have a long tradition of bilateral cooperation. The establishment of the Forum on China-Africa Cooperation (FOCAC) in 2000 has dramatically revolutionized Sino-African cooperation.

ACADEMIC PARTNERSHIPS

Although mutual academic mobility has been a significant feature of Sino-African educational cooperation since the 1950s, there has been little opportunity for direct interinstitutional engagement. This is because Sino-African engagement is predominantly engineered through intergovernmental bureaucracies, without scope for the participation of nonstate stakeholders. Interinstitutional cooperation is therefore a relatively recent and groundbreaking development. The 2006 Beijing Action Plan provided the first attempt to create institutional-level collaboration through the establishment of Confucius Institutes, although these are also largely organized at the intergovernmental level—as part of China's global “soft power.” The 20+20 cooperation program established 2009 is another significant initiative. This program entails the launch of structured one-to-one partnerships between 20 Chinese and 20 African tertiary education institutions, to promote capacity building and sustainable development.

SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT COOPERATION

The Fourth and Fifth FOCAC Plans of Action issued in 2009 and 2012 both portray a radical shift in the character, scope, and discourse underlying the emerging trajectory of Sino-African engagement. These blueprints demonstrate the emergence of a distinctive and dominant discourse of knowledge, science and technology, and its linkages to sustainable development and poverty reduction in Africa. Un-

der this remit, China pledged to provide 100 postdoctoral fellowships for Africans and conduct 100 joint-research demonstrations. Significantly, the guides established three serious programs that are particularly critical to the emerging Sino-African development paradigm. These include China-Africa Technology Partnership Program, China-Africa Research and Exchange Program, and the China-Africa Think Tank Forum. All these flagship cooperation programs are generally focused on joint research and providing a range of initiatives to strengthen the capacity of African countries for science and technology development, policymaking, management, and technology transfer. A new technical cooperation focuses on areas that are critically connected to people's livelihoods—including health-care, environment, agriculture, renewable energy, and water development.

This trajectory denotes a Chinese shift toward poverty reduction and sustainable development, as opposed to the traditional preoccupation with grand infrastructure funding. The Think Tanks Forum represents a new focus on providing the scientific backbone and gravitas, required to strengthen the knowledge-base and robustness of Sino-African cooperation in a complex world. However, China's growing dominance in Sino-Africa cooperation is widely questioned for reproducing new patterns of dependency.

CONCLUSION

Chinese assistance for education development in Africa has evolved over many decades and is currently quite diverse and institutionalized in its scope and architecture. More recently, there is a distinct and unprecedented shift toward strengthening science and technology capacity and learning how knowledge can be more directly applied to improve people's livelihoods in Africa. This obligation suggests that Chinese development assistance may be a good force in achieving the Millennium Development Goals in Africa. However, these potential gains can be severely threatened or eroded if China reproduces the same patterns of dependency associated with the contemporary North-South cooperation. The spheres of Sino-African development cooperation should be expanded to incorporate nonstate actors from both sides—in order to create sufficient capacity and synergies for implementing Sino-African development engagement. ■

Deceptive Foreign Credential Evaluation Services

GEORGE D. GOLLIN

George D. Gollin is professor of physics, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign. E-mail: g-gollin@illinois.edu.

A year after entering practice in Africa, the young African physician appeared to be seeking employment in Greece. He asked a credential evaluation service to vouch for the legitimacy of his medical degree, sending a report of its conclusions to his new home country (Greece). The service promised “fair & honest evaluations,” and claimed it was “fighting degree frauds through professional techniques and verifications.” It determined “that applicant’s studies have the equivalency of a Doctor of Medicine . . . from a regionally accredited Institution of Higher Education of the United States of America.”

The report failed to mention that the credential evaluation firm’s owner was himself a perpetrator of degree frauds, having been fined 15,000 Euros for running a diploma mill in Europe. The medical degree frauds came from a Pakistani mill, which had once tried to sell me a doctoral degree in thoracic surgery. However, I am a physicist, not a physician.

Another credential evaluator was paid by the owners of a North American diploma mill for pretending that they ran a recognized African school, rather than a criminal enterprise based in the United States. A third employed an unsavory fellow who was the “Vice President” and “Dean of Studies” of a pair of diploma mills.

There are many legitimate credential evaluation services in the higher education landscape, but also plenty of snakes in the weeds.

FOREIGN CREDENTIAL EVALUATION SERVICES

The rapid changes in international higher education complicate the decision process, regarding transfer of credits when students cross national boundaries. Since it is costly to maintain in-house expertise in the evaluation of foreign programs, it is natural for universities and employers to seek the analyses of outside experts—such as the International Education Services division of the American Association of Collegiate Registrars and Admissions Officers (AACRAO), or the National Association of Credential Evaluation Services (NACES). Members of the ENIC-NARIC Networks (ENIC: European Network of Information Centers in the European Region; NARIC: National Academic Recognition Information Centers in the European Union) also provide reliable credential evaluation services.

Unfortunately, there is no regulatory oversight in the United States of the hundreds of foreign credential evaluation services. Even an evaluator’s membership in a professional association is sometimes uninformative: in 2009, a credential evaluator who had worked with the notorious “St. Regis University” invited legitimate evaluators to join an impressively named recognition mill intended to help “the smaller independent agencies to unite and receive greater acceptance.” Most of the entities already listed as members were cooperating with known diploma mills. And NAFSA, the well-respected Association of International Educators, cautions that NAFSA membership does “not imply that NAFSA has reviewed or endorsed their programs or activities, or that NAFSA membership confers any endorsement.” NACES members are held to standards, but only 21 evaluators are currently listed by the organization as members.

How is a corporate personnel office to tell the difference between the legitimate Foreign Credentials Service of America and the bogus agency, which plagiarized extensively from FCSA and then closed abruptly when its American owners were charged with mail and wire fraud a year later?

Sometimes dishonest credential evaluators will offer gross misrepresentations in their comparisons of the legitimate academic programs of different countries.

A PAUCITY OF INFO FACILITATES DECEPTION

It can be surprisingly difficult to find good information about a school’s degree granting authority. Sometimes there are subtleties: in the United States, the Council for Higher Education Accreditation (CHEA) maintains an accurate database of accredited programs and universities, but degree granting authority in the US issues from the states, rather than the federal government. Legitimate schools that do not seek accreditation are absent from the CHEA database.

Sometimes information about a country’s universities is incomplete, unavailable, or unreliable. After the end of Liberia’s civil war, that nation’s only published list of recognized universities was on the Web site of Liberia’s embassy in the United States. But the embassy’s chief and deputy chief of mission were taking bribes from the owners of an American mill and had granted them control of the Web site. The list of “recognized” schools included their diploma mills, until a new ambassador ejected the scoundrels. The

UNESCO (United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization) Portal to Recognized Higher Education Institutions is incomplete—only three African countries are listed—while the more extensive Electronic Database for Global Education, managed by AACRAO, requires a paid subscription.

In my experience, most deceptive evaluations misrepresent a degree provider's authority to issue degrees. The absence of a universally accessible, exhaustive database of recognized schools allows corrupt evaluators to sell their services to the customers of diploma mills.

Sometimes dishonest credential evaluators will offer gross misrepresentations in their comparisons of the legitimate academic programs of different countries. An example was an analysis of one country's three-year degrees, which suggested based on judgments by others that those degrees did not correspond to US bachelor's degrees arose racial prejudice, rather than a thoughtful evaluation of the academic programs in question. The authors—both of whom have known associations to degree mills—came to conclusions that would undoubtedly attract prospective customers seeking exaggerated evaluations of their credentials.

DISSEMINATION OF INFORMATION IN A LITIGIOUS WORLD

Documenting the identities and practices of higher education fraudsters, publicly posted and indexed by Google, accurate information can be devastating to the diploma mill industry. The monthly income of St. Regis declined steadily from a high of \$250,000 in December 2004, to just a few thousand dollars in August 2005, thanks to a mix of hostile news coverage and unflattering analyses published to the Internet. Exposure of the deceptive practices of dishonest credential evaluators could also be an effective tool for their suppression.

One possible repository for documentation would be a government agency, which would receive reliable information from higher education professionals (including favorable evaluations of diploma mill degrees), then publish it. But the revelation of such information carries risks to the whistle-blowers, ranging from lawsuits to threats of violent retribution. For several years, Oregon posted a useful (but incomplete) list of diploma mills. The state was regularly threatened with legal action by the operators and customers of degree mills and eventually removed the material from the worldwide Web.

Given the international nature of the dark sector, which markets false academic credentials, it would be sensible for UNESCO to assume responsibility for an information archive. But that would require a commitment of will and resources that have not been forthcoming. ■

Financial Aspects of Offshore Activities

JOHN FIELDEN

John Fielden is director of the Commonwealth Higher Education Management Service Consulting, a small independent consultancy based in Odiham, Hampshire, in the UK. E-mail: johnfielden1@btinternet.com.

In April 2013 it was announced that the University of East London would close its new campus in Cyprus, after operating for only six months with an enrollment of just 17 students. In so doing, it joined the 11 closures of offshore campus ventures in the two years (2010–2012), recorded by the Observatory on Borderless Higher Education. These statistics emphasize the risky nature of offshore activities by universities and colleges. It is not just international branch campuses that are volatile; Australian transnational education operations have also fluctuated dramatically, falling from a peak of 1,569 programs delivered in other countries in 2003 to 889 in 2009. Despite these reverses, the growth in offshore provision continues remorselessly in some countries; in the United Kingdom, for example, in 2011/12 there were 571,000 international students studying for UK awards outside the United Kingdom, an increase of 40 percent on the figure two years before.

For members of university boards and senior managers the need for rigorous analysis of potential offshore activity has never been greater. They will be helped by a study from the United Kingdom's Higher Education International Unit—a guide to the financial aspects of UK offshore activities. This study sets out some of lessons learned by 24 universities in the United States, Australia, and the United Kingdom. Those interviewed were understandably reluctant to reveal too much about the financial consequences of their operations but were only too happy to pass on advice and recommendations to others. These have been encapsulated in the report under three headings: those at the early stage of entering into a Memorandum of Understanding; those when things are getting more serious and a legal agreement is required; and those at the operational stage when activities are underway.

SIGNING A MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING

The origins of these memorandums may hold the key to future success. Until recently they have been regarded by some as trophies collected at conferences or even a performance indicator of internationalization; some regard them as “a license to start talking,” rather than any serious indication of collaboration. The interviews identified a trend to a

more strategic approach. Major institutions are now investing research effort in identifying favorable countries and suitable partner institutions within them. In some cases, this fits within a strategy of having a limited number of significant “deep partnerships” for research and teaching in a small number of countries. This has led to a new-growth industry, developing country profiles backed by extensive due diligence on their currency, regulatory frameworks, tax regimes and incentives, national quality-assurance agencies, and legal requirements for the operation of higher education institutions.

The word “values” is increasingly used when making decisions about foreign ventures. This applies particularly to the choice of partner. If the initiative comes from a government that will be the partner, this can be a sensitive issue; two major UK institutions—the University College London and the University of Westminster—have contracts for the delivery of higher education with the governments of Kazakhstan and Uzbekistan, which are not notable democracies. Both have taken great care to protect their reputation in their contracts. When choosing a commercial partner the problems are even greater, since many countries have financial and corporate accounting systems that are not very transparent. Commercial partners are often large conglomerates with property interests and see a university either as an attraction in a business development or as an emblem of corporate social responsibility. Even in such cases, however, the profit motive may not have gone away, and any difference of motive with the university can be a source of future discord.

DEVELOPING A BUSINESS BASE

The second stage of activity involves the development of a business case for the board and a subsequent legal agreement. It is at this stage that common values and motives are essential with early agreement on tuition-fee levels, scholarships, and a reasonable period of payback. Another key issue, once the technical studies are underway, is having a common language and understanding, since informal relationships in the operational phase will thrive if there is a personal positive chemistry between the partners’ leading players. Whatever the legal agreements say, unexpected occurrences and midterm corrections will be inevitable. An American interviewee said “anyone who has low tolerance for surprises, ambiguity and frequent shifting shouldn’t even think about offshore operations.” Cultural difficulties often arise in the negotiation phase. In some countries, the final legal agreement is regarded as the starting point for negotiation, and key definitions of words such as “students” or “surplus” are particularly prone to misinterpretation. A “yes” can mean “I hear you,” rather than “I agree.”

Other major topics in negotiations are the percentage share in any local holding company that is created to operate an offshore campus and the terms of an exit strategy. Since few universities are able (for fiduciary or legislative reasons) to invest large sums in overseas operations, the most common role of a commercial partner is to provide the physical infrastructure and sometimes the equipment. The argument then centers on the financial value of the intellectual property and brand of the incoming university, which will be used to calculate its share of any surplus or deficit. This becomes a haggle and can even result in world-class institutions—such as, the University of Nottingham having to accept stakes of 37.1 percent and 29.1 percent in the associate companies running its two offshore campuses. In discussions, offshore providers have decided that it is essential to think early and hard about the terms of an exit strategy; in some cases, this is even considered at the Memorandum of Understanding stage in case it becomes a deal breaker.

In the United Kingdom, for example, in 2011/12 there were 571,000 international students studying for UK awards outside the United Kingdom, an increase of 40 percent on the figure two years before.

MANAGING OFFSHORE ACTIVITIES

Once an offshore activity is up and running, the key question is where decisions are made and what is delegated to a local board or an academic partner. Most international branch campuses are owned by a local joint company with a board that takes the key decisions, while most transnational education operations have no local legal entity behind them and are managed by the home institution’s academic structures. The most important decisions relate to admissions criteria (and consequential student numbers), local marketing strategies, and the level of tuition fees. This is when an early investment in building good personal relationships pays off. A commercial partner will be tempted to lower entry standards, adopt aggressive local marketing campaigns, and increase tuition fees, while the university will not.

Few offshore ventures make significant financial surpluses and many take between 5 to 10 years to see a return on investment. However, there are examples of reasonable

financial benefits, and the research found that the most successful Australian universities claim to have average profit margins of 8 to 10 percent. But a key question is the cost base on which the 10 percent is calculated, since such a return is unlikely if all management and staff time is fully charged to the venture. Many of the universities in the sample claimed that it was not their aim to make financial surpluses but to promote their reputation in the region, to develop collaborative research with the partner or in the country, and to generate a flow of postgraduates back to the home campus.

Although the study has emphasised the importance of rigorous processes for due diligence and financial planning with comprehensive research about markets, a key conclusion is that these are not enough. Successful offshore operations demand good leadership and personal skills and mutually trusting relationships between the partners. If these exist, the unanticipated events and upheavals that will inevitably arise can be overcome. ■

Are Global Rankings Unfair to Latin American Universities?

ANDRÉS BERNASCONI

Andrés Bernasconi is a professor of higher education at the School of Education of the Pontificia Universidad Católica de Chile. E-mail: abernasconi@uc.cl.

In its 2012 edition, the *Times Higher Education* World University Ranking put no Latin American university in the group of the best 100, and only four among the entire cast of 400. The Shanghai 2012 ranking treats Latin America no better: one in the leading group of 150 and 10 in the overall group of 500 universities ranked.

This status is somewhat puzzling, given that Brazil is the 6th economy in the world and Mexico the 14th. This should make a difference when it comes to the possibility of supporting fine institutions of higher education, as one finds in countries such as Israel, with 3 institutions in the top 100 in the Chinese ranking; or the Netherlands, with 2.

University leaders in Latin America do feel there is something wrong in the rankings, arguing that they are biased and unfair to the region and that Latin American universities are essentially different from the concept of a university implied by the rankings.

THE PROBLEM IS THE RANKINGS

A group of Latin American university leaders met in Mexico in May, 2012, backed by UNESCO (United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization), to discuss rankings and what to do about them. It was concluded that rankings are invalid measurements of university performance—both in their composite index and with respect to every variable purported to measure. Another conclusion was that rankings are particularly unfit to recognize Latin America's universities—"responsibilities and functions that transcend the more traditional ones of Anglo-Saxon universities, which serve as standards for the rankings." The rectors also noted that this bias favoring the Anglo-Saxon model of the university is reinforced by the use of the ISI-Thomson Reuters and SCOPUS publication and citations databases, which collect material mostly published in English and "in the fields of health sciences and engineering."

Of course, Latin America is not the only region in the world with a valid claim against the biases of the rankings. Thus, Asia has at least as good a motive as in this part of the world to protest the unfairness of it all, perhaps even better than here: after all, Asians are much more numerous and are not even part of the hegemonic Western tradition. Nonetheless, most of the universities showing greatest progress in the rankings are located in Asia: Korea, Singapore, Taiwan, and China. Instead of complaining that no sufficient journals exist to publish their work in Korean or Chinese, scholars in that part of the world teach themselves English language and publish internationally in that language, as scholars do also in Israel and the Netherlands.

LATIN AMERICAN UNIVERSITIES ARE DIFFERENT

Now, what are three unique responsibilities and functions discharged by Latin American universities, which would recommend treating them differently from the model of the "Anglo-Saxon" university? Usually Latin American universities speak about their "social" mission, an elusive concept that is meant to encompass everything that universities supposedly do in here that is not research, or teaching, or transfer of research results, or indeed any of the functions associated with the university as an institution elsewhere in the world. The notion of a distinct "social" mission mostly seeks to capture the roles really or allegedly played by universities in fostering democracy, promoting social inclusion, or forging a national identity. Universities in Latin America have often played this role when democratic rule has broken down and only universities and few other institutions have remained as spaces of relative freedom and political organization. These have been worthy endeavors, certainly, but not exclusive of universities in the Latin American region. Moreover, as democratic governance and

the rule of law consolidate in Latin America, universities are increasingly relieved of this subsidiary political role; and need instead to reconnect with their proper institutional function as centers of knowledge.

RANKINGS AS A MESSAGE TO LATIN AMERICA

Criticism of rankings as a valid methodology to order universities on the basis of quality is well founded. But one needs not to agree with the proposition that university Num. 100 is “better” in any meaningful way than Num. 120, to listen to the message that research-based rankings

Instead of complaining that no sufficient journals exist to publish their work in Korean or Chinese, scholars in that part of the world teach themselves English language and publish internationally.

keep sending year after year: Latin American higher education is nearly invisible to the world of research.

Yes, as the rectors claim, this is in part a problem of insufficient funding for science in Latin America. However, this issue is not the only one and not even the main one. There have been great increases in public money allocated to research since the 1990s in Brazil, Chile, and Mexico. Publications have multiplied in response, but not at a rate that would make any difference globally. The two key resources lacking in Latin American universities are a large enough numbers of dedicated research faculty and good governance.

Most of the finest universities in Latin America (with the exception of Brazil’s top few) still have academic staffs in which PhD holders are a minority of the faculty and where fluency in languages, other than Spanish and Portuguese, is still exceptional (and Brazil is no different here). Moreover, many research-trained academics in the region have salaries so low that they need to have a second job to make ends meet. No internationally competitive research performance can be expected of faculty not trained to carry out research, by researchers who are distracted by financial insecurity, or from academics whose entire knowledge base is published in Spanish and Portuguese.

The second major roadblock is the governance of institutions and the steering of the national higher education systems. University autonomy, an object of quasi-religious attachment in Latin America, served for decades the noble

function of keeping corrupt, incompetent, loony, or autocratic governments off the backs of universities. Sadly, in some countries, that function of autonomy continues to be necessary today. However, in most of the region, stable democracies with reasonable leadership are consolidating a space of civilized dialogue in which universities can afford, at low risk to their prerogatives, to allow more policymaking in higher education on the part of elected officials, rather than slamming the door of autonomy in their faces. This is important because most Latin American universities, especially in the public sector, do not have the quality leadership or the internal political platform to reform themselves. Therefore, they need to work with their governments (as universities increasingly do in Europe, Australia, and Asia) to find new strategies and mechanisms to change. And change is sorely needed in several key dimensions: academic cadres have to be renovated, research money has to be directed to those who can use it productively, and career structures and salary schedules for professors have to be redesigned. In the area of administration, reform is needed to introduce long-term, strategic decision making in universities, curb administrative bloat, and limit the deleterious effect of partisan politics upon university affairs. Such changes may usher a new era for Latin America’s universities, one where research-based rankings may feel less alien to them. ■

The Implications of Excellence in Research and Teaching

JOHANNES WESPEL, DOMINIC ORR, AND MICHAEL JAEGER

Johannes Wespel is a researcher at the HIS-Institute for Research on Higher Education in Hannover, Germany. E-mail: wespel@his.de. Dominic Orr is a project leader at the same center. E-mail: orr@his.de. Michael Jaeger is deputy head of the same center. E-mail: m.jaeger@his.de.

In recent years, national initiatives to foster scientific excellence have become popular as a steering and funding instrument for public higher education systems in many Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) countries, most prominently in Germany with its “Excellence Initiative.” This contribution considers if and how university teaching is taken into consideration in various existing excellence initiatives. The two main results are that (a) teaching and learning play a subordinated role in ex-

cellence-funding schemes for universities, and (b) there is less uniformity with regard to the definition of and the programs to promote excellence in teaching than for research.

EXCELLENCE INITIATIVES

Official descriptions of state-run funding schemes targeting scientific excellence were analyzed for an OECD working group, and the results were discussed at an OECD seminar for national experts. The data material spans 24 such schemes from 16 countries on four continents. The analysis shows that a prototypical design has emerged for excellence initiatives. A restricted number of centers composed of high-class scientists are singled out in a competitive, multistage process involving international peer reviewers and, in many cases, site visits. Selected centers receive generous state funding to carry out research schemes, albeit depending on positive progress and outcome evaluations. Funding periods are longer than for project funding. The average for the research sample is over six years, and further sustainability of the centers is an important objective of the funding schemes. Most initiatives have undergone several funding cycles since their inception. Political aims of excellence schemes are defined in a rather general fashion and are usually not per se linked to specific areas of science. The goals of raising the competitiveness of the national science system and sparking new synergies through cooperation between institutions and/or disciplines rank particularly high. Many excellence initiatives originate from a national innovation strategy, in which the public research sector represents a crucial building block.

The two main results are that (a) teaching and learning play a subordinated role in excellence-funding schemes for universities, and (b) there is less uniformity with regard to the definition of and the programs to promote excellence in teaching than for research.

THE STATUS OF TEACHING

Universities, the main target of the excellence initiatives surveyed in this project, serve as society's principal adapter between scientific research and its dissemination, by way of teaching and learning. It is, therefore, interesting to see in what way public funding supports this link. To this end, the program descriptions of the excellence initiatives are analyzed in the sample, in terms of whether and how teach-

ing is integrated into the assessment criteria for proposals. It has been found that the vast majority of initiatives concentrate on research-related factors—such as, past merit in research, the innovativeness and feasibility of the proposed research project(s), and the utility of the outcomes. Teaching is not among the assessment criteria in most of the initiatives. Only a few cases include aspects of teaching specifically: Spain's International Campus of Excellence initiative (excellence in research and in teaching are weighted equally high); Ireland's Program for Research in Third-Level Institutions (impact on teaching and learning is one of four major assessment criteria); South Korea's World Class University Program (aims at creating new faculty environments, including teaching improvement); and Germany's Excellence Initiative (effects of research on teaching are one criterion among 15 different criteria).

The results show that the term "excellence," as used in state-run funding schemes, clearly gravitates toward research performance. Critics fear that the unique reputation given by an official "excellence" status, in connection with the considerable funds awarded to successful applicants, may encourage university-based scientists to concentrate on research at the expense of teaching. It is mainly in the context of this debate that a few countries have launched separate, stand-alone initiatives to foster new and outstanding teaching concepts. Those teaching-excellence initiatives are clearly inspired by the research-centered excellence schemes, in terms of their structure and how the selection process is set up: international peers evaluate a pool of competing proposals in a quality-based procedure, and funding is then restricted to the very best applicants. Examples of such initiatives are Finland's Centers of Excellence in University Education scheme, whose funded units are expected to play a key role in improving the quality and relevance of university education in a long-term perspective; the United Kingdom's Centers for Excellence in Teaching and Learning program, active between 2005 and 2010, supporting 74 centers of teaching and learning development at British universities; France's Initiatives d'excellence en formations innovantes ("excellence initiatives in innovative teaching"), launched in 2012 with the aim of funding innovative teaching projects with a role model function for other higher education institutions; and Germany's scheme, Exzellente Lehre ("excellent teaching"), providing funds for 10 selected higher education institutions implementing innovative teaching concepts.

EXCELLENCE AND DIVERSITY

A closer look at the specialized, teaching-excellence program descriptions reveals that the funded units as well as the concrete measures to achieve and sustain excellence are very diverse, even within the single initiatives. Eligible units

can be departments, faculties, universities, time-bounded programs, or interinstitutional networks. They can be independent centers, attached to or identical with existing educational units. Supported measures include staff qualification, curricular reforms, skills development for students, establishing e-learning offers, or strengthening the students' voice in university governance. This is in contrast to research-excellence initiatives, for which definitions of what excellence is actually about—and in what way it is best achieved—are rather more uniform across countries and initiatives. This finding is in line with a second juxtaposition: teaching excellence initiatives make the exemplary character of the proposed concepts—i.e., their transferability to other institutions and settings—a primary assessment criterion apart from the innovativeness of the concept as such. A comparable criterion is much less prominent in research-excellence initiatives across the board. It thus appears that teaching-excellence initiatives generally play a different role from research excellence initiatives. Whereas in research, excellence schemes can be seen as a means to pinpoint scientific value creation through tried and tested operational patterns, and teaching initiatives have a more explorative character: they are expected to help clarify what excellent teaching is all about in the first place.

The hesitance to include teaching and learning in the major national excellence initiatives, described above, appears to be due to the lack of agreed procedures, standards, and measurements for excellence in teaching.

The hesitance to include teaching and learning in the major national excellence initiatives, described above, appears to be due to the lack of agreed procedures, standards, and measurements for excellence in teaching. It remains to be seen whether a more unified understanding of teaching excellence will emerge in time, or whether the diversity of approaches currently observable will remain—possibly as a result of the contextual and multifarious nature of the activity of teaching. If the emergence of teaching excellence cannot be found, it is likely that research will continue to determine the definition of overall excellence in higher education—a focus that obscures the huge challenges facing mass provision of higher education in a knowledge society. ■

Getting Value for Money in Higher Education

PHILIP G. ALTBACH AND PAWAN AGARWAL

Philip G. Altbach is professor and director of the Center for International Higher Education, Boston College. E-mail: altbach@bc.edu. Pawan Agarwal is advisor for higher education, the Planning Commission, Government of India. E-mail: apawano8@gmail.com.

Although Indian higher education suffers from many dysfunctionalities and the system overall is characterized by “pinnacles of excellence in a sea of mediocrity”—by some international comparisons, India does reasonably well. Here are a few examples:

- India is a global leader in terms of GDP spent by public and private sources on higher education. India devotes a very high proportion of its national wealth of higher education. At 3 percent of the GDP (1.2% from public and 1.8% from private sources), Indian spends more than what the United States (1.0% public and 1.6% private) or Korea (0.7% public and 1.9% private) spends on higher education. This suggests a limited scope for further increase, although more is required since in absolute figures investment in higher education does not measure up in international terms. Further, there is an urgent need for effective and efficient use of funds, in order to promote both equity and excellence.

- India's gross enrollment rate, 18 percent, the proportion of the age group accessing higher education, is among the highest of countries at India's level of development. This is particularly impressive given India's size and complexity. The recently approved 12th Five-Year Plan aims at raising the gross enrollment rate to 25 percent by 2017 and is both desirable and achievable.

- Finally, academic salaries, when measured against other countries by accurate purchasing power parity comparisons, are quite good. Among 28 countries in a recent study, India ranked fourth from the top in entry salaries for academics—and better than the other BRIC (Brazil, Russia, India, and China) nations. China scored near the bottom for average salaries. This good showing is the result of the major pay increase implemented in 2006.

VALUE FOR MONEY?

Is India gaining value for its investment in higher education? Also, is more money the answer to the challenges? Most observers would agree that on average Indian colleges and universities do not produce a very distinguished job

and are definitely not “world class.” A number of factors are related to the positive trends noted here. Although India invests significant sums in postsecondary education, with the funds increasingly coming from students and their families, it does not spend effectively. There is little coordination between the states and the central government.

Many of India’s 34,000 undergraduate colleges are too small to be viable. They are generally understaffed and ill-equipped; two-thirds do not even satisfy government-established minimum norms, and they are unable to innovate because of the rigid bureaucracy of the affiliating system that links the colleges to a supervising university. All this makes the system highly fragmented, scattered and difficult to manage. There is a strong case for consolidation

India devotes a very high proportion of its national wealth of higher education.

and merging small institutions. But the affiliating system is vast and deep-rooted and, therefore, is neither feasible nor desirable to dismantle it. However, decentralization of part of the curriculum holds great promise. With greater academic autonomy, the core courses could be retained by the university, while the responsibility for the rest of the curriculum could be devolved to the colleges. This would create a desired innovation culture in the colleges. Clustering and even merging colleges that are very small would also have to figure into this reform. In addition, universities that affiliate a large number of colleges would need to be reorganized into two or more universities, with each of them affiliating a smaller number of colleges—in order to improve overall academic effectiveness.

While gross enrollment rates are not bad by relevant international standards, India, however, is about four decades behind most advanced nations in enrollments. While the United States had an enrollment rate of 15 percent by the 1940s, most advanced nations reached that stage several decades later. The United Kingdom, Australia, France, and Japan had enrollment rates of 18, 23, 24, and 25 percent in 1975; and Korea enrolled only 8 percent in 1975, which rose to 13 percent in 1980, and then rapidly rose to 34 percent in 1985. All these countries have achieved a system close to universal higher education; but it must be recognized that enrollments have grown hand in hand, based on the rise in demand for qualified people with agriculture contributing to less than 5 percent of the workforce. Considering that over half of the people in India are still engaged in the farm

sector with limited need for higher qualifications, current levels of enrollment in India appear to be adequate. The bigger challenge is that the students do not choose to study in fields that will best contribute to economic growth—or to their own job prospects. Also, employers regularly complain that graduates are not adequately for available jobs.

While it is true that Indian academics, by international comparisons, are relatively well paid, they are not necessarily effective. Academics, and especially college teachers, are constrained by rigid bureaucracy. Further, their work is not carefully evaluated—salary increases and promotions are awarded rather on the basis of seniority. Unfortunately, when salaries were increased in 2006, this boon was not accompanied by any reforms in the teaching profession or requirements for evaluation. A System of Academic Performance Indicators for promotion and appointment of professors and lecturers is yet to take roots. It appears that Indian academics want to do a good job and most are committed to their profession—structural impediments and an ossified culture get in the way.

Our general impression is that despite several areas in which India compares well, globally, deep structural and cultural impediments constrain the academic system as a while from performing effectively.

CONCLUSION

India has achieved some areas of accomplishment in higher education. The challenge is to capitalize on these plans and reform an ossified system. In the Indian case, expenditure does not necessarily mean effectiveness. In this way, Indian higher education may be compared to the American health care system. The United States spends the most per capita on health care, but expenditure does not yield results. The Obama reforms, like the 12th Plan India, may finally improve an ossified system traditionally dominated by special interest and conflicts between the federal government and the states. The recently approved 12th Plan provides a good framework for change. It seeks to align central government investment with that of the state governments—align new capacity with demand. It also seeks to create a performance culture through deepening of competitive grants and creation of related institutional arrangements. However, success depends on effective implementation. ■



In addition to our Web site and Facebook page, we are now tweeting. We hope you will consider “following” us on Twitter!

India's International Education Strategy—Is There One?

P. J. LAVAKARE

P. J. Lavakare is a member of the Board of Governors, MITS University, Rajasthan, India. E-mail: lavakare@vsnl.com.

Across the world, the profile of higher education is changing. Globalization has opened up global markets for employment, and the students are eager to grasp them. The need for students to become “global citizens” is recognized by all education providers. In some developed country institutions, higher education is being recognized as a for-profit activity, by setting up campuses abroad, as part of the new economic domain. For some, enrolling international students is proving to be a source of revenue, for balancing the dwindling budgets of the institutions. The student is becoming the driving force for promoting international education. In India, however, this is not yet how internationalization of education is perceived. India is still debating on how to react to the process of internationalization. A new scheme is being formulated in the latest Five-Year Plan for the development of the country.

EXPANSION—ROLE OF INTERNATIONAL PARTNERSHIPS

India's international strategy is constrained by domestic considerations. With the growing demand on higher education and a low gross enrollment rate of about 19 percent, the national concern is to expand the available pool of higher education institutions. The resources required are beyond the available budgets. Increasingly, the country is appealing to private and international higher education providers, to add to the national capacity. The market is economically attractive to private higher education providers. The doors for entry of individual foreign higher education institutions are still not fully opened. Under these constraints, one may approve of looking at all means of partnerships at the government level. At this stage, it may be interesting to see how India has benefited from international partnerships in the past and whether some of those models are still relevant.

As a case in point, one would like to use India's experience with the United States—in selected areas of education, such as agriculture and science and technology. In the agriculture sector, in the 1950s, the introduction of the “Green revolution” in India can be traced back to Indo-US collaborations in agricultural sciences. This helped to sustain research and education in agriculture. Agriculture education in India has greatly benefited from the government-level collaboration in education through these colleges.

In the 1960s, a consortium of American universities facilitated the establishment of educational institutions,

like the Indian Institute of Technology, Kanpur; and the National Council of Educational Research & Training, New Delhi, both founded with academic partnerships under the umbrella of the two governments. Both these institutions are now totally Indian in terms of faculty and governance. Can one use this model to help the Indian government's effort to increase the number of colleges and universities, through private and public initiatives? Can some of the new educational institutions be partnered by the two governments? If the older models have proved effective, it is clear that such government-level partnerships can be more effective than leaving the expansion program totally in the hands of private initiatives. It is also possible that through mutual agreements, an educational institution in India could also be set up jointly by an Indian and an American university. The new Five Year Plan for higher education has hinted at a policy for internationalization. Can the new policy make way for such government-level initiatives?

According to a report by the Association of Indian Universities, about 630 foreign higher education institutions were operating in India as of 2010. Almost all of them are unregulated and not recognized by the Indian government

India is still debating on how to react to the process of internationalization. A new scheme is being formulated in the latest Five Year Plan for the development of the country.

to offer degrees. Students obtaining degrees from these institutions are not in a position to get jobs in the public sector or cannot enroll in Indian graduate programs. The national legislation that is expected to be brought out in the future shall necessarily demand that these institutions get registered with the Indian government. The fate of these institutions is uncertain in the coming years. Such foreign education providers have, in a way, tarnished the image of internationalization of higher education in India.

COLLABORATION FOR TEACHING FACULTY

In India, based on an overall shortage of good-quality teaching faculty the government has stepped in to consider the route of internationalization in the new plan. Government schemes have been announced, and arrangements are being worked out with advanced countries, to accept Indian faculty for being trained in international standards of teaching and research. While the initiative is useful, the basic problem still remains filling the large number of vacant

faculty positions in even good-quality Indian institutions, like the Indian Institutes of Technology. The government policies do not approve the regular appointment of foreign faculty to be employed in India. Moreover, the salaries that can be offered will not be attractive to faculty. With no solution yet to fill the vacant faculty positions from within or outside the country, internationalizing our education system merely through “faculty training abroad” is not going to be an effective strategy.

OFFERING JOINT DEGREES THROUGH COLLABORATION

The government is attempting an international education strategy to encourage Indian institutions to enter into partnerships with foreign universities, to offer joint degrees to Indian students. The foreign universities do not have to open campuses in India, but their faculty would teach approved courses in India. The student will spend part of the four-year bachelor's degree program in India and the remaining period at the foreign university. This is an attractive approach for internationalization, giving an opportunity of “global immersion” to Indian students, who also get a foreign degree at a reduced cost. The academic quality, the financial implications, and administrative arrangements for recognizing the joint degree have yet to be worked out between partnering institutions. Yet, before the institutions could explore this opportunity, the government has come up with a caveat for the choice of institutions with which the private educational institutions in India could collaborate. Government insists that Indian institutions can only select a “partner” institution abroad, which is within the top 500 ranked internationally. As is well known, hardly any of the Indian institutions are ranked within the top 500 world institutions. So, are the well-ranked foreign institutions expected to come down to partner with the “non-ranked” Indian institutions? This is not an attractive offer for partnership. Unfortunately, this approach to internationalization does not seem to be workable, either.

NO FOCUS ON INTERNATIONAL STUDENTS

The final area of internationalization strategy pertains to sending Indian students abroad and attracting foreign students to India. Government has left it free for Indian students to study anywhere abroad. Government has no plans, (unlike what Brazil has) to provide scholarships for studying in countries such as the United States. There are also no plans to promote the cultural understanding of other countries, by supporting Indian students to study, for example, in a country like China or Brazil. One has seen President Obama's “100,000 strong” program initiative of supporting American students going to China. India also has no major schemes for attracting foreign students. The infrastructure, in terms of good hostels, trained staff, and adequate student

advising services, required to host international students, does not exist in the majority of the higher education institutions. Numbers of students, earlier coming from Africa, have reduced over recent years, and India has not yet shown any concern for attracting them back. The student focus, in the internationalization strategy of India, is totally missing.

CONCLUSION

India has fiddled with the various stakeholders of internationalization—the students, the faculty, and the educational institutions—in a lackadaisical manner using administrative and regulatory framework. In 2004, the government did set up academic committees under the aegis of its apex body—University Grants Commission—to Promote Indian Higher Education Abroad and in 2009 to prepare an Action Plan for Internationalization of Higher Education. Unfortunately, the strategies recommended by both these committees have not been reflected in India's internationalization strategy. The new plan proposes that a professional national agency, the India International Education Centre would be created to undertake internationalization activities. It is expected to support selected institutions to establish dedicated internationalization units. Hopefully, this new proposed agency does not become a nonstarter in the bureaucratic maze of the Indian higher education system. ■

English Education in Distress?

HEATHER EGGINS

Heather Eggins is visiting professor at the University of Sussex, UK. E-mail: heggins@btinternet.com.

England, like every Western country, is concerned to maximize the abilities of its people and thereby, through their skills, enrich the nation. Hence, over the last 10 years, the issue of access to higher education has been of great concern to the English government but is now, in combination with changes in circumstance, facing considerable problems. The efforts of the last government, a Labour administration, met with some success, in that the participation rate for those from disadvantaged groups that stood at 18 percent in 2004 is now much improved. A range of initiatives was introduced, including summer schools, mentoring, visits to local universities, and specially designed “access” courses. Now, however, with the participation rate of those groups standing at 30 percent, the universities are caught in a whirl of confusing and conflicting policies that

threaten to undermine the success of the access drive and destabilize the whole system.

THE PRESENT GOVERNMENT'S APPROACH

The present Conservative Liberal Democrat coalition, elected in 2010, has had to govern in an era where tough financial measures need to be introduced in response to the international crisis. Up to £9,000 per year can now be charged in tuition fees, and students have considerably more "buying power." Students now have a very wide range of bursary offers by individual universities to consider, and if they are fortunate enough to gain two A marks and a B mark, they can expect to get a place at the university and course of their choice. The fact that students who gain the highest grades can go anywhere they choose means that the universities have an inability to plan their final figures. A level of uncontrollable risk has been introduced, which is causing great financial distress for them, with a number of universities in deficit.

FAIR ACCESS

The notion of "widening participation" implies attracting more overall numbers of students and expanding the total system. The notion of "fair access" makes it possible for all those from disadvantaged backgrounds who have the ability to attend university. A recent government report makes recommendations for a new, national access strategy. A network of regional coordinators will be created to target primary schools and work with pupils through their secondary school and sixth-form studies. The aim of the network is to support bright children from primary school age, whatever their background, to aspire to attend university and to make sure they are academically prepared for it.

The Office for Fair Access, a government body, has the role of approving the access policies of every higher education institution that intends to charge over £6,000 tuition fees annually. Institutional access policies are expected to include a range of bursaries, as well as other access initiatives. The most elite universities, which have historically had higher percentages of students from independent schools, are under pressure to accept more pupils from disadvantaged backgrounds.

However, against this background of the ongoing policy on access, the financial crisis remains and, in England, there is a £9,000 maximum tuition fee for undergraduate studies. The burden of paying has shifted from direct government funding to institutions to loans made by the government for the student to cover the cost. These are available to full and part-time students and to students studying at private universities. Means-tested grants for accommodation costs are still available for those from disadvantaged backgrounds.

ALLOCATED TARGET NUMBERS

A major problem in the English system is the way in which the overall numbers are controlled. Each university has an allocated target, proposed by the Funding Council. There is little leeway in failing to meet the target, or overstepping the target, before there is a lowering of the allocated number allowed or a fine imposed for overstepping. This system, though tricky to manage, worked reasonably well. However, in an effort to open up the system to more student choice, the whole system has become unstable.

PROBLEMS

Two initiatives in particular have caused this. The first has been concerned with the range of fees charged by universities. In order to make sure that students were offered a range of prices for higher education places, the government made 20,000 places available in 2012 to institutions charging £7,500 or less. These places were meant to act as an incentive to universities to drop their prices to £7,500 or less and to colleges to offer courses at degree level and thereby draw in more money from government. However, the incentives did not work. Of the 9,600 places allocated to universities, 4,200 were unfilled, and of the 10,400 allocated to Further Education colleges, 2,800 were left empty (i.e., over a third were unused).

The burden of paying has shifted from direct government funding to institutions to loans made by the government for the student to cover the cost.

The second initiative has formed more serious effects, creating uncertainty and, for institutions, a high level of risk. In 2012, the government allowed universities in England to recruit as many extra students as they wished—with the grades AAB (the highest grades)—in the university entry examinations. This appeared to be advantageous to the universities in the most-highly selective group (the Russell Group). However, the overall numbers of applicants for 2012/13 showed a fall of 5 percent for those aged 18 and a fall of 15–20 percent for those aged 19 and older. The pool of those applicants achieving AAB shrank, which left several universities unable to enroll the numbers of students they expected. Liverpool, Sheffield, and Southampton—all in the Russell Group—failed to meet their targets, though the University of Bristol grew by 28 percent. Among those other universities charging less than the full £9,000, there were wide variations. While Staffordshire University

showed a loss of only 3 percent, Leeds Metropolitan was down 23 percent.

2013/14

The 2013/14 arrangements could well introduce even more fluidity into the English system: This time, students with ABB, a larger pool than AAB, can be offered places at any university. The rules for the extra places at the margin are also changed: There will be only 5,000 places, but many of these will go to institutions charging between £7,500 and £8,250 a year.

Meanwhile each university continues to be allocated a fixed intake of students. Eleven higher education institutions exceeded their limits on student numbers in 2012; the fines have just been published. Take too many students, and you are fined. Take too few and your numbers for the future risk being cut. It is a tightrope that few would voluntarily choose to walk. The applications for 2013/14 in England are marginally up (+2.8%) on 2012/13, but still a good deal below 2011/12. The volatility could well be worse next year. The combination of sudden changes of policy, against a background of a hike in tuition fees that students were unprepared for, has destabilized the English higher education system: A growing number of English universities will be faced with deficits. The outcomes in 2013/14 could spell unacceptable financial turmoil for them. "The students," as the Minister for Higher Education says, are now "in the driving seat"; the institutions are in retreat. ■

What Will English Higher Education Look Like in 2025?

JEROEN HUISMAN, HARRY DE BOER, AND PAULO CHARLES PIMENTEL BÓTAS

Jeroen Huisman is professor at the University of Bath, UK. E-mail: j.huisman@bath.ac.uk. Harry de Boer is senior research associate at the University of Twente, the Netherlands. E-mail: h.f.deboer@utwente.nl. Paulo Charles Pimentel Bótas is research officer at the University of Bath, UK. E-mail: paulobotas@gmail.com. For those interested, the full scenarios can be found in Higher Education Quarterly 66 (4), 341–62.

In 2009, the Labour government asked for an independent view on the future direction of higher education funding in England. The Browne committee presented their report, *Securing a Sustainable Future for Higher Edu-*

cation, in 2010. The new government—a coalition of the Conservative and Liberal Democrat parties—took on board many of the suggestions of the Browne committee and integrated these in its 2011 white paper—"Students at the Heart of the System." Many observers thought the proposed policies would shake up the higher education system. For example, the government proposed a set of measures that undoubtedly affect students and higher education institutions. The key elements of the white paper are that higher education institutions could set their fee levels at £6,000 up to a maximum of £9,000, which before the policy stood at £3,290. The teaching grant—allocated to higher education institutions on the basis of student numbers and the disciplines they were enrolled in—would disappear, making higher education institutions to a large extent dependent on the student fee income. Whereas student places were more or less fixed (as in, limited places for domestic students for each discipline/program at higher education institutions), the government proposed to make a large share—about a quarter—of the student places available on a competitive basis, allowing institutions to bid for places.

IMPACT

Observers feared that the high(er) fee levels would deter students from enrolling in higher education and that this would especially affect students from lower-social economic backgrounds and hence threaten access to higher education. Also, some higher education institutions might lose out in the very competitive system; the largest trade union predicted that about a quarter of the higher education institutions would be threatened in their existence. It was also argued that the policies would create a new binary system, for the policies could work out well for the research-intensive universities and would be detrimental to the flourishing of the teaching-oriented institutions.

Whereas some of the expected impacts were well-argued and supported by some empirical evidence, it is obviously impossible to fully predict the outcomes of the policy reform. Bearing in mind the title of a seminal work on policy change—"Great Expectations and Mixed Performance"—the actual implementation of a policy may differ from the policy intentions. At the same time, future socioeconomic and cultural changes will continue to impact the system independently from the policy reform, potentially interfering with policy intentions.

DELPHI STUDY

Thus, it is relevant to discuss the potential developments, if only to engage in a debate about the future shape and size of the English higher education system and to reflect on possible outcomes in terms of likelihood and desirability. We therefore set up a Delphi study (supported by a grant from

the Leadership Foundation for Higher Education). In the Delphi study, higher education experts were asked to reflect on statements on the potential developments and situations in 2025 (e.g., “In English higher education in 2025, private providers cater for 15% of students.”). In our study, in total 44 experts commented individually on the likelihood and desirability of certain developments toward 2025 (21 statements were offered). In the second round, 70 percent of the experts reflected on the full set of first-round arguments, claims, and assertions. Several rounds of reflections can be used for a Delphi study, (e.g., to reach consensus). We thought the data from the two rounds were sufficiently rich and used arguments from the full set of data to build two scenarios for English higher education.

SCENARIO 1: RETURN OF THE BINARY DIVIDE BY 2025

The first scenario departs from the assumption that the market mechanisms introduced in the past two decades or so, will continue to coordinate the system. This will imply a somewhat smaller system in 2025, due to mergers and some institutions not having survived the financial crises. The differences between the traditional universities and former polytechnics increased, and a new binary line emerged. The system in 2025 consists of about 25 research-intensive universities and 70 other higher education institutions. The sector of research-intensive institutions is rather homogeneous; and institutions still figure largely in the global rankings, if only for the fact that international competitors also suffered from the global crises. The nonresearch sector is much more diverse, but has in common a focus on undergraduate programs, although there are some pockets of research excellence. Private (for-profit) institutions have been able to enter the market and there will be—in 2025—a substantial number of smaller and medium-size private universities.

SCENARIO 2: RETURN OF THE VISIBLE HAND

This scenario argues that increasing criticism on the failure of market mechanisms, to live up to the promises, has led to a situation that the government was forced to step in directly. More investments, combined with strong governmental regulation, have led to a three-tier system in 2025: six research-intensive universities (the Super Six have been able to pursue excellence strategies and belong to the small group of world-class universities) that set relatively high fees; about 40 comprehensive universities with broad missions (the Grand Universities); and five private universities (that have a hard time as students decide to go public). The system is much smaller due to enforced regional mergers between comprehensive institutions. These institutions thrive, partly because of good networks and cooperation between them, combined with strong institutional leadership

and management.

CONCLUSION

Both scenarios imply a rather drastic change to the English higher education system, a change comparable to the abolishment of the binary system in 1992: the number of institutions will change, as well as their profiles (research or teaching focused, not-for-profit versus private institutions). There will be serious implications for access, funding, and quality assurance. The scenarios contain more details, also on teaching and learning and the student body. Of course, in 2025 our predictions will be proven wrong, but that is not the point. We hope that in the coming years the scenarios will stimulate a debate on the future worlds that academics, higher education managers, policymakers, and students would like to live in. ■

The Challenge of Sustaining Student Loans Systems: In Colombia and Chile

JAMIL SALMI

Jamil Salmi is a tertiary education consultant and former manager of tertiary education at the World Bank. E-mail: jsalmi@tertiaryeducation.org.

The Chilean government almost fell last year because of student protests against the student-loan system. As a result of the Chilean student-loan crisis, students in Colombia have requested free higher education for all, which would make any kind of student loan irrelevant. Is the end of student loans in Latin America in sight, echoing the growing concern in the United States, where the US\$1 trillion student-loan debt figure has been used to denounce student loans as a failed system and approach? In a recent *New York Times* column, Charles Blow described US debt levels as “staggering,” and “having long-term implications for our society and our economy, as that debt begins to affect when and if young people start families or enter the housing market” (March 8, 2013). In this context of crisis and apocalyptic statements about student loans in the Americas, the purpose of this discussion is to share, with readers, lessons from recent developments in Chile and Colombia.

THE CASE OF CHILE

What started as a demand by secondary school students was that their free transport pass be extended from 10 months

to the entire calendar year. Ironically, the government rejected that initial demand citing its high budgetary cost but later agreed to a reform package costing 20 times as much as the initial request of the students, which evolved into a full-blown confrontation opposing secondary and university students organizations and the entire government. The leading factions of university students went as far as demanding a constitutional amendment that would guarantee free public, high-quality education for everyone at all levels, including higher education.

To be fair to the students, they had legitimate grievances. For several decades, Chile has had a segregated higher education system, with two groups of universities offering different benefits to students. First, 16 public and the 9 private universities receive government subsidies, whose students are eligible to get generous scholarships and have access to a highly subsidized income-contingent loan system. Second, 36 private universities do not receive public funding but enroll 53 percent of all university-level students in the countries. These students have limited access to scholarships but are eligible for a loan scheme, run by commercial banks with government guarantee, that was established in 2005. The new scheme was very successful in terms of uptake and had a good targeting system. By 2011, 75 percent of all eligible students from the first and second quintiles received a loan. But the scheme started to run into severe difficulties when the first repayments were due, as some graduates found themselves with high-debt levels and a limited repayment capacity because the scheme was not income-contingent. The average debt-service ratio, calculated as the monthly payment over the monthly income, was 18 percent, compared to 4 percent in Australia, 6.4 percent in New Zealand, 2.9 percent in the United Kingdom, and 2.6 percent in the Netherlands. As a result, the default rate quickly rose to 36 percent, which is extremely high for a young, student-loan program. Not surprisingly, one of the key demands of the protesting students was to abolish the student-loan program became one of the key demands of the protesting students.

A few months ago, the government announced its intention to merge the two existing student-loan schemes, applying the terms and conditions of the first one to the entire system. This means, among other things, that repayments will be income contingent, allowing students to choose their preferred careers and paying for their degree with a fixed share of future income and thereby ensuring a reasonable debt burden. Monthly payments will range from 5 to 15 percent of monthly income, depending on the income level of graduates. Repayments will be collected through the tax system, even though the Ministry of Finance was initially reluctant to involving the administration of student-loan repayments.

THE CASE OF COLOMBIA

Few people in the world are aware that the first ever student loan agency was established in 1951 in Colombia. The Colombian Student Loan Agency—Instituto Colombiano de Credito Educativo (ICETEX)—was the dream of a young and idealistic Colombian, Gabriel Bettencourt, who after benefiting himself from a loan to get his master's degree in the United States, convinced the president of the republic to set up an agency that would provide the same kind of services to all needy Colombians.

After several decades of uneven developments, ICETEX has grown to be one of the strongest and most successful mortgage-type, student-loan agencies in the world. Under the leadership of a visionary president and with support from two successive World Bank loans since the mid-2000s, ICETEX has extended coverage to 19 percent of the students, focusing on students from the lowest so-

Is the end of student loans in Latin America in sight, echoing the growing concern in the United States, where the US\$1 trillion student-loan debt figure has been used to denounce student loans as a failed system and approach?

cioeconomic groups. This is the highest student-loan coverage rate in Latin America. ICETEX has also improved its collection record—reducing overdue loans from 22 percent in 2007 to 13 percent in 2009, and modernized its management practices, bringing operating costs from 12 percent in 2002 to 3 percent today. It has also entered into partnerships with participating universities to provide not only financial but also academic and psychological support to loan beneficiaries, which has greatly reduced dropout rates among loan beneficiaries, compared to students without a loan.

However, this situation has faced two types of troubles in recent years. First, with the economic crisis, a growing number of graduates found it difficult to meet their repayment obligations. The proportion of graduates who are not current with their loan payments has reached 17 percent. Second, the Chilean crisis has spilled over to Colombia. Students from both public and private universities have demanded the abolition of fees across the board, increased funding for public tertiary education and the transformation of student loans into grants. One afternoon, a few months ago, they went to protest in front of ICETEX and ended up smashing a few of the building's windows. Robust pressure

from the streets, through mostly peaceful demonstrations bringing students and teachers together, forced the government to withdraw the draft Higher Education Reform Law from congress.

CONCLUDING LESSONS

Many years ago, my Student Loan mentor—Professor Bruce Chapman—shared with me in confidence the three secrets for running a successful student loan scheme: the first one is collection, the second is collection, and the third is collection. At the end of the day, no matter what type of student-loan system operates in one's country, it is doomed unless you have a proper collection mechanism.

Traditional, mortgage-type student-loan schemes are vulnerable by design, as illustrated by the Chilean and Colombian cases. Without an income-contingent provision, times of economic crisis are bound to create difficulties, as unemployment rises and incomes stagnate.

Obviously, income-contingent loan systems have a higher probability of success. But the necessity of having a foolproof collection system makes it challenging for most developing countries. My sense is that Chile is better placed than Colombia to work through its income tax administration to collect student-loan repayments in an efficient way. This is one of the positive consequences of the recent crisis, which has forced the Chileans to come up with a more rational and effective approach to student-loan origination and collection. I would hope that Colombia does not need a crisis of such gravity to find ways of transitioning to an income-contingent, student-loan model that would allow ICETEX to further consolidate its recent progress. In fact, ICETEX has already opened the possibility for graduates to move to an income-contingent repayment schedule. Two-hundred graduates took advantage of this new option in 2012. If this approach proves to be successful in making repayments easier, ICETEX can hopefully extend it to all loan beneficiaries. ■

American Engineering Doctoral Enrollments

RICHARD A. SKINNER

Richard A. Skinner is senior consultant to the higher education executive search firm, Harris Search Associates. E-mail: rick@harrisandasociates.com.

The reliance of American engineering doctoral programs on foreign students, especially those from India, is a case in point. US immigration policy changes in 1965

launched a steady and growing stream of Asian students enrolling in American universities—with engineering the second-most enrolled field. Moreover, foreign student numbers have increased dramatically in doctoral programs. By 2006, foreign students on temporary resident visas earned 64 percent of engineering degrees, and many remained in the United States, often as professors. In the latter case, these faculty made it possible for engineering enrollments at both undergraduate and graduates levels to grow to a 20-year high by 2010. Whether that upward trend can continue is more problematic.

THE NEED FOR GREATER CAPACITY

In recent years, the top-ranked engineering programs in America have increased the numbers of undergraduates and are usually successful in filling master's level programs. Doctoral programs, however, are seldom filled to capacity. The result is a case of the proverbial chicken-or-egg dilemma: more faculty are needed to teach larger numbers of engineering students and thereby increase the numbers of doctoral students.

A shortage of doctoral students means that increases in engineering graduates will be harder to acquire, and thus there will be fewer domestic engineering graduates to pursue doctoral studies. Foreign students come to America to pursue graduate degrees more so than undergraduate ones. Foreign students earned 24 percent of science and engineering master's, 33 percent of science and engineering doctorates, and only 4 percent of bachelor's degrees in 2007. But foreign students made up only 3.5 percent of total US enrollments in 2010/11.

Moreover, Indian immigration—a major source of engineering doctoral students—is likely to continue to flow based on the persistent gap in personal income between the two countries and could accelerate, with the large increase in India in the 16-to-34-age group in the future.

GROWING ENGINEERING ENROLLMENTS

In the near term, American engineering schools should continue to rely on international students to enroll and complete the PhD. Most signs are that such reliance is a reasonable strategy, but only for the near term. Demographic trends in India signify increases in the number of qualified students from India who can seek admission to US doctoral programs. Moreover, Indian research universities have not advanced as rapidly as their Chinese counterparts; so, American institutions will remain attractive for Indians to do doctoral work, particularly since English is a common language.

In addition, the US immigration policy gives preference for reuniting families and 40 percent of Indians immigrated to America, after 2000. Indian immigrants in siz-

able numbers are likely to continue to come and enroll in a variety of professional fields, including engineering doctoral studies. In 2010 more than 60 percent of Indian science and engineering doctoral recipients reported plans to stay in the United States. Beyond the near-term, however, some data suggest that reliance on international students may not be reliable in a more distant future. The National Science Foundation reported that in the first decade of the century the percentage decreased of Asian students reporting plans to remain in the United States. As well, if the economies of China, South Korea, Taiwan, and especially India improve from the global recession of recent years, then foreign students' numbers may decline further as opportunities at home improve.

Midterm prospects for increasing enrollments in doctoral engineering programs depend on persuading graduates to pursue the PhD and the financial support available for doctoral students—both domestic and foreign. Prospects for persuasion's success are not always successful, so American PhD programs will likely need to recruit international students. That, in turn, will necessitate changes to immigration policy. Such procedures gained a champion in the Partnership for a New American Economy, a coalition of city mayors and corporate heads chaired by chief executive officers from Microsoft and Boeing and New York Mayor Bloomberg, among others.

The Partnership for a New American Economy, as one of the organization's key principles, has increased "opportunities for immigrants to enter the United States workforce—and for foreign students to stay in the United States to work—so that we can attract and keep the best, the brightest, and the hardest-working, who will strengthen our economy." Federal immigration law will need to focus

more on facilitating entry and residence by educated individuals interested in graduate studies and engineering-related entrepreneurship, rather than the current preference for reuniting families.

LONG-TERM PROSPECTS

In the long-term, the immigration of foreign students to America for graduate education may well decline, as income differentials between American and foreign professions narrow and weaken the economic incentive for immigration. Improvement in other countries' universities—especially research-intensive ones, coupled with the demands for faculty in home countries—could strengthen the case for remaining home and foregoing immigration. Only India will require an additional 1 million professors by 2020.

American doctoral engineering programs' reliance on international students in general and Indian students, in particular, illustrates how one-sided the flow of talent can become over time. Had foreign students not immigrated to the United States in sizable numbers beginning in the mid-1960s, pursued engineering PhDs and then remained, it is hard to imagine how the field could have grown and contributed so substantially—to endeavors such as the American space program, advances in computing, and improvements in the use of energy.

However, whether similar enterprises will be possible in the future—as at least in part because American engineering programs can be certain of ample numbers of well-qualified domestic or foreign students—pursuing the doctorate is problematic. ■

CRITICAL INTERNATIONAL NEWS AT A GLANCE ON FACEBOOK AND TWITTER

Do you have time to read more than 20 electronic bulletins weekly in order to stay up to date with international initiatives and trends? We thought not! So, as a service, the CIHE research team posts items from a broad range of international media to our Facebook and Twitter page.

You will find news items from the *Chronicle of Higher Education*, *Inside Higher Education*, *University World News*, *Times Higher Education*, the *Guardian Higher Education network UK*, the *Times of India*, the *Korea Times*, just to name a few. We also include pertinent items from blogs and other online resources. We will also announce international and comparative reports and relevant new publications.

Unlike most Facebook and Twitter sites, our pages are not about us, but rather "newsfeeds" updated daily with notic-

es most relevant to international educators and practitioners, policymakers, and decision makers. Think "news marquis" in Times Square in New York City. Here, at a glance, you can take in the information and perspective you need in a few minutes every morning.

To follow the news, press "Like" on our Facebook page at: <http://www.facebook.com/pages/Center-for-International-Higher-Education-CIHE/197777476903716>. "Follow" us on Twitter at: https://twitter.com/#!/BC_CIHE.

We hope you'll also consider clicking "Like" on Facebook items you find most useful to help boost our presence in this arena. Please post your comments to encourage online discussion.

NEW PUBLICATIONS

Balán, Jorge, ed. *Latin America's New Knowledge Economy: Higher Education, Government, and International Collaboration*. New York: Institute of International Education, 2013. 154 pp. (pb). ISBN 978-0-87206-358-7. Web site: www.iie.org.

A consideration of key elements in Latin America's growing participation in the knowledge economy, this volume has a focus on international exchange issues. Among the topics considered by the authors are governance of public universities, workforce training and higher education, scholarship abroad programs, research universities in Brazil, western hemisphere academic exchange programs, and others.

Farrugia, Christine, Rajika Bhandari, and Patricia Chow. *Open Doors: Report on International Educational Exchange*. New York: Institute of International Education, 2012. 112 pp. (pb). ISBN 978-0-87206-353-2. Web site: www.iie.org.

The Institute of International Education's annual publication is about trends in student mobility to and from the United States. This volume includes statistics on key trends—with numbers and national origins of students coming to the US to study, and trends among American students for study abroad. Detailed information about numbers of students as specific universities, fields of study, and related topics are provided.

Goodman, Roger, Takehiko Kariya, and John Taylor, eds. *Higher Education and the State: Changing Relationships in Europe and East Asia*. Oxford, UK: Symposium Books, 2013. 270 pp. \$56 (pb). ISBN 978-1-873927-76-2. Web site: www.symposium-books.co.uk.

In the era of massification, the role of the state in higher education has been changing, as government support for higher education has dwindled in many countries and the private sector has expanded. This book focuses on the changing role of the state in East Asia and Europe. Various aspects of higher education relations are discussed in chapters dealing with, among others, Germany, France, Italy, the United Kingdom, Japan, and Korea. Several of the chapters provide comparative

perspectives.

Johnston, Lucas F. *Higher Education for Sustainability: Cases, Challenges, and Opportunities from Across the Curriculum*. London: Routledge, 2013. 262 pp. (pb). ISBN 978-0-415-51936-6. Web site: www.routledge.com.

Examining curricular efforts to introduce themes of sustainability and environmentalism, this book provides a series of case studies mainly from the United States but also including several European countries and Canada. Themes include sustainability in courses on tourism and hospitality, the role of interdisciplinarity in courses on sustainability, and others.

Kwiek, Marek, and Andrzej Kurkiewicz, eds. *The Modernization of European Universities: Cross-National Academic Perspectives*. Frankfurt am Main, Germany: Peter Lang, 2012. 360 pp. (hb). ISBN 978-3-631-63796-8. Web site: www.peterlang.de.

Modernization in the European context includes a complex set of issues—including Bologna-induced integration, the development of differentiated systems, changes in governance, and others. This book includes essays concerning new patterns of funding higher education, student finance issues, and a range of analyses of patterns of modernization in a broad European context.

Manning, Kathleen. *Organizational Theory in Higher Education*. New York: Routledge, 2013. 219 pp. (pb). ISBN 978-0-415-87467-0. Web site: www.routledge.com.

Intended mainly as a textbook on academic organization for use in American universities, this volume focuses on various interpretations of organization theory as they apply to higher education. For each theoretical perspective, a case study is also provided. Among the organizational perspectives discussed are "organized anarchy," political, bureaucratic, cultural, and others.

Maximova-Mentzoni, Tatiana. *The Changing Russian University: From State to Market*. London: Routledge, 2013. 194 pp. \$155 (hb). ISBN 978-0-415-54018-6. Web site: www.routledge.com.

Following the collapse of the Soviet Union, the universities were starved of funding and found it very difficult to adjust to the new circumstances in Russia. This book focuses on the transition of higher education in Russia in the 1990s, and the implications for the current situation of higher education. The main focus is on the development of marketization of higher education. Much of the analysis is based on a single case study.

McCabe, Donald L., Kenneth Butterfield, and Linda K. Treviño. *Cheating in College: Why Students Do It and What Educators Can Do About It*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2012. 224 pp. (hb). ISBN: 971-1-421407166. Web site: www.press.jhu.edu.

Based on a study of academic cheating in 31 diverse American colleges and universities, the researchers found that two-thirds of undergraduate students engaged in some kind of cheating, and that cheating is also common among graduate and professional students. A variety of variables are studied relating to cheating, and recommendations are made for reducing its prevalence.

Olivas, Michael. *Suing Alma Mater: Higher Education and the Courts*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2013. 232 pp. \$32.92 (pb). ISBN 978-1-4214-0923-8. Web site: www.press.jhu.edu.

A key resource on the highly complicated and often contentious relationship between the law and higher education in the United States, this volume relies in part on analyzing key court cases as a way of illustrating how the courts deal with academic issues. Additional chapters focus broadly on higher education law in the United States and on new trends relating to the politics of court cases brought to the Supreme Court.

Rolfe, Gary. *The University in Dissent: Scholarship in the Corporate University*. London: Routledge, 2013. 150 pp. ISBN 978-0-415-68115-5. Web site: www.routledge.com.

Extending the argument of Bill Readings in his *The University in Ruins*, this volume provides a philosophical discourse critical of the growing corporatization of higher education worldwide.

Schloss, Patrick J., and Kristina M. Cragg, eds. *Organization and Administration in Higher Education*. New York: Routledge, 2013. 305 pp. (pb). ISBN 978-0-415-89270-4. Web site: www.routledge.com.

Focusing entirely on the United States, this book provides essays by administrators, discussing key themes in higher education management. Among the themes discussed are administrative aspects of accreditation and assessment, performance expectations for academic leaders, student governance, human resource strategy, curriculum issues and resources, philanthropy, and others.

Smelser, Neil J. *Dynamics of the Contemporary University: Growth, Accretion, and Conflict*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 2013. 139 pp. \$39.95 (hb). ISBN 978-0-520-27581-2. Web site: www.ucpress.edu.

This short book, based on the 2012 Clark Kerr Lecture series, discusses a range of themes central to an understanding of contemporary higher education. These include revenues and costs, the stability of academic departments, the accretion of functions of universities, growing commercialism, and the rise of on-line and for-profit higher edu-

cation. While the focus in this volume is on American higher education, it has wide international relevance.

Sovic, Silvia, and Margo Blythman, eds. *International Students Negotiating Higher Education: Critical Perspectives*. Abingdon, UK: Routledge, 2013. 243 pp. (pb). ISBN 978-0-415-61470-2. Web site: www.routledge.com.

A broad analysis of issues relating to students studying abroad, this volume discussed both the broader policy issues and some specific topics relating to the challenges of international students. Among the themes considered are the ethical commitments of universities for serving international students, an internationalized curriculum, case studies of international students in the arts and in business studies, and several chapters focusing on language issues relating to international students.

Vukasovi, Martina, Peter Maassen, Monika Nerland, Rómulo Pinhwieo, Bjørn Stensaker, and Agnete Vabø, eds. *Effects of Higher Education Reforms: Change Dynamics*. Rotterdam, Netherlands: SENSE, 2012. 311 pp (pb). ISBN 978-94-6029-014-9. Web site:

www.sensepublishers.com.

This volume contains a range of research-based essays relating broadly to academic change in different national and regional contexts. Among the topics considered are student financial aid in the United States, the development of a European quality-assurance system, research mobility in Europe, economic development and higher education in Africa, and a series of studies of the academic profession.

Wang, Qi, Ying Cheng, and Nian Cai Liu, eds. *Building World-Class Universities: Different Approaches to a Shared Goal*. Rotterdam, Netherlands: SENSE, 2013. 226 pp. \$54 (pb). ISBN 978-9462-09-032-3. Web site: www.sensepublishers.com.

The focus of this volume is on the different strategies for building world-class universities. Case studies from Russia, Saudi Arabia, the Netherlands, Denmark, and Taiwan are included. Broader analyses include discussions of the role of rankings, political and cultural variations among research universities, the role of top-tier researchers, and others.

CENTER SPONSORS SUCCESSFUL CONFERENCE

On April 5, a conference titled "At the Forefront of International Higher Education" was held at Boston College to celebrate the career and scholarly contributions of the Center's founding director, Philip G. Altbach. The event attracted more than 100 researchers, scholars, policymakers, university administrators, and students from several countries and featured discussions of key issues in international higher education. Among the speakers were J. Donald Monan, S.J., Hans de Wit, Jamil Salmi, D. Bruce Johnstone, Nian Cai Liu, Henry Rosovsky, Judith Eaton, Patti McGill Peterson, and others. The symposium was made possible through the generous support of the American Council on Education, the Association of International Education Administrators, the

European Association for International Education, the Ford Foundation, the National Research University-Higher School of Economics, Johns Hopkins University Press, the Lumina Foundation, the Talloires Network, SAGE India, Ms. Mariam Assefa, Dr. Hans de Wit, and Dr. Tom Parker. A related book, *At the Forefront of International Higher Education*, coedited by Alma Maldonado-Maldonado and Roberta Malee Bassett, will be published by Springer later in 2013. A video of the conference can be found at <http://www.youtube.com/bostoncolleg-ecihe>.

NEWS OF THE CENTER

With the retirement of Center director Philip G. Altbach from active teaching at Boston College in June, there will be minimal change at the Center. Dr. Altbach will continue to be director of the Center and will remain actively involved with its work. Laura E. Rumbley will continue as associate director and will take more management responsibilities. Boston College has approved this arrangement, and the Center is indebted to Dean Maureen Kenny and Provost Bert Garza for their support.

The Center welcomes Ariane De Gayardon as research assistant. She comes to the Center from Kings College, London, and will be pursuing a doctorate in higher education at Boston College. We congratulate Dr. Iván F. Pacheco, who has completed his doctorate. He was recently invited to present his results at conferences in Colombia and New York. Iván was a graduate assistant at CIHE.

Center director Philip G. Altbach was awarded the Marta Houlihan Award for Distinguished Contributions to the Field of International Education by NAFSA: Association of International Educators. He also was named an AERA Fellow for 2013 by the American Educational Research Association.

The Center was involved in a training program for administrators at Princess Nora University in Riyadh, Saudi

Arabia, the largest women's university in the world. The program was coordinated by Liz Reisberg, formerly on the Center's staff, and included associate director Laura E. Rumbley, BC vice provost for faculty Patricia DeLeeuw, and Karen Arnold of the higher education program. Philip G. Altbach and Liz Reisberg continue to serve on the planning committee for the annual international conference on higher education in Riyadh—they recently participated in the conference.

Dr. Altbach also spoke at a workshop for Saudi rectors and later at a workshop for rectors of Catholic universities sponsored by the International Federation of Catholic Universities in London. He will be on the faculty of a leadership program at the University of Hong Kong as well and will participate a conference sponsored by the Society for College and University Planning in Montreal, Canada, and later a conference on the media and higher education in Toronto.

Associate director Laura E. Rumbley chairs the publications committee of the European Association of International Education.

PROTECT YOUR INTERNATIONAL HIGHER EDUCATION SUBSCRIPTION!

In order not to miss any future issues of *IHE*, please be sure that you are a registered subscriber! If you do not receive an electronic copy of the newsletter, you probably are not registered in our database. To avoid being dropped from the distribution in the future, please update your registration online.

Go to:

<http://www.bc.edu/content/bc/research/cihe/ihe.html>

Click on:

"Subscribe to IHE" in the navigation panel on the left side of the screen.

Click on the link:

[Click here for our subscription form.](#)

Choose your subscriber status:

New Subscriber/Existing Subscriber/Not a Subscriber
[If you are not sure, choose "New"]

Skip "Expert Status"

Complete the remainder of the form and click "Submit"

If you have any questions, contact us at highered@bc.edu



Center for International Higher Education
Boston College
Campion Hall
Chestnut Hill, MA 02467-3813
USA

PRESORTED
FIRST-CLASS MAIL
U.S. POSTAGE
PAID
N. READING MA
PERMIT 258

THE CENTER FOR INTERNATIONAL HIGHER EDUCATION (CIHE)

The Boston College Center for International Higher Education brings an international consciousness to the analysis of higher education. We believe that an international perspective will contribute to enlightened policy and practice. To serve this goal, the Center publishes the International Higher Education quarterly newsletter, a book series, and other publications; sponsors conferences; and welcomes visiting scholars. We have a special concern for academic institutions in the Jesuit tradition worldwide and, more broadly, with Catholic universities.

The Center promotes dialogue and cooperation among academic institutions throughout the world. We believe that the future depends on effective collaboration and the creation of an international community focused on the improvement of higher education in the public interest.

CIHE WEB SITE

The different sections of the Center Web site support the work of scholars and professionals in international higher education, with links to key resources in the field. All issues of International Higher Education are available online, with a searchable archive. In addition, the International Higher Education Clearinghouse (IHEC) is a source of articles, reports, trends, databases, online newsletters, announcements of

upcoming international conferences, links to professional associations, and resources on developments in the Bologna Process and the GATS. The Higher Education Corruption Monitor provides information from sources around the world, including a selection of news articles, a bibliography, and links to other agencies. The International Network for Higher Education in Africa (INHEA), is an information clearinghouse on research, development, and advocacy activities related to postsecondary education in Africa.

THE PROGRAM IN HIGHER EDUCATION AT THE LYNCH SCHOOL OF EDUCATION, BOSTON COLLEGE

The Center is closely related to the graduate program in higher education at Boston College. The program offers master's and doctoral degrees that feature a social science-based approach to the study of higher education. The Administrative Fellows initiative provides financial assistance as well as work experience in a variety of administrative settings. Specializations are offered in higher education administration, student affairs and development, and international education. For additional information, please contact Dr. Karen Arnold (arnoldk@bc.edu) or visit our Web site: <http://www.bc.edu/schools/lsoe/>.

OPINIONS EXPRESSED HERE DO NOT NECESSARILY REFLECT THE VIEWS OF THE CENTER FOR INTERNATIONAL HIGHER EDUCATION.

EDITOR

Philip G. Altbach

PUBLICATIONS EDITOR

Edith S. Hoshino

EDITORIAL ASSISTANT

Salina Kopellas

EDITORIAL OFFICE

Center for International
Higher Education
Campion Hall
Boston College
Chestnut Hill, MA 02467
USA

Tel: (617) 552-4236

Fax: (617) 552-8422

E-mail: highered@bc.edu
<http://www.bc.edu/cihe>

We welcome correspondence, ideas for articles, and reports. If you would like to subscribe, please send an e-mail to: highered@bc.edu, including your position (graduate student, professor, administrator, policymaker, etc.), and area of interest or expertise. There is no charge for a subscription.

ISSN: 1084-0613
©Center for International
Higher Education