

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, Portuguese, and Spanish. Links to all editions can be found at www.bc.edu/cihe.

International Issues

- 2 The Need for Research and Training for the Higher Education Enterprise
The Shanghai Statement
- 4 Research Universities in Developing and Middle-Income Countries
Karen MacGregor
- 6 The Abdication of Thinking Capacity in International Higher Education
Philip G. Altbach
- 8 Higher Education in Post-Conflict Conditions
Iván F. Pacheco and Ane Turner Johnson

Asian Themes

- 10 Can the Great American Universities Take Root in Asia?
Harry Lewis
- 11 Does a Higher Education Community Exist in Asia?
Hugo Horta and Jisun Jung

Internationalization Trends

- 12 Soaring Spain: A Dream Deferred?
Laura E. Rumbley and Laura Howard
- 14 Europe's 25 Years of Internationalization
Hans de Wit and Fiona Hunter
- 16 Franchising, Validation, and Branch Campuses in Europe
Lukas Bischof
- 17 India: Mobility Trends
Wesley Teter and Don Martin
- 19 Academic Collaboration with African Universities
Ad Boeren

Latin America Focus

- 21 Brazil: A For-Profit Giant
Dante J. Salto
- 22 Financing Higher Education in Latin America
Ana García de Fanelli
- 24 Accreditation in Colombia
Alberto Roa Varelo

Countries and Regions

- 25 Democratic Reform in Egyptian Universities
Ahmed El-Obeidy
- 27 Vietnam: New Legislation
Duy Pham

Departments

- 28 New Publications
- 30 News of the Center

The Need for Research and Training for the Higher Education Enterprise

Prepared by the Boston College Center for International Higher Education in consultation with participants in the first International Higher Education Research and Policy Roundtable Shanghai Jiao Tong University, November 2–3, 2013

This “Shanghai Statement” is intended to highlight the need for “thinking capacity,” data, policy analysis, and professional training for tertiary education worldwide. We are convinced that both institutions and systems, faced with a myriad of challenges and crises, require thoughtful leadership and data-based analysis. We can no longer rely on amateur management and ad hoc solutions to unprecedented problems.

THE CONTEXT

Postsecondary education is central to the global knowledge economy, as well as to both social mobility and workforce development worldwide. Vast investments are being made in higher education across the globe—developed countries spend 1.6 percent of gross domestic product while emerging economies allocate somewhat less. Global enrollments approach 200 million. Tertiary education has become a major policy arena in most countries, because of its importance for educating a skilled workforce for the knowledge economy, social mobility, and the production and dissemination of research. Governments, the private sector, and academic institutions themselves require both data and policy guidance to adapt to a changing environment.

In a few countries, a field of higher education studies has emerged to serve these needs. Data are collected by governments and other agencies. Research is undertaken to provide guidance for policy and practice at the national and international levels. Centers and institutes, located mainly in universities but also in government agencies or in private organizations, have been established. This developing field is so far limited to a fairly small group of countries.

Higher education requires professional management. Although only a few countries currently provide such training, there has been recognition, again in a small group of countries, that academic institutions, now in many cases large and bureaucratic entities, require professional management. Programs have been established to provide training for those involved in university service and management, including in some cases the top leadership of academic institutions.

The field of higher education needs to expand worldwide and requires careful attention and development—if the tertiary sector is to be effectively managed and led—and ultimately to deliver desired results for stakeholders. Data and analysis are required if informed decisions are to be made. Training and education are needed for the rapidly expanding cadre of higher education professionals. Research is needed to better understand the nature of the academic enterprise—institutionally, nationally, and globally—and the complex economic, political, pedagogical, and social issues central to higher education.

NECESSARY INFRASTRUCTURES

Higher education requires a range of institutions and infrastructures and, most importantly, a cadre of qualified researchers, scholars, and professors, to provide the research, analysis, and training needed by an expanding and increasingly complex and sophisticated higher education enterprise. Among them are the following:

- **Research centers:** Building and maintaining research capacity in higher education requires dedicated centers or institutes. Interdisciplinary in nature, centers are probably best located in universities. They require qualified staff with deep expertise on higher education. Such centers may be attached to graduate training programs in universities that bring motivated students to assist with research work and the stimulation of an academic environment. Adequate size, scope, and dedicated budgets are necessary.

- **Universities must assign staff to respond individually to prospective students, with information and assistance, during the admissions process.** This will not be inexpensive, but if some of the budget now on agents can be redirected to this task, the funds will be well spent.

- **Training programs:** Higher education administration requires professionalization in the era of mass enrollments and increasingly large universities worldwide. Professionalization means training programs in higher education management, leadership, and in specialized areas of academic life—such as research management, quality assurance, financial affairs, or student development. Some of these may be degree programs at the master’s or doctoral level, as is common in the United States. Some countries offer management degrees in higher education administration, as is common in the United Kingdom—although universities cannot be equated with other kinds of business enterprises. Shorter programs and courses focusing on university management and other higher education issues may also be useful.

- **International and regional centers:** In a globalized world, comparative and international data and analysis are crucial. This is particularly true since academic institutions and systems are themselves increasingly globalized.

At present, there is no international organization with the capacity or interest to systematically collect and analyze data on a broad range of higher education themes, including basic statistics about institutions, systems, and trends. The same can be said for world regions. Further, international organizations can provide “thinking capacity” for considering policy issues and other matters in a broad comparative framework.

- Governments must increase support to education information centers in the primary sending countries to provide on-site information with well-trained professional staff who can offer workshops and guidance to prospective students.

- Specialized organizations and centers: As higher education has become complex and specialized, the need for specialized knowledge and analysis in, for example, fields such as student affairs, internationalization, or academic administration, has become necessary. Organizations focused in specialized areas may be useful in larger countries, and on a regional and international basis, as well.

THE POLICY ENVIRONMENT

Higher education faces a myriad of challenges and there are many enduring themes of policy and practice that deserve additional in-depth research and analysis. While both diverse and requiring a range of approaches in terms of research and analysis, these topics deserve the attention of the higher education community;

- the implications of globalization—cross-border initiatives, international student flows, the impact of global inequalities, and related themes;

- challenges of quality and equity in higher education;

- governance—what are the best models of governance for the era of massification and declining public resources? What is effective in practice;

- systems—how are academic systems organized to meet the needs of massification and the global knowledge economy?;

- private higher education, privatization, commercialization, and related issues; and

- finally, the impact of higher education research on higher education, its funding, its relevance to policy and practice, and the means of sustaining and communicating research findings and analysis to both institutions and policymakers.

COMMITMENT TO THE FUTURE

Postsecondary education, a central element of the emerging global knowledge economy and increasingly important for both social mobility and workforce development worldwide, requires professional expertise, a knowledge base, relevant research on key issues, and training for professionals

responsible for academic institutions and systems. Higher education centers and programs—linked with policymakers in government, the private sector, and in academe—are necessary for the success of the enterprise.

The effectiveness of higher education centers and programs, however, hinges on their ability to:

- engage in a robust and relevant ongoing dialogue with colleagues and counterparts in the policymaking sphere;

- cultivate successive generations of talented young researchers who share an appreciation for, and commitment to, rigorous scholarship designed to enable thoughtful, data-driven decision making; and

- train academic leaders and professional administrators to manage tertiary education institutions and systems in an increasingly complex environment.

In a few countries, a field of higher education studies has emerged to serve these needs. Data are collected by governments and other agencies.

Thoughtful leadership, future-oriented planning, and a sustained commitment to the crucial mission of higher education research as a key ingredient for effective policy formulation and implementation will be needed more than ever in the coming years. All relevant stakeholders should recognize this fundamental dynamic between research, policy, and practice, and contribute substantively to the realization of its full potential. The future of higher education hangs in the balance.

NOTE:

Meeting in Shanghai, China, on November 2 and 3, 2013, the first international round table of directors of higher education centers from around the world along with key higher education policy specialists deliberated on the themes discussed in this statement. This document reflects in general the thinking of 33 research and policy professionals concerning the future development of the field of higher education research, policy, and training—at a crucial turning point for tertiary education globally. The workshop was organized by the Boston College Center for International Higher Education and Innovation, Higher Education and Research for Development (IHERD), an initiative of the Swedish International Development Agency (SIDA), with the collaboration of the Graduate School of Education at Shanghai Jiao Tong University. Funding was provided by SIDA and administered by SANTRUST, a South Africa-based NGO. ■

Research Universities in Developing and Middle-Income Countries

KAREN MACGREGOR

Karen MacGregor is coordinating editor of University World News, from which this article is reprinted. E-mail: editors@iafrica.com. All quotations in this article are from Philip G. Altbach, "Advancing the National and Global Knowledge Economy: The Role of Research Universities," Studies in Higher Education, 38 (April, 2013).

Research universities in low and middle-income countries have crucial roles to play in developing differentiated and effective academic systems and in making it possible for their countries to join the global knowledge society and compete in sophisticated knowledge economies, according to Philip G. Altbach, research professor and director of the Center for International Higher Education at Boston College in the United States.

While research universities in the developing world have not yet achieved the top levels of global rankings, they are "extraordinarily important" in their countries and regions—and are steadily improving their reputations and competitiveness on the international stage—wrote Altbach in an article titled "Advancing the National and Global Knowledge Economy: The Role of Research Universities in Developing Countries": "A key point is that research universities around the world are part of an active community of institutions that share values, foci, and mission."

Altbach's article was published in a special issue of the journal *Studies in Higher Education* dedicated to disseminating key concepts arising out of an investigation into higher education's knowledge structure, in a collaboration between the Center for International Higher Education and the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development's Innovation, Higher Education and Research for Development program.

Research universities were defined as academic institutions "committed to the creation and dissemination of knowledge, in a range of disciplines and fields, and featuring the appropriate laboratories, libraries, and other infrastructures that permit teaching and research at the highest possible level." Worldwide, research universities played complex roles in the academic system, including the core mission of research production and training students to engage in research.

"The research university is no ivory tower and is relevant to the wider community; much of its research is carried out in collaboration, with funding and sponsorship

from nonuniversity sources. The research university is a highly complex and multifaceted institution, serving many societal roles." Research universities worldwide have a great deal in common, "stemming from a specific tradition and serving similar roles," Altbach pointed out. There are national variations, but "synergy of research and teaching is a hallmark."

Knowledge production and dissemination must spread internationally, he argued, and wider dissemination of research capacity throughout the world was imperative.

"The argument can be made that all countries need academic institutions, linked to the global academic system of science and scholarship, so that they can understand advanced scientific developments and participate selectively in global science."

Most countries could afford to support at least one university of sufficient quality to participate in international discussions of science and scholarship and conduct research in fields relevant to national development.

ALL COUNTRIES WANT WORLD-CLASS UNIVERSITIES

Around the world, countries have recognized that research universities are key to the knowledge economy of the 21st century. In the United States and Britain, there was rising concern about the ability to maintain the standards of existing research universities. Germany had allocated resources to some key institutions, and Japan had funded competitive grants to create centers of excellence.

"China has placed emphasis on creating 'world-class' research universities, and India is finally beginning to think about the quality of its mainstream institutions. Similar programs to enhance standards exist in South Korea, Chile, Taiwan, and elsewhere," Altbach wrote.

"Several of Africa's traditionally strong universities are seeking to improve their quality in an effort to achieve research university status, with assistance from external funders; but this process is, in general, behind levels of academic development in other continents."

"Research universities have emerged on the policy agenda in many developing countries, especially larger nations that seek to compete in the global knowledge economy."

RESEARCH UNIVERSITIES AND ACADEMIC SYSTEMS

Research universities are a very small and specialized but crucial part of any academic system, Altbach argued. In America there were around 220 research universities in a system of more than 4,000 postsecondary institutions. In the United Kingdom, there were just 25 research universities among 100 universities and 300 postsecondary institutions. "Smaller developing countries have perhaps one research university, and many have none." China was

developing around 100 research universities—out of more than 3,000 institutions countrywide as part of its efforts to build world-class institutions.

A clearly differentiated academic system was needed for research universities to flourish, Altbach wrote. A good example was the three-tier California public higher education system, established by the California Master Plan, which has at its pinnacle 10 campuses of the research-oriented University of California, the 23-campus California State University system with around 433,000 students, and a community college system with 3 million students. Funding patterns, missions, and governance differ across the three tiers and state regulation maintained their different missions. “By distributing resources with an ideal of efficiency at its core, the Master Plan also institutionalized a commitment to excellence in its best research universities, such as the University of California, Berkeley.”

While research universities in the developing world have not yet achieved the top levels of global rankings, they are “extraordinarily important” in their countries and regions.

Clark Kerr, architect of the Master Plan, had a vision of the key characteristics of research universities: internal governance primarily in the hands of professors; key decisions receiving inputs from academics—the concept of shared governance is central; rigorous meritocracy; research intertwined with teaching; academic freedom; and engagement with society.

Developing countries also needed to clearly differentiate the missions of institutions in the postsecondary system and to organize institutions in a rational way.

“Appropriate patterns of funding, realistic teaching arrangements, administrative arrangements, and other key elements of institutions will need to be organized and then implemented. Ensuring that the rapidly expanding private higher education sector is to some extent integrated into the system will also be necessary,” Altbach argued.

“The fact is that few if any developing countries have a differentiated academic system in place; and this central organizational requirement remains a key task.” Without an appropriate system, which would vary according to national requirements, research universities could not fully flourish.

“These institutions must be clearly identified and supported. There must be arrangements so that the number

of research universities will be sufficiently limited so that funding is available for them and that other resources, such as well-qualified academics, are not spread too thinly.”

Altbach explored aspects of academia key to research universities—communications and networks, journals, libraries, informal communities of scholars, conferences and professional organizations, the Internet, repositories of knowledge, research universities as critical centers, the globalization of science and scholarship, internationalization and the research university, the dilemma of language and the academic profession.

PRESENT CIRCUMSTANCES

“To paraphrase Charles Dickens, these are the best of times and the worst of times for research universities,” Altbach wrote. While there was wide recognition of the importance of the research university, international academic connections and research, many countries did not realize the complexity of and resources needed to build and sustain them.

He outlined some of the characteristics of successful research universities:

- Virtually all are a part of a differentiated system, standing at the top of an academic hierarchy and receiving appropriate support for their mission.
- Research universities—except in the United States, Japan, and a small number of church-linked institutions in Latin America—are overwhelmingly public institutions. The private sector can seldom support a research university, although some private institutions are emerging with a research focus—such as in Turkey, India, and Latin America.
- Research universities are most successful in regions with little or no competition from nonuniversity research institutes or with strong ties between the universities and such institutes. The “academy of science” system in countries such as Russia and China and some models of research institutes elsewhere lack connections to universities. Some countries are trying to better integrate research institutes and top universities, in some cases merging them—this would undoubtedly strengthen the universities.
- Research universities are expensive, requiring more funding than other universities—to attract the best staff and students and to provide the infrastructure necessary for top research and teaching. The “cost per student” is higher than the average across an entire system. Adequate salaries for faculty, well-equipped libraries and laboratories, and scholarships for bright but needy students are examples of the expenditures required.
- Research universities must have adequate and sustained budgets; they cannot succeed on the basis of inadequate funding or severe budgetary fluctuation over time.

- At the same time, research universities have the potential for significant income generation. Students are often willing to pay higher fees because of the prestige attached to a degree from them, quality academic programs, and access to top professors. Research universities also generate intellectual property and discoveries and innovations with value in the marketplace. In some countries, they can generate philanthropic gifts.

- Research universities require physical facilities commensurate with their missions, including expensive libraries and laboratories and sophisticated information technology. The infrastructures of research universities are complex and expensive. Not only do they need to be built but they must also be maintained and periodically upgraded.

- Research universities require autonomy to shape their programs and practices. The balance between autonomy and accountability in developing countries may be complicated.

- Academic freedom is a requirement for all postsecondary institutions but especially research universities.

CONCLUSION

Research universities in developing countries are at the top of the academic hierarchy and are central to the success of any modern knowledge-based economy, Altbach concluded. "All developing countries need these institutions to participate in the globalized environment of higher education. Thus, understanding the characteristics of the research university and building the infrastructures and the intellectual environment needed for successful research universities is a top priority." ■

The Abdication of Thinking Capacity in International Higher Education

PHILIP G. ALTBACH

Philip G. Altbach is Research Professor and director of the Center for International Higher Education. E-mail: altbach@bc.edu.

For almost a half-century, several international governmental organizations consistently provided both a forum for discussions about global higher education issues and some capacity for policy analyses and supporting research. These organizations produced policy documents,

published monographs, books and journals, sponsored international meetings, and from time to time financed and coordinated research projects on key international issues. They also collected statistics and occasionally issued policy documents relating to global and region-wide higher education issues. Perhaps most important, they provided forums for discussion, which brought together higher education leaders, researchers, and often government officials concerned with higher education. The ability to work on a global scale and to bring together multiple constituencies is of special significance, especially for such complex endeavor as higher education and research.

The ability to work on a global scale and to bring together multiple constituencies is of special significance, especially for such complex endeavor as higher education and research.

There is sufficient evidence to note that in the past few years, two of the leading international governmental organizations involved in these activities, UNESCO and the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) have largely left the field of higher education, leading a considerable vacuum. Only the World Bank, a latecomer to the area with activities largely limited to occasional policy studies and some research activities, seems to remain active.

This abdication is quite unfortunate since higher education more than ever needs "thinking capacity," analysis of contemporary issues, and "convening authority" for conversations and debates. It is also quite surprising, since higher education has never been more important to countries worldwide. Further, academic institutions and systems are increasingly affected by global trends that require comparative analysis and international debate and can benefit from an analysis of "best practice" worldwide.

THE PAST AND PRESENT

UNESCO at one time played a useful role in higher education, despite its well-known reputation for bureaucracy and inefficiency. It was the only organization in the world with full global coverage. It was able to attract representations from the developing countries as well as industrialized nations. In some countries, UNESCO had a unique connection with top governmental officials. Several of its regional offices built capacity for higher education research and poli-

cy analysis in eastern and central Europe, especially serious during the Cold War period, and in Latin America. Several journals provided an outlet for analysis and debate, such as *Higher Education in Europe*, published by the UNESCO European Centre for Higher Education (UNESCO-CEPES), which was closed in 2010. Particularly surprising was closing down *Higher Education in Europe* and not permitting an interested and well-respected publisher to continue it. UNESCO's two world conferences on higher education (held in 1998 and 2009) and several regional meetings were useful—being the forums that brought together government officials, university leaders, and researchers. In the past decade, this entire infrastructure has been systematically dismantled.

OECD, although its basic responsibility was mainly limited to membership in the industrialized world, also played an active and quite useful role. Its program on Institutional Management in Higher Education sponsored annual conferences for academic leaders on relevant topics and published a highly regarded international journal, *Higher Education Policy*. The journal was suddenly abolished, again with no thought of handing it to a publisher. OECD also sponsored a number of research projects, such as an analysis of emerging higher education trends in 2030, which resulted in useful books and conferences. All of this seems to be gone, as OECD has moved away from a concern for higher education. Emblematic for this development is the current situation of Assessment of Higher Education Learning Outcomes; after conducting a feasibility study this ambitious initiative has been put on hold but in reality closed down.

Both organizations, and also the World Bank, from time to time sponsored major reports on key higher education themes. Examples included *Peril and Promise*, and others. These thoughtful and globally concerned documents sometimes had a significant impact on national policy and more broadly on global thinking about higher education. Although some of UNESCO's global higher education initiatives were of mixed quality and with regularly insufficient funding, they brought together almost all countries to think about higher education issues. Major documents and reports were prepared for them.

A KNOWLEDGE BASE

It is rightly argued that in a majority of cases, the principal function of international organizations consists of legislative and standard-setting activities, policy advocacy, and policy advising, as well as the launching and implementation of various operational projects; and those activities imply the need for in-house expertise. The “standardization work” undertaken by UNESCO and OECD, in collaboration with

other organizations, has been essential for collecting comparative educational statistics. UNESCO collects a range of statistics concerning education, with some coverage of higher education. These efforts had the advantage of global coverage but the disadvantage of only modest accuracy, due in part on a lack of capacity at UNESCO and on the reliance of what was provided by governments around the world. One has the impression that there is less attention to statistics now. OECD statistics tended to be more accurate and comprehensive but covered only the OECD-member countries, with a few additional ones added.

IMPLICATIONS OF ABDICATION

Unfortunately, no other organizations offer the services or the broad perspectives that have disappeared with the abdication of UNESCO and OECD. The World Bank continues its small-scale concern with global higher education issues but does not sponsor meetings or involve relevant stakeholders. A large number of regional and single-purpose conferences take place, such as Shanghai Jiao Tong University's biannual World Class University meeting. The British Council's Going Global conference and the Qatar Foundation's WISE conference bring together a smaller number of participants but seem to have no key themes and little, if any, lasting significance.

Both organizations, and also the World Bank, from time to time sponsored major reports on key higher education themes. Examples included *Peril and Promise*, and others.

Organizations such as the European Association for International Education attract an increasing number of global participants to their annual meetings. However, in general, such organizations are concerned with specific aspects of higher education, such as in EAIE's case with the theme of internationalization and student mobility or in case of the International Ranking Expert Group Observatory on university rankings.

Agencies and funders are typically driven by the current “hot topic” or fad in higher education. The current concern about “workforce training” and employability of graduates is a case in point: a few agencies and foundations have taken an interest in these themes with an international perspective, but they do not have a global view nor an interest in creating a knowledge base for international discus-

sion. One can predict that the next set of ad hoc conferences and short-term research projects may be on massive open online courses and other elements of distance education. While these short-term concerns are certainly relevant and deserve attention, nothing can replace continuing investment in a broad international perspective on global higher education.

SOLUTIONS

This solution to the problem of a lack of “convening authority” and “thinking capacity” is not rocket science. It would be best, of course, if an international organization with appropriate resources and broad acceptability, among relevant global constituencies, could undertake this responsibility; but, this seems unlikely. It might be possible for an arrangement like the TIMSS and PIRLS International Study Center at Boston College, which coordinates the periodic mathematics and science evaluations, is funded by a number of agencies and has been able to remain active over more than a decade to undertake the task. Perhaps a group of regional and national higher education organizations could combine for this task. Perhaps the Qatar Foundation or a similar organization with considerable resources could underwrite a serious higher education initiative that would go beyond occasional conferences. There is a desperate need for ongoing international debate, discussion, and regular data collection on higher education. At present, we have only a fragmented picture at best. ■

Higher Education Conflict and Postconflict Conditions: Colombia and Kenya

IVÁN F. PACHECO AND ANE TURNER JOHNSON

Iván F. Pacheco is a recent graduate from the doctoral program in higher education at Boston College. E-mail: ivan.pacheco@bc.edu. Ane Turner Johnson is assistant professor of Educational Leadership at Rowan University in New Jersey. E-mail: johnsona@rowan.edu.

What role have universities played during armed conflict and postconflict? International organizations, such as UNESCO and the World Bank, have acknowledged the importance of higher education for economic development. They have also stressed the importance of economic development to achieve peace in conflict-affected nations.

However, the connection between higher education and peace building remains largely unexplored.

The cases of Colombia and Kenya can shed some light on this issue. These countries have many characteristics in common, as well as important differences. Both of them are medium-size countries, they have similar number of inhabitants (Colombia, 47 million; Kenya, 42 million), and have suffered internal armed conflict. Colombia, which is currently considered a middle-income country, has been a relatively stable, yet very imperfect democracy since 1819 (with a dictatorial episode between 1953 and 1958). Kenya, a low- to middle-income country, achieved its independence in 1963 from the British and has experienced political tumult—with aborted coup attempts, dictatorial presidential regimes, and general election unrest in 1992 and 1997. In 2007–2008, Kenya experienced yet another contentious election campaign that resulted in the deaths of over 1,500 people and the displacement of at least 300,000 Kenyans. The risk of violence continues as Kenya ranks 22nd on a list of 163 countries vulnerable to instability and conflict.

What role have universities played during armed conflict and postconflict?

COLOMBIA

Colombia's armed conflict started in 1964. It is considered a low-intensity conflict and affects mostly the rural areas of the country. Unlike other armed conflicts, the Colombian educational system has not been dismantled as a consequence of the confrontation. However, the impact of the conflict in higher education is undeniable, and while the media gives some attention to the riots, infiltration, and effects of the conflict on universities, the efforts from many higher education institutions and their communities to build peace or to help people affected by the conflict rarely make it to the headlines.

Colombian higher education institutions have contributed to the demobilization of former combatants. Some public universities (e.g., Distrital, Pedagógica, and del Valle) admitted groups (about 200 people each) of demobilized guerrillas as regular students. Today, most public universities and some private ones have special quotas for demobilized combatants, forcibly displaced people, and veterans of the regular forces who have been decorated or have been seriously wounded in combat. For those who do not have the credentials to be admitted in higher education programs, some higher education institutions have created nonformal

education programs, to train them in specific crafts so they can make a living.

Under the umbrella concepts of service and extension (outreach), many Colombian universities have developed programs to benefit displaced people, demobilized soldiers, or the communities in which they live. University clinics providing legal advice and representation, psychological guidance, and other services are very common. A few universities have projects on victims' memory recovery, including a radio program (Universidad Santo Tomas' "La Palabra Tiene la Palabra"), a Web page created to honor those leaders of land restitution processes (<http://www.estatierraes-mia.co/>) or a spin-off foundation from the Universidad Sergio Arboleda, to make victims visible.

KENYA

The violence of the 2007–2008 presidential elections manifested predominantly in Nairobi, the Rift Valley, and the western and coast regions of the country. During the recent crisis, public services ground to halt, with many universities forced to close their doors. Yet, the impact of the election violence on higher education in Kenya has been virtually ignored by both the media and the scholarship. Even the famous Waki Report neglects to address the universities in any substantive manner. However, many administrators and faculty at public institutions in Kenya attempted to ameliorate the impact of the crisis, on campus and in the surrounding communities.

The epicenter of the conflict, Nairobi, is home to many higher education institutions, as well as two major public universities—Kenyatta University and the University of Nairobi. At these universities, activities, processes, and new practices related to conflict transformation occurred both throughout the conflict and post conflict. Attempts were made at both institutions to cut across conflict lines through conflict resolution workshops, as well as by providing charity to campus stakeholders affected by the conflict. At Kenyatta, the outreach office became central to the charity efforts—providing clothing and food to students and staff. Finally, university staff at both institutions reported a shift in their thinking, regarding the role of the university in society, capitalizing on the shared identity of those at the institution through counseling sessions with students and staff alike. At the University of Nairobi, administrators described seeking to disrupt misinformation campaigns that would incite violence on campus through peer counseling, involving student leaders and student-led organizations. Moreover, the universities attempted to contain potentially volatile issues that may have led to violence on campus—such as insisting upon tuition payment during the crisis, by deferring fees for students.

Recently, Kenyatta University opened a branch campus in the Dadaab refugee camp, in the northeastern province of Kenya, home to both Somali refugees and the internally displaced, bringing hope to many in the camp. The branch campus brings graduate and undergraduate programs in Project Management, Public Administration, Finance, and Education to Dadaab, considered the largest refugee camp in the world. Research consistently shows that increased investment in education drives down the potential for conflict; therefore, when refugees are repatriated, they will bring with them the knowledge and skills to rebuild a more peaceful society. As a result of the conflict and the universities' attempts to redress its impact, institutions in Kenya have begun to acknowledge their agency in peace building and, subsequently, development.

The impact of the conflict in higher education is undeniable.

CONCLUSION

The armed conflict has affected higher education in both countries—in the Kenyan case, to the point of producing temporary closure of some universities. However, the impact of the conflict in higher education and, mostly, the potential contribution of higher education to the construction of peace have been, in general, ignored.

One important point in common to both countries is that conflict transformation efforts started during the conflict stage; universities did not wait until the end of the conflict, or the signing of a truce or a peace agreement, to start their peace-building efforts. Peace-building efforts have taken many shapes: from charity activities organized as outreach for the university community, to contributing to social and economic development; from conflict resolution workshops, to unemployment buffering through higher and nonformal education; from contributing to the demobilization of combatants, to the provision of higher education in refugee camps.

Peace building, as a role of higher education, must be more than just a reaction to conflict, it must be infused into the purpose of higher education in fragile states. Providing opportunities to universities to play a role in peace building and funding university activities in conflict abatement may contribute to a new discourse and sustainable responses to violence. ■

Can the Great American Universities Take Root in Asia?

HARRY LEWIS

Harry Lewis is professor of computer science at Harvard and former dean of Harvard College. E-mail: lewis@seas.harvard.edu. This article appeared in the South China Morning Post, on August 5, 2013.

The news that the University of Chicago Booth Business School's executive master of business administration program would relocate from Singapore was greeted in Hong Kong, with as much enthusiasm as the acquisition of a star athlete. Education Secretary Eddie Ng Hak-kim trumpeted that the move would "enhance Hong Kong's position as a regional education hub, nurture talent to support the growth of our economy, and strengthen Hong Kong's competitiveness."

But the ongoing changes in higher education are more like biological evolution than a cricket match. Extinction too is part of evolution—and several other American outposts in Singapore, including New York University's Tisch School of the Arts and the hotel school of University of Nevada, Las Vegas, are pulling out of the city state with uncertain future plans.

Asia is trying to shortcut a process that took centuries to create the great American universities. And American universities seem to think that an intellectual Bering land bridge has opened. Suddenly, they see huge areas with no natural competitors, a promising ecosystem for invasive species.

For a university giving up the right to political expression means giving up the pursuit of the truth. This is vanity on both sides, I expect. I wonder how we will think about today's higher education innovations a few decades from now. Perhaps some of the new institutions will prove to be failed experiments, mutations that proved not to fit the environmental niche. The Singapore government was unwilling to keep subsidizing the University of Nevada, Las Vegas, for example, and a joint Singaporean venture with New York University School of Law is closing after spending down its sizable government subsidy.

All is guesswork and experimentation. Will any of these American transplants survive for even a decade? If they survive for the century, will they and their venerable American cousins have become strangers to each other, like the snapping shrimp, that no longer recognize each other as relatives because the rising Isthmus of Panama separated them into Caribbean and Pacific species?

If it is too expensive for universities to do business in Singapore—and the strength of the Singapore dollar is part of the story—how will they do in Hong Kong? That may depend on the willingness of Hong Kong to continue the kinds of subsidies that drew the Chicago Business School. Hong Kong is charging Chicago a mere HK\$1,000 for a 10-year lease on old officers' quarters on Hong Kong Island. I hope Hong Kong's own universities, themselves products of a continuing evolutionary process, are treated equally well. The University of Chicago is surely grateful to the people of Hong Kong for making its very profitable business program even more lucrative.

There is a risk that Hong Kong, like Singapore, will find these subsidies unsustainable. Perhaps the government should wait a few years before celebrating its triumph. As a Singaporean official said: "If a branded school is unable to persuade its students to pay their market fees, then it suggests that the brand may not be so attractive after all."

But the ongoing changes in higher education are more like biological evolution than a cricket match

The cream of the crop of academic exotics in Asia is the Yale-National University of Singapore campus, set to open soon. Will the environment be rich enough—in Singaporean and American funds, and Asian students—to keep it alive? So far, none of the closures seems to be related to issues that deeply concern the Yale faculty: how to teach in the spirit of open inquiry in a place where one can be jailed for criticizing the government (or for homosexuality, or a variety of other things unconstrained in American universities).

At some point, American universities venturing into authoritarian states will have to square their ambitions with the values of their host countries. New York University president John Sexton's statement about his university's Shanghai campus won't wash forever: "I have no trouble distinguishing between rights of academic freedom and rights of political expression."

Tell that to the students of the Hopkins-Nanjing Center, who thought they would be able to publish a magazine with an article about student protests, just as they could have done at Johns Hopkins University or anywhere else in the United States. The article was censored, and the magazine was put in limbo.

John Sexton is wrong. Anything can be political, not just the liberal arts but also the professional practice of busi-

ness or law. For a university in which students can expect to study social issues of any kind, giving up the right to political expression means giving up the pursuit of the truth. ■

Does a Higher Education Research Community Exist in Asia?

HUGO HORTA AND JISUN JUNG

Hugo Horta is a deputy director at the Center for Innovation, Technology and Policy Research at the Technical University of Lisbon, Portugal. E-mail: hugo.horta@ist.utl.pt. Jisun Jung is a postdoctoral fellow in the Faculty of Education, University of Hong Kong, Hong Kong SAR, China. E-mail: jisun@hku.hk.

Research concerning universities and higher education has been expanding worldwide over the past few decades, but information of higher education research in Asia as a field of knowledge is scarce. While this field is small, it can illustrate key trends in Asian research development. In this context, we analyzed the higher education research community in Asia, including its evolution, poles of knowledge, and collaborations by analyzing all the articles published by Asian affiliated authors in 38 international higher education journals from 1980 to 2012 (totaling 514 articles).

According to our findings, higher education research in Asia has been growing in volume: the number of publications in higher education journals based in Asia more than tripled between the 1997–2001 and 2007–2011 periods. However, in relative terms, the research intensity of Asian-based research continues to evolve slowly and was not notably different in 2007–2011 than it was in 1997–2001 (5–7% of the world's higher education research). This suggests that higher education research in Asia is in a relatively latent state, keeping up with the overall trend of growth in the world publications in higher education research.

CONCENTRATED AND LIMITED

While analyzing the field of research about higher education in Asia, several differences can be observed between countries. The 11 Asian countries, which published at least 10 publications during the period 1980–2012—Hong Kong, Japan, Malaysia, Taiwan, China, Singapore, India, South Korea, Iran, United Arab Emirates, and Saudi Arabia—account for 90 percent of all articles published in Asia

in international higher education journals. Yet, substantial differences exist among these countries. Hong Kong-based higher education researchers publish almost twice as many articles than those based in Japan, which ranks second in terms of the countries with greatest production, and over five times more articles than South Korea, ranking eight. On the other hand, some countries in Asia did not account for a single publication, and these were based mostly in Central Asia. The highest concentration level of this dynamism rests in East Asia, which accounts for 50 percent of all Asian publications. This highlights significant disparities, in terms of the development of higher education in Asia, at regional and national levels.

Low levels of collaboration among Asian countries were also identified in our research, suggesting a low level of regional integration of higher education research. The internationalization of the Asian higher education scholars leans heavily toward native English-speaking countries, particularly the United States and Australia. The role that these countries have in bringing together Asian higher education researchers, to collaborate with one another, is disproportionately high—playing the role of research hubs for Asian

Higher education research in Asia has been growing in volume: the number of publications in higher education journals based in Asia more than tripled between the 1997–2001 and 2007–2011 periods.

higher education researchers. Asian scholars communicate more with one another through US universities than they do either through other Asian universities or directly. Collaboration with other regions of the world, such as South America or Africa is practically nonexistent. A surprising result, as it was expected that collaborations would at least be found with South American countries, that benefited from Asian Diasporas.

FEW SCHOLARS FROM FEW INSTITUTIONS

As the analysis developed, our attention was caught by the fact that a few universities in Asia had a frequent flow of publications in higher education research, while a large number of universities accounted for only one or two publications. In the last three decades, Asian universities that reported any articles only 66 percent had one article published, and 15 percent had only two articles. This unequivocally highlighted most Asian universities' infrequent par-

ticipation in research about higher education. In fact, only nine (3%) Asian universities have had at least 10 or more articles published in higher education journals, from 1980 to the present.

Even more surprising, the publication weight of some individual scholars in the overall publications of these Asian universities became apparent. In four of these nine universities, 30 percent to 60 percent of all the higher education research publications produced were due to a single academic. The importance of these individual academics was so extreme that in one case, the moving of a single academic from one university to another, led the publications in higher education research of the former university to wane while the latter to increase substantially.

CONCLUSION

The higher education research community in Asia is at an embryonic stage of development and mostly concentrated in East Asia. It is somewhat dispersed, unarticulated regionally, and dependent on links with outer regions of the world, particularly with English-speaking countries. The findings highlighted the still low critical mass of higher education scholars in Asia and the need for incentives to establish higher education research in universities. These incentives should not only be driven by public policies but also by Asian universities that have everything to gain by learning how to better manage themselves and contribute to the development of Asian societies.

This article is based on "Higher Education Research in Asia: A Publication and Co Publication Analysis" recently accepted in *Higher Education Quarterly*. See: <http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/hequ.12015/abstract>. ■

Soaring Spain: A Dream Deferred?

LAURA E. RUMBLEY AND LAURA HOWARD

Laura E. Rumbley is associate director of the Center for International Higher Education, at Boston College. E-mail: rumbley@bc.edu. Laura Howard is a lecturer at the University of Cádiz, Spain, and is currently vice president of the European Association for International Education. E-mail: laura.howard@uca.es.

As elsewhere in Europe, Spain was soaring economically and culturally during the late 1990s and early 2000s. Spanish universities were singing the anthem of modern-

ization, based on an enthusiastic commitment to an internationalization agenda. Today, however, Spain is mired in an economic and political crisis, creating real hardship for many Spaniards, and a deep national sense of uncertainty and pessimism. This unsettling turn of events begs the question: What is the current state of internationalization in Spanish higher education; and what are the future prospects for sustained global engagement and high-quality universities in a funding-poor yet relentlessly internationalizing context?

THE BEST LAID PLANS

Spain has been committed to internationalizing its higher education sector in a variety of ways for more than two decades. Since 1987, Spain has consistently been a prime destination and active sending country within the European Union ERASMUS student mobility program. Programming coordinated by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs in the 1990s and early 2000s encouraged Spanish universities to be active in development cooperation, particularly in Latin America and North Africa.

Spain has been committed to internationalizing its higher education sector in a variety of ways for more than two decades.

More recently, new initiatives were launched to raise the country's higher education profile and to map an agenda for enhanced quality and relevance through international engagement. The first notable step was the establishment in 2008 of "Universidad.es"—a public foundation designed to promote Spain globally as a destination for international students and scholars.

Also, in 2008, the Spanish government released its *Estrategia Universidad 2015* (EU2015), a blueprint for how to "substantially improve" the university system and "place it at a level of international excellence." EU2015 pursued excellence in key scientific and technological fields, in order to increase Spain's visibility on the European landscape, and situated internationalization at the heart of university policy in Spain. The focus on research and innovation was emphasized in the EU2015's "Campus de Excelencia Internacional" initiative, which was designed to encourage (and incentivize) universities across Spain to specialize in key areas—from nanotechnology to fine arts—so that the country might invest more strategically in the most promising

campuses to cultivate international recognition in specific fields.

THE HANGOVER

Sadly, Spain's efforts to sustain these new initiatives have been disappointing. In a report published in 2011, an international team of experts (representing, among other entities, the World Bank and the International Association of Universities) determined that the country's progress toward the goals of EU2015 was uneven at best and made 25 specific recommendations to improve performance and overcome implementation obstacles. National funding for the "Campus de Excelencia Internacional" program terminated, leaving many campus initiatives unrealized and others dependent on limited regional funding. In June 2013, as part of a strategy to reduce public spending, the government announced that Universidad.es would be incorporated into the OAPPE, the Spanish national agency for European programs. The fact that the public authorities are unclear as to how this incorporation can be achieved (legally and practically) does not bode well for the future of Universidad.es as a clear, nimble, and effective voice for Spanish higher education around the world.

Spain can no longer sustain the ambitious international agenda for its universities, given the country's precarious political and economic circumstances. The country tumbled into a deep recession in 2008. Unemployment for citizens under age 25 was over 55 percent nationally by the end of 2012, edging even higher in the hardest-hit regions of the country. Spain's young people are more highly educated than any generation in the past; yet, these college graduates (including the increasing percentage with master's degrees) are unable to find jobs offering any permanence or wages sufficient to live independently. Indeed, anecdotes abound of young job seekers altering their resumes to show less education than they actually have, in order not to appear overqualified for entry-level positions. Many are taking advantage of the opportunity to move freely across the European Union to seek employment elsewhere (particularly to Germany). Youth emigration has increased by 41 percent since 2008, including talk of brain drain and lost investment in the country's future.

For students still in university, paying fees has become increasingly difficult. Public university tuition levels, while rising, are not generally considered to be excessive; however, students having to repeat courses they have failed face steep tuition increases. Parents and students are squeezed as incomes shrink and the eligibility rules for study grants tighten. The situation has become so acute that Spanish universities are considering the pursuit of private donors to subsidize students in financial difficulties. Recent figures indicate that some 30,000 students may be at risk of aban-

doning their program without some additional support.

University faculty and staff have been affected, as well. With public spending on universities cut by over 12 percent since 2010, not only have wages been frozen, they have decreased by almost 20 percent in many cases. Promotion opportunities are minimal and many nonpermanent staff have not been renewed. The loss of staff has resulted in increased workloads for those who remain. Morale is low. An open letter published recently by a Spanish scientist emigrating to the United States to take a job at NASA lamented, "The science I will do will no longer be Spanish, nor thanks to Spain; rather I will keep doing science in spite of Spain." The Open Letter for Science in Spain movement (a consensus between the Confederation of Spanish Scientific Societies and the Conference of Spanish University Rectors, among others), is campaigning for the government to increase spending on research back to 2009 levels, in a bid to "avoid long-term damage to the already weakened Spanish research system."

With public spending on universities cut by over 12 percent since 2010, not only have wages been frozen, they have decreased by almost 20 percent in many cases.

STAYING THE COURSE

In spite of this bleak domestic picture—or perhaps precisely because of it—internationalization is generally accepted as one of the only viable avenues for the recovery and rejuvenation of Spain's universities. Universities are seen as fundamental to achieving a "smart, sustainable, and inclusive [European] economy," and there is a very clear sense that the 21st-century Spanish university must be a globally engaged institution.

In the current constrained environment, there are limited options; but there are still opportunities. One of the prime opportunities for Spain lies in its continued attractiveness to international students. Figures from 2011/2012 indicate that Spain received more ERASMUS students than any other participating country (39,300 students, representing 19% of the year's total), and 6 of the top 10 receiving institutions in the Erasmus network were Spanish. Beyond Europe, Spain is typically among the top-three recipient countries for US study abroad participants, hosting 25,965 American participants in 2010/2011 (a 51% increase in a decade).

Although internationalization is about much more than student mobility, for the moment Spain may have to focus precisely on this “low-hanging” fruit in order to keep the internationalization momentum alive. Spanish universities should also advance effective yet low-cost strategies, including internationalization of the curriculum and other “internationalization at home” activities. As the crisis eases, however, the country should quickly pick up where it left off—implementing a vision for internationalization that enhances institutional quality, serves the national interest, and builds a university culture predicated on global engagement as a guiding principle of academic excellence. Above all, Spain’s future internationalization must be more effectively “crisis resistant.” ■

Europe’s 25 Years of Internationalization: The EAIE in a Changing World

HANS DE WIT AND FIONA HUNTER

Hans de Wit is director of the Centre for Higher Education Internationalisation at the Università Cattolica Sacro Cuore in Milan, Italy, and professor of Internationalisation of Higher Education at the Amsterdam University of Applied Sciences, the Netherlands. He is a founding member and past president of the European Association for International Education. E-mail: j.w.m.de.wit@hva.nl. Fiona Hunter is a consultant on higher education and research associate at the Center for Higher Education Internationalisation. She is also a past president of the European Association for International Education. E-mail: fionajanehunter@gmail.com.

With the flagship program of the European Union (ERASMUS) created in 1987 and the European Association for International Education (EAIE) founded in 1989 in Amsterdam, Europe met numerous changes. Promoting student mobility was considered a part of foreign policy. Historical ties with former colonies, political and economic policies, and traditional mobility of the elites (both from former colonies to Europe and from Europe to Northern America) dominated the international education scene. Trade in education, cross-border delivery, and branch campuses were present in the 1980s but marginal to higher education discourse and policies. There were no international rankings of universities. Bologna was only a city and Italy’s oldest university. Cooperation prevailed with commercialization, and competition concerned obscure Anglo-Saxon phenomena that would never reach the continent.

Earlier, institutional and national policies were absent, as well as any European policy for internationalization; but, 25 years later the European Commission has just published its first comprehensive internationalization strategy: European Higher Education in the World. Also, EAIE has celebrated its 25th, and the largest ever, conference in Istanbul with 4,800 participants from all over the world.

THE EAIE: NEEDS AND CHANGING REALITIES

The EAIE responded to current needs and changing realities in European higher education: in the early years, the Erasmus Programme and then other European Commission initiatives for education, research, and development cooperation both within and beyond Europe; the inclusion of education in the 1992 Maastricht Treaty; and the ensuing increased attention by national governments and higher education institutions to internationalize.

Although the main focus had been mobility, the EAIE had always considered the issue of the other 90 percent of nonmobile students and in 1999 launched the “Internationalisation at Home” movement. It has increasingly considered a central element of internationalization strategies, today one of the key pillars of the new internationalization strategy of the European Commission, and together with mobility and partnerships.

The EAIE grew from a start-up to the reality of a living, and working association in a period in which the pace of Europe’s political and economic integration and its higher education sector accelerated amid much excitement, innovation, cooperation, and expansion. Both the EAIE and European Commission policies were driven by a powerful vision and strong ideals of a united Europe, of equal access to higher education, and of international education as a core activity in the curriculum, not only for personal development but as the way to build a better world. They were years of optimism and faith in the European future, and it was against this backdrop that the Bologna Declaration was signed in 1999.

EUROPEAN HIGHER EDUCATION FOR OTHER REGIONS

The Bologna process was conceived and developed well because of the extremely positive experience and influence of cooperation under Erasmus, hailed as one of the most ever successful European initiatives. Initially, the principal focus was on the internal dimension of putting the European House for the purpose of greater commonality in degree structures, credit systems, and quality assurance; but it quickly acquired an external dimension. The emerging European Higher Education Area not only created an external identity for European higher education institutions, but it also generated a strong interest for the new instruments and models in other world regions, even though they may

not always have been fully implemented across Europe.

In the same period, the European Union extended its membership from 15 to 27 countries and the euro was introduced as a single currency. However, the sense of integration and related economic and political security of a single European space soon came under threat, first by the tragic attack on the Twin Towers in New York on September 11, 2001, then the rejection of the European Constitution by Dutch and French voters in 2005, and more recently the global and European economic problems, triggered by the 2008 world financial crisis.

The Bologna process was conceived and developed well because of the extremely positive experience and influence of co-operation under Erasmus, hailed as one of the most ever successful European initiatives.

At the same time, European Higher Education was facing the powerful pressures of globalization and the emergence of the knowledge economy, shifts in economic balances and demographics, and an accelerating information technology revolution. The 2000 Lisbon Strategy of the European Council strived, perhaps over-ambitiously, to make the European Union the most competitive and dynamic knowledge-based economy in the world. Global rankings began to impact as universities thought about themselves and based on how their role was perceived by society and industry at large, requiring them to change at an unprecedented pace.

THE EMERGING BUSINESS OF HIGHER EDUCATION

The EAIE conference grew rapidly because new international education professions were emerging in what was now increasingly being termed the “business of higher education.” On the contrary, it became Europe’s key competitive advantage. Strategic partnerships, joint programs, double degrees, and other collaborative projects featured high on the conference program. As the EAIE conference goes from strength to strength, Europe is experiencing greater uncertainty in the grips of a global economic crisis. The European dream, which so greatly influenced the creation of the EAIE 25 years ago, is being seriously challenged. The creation of European citizenship, a key objective in European programs, seems to be slipping away.

In higher education, new providers emerge challenging traditional university models. The rapid rise of private higher education, both nonprofit and for-profit, has become a global phenomenon capturing 30 percent of the student population. New forms of higher education appear, with massive open online courses being hailed as the new game changer.

NEW OPPORTUNITIES

Universities are expected to become key players in the global knowledge economy, and internationalization is identified as a key response to globalization. This has radically altered the understanding of internationalization in universities, as it shifts from being a marginal to mainstream activity, no longer located exclusively in the international offices, but an integral part of university strategy.

This requires significant rethinking, and each university must interpret internationalization in the specific context of its own mission. The increased focus on intercultural, international, and global competences and learning outcomes of graduates and staff, the link between internationalization, employability, and citizenship require new approaches and strategies and new methods for outcomes and impact. Is internationalization still all “motherhood and apple pie”? Or will the so-called darker sides of internationalization generate tensions that will detract from the reasons that make international education beneficial? Will we see more or less “Europe” in the next decade? Also, how will this affect its relations with other world regions?

Inevitably, more change lies ahead as fundamental questions are asked about the roles and responsibilities of higher education and, consequently, of the purpose and scope of internationalization. The new European Commission policy and the continuing strength of EAIE as a knowledge hub in European and international higher education will provide a new platform for those questions to be asked, and hopefully answered, in the next 25 years.

This is a shortened and updated version of the first chapter by the authors in the book *Possible Futures, The Next 25 Years of the Internationalisation of Higher Education*, published by the EAIE on the occasion of its 25th anniversary, 2013/2014 (www.eaie.org). ■



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

Franchising, Validation, and Branch Campuses in the European Union

LUKAS BISCHOF

Lukas Bischof is a project manager with CHE Consult, a German consultancy and research company on higher education, based in Berlin. E-mail: lukas.bischof@che-consult.de.

The Bologna process aims at creating a European higher education area with more comparable, compatible, and coherent higher education systems in Europe. Indeed, students, staff, and research teams are increasingly mobile within that area. In addition, a growing number of institutions are offering their study programs across borders. The most common form of such cross-border provision of higher education (CBHE) are joint or double degrees. Branch campuses, franchising or validation arrangements are less frequent but have lately stirred controversy in European higher education.

EUROPEAN LEGISLATION HAS CREATED A COMMON MARKET

The European common market guarantees that European citizens have their qualifications recognized in any EU member state in the same way they would be recognized in their own country. At the same time, it allows any European business to offer their services in any other EU member state. A holder of a Spanish diploma is therefore allowed to work in their profession in Germany or any other EU country, and a company from Poland is allowed to offer its services in Ireland. No member state is allowed to infringe on these rights.

Education on the other hand has always been the exclusive domain of each EU member state. In 2008, however, in a series of recent landmark rulings, the Court of Justice of the European Union has established that franchised or validated study programs fall within the responsibilities of the member state in which the diploma-granting institution is established, irrespective of where the course took place. This ruling now effectively allows a British university to allow a nonaccredited institution (or company) based in another EU country (e.g., Greece) the right to issue British degrees, in spite of the receiving country's exclusive responsibility for education. The receiving country must therefore accept these degrees as any other EU degree. Quality assurance of such degrees is the sole responsibility of the exporting country, although to many observers it is not clear how or whether franchised or validated degrees are quality assured by their degree-granting institutions.

THE EUROPEAN MAPPING OF CROSS-BORDER HIGHER EDUCATION

Given the potential implications for consumer protection, transparency, and the general trustworthiness of European higher education, surprisingly until recently there was very little information about the extent and quality assurance of such cross-border provision of higher education. On behalf of the European Commission (the executive branch of the European Union), CHE Consult has now published the first systematic research and comprehensive overview on branch campuses, franchising, and validation activities in the European Union, as well as a comparative overview of national legislation governing their establishment in the European Union. By collecting and verifying data from ministries, quality-assurance agencies, rectors' conferences, CBHE providers, and recognition organizations in all 27 member states, we were able to identify 253 instances of branch campuses, franchising, and validation activities that are currently going on in the European Union. The full report can be accessed under http://ec.europa.eu/education/highereducation/doc/studies/borders_en.pdf.

The results confirm earlier research on cross-border higher education. Firstly, Anglophone countries are major providers of higher education services. Second, economically stronger countries serve as "exporters" of degrees, while economically weaker countries tend to be recipients. The study identified Great Britain, the United States, France, and Poland as the main providers of CBHE arrangements in EU member states, whereas Greece, Spain, and Hungary are the main receivers. More interestingly, we were able to demonstrate that the number of such received activities in a country shows a strong statistical relationship to the percentage of its students leaving to study abroad.

LEGISLATION IS OFTEN INCONSISTENT

Since it is in the exclusive domain of EU member states, legislation on higher education is highly diverse in the European Union: Some member states do not have a policy on CBHE. Of those who do have a policy, it may range from compulsory registration as a means to monitor activities to the outright ban of certain forms of provision. Some member states require proof of accreditation of the exporting country, others require institutions to be authorized by national authorities. In some cases, member states require foreign providers to undergo an additional accreditation, effectively forcing them to become part of the national higher education system, which seems to be a clear violation of the EU Court rulings. Short of outright banning CBHE activity, member states sometimes impede the operations of foreign CBHE providers by denying holders of their degrees access to the national education system; excluding them from access to state-regulated professions or government employ-

ment (which might be in contradiction of EU law); while at the same time barring foreign providers from seeking national accreditation. The study contains a detailed description of the various member states' legislation on provider mobility.

This ruling now effectively allows a British university to allow a nonaccredited institution (or company) based in another EU country (e.g., Greece) the right to issue British degrees, in spite of the receiving country's exclusive responsibility for education.

LOOPHOLES IN QUALITY ASSURANCE

Our research also identified inconsistencies and potential loopholes in current European legislation of CBHE activities: On the European level, the European Union strictly enforces the common market and guarantees the recognition of certificates and diplomas in different member states. At the same time, the responsibility for quality assurance lies with the individual member states. Because of highly heterogeneous registration requirements and the absence of a joint register of "white-listed" providers and programs, rogue providers have been known to take advantage of the system. The validation activities of the University of Wales (UK) provide an interesting example of how structural and contingent factors can interact in the CBHE field. The University of Wales was unusual in being a federal institution awarding degrees but not directly running any of its constituent universities. During the 1990s and the 1st decade of the current century, it found itself losing constituent institutions and turned to validation both as a means of securing a role and generating income. By 2009/10 its international validation activities were taking place in 140 collaborative centers in 30 countries and accounted for two thirds of its income.

Only in late 2011, after the quality of its validation processes was being put into question of a critical report by the British quality-assurance agency, it was announced that only programs it designed itself and controlled would be available internationally. The fact that the university was able to operate in this way reflects the high level of autonomy in the UK higher education system, the popularity of international activities, the need to generate income and the lack of formal powers of the main quality-assurance body

to correct or curtail them. However, within the European Union, no other member state would have had the right to refuse to recognize the University of Wales' degrees.

TOWARD QUALITY ASSURANCE AND TRANSPARENCY

Our research into the prevalence and regulation of franchising, validation, and branch campuses has made it clear that a converging European higher education area with guaranteed recognition of degrees and freedom of establishment needs corresponding mechanisms of transparency and quality assurance. Such a quality-assurance framework should include a joint European register of recognized, quality-assured higher education institutions and programs. Commonly agreed-upon standards and a white list of institutions adhering to them would help to ensure transparency and develop trust in the cross-border education, provided within the European higher education area. ■

India: Mobility Trends

WESLEY TETER AND DON MARTIN

Wesley Teter is a senior consultant on higher education. E-mail: Wesley.Teter@gmail.com. Don Martin is an enrollment management expert. E-mail: dmartin@gradschoolroadmap.com.

After years of declines, the latest trends in international student enrollment in the United States from India show signs of a dramatic turnaround. In April 2013, the Council of Graduate Schools announced that applications from India to US graduate programs increased 20 percent, compared to a mere 1 percent increase worldwide. Similarly, the Educational Testing Service reported that the Graduate Record Examination test volume in India for 2012 grew by approximately 30 percent compared to the prior year, which indicates a strong interest in graduate studies abroad. Most importantly, the American Embassy in New Delhi also confirmed that early data on student visa approvals showed an increase of a staggering 50 percent from October 2012, through early 2013 compared to the same period last year. These indicators of renewed growth are even more significant in the context of substantial declines in new enrollments from India over the past four years.

MOBILITY TRENDS

From 2009 to 2012, US enrollments from India decreased 17 percent at a graduate level and 16 percent at an undergraduate level—a downward spiral that was significantly underreported for a variety of reasons. For example, the to-

tal number of students from India studying in the United States held steady during this period (down just 3%). At the same time, Indian student participation in postgraduation internships—known as optional practical training—surged 80 percent over the same period, compared to a 28 percent increase worldwide. Participation in that training, particularly among science, technology, engineering, and mathematics students who can work up to 29 months, offset the declines and gave a skewed picture of the reality of student mobility trends from India.

In terms of fields of study among mobile students, the popular search engine (GradSchools.com) confirmed that engineering management and construction management are among the top three, most-popular searches by visitors from India. The related issues outlined below are expected to drive future mobility and should therefore act as a foundation for developing a long-term view for student recruitment.

After years of declines, the latest trends in international student enrollment in the United States from India show signs of a dramatic turnaround.

CAREERS AND JOB PROSPECTS

An astounding 54 percent of India's 1.2 billion people are under the age of 25. India's "demographic dividend," coupled with a rising middle class, is expected to propel demand for education and training and play a major role in the country's future economic development. However, India's economy for the fiscal year that ended in March 2013 grew by a relatively weak five percent—the slowest in a decade. Students and their families believe a US degree offers a competitive advantage for better jobs in an increasingly globalized job market.

Career prospects and return on investment are crucial factors to highlight when recruiting in India. Optional practical training, internships, and career services often help to justify a family's once-in-a-lifetime investment. For example, according to the National Science Foundation, doctoral students are particularly attracted by career prospects in the United States. Graduates from China, countries that were part of the former Soviet Union, and India reported distinctly low rates of returning to their home countries (3.7%, 4.1%, and 5.2%, respectively) compared with those from other foreign countries. In fact, Indian nationals were number one in the world for obtaining specialized US work visas known as the H-1B, securing an impressive 59 per-

cent of the global total. Unfortunately, few institutions in the United States make a compelling argument about career prospects when returning to India with a US degree. Surprisingly, few success stories involve young graduates returning to launch their careers.

Student recruitment efforts in India should begin with helping students understand their academic and career goals and how a particular institution in the United States fulfills those needs. Institutions such as Tri-Valley, which was investigated for visa fraud by Immigration and Customs Enforcement in 2011, should not be allowed to dominate the discourse about education to employment prospects. US institutions can help their students overcome these challenges, by ensuring applicants can explain to a consular officer why and how they chose a particular school. Applicants who are unable to do so or are singularly focused on their career interests in the United States are unlikely to be granted a student visa. These prospective students would have to reapply for a visa or consider their options elsewhere.

ACCESS TO QUALITY HIGHER EDUCATION

Given limited access to quality education in India, a growing number of students turn to the United States, United Kingdom, Australia, and low-cost options closer to home. Part of the challenge is that local quality institutions, such as the Indian Institutes of Technology and Indian Institutes of Management, are highly competitive and unable to meet local demand. Due to a struggling quality-assurance system, second-tier institutions are of widely varying standards. The world-class status of universities and colleges in the United States helps to justify the high cost of tuition.

When considering study-abroad destinations, rankings and perceptions of academic quality are the most important elements that prospective students in India and their families are evaluating when considering study-abroad destinations. In terms of recruitment, it is critical that US institutions highlight academic rigor and not "frills" such as new sports facilities, dining halls, and elaborate dorms, which add to the cost of education and have less to do with the quality of the academic experience or future employment prospects.

NEW FINANCING STRATEGIES

High inflation and the increasing cost of US tuition are major barriers to study abroad, particularly at the undergraduate level. Renuka Raja Rao, Country Coordinator for EducationUSA in India adds that "As the number one destination for study abroad, the question most students in India ask is not why study in the US, but how." The falling value of the Indian rupee, which dropped 22 percent from January 2009 to July 2013, is linked to the decline in student mobil-

ity to the United States. These dramatic shifts in currency value negatively impact a middle-class family's ability to invest in overseas education, even with partial scholarships. US institutions should not mistake recruitment opportunities in India as a means to overcome budget shortfalls. New financing strategies, such as creative academic partnerships and blended distance programs, are needed to overcome increasing costs for study abroad.

In the short term, participation in student recruitment fairs in India and an active social media presence can be highly effective outreach channels. Commercial service providers and recruitment agencies report substantial increases in the number of their students applying to US universities, yet little data are available related to visa approvals and other quality-control measures. US consular officers warn students that consultants sometimes "sell to students fake financial packages," which can lead to applicants being found permanently ineligible for visas, because they provided false information during an interview.

According to a survey by World Education Services, 46 percent of students from India selected "tuition and living costs" and 38 percent selected "financial aid opportunities" among their top three information needs. In contrast, the question that more and more US admissions officers ask is how to recruit self-funded undergraduate students without traveling to India, a question that illustrates financial pressures in the United States, but does little to reassure Indian families that US institutions have a genuine academic interest in recruiting talented students. Institutions with a compelling recruitment strategy, including scholarships or assistantships for science, technology, engineering, and mathematics fields, will be well positioned to effectively recruit the next generation of leaders. ■

Academic Collaboration with African Universities

AD BOEREN

Ad Boeren is Senior Policy Officer of Nuffic, The Netherlands. E-mail: aboeren@nuffic.nl.

Over the years, collaboration between academic institutions in the global North and institutions in Africa has been characterized by an evolutionary process from pure capacity building to equal partnerships, from social commitment to matching interests, and from specific needs to global strategies. A brief review of this process against the backdrop of global changes and higher education challeng-

es provides a better understanding of the present opportunities and constraints.

THE EARLY YEARS

Shortly after World War II, when most African countries gained independence, support from the North was rendered for the training of skilled manpower. Scholarships were provided to African students for studies in the North, with the expectation that upon return the graduates would contribute to the development of their respective countries. Young universities in Africa were assisted in setting up facilities, developing curricula, and training staff.

In the same period, other changes took place in the North, which affected the collaboration with African universities.

In those early years, a commitment to help build the higher education sector in developing countries was cultivated at universities in the North, as part of their institutional mission. If not from their own resources, they financed collaborations through development cooperation funds that were made available by their national governments. Many governments in Northern countries set up scholarship and cooperation programs in higher education and research, which were meant to strengthen capacity in developing countries.

CHANGES

Since those early days, the world (of higher education) has changed substantially. Access to higher education has expanded tremendously—in the North as well as in Africa—while funds have not increased proportionately. In the late 1970s, the higher education sector in sub-Saharan Africa was affected by budget cuts, due to economic crises and by parallel reductions of donor support for higher education. As from the 1990s the donor community, led by UNESCO and the World Bank, embraced basic education as their focus of human capacity development, because investments in primary education were assumed to render a higher rate of economic return than higher education. Achieving universal primary education was declared one of the United Nations Millennium Development Goals in 2000. Gradually, the interest of the World Bank for higher education returned, but at a more modest scale than before.

In the same period, other changes took place in the North, which affected the collaboration with African universities. In many Northern countries, governments decided to

change the formula for higher education funding from input to output financing. Higher education institutions were thus encouraged to gain extra funds through marketing practices and public private partnerships. Internationalization of higher education became a new focal point for many institutions in Europe and elsewhere. Institutions, curricula, students, and staff needed to become international, in order to improve the quality of education and to stimulate international mobility. In Europe, the Bologna process was initiated in 1999 to create one higher education area throughout the continent.

These changes in education policies and funding forced Northern academic institutions to reconsider their priorities and strategies, regarding international cooperation. They had to become more selective in maintaining areas of expertise and in pursuing collaborations with partners. It was considered more advantageous to collaborate with prestigious academic institutions and partners in richer countries (or BRICs—Brazil, Russia, India, and China) than with low-reputation colleagues in poor countries.

At the same time, development donors narrowed down the main objectives of the cooperation programs in higher education that they funded.

At the same time, development donors narrowed down the main objectives of the cooperation programs in higher education that they funded. The development cooperation money should be fully dedicated to the needs of developing countries and no longer be used to “co-finance higher education institutions in the North.”

This shift in donor policies has diminished the opportunities for Northern institutions to use collaboration project funds, in order to pursue their own academic interests. As a consequence of funding pressures, internationalization priorities and donor shifts, their motivation to engage in collaboration with institutions in Africa has dwindled. This is unfortunate for two reasons: after decades of cooperation and support, quite a number of universities in Africa have become better and stronger institutions. First, they may not yet feature high in the global rankings but may make strategic partners in the global knowledge networks that emerge. Second, a number of African countries are showing impressive economic growth figures and will be the economic partners of tomorrow, as has happened with the BRIC countries. For economic and academic reasons, it is logical that academic collaboration with African institutions gets proper attention.

NEW DIRECTIONS

However, certain conditions need to be met for Northern institutions (especially those in northern Europe), to engage in partnerships and collaborations with African institutions:

- Institutions in the North should broaden their strategic horizons from a short-term, profit-oriented and egocentric perspective—to a longer-term, global perspective. They need to be aware of the fact that the world is changing rapidly and that opportunities are changing as well. Problems and research questions are increasingly becoming global, and solutions likewise need to be developed on a global scale with the collaboration of local partners.

- African institutions should show more self-confidence and argue the case for true partnerships. Although they may not be able to contribute at the same level based on the start of collaboration, nevertheless they have valuable possible contributions. In time, the scale will level and possibly swing to the other side.

- Mutual benefits form the best foundation for establishing sustainable collaborations. This can be arranged on the basis of sound analysis and negotiations, proper planning, give-and-take, and respect for one another. Returns from such partnerships are uncertain and long term; development cooperation funds are less available for establishing long-term collaborations. Institutions should be prepared to invest in partnerships, not only in those with low-risk returns but also in those with higher-risk collaborations with lower-ranking partners.

- Governments in the North should try to create greater coherence among policy areas, especially those of education, development cooperation, economic, and foreign affairs. International collaboration in higher education and research touches all these spheres, and it would help academic institutions a great deal if these policies were coherent and complementary. With Germany as one of the few notable exceptions, policies of the national ministries in Northern countries are neither coherent nor conducive to engaging in international partnerships and longer-term academic collaborations.

- Development cooperation programs that fund such collaborations should allow some room for institutions to identify and formulate collaboration with partners that not only contribute to ministerial policy goals but also to their own mission and strategy. This presumes a balance between different interests by the stakeholders involved.

Collaboration with African institutions should be of strategic interest for academic institutions in the North, yet this requires a clear vision by institutional leaders and a coherent policy framework that stimulates and supports such efforts. ■

Brazil: A For-Profit Giant

DANTE J. SALTO

Dante J. Salto is an advanced PhD student at the Department of Educational Administration and Policy Studies, and PROPHE Doctoral Research Associate, University at Albany, State University of New York. E-mail: dantesalto@gmail.com.

IHE regularly publishes articles from PROPHE, the Program for Research on Private Higher Education, headquartered at the University at Albany. See <http://www.albany.edu/~prophe>.

Profit making in higher education engages controversial issues and debates involving the proper bounds of market activity. A discussion of the role of the for-profit subsector and its policy implications recently appeared in *IHE* (#71, 2013). One key distinction identified there was between commercial, even for-profit and often shady activities in nonprofit institutions, and the growing reality of institutions that are for-profit by law. While it is widely recognized that many nonprofit institutions engage in profit making, this article deals with institutions that are legally allowed to distribute revenues among shareholders and specifically focuses on one of the world's largest higher education for-profit subsectors. Brazil's for-profits enroll over 2 million students (2010)—43 percent of the private sector and 32 percent of the overall system. Only by virtue of its own stunning growth early in the 21st century does the longstanding US for-profit subsector maintain a raw enrollment lead, with now over 3 million students; nevertheless, the for-profit share of the US higher education system is much smaller than its share of the Brazilian system—11 percent versus 32 percent, respectively.

The growth of the private sector and specifically the for-profit subsector in Brazil should be seen in perspective. With more than 6.5 million students (2010), Brazil has the largest higher education system in Latin America. However, by proportions of the age cohort enrolled (18–24 years old), Brazil lags behind most large Latin American countries, occupying the 11th place among all Latin American countries. Brazil has struggled to improve its enrollment profile. Today, Brazil lags only Chile in the private share of enrollment—73 percent and 79 percent, respectively; and for the last almost two decades Brazil has relied much more than any other Latin American country on the for-profit subsector.

By 2000, just a year after full-legal approval to allow for-profit higher education, the subsector already enrolled 18 percent of the private sector's and 12 percent of the system's students. Comparing the nonprofit and for-profit

subsectors, striking is that for-profit boosted its size by 537 percent in the 2000–2010 period, displacing the public sector from its second position in enrollments, while the private nonprofit and the public sectors increased by only 88 percent and 85 percent, respectively. Large domestic and international companies with skyrocketing revenues have been key players in the growth of the for-profit subsector.

PUBLIC POLICY

Even if the spectacular for-profit growth had not been fully anticipated, it ensued from a formal public-policy decision. First, by a presidential decree signed in 1997, and then by a congressional amendment to the 1996 education law enacted in 1999, Brazil moved toward allowing for-profit higher education institutions on the recognition that many *de jure* nonprofit institutions were *de facto* for-profit, but the state was not collecting taxes. In other words, the massive private higher education expansion had led to nonprofits that were largely earning profits.

Comparing the nonprofit and for-profit subsectors, striking is that for-profit boosted its size by 537 percent in the 2000–2010 period, displacing the public sector from its second position in enrollments.

Some observers claimed that the regulatory changes during Fernando Cardoso's presidency in the 1990s had to do with the overall neoliberal policies promoted by his government in different sectors of the economy. Thus, with the election of the opposition, populist party in 2003, many observers doubted that the promotion of the private sector mainly its for-profit subsector, would continue. However, new President L. I. 'Lula' da Silva actually gave supportive public policy more vigor. His University for All Program to promote access to higher education specifically targeted the private sector—including the for-profit portion, through tax exemptions. The new government justified the necessity of this law and program on the grounds of persistent lagging and unequal access to higher education.

SIZE AND SHAPE: FIELDS OF STUDY

Consistent with major tendencies in private higher education globally, the for-profit subsector accumulates its largest share of enrollments in the fields of social science, business, and law (51%), education (17%), and health and social

welfare (15%). In contrast, the public sector shows a greater concentration in education (41%), followed by social sciences, et al. (15%), and engineering, production, and construction (12%).

For-profits tend to offer programs with low costs and high rates of return to institutional investment. Following the same pattern as in enrollments, for-profit programs concentrate in social science, et al. (43%), education (16%), and health and social welfare (13%). Unlike for enrollment, data on programs allow us to go a step further. Within the first group, most programs cluster in management and administration (22%), law (5%), accounting and taxation (5%), and marketing and advertisement (4%). Within education, pedagogy represents 6 percent, followed by teacher education in professional fields (3%). Finally, within health and social welfare, most programs are found in therapy and rehabilitation (4%) and nursing and primary care (4%). The nonprofit subsector shows a similar composition in the share of fields and programs, in the same order as in the for-profit sub-sector. Contrasts are sharp to the public sector, which concentrates most of its programs in the field of education (41%), followed by social sciences, business, and law (15%), and engineering (12%).

Brazil has given the private sector overall, now very much including the for-profit subsector a major role in access, keeping most selective institutions in the public sector.

By whatever mix of planned and unplanned activity, Brazil has given the private sector overall, now very much including the for-profit subsector, a major role in access, keeping most selective institutions in the public sector. This reality, coupled with the fact that an overwhelming 95 percent of the for-profits are nonuniversity institutions, generate concern about quality in the for-profit subsector. Such concern is hardly unique to the Brazilian case and also is not limited to the legally for-profit portion of the private sector. Most mass private systems worldwide are characterized by private institutions that are on average decidedly inferior in quality to their public and elite private counterparts. On the other hand, Brazil's massive test (*prova*) of graduates found a range of quality in both private and public sectors, with for-profits out-performing what conventional wisdom expected.

Trends seem to point toward continuing growth of the for-profit subsector through two developments: 1) more

nonprofit institutions switching their legal status; and 2) large domestic and international publicly traded companies incorporating nonprofit institutions to their business portfolios. All these trends show how increasingly diverse the Brazilian system is becoming. Although we know that for-profit prominence in this diversity exceeds, as seen in any other Latin American country, it will be interesting to discover what parallels already exist in the region and whether the Brazilian experience presages similar for-profit growth there. ■

Financing Higher Education in Latin America

ANA GARCÍA DE FANELLI

Ana García de Fanelli is a senior research scholar at the National Council of Research in Science and Technology (CONICET) at the Center for the Study of State and Society (CEDES) in Buenos Aires, Argentina. E-mail: anafan@cedes.org.

Latin American countries have developed a strong economic growth during the 2000s—the first time since the debt crisis of the 1980s. In addition, with a “demographic bonus,” in which the proportion of children declines and thus the older generation has increased the size of the working-age population. Thus, for aging societies, it is essential to invest in advanced human capital for the quality and productivity of a smaller work force. So, the expanding regional growth could increase the financial resources to train more and better-qualified higher education graduates.

Based on these economic and demographic contexts, three issues are relevant: first, the change in the proportion of national wealth spent on tertiary education in some Latin American countries, as well as the private sector's contribution to this investment; second, some consequences of this funding pattern in terms of equity; and finally, the innovations in funding mechanisms to allocate public funds.

MORE RESOURCES INVESTED IN HUMAN CAPITAL

Higher education expenditure, as a percentage of gross domestic product, measures the effort for a society (government and private sources) to expand its advanced human capital. From the data available at *Education at a Glance 2013*—covering Argentina, Brazil, Chile, and Mexico—this effort was higher in 2010 than in 2005. The gross domestic product in these four countries increased significantly in this period, so that the total amount of funds devoted

to higher education institutions was quite substantial. Expenditure on higher education, as a percentage of the gross domestic product in these countries, in 2010 neared the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development countries average (1.6 percent) and even higher (2.4%) in Chile. Although Brazil devoted less (0.9%) than that average, the data corresponded solely to public expenditure. Brazil's higher education has mainly been supplied by the private sector, in which the principal source of funding is tuition fees. Brazil is also experiencing an expansion in the for-profit sector, and thus its total investment in higher education is far higher than what this figure reflects.

The enrollment in the private sector increased considerably in some Latin American countries between 2005 and 2009. In Brazil and Chile, the proportion of private enrollment soared to more than 70 percent, while almost half of the tertiary students in El Salvador, Paraguay, Peru, Guatemala, and Colombia currently study at private higher

Thus, for aging societies, it is essential to invest in advanced human capital for the quality and productivity of a smaller work force.

education institutions. In Latin American countries, nearly half of enrollment in tertiary education is concentrated in institutions whose main source of funding is tuition fees. Therefore, students and their parents are already contributing heavily to finance higher education institutions. Moreover, some of these countries charge tuition fees to students at public universities; a prime example is Chile's public university sector. In other countries where undergraduate programs in public institutions are free of charge and the majority of the enrollment is concentrated in the public sector (as in Argentina and Uruguay), the government is the principal source of funding. Nonetheless, in these countries students usually pay tuition fees in the graduate programs.

IMPROVEMENTS IN EQUITY AND ACCESS

To assess the evolution of higher education enrollment in Latin American countries, the need is to take into account of the initial conditions characterized by a significant disparity in enrollment between the low- and high-income population. For example, in Brazil only 2 percent of the relevant age population was enrolled in higher education, compared to 40 percent for the top quintile in 2000. In this context, the growth rate in basic enrollment in the low-income group increased faster than in the richest group,

over the past 10 years. However, given the huge initial gap in student enrollment, a significant difference in the enrollment levels between the poorest and the richest still exists. Among the countries that showed a higher reduction in this gap are Argentina, Chile, and Mexico.

In the context of economic growth, the rise in public and private expenditures for higher education contributed to improving the equity—with greater access to youths from lower-status backgrounds. Nonetheless, despite Latin American countries' success at increasing access to low-income students, higher dropout rates tend to originate in this segment. Moreover, students from disadvantaged backgrounds often attend lower-quality tertiary institutions. A future challenge should focus on improving the graduation rate of these students and their chance to access better-quality programs and institutions.

INNOVATIONS IN THE ALLOCATION OF PUBLIC FUNDS

In most Latin American countries, with the exception of Chile, negotiating the funding model is still the most relevant mechanism to distribute core higher education funding to institutions. Additionally, since the late 1980s and 1990s, many of these governments have been allocating a small proportion of the total budget via formulas and funds to achieve specific objectives.

The contracts to modernize higher education through a competitive procedure are Chile's performance contracts (*Contratos de Desempeño*). They seek to align the university's institutional missions with national and regional priorities, the university's autonomy with public accountability, and the institutional performance with public funding. In addition, the Argentine government allocates funds via a three-year contract so that accredited state-regulated undergraduate courses could meet their commitment to fulfill improvement plans. The linking of funding with program accreditation results helped legitimize the quality-assurance procedures.

Another noteworthy aspect of this period is the deepening of demand-driven mechanisms in Chile. The percentage of state support for demand (via scholarships and student loans), which in 2005 represented 29 percent of total state contributions to higher education, amounted to 64 percent in 2010. Also, Chile is one of the few Latin American countries that assign state contributions to the private sector.

CONCLUSION

In sum, several Latin American countries took advantage of these boom years and raised public and private investment in higher education. This also contributed to improving low-income students' access to these institutions. Regarding allocation mechanisms, the only novelty compared

to the previous decade was the incorporation of several-year contracts, to improve quality and a greater presence of demand-driven mechanisms in Chile. In the future, it should be checked whether the increased funding actually improved the quantity and quality of college graduates, besides enhancing science and technology knowledge in Latin America. ■

Accreditation in Colombia: Achievements and Challenges

ALBERTO ROA VARELO

Alberto Roa Varelo is vice president for academic affairs at Universidad del Norte, Barranquilla, Colombia. E-mail: aroa@uninorte.edu.co.

In the 1990s, Latin American quality-assurance systems began to appear in the context of increased enrollment, specifically in private higher education. The explosion of questionable reputation institutions and programs was massive. Due to this, countries as Chile, Mexico, and Colombia began to develop their own quality-assurance systems at a time when the priority of public policy was on expanding enrollment, but quality had been neglected. In 1992, Colombian Congress issued Law 30, which governs the Colombian higher education system and established the national system of accreditation. Compared to other countries of Latin America, in Colombia accreditation was not intended to be mandatory nor to establish minimum requirements for degree offerings. According to Law 30, accreditation was “to guarantee that Colombian educational institutions meet the highest quality requirements and fulfill their purposes and objectives.” The process of accreditation was determined to be voluntary and managed by the National Council of Accreditation (CNA)—and its result was temporary.

At the time, the best universities of the nation saw accreditation as an opportunity to establish a mechanism of social accountability based mainly on external evaluations undertaken by academic peers. Noted equally was the need to establish a rigorous evaluation model that would recognize institutions and programs with the highest standards, as at the time there was a wide variety of educational offers of dubious quality.

The academic community became involved in designing the model, which led to its support and endorsement. In 1995, the National Council of Accreditation started to

function and divulged the guidelines for academic program accreditation. In 1997, the first programs were accredited, and by 2001 the guidelines for institutional accreditation were determined. However, by design, the accreditation system focused on “high quality,” but there was no established policy to evaluate minimum quality conditions. In the mid-1990s the government established the criteria and process of obtaining mandatory authorization for all academic programs, which was called *Registro Calificado*. Through this process the National Intersectional Commission for Quality Assurance in Higher Education (CONACES) was formed, which is responsible for assessing and granting the authorization. As a result, a multilevel Quality Assurance System was established, currently complemented by the Labor Observatory for Education (OLE), the National System of Information (SNIES), and mandated testing of incoming and graduating students.

It is worth mentioning that compared to the other Latin America countries, the Colombian system, specially the accreditation, has an interesting international position and has become an essential reference for countries beginning to implement systems of quality assurance like Peru and Ecuador.

STRENGTHS, DANGERS, AND CHALLENGES

Twenty years after the emergence of the quality-assurance system, it is necessary to identify the contributions of the accreditation process toward the development of higher education in the country. Specifically, this implies checking accreditation's coherence and efficiency in this system.

Recently, I interviewed eight leaders and experts within the Colombian higher education system: four presidents of prestigious universities; two founding members, and the current coordinator of the National Council of Accreditation; and an external evaluator and international expert on issues of higher education quality assurance in Latin America. The purpose of the inquiry was to explore whether the accreditation had fulfilled its purposes throughout the past 20 years.

In general terms, the interviewed leaders are satisfied with the results of the accreditation system. If the institutions are private or public, they concur that a “culture of self-evaluation,” without losing the sense of autonomy valued in higher education, has emerged to help solidify planning and decision-making processes. They add that with few exceptions, the external peer evaluation process has been positive for Colombian universities, as they have helped to strengthen national academic communities beyond regions, and institutional types. They also agree that the mandates of the National Council of Accreditation have been transparent and academically grounded and that the system is consistent as demonstrated by its results. They

also perceive that even the institutions that are not accredited recognize the legitimacy of the model and aspire to meet the required standards.

Regarding challenges and dangers the system could face, the leaders expressed concern about the influence of politics, bureaucracy, and official pressure to accelerate the fulfillment of government goals in relation to the number of accredited institutions and programs, which would defeat the initial purpose. The majority of the respondents argue that, besides public recognition, there are not enough governmental incentives for accredited institutions. In addition, a problem involves a lack of policies to generate new funding for costly improvement processes.

Finally, it is essential to note that, regardless of a robust accreditation system, key indicators for higher education quality in Colombia continue to be weak in the Latin American context. For example, only 6 percent of professors in Colombia have doctoral degrees. Also, with few exceptions, higher education institutions have not implemented strong reforms to modernize curricula and strengthen the use of technology to support university teaching. Therefore, it is not surprising to find few accredited programs and institutions; only 10 percent of the institutions has achieved this excellence standard. In order to increase accreditation it is necessary for institutions to understand and enact their intended purpose.

They concur that a “culture of self-evaluation,” without losing the sense of autonomy valued in higher education, has emerged to help solidify planning and decision-making processes.

CONCLUSION

Currently, it is necessary to continue strengthening the accreditation system, while keeping in mind that accreditation is a means—not an end in itself. Given its purpose to assure “high quality,” accreditation should drive institutional change. Up to this point, much of the effort of the government has been aimed at strengthening the mandatory authorization in order to properly fulfill its role of inspection and oversight. In this scenario, accreditation could become a formality without real consequences. Therefore, it is necessary to advance the articulation of the quality-assurance system, taking advantage of the legitimacy gained by the accreditation process. To do this, it is necessary to evaluate processes and inputs, and, more importantly, results such

as student learning outcomes.

Additionally, more stimuli are required. Complete autonomy, for example, should be reserved only for accredited institutions. Also, it is necessary to establish competitive funding for institutions that are involved in accreditation; and financial aid, subsidized by the government for students from lower socioeconomic levels, should target those entering accredited programs.

During the last 10 years, the rate of students attending Latin American higher education institutions has significantly increased according to official figures. It is now the time to concentrate on quality, thus, preventing frustrations for new students and society as a whole. In Colombia, as one of the most successful models in Latin America, the accreditation system has a great opportunity to lead quality assurance in higher education and to foster an authentic approach of qualitative improvement. Hopefully, such opportunity will not be lost in the years to come. ■

Democratic Reform in Egyptian Universities

AHMED EL-OBEIDY

Ahmed El-Obeidy is a professor at the University of Cairo, Egypt. E-mail: elobeidy@hotmail.com.

Once the former president Hosni Mubarak was forced to step down in a popular revolt in February 2011, the fight against corruption in the country’s higher education has been intensifying. The prodemocracy academics, as in Cairo University and Alexandria University, have been pushing to revoke the regulations of appointment of university leadership positions by government authorities. University presidents were appointed directly by the country’s president after obtaining approval from security agencies. Deans and department heads came under the authority of the university presidents and were appointed at their discretion. The prodemocracy academics considered that such regulations make university leaders loyal to the governmental authorities.

UNIVERSITY LEADERS’ ELECTION

In response to the uprising, new arrangements were established to hire new university leaders. Under the new arrangements, presidents of universities are chosen through a system in which representatives select the president, while deans of colleges and heads of departments are chosen

through direct voting by faculty members. Representatives to the Electoral College are elected by the faculty members of the university's colleges. This is clear departure from how leadership positions were traditionally filled in Egypt.

By the end of 2011, university elections were carried out in Egypt, with more than 90 percent of faculty members voting, according to media reports. The result of the election process was not only unexpected but also shocking to those looking toward democracy and elimination remnants of the previous corrupted regime. Many of the old university leaders were reinstated and retained their positions after the election by the faculties. Election results confused the revolutionists in the ranks and trend. It seems that faculty members voted for incentives and advantages that they were promised rather than transforming the universities and enhancing the role of universities in socioeconomic development. It seems that voting by the faculty members to choose the occupants of leadership positions changed universities to be as syndicates rather than educational and research organizations.

TYPICAL SELECTION OF UNIVERSITIES LEADERS

Election is a break from how university presidents and deans are selected in many developed and developing countries. In most cases, selecting university presidents and deans is a long process designed to determine the most-qualified candidates for the positions. The university academic leadership positions are typically chosen by selection committees of experienced academic faculty members and driven by the recognition that the fate of academic programs rests on the quality of their decision. The function of the search committee is to find qualified candidates and establish a short list of the most suitable candidates. The final selection of the university president among the short-listed candidates is the responsibility of a board of governance assisted by a faculty advisory committee. Once selected, the president makes all nominations for appointments to other leadership positions under the board of governance.

Under this model, the university's board of governance or of trustees is acting as the supreme governing body of the university. The university bylaws may specify the number of members of the board and how they are to be chosen. Generally, in the US public universities the members of the university boards of governance are selected by the elected state governors on behalf of society. In order for this system to be effective, the selection process of the most-qualified candidates for the leadership positions in the universities requires firmly established institutional organization and good governance.

DEMOCRACY AND ACCOUNTABILITY

When given the opportunity to exercise democracy and vote

for their university leaders, Egypt's universities failed to select candidates based on their qualifications for leadership positions. Without building the capacity of institutional organization and governance, the democratic reforms begun in Egypt's universities cannot be achieved. Breaking the entrenched power structures will need more than election and voting. Establishing a strong and credible selection committee from faculty members is an essential first step for a successful search process for candidates of university leadership positions. Selection committee members that take the broader goal of improving the quality of the university system into account play a major role in the recruitment, interviewing, screening, and evaluating the applicants. Guidelines of selecting candidates for leadership positions must be developed to guide and assist selection committees in carrying out their search and selection responsibilities. The guidelines may include criteria for selecting candidates based on their vision for the higher education system. Training on the process of searching, screening, and selecting candidates of university leadership positions, for all those who are involved in the process, needs to be developed.

In addition to the professional development of selection committee participants, other faculty members could be invited to participate in open interview sessions of final candidates—to give them opportunity to meet the candidates and collect information about the candidate's job-related knowledge and skills. An open dialogue with the candidates would increase the involvement of faculty as well as the transparency of the process. Evaluation sheets could even be provided for attendees to submit at the end of each open interview session, to be considered by the selection committee.

The final decision to select the candidate of a leadership position should be the responsibility of the university's boards of governance, which is acting as fiduciaries on behalf of society. University boards of governance may be appointed by the elected president, Parliament or Shura Council (senate).

CONCLUSION

The demand for change by the pro-democracy academics in Egypt was on the promise to have a positive impact on higher education. Elections have been implemented, and faculty participated in the choice of university presidents, deans, and department heads. However, election is not always the best way to select the most qualified and experienced persons for the university leadership positions.

Democratic reform in universities should not override accountability. The selection of the university leaders should indeed enhance competitiveness among faculty members and the commitment to the selection process. On the other hand, if our goal is for academic reform and improving

higher education and scientific research, in order to have strong impact on socioeconomic developments in Egypt, then we must also improve the process of selecting candidates for university leadership positions. Only through the professional development of all those responsible for the selection process can university in Egypt ensure that they are selecting the most-qualified and experienced university leaders who can make a positive contribution to academic reform and achieve the universities' role in higher education and scientific research. The final decision of selection should be the responsibility of boards of governance in behalf of society. ■

Vietnam: New Legislation and Future Possibilities

DUY PHAM

Duy Pham is a research associate, at the Vietnam National University, Hanoi. E-mail: duyphn@vnu.edu.vn.

For more than two decades after “Doi moi,” (reforms relating to a socialist market economy) Vietnam’s higher education has expanded in many aspects. The number of colleges and universities has quadrupled from less than 100 to more than 400 in 2013. More notably, the system now accommodates 2.2 million students—10 times more than attended in the late 1980s. There are now 83 private institutions showing a significant movement when there were none right after “Doi moi.” Most of them are now operating as for-profit models.

With the expansion, the lack of a national legal framework to regulate the sector has caused many obstacles for the administration and sustainable development of higher education in Vietnam. This pressure urged the country’s National Assembly to issue the first Higher Education Law of Vietnam in July 2012. The law consists of 12 chapters with 73 acts. It covers the main issues of higher education—goals, organization and management of universities, research, international collaboration, quality assurance and accreditation, academic staff, students, and others.

KEY POINTS OF THE NEW LAW

The purpose of the law is to put together main guidelines for education of the Communist Party and related policies of governments, so as to create favorable conditions for higher education to improve and advance. This is the first time all key issues of higher education were fully considered and written down in a document subjected to reviews

by a wide range of stakeholders and passed by votes of the National Assembly.

Basically, the law restates and describes pivotal matters of higher education in Vietnam, which had been stated in previous governmental documents. There are also new points that are declared for the first time. For instance, the models of Vietnamese national universities and regional comprehensive universities are legalized after two decades of existence. In regard to systemwide design, the law enforces Vietnam’s system to stratify institutions into three categories: research-oriented universities, application-oriented institutions, and professional training ones. Given the complexity to characterize each category, it would be a challenge for the Ministry of Education and Training (MOET) to successfully classify institutions.

To regulate the growing private higher education, the concept of private nonprofit institutions has been first defined to distinguish them with for-profit counterparts. It is also stated that the former will be supported so that they can rent cheaper land, receive tax reduction, and their staff can get governmental scholarships. These are good policies that encourage people to invest in the nonprofit institutions. However, given the current economic hardship, hardly any wealthy people can be found who can make significant contribution for a new or a few existing nonprofit institutions.

For governance issues, a few acts deal with institutional autonomy and quality control. Even if the statements seem to be vague, it is affirmed that autonomy will be given based on capacity and quality assurance conditions of institutions. For curriculum development, the law declares that institutions will be given more freedom in curriculum design and management. Accordingly, mandatory curriculum frameworks are replaced by regulations on minimum knowledge, competences, and graduate outcomes. International experience shows that it is perplexing to define and measure student learning and outcomes so it might be easier to set the policy than to make it work in 400 institutions with millions of students.

For accreditation, all institutions are required to go through a complete accreditation process, coordinated by external accreditation agencies. At the first step, those agencies will be institutionalized by the MOET. In the future, it is expected that independent agencies will take the role, and it could form a whole new horizon for accreditation in Vietnam.

INITIAL IMPACT AND FUTURE POSSIBILITIES

A few months after the law becomes effective, some impacts have been noted and future possibilities are seen. Recently, the MOET has emphasized its governmental role by inspecting a number of institutions and programs. During the search, the MOET had discovered some problems

and temporarily stopped many programs from recruiting students in 2012/2013. The ministry found that 161 graduate programs show the lack of academic staff to assure quality. Staff were then asked to supplement additional evidences for further consideration; and most of them are now allowed to recruit incoming students. After the inspections, universities become more prudent than before with assuring quality for their educational programs.

The MOET also coordinated some follow-up activities to put the law into practice. It has coordinated workshops to ask for public opinions on institutional stratification. For accreditation, the MOET has recently assigned Vietnamese national universities to create two accreditation centers in both cities—Hanoi and Ho Chi Minh. Those two centers will coordinate accreditation processes for colleges and universities, other than their member universities. They are not totally independent; but this process illustrates a good sign for the future of accreditation in Vietnam, since it shows that there are

now entities, other than the MOET, having capacity to share administrative responsibility.

Since higher education in Vietnam is growing fairly fast, the law itself seems to be insufficient. Indeed, legal documents need to be drafted and issued to guide the implementation of the new law. They should detail definitions, regulations, and guidelines on institutional autonomy and stratification, accreditation, internationalization, supporting policies for nonprofit institutions, and others. International experience shows that it might take many years and resources to effectively stratify a country's higher education system and thus is true to set up an effective accreditation system.

Last, but not least, one of the main purposes of the new law is to provide a favorable framework to improve the sector. With the new legislation, Vietnam should take actions to build capacity for academic staff and mobilize resources to support higher education. ■

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

Anderson Betty S. *The American University of Beirut: Arab Nationalism and Liberal Education*. Austin, TX: University of Texas Press, 2011. 254 pp. (pb). ISBN 978-0-292-74766-1.

Established in 1866 and one of the Middle East's most prestigious universities, the American University of Beirut has experienced the rise of nationalism and Arab consciousness over more than a century. Its historical development is discussed, with an emphasis on how the institution has survived the main events of the time.

Barnett, Ronald. *Imagining the University*. Abingdon, UK: Routledge, 2013. 188 pp. (pb). ISBN 978-0-415-67204-7. Web site: www.routledge.com.

Barnett, a well-known British higher education scholar, has long been a key thinker about the role of higher education in society—and a critic of current trends concerning entrepreneurialism and marketization. This volume extends Barnett's thinking and centers on advocating imagination—new ideas relating to the role of the university.

Bok, Derek. *Higher Education in America*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2013. 479 pp. \$35 (hb). ISBN: 978-0-691-

15914-0. Web site: www.press.princeton.edu.

Bok, former president of Harvard and one of America's most thoughtful analysts of higher education, has reflected on key themes in higher education in this volume. Among the topics discussed are professional education, the role of research, undergraduate education, and the broader societal context. While the content focuses on the United States, Bok's insights have global relevance. His balanced analysis is in marked contrast with much of the current discussion on higher education themes.

Climent, Vicent, and Francesc Michavila, and María Ripoll, eds. *Los Rankings Universitarios, mitos y realidades [University Rankings, Myths and Realities]*. Madrid, Spain: Universitat Jaume I and Editorial Tecnos, 2013. 260 pp. ISBN 978-84-309-5763-7.

This book consists of 23 papers from a conference held in July 2011—sponsored by the Universitat Jaume I and its Center for Innovation, Creativity and Learning. All the papers are in Spanish, except for one in English. It is divided into four chapters: “Comparing universities”; “The Virtues and Weaknesses of the Rankings”; “The Spanish Universities and International Rankings”; and “International Comparisons.” The authors provide a critique of major international rankings and European and other regional and national rankings that have emerged in recent years, discuss how Spanish universities fare in them, and point to how they might improve their institutions and their position in the rankings. (Urbain Ben DeWinter).

Cohen, Robert, and David J. Snyder, eds. *Rebellion in Black and White: Southern Student Activism in the 1960s*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2013. 337 pp. \$29.95 (pb). ISBN 978-1-4214-0850-7. Web site: www.press.jhu.edu.

Detailed analysis and commentary on student activism in the American south during the 1960s, this volume points out that the student movements of that era started in the south—with the struggle for civil rights for African-Americans. For most of the period, blacks and whites worked together in student organizations. This volume features discussion of free speech struggles in southern campuses, interracial dialogue, conservative student activism at the University of Georgia, and others.

Cummings, William K., and Martin J. Finkelstein. *Scholars in the Changing American Academy: New Contexts, New Rules, and New Roles*. Dordrecht, Netherlands: Springer, 2012. 274 pp. 106.95 (hb). ISBN 978-94-007-2729-8. Web site: www.springer.com.

One of the volumes in the series, “The Changing Academic Profession,” this volume focuses specifically on the United States.

“The Changing Academic Profession” study is a multicountry research project on the attitudes of the academic profession. Based largely on the CAP survey of American academics, this volume discusses such themes as the internationalization perspectives of faculty members, research productivity, teaching and research attitudes, faculty roles in governance, and others.

Dhunpath, Rubby, and Renuka Vithal, eds. *Alternative Access to Higher Education: Underprepared Students or Underprepared Institution?* Durban, South Africa: Pearson, 2012. 320 pp. (pb). ISBN 978-1-775784975.

Focusing mainly on the South African experience, this volume discusses a broad framework of access to higher education to students from disadvantaged backgrounds. Issues such as distance education and access, access and quality, access issues in South Africa, science subjects and access, and others.

Geiger, Roger L., and Nathan M. Sorber, eds. *The Land Grant Colleges and the Reshaping of American Higher Education*. New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction, 2013. 356 pp. (pb). ISBN 978-1-4128-5147-3. Web site: www.transactionpub.com.

The establishment of the “land grant” universities in the United States in the 1860s, by providing to the states land by the federal government for the purpose of higher education, was a key transformation for American higher education. This book provides a series of historical analyses of land-grant institutions from the mid-19th century to the present. This volume is the 30th in the annual Perspectives on the History of Higher Education series.

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. 269 pp. (pb). ISBN-873927-76-2. Web site: www.symposium-books.co.uk.

The relationship between the state and higher education in an era of massification and privatization is changing in many countries. This volume analyzes aspects of these

changes in western Europe, Japan, and Korea. Among the topics discussed are developments in public higher education in Britain, the state, markets, and higher education in Korea and the United Kingdom, the transition university-state relations in Japan, the state and private higher education in Japan, and others.

Kelly, Andrew P., and Kevin Carey, eds. *Stretching the Higher Education Dollar: How Innovation Can Improve Access, Equity, and Affordability*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard Education Press, 2013. 260 pp. \$29.95 (pb). ISBN 978-1-61250-594-7. Web site: www.harvardeducationpress.org.

A collection of chapters on innovative ideas that are intended to use technology and cut costs in American higher education, this volume discusses such themes as the basic cost structure in postsecondary education, student services, online innovations, and others. The authors seem to agree that the traditional university is too expensive and needs to be made more efficient.

Lang, James M. *Cheating Lessons: Learning from Academic Dishonesty*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2013. 255 pp. \$26.95. (hb). ISBN 978-0-674-72463-1. Web site: www.hup.harvard.edu.

Data show that nearly three-quarters of American students cheat during their undergraduate careers. This useful volume, using data and examples from the United States, discusses the research literature on cheating and provides useful advice concerning reducing it. The author emphasizes the importance of focusing on learning in courses as a key strategy.

Leibowitz, Brenda, ed. *Higher Education for the Public Good: Voices from the South*. London: Institute of Education Press, 2013. 224 pp. (pb). ISBN 978-1-85856-521-7. Web site: www.ioe.ac.uk/ioepress.

The focus of this volume is on the public good role of universities. The perspective is largely from South Africa, although chapters by authors in the United Kingdom, the United States, and other countries are also included. Among the topics are considered as student

communities in health sciences, global citizenship in engineering courses, fostering the public good in universities, and others.

Mukerji, Siran, and Purnendu Tripathi, eds. *Handbook of Research on Transnational Higher Education*. Hershey, PA: Information Science Reference, 2013. 2 volumes. \$450. ISSN 978-1-4666-4458-8.

This two-volume collection of rather unrelated chapters—on aspects of international student exchange, international student attitudes, and programs that are not necessarily related issues—is not focused particularly on transnational higher education. Some are not related to international education at all. Among the topics considered are learning across generations, curriculum develop-

ment through competency-based education, a cross-cultural approach to evaluating university services, a global studies curriculum, management of dual-degree programs, and others.

Nielsen, Larry A. *Provost: Experience, Reflections, and Advice from a Former "Number Two" on Campus*. Sterling, VA: Stylus Publishers, 2013. 372 pp. \$35 (hb). ISBN 978-1-57922-969-6. Web site: www.Styluspub.com.

Informal reflections concerning the role of the provost in American higher education, this volume discusses how the provost, usually the person responsible for the "internal affairs" of the university, works among many constituencies on campus. These include

the faculty, students, alumni, the governing board, and others.

Sehoole, Chika, and Jane Knight, eds. *Internationalization of African Higher Education: Towards Achieving the MDGs*. Rotterdam, Netherlands: Sense, 2013. 183 pp. \$54 (pb). ISBN 978-94-6029-309-6. Web site: www.sensepublishers.com.

A series of essays broadly around the theme of how African higher education has dealt with internationalization, this volume discusses such topics as the development impact of international partnerships, academic mobility and gender roles, the role of internationalization in meeting millennium development goals, and others.

NEWS OF THE CENTER

This has been a particularly active period for the Center. Our main project was the first international conference of higher education center directors and policymakers, held in Shanghai with the cooperation of Shanghai Jiao Tong University on November 2–3, 2013. The event was funded by SIDA, the Swedish International Development Agency, with the assistance of Santrust, a South African nongovernmental organization. Laura E. Rumbley was the main organizer of the event. A theme issue of *Studies in Higher Education* will be published, containing the papers prepared for the meeting; and a "Shanghai Statement," which can be found elsewhere in this issue, was approved by the participants.

In September, the Carnegie Corporation approved a major grant to support two key Center activities: the ongoing publication of the Center's flagship publication, *International Higher Education*, and the reinvigoration of the International Network of Higher Education in Africa (INHEA). INHEA, founded by Dr. Damtew Teferra at CIHE a decade ago, is now under his leadership at the University of KwaZulu-Natal in South Africa and remains closely affiliated with the Center.

CIHE is collaborating with the International Federation of Catholic Universities in organizing a year-long leadership training program for Catholic university rectors in Latin America. The program, which will be conducted in Spanish, is coordinated by Laura E. Rumbley, Liz Reisberg, Iván F. Pacheco, and BC higher education program chair, Ana Martinez-Aleman.

CIHE is also collaborating with the consulting firm, Global Opportunities Group, headed by CIHE alumnus David Engberg, on a study commissioned by the British Council and the German Academic Exchange Service (DAAD) to examine nationally funded scholarship programs for outbound international mobility in 11 countries. The results of the study will

be delivered at the 2014 Going Global conference in Miami in April 2014.

Center director Philip Altbach has been appointed to the Committee for the Competitiveness of Russian Universities by Education Minister Livanov. The committee, which met in Moscow on October 26–27, 2013, is responsible for selecting several Russian universities to receive extra funding to improve their global standing. Altbach continues to serve on the international advisory committee of the Graduate School of Education at Shanghai Jiao Tong University.

CIHE, in collaboration with the National Research University–Higher School of Economics in Moscow, is working on a research project on "academic inbreeding." Project researchers met at Boston College in December to discuss their research. A book will be published from this research. A previously CIHE-HSE research project, on the challenges facing young academics, resulted in a book that is now in production with the State University of New York Press.

The 3rd edition of the Center's *Higher Education: A Worldwide Inventory of Centers and Programs* is now in final production. This publication contains an extensive global catalogue of the research centers and graduate-level degree programs focused on higher education, as well as a comprehensive listing of journals and other key publications in higher education worldwide.

CIHE associate director Laura E. Rumbley has been appointed as coeditor of the *Journal of Studies in International Education*. She continues as chair of the publications committee of the European Association for 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

ALTBACH FESTSCHRIFT PUBLISHED

The Forefront of International Higher Education: A Festschrift in Honor of Philip G. Altbach, edited by Alma Maldonado-Maldonado and Roberta Malee Bassett, has been published by Springer Publishers—Dordrecht, Netherlands: Springer, 2014. 333 pp. \$129 (hb). Web site: www.springer.com. This volume, which was prepared to coincide with a conference to honor Philip G. Altbach on April 5, 2013 at Boston College, features chapters focusing on themes relating to research undertaken by Philip G. Altbach. The authors are either students who worked with Professor Altbach or colleagues involved with the Center for International Higher Education at Boston College. Colleagues include Ulrich Teichler, Jane Knight, Martin J. Finkelstein, Hans de Wit, Simon Schwartzman, Jorge Balán, D. Bruce Johnstone, Judith S. Eaton, Akiyoshi Yonezawa, N. Jayaram, Heather Eggins, Frans van Vught, Nian Cai Liu, Jamil Salmi, and others. Former and current students include Patti McGill Peterson, David A. Stanfield, James J.F. Forest, Robin Matross Helms, Sheila Slaughter,

Liz Reisberg, Laura E. Rumbley, and the two coeditors of the book: Alma Maldonado-Maldonado and Roberta Malee Bassett.

Chapters include topics such as higher education innovation in India, center-periphery theory, world-class universities, tuition and cost sharing, quality assurance, the academic profession and academic mobility, and various aspects of internationalization.



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