INTERNATIONAL HIGHER EDUCATION

Number 69: Fall 2012

THE BOSTON COLLEGE CENTER FOR INTERNATIONAL HIGHER EDUCATION

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

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

International Issues

Rankings: The Never Ending Story

Aspects of Internationalization

Africa Focus

European Perspectives

Departments

Corruption: A Key Challenge to Internationalization

Philip G. Altbach

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

A specter of corruption is haunting the global campaign toward higher education internationalization. An overseas degree is increasingly valuable, so it is not surprising that commercial ventures have found opportunities on the internationalization landscape. New private actors have entered the sector, with the sole goal of making money. Some of them are less than honorable. Some universities look at internationalization as a contribution to the financial "bottom line," in an era of financial cutbacks. The rapidly expanding private higher education sector globally is largely for-profit. In a few cases, such as Australia and increasingly the United Kingdom, national policies concerning higher education internationalization tilt toward earning income for the system.

Countries whose academic systems suffer from elements of corruption are increasingly involved in international higher education—sending large numbers of students abroad, establishing relationships with overseas universities, and other activities. Corruption is not limited to countries that may have a reputation for less than fully circumspect academic practices, but that problem occurs globally. Several scandals have recently been widely reported in the United States, including the private unaccredited "Tri-Valley University," a sham institution that admitted and collected tuition from foreign students. That institution did not require them to attend class, but rather funneled them into the labor market, under the noses of US immigration authorities. In addition, several public universities have been caught admitting students, with substandard academic qualifications. Quality-assurance agencies in the United Kingdom have uncovered problems with "franchised" British-degree programs, and similar scandals have occurred in Australia. A prominent example is the University of Wales, which was the second-largest university in the United Kingdom, with 70,000 students enrolled in 130 colleges around the world. It had to close its highly profitable degree validation program, which accounted for nearly two-thirds of institutional revenue.

With international higher education now a multibillion dollar industry around the world, individuals, countries, and institutions depending on income, prestige, and access—it is not surprising that corruption is a growing problem. If something is not done to ensure probity in international relationships in higher education, an entire structure—built on trust, a commitment to mutual understanding, and benefits for students and researchers—a commitment built informally over decades will collapse. There are signs that it is already in deep trouble.

Examples and Implications

A serious and unsolved problem is the prevalence of unscrupulous agents and recruiters funneling unqualified students to universities worldwide. A recent example was featured in Britain's *Daily Telegraph* (June 26, 2012) of an agent in China caught on video, offering to write admissions essays and to present other questionable help in admission to prominent British universities. No one knows the extent of the problem, although consistent news reports indicate that it is widespread, particularly in countries that send large numbers of students abroad, including China and India. Without question, agents now receive millions of dollars in commissions paid by the universities and, in some egregious cases, money from the clients as well. In Nottingham University's case the percentage of students recruited through agents has increased from 19 percent of the intake in 2005 to 25 percent in 2011, with more than £1 million going to the agents.

Countries whose academic systems suffer from elements of corruption are increasingly involved in international higher education—sending large numbers of students abroad, establishing relationships with overseas universities, and other activities.

Altered and fake documents have long been a problem in international admissions. Computer design and technology exacerbate it. Fraudulent documents have become a minor industry in some parts of the world, and many universities are reluctant to accept documents from institutions that have been tainted with incidents of counterfeit records. For example, a number of American universities no longer accept applications from some Russian students—because of widespread perceptions of fraud, document tampering, and other problems. Document fraud gained momentum due to commission-based agents who have an incentive to ensure that students are "packaged" with impressive creden-

tials, as their commissions depend on successful student placement. Those responsible for checking the accuracy of transcripts, recommendations, and degree certificates face an increasingly difficult task. Students who submit valid documentation are placed as a disadvantage since they are subjected to extra scrutiny.

Examples of tampering with and falsifying results of the Graduate Record Examination and other commonly required international examinations used for admissions have resulted in the nullifying of scores, and even cancelling examinations in some countries and regions, as well as rethinking whether on-line testing is practical. This situation has made it more difficult for students to apply to foreign universities and has made the task of evaluating students for admission more difficult.

Several countries, including Russia and India, have announced that they will be using the *Times Higher Education* and Academic Ranking of World Universities (Shanghai rankings), as a way of determining the legitimacy of foreign universities for recognizing foreign degrees, determining eligibility for academic collaborations, and other aspects of international higher education relations. This is unfortunate, since many excellent academic institutions are not included in these rankings, which mostly measure research productivity. No doubt, Russia and India are concerned about the quality of foreign partners and find the rankings convenient.

Several "host" countries have tightened up rules and oversight of cross-border student flows in response to irregularities and corruption. The US Department of State announced in June 2012 that visa applicants from India would be subjected to additional scrutiny as a response to the "Tri-Valley scandal." Earlier both Australia and Britain changed rules and policy. Corruption is making internationalization more difficult for the entire higher education sector. It is perhaps significant that continental Europe seems to have been less affected by shady practices—perhaps in part because international higher education is less commercialized and profit driven.

The Internet has become the "Wild West" of academic misrepresentation and chicanery. It is easy to set up an impressive Web site and exaggerate the quality or lie about an institution. Some institutions claim accreditation that does not exist. There are even "accreditation mills" to accredit universities that pay a fee. A few include pictures of impressive campuses that are simply photo-shopped from other universities.

What Can Be Done?

With international higher education now big business and with commercial gain an ever-increasing motivation for international initiatives, the problems mentioned are likely to persist. However, a range of initiatives can ameliorate the situation. The higher education community can recommit to the traditional "public good" values of internationalization, although current funding challenges may make this difficult in some countries. The International Association of Universities' recent report, "Affirming Academic Values in Internationalization of Higher Education," is a good start. The essential values of the European Union's Bologna Initiatives are also consistent with the best values of internationalization.

Accreditation and quality assurance are essential for ensuring that basic quality is recognized. Agencies and the international higher education community must ensure that universities were carefully evaluated and that the results of assessment are easily available to the public and the international stakeholders.

Altered and fake documents have long been a problem in international admissions.

Governmental, regional, and international agencies must coordinate their efforts and become involved in maintaining standards and protecting the image of the higher education sector. Contradictions abound. For example, the United States Department of State's Education USA seeks to protect the sector, while the Department of Commerce sees higher education just as an export commodity. Government agencies in the United Kingdom and Australia seem also to be mainly pursuing commercial interests.

Consciousness-raising about ethics and good practice in international higher education and awareness of emerging problems and continuing challenges deserve continuing attention. Prospective students and their families, institutional partners considering exchanges and research, and other stakeholders must be more sophisticated and vigilant concerning decision making. The Boston College Center for International Higher Education's Corruption Monitor is the only clearinghouse for information, relating directly to corrupt practices; additional sources of information and analysis will be helpful.

The first step in solving a major challenge to higher education internationalization is recognition of the problem itself. The higher education community itself is by no means united; and growing commercialization makes some people reluctant to act in ways that may threaten profits. There are individuals within the academic community who lobby aggressively to legitimize dubious practices. Yet,

if nothing is done, the higher education sector worldwide will suffer and the impressive strides taken toward internationalization will be threatened.

Author's note: I acknowledge comments from Rahul Choudaha and Liz Reisberg. This article also appears in *University World News* and *Vedimosti* (Moscow). ■

Five Truths about Internationalization

Jane Knight

Jane Knight is adjunct professor at the Ontario Institute for Studies in Education, University of Toronto, Ontario, Canada. E-mail: jane.knight@utoronto.ca.

After several decades of intense development, internationalization has grown in scope, scale, and value. University strategic plans, national policy statements, international declarations, and academic articles all indicate the centrality of internationalization in the current world of higher education.

My recent article on the "Five Myths of Internationalization" (*IHE* no. 62, 2011) brought to light some misconceptions about internationalization. The myths challenged internationalization as a proxy for quality, foreign students as agents of internationalization, institutional agreements and international accreditations as indicators of the level of internationalization, and internationalization as a strategy for high rankings in league tables.

Builiding on and Respecting the Local Context

Internationalization acknowledges and builds on national and regional priorities, policies, and practices. The attention now given to the international dimension of higher education should not overshadow or erode the importance of local context. Thus, internationalization is intended to complement, harmonize, and extend the local dimension—not to dominate it. If this fundamental truth is not respected, a strong possibility exists of a backlash and for internationalization to be seen as a homogenizing or hegemonic agent. Internationalization will lose its true north and its worth, if it ignores the local context.

A Customized Process

Internationalization is a process of integrating an international, intercultural, and global dimension into the goals, functions, and delivery of higher education. As such it is a process of change—tailored to meet the individual needs and interests of each higher education entity. Consequently, there is no "one size fits all" model of internationalization. Adopting a set of objectives and strategies that are "in vogue" and for "branding" purposes only negates the principle that each program, institution, or country needs to determine its individual approach to internationalization—based on its own clearly articulated rationales, goals, and expected outcomes.

Benefits, Risks, and Uintended Consequences

While there are multiple and varied benefits of internationalization, to focus only on benefits is to be unaware of the risks and unintended negative consequences. Brain drain from international academic mobility is one example of an adverse effect. The current concept of brain circulation does not acknowledge the threat of academic mobility and the great brain race for those countries at the bottom of the brain chain. Second, the desirability of an international qualification is leading to bogus certificates from degree mills, multiple credentials from double-degree programs, and the rise of accreditation mills certifying rogue operations. Third, in some countries, the overreliance on income from international student fees is leading to lower academic standards and the rise of "visa factory programs." Fourth, increased commodification and commercialization of cross-border franchising and twinning programs are threatening the quality and relevance of higher education, in some regions of the world. Moreover, recent surveys show that higher education leaders still believe that the benefits of internationalization still outweigh the risks. However, it is imperative to be vigilant to the different impacts, both positive and negative of internationalization.

Internationalization acknowledges and builds on national and regional priorities, policies, and practices.

Not an End Unto Itself

Internationalization is a means to an end, not an end unto itself. This is a common misunderstood truism, which can lead to a skewed understanding of what internationalization is or can do. The suffix of "-ization" signifies that internationalization is a process or means of enhancing or achieving goals. For example, internationalization can help develop international and intercultural knowledge, skills, and values in students—through improved teaching and

learning, international mobility, and a curriculum that includes comparative, international, and intercultural elements. The goal is not more internationalized curriculum or increased academic mobility per se. Rather the aim is to ensure that students are better prepared to live and work in a more interconnected world. Understanding internationalization, as a means to an end and not an end unto itself, ensures that the international dimension is integrated in a sustainable manner into the major functions of higher education teaching and learning, research and knowledge production, and service to the community and society.

While there are multiple and varied benefits of internationalization, to focus only on benefits is to be unaware of the risks and unintended negative consequences.

Globalization and Internationalization are Different but Linked

Globalization focuses on the worldwide flow of ideas, resources, people, economy, values, culture, knowledge, goods, services, and technology. Internationalization emphasizes the relationship between and among nations, people, cultures, institutions, and systems. The difference between the concept of worldwide flow and the notion of relationships among nations is both striking and profound. Internationalization of higher education has been positively and negatively influenced by globalization, and that the two processes, while fundamentally different, are closely connected. For instance, the competitiveness and commercialism agenda, often linked to globalization, has had a major impact on cross-border education development. In turn, the growth of cross-border education and its inclusion in bilateral and regional trade agreements have strengthened globalization.

The fundamental principles guiding internationalization always means different objects to various people, institutions, and countries. Yet, forecasting that internationalization would have evolved from what has been traditionally considered a process, based on values of cooperation, partnership, exchange, mutual benefits, and capacity building. Now, internationalization is increasingly characterized by competition, commercialization, self-interest, and status building. More attention is called for discovering truths and values underpinning the internationalization of higher education. ■

The Role of Regulating Private For-Profit Higher Education

William G. Tierney

William G. Tierney is professor and director of the Center for Higher Education Policy Analysis, Rossier School of Education, at the University of Southern California, Los Angeles. E-mail: wgtiern@usc.edu.

Although private nonprofit colleges and universities have a long and distinguished history throughout the world, what has come to be known as "for-profit higher education" is a relative newcomer. Private nonprofit institutions, such as Stanford University in the United States or Universidad Santa Maria la Antigua in Panama, are examples of established universities with significant reputations. Their focus and intent has been relatively clear. They are largely mission focused or cater to a specific traditionally aged clientele, such as members of a particular religion.

For-profit higher education is a relative newcomer onto the world stage, even though the prototype has existed for quite some time. Small, technical training institutions came into existence in the 19th century, as a way to give individuals a vocation. Barbers, plumbers, secretaries, and a host of other trades are engaged in the sorts of professions taught at relatively small postsecondary institutions. The owners of these institutions generally did not think of themselves as competitors to either public or private tertiary institutions. Instead, these schools taught a trade to working-class students and turned a modest profit.

Over time, the institutions became a bit more formalized. Trades became professions, and in order to be licensed by the state the student may have needed to pass an exam or amass a specific number of credits. The state may have required that all of the students who were to be licensed also needed a high school degree or its equivalent. The result was that the small for-profit institution may have added courses that enabled students to gain their high school equivalency. Nevertheless, until the 1970s, for-profit colleges and universities were a miniscule part of the tertiary education universe. In 1967, for example, roughly 7 million students attended degree-granting institutions in the United States; and fewer than 22,000 of these students, or less than one-third of 1 percent, attended for-profit institutions.

By 2012, however, for-profit institutions in the United States have become 12 percent of the market. The same sorts of growth exist throughout the world. Malaysia, for

example, has seen dramatic growth in the for-profit sector, as have other countries—such as, Turkey and Singapore. Three reasons account for that growth.

For-Profit Growth

First, educational entrepreneurs have seen an opening. John Sperling founded the University of Phoenix in 1976; Phoenix is now America's second-largest postsecondary institution, with over 400,000 students. Phoenix and other institutions began to experiment with the meaning and purpose of higher education in a number of ways. Part-time working adults have been viewed as a potentially huge customer base. These students do not need a campus and the related accoutrements—student centers, fancy eateries, and so on. Rather than a potpourri of courses whose utility for future work is not apparent, students select courses from a finite number that are offered at convenient times and locations. The focus is on efficiency. Faculty work is also very different. Tenure, shared governance, and academic freedom are largely absent. Whereas in traditional institutions the professor develops the syllabus—so that the same course might have different foci, objectives, and goals, depending on the instructor—at the for-profits, the syllabi are standardized. Pedagogy from class to class is more similar than different. Entrepreneurs have seen an opening in a "market" and they have taken it; and in doing so, they have redefined who the customer is and what the customer wants.

For-profit higher education is a relative newcomer onto the world stage, even though the prototype has existed for quite some time.

A second reason for the growth is due to the advances made in technology. Online learning is not yet optimal or pervasive, but we frequently forget how fast technology has been adopted throughout the world. The Web, the Internet, YouTube, and Facebook were unknown quantities, a little over a generation ago. The continued advances in technology have enabled courses to be reconfigured, in ways that were unthinkable when the University of Phoenix started. For-profit institutions have been early adopters of new technologies and, in doing so, have created new markets for themselves.

Finally, tertiary education is a growth industry. As importantly, the public sector cannot accommodate the vast postsecondary needs of the citizenry. Throughout the world the assumption is that more education is the way to economic growth. Public universities, traditionally configured, are unable to meet the capacity demands and the needs of traditionally aged students and working adults, without significant additions to their revenue streams.

Challenges of Growth

However, the explosion of growth in the for-profit sector has created related challenges. In particular, for-profits have been charged with unethical admissions practices, burdening students with an unacceptable level of debt, and not preparing students with the skills necessary for their wanted jobs. Because many students are the first family member to attend a tertiary institution, they may not understand the costs of attending a for-profit institution or the consequences of the loans obtained to pay for their training. Admissions counselors also may coerce potential customers with false advertising or promises of jobs that do not exist.

A second reason for the growth is due to the advances made in technology.

These issues are confusing because frequently students who attend for-profit institutions are also students who are most at risk of not completing their coursework. A country will want more students entering the postsecondary system, and those students are likely to come from populations with historically low participation and completion rates. Yet, those same students may not complete their studies at a level equivalent to traditional college-going populations, which means they will encumber loans on which they may default. Thus, how to determine acceptable levels of attrition, debt burden, and salaries upon completion are issues that are highly charged among critics and supporters of the for-profits.

The role of the government is to ensure that the citizenry is protected from fraudulent services. Just as the government watches over the health and food safety of its citizens, it must also put in place regulations to ensure that private companies perform in a manner that protects the customer. The simple suggestion is that the "buyer beware" is an unacceptable public policy, with regard to education. Edu-

cation is a public good that not only benefits the individual but also the nation. Thus, a view to the future suggests that states will develop strategies to ensure that for-profit colleges and universities deliver high-quality services, which not only benefit the customer but also aid the state in its quest for increased educational attainment for its citizenry. ■

The Rise of Post-Confucian Knowledge Economies

SIMON MARGINSON

Simon Marginson is professor of higher education at the University of Melbourne, Australia. His recent books include Higher Education in the Asia Pacific: Strategic Responses to Globalization *(Springer, 2011), edited with Sarjit Kaur and Erlenawati Sawir. E-mail: s.marginson@unimelb.edu.au.*

Universities and research in East Asia and Singapore have been completely transformed over the last 15 years. On present trends, these higher education systems are on course to share global leadership with institutions in the English-speaking countries and western Europe.

There is much rhetoric about the rise of Asian knowledge economies—both admiring and (in some quarters) half fearful as well, and not all of it is accurate. For example, education and research outside East Asia—including India and Southeast Asia—are well behind the progress of East Asia and Singapore at this stage. Progress is being made, and there are pockets of real strength—as in research in Thailand and in Malaysia's customer friendly private colleges.

Nevertheless, in China, Hong Kong, Taiwan, South Korea, and Singapore the true global change is taking place. These systems are joining Japan, which has sustained a front-rank, high-participation science and engineering system for more than three decades and was the second largest research and development investor in the world, until passed by China recently.

Research Leaders

The momentum of East Asia's knowledge economies is based on the record in the data on research performance and educational participation. It can also be observed through research. Recently, I completed an Australian Research Council-funded comparison of the global links and capacities of leading research universities in the Asia Pacific—including 16 case studies in 15 different higher education systems in the region.

The case-study universities included the University of Tokyo in Japan, Seoul National University in Korea, Peking and Shanghai Jiao Tong University in China, Taiwan National University, the University of Hong Kong, and the National University of Singapore. Each already plays an important global role and has a larger future.

The University of Tokyo produces as many science papers as any US university, except Harvard University. Peking University (Beida) is at the heart of China, and Shanghai Jiao Tong produces the third-largest number of papers in China after Zhejiang and Tsinghua University. On several indicators, Taiwan National University is currently the top-performing Chinese university. The National University of Singapore is a byword for effective global strategy and partnerships. Hong Kong University is the largest of five universities in the Hong Kong Special Administration Region with impressive research credentials. Seoul National University is the fifth university in the world, in alumni with chief executive officer positions in Fortune 500 US enterprises.

It is significant that though there are many differences between them, all of these systems have Sinic cultural roots.

Post-Confucian

It is significant that though there are many differences between them, all of these systems have Sinic cultural roots. The outlier in Southeast Asia, Singapore, has a plural cultural composition but the Chinese influence is strong. All have been shaped by the deep Confucian commitment to education in the family, which underpins the quality of schooling, ensuring that advances in participation are matched by advances in student learning. These nations lead the world in the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development's survey of the learning achievement of 15-year-olds—Program for International Student Assessment.

All, whether in one-party states or plural polities—like Korea, Japan, and Taiwan—benefit from strong, effective state machines that invest heavily in education and research capacity, target that investment to goals, and follow through to ensure those goals are achieved. Only in Japan, where

the earlier dynamism has fallen away, has investment leveled off. The Post-Confucian higher education systems are a remarkable combination of resilient tradition and Western science. They are ushering in a new hybrid East-West modernity.

Higher education in East Asia and Singapore is advancing rapidly on three fronts at once: the overall rate of participation in tertiary education—now exceeding 85 percent in Taiwan and South Korea—the quality of leading universities, and rapidly growing research and development, within taxation and public spending low by world standards. The achievement rests on economic growth. All except China have reached western European levels of wealth. According to the World Bank, Gross National Income per head in 2010 was US$29,010 in South Korea, US$47,130 in Hong Kong, and US$55,380 in Singapore. It was US$34,780 in Japan.

Higher education in East Asia and Singapore is advancing rapidly on three fronts at once.

China Rising

In China the gross national income per head was just US$7,570, but this had doubled in five years; and amid gross inequalities Beijing, Shanghai, and parts of Eastern China are much wealthier. It is planned that the participation in tertiary education will reach 40 percent by the year 2020. Participation was just 5 percent in 1990. Regional differences are a continuing problem, however.

China plans to boost research and development spending to 2.5 percent of gross domestic product by 2010. Spending on research is already at 40 percent of the level applying in the United States. In the last decade the number of science papers has grown by 17 percent a year.

China's research trajectory is not free of problems. Arguably, there is too much research in state enterprises and not enough in the universities. Problems occur of bureaucratic interference in decisions about research grants, and the feisty debate inside Chinese universities is not matched by free conversation outside in civil society. China's publication numbers are not yet matched by a parallel performance in highly cited papers.

But research output in China is growing by leaps and bounds, and in some fields—such as chemistry, engineering, and materials—China clearly excels in world terms. Physics and maths are also strong, as elsewhere in East Asia. Life sciences and medicine are less developed.

All in all, East Asian research universities have a way to go yet. According to the Leiden University data, on 2005–2009 science paper output, in Asia and the Western Pacific, 18 universities produced more than 5,000 papers and had at least 10 percent of all papers in the top-tenth in their field in citation rate—6 in each of China and Australia, 2 in each of Singapore and Hong Kong, and 1 in each of Japan and Korea. The equivalent number of universities in Europe was 47 and in the United States 64.

However, 38 Asia Pacific universities produced more than 5,000 papers. Cite rates are improving. Given the continuing growth of investment in research, it looks likely the Post-Confucian systems will make it. ■

Challenges in Adopting English-Taught Degree Programs

Annette Bradford

Annette Bradford is a doctoral student in the Education Policy program at George Washington University, Washington, DC. E-mail: acb83@gwu.edu.

In an attempt to increase the competitiveness of their higher education systems in the globalizing world, many non-English-speaking countries are increasing the number of degree programs—either partially or entirely, through the medium of English. European universities, most notably those in the Netherlands and Scandinavia, have been administering English-taught programs for a number of years. Yet, concerns about the difficulties of implementation and the quality of these programs are still present. As universities in other parts of the world, particularly in East Asia, are stepping up their numbers of English-taught programs, they are encountering similar challenges.

Rising Numbers of Programs

With the implementation of the Bologna-process three-cycle system, which was largely completed in 2010, the number of English-taught programs in non-English-speaking Europe has grown dramatically. Recent data reported by the Institute of International Education counted 560 master's programs taught entirely in English—in 2002, 1,500 in 2,008 and 3,701 in 2011—with further 963 programs

including English as one of their languages of instruction. In the Benelux countries and Scandinavia, master's education is now almost entirely conducted in English. At the undergraduate level, entire English-taught degrees are not growing at such remarkable rates, but are nevertheless increasing, with the Netherlands alone reporting over 200 programs to the bachelorsportal.eu database.

In more recent years, East Asian universities have also begun to rapidly expand their offerings in English. Korea has embraced English-medium instruction enthusiastically, with a large number of universities seeking to incorporate it into their existing programs, conducting about 30 percent of their classes in English. Taiwan and Japan are focusing more on entire English-taught programs. Taiwan has at least 170 English-taught programs at various levels, and the Japanese government intends for there to be 157 programs in its 13 Global 30 Project-funded institutions alone by 2014. In mainland China, at the request of the Ministry of Education, Chinese universities teach a growing range of professional subjects entirely in English, including information science, biotechnology, new materials, engineering, international trade, finance, and law.

The challenges that arise alongside the adoption of such programs can be categorized into three types—those related to language, culture, and the structure of the programs.

Linguistic Challenges

There is concern about the quality of teaching and learning that occurs when instructors and/or students are working in a non-native language. Even students in countries with strong histories of English-language instruction, such as Norway and the Netherlands, have reported concerns with unfamiliar vocabulary and trouble taking notes, while listening in English-medium classes. Consequently, instructors need to make constant adaptation to their lectures, and this affects the quality and quantity of content that can be taught over a semester.

Limitations in professors' linguistic competencies also pose challenges for program quality. European students regularly identify insufficiency in the oral skills of their professors, leading to a loss of confidence in professors' content knowledge. Professors themselves have commented that classes can become dry and technical when their language abilities prevent them from recounting anecdotes or using colloquial language.

Cultural Challanges

Higher education institutions that adopt English as the medium of instruction are opening themselves up to more diverse student and teacher populations, with a greater range of cultural norms and expectations. These differences can permeate all levels of the English-taught program—including classroom behavior, forms of assessment, and teacher evaluation. This presents challenges for educators accustomed to teaching a fairly homogenous body of students, as they may lack the intercultural knowledge important for developing internationalized curricula, adopting more inclusive practices, and promoting reciprocal cultural understanding. Such pragmatic ability is more serious than language proficiency, when conducting English-medium classes.

Many observers have remarked that English instruction leads to an "Americanization" of classroom and accountability practices, partly due to the difficulty of separating English from its dominant culture and to the need for international transparency in the programs. This can create particular difficulties in Asian classrooms, where traditional pedagogy emphasizes the authority of the teacher and most of the international students are likely to hail from other Asian nations.

Linguistic and cultural challenges increase the burden that the English-taught programs place on faculty. For example, estimates assess that it takes four to five times more effort for a Japanese professor to teach in English rather than in Japanese, and studies in Taiwan have revealed dissatisfaction with the amount of time it takes to prepare a class that caters to diverse learning styles. Even Danish and Finnish professors, with high levels of communicative English ability, have expressed reluctance to teach in English-medium programs. Faculty burden can be alleviated by employing native-English speakers. However, problems exist in recruiting and retaining these faculty members, extra payment may be required to make employment attractive, and they are not always available for long-term teaching contracts—often because of employment regulations and visa restrictions.

With the implementation of the Bologna-process three-cycle system, which was largely completed in 2010, the number of English-taught programs in non-English-speaking Europe has grown dramatically.

Structural Challenges

Structural challenges are those related to the administration and management of the programs. In addition to finding

faculty to teach in the programs, any institution adopting English-medium instruction must also extend its administration and support services to cater to a new heterogeneous student and faculty body in English. Students enrolled in the English-taught programs also typically need more support than local students. In particular, they require help with housing, transferring foreign credentials to the host nation, and extra academic and pastoral counseling. In many nations, administrative staff do not specialize and are not assigned to one office for more than a few years. Thus, it can be difficult to find personnel with the required skills.

The challenges that arise alongside the adoption of such programs can be categorized into three types—those related to language, culture, and the structure of the programs.

Another structural challenge to the implementation of these programs is that of institutional intransigence. Supranational and national initiatives such as the European Bologna Declaration and Japanese Global 30 Project have enabled English-taught programs to be introduced, but it is the stakeholders within the higher education institutions to allow them to thrive. Without buy-in from institutional stakeholders, such as the professors' councils and faculty, English-instruction programs are not likely to be implemented as intended.

Moving Forward

To aid successful implementation of English-taught programs, institutions should direct attention to addressing the three challenges set out above. Valuable elements of student and faculty support could include language and academic-skills classes for students and intercultural teaching skills classes for faculty. Programs in Taiwan are taking actions that exemplify this sort of proactive engagement with the challenges seen in previous cases. National Taiwan University of Science and Technology offers a free summer intensive English program for domestic students, to enable them to participate in English-taught classes; and National Chang Hwa Normal University offers pedagogical workshops for its faculty. Similarly, Yuan Ze University partnered with the University of New South Wales, to send faculty to Australia for intensive training to enhance their abilities to deliver programs in English. In order to address structural challenges, universities should adjust administration practices, including those related to administrative staff and faculty employment, to enable positive outcomes for their programs. ■

When Rankings Go Too Far

Phil Baty

Phil Baty is editor of the Times Higher Education*'s World University Rankings. http://bit.ly/thewurTimes Higher Education. An earlier version of this article appears in* University World News *and is published here with permission. E-mail: Phil.Baty@tsleducation.com.*

When governments seek to identify the world's best universities, they increasingly rely on global university rankings. In Russia, Prime Minister Dmitry Medvedev recently signed an order awarding official recognition to degrees from 210 leading universities from 25 countries—determined in large part by their presence in the *Times Higher Education*'s World University Rankings. The thousands set to benefit from study-abroad scholarships under Russia's five-billion ruble (US$152 million) the Global Education program will also have to attend a top-ranked university.

A similar scholarship project in Brazil, the £1.3 billion (US$2 billion) Science without Borders program for 100,000 students, also draws heavily on the *Times Higher Education* and other rankings to select the host institutions. And in India this month, the government's Universities Grants Commission set out new rules to ensure that only 500 universities ranked by *Times Higher Education* or the Shanghai Academic Ranking of World Universities are allowed to run joint-degree or twinning courses with Indian partners. Such high-level official endorsement of *Times Higher Education*'s work is, of course, gratifying.

Times Higher Education's Approach

This magazine has published a global university ranking since 2004, but as the reach and influence of our work grew, we needed to work harder to produce research that could better bare the increasing weight that was being placed upon it. So in 2009, after a thorough review of our rankings work, we scrapped the system used for the previous five years and started again. We ripped up the overly simplistic model that had been hampering global rankings for years and changed the game.

First, we brought in a new expert data partner, Thomson Reuters. In concert with Thomson Reuters, with input from more than 50 leading figures from 15 countries across

every continent, and after 10 months of open debate and consultation—we developed a new rankings system for a new era of globalized higher education. Fortunately, the review produced the most balanced and comprehensive rankings system around.

Times Higher Education's global rankings are the only ones in the world to examine all core missions of the modern global research university—research, teaching, knowledge transfer, and international activity. They are the only rankings to fully reflect the unique subject mix of each and every institution across the full range of performance indicators and to take a proper account of excellence in the arts, humanities, and social sciences—so badly neglected by other rankings. They are the only global rankings to employ a rigorous, invitation-only survey of experienced, expert academics—with no volunteers and certainly no nominations from universities themselves.

Indeed, our work has attracted glowing praise from many quarters. I was particularly satisfied to read the words of a rankings skeptic—Daniel Lincoln, visiting scholar at the Center for International Higher Education at Boston College—who recently noted that "Baty and *THE* are well known for their integrity as well as their sincerity."

Times Higher Education's **global rankings are the only ones in the world to examine all core missions of the modern global research university—research, teaching, knowledge transfer, and international activity.**

Caveats

But a reputation for integrity must be earned and maintained through open and honest discussions about both the uses and the abuses of global rankings. All global university ranking tables are inherently crude, as they reduce universities and all their diverse missions and strengths to a single, composite score. Anyone who adheres too rigidly to rankings tables risks missing the many pockets of excellence in narrower subject areas not captured by institution-wide rankings or in areas of university performance that are simply not captured well by any ranking.

For example, all of the global rankings put the most emphasis on research evaluation, judged primarily through the examination of citations to research papers published in the leading international journals. This may not best serve the interests of emerging research institutions in developing nations, where research publication may be more of a national or regional activity, and it certainly does not serve those whose mission is focused on teaching.

One of the great strengths of global higher education is its extraordinarily rich diversity; and this can never be captured by any global ranking, which judges all institutions against a single set of criteria. In this context, a new declaration from a consortium of Latin American university rectors must be welcomed.

The declaration, agreed at a two-day conference at the National Autonomous University of Mexico, titled "Latin American Universities and the International Rankings: Impact, Scope and Limits," noted with concern that "a large proportion of decision makers and the public view these classification systems as offering an exhaustive and objective measure of the quality of the institutions." No university ranking can ever be exhaustive or objective.

The meeting, which drew together rectors and senior officials from 65 universities in 14 Latin American countries, issued a call to policymakers to "avoid using the results of the rankings as elements in evaluating the institution's performance, in designing higher education policy, in determining the amount of finance for institutions and in implementing incentives and rewards for institutions and academic personnel."

Responsibly and transparently compiled rankings can, of course, have a very useful role in allowing institutions to benchmark their performance and to help them plan their strategic direction. They can inform student choices and help faculty make career decisions. They can help governments to better understand some of the modern policy challenges of mass higher education in the knowledge economy and to compare the performance of their best research-led institutions to those of rival nations. And yes, they can play a role in helping governments to select potential partners for their home institutions and determine where to invest their scholarships.

But they can only play a helpful role if those of us who rank are honest about what rankings do not—and can never—capture, as much as what they can, and as long as we encourage users to dig deeper than the composite scores that can mask real excellence in specific fields or areas of performance.

Times Higher Education is working hard to expand the range of data that it releases and to allow more disaggregation of the ranking results and more nuanced analyses. Rankings can be a valuable tool for global higher education—but only if handled with care ■

Chinese National University Rankings

Liu Jin and Hong Shen

Liu Jin is a PhD candidate in the School of Education, at Huazhong University of Science and Technology, Wuhan, China. He is a visiting scholar at CIHE at Boston College. E-mail: liujinzju@gmail.com. Hong Shen is professor and vice dean of the School of Education, at Huazhong University of Science and Technology. E-mail: hongshen@mail.hust.edu.cn.

The Academic Ranking of World Universities, published initially by Shanghai Jiao Tong University in China, is well known in the field of international higher education. However, its influence in China—as well as that of *Times Higher Education* ranking, Webometrics ranking, and other world university rankings—cannot be compared to Chinese national university rankings' influence.

Each year, more than 9 million Chinese high school students attempt to enter universities, by taking the nationwide entrance exam (*Gaokao*). During this process, the Chinese national university rankings play the most essential role. Unlike America, in China, students find it almost impossible to transfer among universities once they have made a decision. Choosing a university means deciding one's life and future, which makes university selection one of the most significant events to millions of Chinese families. In this process, most families on the Chinese national rankings and world university rankings have a much smaller influence in China, because only few Chinese universities are on the world university ranking lists.

Four Major Rankings

In 1987, the Chinese Academy of Management Science released the first national university ranking. Before that, Chinese society did not care about the university rankings, because Chinese universities lacked competition. Since then, 17 influential national university rankings in China have occurred—among those, 7 have been suspended or disappeared. Each of the rankings declares itself to be nonprofit and that its core mission is to promote the development of higher education in China. However, some of them make a profit by selling ranking books or assisting universities with development plans. Currently, there are four influential national university rankings in China.

Netbig University Ranking. This ranking was developed in 1999 by the Chinese Netbig company, with the stated purpose of helping students' university selection process, which is consistent with the basic idea of the *US News & World Report* ranking, except for ranking index and weights. This index system includes 6 first-level indices (university prestige, academic resources, academic achievements, graduates' status and influences, faculty resources, and infrastructure) and 19 second-level indices, which are each given about a 2 percent to 15 percent weight.

Guangdong Institute of Science Management Ranking. This ranking was founded by Wu Shulian and includes comprehensive subrankings in dozens of categories, such as faculty efficiency and research efficiency. The mission of these comprehensive subrankings is to evaluate contributions of universities to society, by measuring their implementation of main functions. There are 2 first-level indices (students training and scientific research), 4 second-level indices (undergraduate training, graduate training, natural science research, and social science research), and 33 third-level indices (e.g., undergraduate employment rate); each of the three levels is given a different weight.

The method of Chinese national rankings is based on setting up a multidimensional index system, giving weight to each index, collecting data, and analyzing the results through metrics.

Chinese Alumni Network Ranking. This ranking was initiated by the Chinese Alumni Network, which aims to measure universities' academic potential and contributions to science. This is the first ranking that separates public universities from private universities. This ranking has 3 first-level indices (students' training, scientific research, and comprehensive prestige), 7 second-level indices (scientific research bases, research projects, scientific research, training base, teaching staff, outstanding alumni, and prestige), and 9 third-level indices (scientific innovation, basic research projects, major scientific research, outstanding talent, quality of faculty and academic levels, national reputation, alumni donations, and social prestige). In addition to the comprehensive rankings, this system includes some special classifications—such as, the Chinese University Ranking of Alumni Donation, the Chinese University Ranking of Alumni Fellowship, and the Chinese University Ranking of Nature & Science Papers.

Research Center for Chinese Science Evaluation Ranking. This ranking, designed by Qiu Junping and his team at Wuhan University, aims to evaluate the competitiveness of universities. The basic idea of the ranking is to divide the

university into three categories: (1) top public universities, (2) general public universities, and (3) private universities. Categories of universities are measured by different indicators, which means that this ranking holds a rather large indicator pool. For example, the ranking index of public top universities contains 4 first-level indicators (educational resources, the standard of teaching, scientific research, and university prestige), 13 second-level indicators (e.g., funding for education), and more than 50 third-level indicators (e.g., total campus area).

In addition to the above rankings, China also contains less-influential rankings. For instance, Renmin University focuses on the ranking of top universities. Chinese University Performance Report, published by the Chinese National Institute of Educational Sciences, is focused on the ratio between university input and output.

Methodology and Databases

The method of Chinese national rankings is based on setting up a multidimensional index system, giving weight to each index, collecting data, and analyzing the results through metrics. In spite of careful scrutiny and sophisticated calculations in each ranking, ordinary academic observers still believe that these rankings are a reflection of initiators' and executors' personal feelings, rather than rigorous scientific research.

Academic observers also question these rankings' data source. Among the four rankings above, two of them are published by companies, one is hosted by a university, and the other is released by a nonprofit organization. None of them are government agencies, which makes it difficult to obtain access to data. Mainly, in China, serious data are often owned by the government. For most rankings, a majority of data come from secondary sources, which include the Internet, newspapers, magazines, and books. To make matters worse, the information is often pieced together without a clear sense of dates. For instance, in the Guangdong Institutes of Science Management 2011 ranking, some data are from 2010, while others were collected in 2008 and 2009.

Conclusion

Chinese university rankings' existence is related to certain demands: Students require the need to make university choices, and universities must improve their rankings, in order to attract the most-qualified students and research funding. The publishers of rankings have the demand of making money.

Chinese national rankings have far-reaching influence and have promoted development of Chinese higher education. However, as more universities attempt to change for adjusting to ranking criteria, problems occur. For example, overestimating the index of research achievement has triggered a publishing boom of large-scale papers in recent years; universities that insist on not expanding the scale of enrollment find it difficult to keep a good place in Chinese university rankings; moreover, questions about the index system itself are increasing. ■

Full-Scale Branch Campuses in China

David A. Stanfield and Wang Qi

David A. Stanfield is a research assistant at the Boston College Center for International Higher Education and doctoral student in Boston College's Higher Education Administration program. E-mail: david.stanfield@bc.edu. Wang Qi is an assistant professor at the Graduate School of Education, Shanghai Jiao Tong University, China. E-mail: qimwang@sjtu.edu.cn.

Two full-scale British branch campuses currently operate in mainland China, and two prominent American institutions will soon open. With intentions to replicate the world-class education offered on their home campuses, these foreign outposts have generated considerable attention. China poses a variety of unique challenges that may hinder branch campuses from achieving this aim.

Characteristics of Full-Scale Branch Campuses

International branch campuses in China are unique, due to the Ministry of Education's stipulation that foreign institutions must form a legal partnership with a local Chinese university. Although approximately 20 international branch campuses exist in China, a majority are small niche institutions, offering one or two degree programs with small enrollments. In contrast, 4 branch campuses seek to offer a range of disciplines at the undergraduate and postgraduate levels that reflect the quality and experience of their home institutions. The University of Nottingham Ningbo China (UNN), the first full-scale branch campus in China, currently enrolls over 5,000 students and cooperates with the nonprofit Zhejiang Wanli Education Group. Xi'an Jiaotong-Liverpool University (XJTLU), with over 3,200 students, collaborates with Laureate, a prominent American for-profit education group. With campuses already well under construction, two notable American institutions—Duke Kunshan University (partnered with Wuhan University) and New York University (NYU) Shanghai (partnered with East China Normal University)—are slated to open full-scale operations in the near future.

Full-scale international branch campuses are established as independent entities and adopt the foreign partner's curriculum and organizational structure, although the Ministry of Education requires some modification in order to receive accreditation. For instance, institutions must offer a course on Chinese culture and abide by national admission guidelines. The liberal education offered by Western institutions is a new and welcome addition in a system that has struggled to cultivate critical thinking, innovation, and entrepreneurship. These international branch campuses also plan to engage in research production, by leveraging the strength of local university partners.

International branch campuses in China are unique, due to the Ministry of Education's stipulation that foreign institutions must form a legal partnership with a local Chinese university.

Future Potential: World-Class Education?

In *The Challenge of Establishing World-Class Universities,* Jamil Salmi proposes that world-class universities exhibit a concentration of talent, an abundance of resources, and appropriate governance. This is a useful framework to examine the potential for full-scale branch campuses in China to reproduce the educational experience of their home campuses.

Talent. World-class institutions require highly qualified students and faculty. Branch campuses rely on similar admissions standards to their home campuses, including college essays, high school transcripts, and in-person interviews; and in China, the national entrance exam (*Gaokao*) is also required. This array of admissions requirements will help branch campuses identify qualified applicants and maintain high standards; however, whether or not a sufficient number of qualified students will apply is uncertain. The ability of institutions to recruit top-tier applicants in their home countries cannot be assumed by the branches in China. The elite Chinese universities easily recruit top students, due to the perceived value of their degrees in the local job market. Furthermore, in a society that relies on personal networks, students believe top-tier public institutions will help build the relationships necessary to receive the highest paying and most sought after jobs. Despite the international prestige and recognition of the Western branch campus brands, students hoping to work in China will likely prefer a degree from an elite public university. Moreover, even though foreign outposts clearly state that degree requirements and course offerings mirror the home institution, students often perceive branches as inferior.

World-class universities also require highly qualified faculty and researchers. XJTLU and UNN recruit full-time, long-term faculty from their home campuses and internationally. Though, in practice, international branch campuses often struggle to recruit home-campus faculty—due to inflexible research and teaching obligations, the hassle of moving abroad, and incompatibilities with tenure and promotion systems. To attract top faculty, branch campuses must offer and highlight generous salary packages, supplemental research funds, and other nontangible benefits—such as the opportunity to work in a dynamic growing economy. One promising report indicated several professors and researchers from UNN, and XJTLU received competitive Chinese research grants.

Resources. Although full details are not available, financial models for branch campuses in China seem to be a mix of support from the local or provincial government, the Chinese university partner, private industry, and student tuition fees with less financial investment from the home campus. NYU Shanghai is rumored to have negotiated a range of financial support, requiring no investment from the home campus in New York City; whereas, the Duke Kunshan reports contributing several million dollars to the startup and planning expenses.

Although full details are not available, financial models for branch campuses in China seem to be a mix of support from the local or provincial government.

Tuition fees range broadly from 60,000 RMB to 132,500 RMB (US$9,500 to US$20,800) at UNN, XJTLU, and NYU Shanghai. UNN and XJTLU's fees are lower than in the United Kingdom, while NYU and the Duke Kunshan will reportedly charge similar tuition to the home campuses, in New York and North Carolina, and offer some financial aid and scholarships. When compared to the tuition fees of top-tier public universities, between 5,000 and 6,000 RMB (US$750 and US$950), parents and high school graduates will think twice before considering branch campuses. However, branch campuses are a reasonably priced alternative, compared to the increased cost of studying abroad. Yet, an increasing number of Chinese families can afford to send

their children overseas and, when given a choice, most will prefer the full experience of studying abroad.

Additional revenue sources such as intellectual property, corporate partnerships, and private donations from alumni and foundations are in their infancy in China and will take time to cultivate. Developing world-class education and research is expensive, and the ability of international branch campuses to secure adequate funding will be a significant challenge.

Governance. Western-style higher education relies on governance structures that promote autonomy, academic freedom, and free inquiry—standards that differ and may conflict with Chinese requirements and local partner expectations. For instance, the Ministry of Education requires that branch-campus presidents be Chinese nationals, who may not fully grasp Western education ideals and leadership styles. Moreover, despite the promise of autonomy on curricular matters, recent governmental concerns over quality assurance could lead to additional regulation. Perhaps most vital to the Western institutions, academic freedom cannot be guaranteed—due to local laws and cultural sensitivities. Legal arrangements and other outside pressures may prevent international branch campuses from creating the governance models necessary to reach world-class status.

Conclusion

Full-scale branch campuses in China hope to situate themselves in the top-tier of Chinese higher education institutions by providing Western-style education, attracting highly qualified students and faculty, and engaging in research production. While the Chinese system affords some potential advantages, numerous challenges will make the road to educational excellence an arduous journey. ■

The Study-Abroad Fever Among Chinese Students

Zha Qiang

Zha Qiang is an associate professor at the Faculty of Education, York University, Toronto, Canada. E-mail: qzha@edu.yorku.ca.

With respect to Chinese higher education, two phenomena have recently been widely discussed. One factor is that the age of Chinese students who choose to study abroad is increasingly becoming younger. Most Chinese students went abroad to study in graduate programs in the 1980s, then in undergraduate programs from the late 1990s, and now a rising proportion in high schools. It is estimated that high school students now account for half or even more of the Chinese students who choose to study abroad. Understandably, these high school students make this choice so that their access and transition to Western universities will be easier and smoother. The other notable phenomenon is the heightening call for improving and assuring the quality of higher education in China, evident in the emphasis laid in such milestone policy document as the *National Outline for Medium and Long Term Educational Reform and Development (2010–2020) (or 2020 Blueprint),* and most recently a national working conference on higher education quality control and assurance, held March 22–23, 2012 in Beijing. A discussion of these two phenomena together may shed some light on why more Chinese students choose to study abroad, even though access to higher education in China has been hugely expanded in recent years.

The Deteriorating Quality

While the world has been stunned by China's efficiency in moving to mass higher education on a short timeline, why are Chinese students increasingly drawn to studying abroad? Now the access to universities and colleges in China is much broader than 10 years ago. In the late 1990s, less than 10 percent of the 18–22 age cohort could attend postsecondary institutions. This figure rose to 26.5 percent in 2010. In urban areas, the higher education participation rate is actually much higher, with over 50 percent of high school leavers likely to attend universities and colleges, yet an increasing proportion of them now choose Western universities, instead. Overall, Chinese higher education enrollment grew at an annual rate of 46.2 percent between 1998 and 2010, while the volume of Chinese students studying abroad increased by over 25 percent annually in the same time span. The number of Chinese students studying in the United States increased by 80 percent from 1999 to 2009.

In 2011, the number of Chinese students who went to study abroad hit a record of 339,700. This figure is expected to rise to 550,000 to 600,000 by 2014. This group is also getting younger and younger in age. In last five years, the number of Chinese students attending private high schools in the United States grew by over 100 times, from 65 in 2006 to 6,725 in 2011. If this tendency continues, it may threaten student supply in Chinese higher education in the long run, combined with China's demographic change (a projected reduction of 40 million in the 18–22 age group in the population over the next decade). As an immediate consequence, Chinese students are now estimated to contribute over US$15 billion a year to the economies in their host countries (with US$4.6 billion going to the United States alone), equivalent to almost one half of China's total higher

education appropriations in 2008. More Chinese households are becoming well-off, yet this single factor would not be sufficient to explain the reasons behind an ever-growing study-abroad fever among Chinese students and parents. Indeed, there are few cases like China, where the domestic higher education supply and the study-abroad volume are growing dramatically side by side.

In the rapid massification process, Chinese higher education suffered a serious decline in quality, which might be another fundamental reason for the rising study-abroad fever. Ever-since the huge expansion of Chinese higher education enrollment started in 1999, concerns and criticism over deteriorating quality in teaching and learning have been heard. After 2005, the enrollment expansion slowed down considerably, while attention and resource were gradually shifted to addressing issues and problems, based on quality and equity. This process was fueled by the famous question raised by the influential veteran scientist, Qian Xuesheng: why have Chinese universities failed to engender innovative minds? Thus, with respect to higher education, the *2020 Blueprint*, officially unveiled in July 2010, placed a focus on aspects improving and assuring quality, aiming to nurture creativeness among Chinese students and create a batch of "world-class universities." The working conference on higher education quality explicitly announced a policy of stabilizing enrollment in Chinese universities (with future increases targeted at vocational education programs, professional graduate programs, as well as private institutions), while pressing for immediate actions to address the higher education quality issues.

Chinese higher education enrollment grew at an annual rate of 46.2 percent between 1998 and 2010, while the volume of Chinese students studying abroad increased by over 25 percent annually in the same time span.

Efforts to Improve Higher Education Quality

Just before this working conference, the Chinese government unveiled two more important policy documents signaling concrete efforts and more resources to be brought in for this endeavor. One is the *Higher Education Strategic Plan* (promulgated by the Ministry of Education, as an implementation plan for the relevant parts in the *2020 Blueprint* relating to higher education), which ranks assuring higher education quality as the top priority, through implementing a number of large scale projects organized around such tasks as university teacher and curricular development, gifted student creativity education, innovative professional program development, graduate program transformation, and the furtherance of Projects 985 and 211 that aim to create a batch of universities and disciplinary areas on Chinese soil with global competitiveness. The other policy document, namely *Opinions on Implementing the Program of Upgrading Innovative Capacity of Higher Education Institutions* (released jointly by the Ministry of Education and the Ministry of Finance), launched the Project 2011 (coded perhaps after Chinese leader Hu Jintao's remark at Tsinghua University's centennial ceremony in Spring 2011) that pushes for integrative collaborations among Chinese universities, between universities and research institutes, and industry, and regional development needs, for the sake of drawing on and advancing Chinese universities' innovative capacity—in light of nation developmental priorities and world-class standards. In a typical Chinese way, the government has put aside some funds to facilitate and support such integrations.

Will These Efforts Ease the Study-Abroad Fever?

These policies may serve, to a certain extent, to retain some Chinese students. Yet, these policies and programs are largely derived from a human capital vision, which sees higher education as the deliberate (and utilitarian in the sense of government instrumentalism) investment in exchange for global competitiveness (on the part of government) and social status (on the part of individuals). This vision envisages Chinese universities as the government's educational and research arm for national development, and articulates knowledge production and transmission closely with a national development agenda. With massification of the Chinese system, this articulation demonstrates a vertical differentiation. Now on a steep hierarchical structure, the top echelon universities are handsomely supported by the government, in exchange for their knowledge and student output to secure China's continuing success in a knowledge-based economy, while a majority of low-tier

In the rapid massification process, Chinese higher education suffered a serious decline in quality, which might be another fundamental reason for the rising study-abroad fever.

institutions are left to survive on market forces. This approach, in turn, intensifies the tensions and competitions existing in contemporary Chinese society, where a kind of social Darwinism that stresses struggling for existence and the survival of the fittest has taken over and tends to dominating social life. University credentials are crucial to individuals in terms of gaining a competitive edge. If one fails to get access to an upper-tier university, one may risk losing the competition at the starting point. Naturally, when financial conditions permit, one would turn to the opportunity of studying abroad as an alternative strategy, believing an international degree would help raise one's competitiveness. More recently, Chinese students start to be drawn to universities in Hong Kong, where the number of mainland undergraduate students registered a 129-fold increase over the last decade, from 36 in 1997 to 4,638 in 2010. Arguably, universities in Hong Kong take advantage of their liberal learning environment and international faculty.

Essentially, higher education plays a role not only in building human capital, but also in broadening human capability. Unless Chinese higher education provides an environment in which students are enabled to develop their full potential and lead productive and creative lives in accord with their own needs and interests, there will always be many who seek an escape from the ever-growing tensions and competitions. An increasing number of people now seem on their way to such an escape. With the growing size of this group, brain drain remains an issue for China, despite its economic success. Since China opened its door to the world in 1978, close to 2.3 million Chinese students and scholars went to study abroad. As of the end of 2011, over 1.4 million remained abroad. ■

University credentials are crucial to individuals in terms of gaining a competitive edge.

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

Internationalization of Academic Labor: Considering Postdocs

BRENDAN CANTWELL

Brendan Cantwell is assistant professor of higher, adult, and lifelong learning at Michigan State University, East Lansing, MI. E-mail: brendanc@msu.edu.

The Internationalization of academic staff has occurred more slowly than other aspects of internationalization in higher education. In most countries, substantial majorities of all academics are nationals, and significant barriers remain in establishing cross-national academic careers. Internationalization of the postdoctorate, however, may be a sign of growing cross-border mobility of academic labor, at least at early career stages. Currently, large numbers of early career scientists and scholars cross borders to take postdoctoral positions outside of their country of citizenship or permanent residence. Yet, postdoc mobility does not demonstrate a "flattening" of the global academic labor market. This movement is almost exclusively South to North and East to West. In assessing postdoc internationalization, it is important to consider the factors that are driving this phenomenon as well as its implications.

Defining Postdoctoral Internationalization

The postdoctorate is heterogeneous across academic disciplines, countries, and individual institutions. Nevertheless, it is possible to make some generalizations. Postdocs are typically early-career scholars, who are employed on fixed-term contracts subsequent to completing a terminal degree. Postdocs are primarily devoted to research and can be understood as advanced trainees in the final stages of preparation for an academic career. However, it is possible to overemphasize the training aspect of postdoctoral work. Postdocs are the front line of academic labor and make substantial contributions to the research enterprise.

An international postdoc is an early-career academic working outside of her or his country of citizenship or permanent residence. International postdocs typically require work visa as a condition of employment, with the exception of intra–European Union postdoc mobility. Increased internationalization of the postdoc has occurred in many Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development countries, but perhaps most prominently in the United States, where a majority of the nearly 60,000 postdocs working there are temporary visa holders.

Explaining Postdoc Internationalization

One factor driving internationalization of the postdoctorate is globalization of science. Internet-mediated scientific communication and broader access to journals online has led to a wider diffusion of scientific knowledge. Increasingly, students from research universities in many countries graduate, with comparable levels of base knowledge and technical capabilities. The rapid expansion and development of higher education in many countries, and most notably in China, have dramatically increased the pool of potential postdocs worldwide. Additionally, significant asymmetries remain in resources to support research. Simply put, more opportunities exist for postdoctoral work in western Europe and North America, and qualified graduates from around the world compete for these jobs.

The rapid expansion and development of higher education in many countries, and most notably in China, have dramatically increased the pool of potential postdocs worldwide.

Another factor, likely contributing to internationalization of the postdoctorate, is the growing value of international experience in academic careers. Studying and working abroad is now seen as an important component to intellectual and professional development in academic work. International mobility at the early career stage may be highly valued, because international work presumably singles "world-class" knowledge and skills. This is especially true in Europe where mobility is highly encouraged at the early career stage. The United States, where junior academics are not generally encouraged to work abroad, remains an exception to the growing mobility norm.

Professors and lead investigators are also keen to compete globally. Hiring the "best and brightest" postdocs for a research project now implies drawing from a global labor market. Professors in Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development countries regularly recruit postdocs on a global basis. Few early career academics from these countries work as postdocs in developing countries.

Many higher education systems around the world are experiencing an ongoing shift from direct state support to quasi-market funding models. Examples include financing schemes based on research productivity, excellence initiatives, as well as other competitive funding mechanisms, which are growing relative to (sometimes declining) block-grant support. The relative short-time horizons and uncertainty of these funding models are more conducive for hiring temporary staff like postdocs than permanent academics. Moreover, worldwide there seem to be more terminally trained academics than permanent jobs are available. Many early career researchers complete a series of postdocs, not because they wish to but since these are the only opportunities available to them in the market for academic jobs.

Reforms to national immigration policies may also explain, in part, growing internationalization of the postdoctorate. Many Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development countries have refocused their immigration laws to reflect a priority of attracting highly skilled workers as visitors and immigrants. In some cases, this means that legal barriers to hiring international academic staff have been lowered. Member countries of the European Union have formed a single labor market. Countries including Australia and Canada prioritize individuals with advanced qualifications, when issuing work visas. Even policy in the United States, which has been viewed as hostile to immigrant workers in recent years, makes a special exemption for universities.

Immigration policies that favor skilled migrants appear to be an incentive for some early career academics to seek a postdoc aboard. Some early career academics, especially from developing countries, see working as a postdoc in an Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development country as first step toward longer-term migration. European scholars who work as postdocs in North America or another European country also sometimes immigrate. Most often, these cases likely reflect "accidental" migration, which occurs as a result of chance and opportunity rather than an original strategy to emigrate. While assessing academic mobility and migration in zero-sum terms is probably too simplistic, it is clear that the United States is the greatest net beneficiary of the international flow of talent.

Opportunities and Challenges

Internationalization of the postdoctorate presents an important opportunity for higher education worldwide. Transnational mobility of early career academics can promote the exchange of ideas, diffusion of knowledge, and cross-cultural and cross-national understanding. All of this is desirable itself and could lead indirectly to other positive outcomes—such as, research that is more responsive to scientific and societal problems that are salient to more regions of the world.

Some serious challenges relate to postdoc internationalization. While no comprehensive global data exist on postdoc flows, it is evident there is no parity in these flows. Asymmetrical flows of early career academics may contribute to a brain drain. Moreover, while international mobility for early career academics can be good, it is possible to have

too much of a good thing. Academics who move across borders from one postdoc to the next run the risk of becoming "perpetual postdocs." This might conform to contemporary ideals of academic research occurring in flexible, project, and problem-oriented teams and networks, but it is not a model especially well-suited for the development of a stable academic career. Finally, a real concern is based on international postdoc exploitation. My own research into the experiences of international postdocs working in American and British universities found that these individuals are too-often overworked and undersupported.

Conclusion

The postdoc may be a leading indicator of a trend toward the internationalization of academic staff. Policymakers, institutional leaders, and higher education researchers will continue to assess postdoc mobility, as well as the mobility of other academic staff. Thus, they will surely attend to the virtues of cross-border academic work. Clearly, an important issue is the extent to which current and future patterns of academic mobility reproduce global asymmetries, as well as to the outcomes of individual international postdocs. ■

Gender and International Research Cooperation

Agnete Vabø

Agnete Vabø is deputy head of research at the Nordic Institute for Studies in Education, Innovation and Science, Oslo, Norway. E-mail: agnete@nifu.no.

The internationalization of higher education and research is becoming increasingly essential, as higher education becomes an industry in which institutions and countries compete for the best brains, exchange students, and collaborate on research. International activity is also increasingly important for the enhancement of individuals' academic careers.

A survey conducted in 2008 within the framework of the international research project, the Changing Academic Profession study, reveals that a much lower share of American academics and United States–based female academics, in particular, reported research collaboration with international colleagues. Given the increasing influence of international collaboration and competition in science and, not at least, efforts of internationalization undertaken in other regions such as the European Research Area, this pattern is striking.

In the United States, only 28 percent of female academics and 37 percent of male academics (of all ranks) report research collaborations with international colleagues. In contrast, in the United Kingdom 69 percent of male and 53 percent of female academics report such collaboration; in Germany, the proportions are 52 percent for men and 43 percent for women academics.

The highest levels of female participation are found in Australia, Canada, the Netherlands, Finland, Italy, Norway, Portugal, and the United Kingdom. In Latin America—Argentina, Brazil, and Mexico—less than 50 percent of both men and women report taking part in such collaborations.

To a certain extent, these gender variations reflect well-established differences that exist between various fields of science, based on modes of international cooperation and publication.

Gender and Internationalization

To a certain extent, these gender variations reflect well-established differences that exist between various fields of science, based on modes of international cooperation and publication. Science, technology, engineering, and mathematics disciplines are characterized by more international collaboration and publication than the soft or feminized subjects in the humanities and social sciences.

The Changing Academic Profession's data, nevertheless, suggest that some of these barriers are also related to marital status, spouses' employment, and parental status. It is found that female academics with partners, who are employed full time and with children, are less likely to take part in international research collaboration than male academics (with or without children) and are also less likely to do so than single female academics without children.

The long hours and extensive travel abroad often required by an international career may make it incompatible with the traditional divisions of labor between men and women and may help explain why women academics are more active in internationalization at home. The international career path seems to be a less legitimate option for many women. The Changing Academic Profession's data also reveal that more academic women are single, compared to men.

Importing and Exporting Knowledge

Academics have always been international in the sense of knowledge sharing—via publications, conference attendance, and through sojourns at academic milieus abroad. As is also revealed in the Changing Academic Profession study, academics are often involved in internationalization at home, in teaching foreign students and offering international study programs.

As a large nation with a well-developed academic system, containing many excellent research institutions, across most disciplines and research areas, the United States naturally serves a serious role as an importer of academics and students, rather than as a exporter. Given the range and number of prestigious institutions in North America, international activities are not viewed as being as critical as they often are in European countries, particularly smaller ones. Furthermore, mobility between North American institutions is part of the traditional career dynamic for American faculty. In contrast to many European countries, in the United States it is generally accepted that one should not apply for a first position at the same institution where one has earned a PhD.

Barriers to International Mobility

The factors that contribute to the traditional gender roles found in countries also interact with some of the distinctive features of the academic career structures in various countries. Some academic systems are gender segregated, along education-oriented and research-oriented tracks—for example, in Mexico, which has a low proportion of women at the PhD level. In countries with competitive tenure-track systems, like in the United States, it may be particularly risky for women academics to go abroad rather than continue making a name for themselves at home.

The tenure-track system has been argued to hinder international mobility among US academic staff, in general. Academic careers are also characterized by the extensive use of temporary positions. This means that a great deal of importance rests on key stages of an academic career in America, to determine if one can make a name for oneself institutionally—as a researcher, lecturer or supervisor. Consequently, staying abroad is often risky, especially for women, as it could mean losing visibility or dropping out from the national competition for prestige and tenure.

One should not underestimate the extent to which such features limit the realizations of international collaboration and hinder possibilities to profit from such networks and cooperation. More internationalization could not only broaden the basis for collaborating, with excellent academic milieus in other countries and milieus with complementary expertise and data, but could also lead to further funding opportunities. ■

Harmonization and Tuning: Integrating African Higher Education

Karola Hahn and Damtew Teferra

Karola Hahn is managing director of the Ethiopian Institute of Architecture, Building Construction and City Development, Addis Ababa University, Ethiopia. E-mail: karola.hahn@eiabc.edu.et. Damtew Teferra is founding director of the International Network for Higher Education in Africa, Boston College. E-mail: teferra@bc.edu. Both are members of the Steering Committee of the Tuning Africa initiative. Opinions in this article do not necessarily reflect the views of the Steering Committee or other organizations mentioned here.

The harmonization of higher education in Africa is a multidimensional process that promotes the integration of higher education in the region. This objective is to achieve collaboration across borders, subregionally and regionally—in curriculum development, educational standards, and quality assurance, joint structural convergence, and consistency of systems, as well as compatibility, recognition, and transferability of degrees to facilitate mobility.

The African Union Commission promotes this process for African higher education. The European Commission supports these efforts through the Africa-European Union Strategic Partnership including the Africa-European Union Migration, Mobility and Employment Partnership and the Joint Africa-European Union Strategy Action Plan. Various initiatives to foster harmonization have been launched in the last three decades—the most prominent, including the Arusha convention (1981) and the SADC Protocol on Education and Training (1997). The convention that is being revised will serve as the legal framework for the harmonization of higher education in Africa.

Tuning: Pioneering Initiatives

Tuning is a complex methodology to improve teaching, learning, and assessment in higher education reform. It guides the development of curriculum, a credit accumulation mechanism, and transfer system—so as to obtain intended learning outcomes, skills, and competences. One of its objectives is to ensure consensus of academics across borders on a set of reference points for generic and subject-specific competences, alongside subject lines.

Tuning as a tool has been developed in Europe following the Bologna process. So far, tuning projects have been completed in over 60 countries around the world—including Europe, Latin America, Russia, and the United States. Projects have recently started in Australia, India, and Chi-

na. More than 1,000 universities, ministries, agencies, and other bodies have been involved in such projects. Tuning Africa is part of this larger initiative, to help harmonize and reform higher education in the region.

Tools of Integration

The importance of tuning as a tool to implement harmonization of higher education in Africa has been first discussed at a political level. The European Union commissioned a feasibility study in 2010, to explore its potential, relevance, and timeliness. Following the study and a broad consultation, the tuning approach has been started in a pilot project. Unlike many top-down initiatives, the tuning process in Africa began in a dual mode of interaction, combining top-down (first) and bottom-up (later) approaches.

In a Validation Workshop held in Nairobi in March 2011, five priority areas were identified for the pilot project—including agricultural sciences, civil and mechanical engineering, medicine, and teacher education—that will be coordinated across the five regions.

The Pilot Project

A call for participation in the "Harmonization and Tuning African Higher Educa-tion" was launched in October 2011. In November 2011, a selection workshop was held in Dakar, followed by an international conference on "Tuning, Credits, Learning Outcomes and Quality: A Contribution to Harmonisation and the Space for Higher Education in Africa," attended by stakeholders—including the African Union Commission, the European Commission, the Association of African Universities, the Conseil Africain et Malgache pour l'Enseignement Supérieur, the Inter-University Council for East Africa, the Council on Higher Education (South Africa), the African Council for Distance Education, national quality-assurance agencies such as the South African Qualifications Authority, and national ministries.

The selection workshop screened 96 applications. As not all short-listed universities were finally selected, further efforts of recruitment are being made to reach 60—the designated number of potential participants for the pilot phase.

Outstanding Issues

Ownership, inclusiveness, and leadership. Initially, the tuning Africa initiative was promoted by political convictions of regional integration, mobility, and harmonization. At the launch of the initiative, concerns were raised about ownership, inclusiveness, leadership, and strategy. In a direct response, it was agreed to start the initiative with a feasibility study.

As the tuning process needs to involve numerous and diverse stakeholders—such as administrators, ministries, higher education and quality-assurance agencies, policymakers, employers, the public sector, students, regional bodies, intermediary actors, and university associations—a continuous consultation over a reasonable period of time has been advised.

The initiative is now ushering into a new phase, where the African Association of Universities is identified as implementing agency under the guidance of the African Union Commission. In this phase, it is expected that the association would engage African universities in a consultative, transparent, and effective way by facilitating and ensuring their full leadership and ownership of the dialogue.

Coherence, consistency and dissemination. The prevalent plans contain a plethora of national and regional quality assurance, accreditation, qualification frameworks, credit accumulation and credit transfer systems, and curricula reforms. In addition, it needs to be ensured that these efforts are effectively integrated and synchronized, to create coherence and consistency.

Tuning still remains a new lexicon in the African higher education landscape. In the tuning Africa pilot project, only 60 universities are involved; and this comprises a small critical mass of champion universities, along with supporting political and intermediary bodies. Therefore, an appropriate dissemination strategy to popularize the initiative is imperative.

The prevalent plans contain a plethora of national and regional quality assurance, accreditation, qualification frameworks, credit accumulation and credit transfer systems, and curricula reforms.

Resources. Implementing harmonization and tuning requires resources. As most African universities experience chronic financial constraints, the provision of resources still must be negotiated by numerous constituencies. The success of the initiative may also be hampered by the disparate institutional infrastructure and the weak human resources base, in many institutions.

Outcome-oriented learning: Issue of viability. The successful implementation of a paradigm shift from input-oriented teaching to outcome-oriented learning—with all its associated implications to competence assessment and quality assurance—remains a key challenge to tuning Africa. The rapid massification of higher education, meager and overstretched resources, poor management and leadership, underqualified staff, and underprepared students will pose

imminent threat to its success. Therefore, appropriate, contextualized, and realistic approaches need to be put in place, for the tuning Africa pilot project to succeed.

Distance education has an important role in expanding access to higher education and training in Africa. Thus, the pilot project is pioneering in integrating distance education into the mainstream. This component has never been tested in a tuning project, so far.

Conclusion

The tuning higher education in Africa pilot project is expected to be a consultative process that will foster discourse at a grassroots level across borders, through a number of regional seminars and conferences. These will provide the platform of dialogue for quality assurance, improvement of teaching and learning, and assessment. As the dialogue on credits and a common credit system is one of the central pillars of the tuning approach, the pilot project might also advance the discourse toward an African credit system.

The success of the pilot project will depend on the involvement of a critical mass of universities and stakeholders, sustained resources, well-organized dissemination, as well as transparent and credible leadership. The direct linkage and integration of the tuning pilot project into existing quality-assurance initiatives—including regional and national qualification frameworks—are expected to contribute to a sustainable, institutionalized, and harmonized reform. ■

Growth of Information and Communications Technology at African Universities

Sarah Hoosen and Neil Butcher

Sarah Hoosen is a researcher and project manager who has evaluated several projects and conducted research in the area of education and technology. Neil Butcher is managing the Partnership for Higher Education in Africa's Educational Technology Initiative, on behalf of the South African Institute for Distance Education. E-mail: neilshel@nba.co.za.

Across Africa, access to information and communications technology (ICT) continues to improve, as the costs of telecommunications and access devices are declining rapidly. National, regional, and continental bodies recognize the critical role that ICT can play in higher education, on the continent. Many countries are focused on developing national ICT policies and infrastructure plans to support their socioeconomic development efforts and ramifications in African higher education institutions.

Significant work has been carried out at the institutional level—by institutions and also through donor-funded projects. Established in 2008, the Partnership for Higher Education, Educational Technology Initiative aims to support ICT integration in African universities. Teaching and learning initiatives are supported that integrate use of technology and promoting collaborative knowledge creation and dissemination. The policy also focuses on initiating and sustaining effective educational technology projects on the nature and quality of the student-learning experience and outcomes. Seven institutions from six countries are participating: Makerere University in Uganda, the University of Dar es Salaam in Tanzania, the Universities of Ibadan and Jos in Nigeria, Kenyatta University in Kenya, Universidade Católica de Moçambique in Mozambique, and the University of Education, Winneba in Ghana. The experiences of managing this project provide an illustration of ICT development at African universities.

A major constraint on integrating ICT into teaching and learning activities is the lack of institutionalized incentives for academic staff to engage with educational technology.

Enhancing Teaching and Learning

In African higher education, ICT has been used to tackle teaching and learning challenges faced in traditional teacher-led lecture rooms—including large classes, multilingualism, development of literacies, and bridging the chasm between theory and practice. The University of Ibadan embarked on a development project aimed at building university staff capacity to develop and/or source digital content and make an effective use of this source for teaching and learning. Makerere University has been engaged in developing e-content for courses and has initiated an e-portfolios project that seeks to introduce electronic portfolios into assessment.

In addition, African universities are increasingly using learning management systems of online, blended, and Web facilitated studying. Thus, analysis demonstrated that investment in learning management systems, including development of the capacity of staff and students to use

them effectively and efficiently, is key to the effectiveness of e-learning and blended learning. However, the audit highlighted several gaps in capacity at participating institutions: shortage of people with technical skills to maintain ICT systems; limited numbers of people with experience in using technology for educational purposes; heavy reliance on content-driven, top-down educational methodologies among academic staff; limited experience in project planning; and so on. To mitigate this, the project included a series of ongoing capacity-building exercises, with changing focus as needs change. Initial capacity-building activities were quite introductory but moved to more advanced ones—such as, developing simulations, animations, and video materials, as well as placing a much stronger emphasis on quality improvement. Nevertheless, a central challenge of ensuring quality remains as there are often no robust quality-assurance/improvement frameworks in place for e-learning at African universities. Perhaps one way of improving quality is through peer networking.

The paucity of ICT infrastructure remains a major barrier to deployment of technology for educational purposes.

Other Challenges

A major constraint on integrating ICT into teaching and learning activities is the lack of institutionalized incentives for academic staff to engage with educational technology—or even to produce better learning experiences for students—as academics are primarily rewarded on the basis of research publication. Furthermore, despite the emphasis on publications and the highlight of documenting educational technology initiatives, research has not gained much traction in that sector. The project has illustrated the paucity of capacity to undertake effective academic research in e-learning in many African universities. This challenge may be due to personnel not having much research experience, research not being given priority in relation to other job demands, or insufficient interest in implementing the research program originally envisaged in the project. Efforts, thus, need to be made to develop research capacity in e-learning, by providing support and also by freeing up time for academics to undertake research.

The paucity of ICT infrastructure remains a major barrier to deployment of technology for educational purposes. Basic problems, such as limited bandwidth and intermittent electricity, place significant limitations on the potential for growth of e-learning at affected universities, which often disrupts development work, research, and other relevant activities. Nevertheless, some improvement seems under way, particularly in the growth of connectivity in east and southern Africa, following successful deployment of undersea cables. Furthermore, growing evidence of successful ICT use in higher education in Africa is promising, and will hopefully invigorate governments, international partners, and institutions themselves—to continue investment and focus on ICT use in higher education. ■

How Post-Soviet Russian Academia Struggles with the Past

Gregory Androushchak and Maria Yudkevich

Gregory Androushchak is adviser to the rector, at the National Research University–Higher School of Economics. E-mail: gandroushchak@gmail.com. Maria Yudkevich is vice-rector, at the National Research University–Higher School of Economics. E-mail: yudkevich@hse.ru.

Why are faculty contracts and practices in post-Soviet universities (even including research ones) focused on teaching and omit the research part of faculty life? While the historical aspects that caused such a focus are no longer valid, these contracts are now supported by a deeply rooted funding model—based on the existence of all public universities in Russia. This example is interrelated with socioeconomic institutions that emerged during recent years. Thus, a policy to move toward more-effective contract practices will create a substantial challenge for the higher education system in Russia, which, however, is the only way to improve the overall performance of Russian universities.

How The Past Planning Legacy Affects Today's Life

For many decades, Soviet universities were funded on the key principle of the Soviet economy—that is, the plan. The central planning agency (the Gosplan) published an insight of what the economy should produce to compete for leadership in all of the conceivable areas; and the ministries estimated the number of employees needed by occupation and qualification. The latter principle was used to calculate the number of students in various educational institutions, including vocational schools—institutions of secondary professional training, somewhat similar to the US two-year colleges and universities.

Although the Soviet system has long gone, the former approach has been used until recently in many post-Soviet countries—except for the Gosplan's central planning agency being replaced by the "perspective needs for high-qualified personnel," which the university sector has to fulfill. In these circumstances, the nature of student admissions by the academic merit in the Soviet times was mainly what the comrades and observers in the West should believe in—rather than what was really occurring. Experienced former university officials provide quite conclusive evidence that the admissions system was cynically designed just to cut off the necessary number of university applicants, rather than to compete for the best. That competition did not enter the funding formula, in any way; the most important criterion for public funding was just the head count. Moreover, universities that do not admit as many applicants, as planned for them, face cuts of publicly funded places in subsequent years, resulting in reductions of their prospective funding.

Since 1992, universities were allowed to teach students above the publicly funded student body. Naturally, the former had to pay. However, the quest for higher education was so high among Russian youths that their only goal was to enter a university, rather than to seek for good education in a desired field. That meant that competition for students did not work at all in the Soviet space, in the way it does in many countries.

Why are faculty contracts and practices in post-Soviet universities (even including research ones) focused on teaching and omit the research part of faculty life?

Thus, universities lost incentives to attract and employ the best possible faculty. Primarily, due to lack of incentives to sustain and improve teaching quality, the economic turmoil of the 1990s was exacerbated by lack of financial resources received from the country for each student.

Getting Even Worse?

The end of the 1990s brought about yet another disaster onto Russian universities. The economic crises of 1991 to 1993 and 1998 virtually destroyed the economy, leaving most of the employment opportunities in oil and gas extraction and retail. However, given the clumsy planning of public funding for disciplines, universities still thought they should focus on educating engineers. Therefore, when searching real jobs, most graduates found few opportunities to apply for work based on what they had been taught. Thus, many students, especially in large cities, meeting no match between their studies and jobs became demotivated. This situation has developed an amazing impotence of the universities, which could not compete either for students or faculty. In the late 1930s, faculty were spared the research function held by the Academy of Sciences.

Hence, many universities primarily become educational entities, built around teaching and learning processes. Thus, faculty contracts explicitly describe teaching loads and obligations. At the same time, the professoriate in general has little incentives and opportunities to actively involve in research: research is poorly rewarded and teaching loads are heavy.

Overall, public-funding mechanisms play a decisive impact on most of the spheres of university life—including faculty contracts and research and teaching outcomes.

While little room is left for science, research productivity—such as, publications, participation in conferences, etc.—per faculty is considered of great importance for assessing the performance of individual faculty and of whole universities. However, the procedure of internal publications (published by departments or universities, without any peer review) is useless as a means of external evaluation of research quality and performance of faculty.

The absence of mechanisms for external evaluation of faculty performance has reduced academic mobility. Faculty became closely tied to their universities and chose to make university-specific investments, which would have little relevance in other places. During the initial stages of their academic careers, faculty focus on producing publications and after acquiring academic credentials turn to securing administrative positions, which both guarantee higher salaries and a certain degree of employment security. As a result, most universities are governed by internal hierarchical bureaucracy, with the academic community playing a minor role in the decision making.

What Could Be Done?

Overall, public-funding mechanisms play a decisive impact on most of the spheres of university life—including faculty contracts and research and teaching outcomes. Hopefully, during the next few years, the situation of university competition will improve, for which there are already positive

signs and premises. First, evidence exists of saturation of the market of higher education. In 2008, the proportion of high school graduates entering universities in Russia reached about 80 percent. The demand shifts from merely entering any university, to entering a particular university and a field of studies. Such conscious applicants constitute no less than a quarter of high school graduates. Second, Russia is witnessing a tremendous decrease of the 17–18-year-old population, which is the primary source of university applicants. Finally, what is really important, the contraction of the number of perspective students is a faster prospect than that of the publicly funded places at the universities. That characteristic forces universities to compete for students.

The wisest university leaders have already identified the challenge and develop marketing strategies that point out advantages of their programs to students—mainly, the quality of faculty and provided education, overall. To improve quality, universities need proper conditions—both monetary and nonmonetary ones—to attract productive and dedicated faculty to universities and to restore the academic environment.

How can that be done? First, the Gosplan central planning agency system of university admissions should be reformed. Government money should follow students but should not be distributed without respect to university quality. Second, research functions at strong universities should be restored. During the recent years, the Russian Ministry of Education and Science has launched a number of competitive grant programs for universities—supporting basic science, developing collaboration with industry, and other sectors. Third, the academic system should somehow be shaken up by taking steps to full-fledged participation in the international academic market and engaging in international faculty recruiting.

Nevertheless, faculty contracts are the key element for success. While the current contracts in many post-Soviet countries still reflect the old legacy, given the need for upgrading, prerequisites and signs of improvement are under way. ■

Poland's System: Contraction and Implications

MAREK KWIEK

Marek Kwiek is professor and director, at the Center for Public Policy Studies, Poznan University, Poznan, Poland. E-mail: kwiekm@amu.edu.pl.

In the near future, the decline of enrollment levels in Poland is expected to be the highest drop in Europe. There are two Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development scenarios for Poland. First, enrollments in 2025 are expected to fall to 55 percent of the 2005 levels or dwindle by almost a million students (947,000). Or, second, based on trends, they are expected to fall to 65 percent of the 2005 levels or decline to almost 800,000 students (775,000). In none of the other European systems will demographic shifts lead to shrinking student populations to a comparable degree. The decrease in student numbers is expected to fall from 1.82 million (2010), to 1.52 million (2015), to 1.25 million (2020).

The reduction in Poland will affect both the public and private sectors and, chiefly, fee-based studies—should the public sector remain to be tax based. Tax-supported student places are today available only to full-time students in the public sector, while part-timers do pay fees. The private sector, offering only fee-based vacancies, is expected to be affected more severely by changing demographics, than the public sector.

Thus, the major factors of change are the number of declines in the public sector and/or the introduction (or its lack) of fees in that sector. If fees are not introduced, enrollments in full-time programs in the public sector will remain at current levels—in 2020 about 850,000 students, as in 2010. If fees are introduced, student numbers will decrease in both public and private sectors and both modes of studies (full time, part time)—about 550,000 students in full-time programs in the public sector, in 2020. If fees are not introduced and the public sector expands, enrollments in full-time programs in the public sector will increase in 2020—e.g., to 1 million students. If the number of vacancies increases merely by 2 percent every year between 2011 and 2020, the public sector will be offering more than 1 million vacancies by the end of the decade, and these are students' "first-choice vacancies" in a possibly expanding public sector. Consequently, in Poland's first scenario, the private sector in 2020 can expect about 250,000 students, in the second about 450,000 students, and in the third only about 100,000. In 2010, it enrolled 580,000 students.

Implications for the Private Sector

Policy implications are surprising: In fact, Poland has the biggest private higher education sector in Europe (31.8% of students in a system of 1.82 million in both sectors in 2010) and is heavily dependent in its survival on the introduction of universal fees in its competing public sector. If universal fees are not introduced, the private sector will be heavily reduced in size, by 60 percent or more; if fees are introduced, enrollments will still drop to about 75 percent of current levels. Thus, the introduction of universal fees in the public sector is the most effective survival strategy of the private sector in the years to come. Individual private institutions' strategies count much less than macrolevel changes in funding mechanisms for public institutions. Maintaining the tax-based public sector under declining demographics in the next decade means a disaster to the private sector, unless there are mergers between public and private institutions. Opening to international students is important but does not change the picture radically (in 2010, the share of international students was below 1%). Following intensive public discussions between policymakers and the academic community in 2008–2010, the new law of March 2011 has not introduced universal fees, though.

In none of the other European systems will demographic shifts lead to shrinking student populations to a comparable degree.

The Role of Politics

While demographic factors for the next decade in Poland are well defined, political factors are not ascertained. The latter depend largely on policy choices to be made in the next few years. One policy stance (known from the political economy of reforms) is to leave things as they are—that is, not to introduce universal fees. The new law on higher education in the area of fees leaves things as they are. A less obvious and much more contestable policy stance is to intervene, especially through changing funding arrangements.

Possible policy interventions defending the private sector, based on declining demographics, are either in the private sector only (public subsidization of teaching, for full-time students only: about 110,000 in 2010 or 17% of all private sector students), or in the public sector only (introduction of universal fees), or in both sectors (the combination of both policy interventions). What seems theoretically possible—the idea of fees for all to be introduced in the public sector, supported strongly by the Polish Rectors' Conference—may be politically complicated; lobbying for one or both of the two policy interventions is currently in progress and is expected to continue. Given the stability of demographic factors, the unpredictable political factors are therefore extremely important for the future of the higher education system as a whole.

Long-Term Decline

Polish private higher education is exceptional from a global perspective. A gradual decline constitutes in the share of enrollments and, at the same time, a gradual decline in its absolute enrollments. It is expected to have fewer students every year in the next decade. A higher education system that currently includes 325 private institutions, with almost 600,000 students (2010), faces an enormous challenge: to develop fair public policy for the contraction era. In post-communist Europe short-term declines in enrollments in the private sector did occur in the last decade, but the Polish case is clearly different.

Contrary to other countries in central and eastern Europe, the current and projected contraction in Poland is long-term rather than limited in duration. It will affect both public and private sectors, and the major political factor relevant for the future public-private intersectoral dynamics will be the introduction (or its lack) of universal fees in the public sector. It is unclear when Poland will be politically prepared for the new realities and to what extent the survival problem of the private sector for 2011–2020 will become a major policy problem. The introduction of fees may also be politically difficult in the current climate of the economic crisis. So far, both the public and academic awareness of the looming demographic crisis in higher education—rather than merely in pensions and health-care systems—is minimal. The demographic parameter is bound to be a major one in a new public policy necessary for the contraction era. ■

If universal fees are not introduced, the private sector will be heavily reduced in size, by 60 percent or more.

Crisis in the Dutch Universities of Applied Sciences

HANS DE WIT

Hans de Wit is professor of internationalization of higher education, at the Amsterdam University of Applied Sciences in the Netherlands, and director of the Centre for Higher Education Internationalisation at the Università Cattolica Sacro Cuore in Milan, Italy. E-mail: j.w.m.de.wit@hva.nl.

Universities of applied sciences in the Netherlands are facing severe criticism from media and politicians, about their performance. In 2010, the InHolland University of Applied Sciences, one of the larger universities of applied sciences, was confronted with scandals about bachelor's degrees in media and entertainment management—given to students who were allowed to pass without proper qualifications, as to increase the graduation rate. Also, the governing board was criticized for exorbitant declarations. In 2011, Stenden Hogeschool was criticized for granting bachelor's degrees, in violation of ministerial regulations, at its four international branch campuses. Windesheim Hogeschool was in the same year criticized for the quality of its journalism degrees. At the end of 2011, the Hogeschool van Amsterdam was confronted with accusations about the quality of the degrees of its school of economics and management. These were only some of the main scandals.

The main issues are the quality of the degrees—including accusations of diploma fraud, high dropout rates, and poor graduation rates. This negative perception of the current performance of Dutch universities of applied sciences should be understood in the context of reform of Dutch higher education and of the demands of the global knowledge society.

Like other European countries—such as, Austria, Belgium, Germany, and the Scandinavian countries—the Netherlands has a binary system of higher education, composed of research universities and universities of applied sciences. In comparison to the other countries, in the Netherlands the sector of universities of applied sciences is larger in the number of students and institutions than the 13 research universities. Of the 600,000 students in Dutch higher education, over 400,000 study at around 40 universities of applied sciences.

Mergers and Massification

Over the past two decades, the universities of applied sciences have gone through a merger process, in which the 400 institutions were reduced by 90 percent. The rationale behind this merger process was based on an increase in the number of students in this sector, instead of an expansion of the research universities, as to maintain the quality of academic education and to reduce its costs. The result has been that big conglomerates have emerged, several of them comprising over 30,000 students.

In the same period, the number of students doubled. Economics and management, 40 years ago a rather small discipline, are responsible for the largest growth (one-third of the total number of students), but all disciplines have faced a substantive increase.

Universities of applied sciences mainly provide undergraduate education, a four-year bachelor's degree program—leading to a bachelor's degree in business administration, nursing, and other fields. This sector differs from the three-year bachelor's degree program at the research universities—leading to a bachelor of arts or bachelor of science. Although the universities of applied sciences can develop master's degree programs, these must be self-funded and cannot compete with the subsidized and higher quality master's degree programs of the research universities and, as a result, are nearly nonexistent.

The main issues are the quality of the degrees—including accusations of diploma fraud, high dropout rates, and poor graduation rates.

Until the 1990s, the reputation of universities of applied sciences remained quite solid. They delivered graduates with an excellent professional training, provided by a teaching staff that was and still is to a large extent recruited from the professional field itself. In particular, in sectors in which there was and is no equivalent in the research universities (arts, nursing, social work, etc.), the programs continue to have a good national and even international reputation.

The merger process, in combination with the rapid increase in the number of students, is observed as the main reason why the sector is currently under pressure. These are certainly relevant factors, and the related increase of a central and middle management layer is an easy target for criticism. But probably more serious is the lack of innovation in the sector, over the past 20 years. The United Kingdom transferred the polytechnics into new universities; and in countries such as Germany, Denmark, and Norway, the universities of applied sciences invested in applied research, master's degree, and even PhD programs, as well as

in increasing the level of their teaching staff. In the Netherlands, the merger process and massification absorbed all energy, leaving little space for innovation. Only 50 percent of the teaching staff in Dutch universities of applied sciences have a master's degree and less than 3 percent have a PhD. This is quite different from Germany and Scandinavia, where most if not all teaching staff have a master's degree and the number of PhDs is between 20 and 40 percent. In 2001, it was decided to create professorships (*lectoren*) in Dutch universities of applied sciences and to develop applied research. However, their role and numbers are relatively small, and they are too isolated from the teaching and learning side to be effective.

Over the past two decades, the universities of applied sciences have gone through a merger process, in which the 400 institutions were reduced by 90 percent.

The Insufficiency of Educating Good Professionals

The professional field and the national accreditation agency ask increasingly for graduates who are not only good professionals but also more analytical and reflective—in other words, have more academic skills, in order to be able to operate in the global knowledge society. The curriculum and the teaching staff are not equipped for that. At the same time, the diversity in the student background, including an increasing number of second-generation immigrant students, is placing additional pressure on students. Dropout rates and extended durations of study have increased over the years. As a result, the universities of applied sciences face two conflicting pressures from government: to increase the number of graduates and to improve their quality. Also, program managers and teaching staff feel pressure from the university leadership to increase graduation rates, given that funding is based on the number of graduates. The tension between these two demands has resulted in an increasing number of media scandals, in particular claiming that programs have allowed students to graduate without proper qualifications, as to lift up the numbers.

Tension Between Higher Graduation Rates and Quality

On the one hand, program managers and teaching staff feel the pressure of letting students pass; on the other hand, they are pressured to pay more attention to academic skills, for which they are not trained. The leadership of universities of applied sciences and government are also under pressure to react to these incidents. Targets have been set for all teaching staff, in 2016, to have a master's degree—an ambitious if not impossible goal, as no time and funding exist to make that happen. Also, plans are underway to include more space in the curriculum for research and methodology, but this requires different types of skills of the teaching staff than is available.

In comparison with the universities of applied sciences in other countries, which earlier and more gradually have adapted to the requirements from the professional field, Dutch universities of applied sciences face a difficult time. It requires more time and funding than the government in the current economic climate can and will invest in modernizing the sector. The danger might be that the distance to research universities and to universities of applied sciences in other countries is increasing rather than decreasing, and this tendency might impact negatively the still strong reputation of several of their programs. The media scandals and accusations of diploma fraud, in most cases not sustained, are not helping; but the sector can also not ignore the serious quality issue, which is difficult to solve—due to years of ignoring to address the changes that the knowledge economy requires. ■

Restructuring the Irish Higher Education Landscape

Ellen Hazelkorn

Ellen Hazelkorn is vice president, research and enterprise, and dean of the Graduate Research School. She is also head, Higher Education Policy Research Unit, Dublin Institute of Technology, Ireland. E-mail: Ellen.hazelkorn@dit.ie.

Over the past 40 years, Ireland has experienced a remarkable transformation in fortunes. Its emergence from a protectionist preindustrial to a postindustrial high-tech economy came on the coattails of European Union membership and accelerating internationalization and deregulation of financial and investment markets. Strategically situated between the United States and Europe, Ireland became a leading importer of foreign direct investment. By 2000, it was the second-largest exporter of computer software in the world, after the United States, and home to the top-10 pharmaceutical companies. The boom years of the "Celtic Tiger" made it the poster child of globalization. After the

2008 global financial crisis, Ireland became the symbol of economic collapse, before being rescued by the "troika" of the International Monetary Fund, European Commission, and European Central Bank. Today, it is variously described as the great experiment or success story for austerity.

The expansion of Irish higher education reflects these changing dynamics. Until the crisis, the system had grown with minimum policy guidance or coordination. The exception was the government's rigid enforcement of the European binary model, with universities catering for classical education, and institutes of technology providing vocational-focused education with a strong emphasis on the region and small and medium-sized enterprises. There are a small number of other institutions, for-profit colleges, and an uncoordinated and unrecognized further education sector. Today, about 40 institutions cater for a total student population of 190,000—estimated to rise to over 250,000, by 2020.

Until recently, the primary focus has been on widening access. The introduction of free secondary education in 1967 drove the first wave of transformation. Higher education remained largely disconnected from other policy considerations until the 1990s, when rapid economic growth caused labor shortages and international competitiveness forced a new direction. The abolition in 1995 of tuition fees for all undergraduate students played another crucial role. Today, all policy documents and national strategies link higher education, the knowledge economy, and global competitiveness. While the government maintains its commitment to 72 percent participation, quality and excellence are the major drivers.

New Landscape

The *National Strategy for Irish Higher Education to 2030* (2011) made recommendations about inter alia, life-long learning, equality between full and part-time study modes, and internationalization. Controversially, the Higher Education Authority was given an enhanced role to drive change and modernization. All institutions would be subjected to greater oversight, through a strategic dialogue process and institutional contracts, while the twin objectives of rationalization and institutional diversity would create a few new Technological Universities, by merging larger institutions of technology.

This gap is currently being addressed. *Towards a Future Higher Education Landscape* (2012) sets out guiding principles and objectives for a "co-ordinated system of higher education," with an emphasis on mission distinctiveness. Given the financial and competitive pressures, no single institution is expected to cover all disciplines or research fields. The future system's differentiation will be based on qualifications level, discipline specialization, program orientation, regional engagement, student profile, mode of provision, and research intensity and specialization. Collaboration, alliances, and mergers are actively encouraged to reduce duplication and ensure better efficiency, value-for-money, and higher quality.

Until July 31, 2012, each higher education institution has to say how it fits into this new landscape, the distinctive role it will play, and whether it plans to merge with another institution. Institutions of technology wishing to be designated as a Technological University need to indicate their intentions. All proposals will be reviewed by an international panel—how individual strategic plans fit together to provide a range of programmatic and research missions—meet social and economic needs, demographic trends, and financial considerations. By the end of 2012, the Higher Education Authority will recommend a "blueprint" for Irish higher education, indicating numbers, types, and locations of institutions required over the next 10 to 20 years.

Collaboration, alliances, and mergers are actively encouraged to reduce duplication and ensure better efficiency, value-for-money, and higher quality.

Sustainability

Irish higher education is a public-funded system, and as everywhere, it is now under strain. Student numbers have risen sharply, due to demographic factors and loss of alternative employment opportunities; but state funding per student has decreased almost 20 percent, since 2007, to EUR 8,000. Each undergraduate student pays a "contribution," now EUR 2,000 per annum, up from EUR 900 in 2008, but due to increase to EUR 3,000 by 2015. There is a student grant system but no loan program. All postgraduates pay a tuition fee.

Sustainability is the biggest challenge. Only minor success has been achieved in finding alternative funding from philanthropic and commercial sources. Given likely further declines in public funding, it will be inadequate to meet anticipated demand to assure quality. The current government—responsible for the abolition of tuition fees in the 1990s—campaigned against their reintroduction in 2011. Various options are under consideration, including a higher contribution from families who can afford to pay, variegated fees for different programs, allowing institutions to set a market-based fee, restricting student numbers nationally or per institution, and expanding the role of private providers.

Prioritizing Research

Prior to 2000, Ireland had no national research policy, investment strategy, or international reputation in scientific research. Despite significant investments since then, it still spent only 1.2 percent of gross domestic product (public and private) on higher education, well below averages in many other countries. Nonetheless, by 2009, Ireland ranked 8th on the impact of research publications, within a group of 20 comparator countries. When the crisis hit, research funding was reduced by almost 30 percent between 2009 and 2010. Since then, the government has sought to preserve research and development funding.

A *Research Prioritization Exercise*, undertaken by the Department of Enterprise, Jobs and Innovation during 2010–2011, was tasked with defining a strategic framework for research funding and activity. While Science Foundation Ireland had targeted information and communications technology, biotechnology, and energy, other agencies encouraged a bottom-up approach. Essentially, the *Research Prioritization Exercise* marks the end of laissez-faire and building a broad base of expertise in favor of strong endorsement for a "more top-down, targeted approach" with an emphasis on research, which links directly to societal and economic needs.

After an extensive process, 14 priority areas plus 6 platform sciences and technology were selected. Each field was reviewed against 4 high-level criteria: association with large global markets in which Irish-based enterprise does/can realistically compete; public investment in research and development is necessary and can complement private-sector research; Ireland has objectively measured strengths; and the field represents a national or global challenge to which Ireland should respond. The arts, humanities, and social sciences received scant recognition—except as a "minority" as "research for knowledge" or "research for policy."

Research relevance is reinforced through a two-stage assessment process. Each proposal will be screened according to fitness with the priority areas, clarity of deliverables, and, where appropriate, end-user engagement. If successful, proposals will be assessed against excellence and originality, using international peer review. This will account for 80 percent of public competitive funding, to ensure consistency across agencies and programs.

Implications

While not unique, developments in Ireland represent a significant move toward greater government steerage of both higher education and the research system. Emphasis on performance of the system as-a-whole is admirable in a world obsessed with world-class universities, but it could cramp virtuous ambitions and institutional autonomy. Given limitations on the state's capacity to fund mass public higher education at a time of accelerating global competitiveness, the for-profit sector may provide relief but will alter the character of the system. Emphasis on research relevance with a focus on short-term job creation and innovation has implications for research and institutional structures, educational programs, and academic careers. It represents a significant shift from higher education as human capital development underpinning civil society, to being an arm of industrial policy. Some of these developments will positively encourage quality specialization rather than sheer comprehensiveness, but they could equally affect the breadth and balance across disciplinary provision and Ireland's attractiveness for international talent and investment. Again, Ireland offers an interesting case study. ■

NEW PUBLICATIONS

Allen, Walter R., Robert T. Teranishi, and Marguerite Bonous-Hammarth, eds. *As the World Turns: Implications of Global Shifts in Higher Education for Theory, Research, and Practice.* Bingley, UK: Emerald, 2012. 469 pp. $154.95 (hb). ISBN 978-1-78052-640-9.

A collection of essays on a range of themes relating to higher education, this volume features topics such as gender, success for black and Latino students in California, the political economy of higher education, and numerous others.

Berneman, David W., and Paul J. Yakoboski, eds. *Smart Leadership for Higher Education in Difficult Times.* Cheltenham, UK: Edward Elgar, 2011. 198 pp. $99.95 (hb). ISBN 978-1-84980-616-9. Web site: www.e-elgar.com.

A collection of essays by prominent American university presidents (and several other experts) on the challenges facing American higher education in the context of external pressure for change and economic difficulties, this volume focuses on several key issues. Among them are the challenge of access, the problems of change and reform, protecting faculty vitality, and others.

Delbanco, Andrew. *College: What It Was, Is, and Should Be.* Princeton, NJ: Princeton Univ. Press, 2012. 228 pp. $24.95 (hb). ISBN 978-0-691-13073-6. Web site: www.press.princeton.edu.

An argument for a return to the liberal arts goals of American collegiate higher education and an attack on the commercialization and vocationalization of the curriculum, this volume provides both a contemporary and historical perspective. While focusing on the United States, the broader themes are relevant elsewhere, particularly where there is a rethinking of purely vocational higher education.

News of the Center

Laura E. Rumbley has joined the Center as associate director. She will also be teaching several courses on international higher education. In addition to her work at Boston College, she serves as Web site content editor for the IREG Observatory on Academic Ranking and Excellence. Rumbley has recently edited a collection of essays that will serve as a first-ever "conversation starter" document for the annual conference of the European Association for International Education, to be held in Dublin in September. She has returned to BC after two years as the deputy director of the Academic Cooperation Association, in Brussels, Belgium.

Philip G. Altbach, Liz Reisberg, and Karen Arnold of the BC higher education program were on the faculty of a leadership training seminar sponsored by the University of Campinas in Brazil in July. The program was organized by Reisberg and colleagues at Campinas. The University of Campinas is the sponsor of the new Portuguese translated edition of *International Higher Education*. Altbach and Reisberg continue as members of the planning committee of the Riyadh international conference on higher education, to be held in Riyadh, Saudi Arabia, in April 2013. Altbach will present a keynote talk to the annual higher education summit, sponsored by the Federation of Indian Chambers of Commerce and Industry, in New Delhi, India, in November, and also at the India International Center. He will also be speaking at the Beijing Forum, in October.

A volume of Philip G. Altbach's writings about Indian higher education will be published by Sage Publishers in November, in recognition of his 50 years of research and commentary on this topic. *The Road to Academic Excellence,* coedited by Altbach and Jamil Salmi and published by the World Bank, has recently appeared in French, Chinese, and Korean editions, and a detailed summary has been published in Arabic. Altbach's *Leadership for World-Class Universities* will be published in a Chinese edition by the Renmin University Press, in November.

The Center's ongoing collaboration with the American Council on Education continues apace, with a second installment in the *International Briefs for Higher Education Leaders* series now in production. The focus of the newest *Briefs* is "Global Engagement: New Modalities" and will feature 10 to 12 short articles, focused on emerging trends and new strategies for global engagement. The articles' authors represent a wide range of institutional types, perspectives, and experience. A complementary webinar is scheduled for November 28, 2012.

In collaboration with the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development, the Center is due to host a small working conference at Boston College, on the subject of the role of research universities in developing and emerging economies.

Work with the National Research University–Higher School of Economics in Moscow on a new research project, focused on working conditions and career opportunities for new faculty members, is well under way. Authors from 10 different countries are currently developing national case studies to examine the situation of early career acacemics, and a project meeting is scheduled for mid-October in Moscow to advance this work.

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 notices 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.

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.

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